

Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2014 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of nearly 600 business leaders and growing.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Carrie in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Ms. Clogg for utilizing her talents to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Carrie on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2014 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

IN MEMORY OF THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF DR. JAMES SCHLESINGER

### HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 8, 2014*

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I reflect on the recent passing of a great American servant and defender, Mr. James Schlesinger. While I am sure that I don't need to enumerate each of his many accomplishments in the service of his nation—Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Director of Central Intelligence, Secretary of Defense, and Secretary of Energy—I would like to spend a moment reflecting on his remarkable service to the national security of the American people.

When I took over at the beginning of this Congress as the Chairman of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee, which oversees, among other vital national programs, the nation's nuclear forces, I knew that I needed to find the best of this nation's leaders to seek their advice and counsel. Of course, Dr. Schlesinger was at the top of this list. I was grateful that despite struggles with his health, he took the time to come and conduct a seminar for my colleagues on the subcommittee and me. We are able to better do our important work because of the ground he tread in his lifetime of service and because of the counsel he lent us selflessly.

As the former Secretary told us, “[n]uclear weapons are used every day . . . to deter our potential foes and provide reassurance to the allies to whom we offer protection.” These are true words from the man the Wall Street Journal referred to as the “Yoda” of nuclear deterrence.

Mr. Speaker, we've lost a great advocate for this country's security. But, we are fortunate that we have his example and his work to guide us. Never more than today do we realize the value in what James Schlesinger stood for across his 85 years. We thank God that we live in a nation led and protected by such men as Dr. Schlesinger. I take the liberty of speaking for the whole House when I say to his family, thank you for allowing him to spend his life in service to his country.

I submit a Wall Street Journal op-ed (“Why We Don't Want a Nuclear-Free World”, July 13, 2009) and an obituary that appeared on the same page on March 28th.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 13, 2009]

#### WHY WE DON'T WANT A NUCLEAR-FREE WORLD

(By Melanie Kirkpatrick)

“Nuclear weapons are used every day.” So says former Defense Secretary James Schlesinger, speaking last month at his office in a wooded enclave of Maclean, Va. It's a serene setting for Doomsday talk, and Mr. Schlesinger's matter-of-fact tone belies the enormity of the concepts he's explaining—concepts that were seemingly ignored in this week's Moscow summit between Presidents Barack Obama and Dmitry Medvedev.

We use nuclear weapons every day, Mr. Schlesinger goes on to explain, “to deter our potential foes and provide reassurance to the allies to whom we offer protection.”

Mr. Obama likes to talk about his vision of a nuclear-free world, and in Moscow he and Mr. Medvedev signed an agreement setting targets for sweeping reductions in the world's largest nuclear arsenals. Reflecting on the hour I spent with Mr. Schlesinger, I can't help but think: Do we really want to do this?

For nuclear strategists, Mr. Schlesinger is Yoda, the master of their universe. In addition to being a former defense secretary (Nixon and Ford), he is a former energy secretary (Carter) and former director of central intelligence (Nixon). He has been studying the U.S. nuclear posture since the early 1960s, when he was at the RAND Corporation, a California think tank that often does research for the U.S. government. He's the expert whom Defense Secretary Robert Gates called on last year to lead an investigation into the Air Force's mishandling of nuclear weapons after nuclear-armed cruise missiles were mistakenly flown across the country on a B-52 and nuclear fuses were accidentally shipped to Taiwan. Most recently, he's vice chairman of a bipartisan congressional commission that in May issued an urgent warning about the need to maintain a strong U.S. deterrent.

But above all, Mr. Schlesinger is a nuclear realist. Are we heading toward a nuclear-free world anytime soon? He shoots back a one-word answer: “No.” I keep silent, hoping he will go on. “We will need a strong deterrent,” he finally says, “and that is measured at least in decades—in my judgment, in fact, more or less in perpetuity. The notion that we can abolish nuclear weapons reflects on a combination of American utopianism and American parochialism. . . . It's like the [1929] Kellogg-Briand Pact renouncing war as an instrument of national policy. . . . It's not based upon an understanding of reality.”

In other words: Go ahead and wish for a nuclear-free world, but pray that you don't get what you wish for. A world without nukes would be even more dangerous than a world with them, Mr. Schlesinger argues.

“If, by some miracle, we were able to eliminate nuclear weapons,” he says, “what we would have is a number of countries sitting around with breakout capabilities or rumors of breakout capabilities—for intimidation purposes . . . and finally, probably, a number of small clandestine stockpiles.” This would make the U.S. more vulnerable.

Mr. Schlesinger makes the case for a strong U.S. deterrent. Yes, the Cold War has ended and, yes, while “we worry about Russia's nuclear posture to some degree, it is not just as prominent as it once was.” The U.S. still needs to deter Russia, which has the largest nuclear capability of any potential adversary, and the Chinese, who have a modest (and growing) capability. The U.S. nuclear deterrent has no influence on North Korea or Iran, he says, or on nonstate actors. “They're not going to be deterred by the possibility of a nuclear response to actions that they might take,” he says.

Mr. Schlesinger refers to the unanimous conclusion of the bipartisan Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States, which he co-led with Chairman William Perry. The commission “strongly” recommended that further discussions with the Russians on arms control are “desirable,” he says, and that “we should proceed with negotiations on an extension of the START Treaty.” That's what Mr. Obama set in motion in Moscow this week. The pact—whose full name is the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty—expires in December. But what's the hurry? Mr. Schlesinger warns about rushing to agree on cuts. “The treaty . . . can be extended for five years. And, if need be, I would extend it for five years.”

There's another compelling reason for a strong U.S. deterrent: the U.S. nuclear umbrella, which protects more than 30 allies worldwide. “If we were only protecting the North American continent,” he says, “we could do so with far fewer weapons than we have at present in the stockpile.” But a principal aim of the U.S. nuclear deterrent is “to provide the necessary reassurance to our allies, both in Asia and in Europe.” That includes “our new NATO allies such as Poland and the Baltic States,” which, he notes dryly, continue to be concerned about their Russian neighbor. “Indeed, they inform us regularly that they understand the Russians far better than do we.”

The congressional commission warned of a coming “tipping point” in proliferation, when more nations might decide to go nuclear if they were to lose confidence in the U.S. deterrent, or in Washington's will to use it. If U.S. allies lose confidence in Washington's ability to protect them, they'll kick off a new nuclear arms race.

That's a reason Mr. Schlesinger wants to bring Japan into the nuclear conversation. “One of the recommendations of the commission is that we start to have a dialogue with the Japanese about strategic capabilities in order both to help enlighten them and to provide reassurance that they will be protected by the U.S. nuclear umbrella. In the past, that has not been the case. Japan never was seriously threatened by Soviet capabilities and that the Soviets looked westward largely is a threat against Western Europe. But now that the Chinese forces have been growing into the many hundreds of weapons, we think that it's necessary to talk to the Japanese in the same way that we have talked to the Europeans over the years.”

He reminds me of the comment of Japanese political leader Ichiro Ozawa, who said in 2002 that it would be “easy” for Japan to make nuclear warheads and that it had enough plutonium to make several thousand weapons. “When one contemplates a number like that,” Mr. Schlesinger says, “one sees that a substantial role in nonproliferation has been the U.S. nuclear umbrella. Without that, some and perhaps a fair number of our allies would feel the necessity of having their own nuclear capabilities.”

He worries about “contagion” in the Middle East, whereby countries will decide to go nuclear if Iran does. “We've long talked about Iran as a tipping point,” he says, “in that it might induce Turkey, which has long been protected under NATO, Egypt [and] Saudi Arabia to respond in kind. There has been talk about extending the nuclear umbrella to the Middle East in the event that the Iranians are successful in developing that capacity.”

Mr. Schlesinger expresses concerns, too, about the safety and reliability of U.S. nuclear weapons, all of which are more than 20 years old. “I am worried about the reliability of the weapons . . . as time passes. Not this year, not next year, but as time passes and the stockpile ages.” There is a

worry, too, about the “intellectual infrastructure,” he says, as Americans who know how to make nuclear weapons either retire or die. And he notes that the “physical infrastructure” is now “well over 60 years” old. Some of it “comes out of the Manhattan Project.”

The U.S. is the only major nuclear power that is not modernizing its weapons. “The Russians have a shelf life for their weapons of about 10 years so they are continually replacing” them. The British and the French “stay up to date.” And the Chinese and the Indians “continue to add to their stockpiles.” But in the U.S., Congress won’t even so much as fund R&D for the Reliable Replacement Warhead. “The RRW has become a toxic term on Capitol Hill,” Mr. Schlesinger says. Give it a new name, he seems to be suggesting, and try again to get Congress to fund it. “We need to be much more vigorous about life-extension programs” for the weapons.

Finally, we chat about Mr. Schlesinger’s nearly half-century as a nuclear strategist. Are we living in a world where the use of nuclear weapons is more likely than it was back then? “The likelihood of a nuclear exchange has substantially gone away,” he says. That’s the good news. “However, the likelihood of a nuclear terrorist attack on the United States” is greater.

During his RAND years, in the 1960s, Mr. Schlesinger recalls that “we were working on mitigating the possible effects [of a nuclear attack] through civil defense, which, may I say parenthetically, we should be working on now with respect, certainly, to the possibility of a terrorist weapon used against the United States. . . . We should have a much more rapid response capability. . . . We’re not as well organized as we should be to respond.”

Mr. Schlesinger sees another difference between now and when he started in this business: “Public interest in our strategic posture has faded over the decades,” he says. “In the Cold War, it was a most prominent subject. Now, much of the public is barely interested in it. And that has been true of the Congress as well,” creating what he delicately refers to as “something of a stalemate in expenditures.”

He’s raising the alarm. Congress, the administration and Americans ignore it at their peril.

[From The Wall Street Journal, Mar. 28, 2014]

**JAMES R. SCHLESINGER: A DEFENSE STRATEGIST WITHOUT ILLUSIONS ABOUT THE WORLD’S THREATS.**

One can only imagine the wry, bemused expression that would have passed across former Defense Secretary James R. Schlesinger at the irony of his death this past week at age 85. Jim Schlesinger, the ultimate Cold Warrior, left the public stage at the moment his successors in Washington are arguing among themselves whether Vladimir Putin of Russia, with some 50,000 troops arrayed on Ukraine’s border and a nuclear weapons arsenal in his pocket, is or is not a threat to the interests of the United States.

The phrase “he does not suffer fools gladly” wasn’t invented for Jim Schlesinger, though some in the Washington policy-making fraternity could have been forgiven for thinking so. Nuclear strategist, defense secretary to Presidents Nixon and Ford and then the first secretary of energy under Jimmy Carter, Schlesinger puffed on an ever-present pipe and offered unvarnished and sometimes uncomfortable advice through some of the most difficult events of the Cold War era.

Equivocation wasn’t a word he recognized. In the 1973 Arab-Israeli war, with the Soviet

Union supplying some of the Arab countries, the Schlesinger Defense Department airlifted supplies to Israel, a U.S. ally.

Above all, Schlesinger believed that the U.S. should do nothing to put its pre-eminence in national security at risk. He pushed hard for increased military spending and voiced doubts about the terms of nuclear-arms negotiations with the Soviet Union in the 1970s.

He believed in the idea of military deterrence, and that included the U.S. nuclear deterrent. In a typically blunt assertion during a Weekend Interview with the Journal in 2009, Schlesinger said, “Nuclear weapons are used every day.” They are used “to deter our potential foes and provide reassurance to the allies to whom we offer our protection.”

Schlesinger’s robust clarity about the nature of threat and adversaries is out of favor in Washington these days. Foreign-policy tastes now run more toward “nuance.” Jim Schlesinger, a card-carrying economist, had nothing against nuance. He simply wanted to do whatever is necessary to make sure the U.S. never ended up on the wrong side of it. That point of view is missed.

#### RECOGNIZING JAMES BEN MAGEL

##### HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 8, 2014*

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize retiring Councilman of Pleasanton, Texas, James Ben Magel. He has served the citizens of the city of Pleasanton well, and is now ending his tenure after 18 years. His tireless efforts have improved the community, and he has served to better the development and progress of Pleasanton.

“Jimmy” Magel was born in Kenedy, Texas. Shortly after his birth, his family moved to Pleasanton. After graduating from Pleasanton High School in 1966, he attended the University of Texas at Austin, earning a degree in Pharmacy in 1971. He returned to Pleasanton and worked at Henry’s Pharmacy. In 1974 he began working for Rexco Pharmacy, which he now owns. In 1970 he married Bernice Tieken. Together, they share two children and one grandchild. Currently, he serves as President of the Pleasanton Ex-Students Association and is a member of the St. John Lutheran Church Council in Jourdanston. One of his proudest achievements was earning the rank of Eagle Scout. A loving husband and father, Mr. Magel has been a devoted public servant and community leader.

As Councilman, Mr. Magel has played an integral role in leading change within the Pleasanton community. Particularly, Mr. Magel paved the way for multiple construction projects, such as the construction of a public works facility, the new police department, the expansion of Pleasanton City Hall, a new civic center and library. He was also instrumental in the assembly of the Regional Water Waste Collection Line and various other infrastructure projects. Mr. Magel’s commitment to the maintenance of public buildings and infrastructure has helped the city of Pleasanton continue to be a remarkable place to live and raise a family.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Mr. James “Jimmy” Ben Magel, retiring Councilman of Pleasanton. His years of dedication and commitment to our community have truly

impacted the quality of life for the people of the city.

#### TRIBUTE TO LINCOLN DIX

##### HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 8, 2014*

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Lincoln Dix of Staples Advantage in Urbandale, Iowa for being named a 2014 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2014 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of nearly 600 business leaders and growing.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Lincoln in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Mr. Dix for utilizing his talents to better both his community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Lincoln on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2014 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

##### HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 8, 2014*

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 165 and “aye” on rollcall No. 166, supporting the passage of the Budget and Accounting Transparency Act.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

##### HON. CAROLYN MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 8, 2014*

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent during the week of March 24, 2014. If I were present, I would have voted on the following: rollcall No. 136—On final passage of H.R. 3060—“yea”; rollcall No. 137—On final passage of H.R.1813—“yea”; rollcall No. 138—H.R. 2824—Lowenthal Amendment—“yea”; rollcall No. 139—H.R. 2824—Cartwright Amendment—“yea”; rollcall No. 140—H.R. 2824—On motion to recommit with instructions—“yea”; rollcall No. 141—On final passage of H.R. 2824—“nay”; rollcall No. 142—H. Res. 524—On ordering the previous question on the rule—“nay”; rollcall No. 143—