

left it exposed, for all the world to see," to the many writers, activists, and leaders who counted him as a mentor and inspiration.

He was a good friend of my parents, Thomas and Grace Dodd, and one of Connecticut's best-known native sons. I was especially proud to see him in attendance at the dedication of the Thomas J. Dodd Library in Storrs; like my father, Bill Buckley was a dedicated foe of totalitarianism in all its forms.

In the wake of his death, tributes have risen from left and right and from every point in between. Even those who stood against Bill's staunch conservatism respected his intellectual rigor and integrity. In the inaugural issue of *National Review*, which Bill launched in 1955 at the age of 30, he wrote this: "Our political economy and our high-energy industry run on large, general principles, on ideas—not by day-to-day guess work, expedients and improvisations. Ideas have to go into exchange to become or remain operative; and the medium of such exchange is the printed word." It was that commitment to ideas, to reasoned and courteous debate, that we appreciated most in Bill and that we will miss most.

His intellectual honesty spared neither himself nor his friends. When he changed his mind—as he did on civil rights, on Vietnam, and on Iraq—he did it publicly and forthrightly. And long after the movement he founded took on a life of its own, Bill continued to hold it to his high standards and to call it to account. In his last years, he wrote: "Conservatives pride themselves on resisting change, which is as it should be. But intelligent deference to tradition and stability can evolve into intellectual sloth and moral fanaticism, as when conservatives simply decline to look up from dogma because the effort to raise their heads and reconsider is too great."

Bill resisted dogma, not because it was often wrong but because it was always lazy. He was too energetic for that. And while he pioneered new thinking, worked to rid the conservative movement of xenophobia, and even staged a quixotic run for mayor of New York City—asked what he would do if elected, he replied: "Demand a recount!"—he developed a one-of-a-kind prose style and public persona. "I am lapidary but not eristic when I use big words," he said. Those are my thoughts exactly.

Bill Buckley lived a full life, devoted to words, to ideas, and to his deeply-held principles. We didn't agree on much. But given his grace, his wit, and his deep erudition, I can think of few people with whom disagreement was so agreeable.

I request unanimous consent that the attached article, "May We Not Lose His Kind," be printed in the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

[From the *Wall Street Journal*, Feb. 29, 2008]

MAY WE NOT LOSE HIS KIND

(By Peggy Noonan)

He was *sui generis*, wasn't he? The complete American original, a national treasure, a man whose energy was a kind of optimism, and whose attitude toward life, even when things seemed to others bleak, was summed up in something he said to a friend: "Despair is a mortal sin."

I am not sure conservatives feel despair at Bill Buckley's leaving—he was 82 and had done great work in a lifetime filled with pleasure—but I know they, and many others, are sad, and shaken somehow. On Wednesday, after word came that he had left us, in a television studio where I'd gone to try and speak of some of his greatness, a celebrated liberal academic looked at me stricken, and said he'd just heard the news. "I can't imagine a world without Bill Buckley in it," he said. I said, "Oh, that is exactly it."

It is. What a space he filled.

It is commonplace to say that Bill Buckley brought American conservatism into the mainstream. That's not quite how I see it. To me he came along in the middle of the last century and reminded demoralized American conservatism that it existed. That it was real, that it was in fact a majority political entity, and that it was inherently mainstream. This was after the serious drubbing inflicted by Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal and the rise of modern liberalism. Modern liberalism at that point was a real something, a palpable movement formed by FDR and continued by others. Opposing it was . . . what exactly? Robert Taft? The ghost of Calvin Coolidge? Buckley said in effect, Well, there's something known as American conservatism, though it does not even call itself that. It's been calling itself "voting Republican" or "not liking the New Deal." But it is a very American approach to life, and it has to do with knowing that the government is not your master, that America is good, that freedom is good and must be defended, and communism is very, very bad.

He explained, remoralized, brought together those who saw it as he did, and began the process whereby American conservatism came to know itself again. And he did it primarily through a magazine, which he with no modesty decided was going to be the central and most important organ of resurgent conservatism. *National Review* would be highly literate, philosophical, witty, of the moment, with an élan, a teasing quality that made you feel you didn't just get a subscription, you joined something. You entered a world of thought.

I thought it beautiful and inspiring that he was open to, eager for, friendships from all sides, that even though he cared passionately about political questions, politics was not all, cannot be all, that people can be liked for their essence, for their humor and good nature and intelligence, for their attitude toward life itself. He and his wife, Pat, were friends with lefties and righties, from *National Review* to the *Paris Review*. It was moving too that his interests were so broad, that he could go from an appreciation of the metaphors of Norman Mailer to essays on classical music to an extended debate with his beloved friend the actor David Niven on the best brands of peanut butters. When I saw him last he was in a conversation with the historian Paul Johnson on the relative merits of the work of the artist Raeburn.

His broad-gaugedness, his refusal to be limited, seemed to me a reflection in part of a central conservative tenet, as famously expressed by Samuel Johnson. "How small of all that human hearts endure / That part which laws or kings can cause or cure." When you have it right about laws and

kings, and what life is, then your politics become grounded in the facts of life. And once they are grounded, you don't have to hold to them so desperately. You can relax and have fun. Just because you're serious doesn't mean you're grim.

Buckley was a one-man refutation of Hollywood's idea of a conservative. He was rising in the 1950s and early '60s, and Hollywood's idea of a conservative was still Mr. Potter, the nasty old man of "It's a Wonderful Life," who would make a world of grubby Pottersvilles if he could, who cared only about money and the joy of bullying idealists. Bill Buckley's persona, as the first famous conservative of the modern media age, said no to all that. Conservatives are brilliant, capacious, full of delight at the world and full of mischief, too. That's what he was. He upended old clichés.

This was no small thing, changing this template. Ronald Reagan was the other who changed it, by being a sunny man, a happy one. They were friends, admired each other, had two separate and complementary roles. Reagan was in the game of winning votes, of persuading, of leading a political movement that catapulted him to two terms as governor of California, the nation's biggest state, at a time when conservatives were seemingly on the defensive but in retrospect were rising to new heights. He would speak to normal people and persuade them of the efficacy of conservative solutions to pressing problems. Buckley's job was not reaching on-the-ground voters, or reaching voters at all, and his attitude toward his abilities in that area was reflected in his merry answer when asked what he would do if he won the mayoralty of New York. "Demand a recount," he famously replied. His role was speaking to those thirsting for a coherent worldview, for an intellectual and moral attitude grounded in truth. He provided intellectual ballast. Inspired in part by him, voters went on to support Reagan. Both could have existed without the other, but Buckley's work would have been less satisfying, less realized, without Reagan and his presidency, and Reagan's leadership would have been more difficult, and also somehow less satisfying, without Buckley.

I share here a fear. It is not that the conservative movement is ending, that Bill's death is the period on a long chapter. The house he helped build had—has—many mansions. Conservatism will endure if it is rooted in truth, and in the truths of life. It is.

It is rather that with the loss of Bill Buckley we are, as a nation, losing not only a great man. When Jackie Onassis died, a friend of mine who knew her called me and said, with such woe, "Oh, we are losing her kind." He meant the elegant, the cultivated, the refined. I thought of this with Bill's passing, that we are losing his kind—people who were deeply, broadly educated in great universities when they taught deeply and broadly, who held deep views of life and the world and art and all the things that make life more delicious and more meaningful. We have work to do as a culture in bringing up future generations that are so well rounded, so full and so inspiring.

Bill Buckley lived a great American life. His heroism was very American—the individualist at work in the world, the defender of great creeds and great beliefs going forth with spirit, style and joy. May we not lose his kind. For now, "Good night, sweet prince, and flights of angels take thee to thy rest."

HONORING MASTER SERGEANT
WOODROW WILSON KEEBLE

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Master Sergeant Woodrow Wilson Keeble, a South

Dakota hero, who was posthumously awarded the Medal of Honor at a White House ceremony this afternoon.

Master Sergeant Keeble was born in Waubay, SD, and was a member of the Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate. He served in the Army in both World War II and the Korean war, and was highly decorated for his service having been awarded two Purple Hearts, the Bronze Star, the Silver Star, the Combat Infantryman Badge, and the Distinguished Service Cross.

The action for which Master Sergeant Keeble was awarded the Medal of Honor occurred in October 1951 near Kumsong, North Korea. The accounts of his actions that day are truly worthy of a Hollywood movie. Though wounded and having fought continually for several days in brutally cold weather, Master Sergeant Keeble single-handedly took out three machine gun emplacements which had pinned down U.S. troops. As a result, U.S. troops were able to achieve their objective.

First Sergeant Joe K. Sagami described the action this way:

He worked his way down about fifty yards from the ridgeline and flanked the enemy's left pillbox; attacking it with grenades and rifle fire eliminating it. He then retreated to about the point where the First Platoon was holding the unit's first line of defense and worked down about fifty yards from the ridgeline and proceeded to outflank the enemy's right pillbox with grenades eliminating it. Then without hesitation he lobbed a grenade into the back entrance of the middle pillbox and with additional fire eliminated it. He then ordered his First Platoon forward to eliminate what little resistance was left.

In reading the words of those who fought with Master Sergeant Keeble, which have been collected by researcher Merry Helm, it is clear that everyone loved and respected the man they called Chief. Joseph Marston of George Company said, "What 'Chief' accomplished that day was common knowledge throughout the whole battalion. He was known for his bravery."

When asked about Master Sergeant Keeble, Carl Fetzner, who served in Second Platoon, said:

Sure I remember him. Nobody could forget him! I had barely gotten to the company when this happened. I didn't know much about what was going on, but I do know SGT Keeble was the finest, most courageous person I ever knew. When we pulled back in reserve—you know when we could go [back from] the lines to clean up, whatever, take a little rest . . . he knew what was going on. He took care of his men, he liked people, and he always did everything he could to help you, especially the new men . . .

After the Korean war, Master Sergeant Keeble came home and went to work at the Wahpeton Indian School. He enjoyed making copper sculptures and was active in his community. Like so many veterans, he was more concerned about taking care of his family than collecting medals. At the time, few even knew that the members of his own company had submitted a recommendation that he be awarded a Medal of Honor for his brave action in October 1951.

Because the recommendation paperwork had been lost twice, Master Sergeant Keeble did not receive the honor his fellow soldiers knew he deserved. It all might have been forgotten if the men he served with, and later his family and friends, had not kept the issue alive for the next five decades.

Master Sergeant Keeble's case was first brought to my attention in 2002 by his family and members of the Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate. At that time, I contacted the Secretary of the Army asking that Master Sergeant Keeble's case be reconsidered based on the loss of the original recommendation paperwork. The case was bolstered by original documents and affidavits that had been saved by those who served with Master Sergeant Keeble.

Though it has taken many years of work by many people, countless letters and phone calls, and even legislation passed in May 2007 authorizing the President to act, President Bush recently approved the recommendation and posthumously awarded the Medal of Honor to Master Sergeant Keeble's family this afternoon.

I never had the opportunity to meet Master Sergeant Keeble who died in 1982, but it has been an honor to get to know more about him by working with his family over the past 6 years. I want to thank his family and friends, the Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate, and all the people of South Dakota who have fought to secure this much-deserved honor for Master Sergeant Keeble. I also want to say a special word about his wife Blossom, who died last year. I wish we could have gotten Master Sergeant Keeble this recognition before Blossom passed away, but thankfully she knew how close we were to getting this done.

At a time when so many young men and women are deployed in dangerous places in defense of our country, it is important that we honor all of those who have served our nation in uniform. While we owe them a debt of gratitude that can never be fully repaid, I am proud that today we have properly thanked a South Dakota hero for his service.

I know I join with my colleagues and all South Dakotans in honoring Master Sergeant Keeble for his service to our nation and congratulating his family on receiving his Medal of Honor.

(At the request of Mr. REID, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

NATO SUMMIT

• Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, from April 2 to 4, 2008, leaders of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, NATO, will meet at a summit in Bucharest, Romania, to address issues critical to American national security and the future of the Euro-Atlantic community. NATO leaders must seize this opportunity to strengthen transatlantic ties, augment alliance members' contributions to common missions and con-

tinue to build the integrated, stable and prosperous Europe that is a vital interest of the United States.

A top priority for the summit must be to reinforce NATO's critical mission in Afghanistan. The contributions there of all the NATO allies alongside more than a dozen other countries bears testimony to how the alliance can contribute to the 21st century missions that are vital to the security of the United States and its allies. NATO's involvement provides capabilities, legitimacy, and coordination in Afghanistan that simply would not be available if NATO did not exist.

Success in Afghanistan is vital to the security of the United States, to all NATO members, and to the people of Afghanistan. NATO's leaders must therefore send an unambiguous message that every country in NATO will do whatever needs to be done to destroy terrorist networks in Afghanistan, to prevent the Taliban from returning to power, and to bring greater security and well-being to the Afghan people. This will require adequate numbers of capable military forces and civilian personnel from NATO members and putting more of an Afghan face on counter insurgency operations by providing more training and resources to the Afghan National Army and police forces, and by embedding more Afghan forces in NATO missions. We must also win long-term public support through assistance programs that make a difference in the lives of the Afghan people, including investments in infrastructure and education; the development of alternative livelihoods for poppy farmers to undermine the Taliban and other drug traffickers; and increased efforts to combat corruption through safeguards on assistance and support for the rule of law.

Success in Afghanistan will also require the removal of restrictions that some allies have placed on their forces in Afghanistan, which hamper the flexibility of commanders on the ground. The mission in Afghanistan—legitimized by a United Nations mandate, supported by the Afghan people, and endorsed by all NATO members after the United States was attacked—is central to NATO's future as a collective security organization. Afghanistan presents a test of whether NATO can carry out the crucial missions of the 21st century, and NATO must come together to meet that challenge. Now is the time for all NATO allies to recommit to this common purpose.

The summit must also address the question of the alliance expanding membership. NATO enlargement since the end of the Cold War has helped the countries of Central and Eastern Europe become more stable and democratic. It has also added to NATO military capability by facilitating contributions from new members to critical missions such as Afghanistan.

The three current candidates for NATO membership—Albania, Croatia and the Republic of Macedonia—have