

Guam was hit by Supertyphoon Pongsona, one of the most devastating storms experienced. During the destructive storm, David stationed himself in the newsroom, working diligently to keep a traumatized community informed. Hourly he provided crucial and updated information on the newspaper's Web site.

When the storm subsided and David was informed of the loss of his parent's home, he took up residence in the newsroom for weeks to ensure coordinated local coverage. As a team player, David also galvanized nonprofit and community-based aid organizations, as well as the island's federal emergency management teams, in coordinating newspaper coverage in an effort to distribute vital information to a recovering community.

According to his nominator for the award, "David's editing leadership insured news coverage that focused on readers' needs during the storm and for weeks after, while the island still was rebuilding from the storm's devastation. David more than proved his leadership ability during this ordeal."

In addition, David is also actively involved in a leadership role with newspaper outreach efforts within the community. And recently, during the newspaper's planning process, he chaired an instrumental inter-department team. It is worth noting that David's award is in addition to other key corporate honors bestowed to Pacific Daily News staff and executives this year.

Gannett is an international company with headquarters in McLean, Virginia and maintains operations in forty-four states including the District of Columbia, Guam, Belgium, Germany, Hong Kong, Italy and the United Kingdom. In terms of circulation, Gannett is considered America's largest newspaper group with 100 daily newspapers and a combined daily circulation of 7.7 million. In addition of the Pacific Daily News, publications include USA Today, the nation's largest-selling daily newspaper, with a circulation of approximately 2.3 million and availability in 60 countries worldwide.

I want to commend David for his hard work and dedication to the people of Guam, and to express my sincere congratulations on his joining the ranks of 149 other Gannett managers that have been cited for outstanding work since the supervisor awards were introduced in 1994. As a native son of Guam, David serves as a model of success, hard work and perseverance for both young and old alike.

HAPPY NEW YEAR 4702 TO THE ORGANIZATION OF CHINESE AMERICANS

HON. MELISSA A. HART

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 15, 2003

Ms. HART. Mr. Speaker, I would like to wish the membership of the Organization of Chinese Americans a healthy and happy New Year for the year 4702, the year of the Monkey.

The New Year is a time for reflection and thanksgiving for the joys of life and loved ones and I am thankful for the richness that this organization brings to my region. Chinese Amer-

icans have made great contributions to Western Pennsylvania and to our Nation as a whole and I am very honored for this opportunity to wish them the best year yet in 4702.

I encourage my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join with me in wishing the members of the Organization of Chinese Americans a very happy and prosperous New Year.

IN RECOGNITION OF LARRY ZARIAN, RECIPIENT OF THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA, VERDUGO HILLS COUNCIL 2003 GLENDALE DISTINGUISHED CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 15, 2003

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor longtime Glendale community leader and activist Larry Zarian on the occasion of his receiving the Verdugo Hills Council, Boy Scouts of America 2003 Glendale Distinguished Citizen of the Year award. Larry has been actively involved with the Boy Scouts for many years, having served on the executive board of the Verdugo Hills Council, Boy Scouts of America for seventeen years.

Larry has been a vibrant part of the fabric of Glendale since he began residing there in 1953. Most notably, Larry served for sixteen years on the Glendale City Council and as mayor of Glendale for four terms. He is responsible for many accomplishments during his tenure on the Glendale City Council. He organized groups to raise funds for the Veteran's Memorial monument; worked to maintain Glendale hillsides; and was a supporter for code enforcement, enabling the city to identify landlords who maintained substandard conditions.

His activism and leadership was apparent when he was appointed to serve on a city commission at the age of 20. Subsequently, Larry was appointed by various local, state and national leaders to serve on other commissions. He served as chairman on the state Water & Power Commission & Planning Commission. Governor George Deukemejian and later Governor Pete Wilson appointed Larry to serve on the regional Water Quality Control Board. President Reagan appointed him to the National Highway Safety Commission.

As a member of the Glendale Junior Chamber of Commerce, Larry mentored young entrepreneurs about civic responsibility, community involvement and leadership. His dedication and service to the community placed him on numerous boards such as the Glendale Adventist Medical governing board where he helped raise funds for the MRI Center. As a board member of the Foundation for Glendale's Association for the Retarded, Larry was instrumental in securing the organization's first home in Glendale. Currently Larry is a member of the board of directors for Glendale Symphony. As an active and proud member of the Kiwanis, Larry annually helps with the Special Olympics and Jazz Day where he dons an apron to serve sandwiches.

Larry has been recognized for his selfless contribution to his community as recipient of Verdugo Hills Council Good Turn Award; Cit-

izen of the Year from the Glendale Chamber of Commerce; and Philanthropist of the Year from Glendale Adventist Medical Center. For many years, Larry has aptly been voted as one of the top 103 most influential people in the City of Glendale.

It is my pleasure to recognize Larry Zarian. I ask that all members of the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Larry for all his years of selfless service and dedication to the Boys Scouts of America and to the Glendale community at large.

IRAQ: A WAR OF CHOICE, (CONT.)

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 15, 2003

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on December 8, I inserted into these pages an extraordinarily important article by Richard Haass, formerly the Director of Policy Planning at the State Department in the Bush administration. This article by Mr. Haass, which appeared in the November 23 Washington Post, has received far too little attention. In it, this very high ranking State Department official under the presidency of George Bush acknowledged what many of us have been arguing in the face of the administration's efforts to prove the contrary; namely, that the war in Iraq was motivated not by a fear of weapons of mass destruction or of the need to combat terrorism, but rather as a conscious policy choice in service of the administration's view of the world. As Mr. Haass himself argued in the central point of his essay, Iraq was a war of choice and not of necessity. Obviously if it had been occasioned by the likelihood of Saddam Hussein using weapons of mass destruction or of his furthering the efforts of al Qaeda, it would have fallen into the war of necessity category.

While I was disappointed that more attention had not been paid to this, I was not surprised to see in the December 8 Washington Post a very thoughtful article by Lawrence J. Korb underlining exactly how significant Mr. Haass's article was. Lawrence J. Korb who served as an Assistant Secretary of Defense under President Reagan has been for years one of the most thoughtful critics of national security excesses, and a strong articulator of rational foreign policy.

As Mr. Korb explicitly notes, what Richard Haass says in explaining the war in Iraq is directly contrary to the rationale given by the President, the Secretary of Defense and other high administration officials. It is, as Mr. Korb notes, unfortunate that Mr. Haass "was unwilling to go public with his views as did General Eric Shineski, while he could have made a difference." But while I join Mr. Korb in that regret, I do want to express admiration for Mr. Haass for speaking out now. Obviously he is aware of how much what he writes contradicts the official rationale for this war given by the Bush administration, and in this case the adage better late than never is relevant.

Because Lawrence J. Korb so clearly emphasizes the importance of Richard Haass's original article and because this is a significant debate that is getting too little attention from the American public, I ask that Lawrence J. Korb's article be printed here.

A WAR OF CHOICE OR OF NECESSITY?

(By Lawrence J. Korb)

Eight months after the Bush administration got us involved in a bloody war in Iraq, we are now told by one of Secretary of State Colin L. Powell's closest advisers that Iraq was a war of choice after all. According to Richard Haass, director of policy planning at the State Department until June 2003 and still the Bush administration's special envoy to Northern Ireland, the administration "did not have to go to war against Iraq, certainly not when we did. There were other options" [op-ed, Nov. 23]. Really?

This is not what the administration told us before the war and continues to tell us to this day. On March 20, as he was sending troops into Iraq because the regime of Saddam Hussein allegedly possessed weapons of mass destruction and had ties to al Qaeda, Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld told them, "We are at the point at which the risk of not acting is too great to wait longer. As you prepare, know that this war is necessary . . ." Some three weeks into the war, Powell, who had made the case for war to the United Nations, stated: "We do not seek war. We do not look for war. We don't want wars. But we will not be afraid to fight when these wars are necessary to protect the American people, to protect our interests, to protect friends."

Even after it had become abundantly clear that the arguments the Bush administration advanced for going to war were specious, both Vice President Cheney and Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul D. Wolfowitz explicitly rebutted Haass's position. In an Oct. 10 speech to the Heritage Foundation in which he lashed out at those who said we had a choice about invading Iraq, the vice president said: "Some claim we should not have acted because the threat from Saddam Hussein was not imminent. Since when have terrorists and tyrants announced their intentions, policy putting us on notice before they strike? On Nov. 4 Wolfowitz stated: "But one of the things that Sept. 11 changed was that it made it a war of necessity, not a war of choice."

The president himself continues to proclaim how necessary the war was. On Nov. 22 he said at a press conference in London, "Our mission in Iraq is noble and it is necessary."

On Thanksgiving Day the president told the troops in Baghdad: "You are defeating the terrorists here in Iraq so we don't have to face them in our own country."

Even more surprising is Haass's contention that despite its public pronouncements, the Bush administration knows that, because this is a war of choice, Americans will not support it unless it is relatively short and cheap. This is why the administration has changed its policy and accelerated the timetable to hand over increasing political responsibility to Iraqis, even if it means reducing what it is trying to accomplish.

Haass weakens his own case by arguing that the first Persian Gulf War was a real war of necessity and Vietnam was only a war of choice. Even those who argued against the recent invasion of Iraq would not contend that it was less necessary than the first Persian Gulf War. As Secretary of State James Baker noted in 1990, that war was really about oil. And Powell, then chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as well as such defense hawks as Sen. Sam Nunn (D-Ga.), wanted to give sanctions more time to work before invading Iraq. (If it was so necessary, why did the administration of the elder Bush not invade until it got other nations to fund the war?)

It is equally absurd to argue that the first Gulf War was more necessary than Vietnam.

In the mid-1960s many Americans, including most of us who were in the armed forces, believed that if South Vietnam fell to the Communists all of Southeast Asia would soon follow and the containment policy would be undermined. This is why the American people supported that conflict through the Tet offensive of 1968, even though more than 30,000 Americans had died by then.

Ironically, while Haass is wrong about Vietnam and the first Gulf War, he is right about Iraq. It is a war of choice—a bad choice as it turns out. Unfortunately, he was unwilling to go public with his views, as did Gen. Eric Shinseki, while he could have made a difference. This article should have been written nine months ago when Congress and the American people had a choice. Now our only real choice is to continue to stay and absorb the casualties and the cost.

HONORING THE GUAM COUNCIL OF WOMEN'S CLUBS ON THEIR TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 15, 2003

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Guam Council of Women's Clubs on their 20th anniversary and to acknowledge the Council's present and past members. I commend the numerous contributions of the council to programs and organizations that benefit not only Guam's local population, but also the national and international community.

The Guam Council of Women's Clubs was founded in June 1983 as a response to the devastation in Guam from Super typhoon Pamela. A group of prominent local women answered the call to service, establishing the council in an attempt to unify existing organizations towards the goal of recovery. The organization was to be a congress made up of representatives from every association devoted to promoting women's issues around common backgrounds, cultures, ethnicity and purpose. Through this collaboration, the founders sought to harness the energy and spirit of such organizations to contribute to the betterment of the local community, while providing an opportunity to pursue and express the political, social and economic needs of every woman, as individuals and as a powerful collective force.

The names of the individual organizations which collectively comprise the Council include: the American Association of University Women; the Catholic Daughters of America; the Chinese Ladies Association; the Christian Women's Club; the Filipino Ladies Association of Guam; the Guam Women's Club; the Guam Memorial Hospital Volunteers Association; the International Women's Club; the Women's Division of the Japan Club of Guam; the Korean Women's Association; the Palau Women's Club; and most recently, the two Soroptomist International organizations.

As a founding member of this organization, I want to express my deepest gratitude to the Guam Council of Women's Clubs and its members for their years of hard work and dedication to the people of Guam, as they celebrate their 20th anniversary of service.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JIM GIBBONS

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 15, 2003

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer a personal explanation of the reason for my absence on November 17, 2003 during rollcall Votes #620, 621, 622, and 623. When these votes were called, I was detained in Nevada's Second Congressional District while tending to certain duties in the State of Nevada.

If present, I would have voted: "aye" on rollcall Vote #620, S.J. Res. 22; "aye" on rollcall Vote #621, S.J. Res. 18; "aye" on rollcall Vote #299, H. Con. Res. 299; and "aye" on rollcall Vote #623, A Motion on Hour of Meeting.

THE TRUTHS OF GENEVA

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 15, 2003

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, no situation in the world is more deeply troubling to me and many others than the ongoing conflict involving Israel and the Palestinians. I speak as a strong supporter of Israel and of the moral importance of its continuing to exist as a free, independent, secure nation. Sadly, from the moment Israel's creation was announced—in accord with a U.N. resolution—in 1948, the unremitting hostility of its Arab neighbors plunged that small nation into war. The years since have been marked by a continuation of that hostility in many parts of the Arab world, with consequent violence and with large numbers of people's lives being lost, but also some progress in achieving peace. Most notably, the government of Menachem Begin signed an important peace treaty with Egypt in 1978 which, despite the skepticism of many Israelis and some of Israel's strongest supporters in America, has in fact worked enormously for the benefit of Israel by providing a peaceful situation for much of its borders. This 1978 agreement was one in which Israel gave up a large amount of territory which it had gained in a defensive war, territory which had both important strategic value and from which Israeli settlers were moved as part of the agreement. This has obvious relevance as a precedent for an agreement to end the current conflict.

In addition to this peace agreement with Egypt, Israel has over the years worked out arrangements with its neighbor to the east, the Kingdom of Jordan, which has similarly been beneficial compared to the strife that had previously existed in that area.

The central remaining question is of course whether or not an agreement can be reached between Israel and the Palestinians which will preserve Israel's security while allowing it to maintain its important political and moral role as a free, Jewish, democratic state. I know there are people who argue that it is inappropriate for Israel to be a Jewish state. Such arguments seem to me quite hollow, particularly when they come from those who have no quarrel with the existence of a number of official Islamic states throughout the Middle