

and equitable arrangements for the sharing of oil revenue or holding elections are but dim and distant visions. Iraqis have not assumed control over their own security. Indeed, independent assessments of Iraq have suggested that Iraqi security forces are riddled with sectarian corruption and will not be capable of providing security for some time to come, if ever.

U.S. troops have been “partnering” with Iraqi troops for years now, and U.S. troops have been training, equipping and supporting Iraqi forces to the tune of billions of dollars. U.S. troops have been conducting counterterrorism operations, as the President also noted in his speech. So what, pray tell, is new or different about this strategy? I can see nothing by which to judge success so that our troops may “return on success.” It is just a nice paint job slathered across the same old junk car.

The warranties on this new speech and this new sales job expire as soon as the car is driven off the lot. The only timeline offered by President Bush or General Petraeus ran out of time after July 2008. The pretty six-colored chart that General Petraeus used to show the troop drawdown associated with the transition had no dates on it past July 2008, though it was pretty clear that U.S. troops would be in Iraq for a very long time to come. President Bush explicitly said that if he has his way, U.S. troops would be in Iraq long past his exit from the White House. He boldly asserts that he will leave his staggering foreign policy calamity for someone else to clean up. Talk about passing the buck.

Mr. President, we simply cannot afford another slick White House sales job. Too many young men and women have died or have been maimed in this horrific war. We owe it to them to take a good hard look at the facts. General Petraeus, in his testimony, suggested that because of the “surge,” the number of Iraqi deaths have decreased, indicating “progress.” That may or may not be true—I do not know—but I do know that General Petraeus carefully did not note that the number of U.S. deaths in Iraq actually increased during the surge period, compared to the same periods in prior years. General Petraeus also did not note that the U.S. military death rate in Iraq, that is, the average number of deaths per month, also continues to climb from prior years.

General Petraeus pointed to the decrease in the number of improvised explosive device, or IED, attacks during the surge period of June through August as another sign of progress. It is true that the number of attacks dropped—as it does every year during the very hottest months of June, July, and August. But what General Petraeus did not say is that the number of U.S. deaths from IEDs increased during the surge period, compared to the same period in prior years. That, as they say, is the rest of the story. That is the whole truth, not carefully cher-

ry-picked statistics designed to bolster the President’s pitch for progress.

The President and his men also did not talk about the price tag of this shiny little war sedan. No need to discuss that before they have hooked us into writing the check. But the cost of this war should be uppermost in our minds, as the Senate addresses the Defense authorization bill, and certainly before the Senate considers yet another war funding supplemental appropriations bill—the largest one ever.

Congress has already appropriated over \$450 billion for the war in Iraq, and if Congress approves the President’s latest request for supplemental funds, that figure will grow to over \$600 billion during fiscal year 2008. That is a price tag with nine zeroes in it, folks. These direct costs do not cover the many hidden, indirect costs of this war, such as higher Veterans Administration costs, more veterans’ disability payments, the considerable interest on the additional debt, higher oil and gasoline prices, increased security costs here at home, and the incalculable damage done to our image and reputation in the world because of this war. The combined direct and indirect costs and obligations of this war will exceed \$1 trillion by the most conservative estimates. Many economists believe that the costs are much higher.

That \$600 billion or \$1 trillion pricetag also does not begin to cover the lost opportunity costs—all the ways in which money now spent on Iraq could have been used to make our bridges safer, secure our border, improve education, or to prepare for and rebuild after natural disasters and weather-related farming failures. That money could have been used to develop safe, clean, alternative energy sources so that the United States would not have to rely so much on oil from the Middle East or other volatile regions of the world.

Nor does that \$600 billion or \$1 trillion cover the costs of keeping upwards of 130,000 troops in Iraq for the many additional years the President and his men suggest will be necessary to achieve their vision of progress and success. It boggles the mind to consider the long-term costs of buying this war.

We all say that we support the troops. These brave men and women have been given a near impossible task, which they have performed with dedication, professionalism, courage, and honor. The Congress has provided everything the generals have asked for, and more. The President has taken that support for our men and women in uniform to imply support and even validation of his policy. He wants to keep the U.S. military tied down in Iraq indefinitely, trying to bargain for a little more time, a little more time, time and time again, never grasping that his policy is fatally flawed. History shows the fallacy of thinking that democracy can be force-fed at the point of a gun.

In the fifth year of this misguided, infernal war, I am convinced that the

best way to support our troops is to bring them home—home, sweet home—and the only way to get them home may be to somehow restrict the funds for this disastrous, awful war. We have tried this before and the President, the President, vetoed the bill. I am here today to insist that we must try again. Strings must be attached to this money. This Senator will support no more blank checks for Iraq.

On October 11, 2002, I was one of only 23 Senators who voted against the authorization that led to this awful, infernal war. I call on my colleagues, for the sake of our soldiers and for the sake of our Nation, to remember that half-truths and misleading claims are what led to this war. We can all recall that on February 5, 2003, the President sent Colin Powell, both a ribboned and starred general and a respected diplomat, to the United Nations to sell this war to the UN and to the Nation. Secretary Powell painted frightening visions of anthrax, truck and rail car-mounted mobile weapons laboratories, and nuclear weapons—none of it was accurate. The Nation was led to believe that our troops would be greeted as liberators, and that oil money would pay for Iraq’s reconstruction. Now while the half-truths have changed, the strategy of misleading the Nation remains the same.

Iraq may descend further into chaos if U.S. troops leave now, or it may descend into chaos whenever they leave. As long as the United States keeps the peace in Iraq, there is no incentive for Iraqis to maintain the peace on their own. After nearly 5 years of this awful, terrible war, more than 3,800 deaths, over 27,000 wounded, and no end in sight, we must change course. This war, this draining, desultory, dreadful occupation of Iraq must end.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut.

COMMENDING SENATOR BYRD

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, before I begin my remarks, I must pay tribute to Senator BYRD. We are on different sides of the discussion on the Iraq war, but he is an extraordinary public servant who remains as full of not just passion, which is evident, but brainpower at a mature age, shall I say, as he was when he was a lot younger. It is a privilege to serve with him and to have listened to him.

IRANIAN REVOLUTIONARY GUARD CORPS

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise to speak on amendment No. 3017 which Senator KYL of Arizona and I have offered. This amendment would designate the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps as a foreign terrorist organization and thereby subject this deadly, nefarious group to a series of economic and diplomatic sanctions that Senator KYL and I think will be felt in Iran and that this group, because of its

dangerous and destabilizing work throughout Iraq and the Middle East, deserves.

This is obviously a week in which the leader of Iran, President Ahmadi-Nejad, is in the United States of America. A great debate rages about what is the appropriate way to greet him? What sanctions, what platforms should be given to him? What sanctions should be discussed?

Personally, I feel it was a terrible mistake for Columbia University to invite him to speak because he comes literally with blood on his hands—the blood of American soldiers who are being killed today in Iraq by Iraqi extremists trained by the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps, the Quds Force, in Iran at bases surrounding Tehran.

But I offer this amendment in this spirit: If we are looking for a way to meaningfully respond to the presence of Ahmadi-Nejad in the United States, I cannot think of anything better than adopting this resolution which documents exactly the campaign of death and murder of Americans and others throughout the Middle East that it is carrying out.

Regardless of where any individual Member of this Chamber stands on the war in Iraq and what the best way forward on the war in Iraq is, this matter of Iran's deadly role in Iraq and throughout the Middle East should draw us all together. This is a matter on which we are not for or against the war in Iraq, we are not Democrats or Republicans, we are Americans standing based on the evidence against a force, the Iranian Republican Guard Corps, the Quds Force, that has blood on its hands, and the blood is American blood.

General Petraeus, 2 weeks ago, testified before Congress, and he could not have been clearer about the threat we face from Iran. In his words:

It is increasingly apparent to both coalition and Iraqi leaders that Iran, through the use of the Iranian Republican Guard Corps Quds Force, seeks to turn the Shi'a militia extremists into a Hezbollah-like force to serve its interests and fight a proxy war against the Iraqi state and coalition forces.

General Petraeus's testimony is the latest in a growing dossier of evidence about Iranian terrorism—call it what it is. Ahmadi-Nejad is maybe called President; he is the terrorist dictator who, with a small group around him, has seized control of a great Nation, Iran—a growing dossier of evidence about Iranian terrorism in Iraq and throughout the region that we in this Chamber have received from our American military commanders on the ground in Iraq, from our top diplomats there, and from our own intelligence community.

This is not opinion; this is fact. Specifically, we have received detailed information in recent months about how operatives from the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps have been training—have been training—arming, funding, and even directing extremists in-

side Iraq. As Ambassador Crocker testified:

While claiming to support Iraq in its transition, Iran has actively undermined it by providing lethal capabilities to the enemies of the Iraqi state.

The IRGC, Quds Force, is also importing terrorists from the Lebanese Hezbollah to help build its extremist proxies in Iraq. We know this because coalition forces, American forces, have captured one of the Hezbollah leaders inside Iraq and recovered documents that detail the relationship between the Iranian regime and the extremist groups they are sponsoring who are killing Americans.

General Petraeus said it when he was here:

This is not intelligence. This is evidence.

We also know Iran has been using its territory to train and organize these extremists, as I said. What is the source of that? The U.S. military spokesperson in Iraq, BG Kevin Bergner, U.S. Army. He has said groups of up to 60 Iraqi militants at a time have been taken to three camps near Tehran, where they received instruction in the use of mortars, rockets, improvised explosives, and other deadly tools of guerrilla warfare that they then use against our troops in Iraq.

General Bergner also reported this summer the U.S. military has concluded that “the senior leadership” in Iran is aware of the activities of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps in sponsoring attacks against our soldiers in Iraq, and that, in his words, it is “hard to imagine” that the Supreme Leader of Iran, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, does not know about them.

The consequences of this Iranian terrorism in Iraq have been immense and terrible for our men and women in uniform and for their families and friends at home. According to LTG Ray Odierno, the deputy commander of our forces in Iraq, Iranian-supplied weapons were responsible for a full one-third of American combat deaths this July. That builds on a similar record in preceding months. Let me repeat that. Up to a third of the deaths of American soldiers in Iraq in July were caused by sophisticated explosive devices used by people trained in Iran, with those devices supplied by Iran. This means the Iranians and their agents are killing our troops. Why are they doing it? Because they want us to retreat from Iraq.

The Iranians understand—sometimes, it seems, better than a lot of Americans do—that if American power collapses in Iraq, if we retreat and abandon our allies and the hopes we share with them for a better future in Iraq and throughout the Middle East, our position throughout the region will become much weaker and Iran's position will become much stronger.

Iranian aggression in Iraq fits squarely into a larger pattern of regional aggression, leading, they hope, to regional domination.

Tehran is also training, funding, and equipping radical groups that are re-

sponsible for the deaths of Lebanese, Palestinians, Afghanis, and Israelis. They are attempting to destabilize a series of moderate regimes in the Arab world.

Last week, Admiral Fallon, the commander of our Central Command, said the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps is supplying anticoalition forces with the same sophisticated explosive devices it is giving to extremists in Iraq. In Admiral Fallon's words:

There is no doubt . . . that agents from Iran are involved in aiding the insurgency.

The fact is, it is Iraq that today is the central front of Iran's efforts to become the hegemonic power in the Middle East. The Iranian regime knows Iraq has become the central front in our war with Islamist terrorism. It is where they believe they can begin the process of pushing us out of the region and seizing control. That is why I do not believe a person can be serious about responding to the threat of Iran while calling for our precipitous withdrawal from Iraq.

Ahmadi-Nejad, a few weeks ago, said:

The political power of the occupiers is collapsing rapidly.

By that he means us.

Soon we will see a huge power vacuum in the region. . . . We are prepared to fill that gap.

Asked about that statement, our own Ambassador Crocker said:

Ahmadi-Nejad means what he says, and is already trying to implement it, to the best of his ability.

That is a quote from our Ambassador in Baghdad.

It is vital to the national security interests of the United States that the Iranian Government not be allowed to prevail in its war against us and the Iraqi people's hopes for a better future. The amendment Senator KYL and I and others are offering, we believe, is an important component of our response to this threat.

First, it will send a clear message both to the fanatical regime in Tehran—not, I believe, representative of the feelings and hopes of the Iranian people—and it will send a clear message to our allies in the region that the United States will not stand idly by and allow Iranian-backed terrorists to kill hundreds of American soldiers. We will not stand idly by and allow Iran, through its proxies and then directly, to dominate Iraq.

This amendment acknowledges what our military commanders and top diplomats are telling us, which is that regardless of what we might desire in Washington, the Government in Tehran has made a decision, and they are carrying it out—to wage a proxy war against the United States in Iraq and against our allies in the Arab world and Israel throughout the region. We must respond.

Our amendment states it should be the policy of the United States to stop the violent activities and the destabilizing influence inside Iraq of the

Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran, as well as its foreign facilitators such as Lebanese Hezbollah and the indigenous Iraqi extremists.

Our amendment recognizes that thwarting Iran's campaign of terror must be among the crucial considerations for any plan for the transition and drawdown of our forces in Iraq. As General Petraeus warned us in his testimony, the threat of Iran may, in the long run, prove an even greater danger to the stability of Iraq—their hopes for political reconciliation and self-government—than al-Qaida. We cannot ignore Iran.

For that reason, the amendment Senator KYL and I are offering calls on the State Department to designate the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps as a foreign terrorist organization and place the IRGC on the list of Specially Designated Global Terrorists. This is no small organization. I have seen estimates to say it is as large as 150,000 or 180,000. They have ground troops. They have air capability. They even have naval assets. They have businesses which are doing business with other businesses throughout the region and the world.

This is the organization that the evidence, presented to us by the American military intelligence communities, tells us is responsible for the murder of American soldiers in Iraq.

They are launching terrorist attacks through their agents against our troops; therefore, they should be treated as terrorists. They must begin to suffer the economic and diplomatic punishments that come with being designated as a foreign terrorist organization.

Of course, everyone in this Chamber would prefer that we find a way to convince the Iranian regime to stop these attacks against our soldiers, Iraqi soldiers, and civilians through negotiation, but reality requires that we recognize that we have tried to use the tools of diplomacy with Iran, Mahmud Ahmadi-Nejad's government, and it has produced nothing.

Since May, Ambassador Crocker, our Ambassador, has met three times with his Iranian counterparts in Baghdad—the highest level official meetings between American and Iranian representatives in decades—and what have these talks produced? These talks, at which our Ambassador has presented the Iranians with hard evidence that we know the IRGC, the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps, is training Iraqi extremists who are coming back into Iraq and killing American soldiers—what has that evidence produced? Nothing. Nothing at all. In fact, there is some evidence that the Iranian activity is growing.

In Ambassador Crocker's own words as he testified before Congress:

I laid out the concerns we have over Iranian activity that was damaging to Iraq's security, but found no readiness on the Iranian side at all to engage seriously on these issues. The impression I came away with

after a couple of rounds is that the Iranians were interested simply in the appearance of discussions, of being seen to be at the table with the U.S. as an arbiter of Iraq's present and future, rather than actually doing serious business. Right now—

Ambassador Crocker says—

I haven't seen any signs of earnestness or seriousness on the Iranian side.

Far from convincing the Iranian regime to stop its proxy attacks on Iraqi soldiers, the evidence is that these attacks have escalated—increased—over the last month. According to the most recent National Intelligence Estimate:

Iran has been intensifying aspects of its lethal support—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I wonder if I might ask unanimous consent for 3 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. The war Iran is fighting against American troops and our allies in Iraq is an undeclared war, but it is, nonetheless, a real war in which real Americans and Iraqis are being murdered by Iranian agents. We cannot close our eyes to that outrageous reality. This amendment exposes that behavior and demands justice.

As we speak, the President of Iran is in the United States. There is no better time than that for us to stand together, united as Americans, regardless of our position on Iraq or our party affiliation, and send a crystal clear message to Mahmud Ahmadi-Nejad and the fanatical terrorists and tyrants who now run the great country of Iran and oppress its people that their campaign of terror against our troops in Iraq must end and we will stand united as Americans against it. Ahmadi-Nejad should not be given any American platform to speak from until he acts to stop his government's killing of Americans. They have been shouting for almost three decades "death to America." He leads those chants of tens of thousands in Iran today. But they have done more than shout; they have acted to bring that death to Americans in the marine barracks in Beirut, Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia, and today in Iraq.

Giving this evil and fanatical man a platform at a great American university is an insult to the hundreds of Americans whose blood he and his extremist allies in Iran have on their hands. He deserves no audience, no respect, no opportunity to explain away his hateful words and murderous actions. He and the ruling clique in Iran deserve the punishment, and more, this amendment Senator KYL and I are introducing would impose on them as the terrorists they are.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, first let me compliment my colleague from Connecticut, who is largely responsible for the idea of this amendment and much of the text of it, for his leadership over the years in trying to ensure we take appropriate action against Iran as it confronts America, both with regard to its nuclear program development as well as, more currently, its activities against our forces in Iraq. He has been truly inspirational, and I appreciate that leadership.

The Senator from Connecticut has well laid out the case for this sense-of-the-Senate amendment that the U.S. Government should designate specifically the Islamic Revolutionary Guard as a foreign terrorist organization and include it on the list of Specially Designated Global Terrorists. In addition, this sense-of-the-Senate amendment urges the use of our diplomatic and economic tools to pressure the Iranian regime not only to abandon its nuclear program but also to stop the use of its surrogates against our forces in Iraq.

There have been only two questions raised about this amendment. I am hoping and expecting that it will receive very strong bipartisan support tomorrow, assuming we are able to vote on it tomorrow. The only two questions were, first of all, Can this be read in any way as an authorization of military action against Iran? I will assure my colleagues that is absolutely not our intention—in fact, quite the opposite. This is intended to obviate the necessity for such military conduct. Nobody wants to have to engage in military action against Iran directly, but what we would like to do is get them to stop killing our troops. One way to do that is to put economic pressure on the organization that is doing the killing, and that is what this amendment would ask the administration to do.

Secondly, there is the question of whether the Islamic Revolutionary Guard is the appropriate entity to list on the Specially Designated Global Terrorists, and the answer to that is clearly yes. As I will point out in a moment, we have incontrovertible evidence that this is the group, as Senator LIEBERMAN pointed out, that is causing the trouble.

Some have said: Well, we should just designate the Quds Force of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard as the terrorist entity. That is like saying the Mafia isn't really responsible for what the Mafia does; it is only their hit men. The Quds Force is the group of hit men for this entity. This entity is clearly the overall entity responsible for this action, and it is the entity that engages in the economic activity which supplies the financial resources to the Quds Force. So it would not be adequate, obviously, just to designate the Quds Force, which is an arm of the Revolutionary Guard, as the terrorist entity.

What evidence do we actually have that this is the entity of the Iranian

Government that is doing all the dirty work? Well, there are many public statements, and I will quote from some of them. Senator LIEBERMAN quoted some of them. There is also other information, as one might imagine, and my colleagues should be encouraged to consult with terrorist agencies if they have any questions about the specific involvement of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard. But it is clear that this is the entity on which we should be focusing.

Senator LIEBERMAN quoted one of General Petraeus's statements in his testimony before the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services on September 10 that it is apparent Iran, through the use of the Iranian Republican Guard Corps—Quds Force—is causing this proxy war.

Here is something else General Petraeus also recently stated:

We know that it goes as high as Suleimani—

And his full name is BG Qassem Suleimani—

who is the head of the Quds Force of the Iranian Republican Guards Corps. That is quite high level. We believe that he works directly for the supreme leader of the country.

There is a specific reference to the IRGC.

In addition, Brigadier General Bergner, who is a spokesman for the Multi-National Force-Iraq, recently talked about the Quds Force operation in three camps near Teheran, and he said:

The Quds Force, along with Hezbollah instructors, train approximately 20 to 60 Iraqis at a time, sending them back to Iraq organized into these special groups. They are being taught how to use Explosively Formed Penetrators, mortars, rockets, as well as intelligence, sniper and killing operations. In addition to training, the Quds Force also supplies the special groups with weapons and funding of 750,000 to 3 million U.S. dollars a month.

Now, Senator LIEBERMAN also referred to General Odierno. When I was in Iraq last, I was ushered into General Odierno's office to have a very candid discussion with him, and what an impressive military officer he is. He said: Come look at what I have on the table here, and he proceeded to show us a great deal of military hardware and described to us what it was. Essentially, it was all of the things—examples of many of the things they had found supplied by Iran, the weaponry that is killing American troops. On one, he said: Here, look at this. He said: You probably can't read Farsi, but this says, "Made in Iran." Well, I accept his statement of what the Farsi says: "Made in Iran."

He also showed us the earth penetrators. Before we went to Iraq, we were in Kuwait at the base from which a lot of our equipment has come back out of Iraq for repair or disposition, and I say "disposition" because some of it has been so devastated by the explosion of these weapons smuggled in from Iran that there is nothing much left of them. What was so impressive—

or depressive—to see was to see the biggest, heaviest tank in the world, an Abrams tank, blown apart by these things as if it were a stick of dynamite in a tin can. The force and the destructive capability was almost beyond belief. We saw examples of that in General Odierno's office—a canister about this big with a concave shape in the middle that he said is the shaped charge that explodes up into the tank or the humvee or whatever the military vehicle is and devastates it. In any event, they have no doubt whatsoever that this equipment which is killing American troops is coming from Iran.

The Department of Defense report to Congress entitled "Measuring Stability and Security in Iraq" that was just released on September 18 of this year states:

Most of the explosives and ammunition used by these groups are provided by the Iranian Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps—Quds Force. For the period of June through the end of August, the Explosively Formed Penetrator events—

The equipment to which I just referred—

are projected to rise by 39 percent over the period of March through May.

There is a very interesting story in Time magazine, a recent issue, quoting a former CIA explosive expert who still works in Iraq as saying that these explosively formed projectiles we are finding in Iraq, that:

The Iraqis are making them. End of story.

His argument is that only a state is capable of manufacturing these EFPs. In other words, these are manufactured by people officially connected with the government. They have access to the equipment and material and technology to make them. It is a complicated process that is involved in the making of the weapons I described.

Incidentally, this same individual is convinced that the IRGC is helping Iraqi Shia militias fight in their mortars on the Green Zone, helping them to make sure they actually land on the Green Zone:

The way they're dropping them in, in neat grids, tells me all I need to know that the Shi'a are getting help. And there's no doubt it's Iranian, the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps.

The investigations into these particular attacks, incidentally, were also discussed in an August 2005 Time report about an Iranian operative who headed a network of insurgents created, again, by the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps and that they began introducing these EFPs into the country at the beginning of that year. Abu Mustafa al-Sheibani, an Iranian operative who headed a network of insurgents created by the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, introduced the EFPs into the country in early 2007. U.S. military sources claimed to have captured EFPs that displayed the hallmarks of Iranian-manufactured weaponry.

This is all IRGC. This is the entity which would be declared the terrorist group under our amendment.

Ray Takehy, of the Council on Foreign Relations, recently said this—I am speaking of the IRGC:

They are heavily involved in everything from pharmaceuticals to telecommunications and pipelines—even the new Imam Khomeini Airport and a great deal of smuggling.

I am going on to quote him:

Many of the front companies engaged in procuring nuclear technology are owned and run by the Revolutionary Guards. They're developing along the lines of the Chinese military, which is involved in many business enterprises. It's a huge business conglomeration.

This makes the point Senator LIEBERMAN made before—that this Revolutionary Guard Corps is deeply involved in economic activity. They rely on financing for a lot of their activity. It is this vulnerability which causes us to believe that if they are listed as a state-sponsored terrorist group, we can, through the use of the sanctions that are available to us, inhibit and impede and ultimately stop their activity.

The Revolutionary Guard Corps plays a key role in the military industries in Iran. According to Anthony Cordesman, who is a distinguished expert in this area and who is currently with the Center for Strategic and International Studies, they have been involved in the attempted acquisition of nuclear weapons and surface-to-surface missiles, among other things.

Interestingly, also, the unanimously passed U.N. Security Council resolutions sanctioning Iran have listed several IRGC entities as being involved in Iran's nuclear and ballistic missile activities.

Finally, the UNSCR resolutions list high-ranking IRGC personnel for their involvement in these programs, including the deputy commander of the IRGC, the chief of the IRGC joint staff, the commanders of IRGC ground forces, the commander of the IRGC Navy, the commander of the Basij Resistance Force, the commander of the Quds Force, and the Deputy Interior Minister for Security Affairs, who is also an IRGC officer.

I note that these resolutions, 1737 and 1747, which were immediately implemented by our European partners, have not yet been fully implemented by our own Treasury Department.

I cite all of this evidence and these quotations to simply make the point that there is absolutely no doubt that it is the IRGC that is involved in these activities against our American forces and is responsible for their deaths in Iraq. It is the IRGC that needs to be named to the Specially Designated Global Terrorist list. I misspoke before and said the state-sponsored list. I meant the Specially Designated Global Terrorist list.

By being so listed, we can employ our financial and immigration sanctions,

which could include them potentially blocking assets and even the prosecution of supporters who would provide funding to them. It could also involve refusal of visas and deportations of members. It would allow us to block the assets—in the United States—of any foreign company doing business with them, in effect, cutting them out of American markets.

Any lesser sanctions, such as focusing on the Quds Force, would not in any way solve the problem. That is like the hit men for the Mafia; you have to get to the Mafia.

We cannot settle for symbolism. This is serious. As I said, finally—and this is my last point—our resolution should not be read as an authorization for the use of force. I think we might even be changing a couple words in it to make that crystal clear. That was not our intention. To the extent that anybody might try to use that as an excuse for not supporting it, you will not have that excuse. We took out a couple of phrases that were pointed out as potentially offering that degree of support. This is not such an authorization for the use of military action. This is designed to prevent that. So if your concern is that we might ultimately be forced—or some people might believe we might be forced—to take action against Iran, and you want to void that result, this kind of economic sanction is within our power as Americans. We don't have to rely upon anybody else in the world to do it; we can do that. We know it can hurt them, and it goes to the entity causing harm to our forces and, therefore, we believe it is an appropriate action for the administration to take.

This would put the Senate on record as urging the administration to take this action as soon as possible, so we can end the actions of the IRGC.

I compliment my colleague from Connecticut again for his leadership and sponsorship of the resolution. I hope tomorrow we will vote on it and our colleagues will be supportive of it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be added as a cosponsor to the legislation offered by the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Arizona.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I compliment them for their leadership on this important issue.

I ask unanimous consent that the debate time for the energy and resources conference report be preserved.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FORGING UNITY

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, a lot is being said about whether Ken

Burns included enough Latinos in his new television series on World War II. This is one more reminder that “pluribus” comes easy, but “unum” is hard.

It would be a lot easier if “e pluribus unum,” the national motto displayed above the Presiding Officer's desk in the Chamber, were reversed and became “many from one” instead of “one from many.”

Ken Burns's epic series on “The War” began last night on public television. It promises to stick in our collective memory as only a few television events have—for example, the Roots series, Burns' own Civil War series, and Super Bowls.

In fact, our country is so splintered these days and so enthralled with our diversity that not very much becomes collective memory, as did, for example, McGuffey's Reader in the 19th century, or the three network newscasts in the mid-20th century.

This diminution of our common core of beliefs and experiences is America's fundamental challenge because forging unity from our magnificent diversity is America's greatest achievement and has created our capacity for other achievements.

At the Library of Congress some weeks ago, reflecting on his 6 years of work on this television series, Ken Burns said Americans were more united during World War II and its aftermath than at any other time. It was no coincidence that during this era the “greatest generation” also accomplished the most: Welcoming new citizens based upon beliefs instead of race, building overwhelming military power and the best universities, and producing nearly one-third of the world's wealth for 5 percent of the world's people.

Quoting the late Arthur Schlesinger's book, “The Disuniting of America,” Ken Burns said America today could use “a little less pluribus and a little more unum.”

Following World War II, liberals such as Schlesinger, Albert Shanker, and Hubert Humphrey were vigorous apostles of America's common purpose. Their Fourth of July speeches were as effusive as anybody's.

But today, the left disdains, and the right seems to have forgotten the importance of unum, which means we are abandoning our greatest achievement.

We see this in our work in the Senate. There is no constituency for consensus, only for division, and many of those who work hardest for consensus are retiring or near the end of their careers here.

A good example is the debate on Iraq, a war that, unlike World War II, divides us instead of unites us. The President is conducting the war the way he wants to conduct the war, not recognizing that persuading at least half the people he is right is the only way he can sustain a long-term U.S. presence in Iraq.

The Democratic majority, on the other hand, is working hard for a per-

ceived political advantage, not recognizing that most voters would prefer we work together when Americans are fighting and dying.

Both sides deserve an “incomplete” on their report cards.

A unified country would speak with one voice on where we go from here in Iraq because our troops deserve to hear it; because the enemy needs to hear it; because one political party does not go to war, our country does; and, finally, because the Senate looks downright ridiculous lecturing Baghdad about being in a political stalemate when we cannot get out of one ourselves.

We still have an opportunity to speak with one voice on Iraq. Seventy-eight of us in the House of Representatives and the Senate—35 Democrats and 43 Republicans—have cosponsored legislation making the bipartisan Iraq Study Group recommendations the policy of our Government. It is a consensus most Members, I believe, agree with. It is sitting there staring us in the face, waiting for us to adopt it and the President to sign it.

At West Point a few weeks ago, 30 cadets told Ken Burns, after they had seen some of his World War II series, that they had watched his Civil War series with their parents and had decided then to attend West Point. We can only hope that Burns' new series can have as much impact and remind us of that time—World War II and its aftermath—when Americans pulled together, and remind us that today we could use a little less pluribus and a little more unum.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the names of the 78 cosponsors of the Iraq Study Group recommendations, on S. 1545 in the Senate and H.R. 2574 in the House. In the Senate, there are nine Democrats and eight Republicans among the cosponsors.

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

THE IRAQ STUDY GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS IMPLEMENTATION ACT COSPONSORS OF S. 1545

Democrats: Ken Salazar (D-CO), Mark Pryor (D-AR), Robert Casey (D-PA), Blanche Lincoln (D-AR), Bill Nelson (D-FL), Mary Landrieu (D-LA), Claire McCaskill (D-MO), Kent Conrad (D-ND), and Tom Carper (D-DE).

Republicans: Lamar Alexander (R-TN), Bob Bennett (R-UT), Judd Gregg (R-NH), John Sununu (R-NH), Susan Collins (R-ME), Pete Domenici (R-NM), Arlen Specter (R-PA), and Norm Coleman (R-MN).

COSPONSORS OF H.R. 2574

Democrats: Mark Udall (D-CO), Jason Altmire (D-PA), Leonard Boswell (D-IA), Rick Boucher (D-VA), Nancy Boyda (D-KS), Robert Brady (D-PA), Henry Cuellar (D-TX), Danny Davis (D-IL), Lincoln Davis (D-TN), John Dingell (D-MI), Charles Gonzalez (D-TX), Jane Harman (D-CA), Baron Hill (D-IN), Steve Israel (D-NY), Daniel Lipinski (D-IL), Tim Mahoney (D-FL), Jim Matheson (D-UT), Dennis Moore (D-KS), James Moran (D-VA), Donald Payne (D-NJ), Collin Peterson (D-MN), Mike Ross (D-AR), Bobby Rush (D-IL), John Salazar (D-CO), Heath Shuler (D-NC), and David Wu (D-OR).