

"He knows more about the District's relationship with Congress than any other living human," said Tony Bullock, a spokesman for Anthony A. Williams (D), a former chief financial officer who became mayor.

Miconi's legacy includes the mundane and the landmark, both shaped by his tenacity in the face of bureaucratic resistance. After a 20-year battle with federal deadbeats, most notoriously the Pentagon, Miconi drafted a law a decade ago to force agencies to pay water bills on time through the Treasury, a measure that sends \$25 million a year to the D.C. Water and Sewer Authority.

After District police dismantled their helicopter unit in a cost-cutting move, Miconi helped find \$8.5 million in 1998 for the Interior Department's U.S. Park Police in Washington. He crusaded for district courts to use \$30 million as it was intended, for legal services for the indigent, before the courts were transferred to federal control in 1997.

He has done so while remaining in the background.

"The amazing thing about Mico Miconi is, you can spend 2½ hours in a meeting with him and not know what his position is. If he played poker, he'd be a millionaire many times over," Bullock said. "He doesn't forget anything, and he's very, very shrewd."

Miconi's departure follows the retirement of his longtime aide and sidekick, Mary Porter, a 40-year veteran of D.C. government and the Hill. Miconi said he plans to help with the transition to a new House staff before leaving. With a parting word of caution, he is optimistic about the District.

"As long as there's an independent chief financial officer, you won't have a control board come back," Miconi said. "I think the future is very bright."

#### CORRECTING THE RECORD

### HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, April 15, 2002*

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 24, just after we entered our spring recess, the New York Times Sunday magazine published a very interesting interview with Richard Holbrooke, who served as U.N. Ambassador during the Clinton administration. In a short interview, the questioner put several important questions and Ambassador gave very cogent answers. Because Ambassador Holbrooke effectively counters a good deal of mistaken argument in this relatively short

space, I ask that some of the remarks relevant to current policy disputes be printed here. Ambassador Holbrooke brings to some of our ongoing debates important perspective and a keen intelligence. In particular I commend to Members Ambassador Holbrooke's argument that with regard to the military effort in Afghanistan, "the military leadership in this country was essentially the same group of senior officers that served the previous administration. The military budget was the budget submitted by the Clinton administration. On the military side I think any President would have responded the same way." He then draws on his significant experience in dealing with the aftermath of a successful military effort to note, accurately, "the true test of a military action is the peace that follows it. Right now, because of the strict limits that the Pentagon has placed on the international peacekeeping force . . . the country is in extreme danger in falling back into the hands of warlords and drug lords and terrorists."

Furthermore, in his comment on foreign policy in general, Ambassador Holbrooke points out that "there are some people in Washington right now who are so hostile on a visceral level to what was done in the Clinton administration that they haven't looked at the successes of that time."

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to Ambassador Holbrooke for speaking out in ways that some will find controversial, but which are in fact lucid and persuasive, and very relevant to our current policy discussions.

*Question.* With all that has been happening in the world these days, has it been hard to sit on the sidelines?

*Answer.* There are plenty of times when you look at things and you say: "They did that well, or they should have done that differently. I might have done that differently." I think everyone second-guesses public officials, and people who have been in public affairs are more likely to do so. But it's not a healthy way to live. And those people who stand around and say, "I would have done it this way instead of that way" are going to waste their lives thinking about things that are too hypothetical.

*Question.* During the first few months of the war in Afghanistan, a log of people, including Democrats, said that they were surprised to find themselves feeling grateful that Bush had won, because no Democratic administration would have prosecuted this war as well as his administration has. Is there anything to that?

*Answer.* I've heard that from people, but I reject it completely. First of all, the mili-

tary leadership in this country was essentially the same group of senior officers that served the previous administration. The military budget was the budget submitted by the Clinton administration. On the military side, I think any President would have responded the same way. And we can win any military victory at any time at any place against any enemy in the world. But the true test of a military action is the peace that follows it. Right now, because of the strict limits that the Pentagon has placed on the international peacekeeping force—5,000 troops, no Americans, limited only to the capital city of Kabul—the country is in extreme danger of falling back into the hands of warlords and drug lords and terrorists. And if this happens, Afghanistan will once again become a sanctuary for attacks against the United States.

*Question.* So what advice would you offer to those in power now?

*Answer.* We should apply what we learned in the Balkans to Afghanistan. But there are some people in Washington right now who are so hostile on a visceral level to what was done in the Clinton administration that they haven't looked at the successes of that time. This was particularly evident in the Middle East, where they thought the president was too engaged, so they decided to be unengaged. Would the deterioration of the situation have occurred had the United States been more actively involved? I can't say, but it's hard to imagine the situation being more dangerous than it is today.

*Question.* Has the administration taken this military victory as a sign that it can afford to go it alone in general?

*Answer.* There are people in the administration who have made strange noises—atonal noises—that have a unilateralist component. If there are people who hold these views, they will come up against the harsh reality of the world, which is that not even the U.S. can go it alone.

*Question.* What about Milosevic? You have made it clear that you have admiration for his wiles, even if you deplore his principles. Now he's defending himself in the special tribunal. How has he been doing?

*Answer.* His performance has been what anyone who knows him would have predicted. He has a legal background, he's smart, he's tricky, he's very dangerous, he's in possession of many facts that he can twist to his own purposes. But I have no doubt that he belongs in The Hague, on trial, that he's responsible for the four wars of the Balkans. This is probably his final strut on the world stage, and the stage is getting smaller—it's no longer southeastern Europe; it's a courtroom.