Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I know that it comes as no surprise to this House that I have been one very critical of this administration’s policies on a number of different fronts, and I suppose that will be no different tonight. I guess I wanted to start out tonight by addressing the WikiLeaks issue. I know that a lot of people across America have looked upon this with interest, and I guess it’s significant in my mind that what we’re seeing on the WikiLeaks issue is really more confirmatory than it is anything that’s informative. In many ways what the WikiLeaks information has demonstrated is that this administration has practiced for a long time a foreign policy of appeasement, and I think it has been a disaster for our country, Mr. Speaker.

I suppose it goes without saying that the most pressing question is how a 22-year-old private first class in a remote location in Afghanistan could have gained access to so many of these documents, especially since they are far outside his scope of responsibilities. It represents, really, a glaring failure on parts of the Department of Defense and even some parts of the Defense Department. And some of these commonsense security measures could have been implemented prior to this. The Pentagon has since announced that it will be implementing new policies, including a technology that makes it impossible to copy classified documents to portable storage devices. Now the fact is that it has taken too long for such a commonsense policy to sink in, and this administration certainly had lead time to consider this long before now, but I guess it is, in a sense, indicative of why bureaucracies are so inefficient most of the time. It took the leak of hundreds of thousands of sensitive documents before this government decided to get up to speed with the unique risks posed by some of the most basic modern conveniences, that being the computer.

Private Bradley Manning, the U.S. Army soldier suspected of leaking the documents, and WikiLeaks founder Julian Assange hid behind the claim that the government’s so-called “lack of transparency” is unjustified. This is their main reason for justifying their own actions, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, in that process they have provided a wealth of aid and comfort to groups that are at war with the United States of America. Of course Mr. Assange claims to be fighting for truth and transparency. The reality is that his desire to promote himself has outweighed his concern for scores and perhaps hundreds of innocent lives that he has endangered with his reckless publicity in this kind of a stunt in the guise of some greater cause.

But Mr. Speaker, it’s telling that the foreign media sometimes is almost more comforting to justice than the American media sometimes. The American media willingly compiled in disseminating this information and they are complicit, in my judgment, in any harm that will come to American servicemembers or American personnel across the country as well. Just to give you an example, Mr. Speaker, the same New York Times that was reticent to cover the story that’s often referred to as “Climategate” willingly ran the WikiLeaks cover story on the front page of their newspaper. Now this is a hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker, that I think is absolutely astounding. In other words, they get to have it both ways. They got to read what one of the bloggers there of The New York Times said. Andrew Revkin of The New York Times, he is actually a reporter, was one of the first ones to cover Climategate. And in his first story only a matter of a few hours after Climategate’s blog posted, in his story he states, “The documents”—this is the Climategate documents, Mr. Speaker—“appear to have been acquired illegally and contain much of private information and statements that were never released to the public eye, so they will not be posted here.”

Well, how gallant, how noble of Mr. Revkin to want to protect some of his perhaps liberal friends from being exposed in some of the over-hyped notion of global warming, but yet why people’s lives are at stake, when American national security is at stake, then all of a sudden The New York Times is all too willing to publish the WikiLeaks information in the interest of full disclosure and grand journalism, and find that unbelievable. If the Times reporters had felt such urges of chivalry when it comes to protecting the men and women who give up their lives so that we can all sleep peacefully at night, it’s just a strange time for them to do that. And to cap it all off, Mr. Speaker, it is rumored that the leading candidate for Time magazine’s “Man of the Year” now is none other than WikiLeaks’ Julian Assange.

Mr. Speaker, before I yield to one of my colleagues here, I would like to say that, unlike authoritarian regimes across the world, democratic governments like ours hold secrets largely because citizens agree that they should in order to protect legitimate policy and national security. But this massive breach of our national security has endangered our ability to build trust and cooperation with our allies, it has certainly not served the public’s interest, and most of all, it has strengthened and emboldened our enemies. Mr. Assange and WikiLeaks should be profoundly ashamed, and I think they should be pursued with whatever legal actions can be brought, and of course The New York Times, for their complicity in this effort, should be ashamed beyond measure, Mr. Speaker.

With that, I would like to yield to my good friend, Congressman LAMBORN from Colorado, to see if he has any thoughts.

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me point out that, to its credit, The Wall Street Journal did not accept...
the offer to disseminate these WikiLeaks latest round of documents from the diplomatic arena, and I think that that is to their credit. Unfortunately, The New York Times did not have the same scruples, which is extremely disappointing to me.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, as we look at some of the reports of what were contained in these diplomatic leaks, there are some really troubling national security implications that arise. One is that we find, for instance, that Iran has received 19 advanced missiles from North Korea. Now we have long suspected that there have been ties on a covert basis between those two countries, we have some evidence of that; this just makes it more of a glaring issue. And our administration needs to be doing more, not just to stop WikiLeaks in the future from revealing our national secrets, but in stopping Iran and North Korea from the propagation of deadly nuclear and missile technology that they seem to be doing. The fact that Iran has received 19 advanced missiles from North Korea, each of which is capable of reaching Western Europe or even Moscow, is very troubling to me. These are our NATO allies that we are bound to defend if they are attacked, and I don't think our administration is doing enough to stop the propagation, the dissemination of deadly technology from North Korea to other countries.

When we are done talking about WikiLeaks, Representative, I would like to make sure we talk more about some of these national security implications as well. I would like to yield back at this time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. LAMBORN. It is my judgment that this would probably be a good time to transition to that. And we would also like to hear from Congressman STEVE KING from Iowa. STEVE, do you have some thoughts about this at all because of some of these national security issues I know DOUG and I are kind of obsessed with them—for good reason, but we know that they care about national security in Iowa as well.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, before the American people.

This is a critical national security issue. And I’m so grateful that we have individuals here in this Congress, as intended by our Founding Fathers, that focus on a variety of issues that could clearly see and be focused on the intelligence that can bring this before the American people in such a way that they can understand, Mr. Speaker, that you will turn your focus hopefully on this subject matter.

There has been a lot of discussion across the country now and in the news media about the WikiLeaks issue. And I look at this, and I think Julian Assange, an Australian citizen, a person who made his living as a hacker, a person who is proud of being able to crack anybody’s security code and get in there and pull that information out and then dump it into the public arena, into the public media sphere. For what purpose? The purpose of that destructive purpose could be achieved by an individual who is a product of Western civilization poring forth state secrets from Western civilization itself? It has to be for either self-aggrandizement, self-aggrandizement, or for the under-mining Western civilization. An enemy, an enemy of the things that we believe in.

And I don’t stand here with the intent to indict the Aussies, I love the Australians. They are a free spirited, strong free market, free will group of people. They had to also take a continent and settle a continent about the size of the United States itself and make a living down there in an environment that’s sometimes beautiful and sometimes harsh. They have a spirit of their own. They remind me that in every conflict that the United States has been in they got there first, and some of them they’ve been in all of them. It’s a shocking thing to say about the relationship between the United States and Australia.

There’s not much to say about their citizen—whom I wish today were an American citizen, and at that point I think the House needs to charge of treason against the United States.

So as I listened to the speakers here, I reached into my dog-eared Constitution and took up this definition, the constitutional definition of treason, and it says—and I know that some have called for charges of treason to be brought against Mr. Assange. I know they apply to an American citizen. But this says, Article III, section 2: Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them or another jurisdiction that’s even further removed from these courts, and under Article III, section 2, strip these Federal courts from the jurisdiction of ruling upon these decisions of terrorism that are attacking America.

If we do that—that’s a pretty sticky constitutional question on how we would deal with American citizens in that category, but it’s not when we deal with someone like Julian Assange. An Australian citizen could be put into that category, moved over to a place offshore of the United States outside of the jurisdiction of the Federal courts, the civilian Federal courts in the
United States, and adjudicated under a military tribunal in a fashion that was designed by this Congress and directed by this Congress. That’s what I’m hopeful that we’ll be able to do.

Mr. LAMBORN. I think this recent civilian trial of the person formerly who was in Guantanamo Bay, who was tried in New York City, I believe, who was found not guilty of about 250 counts of murder—although that’s about how many people were killed in the terrorist attack on the embassy in Africa that was found only guilty of conspiracy to destroy government property when over 200 people were murdered in that terrorist attack shows the weakness of using civilian trials to try these terrorists who are committing acts of war against our country.

And the WikiLeaks documents, getting back to those, show that this administration has been trying to place these Guantanamo detainees in other countries around the world, like Saudi Arabia. They are offering them money. They are offering them concessions if they’ll take some of these people off of our hands so that the President can move closer to his goal of closing Guantanamo Bay, Guantánamo. But that is a misguided policy from day one.

These people should not be released. I think Saudi Arabia said in one of the cables that was disclosed, or they said later on, that they would just release the people. If they were sent to their country and they would ultimately, as we know from cases in the past, many of them would find their way back to the battlefield where they would kill Americans or American allies.

So I think that the whole misguided policy of Guantánamo Bay being closed is exposed by some of these WikiLeaks documents. But still, these should have never been disclosed in the first place. This administration needs to find a way to punish those involved and make sure it never happens again.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I guess, Mr. Speaker, I would like to agree with the gentleman from Colorado because, you know, many of us, including the gentleman from Colorado, including the gentleman from Iowa, were very vociferous in saying that there would come a time where it would be obvious to the world that these civilian trials would not work. It’s very common sense that when we have terrorists that are terrorists that were taken off the battlefield in Afghanistan or Iraq or wherever it might be, because we knew that this would give al Qaeda and other terrorist groups a perfect opportunity, a staging ground, as it were, to be able to manipulate our system, a system that is designed to be unable to identify the security elements of it are astonishing. And of course they use our own court system and our own court rules to make it very possible for them to escape justice.

I thought, to paraphrase President Bush, he said something like this. He said, We should not allow our enemies, or anyone else that would try to use, to destroy liberty by using the forums of liberty to destroy liberty itself. And the reality is is that sometimes we can become victims of our own ostensible decency.

And this administration, in its kowtowing to the word that it has been more committed to protecting terrorist rights than it has been to protecting the lives of American citizens. And I think that is profound beyond anything I could suggest.

Because it just tells me that somehow the administration has a philosophical bent that is going in a way that I think endangers American freedom and future generations. And I am hoping that somehow they will wake up in time. But yes, the gentleman is correct that WikiLeaks, among other things, has exposed once again this administration’s effort to try to put these combatants in different countries to try to avoid the trap that they have set for themselves in America by insisting that this be done in civilian trials.

And again, it is a disgrace beyond words that this man that was instrumental in the murder of about, I think it was 224 people, Mr. LAMBORN, and yet he gets conspiracy to destroy government property. And that is unfortunately—you know, sometimes the administration thinks of these things always in sort of academic terms. But this is real life. And national security in the 9/11 age is something we should all be focused on. And this administration seems to be asleep at the wheel. And just when it would appear as if my colleagues from Iowa might have any thoughts on that, Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Arizona. And I reflect upon a trip that I made down to Guantánamo Bay. I believe it was a year ago this Easter. And the trip was designed to fill me and a handful of other members on the Judiciary Committee in on the practices and the facilities that they had at Guantánamo Bay. And I think this is something that the American people are throwing human faces in the face of our troops. What is the punishment for that? It if happened to be a domestic prisoner in a domestic prison, if you continued with that you would find yourself in solitary confinement. And eventually, the punishment would go to the point where you would be locked up in prison for life. Eventually.

But what we do is nothing. There is no penalty. If Khalid Sheikh Mohammed attacks the guards every day, several times a day, the worst thing we can do to him is cut his outdoor exercise down to 2 hours a day. Two hours a day outdoors. The rest of the time
you are in 75-degree air conditioning with your own selected meals, three out of the nine that are the choice of the menu there, on your own specialized prayer rug with your own Koran. And there was one inmate that wanted a Bible. He asked God.
Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Before I yield to my friend from Iowa, I would just like to kind of follow up what the gentleman said.

You know, sometimes I think we are unaware as a people—and certainly this administration seems oblivious—to how serious a nuclear Iran, what a serious danger to the peace of the entire human family that would represent.

But just for a moment, let’s consider that for a moment. You know, the Ahmadinejad government, the government of the mullahs and Ahmadinejad there, have, through their very brazen, open statements, have condemned Israel, have condemned the United States and threatened both of our countries in very specific terms, wanting to see Israel wiped off the map and the United States be ended as a world power. This we see completely brought to our knees.

I mean, it’s hard to even, to repeat some of the things that this Iranian administration has said about America. And it’s very clear what their intent is, and I would like to break those two elements to every threat, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to national security. One is the intent of a potential enemy and the second one is the capacity of that enemy to carry through with their threats.

And it is not understood by now the intent of jihad, the intent of state sponsors of terrorism like Iran, then we are not listening very well, Mr. Speaker. The intent is clear, Iran would see America destroyed tomorrow if they could. Now, not the Iranian people, but the Iranian Government, as it stands now, would see America in ashes if they could.

So the idea of allowing them to gain nuclear capability seems to be just astonishing beyond words to me, Mr. Speaker. I mean, this administration seems to have embraced some sort of a surreptitious policy of allowing Iran to gain nuclear weapons and then pursuing the traditional idea of containment, like we have in other situations with the Soviet Union.

But that won’t work with a jihadist government. Because when we were dealing with the Soviet Union, we put our security, in a sense, in their sanity. We knew that they wanted to survive and we had the capability to respond in such an overwhelming way that they were deterred from attacking America. But when it comes to the jihadist mindset, Mr. Speaker, that is no longer a strategy that can be embraced.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, if Iran gains a nuclear capability, if they gain nuclear weapons, this world will step into the shadow of nuclear terrorism. Terrorists will have these weapons and, Mr. Speaker, I can’t express to you the danger that that will represent and the change that it will represent to all of us in the free world and, really, throughout the planet.

Because Iran has shown themselves willing to make some of the most deadly weapons that we face in Iraq and blowing up our soldiers with their explosively formed penetrators. They pay money to see some of the Talibain kill American soldiers in Afghanistan. They are clearly demonstrating an intent very clearly, and this administration seems willing to allow them to have the capacity to carry out that intent.

Mr. Speaker, let me just, while I am walking by the neighborhood, remind this administration that Iran has done military exercises that appear to every reasonable military analyst to be preparation for an EMP attack against this country or some other enemy that they might have.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this administration seems woefully unprepared or even unaware of how serious an electromagnetic pulse or a high altitude nuclear blast to create an electromagnetic pulse could be to this country. We now have a nuclear capability it will give them the asymmetric capability to, in fact, launch an EMP attack against this country, and that could cripple our infrastructure. It could cause an almost intractable damage to this country.

The EMP Commission says a major EMP attack on this country could be the one thing that could defeat the U.S. military. It could see more than 60 percent of the population of the United States unsustainable. I don’t know how you wrap your mind around a number like that.

But, yet, that is the path that we are on with this administration continuing to allow Iran to gain nuclear weapons. And I would just call upon the Senate, Mr. Speaker, tonight on this floor, to pass the grid bill that we passed out of this body some time ago to begin to protect our electric infrastructure from either geomagnetic storms or from a high altitude electromagnetic pulse from a nuclear weapon that could be launched against us like Iran.

This administration has paid no attention to that, and yet it represents a very real, very credible threat against the United States, and it is the ideal asymmetric weapon for terrorists, and they know it. We have discovered their writings. They understand that and yet we stand by, and this administration embraces the notion that we can allow a jihadist, terrorist state like Iran to gain the world’s most dangerous weapons and to be able to potentially launch against this country an attack that could be absolutely devastating to our civilization.

I just continue to be astonished that this administration has forsaken its number one constitutional duty in making sure that the protection of the citizens of this country and the national security of this country are job one.

And I really don’t know what to add to that except maybe to ask my friend from Ohio—Mr. KIng from Iowa. Well, I thank you, Mr. Speaker, that I was very happy with the job that was done by then-Commander in Chief Bill Clinton on each of these issues but primarily with Korea. I thought that he was too soft, too tepid, not bold enough, and I looked through that and I thought North Korea will march through his path and they’ll become a nuclear power and nothing is going to stop them because we are not bold, we’re not strong enough, and we didn’t show the resolve necessary to cause them to back up and back off, North Korea. Also true with Iran.

And in my President Bush, Bush 43, come into office, I was hopeful there would be a bolder position with regard to our posture towards North Korea and towards Iran. And I can remember serving here in this Congress through some of those years. And I watched how the political handcuffs were put on George W. Bush in such a way that he didn’t have the political support to use the bold actions that I believe might have worked to keep us from avert the nuclear power that has materialized in North Korea nor the impending nuclear power that appears
happy. They put the best face on it.
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Mr. GOHMERT. I have the same concerns my good friend from Arizona has. As has been discussed here, people around the world, nations around the world watch everything we do to determine are we serious about providing for a defense for America. Are we serious about providing a defense for our allies. Are we about standing up against rogue nations, against attacks on freedom and liberty.

I know there is some disagreement among historians, but there are those who believe that when the Secretary of State 60 years ago gave a speech which in essence indicated that Korea was really outside our sphere of influence, North Korea had been massing and they had been preparing, but it happened that they began moving south after that speech. People notice when there is a weakness evidenced in America's leadership, and often it leads to acts of violence.

Do you think it was any accident that the flotilla went against the Israeli blockade of Gaza where thousands of rockets had flown into Israel, destroying, killing, terrorizing Israelis. We agreed originally that the blockade was necessary because of all of the death and destruction. Was it any accident that the flotilla ends up setting sail to try at least challenge that blockade after this White House snubs the prime minister of Israel, treats them worse than Chavez or some Third World nation, blackballs them so ably, and begins to side with Israel's enemies, like in May voting with Israel's enemies to make them disclose all of their weaponry. I mean, was it any accident that is when those who were in favor of Israel's enemies sent the flotilla south? I don't think so.

When it comes to strong leadership that protects America, I mean, my friends, it was in discussing the situation of Guantanamo. I know that you would be as delighted as I was to read the headline, "5 Charged in 9/11 Attacks Seek to Plead Guilty." A New York Times article, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: "The five Guantanamo detainees charged with coordinating the September 11 attacks told a military judge on Monday that they wanted to confess in full, a move that seemed to challenge the government to put them to death after what had been listed as routine proceedings Monday. Judge Henry said he had received a written statement from the five men dated November 4 saying they planned to stop filing legal motions and to 'announce their intention to plead guilty.' Speaking in what has become a familiar high-pitched tone in the cavernous courtroom here, the most prominent of the five, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed said, 'We don't want to waste our time with motions.'" That was what they said.

This administration, fortunately, came in after, just a month after this because this is December 8, 2008. These guys were ready to plead guilty. They were ready to be put to death. They had already proclaimed, as Khalid Sheikh Mohammed did, as well as authorized by the other four, they were ready to take full responsibility for their punishment. Oh, no. The strong leaders in this administration came in and said, whoa, whoa, not so fast. We want to give you a show trial in New York City, cost ourselves billions of dollars, put New Yorkers at risk so you can have a big show, and we can pound our chest and talk about how civilized we are.

What civilized nation would not protect itself so it can remain civilized instead of being overtaken by barbarians? The civilized thing to do is to protect the civilized people that put you in office. But that is not what this administration did. They came in and basically said, you know what, hold off on that guilty plea. Once these guys begin to plead guilty. It's a show on early trial, well for heaven's sake, they pulled back on their guilty pleas and here 2 years later, 2 full years later, this administration has now announced basically that we are not sure when we are going to even start bringing them to trial. We are not sure where we are going to try them. It has shown weakness in leadership.

I just remind my friend, and I know he knows that John Stuart Mill, who said in the 1800s: "War is an ugly thing, but not the ugliest of things. The decayed and degraded state of moral and patriotic feeling which thinks that nothing is worth war is much worse. The person who has nothing for which he is willing to fight, nothing which is more important that his own personal safety, is a miserable creature and has no chance of being free unless made and kept so by the exertions of better men than himself."

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that is an accurate assessment of the administration. Mr. Speaker, it is kind hard to top that. The message I was hoping that could be relayed more than anything else is that there has been a general lackadaisical, asleep-at-the-wheel, detached perspective of this administration when it comes to national security. And unfortunately, we live in a 9/11 world where there are those out there who don't hold to the ideals of freedom and protecting innocent life, like has been the ideal of America. This administration is continuing down this path.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to have to come to this floor in future days and have to decry what we failed to do. I think there is still time for this administration to wake up and realize that allowing Iran to gain nuclear weapons, allowing North Korea to proliferate nuclear capability, missile capability throughout the world, allowing terrorists to use the forms of liberty to destroy liberty itself in our civilian world, all the potential of the terror to gain control of an EMP capability that could threaten our whole society, standing by while the Senate sits quietly and does nothing to pass the GRID bill passed in the House of Representatives, these are very, very important things. Mr. Speaker, I just hope somehow this administration realizes that their first purpose and their first responsibility to God, country, and their fellow human being is to protect the lives and constitutional rights of the citizens of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that happens.