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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MILLER of Michigan addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the 5-minute Special Order was ordered in favor of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) vacated.

There was no objection.

THE STATE OF OUR NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

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've seen 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 Iraq 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 State Department and even some parts of the Defense Department. And some of these commonsense 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 impossible to copy classified data 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 complied 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, people perhaps put their finger on the just 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 all manner of private information and statements that are never public, but yet why the New York Times is willing to run this with whatever legal consequences the reporter has a right to do. 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 be kept 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 say that, unlike authoritarian regimes across the world, democratic governments like ours hold secrets largely be- cause citizens agree that they should be kept 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 say that, unlike authoritarian regimes across the world, democratic governments like ours hold secrets largely be- cause citizens agree that they should be kept 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 the enemy, Mr. Speaker. Without objection, the 5-minute Special Order was ordered in favor of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) vacated.

There was no objection.
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.

Representative Frank, 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 it is confirmed 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 revelations 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 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 execute a man like that, that we can protect ourselves. And if we fail to do so, I think that that is sometimes bedevilment, 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 see and talk 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 we would have to charges 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 3: Treason against the United States shall consist—against us shall consist in levying war against us, or in giving aid and comfort to our enemies—which certainly al Qaeda and the Taliban and the enemies of the terrorists who are lining up against us are our enemies—and giving them aid and comfort, giving aid and comfort to the enemy. And I wish I hope that there's a subject that we wouldn't have much debate on here in this Congress that Mr. Assange has given aid and comfort to the enemy. He's empowered the enemy. He's threatened Americans at risk. He's put the allies of Americans at risk. And it's a precarious situation around the globe, in this geopolitical-military-economic chess game that goes on constantly on the entire planet, he's taken away some of our advantage and he's given it to our enemies.

And I wish and hope that there's a way that we can find a way to prosecute a man like that, that we can protect ourselves. And if we fail to do that, or even if we're successful in that but it exposes some other vulnerabilities, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress take a look at some new legislation, a new structure of law, that's really not brought about because of the actions of Mr. Assange but brought about because of the actions of our enemies, our terrorist enemies.

And I have come to realize, and I think that there will be a significant number of Members of Congress that have come to realize, that we don't have the tools to fight these enemies; that the idea that we could catch terrorists like, for example, Osama bin Ladin's chauffeur, and we can't find a way to try that chauffeur, and then have him under Article III, section 2, strip these terrorists that are attacking America. And in this precarious situation around the globe, in this geopolitical-military-economic chess game that goes on constantly on the entire planet, he's taken away some of our advantage and he's given it to our enemies.

And I wish and hope that there's a way that we can find a way to prosecute a man like that, that we can protect ourselves. And if we fail to do that, or even if we're successful in that but it exposes some other vulnerabilities, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress take a look at some new legislation, a new structure of law, that's
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 civil 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 away from 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. 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 prisoners 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 Guantanamo 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. So if we’re going to try cases 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 when we sent these terrorists to a location and let them stay there.

Not only does it give them the ability to have discovery where they are able to potentially undermine our security apparatus and gain information that is critical to protecting our agents in the field, but this also gives them the ability to claim all kinds of things before the world. And of course you know 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 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 Press, 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.
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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 today if my colleague 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 Guantanamo Bay. I believe it was a year ago last 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 Guantanamo Bay. And I think this is something that the American people are throwing human feces in the face of our troops. What is the punishment for that? If it 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 Mohamed 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 can't read it. He converted to Christianity. It was verboten to bring a Bible into Guantanamo Bay because it would set the inmates off, the other inmates off who thought that a Bible was an insult and affront to them.

And they were watching their flat screen TV in their little break room, and a lady came on to do a commercial, and she had a short-sleeved shirt on and showed her elbow. Showed her elbow. I don't get really all that worked up over an elbow. But they got all worked up over the elbow and trashed the room, tore up the furniture, broke the flat screen TV, scat tered it all. It was like a little riot in their break room. What's their punishment for that? New furniture, new flat screen TV. We coddle these prisoners. We don't even have a punishment for those that attack our American guards.

And we set up the trial room so that there are microphones, a sound system, places for witnesses to sit, places for family members to observe, a soundproof glass that's there. And when it gets back to the critical component of the testimony, we have an officer that is assigned with the job to cut off the testimony until such time as the witnesses that don't have access to classified are marched out of the witness chamber, and they pick up the testimony.

This facility is laid out for the purposes of trying people where national security is an issue. And if we had been trying the individual you talked about, Mr. LAMBORN, I believe he would have been convicted in Guantanamo Bay. Because the evidence that was necessary to convict him would have been used rather than held back for fear that it would leak out. And we have a spillage of national secrets that becomes the subject here of the WikiLeaks.

So those are things that go across my mind. We have got to do a lot more. We have got to be a lot smarter about this. What would be very helpful is if we had a Commander in Chief who was making the ask of this Congress rather than us. And I think probably one of the most dangerous areas there has been is just the passive nature that the administration has shown toward North Korea.

North Korea is one of the most dangerous police states in the world. And they have shown time and again that they are not interested in becoming a stable diplomatic partner really to any member of the international community for that matter, but certainly not the United States.

And a timeline of North Korea's blatant provocations would probably be worth looking at here. Just to give you an example, in March of 2010 they were involved in the sinking of a South Korean submarine. It killed 46 sailors. In November of 2010, U.N. Security Council passed a resolution that North Korea has been passing, as Mr. LAMBORN said, forbidden nuclear technology to state sponsors of terror. I know Mr. LAMBORN mentioned the missile technology, which is more recent, but also nuclear technology to sponsors of terrorism, including Iran and Syria. Of course the Syrian plant was almost a mirror image of the one in North Korea. And fortunately our friends in Israel were able to make sure that that one didn't work so well any more. And they did the world a great favor in that regard. Because nuclear weapons in the hands of Iran or Syria would be a greater danger to the human family to say the very least.

In November of 2010, North Korea shelled the Yeonpyeong Island, a group of South Korean islands, and it claimed the lives of two South Korean marines. Two civilians I believe were also killed. It wounded somewhere around 15 marines and three other civilians. And of course, this administration, while they have some shows of resolve here lately, a lot of these things have occurred because they have stood by and let North Korea get away with this so long. And really in a sense North Korea sometimes does this to get attention, and they have no respect for innocent human life. So blowing up a few people to try to get one of the Democrat administrations to give them more money is something that they don't hesitate to do. And they have done this on a regular basis over a long time.

The U.S., Mr. Speaker, must move to re-list North Korea as a state sponsor of terrorism and call on all responsible nations to adopt tough new sanctions on the North Korean regime. The North Korean regime will collapse on itself if China and other countries in the world do not continue to prop them up.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Thank you, Mr. KING. You know, I suppose that there are a lot of different issues we could talk about with the WikiLeaks situation that. But I would point out that probably one of the big things that it showed is that just our appeasement toward our enemies. And I think probably one of the most dangerous areas there has been is just the passive nature that the administration has shown toward North Korea.

China should be especially called upon to stop enabling this regime and to join responsible nations in sending an unequivocal message to North Korea that its aggression is unacceptable. And, of course, you know it shouldn't come as a surprise to us, but China's objections kept us from seeing Ahmadinejad was re-elected as President. There was rampant fraud throughout the country. It was obvious to any observer, and the people of Iran were offended and resent that and they rebelled and took to the streets.

We did nothing to support them. That would have been, and maybe still is, the best way to overthrow this murderous regime in Tehran. But we are doing nothing to help the opposition.

That type of lack of effort, I don't understand it. It's our best shot at freeing the people of Iran so that they can become more democratic and peace loving. There are many pro-Western Iranians, especially young people. Some of them have been to the West, and they like the West. And yet we are doing nothing to support those in opposition to this government.

And to find out from WikiLeaks, to have the confirmation that 19 intermediate range missiles that could go as far as Moscow or Western Europe have been sent from North Korea to Iran, and that we know Iran is working on a nuclear weapon at the same time to put on these missiles, there is no question about that, this is unacceptable. This should not be happening. We should not be allowing North Korea to send this kind of technology to Syria and Iran. And we delayed that for 6 months.

In other words, because of China, because of their commitment to delay this, Iran was given 6 additional months to work on advancing their nuclear capacity without public scrutiny. And there is no telling how far they were able, willing to go, really, to advance this effort. But they were eventually forced to see this information like a rest of the world, that is to see that the North Korean Government fall and North Korea be reunited and somehow, some semblance of freedom come to that people and that this country, like many of its people, would like for it to be reunited with the world community in a responsible way.

To pursue a lot of diplomacy with North Korea is wasted effort, and we should be pursuing now the effort to see a North Korea and South Korea reunited under a free government like South Korea.
Korea proliferate like this, and our ad-
ministration should and needs to do
more.
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 en-
tire human family that would repre-
se
But just for a moment, let’s consider
that for a moment. You know, the
Ahmadinejad government, the govern-
ment 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, want-
ing to see Israel wiped off the map and
the United States be ended as a world
power and to see us completely brought
to our knees.
I mean, it’s hard to even, to repeat
some of the things that this Iranian ad-
ministration has said about America.
And it’s very clear what their intent is,
and I think it’s 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’s 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 peo-
ple, 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 as-
tonishing 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 contain-
ment, 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. 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 dead-
ly weapons that we face in Iraq and
blowing up our soldiers with their ex-
plosively formed penetrators. They pay
money to see some of the Taliban kill
American soldiers in Afghanistan.
They have an intent, Mr. Speaker, to
carry out an EMP attack against this
country, and they have the capaci-
ty to carry out that threat.
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 pre-
paration for an EMP attack against this
country or some other enemy that they
might have.
Mr. Speaker, I think that this admin-
istration seems woefully unprepared or
even unaware of how serious an elec-
 tromagnetic pulse or a high altitude
nuclear blast to create an electrome-

tromagnetic pulse could be to this coun-
try.
And if we have not understood by
now the intent of nuclear capability it will
give them the asymmetric capability to, in
fact, launch an EMP attack against this
country, and that could cripple our in-
frastucture. It could cause an almost
inarticulable 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 at-
tention 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 weap-
ons 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 Ohio—whether you are not
from Ohio—to comment.
Mr. KING from Iowa. Well, I thank
the gentleman from Arizona. And I
loved Ohio until Ohio State beat the
Hawkeyes a week and a half ago, but
we think about this as Americans,
watching this world, this Western civil-
ization world falling under the shad-
ow of nuclear terrorism, if we think
worrying about some jet airliners being
flown into the Twin Towers or into the
Pentagon just down the road a little
ways or off into the field in Pennsyl-
vania, what that did to this country,
how it shook up this country, how it
immobilized our financial markets and
our daily lives, right down to football
games and weddings were brought to
a halt, and we know it was more than
1,000 miles away, nearly
2,000 miles away to get to the other
side of the continent, they stopped
their football games there, too. They
stopped their weddings there, too. And
I don’t think they stopped theerals for a while. That’s how much it dev-
astated this country. And I thought
that we really should have looked at
those crises on September 11, 2001 and
said it’s not going to break our stride.
We’re going to go forward, and we’re going
to live, and we’re going to live while we
adapt to the new threat that has come
upon us.

But this new threat that’s out there
now that hangs over our head, the
shadow of nuclear terrorism that hangs
over our head out of North Korea, who
is completely belligerent today, and
out of Iran as well.
And I will tell 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
him to back up and back off, North
Korea. Also true with Iran.
And as I watched 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 re-
member 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 put a stop to the
Iranians and the North Koreans, then
to avert the nuclear power that has
materialized in North Korea nor the
impending nuclear power that appears
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They knew it was inevitable, but they were not and are not happy. And, yes, there are attempts to contain Iran with a theater defense, and that’s good as far as it goes. But theater defense for missiles against missiles is not the same as defense against intercontinental ICBMs. And the sad part is that’s what we would have had with the ground based interceptors in Poland.

So, yes, I do like that we will have Aegis ships with theater missile defense against those in places around Iran. I’m troubled by the role of Turkey. I think they are as stable as an ally as they once were under their current leadership. And I’m not sure they’re very dependable these days. I hope they become more so. But Iran is developing threats that will go beyond our theater defenses faster than we will have intercontinental protection in place. So they will be able to go beyond our theater defenses before we have intercontinental defenses. So their theater defense is an advantage by continuing forward, and then our defenses will be put into place.

And that is what concerns me about the phased adaptive approach, which is the theater defense in the alternative to the third site that would have been in Poland. And I yield back to the gentleman from Arizona, who is an expert on these issues.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Well, I think the gentleman is absolutely correct, not that I’m an expert, but that your points are absolutely correct. I would say that it’s important to realize that the European site was not only a redundant protection to the United States from potentially ICBMs coming from Iran. And it was also something that could have calculated or factored into the calculus of Iran in moving towards developing nuclear capability in the first place, because in a sense, Mr. Speaker, missile defense is the last line of defense against an enemy coming missile. Everyone can understand that basic equation. But it’s also the first line of defense against nuclear proliferation. Because a rogue state like Iran knows that they face great challenges and great dangers by pursuing nuclear weapons because they realize that their neighbors understand the aggressive nature of that rogue state of Iran and can’t abide them having nuclear weapons, and they realize that could potentially invite some of the world to shoot down ICBMs, unless they’re in a perfect spot, which is a very rare occurrence. And I would just suggest to you that this administration, once again, has placed their ideological commitment to the left above national security.

You know, there may be some day when we wished we had these days back again. With all of the challenges we face, it seems like the administration forgets its first responsibility, its first constitutional duty of defending the citizens and the national security of this country. It shouldn’t surprise us that they forget the idea of property rights, and it shouldn’t surprise us that they forget the idea of protecting the rights of innocent, unborn children. And it shouldn’t surprise us that they are willing to put people on the courts that have no respect for the Constitution. And it shouldn’t surprise us that somehow the foundations of the Nation, the right to live and be free and pursue our dreams, is subordinated to the notion that we that to build a large State. Those things shouldn’t surprise us. But if this administration continues to go in the direction it is going, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that we will all wish we had these days back again when we could have prevented something that would not only fall on us because of the ideological commitment of this administration to weaken America.
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I wonder if my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) has any comments along those lines.

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 leader and then treats them so callously, 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 want to protect 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, 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 Guantnamo 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 confessions to plea in full'.

Mr. Speaker, I have so much respect and abiding love and appreciation for my dear friend from Arizona, as well as my friend Colleen Hanley of Arizona, who here earlier from Iowa, my dear friend STEVE KING. Congressman KING and I were down in Guantanamo together, and I heard him earlier talking about pulling back the privileges and punishing as much as Guantanamo Bay against our own servicemen.

I did recall something that he may not have recalled. There is another severe form of punishment when such an assault is committed on our guards at Guantanamo, which apparently is pretty customary down there, of throwing urine or feces on our guards. They have to come up with creative ways to do that, and do so.

One of the other ways—and it's the only other way in addition to taking some of their outdoor exercise time down to 2 hours. The other thing that they have not been known to do is to really punish them, to actually torture them, is to take away some of their movie-watching time during the day. It's just devastating, you know, to the Guantanamo detainees to have some of their movie-watching privileges taken away because they threw feces or urine on one of our gallant servicemen or -women. You've got to take away some of their movie-watching. It really teaches them a lesson. It just shows them we're not going to be messed with. If you mess with us, you won't get to watch as many movies today as you would have otherwise. We'll show 'em.

I was also hearing on the news today that Uighurs, Chinese Muslims who have been transferred out of Guantanamo, had given interviews, indicating, actually, they were a lot better treated in Guantanamo than they were at home in China. So, despite the way some people have tried to characterize the prison in Guantanamo, it is not quite as bad as it is by a long shot. It provides better living conditions than many of these people have ever had in their lives.