

Thank goodness, I can come to the floor of the House and speak my piece. And as long as C-SPAN cameras are running, well, it will not be cut off, but I understand there is even an effort to try and limit C-SPAN's access to American households.

But I have to tell my colleagues something. As I saw the African Americans, mostly African American families ripped apart, I could only think about slavery, families ripped apart, herded into what looked like concentration camps. So I was reminded of a Miami Herald article written on July 5, the day after Freedom Day, 1987.

The title of the article was "Reagan Aides and the Secret Government," and here is a quote from that article: "A copy of the memo was obtained by the Herald. The scenario outlined in the Brinkerhoff memo resembles somewhat a paper Giufreda had written in 1970 at the Army War College in Carlyle, Pennsylvania, in which he advocated martial law in case of a national uprising by black militants." In which he advocated martial law in case of a national uprising by black militants. The paper also advocated the roundup and transfer of two "assembly centers or relocation camps of at least 21 million American Negroes."

Now, I did not write that; the U.S. Government wrote that. They were going to round up 21 million Negroes because they were afraid of freeing black people. A story of neglect? I am not surprised about any story of neglect of the people that comes from this body with this set of priorities, that passes these kinds of budgets on the backs of the American people, these kinds of tax cuts on the backs of the American people.

I want to commend my sister Congresswoman, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), who has said that it is time for us to get serious about poverty in this country. It is time for us to get serious. I am a proud cosponsor of legislation with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

I will just conclude by saying that on the United States State Department Web site is "How to identify misinformation." Does the story fit the pattern of a conspiracy theory?

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KING of Iowa). The Chair must remind the gentlewoman from Georgia that it is out of order in debate to ascribe unworthy motives to the President.

U.S. AGGRESSIVE INTERVENTIONISM POLICY IS MISGUIDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, many reasons have been given for why we fight and our youth must die in Iraq. The

reasons now given for why we must continue this war bear no resemblance to the reasons given to gain the support of the American people and the United States Congress prior to our invasion in March of 2003.

Before the war, we were told we faced an imminent threat to our national security from Saddam Hussein. This rationale, now proven grossly mistaken, has been changed. Now we are told we must honor the fallen by completing the mission. To do otherwise would demean the sacrifice of those who have died or been wounded.

Any lack of support for completing the mission is said by the promoters of the war to be unpatriotic, un-American, and detrimental to the troops. They insist the only way one can support the troops is to never waver on the policy of nation-building, no matter how ill-founded that policy may be. The obvious flaw in this argument is that the mission of which they so reverently speak has changed constantly from the very beginning.

Though most people think this war started in March of 2003, the seeds were sown many years before. The actual military conflict involving U.S. troops against Iraq began in January of 1991. The prelude to this actually goes back over 100 years when the value of Middle East oil was recognized by the industrialized West. Our use of troops to eject Saddam Hussein from Kuwait was the beginning of the current conflict with the Muslim fundamentalists who have been, for the last decade, determined to force the removal of American troops from all Muslim countries, especially the entire Arabian peninsula, which they consider holy. Though the strategic and historic reasons for our involvement in the Middle East are complex, the immediate reasons given in 2002 and 2003 for our invasion of Iraq were precise. The only problem is, they were not based on facts.

The desire by American policymakers to engineer regime change in Iraq had been smoldering since the first Persian Gulf conflict in 1991. This reflected a dramatic shift in our policy since, in the 1980s, we maintained a friendly alliance with Saddam Hussein as we assisted him in his war against our arch nemesis, the Iranian Ayatollah.

Most Americans ignore that we provided assistance to this ruthless dictator with biological and chemical weapon technologies. We heard no complaints in the 1980s about his treatment of the Kurds and the Shiites or the ruthless war he waged against Iran. Our policy toward Iraq played a major role in convincing Saddam Hussein he had free reign in the Middle East, and the results demonstrate the serious shortcomings of our foreign policy of interventionism that we have followed now for over 100 years.

In 1998, Congress capitulated to the desires of the previous administration and overwhelmingly passed the Iraq Liberation Act, which stated quite

clearly that our policy was to get rid of Saddam Hussein. This act made it official, quote: "The policy of the United States is to support efforts to remove the regime headed by Saddam Hussein." This resolution has been cited on numerous occasions by neoconservatives as justification for the preemptive and deliberate invasion of Iraq.

When the resolution was debated, I saw it as a significant step toward a war that would bear no good fruit. No legitimate national security concerns were cited for this dramatic and serious shift in policy.

Shortly after the new administration took office in January 2001, this goal of eliminating Saddam Hussein quickly morphed into a policy of remaking the entire Middle East, starting with regime change in Iraq. This aggressive interventionist policy surprised some people, since the victorious 2000 campaign indicated we should pursue a foreign policy of humility, no nation-building, reduce deployment of troops overseas, and a rejection of the notion that we serve as the world's policeman.

□ 1915

The 9/11 disaster proved a catalyst to push for invading Iraq and restructuring the entire Middle East. Though the plan had existed for years, it quickly was recognized that the fear engendered by the 9/11 attacks could be used to mobilize the American people and Congress to support this war.

Nevertheless, supposedly legitimate reasons had to be given for the already planned preemptive war; and as we now know, the intelligence had to be fixed to the policy.

Immediately after 9/11, the American people were led to believe that Saddam Hussein somehow was responsible for the attacks. The fact that Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden were enemies, not friends, was kept from the public by a compliant media and the lazy Congress. Even today many Americans still are convinced of an alliance between the two.

The truth is Saddam Hussein never permitted al Qaeda into Iraq out of fear that his secular government would be challenged. And yet, today, we find that al Qaeda is now very much present in Iraq and causing chaos there.

The administration repeatedly pumped out alarming propaganda that Saddam Hussein was a threat to us with his weapons of mass destruction, meaning nuclear, biological and chemical. Since we helped Saddam Hussein obtain biological and chemical weapons in the 1980s, we assumed that he had maintained a large supply, which, of course, turned out not to be true. The people being frightened by 9/11 easily accepted these fear-mongering charges.

Behind the scenes many were quite aware that Israel's influence on our foreign policy played a role. She had argued for years along with the neoconservatives for an Iraq regime change. This support was nicely coordinated with the Christian-Zionist enthusiasm for the war.