

also a lifelong musician who supported himself through high school, college and law school playing clarinet and saxophone. As an adult, he played countless fundraisers with his jazz combo and the Providence Hospital Stage Band.

While Mr. Hart quietly went about helping others, never asking for anything in return except that those that he helped be good people, he was recognized by countless organizations for the works that he did. The effect of Hal Hart on his community and on the lives of those who knew him cannot be overstated. He was loved by his teams and beneficiaries, respected by his adversaries, and he will be universally missed.

While we have lost this great Oregonian, we find solace that so many others have been spurred on by his example. Throughout his years of teaching, he kept framed on his desk a few lines from Ralph Waldo Emerson, and they sum up his philosophy as follows:

To laugh often and love much; to win the respect of intelligent persons and the affection of children; to earn the approbation of honest citizens and endure the betrayal of false friends; to appreciate beauty; to find the best in others; to give of oneself; to leave the world a bit better, whether by a healthy child, a garden patch or a redeemed social position; to have played and laughed with enthusiasm and sung with exaltation; to know that one life has breathed easier because you have lived, this is to have succeeded.

Mr. Speaker, Hal Hart was a success by any measure and in so many different ways.

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

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

UNANTICIPATED GOOD RESULTS (WHEN WE LEAVE)

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, good intentions frequently lead to unintended bad consequences. Tough choices, doing what is right, often leads to unanticipated good results.

The growing demand by the American people for us to leave Iraq prompts the naysayers to predict disaster in the Middle East if we do. Of course, these merchants of fear are the same ones who predicted invading and occupying Iraq would be a slam-dunk operation, that we would be welcomed as liberators and oil revenues would pay the bills with minimum loss of American lives. All this hyperbole, while ignoring the precise warnings by our intelligence community of the great difficulties that would lie ahead.

The chaos that this pre-emptive undeclared war has created in Iraq has allowed the al Qaeda to establish a foothold in Iraq and the strategic interests of Iran to be served. The unintended consequences have been numerous. A well-intentioned but flawed policy that ignored credible warnings of how things could go awry has produced conditions that have led to a war dominated by procrastination without victory or resolution in sight.

Those who want a total military victory, which no one has yet defined, don't have the troops, the money, the equipment, or the support of a large majority of the American people to do so. Those in Congress who have heard the cry of the electorate to end the war refuse to do so out of fear the demagogues will challenge their patriotism and their support for the troops. So nothing happens except more of the same. The result is continued stalemate with the current policy and the daily sacrifice of American lives.

This wait-and-see attitude and a promised reassessment of events in Iraq late this summer strongly motivates the insurgents to accelerate the killing of Americans to influence the coming decision in 3 months. In contrast, a clear decision to leave would prompt a wait-and-see attitude, a de facto cease fire, in anticipation of our leaving; a perfect time for Iraqi factions to hold their fire on each and on our troops and just possibly start talking with each other.

Most Americans do not anticipate a military victory in Iraq, yet the Washington politicians remain frozen in their unwillingness to change our policy there, fearful of the dire predictions that conditions can only get worse if they leave. They refuse to admit the conditions of foreign occupation is the key ingredient that unleashed the civil war now raging in Iraq and serves as a recruiting device for al Qaeda. It is time for a change in American foreign policy.

But what if those who were so wrong in their predictions as to the outcome of their invasion are equally wrong about what might happen if we leave? Unanticipated good results may well occur. There is room for optimism. The naysayers have been wrong before and are probably going to be wrong again.

The truth is, no one knows exactly what would happen if we leave. Civil strife may last for a while longer, but one thing is certain, no longer will American lives be lost. That in itself would be a blessing and reason enough for doing so.

After we left Vietnam under dire circumstances, chaos continued, but no more American lives were lost. But, subsequently, we and the Vietnamese have achieved in peace what could not be achieved in war. We now are friends. We trade with each other, and we invest in Vietnam. The result proves the sound advice of the Founders: Trade in friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none. Example and per-

suasion is far superior to force of arms for promoting America's goodness.

It is claimed that we cannot leave until a new military faction is trained to fill the vacuum. But the question is, will there really be a vacuum, or are we talking about our proxy army being trained well enough to continue to do battle with the very strong militias already in place? Lack of training for the local militias has never been a problem for them.

The real problem with our plans to train a faction of Iraqis to carry out our plans for the Middle East is that the majority of Iraqis object and the army trainees are not as motivated as are the members of the various militias. The Kurds have a militia capable of maintaining order in their region. Sadr has a huge militia that is anxious to restore order and have us gone. The Badr brigade is trained to defend its interests. And the Sunnis are armed and determined. Our presence only serves to stir the pot by our troops being a target of nearly all the groups who are positioning themselves for our anticipated departure.

After we leave, just maybe the Shiites and the Sunnis will develop an alliance based on nationalism. They already talk of this possibility, and it could include the Badr brigade and the Sadr militias. A coalition like this could serve as an efficient deterrent to al Qaeda and Iran since they all share this goal.

Al Qaeda and Iran were not influential in Iraq before the invasion and would not be welcomed after we leave. There is cooperation now, motivated by the shared desire of the Sunnis and the Shiites to oppose our occupation. There's definitely a potential that the Iraqis may do much better in dealing with their own problems than anyone can imagine once we leave. Already there are developing coalitions of Sunnis and Shiites in the Iraqi parliament that seek this resolve.

It is claimed by some that leaving the Middle East would not serve the interests of Israel. Israel with its nuclear arsenal is quite capable of defending itself under all circumstances. Its dependency on us frequently prevents it from taking action that otherwise may be in its best interests because we do not approve of such actions. Israel's overtures to Syria and other neighbors would not be road blocked by U.S. policy if we left the Middle East. With us gone Israel would have greater motivation to talk with other Arab countries as they did with Egypt. It just may be that Israel would accept the overtures made by the Arab League for a comprehensive peace. The Arab League might be an acceptable alternative to the U.S. influencing policy in the region.

We're told we can't let this happen or we'll lose control of the oil and gasoline prices will soar—exactly what has happened with our invasion. And if the neo-conservatives have their way there will be an attack on Iran. If that occurs, then watch what happens to the price of oil.

No matter who ends up controlling the oil they will always have a need for western markets. Instead of oil prices soaring with our leaving, production may go up and prices fall. A change in our foreign policy is overdue.