

this drilling is done and you have the layers of Marcellus, and I think you only fracture maybe 18 inches, perhaps, from that horizontal pipeline, so you haven't permeated the entire Marcellus shale, and that is encased with a layer of perhaps hundreds of yards thick, hundreds of feet thick, at a minimum, of limestone. The geology is very, very—it's almost—you never say "never," but it's impossible in order to get that what would be called migration for that fluid to move outside.

Mr. REED. I believe the chart identifies what we're talking about here. We're talking the aquifer up here within 1,000 feet of the surface. Mostly, in our area, I know the water table is at about 500 feet, maybe 200 feet, people are putting their wells into those aquifers. And we're talking 6,000 feet, 8,000 feet.

I think this chart demonstrates it fairly accurately that we've got a ton of material, literally material, that is protecting this formation and that area down there from our aquifer. And I think that that concern is a legitimate concern, but because of the oversight and the ability of our local agencies to do their job, in my opinion, I think they can handle it appropriately and that Mother Nature will protect that aquifer from the development of this.

I think the standards of how these wells go in need to be enforced, and that means that the type of cement, both the steel that's used and even, as importantly, the cement casing that's utilized to make sure that it's of a high quality and to make sure that it's put in a way and tested so that there are no air pockets, there are no quick pathways somehow for migration to occur through the casing, and that is all done in a very high quality way with a lot of quality controls. That's where the oversight is important.

In Pennsylvania, again, I come back and put a lot of trust in the Department of Environmental Protection. There's a lot of folks on the other side that would be opposed to this. And I don't like to really promote anything, especially this, but there was a film series called "GASLAND." Let me just share with you some thoughts from John Hanger.

Who is John Hanger? John Hanger used to be the head of an environmental group, and he became the secretary of the Department of Environmental Protection in Pennsylvania. And Secretary Hanger did a great job. He was concerned about the environment. He had an environmental record that was tough. He said that "GASLAND" is "fundamentally dishonest" and "deliberately false presentation for dramatic effect." He called the producer of that a propagandist because of the way the information was presented.

Again, it comes back to how we started this. This is an important thing to have a debate on. But make the debate on fact and science, not on myth and emotion.

And there were pictures of fire-spewing faucets that have been repeatedly found to be the result, frankly, of naturally occurring methane migration. People that drill their shallow wells for water, unfortunately, where they tend to drill, they sometimes drill them into methane pockets, naturally existing ones. I saw a picture yesterday of a gentleman farmer from Colorado, and it was a pretty cool picture because it showed a large flame in the middle of a river, but it was from a naturally occurring methane pocket. It had nothing to do with mining. It had nothing to do with drilling. But it was, again, naturally occurring. It had nothing to do with fracking.

The Colorado Oil and Gas Conservation Commission reviewed the specific location of the film numerous times and remarked "dissolved methane in well water appears to be biogenic"—that is, naturally occurring in origin—"and there are no indications of oil and gas impacts to the well water."

The Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture has confirmed that there have been no confirmed cases of threatened animal health in Pennsylvania, because, obviously, a lot of this occurs on our farms.

I would tell you that the Marcellus gas has saved more dairy farms in my district than probably anything else in the past couple years when dairy farmers were losing an average of \$100 per cow per month, based on the fact that the Federal Government prices milk, and it is such a flawed system that this really has been a blessing for our farmers. I have a few farmers running around on new John Deeres, or whatever their choice of tractors are, for the first time in their lives, actually. And so it's been a really good thing so that we don't lose our farms.

We are losing our agriculture acreage at an alarming rate even on a daily basis across this country, but in Pennsylvania, there has been a blessing that has helped to keep that land in production. There's a little bit of a disturbance, a small site for drilling, but once the rigs all go away and you have just that wellhead that you look at in the insert on the poster board there, you can farm around that.

Mr. REED. I hope we can have this conversation many more times as we go forth and bring forth science and data on these issues. The operation, when it originally comes in and the development of the well site does require some industrial-type activity. I do recognize that, and I think my colleague would recognize that. But, again, I believe you said 90 days is the estimated period of time for that development to occur.

I hear the Speaker giving us the sign that our time is up. I do thank my colleagues for joining me tonight, and I thank the Speaker for the opportunity to be here tonight.

□ 1720

#### FISCAL CHOICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSS of Florida). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to come to the floor of the House of Representatives this afternoon to join some of my colleagues on the Democratic side of the Budget Committee to talk about choices. You know, government is all about choosing. It is setting priorities, and it is choosing what we are going to spend the people's money for, how much we are going to ask the people to pay to the government, and how we are going to spend those dollars. It is all about choosing.

It is also about values. This week, this issue of choices is playing itself out in two arenas in government, one in the continuing resolution battle that took place on this floor this afternoon, the idea that we have to figure out how to fund the government for the rest of this fiscal year ending September 30, and whether or not we are willing to let the government shut down tomorrow night because of the choices that we either make or refuse to make. And it is also playing itself out now in the development of the budget for the following fiscal year, 2012.

Yesterday in the Budget Committee, we considered the budget proposal offered by Chairman RYAN and the Republicans that offered some very stark choices for the American people. They are similar to the choices that we have been debating week after week after week for the last couple of months about how we are going to fund the government for the rest of the year.

From the Democratic perspective, at least I know from my perspective, the reason I have not been willing to support the Republican versions of the continuing resolutions that have come to this floor is that they make choices which don't seem very fair to me. They don't seem to represent the values that this country has always embraced, the values of fairness and justice and the idea that we are all in this great journey together and that we are trying to create a country that works for everybody and not just for a very few.

Today, the Republicans brought to the floor a continuing resolution to fund the government for one more week. These are the choices they made as to what we should cut in order to avoid shutting the government down: they wanted to eliminate \$143 million for school lunch assistance programs; \$187 million for education for the disadvantaged programs, school improvement funds, education innovative improvement programs, and adult education. It cuts the WIC program, nutrition for low-income families, women and their children; the Office of National Drug Control Policy. They want

to cut \$495 million from FEMA's first responder program.

All these things they wanted to cut; and yet when you ask them whether they want to have other people, the wealthiest people, the big corporations, the people who have done very well in this country over the last couple of decades, if you ask them, why don't we make them share some of the burden of balancing this budget, they say: Oh, no, we can't do that. We can't do that.

Let me just illustrate with this chart one of the choices that they made in the 2012 budget proposal. They chose to include, refused to eliminate, \$800 billion in tax cuts for the wealthiest 2 percent of Americans, and instead cut \$771 billion from Medicaid over the next 10 years. This was a choice.

Do we want to make sure that our senior citizens have access to nursing homes, that our disabled population has access to assisted living facilities and home care? Our young, low-income, poor families, do we want to make sure that they have health care? Or do we want to make sure that the wealthiest 2 percent of Americans continue to have their cake and eat it, too? Their choice in the budget and in the continuing resolution is to let those wealthiest Americans have their cake and eat it, too, and let the most vulnerable segments of society pay the price of helping to balance the budget.

I am a big fan of political cartoons, and today's cartoon in *The Washington Post* I think said it all, because one of the other proposals that the Republicans made in their 2012 budget proposal was not just to maintain the tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans, but to increase them. They want to cut the maximum tax rate from 35 percent, which was the rate that it was cut to by the Bush administration, they wanted to cut it even further to 25 percent. In other words, a 10 percent additional tax cut for the wealthiest Americans.

As a matter of fact, I offered an amendment in the hearing to rescind the Bush tax cut for only those people making over \$1 million a year, only those people making over \$1 million a year. They voted it down unanimously.

But here is the cartoon by Tom Toles in *The Washington Post*. It has, and I won't name him, but a Republican member of the Budget Committee, offering a platter that says "More Tax Cuts for Wealthy." And the "Truly Rich Guy" says: "Stop!! I can't eat another bite!" And the Republican says: "Sorry, everybody has to share the pain."

This is one of the choices we have. It is stark: again, tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans, or health care, education, nutrition for the other 90 percent of the American people who have not done so well.

So as we move through this process of choosing both how we are going to fund the government until September 30 and how we're going to fund it into the future, the American people need

to know whose side the Republican majority is on and whose side the Democrats are on.

With that, I yield to my colleague, a member of the Budget Committee from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. I thank you, Representative YARMUTH, and thank you for leading the next 30 minutes of discussion here which I think are very critical to the lives of Americans, the American public and American working families across our Nation.

It is an honor to serve with you on our Budget Committee as we spent countless hours yesterday dealing with a saga of a budget for 2012. Just as we're trying to avoid a shutdown of America's government this very hour, they are also pushing through in a rather rushed format a 2012 fiscal plan that takes the pain and suffering of the 2011 plan and expands it exponentially. They grow it drastically, the pain for 2012.

As you indicated, these are choices that we have before us. I believe firmly that our budgets, whatever level—Federal, State, local—are a reflection of our values, our principles, our priorities. That's where we are now, whether we are trying to avoid a shutdown for the 2011 fiscal year which is looming over us, or whether we are putting together the 2012 fiscal plan. It is about priorities and values and principles that we hold near and dear. It is also a statement on an economic agenda.

I have before me here this chart that speaks about the 1.8 million jobs that have been added since last year, since 2010; 1.8 million private sector jobs. You can see the precipitous drop that came with the red ink of the close of the Bush recession. And then early in 2009, we began to recover. We stopped the bleeding of the recession, and it has been a slow but steady and upward and forward climb as we have introduced new jobs into the private sector arena that allows us to now work away at those 8.2 million jobs that were lost during the Bush recession.

Why we would want to stop that progress is beyond me; but those are the cuts that will be made here in the 2011 scenario, by which we are attempting to avoid a shutdown, and the 2012 budget where there are cuts to R&D and to science and technology.

I served as president and CEO of NYSERDA, the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, prior to coming here a couple of years ago. I saw firsthand what science and tech means in terms of job growth and expanding the opportunities.

□ 1730

And so these cuts that are part of the 2011 plan and the 2012 budget that we're dealing with in double-dose fashion will mean tremendous pain for our middle class families.

We need to commit to a jobs agenda. The people told Democrats and Republicans alike in campaign season it's about jobs, jobs, jobs, and the econ-

omy. It's not about growing another pricetag, draining our economy with the cost of a shutdown. We need to avoid that shutdown.

One of the concerns yesterday when we were meeting on the 2012 budget format was—my concern, your concern, our concern as Democrats on that Budget Committee—to avoid the end of Medicare. This plan, introduced by our Republicans on the Budget Committee, is called the "roadmap." And I said it's a road to ruin for our middle class, for our working families. They want to end Medicare, a system that has worked for over 40 years for 46 million Americans. And what does it do? It shifts risk from government over to the senior citizen. It asks the senior citizen to dig deep into the pocket, and then every year dig deeper.

They are already suggesting that the beneficiaries' costs will more than double by the year 2022 and then more than triple by the year 2030. Is this what we're about? Are these our values? Are these our principles? Are these our priorities? I would say boldly, no, they are not. They are not. And senior citizens are already getting wind of this idea, and they are supporting our efforts to stop the end to Medicare, which is part of the format that they have introduced, part of the legislation they have introduced for their budget for 2012.

We failed in that attempt. You and I supported it—GWEN MOORE has joined us I see. We all supported that push to end their desire to end Medicare. We failed with it, and that will be coming to a vote before the full House I think next week.

So these are the things that people need to be alerted to. These are the issues that are going to be tough for middle class America to assume for the poor, the working poor, for the masses out there. And when we see the concentration of wealth and all the benefits and all the focus being in just the upper echelon, we understand what their choices are. Their choices are different than ours—they're with Big Oil, they're with big banks, they're with special interests, they're with millionaires, billionaires. They're with handouts to the oil companies that are sitting on record profits of over \$1 trillion. We're there with the middle class families, the working families, making certain that we create jobs, retain jobs, and keep this pattern of activity going.

Thank you, Representative YARMUTH, for bringing us together for what I think is an urgent, urgent dialogue that needs to reach every household in America.

Mr. YARMUTH. I appreciate the comments from the gentleman from New York and thank him for his work on the Budget Committee as well, and standing up for all Americans as we try to recover from the greatest economic crisis we've had since the Great Depression 80 years ago.

I forgot to mention one thing earlier when I was talking about the proposal to raise the taxes of people making

over \$1 million a year back to the Clinton-era tax levels. And what's interesting about those Clinton-era tax levels, when the highest rate was 39.6 percent, during that time, 20.8 million jobs were created in the United States in the private sector. Then came the Bush tax cuts and took the maximum level tax to 35 percent; 653,000 jobs lost in the private sector.

I know it seems counterintuitive because the mythology has grown out there that when you lower taxes, it stimulates economic activity. The reality is quite different: 39.6 rate, 20.8 million jobs created; cut it to 35 percent, 653,000 jobs lost.

What about annual growth rates? Again, during the Clinton years when the high rate was 39.6, 3.9 percent real GDP growth over that period. When 35 percent, 2.1 percent real GDP growth. So the reality is that lower tax rates do not necessarily equate with better growth or more jobs. What they do equate with is a continuing separation of the very wealthiest Americans from everybody else.

Over the last 30 years, the percentage of all the income earned in the country by the top 1 percent has gone from 9 percent to 33 percent; 33 percent of all the income earned in this country goes to the top 1 percent. They make more and they own more than the bottom 90 percent of the people in this country.

So all we're saying is, we know that everybody is going to have to share in this sacrifice to try and get our fiscal house in order, but we're only asking the most vulnerable people to share. The people who have been doing the best in this country, we're not asking them to even have a little bit of an inconvenience.

And someone who can speak so articulately and passionately about the wrong choice that the Republicans are making is someone who has come from that world, who lives with that world every day, who represents the great city of Milwaukee, our colleague, GWEN MOORE.

I would like to yield to her now.

Ms. MOORE. Thank you for yielding, gentleman, and thank you for putting together this Special Order.

I can tell you that it has been very distressing to watch the progress of this budget being put together for the American people. And part of the distress I think is because of the sort of psychological warfare that is being committed here. I think that the Orwellian way that the budget is being presented—it's being presented as we have got to make draconian cuts in the budget in order to heal our fledgling economy, and especially, we have to so-called "reform" our entitlements programs in order to maintain them for the future.

There has been a call for an adult conversation about this, a call for the facts and for the truth, and no accounting gimmicks and no gimmickry in this discussion of reforming entitlement programs. Democrats are admon-

ished not to scare seniors with entitlement reform and to demagogue the issue, and yet what we have seen from the Republicans are these fire engine red colorful charts warning us of the burden that the aging baby boomers will impose upon the hapless taxpayer unless we adopt the so-called austere "path to prosperity," which ends the entitlement to Medicaid, caps those benefits, which turns Medicare into a voucher—so-called "premium supports"—and which gives instruction to the Ways and Means Committee to privatize or to fix Social Security.

Now experts have told us, even though the Republican Budget Committee has told us that Medicare and Medicaid are driving the budget deficits and that they are the cause of this huge, tremendous debt, experts across the spectrum have told us that the real problem with health care costs is the growth of health care in the private market. We have seen health care costs double, in double digits, increase by double digits every single year. We have seen private health insurance premiums increase, double within the last 20 years. And so it doesn't matter whether you're a Medicaid recipient, whether you are a double recipient—a Medicare recipient who is also using Medicaid because you're in a nursing home. It doesn't matter if you're a large corporation, Harley Davidson or Xerox Corporation. It doesn't matter if you're a small business operator. It doesn't matter if you're someone who is on the individual market looking for insurance. Nobody can afford to fuel these profits for pharmaceutical companies, \$20 million annual salaries for insurance executives, and all of the other giveaways to wealthy insurance companies.

Medicare was overpaying insurance companies by 14 percent until we enacted the Affordable Care Act. We cannot afford, in Medicare part D, the prescription drug program, we simply cannot afford to have a program where Medicare pays pharmaceutical companies for a large group—like Medicare recipients—and then not negotiate the drug prices as they would with any group. I mean, there are companies, large corporations with a much smaller pool of employees that benefit from negotiating for the group, and the law that the Republicans passed, the Medicare part D, doesn't allow those negotiations. These are easy fixes. These are easy fixes that could reap us billions of dollars in savings.

Social Security. Social Security. There is some very low-hanging fruit if people would want to come to the table and negotiate in good faith to create a solvent situation for Social Security well beyond the baby boomer years. We could raise payroll taxes beyond the \$106,800 cap that is now in place.

□ 1740

But, of course, our Republican colleagues have an aversion, as the gentleman has pointed out, of shared sac-

rifice. No one who earns money and who has reaped the benefits of this great American economy should be asked to pay taxes. Who should be made to pay taxes? Those suffering working class, middle class folks.

The gentleman has shared with us earlier in his chart where they're proposing to lower the top tax rate by 10 points, down from 35 percent to 25 percent. Yet they claim that this is a budget-neutral act.

Well, come on now. You know, I don't have a degree from the Wharton School of Economics, but I can tell you that if it's budget neutral and we're still going to receive those revenues, then that must mean that somebody else is going to pay the taxes. Am I wrong about that?

I would like to ask the gentleman.

Mr. YARMUTH. You're absolutely right. If we're going to be revenue neutral and we're going to cut the taxes of some people, then other people are going to have to pay more. And, unfortunately, in this particular proposal, it's going to be the people who can afford it the least.

I thank the gentlelady for her contributions.

I want to welcome another colleague from the Budget Committee, ALLYSON SCHWARTZ from Pennsylvania, who has been instrumental in developing the Affordable Care Act as a member of the Ways and Means Committee in the last Congress and the Budget Committee and who now serves as a very prominent member of the Budget Committee.

I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Thank you very much. I'm pleased to participate in their conversation, and I just want to make a few comments, and then maybe we can talk further about really what the Republicans proposed in their budget.

We sit on the Budget Committee. We went through 12 hours in what we call here in Congress a markup, but really it was a debate and a real reflection on the contrast between what the Republicans are offering to the American people and the way to tackle what are very, very serious financial problems for the country. I think we all agree that they're serious, that we have to make sure that we take seriously the deficit and bring down the deficit over time and be able to get to a balanced budget at some point and begin to pay down the national debt. We all agree on that.

The real issue here is how do we do it? What are the choices we are making? What's on the table for discussion? And we offered up a number of suggestions and ways that we might take some of the money—you've talked about this already before I got here, about the tax breaks for the wealthiest 2 percent of Americans, the tax subsidies for the five largest oil and gas companies. We're talking about literally hundreds of billions of dollars here, that instead they have chosen to

protect those subsidies and those tax breaks and instead to make real cuts in what we believe are some real priorities for us. So budgets are all about choices and priorities.

I want to particularly talk about not just the spending cuts and where else we might be able to take spending cuts. We're interested in everything being on the table and looking at the Department of Defense, for example, which some Republicans agreed with us on.

But one of the changes that they are making—and many of us refer to this as the Ryan budget, but right now it is actually the Republican budget. This is no longer your colleague from Wisconsin's ideas, but it is really the Republican budget that was passed. It was announced by the Republicans last night and will be on the floor potentially next week. And there are dramatic changes for our seniors in this country. Dramatic changes.

We have said to our seniors and our future seniors that when you get to be 65, there's going to be security for you in terms of payment for your health care. They have changed that for future seniors. There will no longer be guaranteed benefits for future seniors. They will instead be offered a voucher. It will not be the whole cost of buying private insurance. They have said that. It will be support for the premium, not the whole thing. And then seniors will have to go—and I think PAUL RYAN mentioned this yesterday—shopping in the insurance marketplace for the best insurance they can get.

When I think about that, maybe that sounds okay. You know, you go shopping. You've got a voucher in your pocket. It sounds like a coupon. You can go to the store, and you're going to be able to get 80 percent of costs paid.

However, this is health insurance, and what we already know is that the insurance industry was not inclined, before the Affordable Care Act, to cover insurance for sick people. They didn't want to cover sick kids. We had to pass a law that said you can't discriminate against children. You have to let them buy health insurance and cover that illness. And they certainly don't want to cover sick adults.

Well, when I go talk to a group of seniors, and I can be at a senior center or any number of places we've all visited as Members of Congress, and we'll have a group of 50, 100 people, and I ask, Do any of you take any medications?

And they all laugh: Of course, I take medication.

Do any of you take two prescription medications?

Of course.

Do any of you take three or four?

These are a healthy group of seniors. They look healthy to me. You know, they're out and about and they're listening to a Member of Congress. And I ask, Well, how are you going to go out and buy insurance that's going to be affordable for you?

What we know and what seniors tell us is that they know that if they go to

a voucher program and they're no longer guaranteed, they will no longer have guaranteed benefits, that their voucher will become less helpful over time as expenses go up, that there will be no controls on how their taxpayer dollars will be used.

So let me just close, if I may, by saying that seniors know that privatizing Medicare—and that's what this is, it's privatizing Medicare—will limit their benefits, will be obstacles to care and on certain reimbursements, that copayments for primary care or copayments for specialty care could be quite significant, that there could be exclusions for certain services that they need, that there could be discrimination based on income and age and illness, and there's more uncertainty if they face a serious illness going forward.

So I just wanted to show two charts that maybe we will want to talk about as we go forward. One of them is, to just follow up on what I said about choices, here we are faced with a choice that the Republicans have made, which is to give tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans. It's going to cost about \$800 billion, and instead they are going to dismantle—this is the case of Medicaid, which is really about seniors in nursing homes, frail elderly in nursing homes, costing about \$771 billion. That's a decision they've made.

We can talk more about how we've bent the cost curve, if we can use that language, on Medicare. We have already taken some serious action.

I'm happy to have further conversation with my colleagues about what this Republican budget means to seniors across this country.

Mr. YARMUTH. Thank you.

I would like to yield again to Mr. TONKO, who has another illustration he wants to give us.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative YARMUTH.

I will do this quickly because I know time is ticking away.

We all mentioned the concern about Medicare and how they're going to privatize it. Well, here it is, the end to Medicare. This is the buyer beware chart. This shows the Republican proposal in 2022 dollars and the Medicare model in 2022 dollars. And the voucher simply isn't going to cover much. They're suggesting 32 percent. So that leaves a \$12,500 price tag to be assumed by—you guessed it—the senior. Dig into your pocket. Under the current Medicare model, it leaves you with a \$6,150 price tag.

□ 1750

So it's going to more than double the commitment from the senior citizen. This is the "buyer beware" chart. The happy shopping spree isn't so happy. Representative YARMUTH, I just wanted to point that out. The bar graph shows it plain and simple: buyer beware.

This is an attack on middle class America. It's an attack on the system that has worked well for so many dec-

ades, and certainly it is a priority that is not ours. It is theirs. We are for the working families of this country, and we will continue to fight that fight.

Mr. YARMUTH. Again, a perfect illustration of the choices that we face as a country as we move forward over the next decades.

We know we have fiscal problems. We know we have very difficult choices. The Republicans have chosen to put the cost of balancing the budget on seniors, on low-income families, on working families, and to completely spare oil companies, millionaires and billionaires, hedge fund managers, and anyone else who has made the most of America, who has done the best, and who needs the least help. The Republicans leave them without any role to play.

Just in the few seconds remaining, I would like to ask Representative MOORE if she has any closing comments.

Ms. MOORE. I think that budgeting is not just about numbers and figures; it's about values.

I think that the Republicans have made it very, very clear that they want limited government. They particularly don't want government enriching the lives of individuals. You would think that they would want to protect some things that are not individual things, like clean air, clean water, food safety protection, but they are eviscerating all of these programs as well: research for cancer, the creation of green energy jobs, the Community Development Block Grant programs.

Mr. YARMUTH. I want to thank my colleagues from the Budget Committee for joining me, and thanks to the American people for paying attention to this very important process we are in now.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### THE U.S. CONSTITUTION AND THE FUNDING OF U.S. ARMED FORCES IN THE FACE OF A GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PEARCE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is a pleasure to address the House tonight and to talk about the issues that are burning across the country. Before I get into the economic discussions, my colleagues from across the aisle, my good friends, have brought up many things that are worthy of discussion. Before I get into that, I'd like to talk a bit about our Constitution.

I think that, if we as a Republic are not aware of the importance of the Constitution, then we tend to diminish it; we tend to walk away from it; we tend to not give it the credibility that it deserves, and that is highly risky for every one of us but especially for those people with very little or no status.