

derives from international consensus. This is not only a moral absurdity. It is injurious to the U.S., because it undermines any future ability of the U.S. to act unilaterally, if necessary.

The key point I want to make about the new unilateralism is that we have to be guided by our own independent judgment, both about our own interests and about global interests. This is true especially on questions of national security, war making, and freedom of action in the deployment of power. America should neither defer nor contract out such decision-making, particularly when the concessions involve permanent structural constrictions, such as those imposed by the International Criminal Court. Should we exercise prudence? Yes. There is no need to act the superpower in East Timor or Bosnia, as there is in Afghanistan or in Iraq. There is no need to act the superpower on steel tariffs, as there is on missile defense.

The prudent exercise of power calls for occasional concessions on non-vital issues, if only to maintain some psychological goodwill. There's no need for gratuitous high-handedness or arrogance. We shouldn't, however, delude ourselves as to what psychological goodwill can buy. Countries will cooperate with us first out of their own self-interest, and second out of the need and desire to cultivate good relations with the world's unipolar power. Warm feelings are a distant third.

After the attack on the USS *Cole*, Yemen did everything it could to stymie the American investigation. It lifted not a finger to suppress terrorism at home, and this was under an American administration that was obsessively multilateralist and accommodating. Yet today, under the most unilateralist American administration in memory, Yemen has decided to assist in the war on terrorism. This was not the result of a sudden attack of Yemeni goodwill, or of a quick re-reading of the Federalist Papers. It was a result of the war in Afghanistan, which concentrated the mind of recalcitrant states on the price of non-cooperation.

Coalitions are not made by superpowers going begging hat in hand; they are made by asserting a position and inviting others to join. What even pragmatic realists fail to understand is that unilateralism is the high road to multilateralism. It was when the first President Bush said that the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait would not stand, and made it clear that he was prepared to act alone if necessary, that he created the Gulf War coalition.

AMERICA'S SPECIAL ROLE

Of course, unilateralism does not mean seeking to act alone. One acts in concert with others when possible. It simply means that one will not allow oneself to be held hostage to others. No one would reject Security Council support for war on Iraq or for any other action. The question is what to do if, at the end of the day, the Security Council or the international community refuses to back us? Do we allow ourselves to be dictated to on issues of vital national interest? The answer has to be "no," not just because we are being willful, but because we have a special role, a special place in the world today, and therefore a special responsibility.

Let me give you an interesting example of specialness that attaches to another nation. During the 1997 negotiations in Oslo over the land mine treaty, when just about the entire Western world was campaigning for a land mine ban, one of the holdouts was Finland. The Finnish prime minister found himself scolded by his Scandinavian neighbors for stubbornly refusing to sign on the ban. Finally, having had enough, he noted tartly that being foursquare in favor of banning

land mines was a "very convenient" pose for those neighbors who "want Finland to be their land mine."

In many parts of the world, a thin line of American GIs is the land mine. The main reason that the U.S. opposed the land mine treaty is that we need them in places like the DMZ in Korea. Sweden and Canada and France do not have to worry about an invasion from North Korea killing thousands of their soldiers. We do. Therefore, as the unipolar power and as the guarantor of peace in places where Swedes do not tread, we need weapons that others do not. Being uniquely situated in the world, we cannot afford the empty platitudes of allies not quite candid enough to admit that they live under the protection of American power. In the end, we have no alternative but to be unilateralist. Multilateralism becomes either an exercise in futility or a cover for inaction.

The futility of it is important to understand. The entire beginning of the unipolar age was a time when this country, led by the Clinton administration, eschewed unilateralism and pursued multilateralism with a vengeance. Indeed, the principal diplomatic activity of the U.S. for eight years was the pursuit of a dizzying array of universal treaties: the comprehensive test ban treaty, the chemical weapons convention, the biological weapons convention, Kyoto and, of course, land mines.

In 1997, the Senate passed a chemical weapons convention that even its proponents admitted was useless and unenforceable. The argument for it was that everyone else had signed it and that failure to ratify would leave us isolated. To which we ought to say: So what? Isolation in the name of a principle, in the name of our own security, in the name of rationality is an honorable position.

Multilateralism is at root a cover for inaction. Ask yourself why those who are so strenuously opposed to taking action against Iraq are also so strenuously in favor of requiring U.N. support. The reason is that they see the U.N. as a way to stop America in its tracks. They know that for ten years the Security Council did nothing about Iraq; indeed, it worked assiduously to weaken sanctions and inspections. It was only when President Bush threatened unilateral action that the U.N. took any action and stirred itself to pass a resolution. The virtue of unilateralism is not just that it allows action. It forces action.

I return to the point I made earlier. The way to build a coalition is to be prepared to act alone. The reason that President Bush has been able and will continue to be able to assemble a coalition on Iraq is that the Turks, the Kuwaitis and others in the region will understand that we are prepared to act alone if necessary. In the end, the real division between unilateralists and multilateralists is not really about partnerships or about means or about methods. It is about ends.

We have never faced a greater threat than we do today, living in a world of weapons of mass destruction of unimaginable power. The divide before us, between unilateralism and multilateralism, is at the end of the day a divide between action and inaction. Now is the time for action, unilaterally if necessary.

HONORING CINDY DWYER ON HER RETIREMENT

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise today to call to attention of all Senators, the retirement of a dedicated public servant and an individual who has given much to the operation of four

Senate offices. Cindy Dwyer, a member of my staff for the past 2½ years, will be ending her career as a staff person in the Senate. As the scheduler in my Washington, DC, Senate office, Cindy has been a model for other dedicated and talented staff members to emulate, and an invaluable asset to everyone who had the honor of working with her. It is with deep regret I announce she will be leaving my office and the Senate in February.

Before coming to Washington, Cindy worked as a kindergarten teacher in Wakonda, SD. In 1975, she began her congressional career in the office of former South Dakota Senator James Abourezk. She worked as a staff assistant in Senator Abourezk's office, and also a part-time employee of the Senate's post office.

After Senator Abourezk's retirement in 1978, Cindy joined the staff of then-Congressman TOM DASCHLE, in his first term as a Member of the House of Representatives serving South Dakota. It was during that time that Cindy began her long and distinguished career as a scheduler for Members of Congress.

Cindy worked as a consultant for several years before rejoining Congressman DASCHLE's staff in 1985. She went on to become Senator DASCHLE's first Senate press secretary when he was elected to the Senate in 1987. She worked for our South Dakota colleague for another 1½ years, before leaving to work for another of our colleagues, Senator J. Robert Kerrey of Nebraska. For 12 years, from 1988–2000, she worked for Senator Kerrey, first on his campaign, and later as a senior member of his staff and a very integral member of the Kerrey team. I have been told that little occurred in Bob Kerrey's office that Cindy wasn't involved with. As one of Senator Kerrey's closest and trusted advisers, she was responsible for helping to execute the very strong record of service that Senator Kerrey delivered for his Nebraska constituents.

While I regretted Senator Kerrey's retirement from the Senate in 2000, his departure turned out to be my good fortune, because it was at that point in time that I had the fortune of working with Cindy. I needed to hire an experienced scheduler, and Cindy Dwyer was that answer. To show Cindy's dedication to the Senate and the Senators with whom she has served, she undertook a herculean effort by working in both offices. For a period of time in 2000, she continued to work with Senator Kerrey, helping to wind down his final few months of Senate service, and began working in my office as my scheduler. Very few staff members could have undertaken the responsibilities that Cindy did, working well beyond a normal workweek, even by Senate standards, to provide service to two Senators.

During her 2½ years of service, Cindy helped to organize the day to day activities of my office and my schedule. The efficiency and organization of my

office is a direct result of her hard work and preparation. She is not only a valuable member of my staff, but a great friend. Her friendly demeanor and willingness to go above and beyond the call of duty have made her a popular figure in my office and throughout the Senate.

Some have suggested that Cindy gets her political roots from her family. Her father, Gene Dwyer, still works as a staff assistant in Senator DASCHLE's Sioux Falls office. Her sister and brother-in-law, Peter and Barbara Stavrianos, have distinguished careers working for Senators McGovern, Abourezk, and DASCHLE.

Cindy will be greatly missed, and Barbara and I wish her the very best on all her future endeavors. It is an honor for me to share Cindy's accomplishments with my colleagues and to publicly commend her outstanding service to my office and the people of South Dakota.

ROWAN ANTON CRAIG

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I rise to let my fellow Senators know of a very happy addition to my family.

On December 22, at 3:05 in the afternoon, my daughter-in-law, Stephanie Craig, with the help of her husband, our son Michael, and our grandson Aidan, gave birth to our newest grandchild, a beautiful baby boy named Rowan Anton Craig. He came in bigger than his older brother at 8 pounds, 9 ounces and 21 inches long.

At 3:15 that same afternoon, my wife Suzanne and I watched our new grandbaby being weighed and measured and swaddled, and we got to hold this bundle of life. What a thrill to be there in the first few minutes of his life.

His middle name, Anton, comes from his great-grandfather on his mother's side of the family. Anton was the patron saint of animals, so we expect to share with him our love of animals, along with many other experiences.

Let me thank my colleagues for your indulgence in letting me share with all of you one of the most unique experiences in my life, a wonderful Christmas present: a new grandchild in our family.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

COL. EDWIN D. STRICKFADEN

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise today to ask the Senate to join me in honoring the retirement of Col. Edwin D. Strickfaden, director of the Idaho State Police. Colonel Strickfaden retired on December 31, 2002, after faithfully serving the citizens of Idaho for 35 years. I join with many Idahoans in recognizing Colonel Strickfaden's career as a sterling example of dedication to public safety and service to others.

Enormous is the debt owed by us to the men and women who work in law enforcement, who, every day put their

lives on the line to defend the rights and liberties we enjoy. Colonel Strickfaden exemplifies the sacrifices made by these exceptional people. He is deserving of our respect and honor as he concludes his distinguished career.

Edwin D. Strickfaden's career with the Idaho State Police began in 1967 at the conclusion of 4 years of service to his country in the U.S. Air Force. He started with the Idaho State Police serving at the King Hill Port-of-Entry facility in King Hill, ID. He was made officer-in-charge of the facility in 1969. A year later, he was again promoted and assigned to the District Two office in Lewiston. In all, Colonel Strickfaden served in six offices of the Idaho State Police throughout Idaho, in three of them as commander. The year's many changes and transfers afforded him vast experience in all aspects of Idaho law enforcement and many opportunities to serve the people of Idaho.

One of many salient moments that defined Mr. Strickfaden's distinguished career is a time when he dove into the icy December waters of the Clearwater River to rescue a woman from a submerged vehicle, an action given special recognition by then-Governor Cecil Andrus. This action typified the courage and dedication he was known for throughout his 35-year career.

The invaluable knowledge and experience that Colonel Strickfaden gained through many years of service became critical in 1998 when he was asked to serve as director of the Department of Law Enforcement. Under Colonel Strickfaden's leadership, the former Department of Law Enforcement and State Police were combined into a single agency. The new Idaho State Police has become an effective organization with numerous successes in the war on drugs and other enforcement issues in Idaho. True to this mission, Idaho has experienced a decline in illegal drug use since Colonel Strickfaden served as director of the Idaho State Police. Without the effective work of the Idaho State Police, our ability to live in a safe and secure environment would be compromised. Colonel Strickfaden's tireless efforts have helped reach the goal of making Idaho a safe and secure environment for all of its residents.

As he enters a new phase of his life, I know my Senate colleagues will join me in thanking Colonel Strickfaden on his distinguished career as an Idaho State Police Officer and wish him every success in his future endeavors.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the

United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

PERIODIC REPORT ON THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE WESTERN BALKANS THAT WAS DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13219—PM 2

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), I transmit herewith a 6-month report prepared by my Administration on the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001.

GEORGE W. BUSH,
THE WHITE HOUSE, January 29, 2003.

REPORT ON ARMENIA, AZERBAIJAN, KAZAKHSTAN, MOLDOVA, THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, TAJIKISTAN, TURKMENISTAN, UKRAINE, AND UZBEKISTAN INDICATING THE CONTINUED COMPLIANCE OF THESE COUNTRIES WITH INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS CONCERNING FREEDOM OF EMIGRATION—PM 3

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

On September 21, 1994, then-President Clinton determined and reported to the Congress that the Russian Federation was not in violation of paragraphs (1), (2), or (3) of subsection 402(a) of the Trade Act of 1974, or paragraphs (1), (2), or (3), of subsection 409(a) of the Act. On June 3, 1997, he also determined and reported to the Congress that Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine were not in violation of the same provisions, and made an identical determination on December 5, 1997, with respect to Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan. These actions allowed for the continuation of normal trade relations for these countries and certain other activities without the requirement of an annual waiver.

On June 29, 2000, pursuant to section 302(b) of Public Law 106-200, then-President Clinton determined that title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 should no