

defenses in many, many ways. The only solution is to responsibly redeploy our troops and military contractors out of Iraq. That way we can get back to the business of conducting an effective foreign policy, safeguarding our Nation's security, and working with the international community to bring peace to the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### SUNSET MEMORIAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker I stand once again before this House with yet another Sunset Memorial.

It is June 20, 2008 in the land of the free and the home of the brave, and before the sun set today in America, almost 4,000 more defenseless unborn children were killed by abortion on demand. That's just today, Mr. Speaker. That's more than the number of innocent lives lost on September 11 in this country, only it happens every day.

It has now been exactly 12,933 days since the tragedy called Roe v. Wade was first handed down. Since then, the very foundation of this Nation has been stained by the blood of almost 50 million of its own children. Some of them, Mr. Speaker, cried and screamed as they died, but because it was amniotic fluid passing over the vocal cords instead of air, we couldn't hear them.

All of them had at least four things in common. First, they were each just little babies who had done nothing wrong to anyone, and each one of them died a nameless and lonely death. And each one of their mothers, whether she realizes it or not, will never be quite the same. And all the gifts that these children might have brought to humanity are now lost forever. Yet even in the glare of such tragedy, this generation still clings to a blind, invincible ignorance while history repeals itself and our own silent genocide mercilessly annihilates the most helpless of all victims, those yet unborn.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps it's time for those of us in this Chamber to remind ourselves of why we are really all here. Thomas Jefferson said, "The care of human life and its happiness and not its destruction is the chief and only object of good government." The phrase in the 14th amendment capsulizes, our entire Constitution. It says, "No State shall deprive any person of life, liberty of property without due process of law." Mr. Speaker, protecting the lives of our innocent citizens and their constitutional rights is why we are all here.

The bedrock foundation of this Republic is the clarion declaration of the self-evident truth that all human beings are created equal and endowed by their Creator with the unalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Every conflict and battle our Nation has ever faced can be traced to our commitment to this core, self-evident truth.

It has made us the beacon of hope for the entire world. Mr. Speaker, it is who we are.

And yet today another day has passed, and we in this body have failed again to honor that foundational commitment. We have failed our sworn oath and our God-given responsibility as we broke faith with nearly 4,000 more innocent American babies who died today without the protection we should have given them. And it seems so sad to me, Madam Speaker, that this Sunset Memorial may be the only acknowledgement or remembrance these children who died today will ever have in this Chamber.

So as a small gesture, I would ask those in the Chamber who are inclined to join me for a moment of silent memorial to these lost little Americans.

So Mr. Speaker, let me conclude this Sunset Memorial in the hope that perhaps someone new who heard it tonight will finally embrace the truth that abortion really does kill little babies; that it hurts mothers in ways that we can never express; and that 12,933 days spent killing nearly 50 million unborn children in America is enough; and that it is time that we stood up together again, and remembered that we are the same America that rejected human slavery and marched into Europe to arrest the Nazi Holocaust; and we are still courageous and compassionate enough to find a better way for mothers and their unborn babies than abortion on demand.

Mr. Speaker, as we consider the plight of unborn America tonight, may we each remind ourselves that our own days in this sunshine of life are also numbered and that all too soon each one of us will walk from these Chambers for the very last time.

And if it should be that this Congress is allowed to convene on yet another day to come, may that be the day when we finally hear the cries of innocent unborn children. May that be the day when we find the humanity, the courage, and the will to embrace together our human and our constitutional duty to protect these, the least of our tiny, little American brothers and sisters from this murderous scourge upon our Nation called abortion on demand.

It is June 20, 2008, 12,933 days since Roe versus Wade first stained the foundation of this Nation with the blood of its own children; this in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHIFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### TENSIONS IN THE WORLD TODAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wash-

ington (Mr. McDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, it says something about tensions in the world today when the first thing I want to enter into the RECORD is a reminder of my strong and long-standing commitment to the defense of Israel, the safety and security of the Jewish people, and the absolute right of Israel to exist.

I offer this preamble because I also want to say I am deeply troubled by the news reports around the world today that Israel recently conducted a major military exercise in what many military analysts see as training for a possible strike against Iran.

The United States supplies Israel with billions of dollars in military hardware, training and intelligence, and I believe it is both appropriate and urgent for the U.S. to raise questions about their intentions and to aggressively pursue diplomacy in this region.

We have made such a mess of things in Iraq that it's hard to believe that any nation can think war can achieve peace.

News reports say Israel conducted a massive military exercise in plain sight to send signals to the United States, Europe, and Iran that Israel is prepared to launch a massive military strike against targets in Iran if diplomatic efforts to halt or delay its nuclear program fail.

Almost immediately, Iran retaliated in the press saying any attack against its proud nation with a strong military capability would be met with an equally massive counteroffensive. The media reminds us that Iran has just taken delivery of accurate Russian-made surface-to-air missiles. We are edging perilously close to a hair-trigger moment when someone, somewhere, will do something that turns saber rattling into a provocative military confrontation, and we will be at war again on another front. I am deeply worried by that.

There are those who would have us believe that U.S. military superiority ultimately trumps any nation, any force. We are the most powerful military Nation on Earth, but with power comes responsibility, accountability and leadership.

For all the bombs and guns and missiles we have at our disposal, history is replete with failed policies and missions and dubious figureheads we propped up against the will of the people, and any rational approach to U.S. foreign policy. This includes the history of our U.S. secret involvement in Iran in the 1950s when we and the British worked to overthrow and replace the Iran elected leader, Mohammed Mossadegh, and installed the Shah of Iran. We kept him in office because we wanted a direct pipeline to Iran's oil well.

□ 1330

As the most powerful Nation on Earth, you would think that we could

do a lot more to prevent war than simply wringing our hands while we read the newspapers. And I think we can.

First, we have to abandon the notion that all U.S. policy begins and ends behind the butt of a gun. Now some will stand up and say, Well, that is just Jim McDermott, the doctor, who believes we don't have to use guns to fight for peace. Well, I have some company.

I would like to enter into the RECORD a story carried earlier this week in the Asia Times. It reports on the first conference held by the Center for New American Security. Ambassador James Dobbins, who was special envoy to Somalia, Haiti, Bosnia and Kosovo under President Clinton and special envoy to Afghanistan under the current President Bush said that this was about U.S. policy in Iran: "I reject the theory that the implicit threat of force is a necessary prerequisite to successful diplomacy."

Let me read the news story:

"Looking back on 40 years of U.S. diplomacy, Dobbins, now director of the Rand International Security and Defense Policy Center, concluded that the conventional wisdom about the need to back up diplomacy with your adversaries with force is wrong.

"I can say that most of it was not conducted against a background of threat of force," said Dobbins, "and when the threat of force was introduced, diplomacy failed."

"In a line that got applause from the more than 750 people attending the conference, Dobbins said his solution was to 'deal with Iran.'"

I urge everyone to read this story and I urge the administration and the Congress to start asking tough questions and demanding straight answers while there is still time.

We have seen what strikes in Iraq did back in the 1980s. We saw a strike in Syria a few months ago, and we are going to wake up one morning with another problem on our hands if we don't start asking serious, tough questions of this administration.

[From the Asia Times, Jun. 17, 2008]

DEAL, DEAL, DEAL WITH IRAN  
(By Gareth Porter)

WASHINGTON—The assumption that the United States should exploit its military dominance to exert pressure on adversaries has long dominated the thinking of the US national security and political elite. But this central tenet of conventional security doctrine was sharply rejected last week by a senior practitioner of crisis diplomacy at the debut of a major new centrist foreign policy think-tank.

At the first conference of the Center for a New American Security (CNAS), ambassador James Dobbins, who was former president Bill Clinton's special envoy for Somalia, Haiti, Bosnia and Kosovo and the George W Bush administration's first special envoy to Afghanistan, sharply rejected the well-established concept of coercive diplomacy.

Dobbins declared in a panel on Iran policy, "I reject the theory that the implicit threat of force is a necessary prerequisite to successful diplomacy."

Looking back on 40 years of US diplomacy, Dobbins, now director of the Rand Inter-

national Security and Defense Policy Center, concluded that the conventional wisdom about the need to back up diplomacy with adversaries with force is wrong. "I can say that most of it was not conducted against a background of threat of force," said Dobbins, and when the threat of force was introduced, "diplomacy failed".

In diplomatic dealings with the Soviet Union, however, Dobbins said, "We never threatened to use force."

Dobbins complained that the debate over diplomacy with regard to Iran has been between those who are ready to use military force now and those who "say we should talk with them first". Advocates of diplomacy, he said, have to "meet a high threshold—they have to offer the reversal of all Iranian positions". In effect, they have to deliver Iranian "capitulation", said Dobbins.

Although very different from the Soviet Union as a threat, Dobbins observed, Iran is similar in that "we can't afford to ignore it and we can't overrun it". Real diplomacy in regard to Iran, he argued, would result in "better information and better options".

In a line that got applause from the more than 750 people attending the conference, Dobbins said his solution was to "deal with Iran".

The Dobbins argument represents the first high-profile challenge by a veteran of the US national security community to a central tenet of national security officials and the US political elite ever since the end of the Cold War.

The recently established CNAS has strong connections with former Clinton administration national security officials and the Clinton wing of the Democratic Party. CNAS president Michele A. Flournoy and chief executive officer Kurt M. Campbell both held positions in the Clinton Defense Department. William J. Perry and Madeleine K. Albright, Clinton's secretaries of defense and state, respectively, gave opening remarks at the conference.

The Clinton wing of the Democratic Party and of the national security elite has long associated itself with the idea that the threat of military force—and even force itself—should be at the center of U.S. policy in the Middle East. Key figures from the Clinton administration, including Perry, Albright, former United Nations ambassador Richard Holbrooke, former assistant secretary of state James P. Rubin and former deputy national security adviser James Steinberg, lined up in support of the Bush administration's invasion of Iraq in 2003.

Flournoy and Campbell have already made it clear that CNAS' orientation will be to hew the common ground uniting the national security professionals who have served administrations of both parties. Flournoy co-authored an op-ed with former Bush administration deputy secretary of state Richard Armitage two days before the NCAS conference, and Armitage also introduced the conference.

A paper by Flournoy and two junior co-authors ostensibly calling for a new U.S. "grand strategy" is notable for its reluctance to go too far in criticizing the Bush administration's policies. It argues that the current US positions in Iraq pose the "real threat of strategic exhaustion" and calls for "rebalancing risk", but offers no real alternative to indefinite continuation of the Bush administration's wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Instead, it urged the "rearticulation" of goals in both Iraq and Afghanistan by replacing the "maximalist language used in past years" with "pragmatism".

But the choice of Dobbins to anchor a panel on Iran indicates that the Clinton wing of the Democratic Party and of the national

security community now has serious doubts about the coercive diplomacy approach to Iran that has dominated policy thinking since the beginning of the Clinton administration.

A paper on Iran policy co-authored by Campbell and released at the conference reflects a new skepticism toward the threat of an attack on Iran as a way of obtaining Iranian cooperation. It argues that U.S. military threats against Iran "have had the opposite effect" from what was desired, hardening the resolve of Iranian leaders to enrich uranium and giving the Islamic regime greater credibility with the Iran people.

The paper also reflected an unwillingness to dispense entirely with the military option, however, proposing that the United States "de-emphasize, but not forswear, the possibility of military action against Iran".

The paper advised against even taking the military threat off the table in return for Iran's stopping its nuclear program, on the ground that Washington must be able to use that threat to bargain with Iran over "stopping its support for terrorism".

The principal author of the paper, James N. Miller, who is senior vice president and director of studies at CNAS, explained in an interview after the conference that he believes Dobbins' assessment of the problem is "about right". Miller said the threat to use force against Iran to coerce it on its nuclear program "is not useful or credible now".

But Miller said he would not give up that threat, because the next president might enter into serious negotiations with Iran, and Iran might refuse to "play ball" and go ahead with plans to acquire nuclear weapons. If the president had a strong coalition behind him, he said, "The use of force is an option that one should consider."

The idea that diplomatic negotiations with Iran over its nuclear program must be backed by the threat of war is so deeply entrenched in Washington that endorsement of it seems to have become a criteria for any candidate being taken seriously by the national security community.

Thus all three top Democratic hopefuls supported it during their primary fight for the Democratic nomination.

Addressing the American Israel Public Affairs Committee convention in early 2007, Hillary Clinton said that, in dealing with the possibility of an Iranian nuclear capability, "no option can be taken off the table". Barack Obama and John Edwards also explicitly refused to rule out the use of force against Iran if it refused to accept U.S. demands to end its uranium enrichment program.

#### HISTORIC FISCAL CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Speaker, shh, there's a secret. I have a secret. It's a secret that the leadership in this House doesn't want the people to know; but I'm going to tell you anyway. This Nation, this Federal Government, is in a historic fiscal crisis right now.

It was announced earlier this week that the deficit for this fiscal year which we are in is projected now to reach \$470 billion. Now, Mr. Speaker, for most people when you talk like this, these numbers are so huge they sound arcane. What does that mean.