

and discussions on your strategic overall plan.

Sincerely,

DANA ROHRBACHER,
Member of Congress.

SMART SECURITY AND THE NOMINATION OF JOHN BOLTON

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, when Senator John Danforth stepped down as the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations earlier this year, President Bush had an option. He could nominate a new Ambassador who would work with the nations of the world to address the growing threat of terrorism and resource scarcity, or he could nominate one of the usual suspects, someone who would maintain the administration's unilateral thinking. By nominating John Bolton, President Bush chose the latter.

As Under Secretary of State for Arms Control, John Bolton demonstrated his poor leadership skills by bullying his colleagues. He demonstrated disdain for international diplomacy by refusing to meet with certain foreign leaders, and he openly criticized the very institution, the United Nations, to which he now has been nominated to represent the United States. This behavior is not going to win the United States many friends on the international stage.

Without a reelection campaign to worry about, President Bush could have utilized the U.N. ambassadorship as a means of helping America regain its lost credibility as the most important democratic Nation in the world. He could have helped America begin its recovery from the mistakes he made in the run-up to the Iraq war and the international alliances that were shattered as a result. But when it comes to addressing America's lost credibility around the world, it remains business as usual for the White House. It seems that the Bush administration has more important matters to take care of, like the shameful way it is working to end the decades-old tradition of the filibuster in the Senate.

The nomination of John Bolton epitomizes the Bush administration's not-so-subtle pattern of disregard for multilateral institutions. Whenever possible, President Bush and his administration continue to sway from the international consensus, not towards it.

But the fight against international terrorism does not belong to a single country, particularly in this era of globalization. When the Internet connects people thousands of miles apart at the mere click of a button, we need to recognize that we are all in it together, because acts of terrorism, abusive regimes, and resource scarcity affect everyone, everyone on the globe. That is why it is more important than ever to work with other nations and

the multilateral institutions that guide them, like the United Nations and the international criminal court.

Mr. Speaker, next week, I will reintroduce the SMART Security resolution legislation that does take into consideration the need for international cooperation in the post-September 11 world. In order to effectively address the threat of terrorism, SMART Security works to strengthen international institutions and respect for the rule of law. We cannot possibly strengthen the United Nations if our own U.N. Ambassador has contempt for the institution he is trying to serve.

Instead of continuing to emphasize our differences with other nations, the United States needs to break its current cycle of shameful unilateralism. We need to court the institutions that used to celebrate America's participation, and our efforts must not stop there. If the U.S. expects other countries to relinquish pursuit of nuclear weapons, then we had better honor our international commitments to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, to the Biological Weapons Convention, to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and the Chemical Weapons Convention.

□ 2015

The United States is at its strongest when we lead the rest of the world towards peaceful resolution of conflicts by working with the rest of the world. This is the way we need to address the growing crisis in Iran and North Korea and the way to ensure that members of international terrorist groups like al Qaeda are caught and brought to justice. The ambassadors that serve the United States abroad reflect our values here at home. The nomination of John Bolton as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations is not consistent with America's best values, our commitment to peace and freedom, our compassion for the people of the world, and our capacity for multilateral leadership. It is time the Bush administration started working with the nations of the world. That world needs to begin here at home.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCAUL of Texas). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak in the place of the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

DEMOCRACY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to praise President Bush's ongoing efforts to carry democracy and freedom to the farthest corners of the Middle East.

Like some of my colleagues, I have had the opportunity recently to travel to this part of the world, to Iraq, to Lebanon, Syria, Egypt, Jordan, Cyprus and Israel. These experiences left me extremely encouraged about the prospect of freedom in the Middle East. I believe we are witnessing a crucial moment in world history as democracy is planting roots in countries previously overrun by terrorists and tyrants.

The most visible instance of this is in Iraq. Four short months ago, Iraqi citizens braved terrorist threats and bodily harm to turn out at the polls in amazing numbers. Today, the fruits of their labor are evident, and the Iraqi people can finally look forward to a future in a free and a democratic society. They have a government that serves as a voice for all Iraqis, be they Kurdish, Sunni, Shiite, Christian, or any of the many other ethnic and religious groups represented in the new government.

Like the Iraqi people, citizens of Afghanistan are also enjoying new-found freedoms. Our United States Armed Forces have liberated millions of Afghans, paving the way for a democratic Afghani government, one that is committed to fighting terrorism on its own.

But Iraq and Afghanistan are not the only nations where freedom is marching, Mr. Speaker. The roots of democracy grow wide, and they have begun their spread into Iran, Syria, Palestine, Libya, and perhaps even Saudi Arabia. The list of democratic accomplishments in the region is growing, suggesting that a true change in outlook and culture is occurring in the Middle East.

Syria has begun pulling its troops out of Lebanon. Israel is working with the Palestinian people to pull troops and settlers out of Gaza, and the post-Arafat PLO is increasingly willing to put this kind of diplomacy over terrorism. Libya has begun the voluntary dismantling of its nuclear program, and Egypt has agreed to allow multi-candidate elections.

Any one of these accomplishments alone would be reason to rejoice; but taken together, they signal an ever-growing, irrevocable force for change across the globe. What we are accomplishing in the Middle East is far more than winning the war on terror. We are winning the war of ideas. People around the globe are crying out for freedom.

Democracy, representation, the opportunity to disagree, these are all essential developments that foster freedom; and we are seeing them spread

across the Middle East. People are choosing democracy over dictators and demagogues, and I am extremely encouraged by these developments.

Mr. Speaker, the naysayers among us, those who said fair democratic elections in Iraq would never occur, who said this region would never accept democracy, they have been proven wrong. Freedom is a universal ideal, one that knows no boundaries or borders. As President Bush so often reminds us, freedom truly is on the march.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

WHY DO THEY HATE US?

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the great unanswered question of the 21st century is, why do they hate us?

We have to find out. The answer relates directly to the safety and security of America and every American, wherever we live.

Why does the world not see us the way we see ourselves? Strong, generous, eager to share what makes us unique. "We hold these truths to be self evident."

Why? Why can they not perceive the America that we know?

Well, several incidents recently give us clues as to the riddle of why the world cannot except our *raison d'être*.

A few weeks ago we strongly objected to the Japanese government's effort to establish a contract with Iran for much-needed energy. We told them do not do it.

This is the continuation of a quarter-of-a-century-old foreign policy initiative: isolate Iran; that will force them to bend to our will.

But Iran is rich in resources, and I think the conclusion follows naturally from these circumstances. When it comes to Iran, economic isolation equals nuclear proliferation.

Attempting to curb, stifle, or choke off the natural economic progress of a nation with supplies very much in demand is unlikely to be effective. It cer-

tainly has not worked for a quarter of a century, no matter which party has had the White House.

Iran is a nation rich in natural energy resources which some nations will seek to leverage regardless of what U.S. policy is.

Today, 14 percent of China's energy needs are met with energy resources from Iran. No one should doubt the obvious. This energy relationship will go on in coming years.

We lean on Japan, but that has no impact on China or Russia or others in the region. If anything, it is an incentive for Iran to deepen its economic and political ties elsewhere.

In attempting to isolate Iran, we may be, in the end, isolating ourselves from the seemingly unstoppable economic and geopolitical expansion in Asia and the Middle East.

A few days after we expressed our extreme concerns to Japan, something happened that did not receive widespread news coverage in the United States. Last year, Japan financed the equivalent of the entire U.S. deficit, \$400 billion.

Now, some in Japan have expressed a preference for the Euro. Japan is our friend, a strong and close ally. It seems to me if our friends are struggling with our foreign policy decisions, imagine what our nonfriends are doing. They are using it to isolate the U.S. from the rest of the world.

Not long after our concerns were expressed to Japan, we showed the iron fist again when Iran, Pakistan, and India began to talk of a pipeline for South Asia across Pakistan to supply energy to starved West India.

The President has defined Iran as the Axis of Evil. The U.S., to put it diplomatically, prefers to end the religious government in Iran where we might change the rhetoric from the Axis of Evil to the access, A-C-C-E-S-S to natural resources.

Our vocal and public expressions against the Iranian Government were noticed. Iran's leaders took a page out of our playbook. We call them the Axis of Evil. They call us the Great Satan.

Lately, the administration has ramped up on the nuclear weapons of mass destruction rhetoric, leaving some to fear or speculate about whether the rhetoric is really the base case for a new preemptive action.

One hears Condoleezza Rice threatening sanctions against those who engage in commerce in Iran. It just so happened that entire nations like India and Pakistan fall into that rhetorical trap.

A proposal to build a pipeline from Iran through Pakistan to serve energy needs in India has been called a peace pipeline. It is the latest positive step between two great nations with a long history of tension and bloodshed.

If the IRA and Northern Ireland can resolve differences, surely there is hope for Kashmir. The signs of hope are there; but like a seed planted in fertile ground, the hope for lasting peace must be nurtured.

Instead, our one-size-fits-all foreign policy aimed at Iran hits India and Pakistan as well. We end up trying to punish Iran by undercutting India and Pakistan.

India's energy problems are real. The future of the nation depends on securing stable energy resources. Yet, U.S. foreign policy meant to punish Iran hurts America's friends and America's foreign policy.

We are telling India and Pakistan to abandon the peace pipeline because we do not like Iran. But we are saying there will be severe consequences for our friends if they do not follow our orders.

Why are we trying to prevent India from solving one of its most pressing energy problems, chronic energy shortage?

We have not isolated Iran. We have merely strongly encouraged Iran to build economic and political relationships everywhere else. We like to pretend our effort in Iran has been effective. I think it is time for us to admit we need a complete reassessment and overhaul of our failing foreign policy beginning in Iran.

In my judgment, it is time to put economic democracy on the table, and there is no place like starting with India and Pakistan.

Their destiny should be in the hands of Indians and Pakistanis. The Administration has been declaring veto power.

Iran, Cuba, and a host of other foreign policy initiatives have shown us that this approach does not work. And our intention to approve or veto the destiny of other nations will not last.

I worry about Iran as much as any Republican and Democrat leader.

But we cannot deny what we know to be true. Our current foreign policy—in philosophy and practice—has been most effective at isolating America.

It's time we revise our vision to something sustainable and tolerable.

We can start by encouraging regional cooperation in Central and South Asia. We can start by encouraging peace, perhaps symbolized by the so called peace pipeline. We have helped Iran win many friends in recent years.

Now it is time to envision a foreign policy which makes it more likely that Iran, the world's second largest holder of natural gas, will focus on developing natural gas instead of nuclear energy that could form the basis for a nuclear threat.

Surely, our experience in Iraq and its problems should have taught us something about the ultimate futility of trying to solve everything with a gun.

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

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