

Third, Major General Geoffrey Miller: According to the Center for American Progress: "a Guantanamo commander, Maj. Gen. Geoffrey Miller, was sent to Abu Ghraib to "Gitmoize" it. Under his command, the International Committee of the Red Cross found interrogation techniques at Guantanamo Bay are "tantamount to torture." "Harsh methods" used at the prison include forced enemas, sleep deprivation and chaining prisoners to chairs and leaving them "to soil themselves." Just weeks after he visited Iraq, the now-infamous abuse occurred at Abu Ghraib.

Fourth, White House Counsel Alberto Gonzales: Gonzales was instrumental in shaping U.S. policy on the interrogation of prisoners. In the now infamous 1/25/02 memo to the president he wrote, "the war against terrorism is a new kind of war" and "this new paradigm renders obsolete Geneva's strict limitations on questioning of enemy prisoners and renders quaint some of its provisions." Gonzales also advised President Bush that laws prohibiting torture do "not apply to the President's detention and interrogation of enemy combatants" and an interrogation tactic only constituted torture if it resulted in "death, organ failure, or serious impairment of body functions."

Last but surely not least, President George W. Bush: The President is not last on this list for no reason, Mr. Speaker. Harry Truman proudly proclaimed "the Buck Stops Here." It would seem this Commander in Chief believes the buck stops far before that Pentagon, White House or Oval Office.

Mr. Speaker, why is Congress receiving more information on these atrocities from the news media than the President, his staff or the Department of Defense on? Moreover, why does he refuse to acknowledge that either he or his immediate advisers are primarily responsible for the culture of abuse "Bring em on" spawned by their reinvention of prisoner interrogation policies?

Privates and Corporals in the Army Guard and Reserves are not responsible for the atrocities at Abu Ghraib and elsewhere. They were only operating in an atmosphere created, fostered and encouraged by top echelon at the Pentagon and White House.

Why are we not pursuing those truly responsible for these crimes? Harry Truman would fully assume the role of Commander in Chief—not just troop deployment but troop deportment and frankly, the truth.

[From the Register-Guard, May 9, 2005]

GO HIGHER ON ABU GHRAIB: TOP OFFICIALS SHOULD'N'T ESCAPE RESPONSIBILITY

Sooner or later, Pfc. Lynndie England will be convicted for her role in abusing and humiliating Iraqi prisoners at the infamous Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq.

Anyone tempted to shed tears over the prospect of the young Army reservist spending time behind bars need only remember the photographs that showed England leering as she pointed to the genitals of a male captive, and as she led a naked prisoner around by a leash.

These images shamed both U.S. critics and supporters of the U.S. invasion. They also had a devastating impact on American efforts to win support in Iraq and throughout the Middle East for the occupation and democratization of Iraq.

It was neither surprising nor upsetting then to learn Friday that the government plans to file new charges against England, whose guilty plea was tossed out and her court martial canceled earlier in the week. A

military judge, Col. James Pohl, declared a mistrial after Pvt. Charles A. Graner Jr., a former guard at Abu Ghraib, testified that the photos were taken for training purposes. That testimony undermined England's admission that she knew her actions were wrong and her acceptance of responsibility.

But England and the few other enlisted men and women who have faced courts martial in the scandal should not be the only ones to pay a price for what happened at Abu Ghraib. High-level military and administration officials must not be allowed to escape responsibility for a scandal that is far more of their making than of low-ranking soldiers. So far, Brig. Gen. Janis Karpinski, an Army reservist who formerly ran U.S. prisons in Iraq, is the only high-level officer to be disciplined, and she rightly regards herself as a scapegoat.

Congress, which abandoned its oversight role during the invasion and its bloody aftermath, should demand an investigation by a bipartisan independent commission similar to the Sept. 11 commission.

Instead of starting at the bottom, as the military's whitewashes have done, the panel should start at the top with Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, who failed to plan for postwar Iraq and then failed to adjust his plans after the insurgency began. Rumsfeld is the reason why there were insufficient numbers of prison guards in Iraq and why they had inadequate training and murky guidelines. Rumsfeld also made the decision to authorize harsh interrogation techniques for detainees at Guantanamo Bay and then to apply those methods in Iraq.

Next on the list should be Attorney General Alberto Gonzales, who three years ago prepared a legal opinion stating that Geneva Conventions protections for detainees in Afghanistan were "obsolete." That opinion, along with his endorsement of the harsh interrogation methods, contributed to the abuses at Abu Ghraib. Also high on the list should be Lt. Gen. Ricardo Sanchez, the former commander of U.S. forces in Iraq, who cleared the use of interrogation techniques in Iraq that violated Geneva Conventions.

The judge in England's case dismissed charges against her because of testimony indicating others were to blame. England should face justice. But the civilian and military leaders who sent her to Iraq and who bear larger responsibility for the illegal and immoral abuses that occurred there should be held accountable as well.

[From the Daytona Beach News-Journal, May 10, 2005]

#### ABU GHRAIB WHITEWASH

On Nov. 4, 2003, Manadel al-Jamadi was found dead in the showers of Abu Ghraib prison outside Baghdad. Al-Jamadi was a detainee who, according to a Navy SEAL testifying in a military court a year later, had probably been beaten by interrogators the night before. Several soldiers posed for pictures besides the body, grinning and with their thumbs up. Five months later CBS broadcast those images and many more, including those of naked Iraqi prisoners forced into human pyramids by their captors, of prisoners leashed like animals or terrorized by dogs and to the seeming entertainment of their American captors.

Whether American soldiers abused detainees "for their own amusement," as Pfc. Lynndie England put it to a military court last week; whether they did it as part of a systematic policy of abuse designed to "soften" detainees for interrogation; or whether the whole thing was "an over-hyped story," as The Wall Street Journal called it two weeks ago, the scandal shattered what little

credibility the American occupation of Iraq was clinging to when it happened. The hope, at the time, was that the United States would show the world that it was different, that it would be accountable.

"Watch America. Watch how we deal with this," then-Secretary of State Colin Powell said almost a year ago in a commencement speech at Wake Forest University. "Watch how a nation such as ours will not tolerate such actions. . . . The world will see that we are still a nation with a moral code that defines our national character."

There was reason to hope. But at the time, Powell and others believed that al-Jamadi's death was the only one on the military's prison watch in Iraq and Afghanistan and that abuse was limited to a few bad apples. It turned out that al-Jamadi's death was, indeed, the only one—at Abu Ghraib. In March, the Pentagon conceded that it was investigating 25 other inmate deaths it has classified as homicides in American custody in Iraq and Afghanistan since 2002. If that many inmates have been killed in prisons and detention centers under American supervision in the two countries, it is unlikely that the beatings, the abuses, the tortures that lead to such homicides would be limited to a few bad apples.

Yet that's the upshot of 11 investigations and reports of what went wrong. Some of the reports judged the Pentagon severely and called for corrective action and punishments. But it was up to the Army to act, because President Bush refused to give anyone else authority to do more than advise.

So the Army judged (and protected) its own. The Army has cleared four of the top five officers overseeing prisons in Iraq. It isn't clear whether it has investigated officers supervising prisons in Afghanistan (with at least two reported inmate deaths) or Guantanamo Bay. Of 353 cases of abuse the Army investigated (the number alone belies any suggestion of a limited problem), 225 are closed. Of 124 soldiers who faced disciplinary action, virtually all were the small fry of enlisted personnel. While 17 have been thrown out of the Army, seven low-ranked soldiers have faced punishment that range anywhere from forfeiting half a month's pay to—in one case—10 years in prison. One general, Janis Karpinski, was demoted and given a written reprimand. She was in charge of Abu Ghraib prison.

That's it. That's where U.S. accountability ends. Condoleezza Rice, Powell's successor at the State Department, told Europeans during her visit a few weeks ago that "bad things happened at Abu Ghraib that, as the president said, make us sick to our stomach. But the real test of a democratic country is how one deals with those." The sickening test result is the scandal has been lumped on the back of just a few lowly soldiers.

#### CAFTA

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today more than 400 union workers and Members of Congress gathered in front of the United States Capitol delivering a united message: vote "no" on the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

This week, the presidents of Central America and the Dominican Republic are touring the Nation on a United States Chamber of Commerce-funded junket, pushing the Central American

Free Trade Agreement. They are traveling to Miami and Los Angeles. They are going to Albuquerque and to my State, Cincinnati, Ohio, attempting to convince the American people and the American press that CAFTA is good for their countries and for their people.

Unfortunately, these leaders are not telling the whole story. Like our own President, they try to convince us that CAFTA will lift up low-income workers in Central America and that CAFTA will create jobs here in the United States. What they have not said is that CAFTA does nothing to ensure enforcement of labor provisions in their own countries. What they have not said is that the combined purchasing power of the CAFTA nations, the combined purchasing power of the CAFTA nations, is equal to that of Columbus, Ohio; or Memphis, Tennessee; or Orlando, Florida. In other words, people in Guatemala and Honduras and Nicaragua and El Salvador and Costa Rica cannot afford to buy the steel produced in Pennsylvania. They cannot afford to buy cars made in Ohio. They cannot afford to buy textiles and apparel from North Carolina and South Carolina and Georgia. They cannot afford to buy software from Northern California or Oregon or the State of Washington.

With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, to the Central American leaders, what they are not saying and what millions of us know already is that millions of their workers in Central America, like tens of millions of American workers, do not support the Central American Free Trade Agreement. What their leaders will not tell the American people, what their leaders will not share with reporters covering their junket, is that 8,000 Guatemalan workers protested against CAFTA in March. Two of them lost their lives when government forces attacked the crowds.

We have not heard Central American leaders mention the literally tens of thousands of El Salvadorans who protested CAFTA in 2002. They do not mention the 18,000 letters sent last year by Honduran workers to their Honduran Congress decrying this dysfunctional cousin of the North American Free Trade Agreement. The Central American leaders do not mention the 10,000 people who protested CAFTA 1½ years ago in Nicaragua. They do not tell us about the 30,000 CAFTA protestors in Costa Rica just last fall. Hundreds of thousands of workers have protested CAFTA in more than 45 demonstrations in these six Central American countries.

Opposition to CAFTA here in the United States has been equally stalwart. More than a year has passed since President Bush signed CAFTA. Every other trade agreement the President has brought to Congress has been voted on within 6 or 7 weeks. This has been 11½ months since the President signed it because there is so much opposition from American workers, from American educators, from American social service organizations, from

Americans of both parties. Instead of supporting the President on CAFTA, overwhelming numbers of Republicans and Democrats in this body and across the country have come out against the agreement.

Last month, two dozen Democrats and Republicans in Congress joined more than 150 business groups and labor organizations echoing a united message: vote "no" on the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

Under NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement, the U.S. has lost more than 1 million jobs. Under NAFTA the promise of a thriving middle class in Mexico was never realized. Under NAFTA, just like every other trade agreement, the administration, the corporate leaders make the same promises. They promise more manufacturing jobs in the United States. They promise growth in industry in the United States. They promise more exports from the United States. But it never happens that way.

The definition of insanity is repeating the same action over and over and over again and expecting a different result. We have heard these same promises about CAFTA, about NAFTA, about trade with China, about the World Trade Organization. We have heard these same promises over and over and over again, and the American people understand the promises simply do not work.

Now the President and his big business allies are hoping that bringing these Central American leaders on their Chamber of Commerce junket can help deliver support for an agreement that, frankly, as we look across this Chamber, is dead on arrival. Right now the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is hosting a reception for the visiting dignitaries, these six presidents, rewarding them for their lobbying efforts this week. Right now the leaders of these countries are raising their toasts to their corporate sponsors.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no more delay. We must throw out this failed agreement and renegotiate the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

□ 1945

#### SMART AND VETERANS MENTAL HEALTH

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, we recently passed the conference report on yet another supplemental appropriations bill for the war in Iraq, bringing the total amount of taxpayer money being spent on this ill-conceived, built-on-lies war to over \$300 billion. The longer we keep funding this irresponsible effort, the more harm we are doing, not just to the people of Iraq but also to our very own troops.

The New England Journal of Medicine recently reported that as many as

one out of four veterans of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq treated at VA hospitals in the past 16 months were diagnosed with mental disorders. Alarmingly, this number has been steadily rising, and we can only guess how many soldiers do not come forward to get help because of the stigma that is associated with mental illnesses.

Post-traumatic stress disorder, also known as PTSD, is the most common disorder seen in returning soldiers and has been diagnosed in 10 percent of returning soldiers at VA hospitals. Other mental disorders that are being seen are drug or alcohol abuse, depression and anxiety disorders. Also phobias and panic are part of the whole diagnosis.

These are the hidden scars that young men and women who serve in combat are left with when they return home. While mental and emotional problems cannot be seen as easily as a physical wound, they are just as debilitating.

Large numbers of veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan are coming home, and they are showing up in our homeless population in numbers that have not been seen since the end of the Vietnam War. This is a shameful epidemic, and we must work to confront it before it is too late.

Serving in a combat zone not only affects soldiers but also their families. When service members come home, they face a real challenge in learning how to readjust to civilian life, often taking a toll on relationships with family members and sometimes leading to even more mental and emotional problems.

Every time we send our young men and women into combat, we are asking them to make a huge sacrifice for the rest of us. Their lives and their health are the real follow-up costs to any war. That is why I have introduced H. Con. Res. 35, asking for the immediate withdrawal of troops from Iraq. Thirty-three other Members of Congress have signed my resolution with me, because we know that the longer we keep our troops in harm's way, fighting a war of occupation, the higher the costs in human lives. Coupled with that bill, I am also reintroducing legislation to support a SMART security platform for the 21st century.

SMART stands for Sensible, Multilateral American Response to Terrorism. SMART treats war as an absolute last resort. It fights terrorism with stronger intelligence and multilateral partnerships. It controls the spread of weapons of mass destruction with a renewed commitment to non-proliferation, and it aggressively invests in the development of impoverished nations, with an emphasis on women's health and women's education.

We must take a smarter approach to our foreign policy and homeland security measures. The sacrifices made by our soldiers are so great. We should be asking them to make sacrifices only after careful and thoughtful deliberation, not rushing to war on unreliable