

did not have to go to war against Iraq, certainly not when we did. There were other options; to rely on other policy tools, to delay attacking, or both. Iraq was thus fundamentally different from World War II or Korea or even the Persian Gulf War, all of which qualify as wars of necessity." Mr. Speaker, the significance of this analysis from a man who occupied so high a post in the Bush administration is great, and because of that, I ask that Mr. Haass's very thoughtful article be printed here.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 23, 2003]

WARS OF CHOICE

(By Richard N. Haass)

Any number of lessons can be learned from the handling of the aftermath of the war in Iraq, but none is more basic than this: Democracies, in particular American democracy, do not mix well with empire.

Empire is about control—the center over the periphery. Successful empire demands both an ability and a willingness to exert and maintain control. On occasion this requires an ability and a willingness to go to war, not just on behalf of vital national interests but on behalf of imperial concerns, which is another way of saying on behalf of lesser interests and preferences.

Iraq was such a war. The debate can and will go on as to whether attacking Iraq was a wise decision; but at its core it was a war of choice. We did not have to go to war against Iraq, certainly not when we did. There were other options: to rely on other policy tools, to delay attacking, or both.

Iraq was thus fundamentally different from World War II or Korea or even the Persian Gulf War, all of which qualify as wars of necessity. So, too, does the open-ended war against al Qaeda. What distinguishes wars of necessity is the requirement to respond to the use of military force by an aggressor and the fact that no option other than military force exists to reverse what has been done. In such circumstances, a consensus often materializes throughout the country that there is no alternative to fighting, a consensus that translates into a willingness to devote whatever it takes to prevail, regardless of the financial or human costs to ourselves.

Wars of choice, however, are fundamentally different. They are normally undertaken for reasons that do not involve obvious self-defense of the United States or an ally. Policy options other than military action exist; there is no domestic political consensus as to the correctness of the decision to use force. Vietnam was such a war, as was the war waged by the Clinton administration against Serbia over Kosovo.

Wars of choice vary in their cost and duration. Vietnam was long (lasting a decade and a half from the American perspective) and costly in terms of both blood (more than 58,000 lives) and treasure (hundreds of billions of dollars). By contrast, Kosovo took all of 78 days, claimed no American lives in combat and cost less than \$3 billion.

What these experiences suggest is that the American people are prepared to wage wars of choice, so long as they prove to be relatively cheap and short. But the United States is not geared to sustain costly wars of choice.

We are seeing just this with Iraq. The American people are growing increasingly restless, and it is not hard to see why. We have been at war now in Iraq for some eight months. More than 400 Americans have lost their lives. Costs are in the range of \$100 billion and mounting.

The Bush administration knows all this; hence the accelerated timetable to hand over increasing political responsibility for Iraq to Iraqis. Such a midcourse correction in U.S.

policy reflects in part the political realities of Iraq, where enthusiasm for prolonged American occupation is understandably restrained; even more, though, the policy shift reflects political realities here at home. Domestic tolerance for costs—disrupted and lost lives above all—is not unlimited. As a result, the president is wise to reduce the scale of what we try to accomplish. Making Iraq "good enough"—a functioning and fairly open society and economy if not quite a textbook model of democracy—is plenty ambitious.

None of this is meant to be an argument against all wars of choice. There may be good and sound reasons for going to war even if we do not have to, strictly speaking. Such reasons can range from protecting a defenseless population against ethnic cleansing or genocide to preventing the emergence of a threat that has the potential to cause damage on a large scale.

But wars of choice require special handling.

First, it is essential to line up domestic support. Congress and the American people need to be on board, not just in some formal legal way but also to the extent of being psychologically prepared for the possible costs. Better to warn of costs that never materialize than to be surprised by those that do.

Second, it is equally essential to line up international support. The United States needs partners: to facilitate the effort of fighting the war, to share the financial and human costs of war and its aftermath, to stand with us diplomatically should the going get tough. We possess the world's most powerful military and economy, but the United States is not immune from the consequences of being stretched too thin or going deeply into debt.

Third, no one should ever underestimate the potential costs of military action; no one should ever assume that a war of choice, or any war, will prove quick or easy. Here as elsewhere the great Prussian military theorist Carl von Clausewitz had it right: "There is no human affair which stands so constantly and so generally in close connection with chance as war."

PLEDGING CONTINUED UNITED STATES SUPPORT FOR GEORGIA'S SOVEREIGNTY, INDEPENDENCE, TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY, AND DEMOCRATIC AND ECONOMIC REFORMS

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 2003

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Georgian President Eduard Shevardnadze resigned on November 23, 2003. Mr. Shevardnadze's resignation caps a political career during which he has won my admiration, and that of freedom-loving people everywhere, for helping, as Soviet foreign minister under Mikhail Gorbachev, end the Cold War.

However, in spite of this remarkable accomplishment, during his 10 years as president, Georgians widely became disheartened with Mr. Shevardnadze for allowing corruption to infest the country, while most of its people fell into poverty and despair. These conditions fed the uprising against him, but it was triggered by the fraudulent parliamentary elections of November 2, 2003.

Opposition began daily protests that attracted thousands, demanding the elections be

annulled or Mr. Shevardnadze's resignation, or both. Throughout nearly 3 weeks of protests, both sides remained mindful of Georgia's interest in peace and safety, and avoided provocations.

Mr. Speaker, his fall ended a political crisis astonishing for its speed and lack of violence in a blood-washed region. There was no blood. No killing.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, this resolution congratulates both Eduard Shevardnadze and the leaders of the opposition, Nino Burdzhadze, Mikhail Saakashvili, and Zurab Zhvaniva, for their courage and patriotism in dealing with the crisis bloodlessly.

Moreover, the resolution pledges support and help for the people of Georgia so as to consolidate the democratic process. Furthermore, it urges all political segments, as well as social sectors and institutions in Georgia, to strive, through dialogue, to achieve the national reconciliation for which both the Georgian people and the international community yearn.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly and wholeheartedly support Georgia's new leaders, while I also urge them to pursue stability, abide by their constitution and hold democratic elections.

And, I look forward to working with Interim President Nino Burdzhadze in her effort to maintain the integrity of Georgia's democracy as she strives to ensure that this change in government follows the constitution.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO EARL VANTASSEL

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 2003

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you with a heavy heart to pay tribute to a remarkable man from my district. Earl VanTassel of Craig, Colorado passed away recently at the age of 85. Earl contributed a great deal to the Craig community, and it is my honor today to rise and pay tribute to his life before this body of Congress and our nation.

Earl was born in Craig in 1918. He attended Craig High School, where he graduated in 1937. In 1943, Earl married Florence Prather, his wife of sixty years. Earl and Florence raised four wonderful children together.

Earl was an excellent and knowledgeable rancher who used his expertise for the betterment of his community. He was a mentor and leader for 4-H participants, and in that capacity, he passed along his knowledge of livestock and ranching to young people throughout the region. Earl was also a dedicated volunteer at the Moffat County Fair, numerous livestock sales, and local rodeos. He delighted in helping with the Craig Sale Barn for many years. In addition, Earl was an active member of the Colorado Cattlemen's Association, the Young Farmers Association and the 4-H Foundation.

Earl's contributions to his community went well beyond ranching. As a member of Colorado's first Conservation Board, Earl worked tirelessly on behalf of the environment. In addition, Earl served over forty years as a member of Craig's Rural Fire Protection District

Board. He was also an active member of the Elks Club, and a volunteer with the Sheriff's Posse as well. Craig is definitely a better place as the result of Earl's many contributions.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to rise and pay tribute to Earl VanTassel. Earl spent a great deal of his life working for the betterment of his community and our State. Above all, Earl was a wonderful father, husband and a friend to many. My heart goes out to Earl's loved ones during this difficult time of bereavement.

TRIBUTE TO SGT. LaVON C. HOVE

HON. GINNY BROWN-WAITE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 2003

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Sgt. LaVon C. Hove, a Korean war veteran from Brooksville, FL, in my fifth congressional district.

This Veterans Day, I will have the pleasure of recognizing Sgt. LaVon Hove for his heroism and bravery as a United States soldier who fought in the Korean war from January 16, 1951 to August 1952.

This conflict enlisted the services of 6.8 million American men and women between 1950 and 1955.

On January 16, 1951 in Chorwon, Korea, Sgt. Hove was wounded in both legs and feet by shell fragments from a nearby explosion.

I will soon present Sgt. Hove with the Purple Heart, the oldest military decoration in the world, 50 years overdue.

Though he earned this honor, he never received it from the Defense Department and I am honored to have the opportunity to present to him the Purple Heart for his selfless devotion to duty and service to the United States.

REMEMBERING W.E.B. DUBOIS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 2003

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the 1963 March on Washington, the life of one of the 20th century's most brilliant individuals came to an end. W.E.B. DuBois—scholar, Pan-Africanist, political leader, champion of the struggle against white supremacy in the United States—died in Ghana on August 27, 1963. This year marks the 40th anniversary of DuBois' death.

DuBois was born on February 23, 1868 in Great Barrington, Massachusetts. At that time Great Barrington had perhaps 25, but not more than 50, Black people out of a population of about 5,000.

While in high school DuBois showed a keen concern for the development of his race. At age fifteen he became the local correspondent for the New York Globe. While in this position he conceived it his duty to push his race forward by lectures and editorials reflecting the need for Black people to politicize themselves.

Upon graduating high school DuBois desired to attend Harvard. Although he lacked the financial resources, the aid of family and friends, along with a scholarship he received

to Fisk College (now University), allowed him to head to Nashville, Tennessee to further his education.

In his three years at Fisk (1885–1888), DuBois' first trip to the south, his knowledge of the race problem manifested. After seeing discrimination in unimaginable ways, he developed a determination to expedite the emancipation of his people. As a result, he became a writer, editor, and a passionate orator. Simultaneously, he acquired a belligerent attitude toward the color bar.

After graduation from Fisk, DuBois entered Harvard through scholarships. He received his bachelor's degree in 1890 and immediately began working toward his master's and doctor's degrees. After studying at the University of Berlin for some time, DuBois obtained his doctor's degree from Harvard. Indeed, his doctoral thesis, *The Suppression of the African Slave Trade in America*, remains the authoritative work on that subject, and is the first volume in Harvard's Historical Series.

At the age of twenty-six, DuBois accepted a teaching job at Wilberforce in Ohio. After two years at Wilberforce, DuBois accepted a special fellowship at the University of Pennsylvania to conduct a research project in Philadelphia's seventh ward slums. This gave him the opportunity to study Blacks as a social system. The result of this endeavor was *The Philadelphia Negro*. This was the first time such a scientific approach to studying social phenomena was undertaken. Consequently, DuBois is known as the father of Social Science. After completing the study, DuBois accepted a position at Atlanta University to further his teachings in sociology.

Originally, DuBois believed that social science could provide the knowledge to solve the race problem. However, he gradually concluded that in a climate of violent racism, social change could only be accomplished through protest. In this view, he clashed with Booker T. Washington, the most influential black leader of the period. Washington preached a philosophy of accommodation, urging blacks to accept discrimination for the time being and elevate themselves through hard work and economic gain, thus winning the respect of whites. DuBois believed that Washington's strategy, rather than freeing the black man from oppression, would serve only to perpetuate it.

Two years later, in 1905, DuBois led the founding of the Niagara Movement; a small organization chiefly dedicated to attacking the platform of Booker T. Washington. The organization, which met annually until 1909, served as the ideological backbone and direct inspiration for the NAACP, founded in 1909. DuBois played a prominent part in the creation of the NAACP and became the association's director of research and editor of its magazine, *The Crisis*.

Indeed, DuBois' Black Nationalism had several forms. The most influential of which was his advocacy of Pan-Africanism; the belief that all people of African descent had common interests and should work together in the struggle for their freedom. As the editor of *The Crisis*, DuBois encouraged the development of Black literature and art. DuBois urged his readers and the world to see "Beauty in Black."

Due to disagreements with the organization, DuBois resigned from the editorship of *The Crisis* and the NAACP in 1934 and returned to

Atlanta University. He would devote the next 10 years of his life to teaching and scholarship. He completed two major works after resuming his duties at Atlanta University. His book, *Black Reconstruction*, dealt with the socio-economic development of the nation after the Civil War and portrayed the contributions of the Black people to this period. Before, Blacks were always portrayed as disorganized and chaotic. His second book of this period, *Dusk of Dawn*, was completed in 1940 and expounded his concepts and views on both the African's and African American's quest for freedom.

In 1945, he served as an associate consultant to the American delegation at the founding conference of the United Nations in San Francisco. Here, he charged the world organization with planning to be dominated by imperialist nations and not intending to intervene on the behalf of colonized countries. He announced that the fifth Pan-African Congress would convene to determine what pressure to apply to the world powers. This all-star cast included Kwame Nkrumah, a dedicated revolutionary, father of Ghanaian independence, and first president of Ghana; George Padmore, an international revolutionary, often called the "Father of African Emancipation," who later became Nkrumah's advisor on African Affairs; and Jomo Kenyatta, called the "Burning Spear," reputed leader of the Mau Mau uprising, and first president of independent Kenya. The Congress elected DuBois International President and cast him the "Father of Pan-Africanism."

This same year he published *Color and Democracy: Colonies and Peace*, and in 1947 produced *The World and Africa*. DuBois's outspoken criticism of American foreign policy and his involvement with the 1948 presidential campaign of Progressive Party candidate Henry Wallace led to his dismissal from the NAACP in the fall of 1948.

During the 1950's DuBois's continuing work with the international peace movement and open expressions of sympathy for the USSR drew the attention of the United States government and further isolated DuBois from the civil rights mainstream. In 1951, at the height of the Cold War, he was indicted under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938. Although he was acquitted of the charge, the Department of State refused to issue DuBois a passport in 1952, barring him from foreign travel until 1958. Once the passport ban was lifted, DuBois and his wife traveled extensively, visiting England, France, Belgium, Holland, China, the USSR, and much of the Eastern bloc. On May 1, 1959, he was awarded the Lenin Peace Prize in Moscow. In 1960, DuBois attended the inauguration of his friend Kwame Nkrumah as the first president of Ghana. The following year DuBois accepted Nkrumah's invitation to move there and work on the *Encyclopedia Africana*, a project that was never completed.

On August 27, 1963, on the eve of the March on Washington, DuBois died in Accra, Ghana at the age of 94. Historians consider DuBois one of the most influential African Americans before the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960's. Born only six years after emancipation, he was active well into his 90's. Throughout his long life, DuBois remained Black America's leading public intellectual. He was a spokesman for the Negro's rights at a time when few were listening. By the time he