

power which constitutes the greatest threat to Israel" and that a division of Iraq "into provinces along ethnic/religious lines . . . is possible. So three (or more) states will exist around the three major cities: Basra, Baghdad and Mosul, and Shiite areas in the south will separate from the Sunni and Kurdish north."

Critics and political commentators agree that the neoconservatives are obsessed with a grand design to militarize the globe and globalize fear. Knowledgeable observers, however, acknowledge that the core of the neoconservatives' thinking revolves around the Middle East and the role of Israel. Unlike Bush, the neoconservatives harbour the belief that freedom for the Arab people, prosperity, and cultural renaissance are a threat to Israeli security and vitality. It is for this reason that neoconservatives make a powerful argument for creating instability and chaos in the Middle East. This was well expressed by Michael Ledeen former US undersecretary of state and a leading neoconservative, when he stated: "Stability is an unworthy American mission, and a misleading concept to boot. We do not want stability in Iran, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, and even Saudi Arabia; we want things to change. The real issue is not whether, but how to destabilize."

Indeed, the neoconservatives have been exceptionally successful in promoting four primary propositions:

1. The welfare of American people and the prestige of the US in the world are contingent upon the ability to dominate the world and especially the Middle East.

2. The U.S. invasion of and military presence in Iraq ensures American safety, security and world peace.

3. The U.S. goals coincide with Israeli goals. Therefore, the invasion of Iraq served the interests of both countries.

4. The Arab people are inherently anti-American and a threat to American interests. Thus, the presence of American forces in the region is an imperative necessity and is essential for world peace.

Neoconservative thinkers Lawrence Kaplan and William Kristol assert in their book, *The War over Iraq*, that the decision about what course to take in dealing with Iraq, "is about more even than the future of the Middle East and the war on terror. It is about what sort of role the United States intends to play in the world in the 21st century." They argue that the only plausible and sensible mission is to persistently apply American might in these parts of the world that constitute a threat to American interests and foresee Iraq as a starting stage; the "mission begins in Baghdad, but it does not end there."

The mission, as Michael Ledeen defines it, is to ensure the total submission of the people in the region. He stated in 2001, "we will not be sated until we have had the blood of every miserable little tyrant in the Middle East . . . and every last drooling anti-Semitic and anti-American mullah, imam, sheik, and ayatollah is either singing the praises of the United States of America or pumping gasoline for a dime a gallon on an American military base near the Arctic Circle."

From the beginning, the neoconservatives viewed the invasion of Iraq either as a staging ground for their perpetual war or securing its instability. While the introduction of economic sanctions against Iraq in August 1990 and the subsequent attack in 1991 along with the presence of an oppressive regime have tremendously weakened Iraq and demoralised its people, it was the invasion in March 2003 that enabled the neoconservatives to directly manage Iraqi affairs and put their vision into practice.

Contrary to their claim of nation-building in Iraq and nurturing democratic institutions, the neoconservatives have made sure that every effort must be made to prevent the Iraqis from exercising their rights to run their own country and establish an open and free country. When General Jay Garner attempted, in early 2003, to allow Iraqis to chart their own destiny, he was immediately replaced. His successor, Paul Bremer, closely followed the neoconservatives' agenda.

The Israeli newspaper Haaretz reported (June 3, 2005) that the occupational authority has institutionalised corruption. The corruption has paralysed the economy and fostered the creation of dysfunctional institutions. This, along with the ever rising new trend of terrorism, constitutes a threat to Iraq's social fabric. Indeed, a growing number of Iraqis question the virtue of the decision taken by the occupational authority in mid-2003 to dissolve the Iraqi border police and leave the Iraqi borders open for extremists. The Iraqis also question the reluctance of the occupational forces to train the newly-established Iraqi army and police and supply them with adequate weapons to defend themselves and their country.

In a radical but alarming move, the neoconservatives have espoused a sectarian and ethnic policy in conducting government and political affairs in Iraq. The policy is contrary to America's officially pronounced goal of nation building and constitutes a formidable obstacle to Bush's vision of a democratic and unified Iraq. In fact, the policy has devastating consequences and may lead to the ruin of Iraq. It should be mentioned that, in practice, Saddam Hussein espoused a sectarian and racial outlook after 1978. But this was never acknowledged as a guiding principle and was disliked by the majority of the population.

In Bush's second term, the neoconservatives appear to have secured undisputed domination in designing American foreign policy. They have situated themselves at the core of the three primary agencies responsible for foreign affairs: The National Security Council, and the state and defence departments. With the presence of Ambassador Zalmay Khalilzad in Baghdad, the neoconservatives are positioned to pursue their vision for Iraq with zeal, confidence, and energy.

Middle East experts and responsible international observers make a strong point that the neoconservatives are progressing with unexpected ease in translating their vision for Iraq into practical steps, which will eventually change the fate of Iraq profoundly. In particular, the neoconservatives have strengthened and widened their network of influence well beyond their traditional allies (e.g. Ahmed Chalabi, Masood Barzani, Barhem Saleh, Ayhem Al Samarai, Meshaan Al Jabory, Moufaq Al Rebuye, etc.) and include powerful individuals and newly emerging organizations inside and outside Iraq that actively promote and espouse the neoconservative design for fragmenting Iraq and creating semi-independent sectarian/ethnic units in place.

The presence of terrorism and extremism in Iraq is a development that accompanies the occupation. Its threat is real with predictable consequences, especially the sudden and mass exodus of whatever is left of the middle class. Nevertheless, once the Iraqis are free and are in charge of their destiny, they will more likely be able to uproot terrorism and extremism. The kindling and institutionalisation of sectarian and ethnic discord, however, have unpredictable and frightening consequences. For many decades sectarianism and racial discrimination were almost alien concepts for the majority of Iraqis. Since the invasion, sectarian and di-

visional ethnic terminologies have become conspicuously common in daily political discourse.

Regardless of the outcome of the ongoing debate concerning the constitution, the neoconservatives have already inflicted damage to the fabric of Iraqi society.

Fragmenting Iraq and kindling sectarian/ethnic discords are weapons of cultural and national destruction, a menace to civilization. They represent a threat to American interests and to regional stability. More importantly, they evidence a purposeful activation of the clash of civilizations.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 11:00 a.m. on account of Hurricane Rita-related issues in the district.

Mr. HINOJOSA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of Hurricane Rita-related issues in the district.

Mr. KIND (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for September 20 and 21 and after 3:00 p.m. today on account of a death in the family.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today after 3:00 p.m. on account of attending a funeral.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCHIFF) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WOLF) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, September 27.

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, September 27 and 29.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and to include extraneous material, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$3,224.