

after that meeting, this same bin Laden operative was in the United States inquiring how one goes about renting a crop duster. So the obvious next step in the war on terrorism is the elimination of Saddam Hussein's tyrannical terrorist regime.

Just as the United States teamed up with determined Afghans who were ready, willing and able to overthrow the Taliban with American support, there are Iraqis ready to overthrow Saddam. But taking the war to Saddam will be no easy task. We must accept the probability that many of the nations rallying around us today will be nowhere to be found. Indeed, some are likely to scream and yell and stomp their feet, demanding "evidence" of Iraq's involvement in the September 11 attacks. It is then that President Bush must patiently remind them that the war on terrorism is a war against all terrorists who threaten America, regardless of whether they bombed the World Trade Towers, sought to murder a former President of the United States, or threaten our people with nuclear, chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction.

We must proceed against Saddam with the same resolve with which we have proceeded against the Taliban in Afghanistan. Once the world sees two terrorist regimes in rubble, I suspect that support for international terrorism will dry up pretty quickly. Dictators will begin to understand that waging a war by proxy against the United States carries deadly consequences.

While we prosecute the war on terrorism to its logical conclusion, we must, at the same time, begin preparing for the next threats to America—threats which could be quite different from those we face today. The next challenge we face may come from a rogue state armed with ballistic missiles capable of reaching New York or Los Angeles. It may come from cyber-terrorists who seek to cripple our nation and our economy by attacking our vital information networks. It may come from a country that has developed small "killer satellites" capable of attacking our space infrastructure, on which both our defense and our economy depend. Or it may come from a traditional state-on-state war, such as a Chinese invasion of Taiwan. In any event, it is essential that we begin preparing now for all of these possibilities, by developing defenses against a wide range of asymmetric threats.

DISTINGUISHING FRIENDS FROM ENEMIES

We must also look realistically at who our potential adversaries could be in the decades ahead. For example, Communist China—a nation with no respect for human rights, for religious freedom, or for the rule of law—remains both a present and an emerging threat to the United States. Its annual double-digit increases in military spending, its virulent anti-American propaganda, and its aggressive arms acquisitions are all very clear indications that China fully intends to become a superpower—and, when it is able, to seek regional hegemony in Asia and threaten our democratic friends on Taiwan. Moreover, China has for years exported dangerous missile technology to Pakistan—support that, according to the Director of Central Intelligence, continues today unabated. China has also supplied chemical weapons-related equipment and technology to Iran. And earlier this year, U.S. and British war planes had to destroy fiber-optic cables that had been laid by Chinese firms in Iraq, as part of Saddam Hussein's ever-improving air defense infrastructure.

Today, China is a thorn in our side. We must make sure that, as China rises, it does not become a dagger at our throat. Nor is China by any means the only nation that could one day threaten us. Countries like

Iran, Syria, Sudan, North Korea and Cuba continue to provide aid, comfort and refuge to terrorist elements that wish to harm the United States, and several of them are seeking weapons of mass destruction and the means to deliver them.

In times of war, the enemy of our enemy is often our friend. During World War II, Churchill explained his wartime alliance with Stalin this way: "If Hitler invaded Hell," Churchill said, "I would make at least a favorable reference to the Devil in the House of Commons." But let us not forget what happened in the aftermath of World War II, when the Soviet Union went from wartime ally to Cold War adversary. We must be careful that, in our zeal to build the coalition against terrorism, we do not mistakenly turn a blind eye to the true nature of certain regimes whose long-term interests and intentions remain contrary to ours.

Of course we must, and should, take the opportunity to reach out to nations that are willing to step up and take concrete steps to help us in the fight against terror. Not for several generations has the geopolitical map of the world been so much in flux, as a variety of countries decide how to respond to the events of September 11 and to President Bush's ultimatum that "either you are with us or you are with the terrorists." President Bush is certainly to be commended for the rapid transformation of our relationship with Russia, whose long-term interests clearly lie with the West. President Putin seems to have seized September 11 as an opportunity to align Russia more closely with the United States, and he should be encouraged in this regard. But we must proceed with care. For example: The idea of giving Russia a decision-making role within NATO—including a veto over certain Alliance decisions (as NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson suggested the other day)—is absurd. Russia still has much to prove before being given de facto membership in the Atlantic Alliance.

We must make clear—as President Bush has made clear—that we want closer cooperation with Russia and a new relationship that puts Cold War animosities behind us. But in building that relationship, we must stand firmly behind our intention to build and deploy ballistic missile defenses. If the United States and Russia are to establish a new strategic relationship based on trust, cooperation, and mutual interests, then Russia must recognize that such missile defenses, in protecting the United States and our allies from mutual adversaries, will enhance the security of both nations in today's new and dangerous world.

MORAL FOUNDATIONS OF SECURITY

America is indeed the greatest nation on the face of the earth, a beacon of freedom for the entire world. We have met tremendous challenges to our freedom before September 11 and defeated them. We will do so again, but in the long run, the greatest emerging threat to America may not come from without, but rather from within. As I have said often during my years in public life, we will not long survive as a nation unless and until we restore the moral and spiritual principles that made America great in the first place.

On September 11, 4,000 innocent Americans were killed by a foreign enemy. The American people responded with shock, sadness, and a deep and righteous anger—and rightly so. Yet let us not forget that every passing day in our country almost 4,000 innocent Americans are killed at the hands of so-called doctors, who rip those little ones from their mothers' wombs. These are the most innocent Americans of all—small, helpless, defenseless babies. For unborn Americans, every day is September 11.

America was attacked by terrorists on September 11 because of what America stands for—our dedication to life, liberty and justice under God. As we defend those principles abroad, let us also renew them here at home. As we go after the terrorists who committed those unspeakable acts against our people, let us, at the same time, get about the task of restoring our nation's moral and spiritual foundations. No matter how successfully we prosecute the war against terrorism—no matter how brilliantly we prepare for the threats of the future—we will never be truly secure if we do not return to the principles on which America was founded, and which made America great.

This is already taking place. In the wake of September 11, flags are flying and church pews are overflowing. This great patriotic and spiritual outpouring is proof that the terrorists' plans have backfired. They thought that their attacks would frighten and divide us; instead they have drawn us closer to God—and to each other. We must encourage this spiritual rebirth, and nurture it so that it becomes another Great Awakening. We must instill in our young people an understanding that theirs is a nation founded by Providence to serve as a shining city on a hill—a light to the nations, spreading the good news of God's gift of human freedom.

Thank you, God bless you, and, as Ronald Reagan always said, God bless America!

THE RECENT ELECTIONS IN ZAMBIA

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today to express concern over the outcome of the presidential elections last month in Zambia. A number of African states will hold important elections this year, the results of which could shape the governance and prosperity of the continent for years to come. Unfortunately, several troubling aspects of the Zambian elections demonstrate the need for a more concerted international effort to demand democratic accountability and transparency in many African states.

The Movement for Multiparty Democracy's candidate for President of Zambia, Levy Mwanawasa, was inaugurated on January 2 as the new President, after claiming a very narrow victory in general elections held on December 27. As the handpicked successor of outgoing president Frederick Chiluba, Mwanawasa approached the contest from an advantaged institutional position and ran against a divided opposition. But polls leading up to the election predicted that Anderson Mazoka, a prominent business executive, would win, or that the race would at least be exceptionally close.

Unfortunately election monitoring reports from the Carter Center, the European Union and national nongovernmental organizations suggest that the balloting may have been marred by fraud. There are credible reports of tabulation irregularities and voter intimidation. Those reports corroborate claims made by the opposition parties themselves. The Carter Center has issued a statement expressing serious concern over the reports of irregularities in the tabulation process, although they have not been able to

verify those irregularities independently. At minimum, it seems clear that the elections were characterized by highly troubling inconsistencies and exceptionally poor management.

Equal consideration must also be given to alarming pre-election reports. An assessment conducted by the Carter Center immediately prior to the voting concluded that some steps taken by Zambian authorities in the pre-election period "handicapped the opposition, created barriers to civil society participation and disenfranchised many voters." Reports of intimidation and the misuse of state resources by government officials undermined the credibility of the ruling party's campaign. At the same time, the Carter Center estimated that only 2.6 million out of an eligible 4.6 million citizens were registered to vote. In part, this low level of registration related to difficulties in obtaining national registration cards. But prolonged uncertainty about the election date, followed by the selection of a date in the middle of the rainy season and during a common holiday travel period also complicated the administration of the elections and lowered participation in certain regions. And the failure of President Chiluba to declare an official holiday on the date of the elections prevented some workers from waiting in long lines that day to vote.

The mismanaged December elections have led to protests in Zambia, although it is a testament to the Zambian people's desire for a genuinely democratic state, governed by the rule of law, that the protests have not exploded into more destabilizing violence. Turning to the courts, the opposition is expected to lodge a full appeal to the Supreme Court. The high court in Lusaka dismissed an earlier opposition petition, declaring that Zambian law required that such petitions be filed after the winning candidate assumed office. But most legal professionals note that the judiciary remains weak and that it will be exceptionally difficult to overturn any election results now that the results have been certified.

In the meantime, the United States and the rest of the international community must work with the Zambian advocates of democracy as they seek credible political options that might resolve the current crisis. Some influential voices are calling for the creation of an independent commission to review the election. That is one option that the United States could support, particularly if the courts are unable or unwilling to resolve the dispute. But any attempt by the United States to help mediate the impasse must be transparent and must have as its goal the inauguration of a Zambian government that responds to the will, and the needs, of the Zambian electorate. And above all, the United States must stand firm in defending the right of the opposition to speak out, and to contest the election results through legal

means. Unfortunately, in his first days after assuming the presidency, Mr. Mwanawasa has demonstrated an ominous reluctance to tolerate opposition politics, and he has publicly warned the opposition against taking any additional steps to contest the results.

A peaceful and credible resolution to election disputes is essential. Without the confidence of the Zambian people, the President of that country will find it difficult, if not impossible, to address the country's precipitous social decline, which has been nudged along by a worsening economic climate, widespread corruption and a massive HIV/AIDS epidemic in a country where the average income is only about one dollar a day. Once the election dispute is resolved, the United States will have to work closely with the legitimate government of Zambia to help address this growing humanitarian crisis.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO MICKEY MIANO

• Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today with sorrow and profound respect to honor the life of Michael "Mickey" Miano, a Connecticut institution and personal friend who passed away earlier this month, just 2 months shy of his 96th birthday.

By trade, Mickey was a restaurateur and businessman, but that doesn't begin to describe the depth of his influence on Connecticut's capital city or the State that was his home. Anyone who wanted to understand Hartford's social and political life in a glance needed only to visit Mickey in his restaurant or in the office of one of the many other businesses he ran over the course of his life. He was a political leader without political office—a man who understood that communities are held together not by government but by the private citizens who live, work, own homes, and raise their families in them.

Mickey came to this country from Italy at age 6 in 1912, left school after the fifth grade to work in the tobacco fields, later joined the merchant marines, and then went into business. His life's trajectory exemplified the rise of a whole generation of Italian-American immigrants, and immigrants of every nationality throughout American history. The fact that Mickey had an uphill climb did not slow his ascent one bit. By age 30, he was well on his way to being a force in Connecticut politics, earning it all through his hard work and the power of his personality. Mickey's place in the history of Connecticut politics is secure. It was an attempt to secure that place that led me to include him in two books I wrote about Connecticut politics earlier in my own life.

And over the years that followed, as more people came to learn how generous he was in spirit and how committed he was to improving his city

and state, he grew more and more instrumental in Connecticut's political life, and my home State grew more and more indebted to him.

I was privileged to have Mickey as a friend. Despite many attempts to draft him into official public service, Mickey never ran for political office—perhaps because he understood that in America, there's no greater honor or privilege than an active and caring private citizen. That is what he was: a grassroots leader who cared about the common good and got results. I know that his optimism and patriotism will continue to inspire all those who knew him as long as we live. I ask to print the following tribute to his life by Tom Condon, another good guy who also happens to write for the Hartford Courant, in the RECORD.

The tribute follows:

[From the Hartford Courant, Jan. 16, 2002]

MICKEY MIANO DIES AT 95

RESTAURATEUR HELPED DEFINE AN ERA IN CITY POLITICS

(By Tom Condon)

Michael "Mickey" Miano, restaurateur, businessman and an enduring figure in Hartford politics for much of the last century, died last weekend, two months shy of his 96th birthday.

Miano, street-savvy and stylishly stout, feisty and flamboyant, got his start in politics at age 9, handing out fliers for Woodrow Wilson in the 1916 election. He gained local prominence in the rough-and-tumble world of East Side politics in the 1930s.

He was part of the first generation of Italian American politicians to gain power in the city, a group that included such figures as Anthony Zazzaro, Rocco Pallotti, Joseph Fauliso and Dominick DeLucco.

Miano declined many requests to run for office, preferring the behind-the-scenes neighborhood and committee work where a job, a favor or a remembered birthday translated into votes and power. He was so good at it that even in his 80s, when he'd lost a step and his influence had waned, politicians still stopped at his memento-filled Franklin Avenue office to pay homage. "You don't want him against you," then-State Rep. Anthony Palermino told a reporter.

He was a soft touch for a favor, but if a situation called for a firm hand, Miano provided it. As a precinct moderator in 1933, he twice settled disputes with his dukes. But he could also be a diplomat.

His East Side restaurant, Mickey's Villanova, was the hot spot for politicians and reporters in the World War II years. Shortly after a bruising municipal election in 1943, heads of the three factions that had been fighting it out all appeared at Mickey's. Miano tactfully seated them in different corners of the restaurant, and shuttled back and forth until each group was buying drinks for the others.

Miano was born in Sicily and came to this country at age 6 in 1912. He left school after the fifth grade to work in the tobacco fields. After a stint in the merchant marine he came back to Hartford and went into a remarkable number of businesses in the next 70-plus years.

He sold wholesale grapes, drove a fruit wagon, brought the circus to town, promoted fights, ran a nightclub and finally got into the restaurant business. Mickey's Villanova, on Market Street, was central to the political action in a way that Frank's, Scoler's and Carbone's would later be. During the war, Bob Steele, Willie Pep and others broadcast to American troops from the restaurant.