

did—including football, the Marines, and his family.

Every member of the House of Representatives has taken a solemn oath to defend the constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic. While we certainly understand the gravity of the issues facing this legislative body, Lance Cpl. Joseph Welke lived that commitment to our country. Today, we remember and honor his noble service to the United States and the ultimate sacrifice he has paid with his life to defend our freedoms and foster liberty for others.

The lives of countless people were enormously enhanced by Joseph's compassion and service. Joseph, who represented the best of the United States, South Dakota, and the Marines continues to inspire all those who knew him and many who did not. Our Nation and the State of South Dakota are far better places because of his service, and the best way to honor him is to emulate his devotion to our country.

I join with all South Dakotans in expressing my sympathies to the family of Lance Cpl. Joseph Welke. His commitment to and sacrifice for our Nation will never be forgotten.

TRIBUTE TO RICK RIDDER

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 2004

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I have used this forum from time to time to acknowledge the bipartisan public service of many distinguished Coloradans. Today I rise in what I hope will be a moment my Republican friends and colleagues will not begrudge—to honor a distinguished Coloradan who is anything but bipartisan. I rise to acknowledge Rick Ridder.

Rick has been a trusted advisor and friend throughout my career in politics. Although Rick is respected and widely sought after in Colorado politics, he has never lost his down-to-earth nature. This is because he is the rarest of political partisans—a determined strategist who keeps his humanity intact. He understands the game of politics well and he most certainly plays to win. At the same time he is unwavering in his integrity and his sincere desire to work for the betterment of people.

Rick has never been particularly impressed with the “glitter” of politics that attracts so many to our profession. Rather, he believes at his core in the importance of our democracy and his duty to fight for its vitality. This should come as no surprise to anyone familiar with his upbringing. By way of example, his mother took him to an Adlai Stevenson rally at the age of three. To occupy her little boy, she suggested that he pass out flyers promoting the Illinois Governor's bid for the presidency in 1956. In addition, having grown up in and around Washington, DC his playmates included the children of Robert Kennedy and Eugene McCarthy. Whereas many of our generation looked at those men as heroes and even icons of a generation, Rick saw them simply as his friends' dads.

Had he a different character this upbringing might have led Rick to a sense of entitlement, but instead, it gave him a razor sharp sense of purpose. He uses his unique experience in

politics to serve a goal greater than his own self-interest. He has worked tirelessly to that effect for decades.

In 1982, he helped Colorado Governor Richard Lamm with his third gubernatorial campaign. He went on to become the National Field Director for Gary Hart's 1984 presidential campaign. In 1985 with his wife Joan, he formed Ridder-Braden Inc., a political consulting and polling firm that has been instrumental in crafting campaigns in Colorado and across the country. His clients have included Colorado Governor Roy Romer, Congressman David Skaggs, Senator BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL and various Members of Congress. In 2004 he helped launch the meteoric rise of Governor Howard Dean, and a provocative ballot initiative on reform of the Electoral College that made a significant contribution to the public debate on a largely over-looked, but critical, component of our democratic process.

While many political consultants are rightly maligned as “hired guns” who corrode public confidence in the political process, professionals like Rick Ridder and Joanie Braden are rare examples of people who work to elevate public discourse and improve our democracy.

For the information of my colleagues I'm attaching the original article.

[From the Rocky Mountain News, Oct. 29, 2004]

CONSULTANT RIDDER SAYS MEASURE IS ABOUT STRONGER DEMOCRACY

(By James B. Meadow)

Joanie Braden was deep into labor, nearing the delivery of her child, when she noticed something that years later would strike her as both odd and normal.

Right next to her bed, there was her husband, the father of the child, diligently checking his wristwatch so he could time the intervals between contractions. And, simultaneously, right next to her bed, the same man was diligently talking long-distance on the phone, processing voter pattern information from key precincts in the 1984 Oregon presidential primary.

“As Rick was doing that,” says Braden, laughing, “I remember him acting as if it was the most natural thing in the world. He was there for me; he was there for the campaign.”

Happily, both labors—natal and political—paid off for Rick Ridder. Nathaniel Ridder arrived pink and healthy; Gary Hart took Oregon.

Given this, it's no surprise to learn that “Rick absolutely loves politics . . . he lives and breathes politics.” At least that's the opinion of Tom Strickland, who hired Ridder for his two cracks at one of Colorado's U.S. Senate seats.

Although Strickland came away 0-for-2, his respect for Ridder remains resolute.

“Rick has a gifted political mind,” says Strickland. “He may be very understated and unassuming—he's like a political version of Columbo, lulling you into thinking he's not following you—but he's really a couple of steps ahead all the time.”

He better be.

As Election Day draws closer, Ridder's campaign for Amendment 36 is taking on water. The controversial measure, which would revamp Colorado's electoral votes system, replacing the current winner-take-all setup with one that awards the electoral votes proportionally, based on popular vote, has drawn national attention.

Republicans have decried it as a not-so-sneaky way to siphon votes from George W. Bush. Not all Democrats are for it, either.

And 36's proponents?

Well, one of them claims it's more representative, makes everybody's vote count equally. Furthermore, “It's the right thing to do in order to create a stronger democracy. The system we installed for democratic rule in Afghanistan did not include an Electoral College, did it?”

Those words come courtesy of Ridder, who's heading up the pro-36 fight. But words—to say nothing of a reported \$700,000—might not be enough to win. Although Ridder's side was ahead early on, a Rocky Mountain News/News 4 poll released today shows the measure sinking 60-32.

Those numbers prompted one political observer to refer to Amendment 36 as “toast.”

Ridder's reaction to the new poll numbers was cautious. “I think that one of the real issues that we're bringing forth in this campaign is the importance of making votes count—one person, one vote. And it is clear that we have started a debate on the issue, particularly on the Electoral College.”

Earlier, in a previous interview, he acknowledged his base optimism. “You have to believe that change is possible and that what you fight for can come about.”

Although there is passion in his voice, it is tamed by a reflexive calm and control.

He is 51, has thinning hair, and his 6-foot-1, 150-pound frame gives him a slightly Ichabod Crane air.

A scion of the Knight-Ridder newspaper family, Victor Frank Ridder II was immersed in politics before, well, almost before he was tall enough to be immersed in anything. When he was 3, his mother was attending a rally for Adlai Stevenson. To occupy her son, she had him handing out leaflets for the Illinois governor who was bidding for the presidency in 1956.

The political theme stayed strong in his life, perhaps in part because growing up in and around Washington, D.C., brought him into contact with playmates who were the children of Robert Kennedy and Eugene McCarthy.

After taking a year off between high school and college to toil on behalf of George McGovern's 1972 stab at the presidency, he returned to academe and graduated from Middlebury College in Vermont and earned a masters in broadcasting from Boston University.

As he was getting ready to start his Ph.D. in communications, he decided instead to defer his studies and work on Hart's 1980 reelection as U.S. senator in Colorado.

In 1982, he returned to Colorado to help with Richard Lamm's third gubernatorial campaign. He then became national field director for Hart's 1984 presidential campaign.

By then, Braden and Ridder, married in 1981, had decided Colorado was the place to raise a family and were ensconced in Denver. In 1985, Ridder-Braden Inc., a political consulting and polling firm, was born.

Over the years, Ridder compiled an impressive—and wholly Democratic—political resume. He worked on all three of Roy Romer's gubernatorial campaigns, as well as for numerous congressional candidates.

Many campaigns later, in November 2002, Ridder surprised the political world when he took on the job of campaign manager for Howard Dean's fledgling presidential run. By April 2003, however, Ridder was gone from the campaign, a victim of infighting and his disinclination to work for a “movement” rather than a candidate.

Although Ridder points to his leap of faith with the Dean campaign as proof that he takes chances, others aren't so sure. One competitor says that Ridder's strength has to do more with “analysis behind the scenes” than being a “big picture guy or a risk taker.”

Ridder, unflappable as usual, takes the comments and criticisms in stride. He's not only heard the personal remarks before, he's aware of the digs against his profession. "There is a wariness of the political consultant industry," he says. "People don't like the perception that they're being manipulated."

Ridder insists this isn't the case. As he once said, "The best we can do is take the positive aspects of our candidate or cause and emphasize them. We can't take Adolf Hitler and make him Mahatma Gandhi."

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4818,
CONSOLIDATED APPROPRIA-
TIONS ACT, 2005

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRISTOPHER SHAYS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, November 20, 2004

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 4818 and salute Chairman KOLBE and Ranking Member LOWEY in their efforts to bring this important measure forward.

Mr. Speaker, the foreign operations bill is a critical funding measure that allows the United States to engage and uplift the world's poorest citizens. The United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the Department of State, the Department of Agriculture and now the established Millennium Challenge Corporation, should be proud of the work they do in partnership with American charitable organizations and various national governments around the globe to alleviate poverty and ease hardship. USAID effectively partners with several organizations based in Connecticut's Fourth Congressional District such as TechnoServe based in Norwalk, Save the Children, based in Westport and AmeriCares, based in Stamford.

TechnoServe's mission is quite simple; it provides hardworking men and women in the developing world with the tools and the means to participate in and benefit from the global economy. In partnership with USAID, the Department of State, USDA and some of the world's most respected corporations, TechnoServe is helping entrepreneurs build businesses that create real economic growth.

TechnoServe helps entrepreneurs build solid businesses that produce quality products for local, regional and international markets. These businesses provide jobs and raise incomes especially in the agricultural sectors of rural communities.

I am also grateful to have Save the Children headquartered in the Fourth Congressional district. Save the Children works tirelessly to provide hope to children in need across the world. The organization's ambitious mission calls its workers to service in the areas of education, HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention, women and children's health, economic development, combating hunger, and assisting refugees. Save the Children also produces excellent reports, which my staff and I use to better assess living conditions for women and children across the globe.

I am also grateful for the important work of AmeriCares, which provides disaster relief, humanitarian aid and is equipped to immediately respond to emergency medical needs for people all around the world. AmeriCares solicits

donations of medicines and other relief materials from U.S. and international manufacturers and delivers them quickly and efficiently to indigenous health care and welfare professionals around the world.

Mr. Speaker, the foreign operations bill is a vital funding component of our presence in the developing world and a bill that will truly save lives and build hope for the future. I salute those in the United States government who are involved in humanitarian and development activities and am grateful for the opportunity to highlight the work of organization's like TechnoServe, Save the Children and AmeriCares as this measure moves to final passage.

THE CASE FOR RESTRAINT IN
IRAN

HON. JAMES A. LEACH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 2004

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, there are few areas of the world with a more troubling mix of geopolitical problems than the Middle East. The irony is that the war in Iraq which has consumed so much of our country's political and economic capital may hold less far-reaching consequences than challenges posed in neighboring Middle Eastern countries.

To the West, the Israeli-Palestinian stand-off remains the sorest point in world relations, although new opportunities for reconciliation between the two sides have presented themselves in the wake of Yasser Arafat's passing. To the East, the sobering prospect of Iran joining the nuclear club stands out.

It is this East of Baghdad trauma that I wish to address this afternoon.

In life, individuals and countries sometimes face circumstances in which all judgments and options are bad. The Iranian dilemma is a case-in-point. But it is more than just an abstract bad option model because at issue are nuclear weapons in the hands of a mullah-controlled society which has actively aided and abetted regional terrorists for years.

In reference to recent disclosures of enhanced Iranian efforts to develop nuclear weapons as well as missile delivery systems to carry such weapons, concerned outside parties are actively reviewing options.

The Europeans have led with diplomatic entreaties; the Israelis, with requests for the provision by the United States of sophisticated bunker-busting bombs; American policy-makers, with open-option planning, with neo-con muscularity being the principal reported theme.

In the background are references to the 1981 preemptive strike by the Israeli Air Force against Iraq's Osirak reactor.

At issue is the question of whether preemption is justified; if so, how it should be carried out; and, if carried out, whether intervention would lead to a more conciliatory, non-nuclear Iran or whether the effects of military action would be short-term, perhaps pushing back nuclear development a year or two, but precipitating a new level of hostility against the United States and Israel in Iran and the rest of the Muslim world which could continue for decades, if not centuries.

Since the American hostage crisis which so bedeviled the Carter administration in the late

1970s, we have had a policy of economic sanctions coupled with comprehensive efforts to politically isolate Iran.

Four years ago, Senator ARLEN SPECTER and I invited Iran's U.N. Ambassador to Capitol Hill, the first visit to Washington by a high-level Iranian representative since the hostage crisis.

On the subject of possible movement toward normalization of relations with Iran, I told the ambassador that while many would like to see a warming of relations, it would be inconceivable for the United States to consider normalizing our relationship so long as Iran continued its support of Hamas and Hezbollah. The ambassador forthrightly acknowledged that Iran provided help to both these terrorist organizations, but also noted, in what was the most optimistic thing he said that day, that his government was prepared to cease support to anti-Israeli terrorist groups the moment a Palestinian state was established with borders acceptable to Palestinians.

For decades in the Muslim world, debate has been on-going whether to embrace a credible two state (Israel and Palestine) approach or advance an irrevocable push-Israel-to-the-sea agenda.

The implicit Iranian position, as articulated by the ambassador, is support for a two-state approach, but if the United States on its own, or Israel as a perceived surrogate, were to attack Iran, the possibility that such a compromise can ever become possible deteriorates.

While angst-ridden, the Muslim world understands the rationale for our intervention in Afghanistan where the plotting for the 9/11 attack on the United States occurred. It has no sympathy for our engagement in Iraq, which had nothing to do with 9/11, but if these two interventions were followed by a third in Iran, the likelihood is that such would be perceived in the vocabulary of the Harvard historian, Samuel Huntington, as an all-out "clash of civilizations," pitting the Judeo-Christian against the Muslim world. In the Middle East it would be considered a war of choice precipitated by the United States. We might want it to be seen as a short-term action to halt the spread of nuclear weapons, but the Muslim world would more likely view it as a continuance of the Crusades: a religious conflict of centuries' dimensions, with a revived future.

If military action is deemed necessary, the United States broadly has only three tactical options: (a) Full scale invasion of Iraq; (b) surgical strikes of Iranian nuclear and missile installations; or (c) a surrogate strike by Israel, modeled along the lines of Osirak.

The first can be described as manifestly more difficult than our engagement in Iraq, particularly a post-conflict occupation. The second presents a number of difficulties, including the comprehensiveness of such a strike and the question of whether all aspects of a program that is clandestine can be eliminated. The third makes the United States accountable for Israeli actions, which themselves are likely to be more physically destructive but less effective than the 1981 strike against Osirak.

In thinking through the consequences of military action, even if projected to be successfully carried out, policymakers must put themselves in the place of a potential adversary. A strike that merely buys time may also