

January 30. It was Powell and his moderates at the State Department versus hard-liners like Rumsfeld, Cheney, and Wolfowitz, who were already planning the next war in Iraq and the shape of a post-Saddam country.

Documents were being prepared by the Defense Intelligence Agency, Rumsfeld's intelligence arm, mapping Iraq's oil fields and exploration areas and listing companies that might be interested in leveraging the precious asset.

One document, headed "Foreign Suitors for Iraqi Oilfield Contracts," lists companies from thirty countries—including France, Germany, Russia, and the United Kingdom—their specialties, bidding histories, and in some cases their particular areas of interest. An attached document maps Iraq with markings for "supergiant oilfield," and "other oilfield," and "earmarked for production sharing," while demarking the largely undeveloped southwest of the country into nine "blocks" to designate areas for future exploration. The desire to "dissuade" countries from engaging in "asymmetrical challenges" to the United States—as Rumsfeld said in his January articulation of the demonstrative value of a preemptive attack—matched with plans for how the world's second largest oil reserve might be divided among the world's contractors made for an irresistible combination, O'Neill later said.

Already by February, the talk was mostly about logistics. Not the why, but the how and how quickly. Rumsfeld, O'Neill recalled, was focused on how an incident might cause escalated tensions—like the shooting down of an American plane in the regular engagements between U.S. fighters and Iraqi anti-aircraft batteries—and what U.S. responses to such an occurrence might be. Wolfowitz was pushing for the arming of Iraqi opposition groups and sending in U.S. troops to support and defend their insurgency. He had written in *Foreign Affairs* magazine in 1999 that "the United States should be prepared to commit ground forces to protect a sanctuary in southern Iraq where the opposition could safely mobilize."

[From the New York Times, Mar. 13, 2007]

WHOSE OIL IS IT, ANYWAY?

(By Antonia Judasz)

Today more than three-quarters of the world's oil is owned and controlled by governments. It wasn't always this way.

Until about 35 years ago, the world's oil was largely in the hands of seven corporations based in the United States and Europe. Those seven have since merged into four: ExxonMobil, Chevron, Shell and BP. They are among the world's largest and most powerful financial empires. But ever since they lost their exclusive control of the oil to the governments, the companies have been trying to get it back.

Iraq's oil reserves—thought to be the second largest in the world—have always been high on the corporate wish list. In 1998, Kenneth Derr, then chief executive of Chevron, told a San Francisco audience, "Iraq possesses huge reserves of oil and gas—reserves I'd love Chevron to have access to."

A new oil law set to go before the Iraqi Parliament this month would, if passed, go a long way toward helping the oil companies achieve their goal. The Iraq hydrocarbon law would take the majority of Iraq's oil out of the exclusive hands of the Iraqi government and open it to international oil companies for a generation or more.

In March 2001, the National Energy Policy Development Group (better known as Vice President Dick Cheney's energy task force), which included executives of America's largest energy companies, recommended that the United States government support initia-

tives by Middle Eastern countries "to open up areas of their energy sectors to foreign investment." One invasion and a great deal of political engineering by the Bush administration later, this is exactly what the proposed Iraq oil law would achieve. It does so to the benefit of the companies, but to the great detriment of Iraq's economy, democracy and sovereignty.

Since the invasion of Iraq, the Bush administration has been aggressive in shepherding the oil law toward passage. It is one of the president's benchmarks for the government of Prime Minister Nuri Kamal al-Maliki, a fact that Mr. Bush, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, Gen. William Casey, Ambassador Zalmay Khalilzad and other administration officials are publicly emphasizing with increasing urgency.

The administration has highlighted the law's revenue sharing plan, under which the central government would distribute oil revenues throughout the nation on a per capita basis. But the benefits of this excellent proposal are radically undercut by the law's many other provisions—these allow much (if not most) of Iraq's oil revenues to flow out of the country and into the pockets of international oil companies.

The law would transform Iraq's oil industry from a nationalized model closed to American oil companies except for limited (although highly lucrative) marketing contracts, into a commercial industry, all-but-privatized, that is fully open to all international oil companies.

The Iraq National Oil Company would have exclusive control of just 17 of Iraq's 80 known oil fields, leaving two-thirds of known—and all of its as yet undiscovered—fields open to foreign control.

The foreign companies would not have to invest their earnings in the Iraqi economy, partner with Iraqi companies, hire Iraqi workers or share new technologies. They could even ride out Iraq's current "instability" by signing contracts now, while the Iraqi government is at its weakest, and then wait at least two years before even setting foot in the country. The vast majority of Iraq's oil would then be left underground for at least two years rather than being used for the country's economic development.

The international oil companies could also be offered some of the most corporate-friendly contracts in the world, including what are called production sharing agreements. These agreements are the oil industry's preferred model, but are roundly rejected by all the top oil producing countries in the Middle East because they grant long-term contracts (20 to 35 years in the case of Iraq's draft law) and greater control, ownership and profits to the companies than other models. In fact, they are used for only approximately 12 percent of the world's oil.

Iraq's neighbors Iran, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia maintain nationalized oil systems and have outlawed foreign control over oil development. They all hire international oil companies as contractors to provide specific services as needed, for a limited duration, and without giving the foreign company any direct interest in the oil produced.

Iraqis may very well choose to use the expertise and experience of international oil companies. They are most likely to do so in a manner that best serves their own needs if they are freed from the tremendous external pressure being exercised by the Bush administration, the oil corporations—and the presence of 140,000 members of the American military.

Iraq's five trade union federations, representing hundreds of thousands of workers, released a statement opposing the law and rejecting "the handing of control over oil to foreign companies, which would undermine

the sovereignty of the state and the dignity of the Iraqi people." They ask for more time, less pressure and a chance at the democracy they have been promised.

#### VIEW FROM AN O'BRIEN COUNTY, IOWA, SOLDIER

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor tonight to read into the RECORD an editorial that was published in the O'Brien County Newsletter, O'Brien County, Iowa. It is from Sean P. O'Brien, First Lieutenant, Field Artillery, United States Army and Purple Heart recipient.

It reads like this: "There are few things that a professional military officer can attribute to editorial statements. However, I would like to share some of the ideas that more than represent what our tour of duty in Afghanistan meant to me. This ethos is to help put these personal feelings, which all soldiers have, into a tangible rallying point.

"I am an American soldier. I am a warrior and a member of a team. I serve the people of the United States and live the Army values. I will always place the mission first, I will never accept defeat, I will never quit, I will never leave a fallen comrade.

□ 2015

"I am a disciplined, physically and mentally tough trained and proficient warrior in my tasks and drills. I always maintain my arms, my equipment, and myself. I am an expert and I am a professional. I stand ready to deploy, engage, and destroy the enemies of the United States of America in close combat. I am a guardian of freedom and the American way of life. I am an American soldier.

"This is called the Warrior Ethos. Every soldier can recite it. It means everything. I cringe when I say this aloud. These words have such weight. As far as service, I understand now. When I shake hands with a veteran, there is a silent conversation that takes place that transcends all words. You can never understand this without experiencing it.

"I cannot deny the power of facing the enemies of truth with truth. The population was the center of gravity, and we systemically engaged in separating these bullies from the population, usually by simply not leaving. The stability created by our presence allowed civil leadership to stop focusing on being brutalized and start focusing on fostering a better way of life for the people, education, medical aid, and commerce. When the population realized that these ideas were worth having, they would generally take on the responsibility of denying safe havens for the bad guys.

"These people, the Afghans, are just like you and me. They want their children to have a safe place to grow. They

are extremely thankful that we are making the sacrifice we are for their nation. It is very humbling to be told that by a common villager. These people have known war as a way of life for 2,000 years. That being said, it is important to know that in every town there is an elder that stated, "The U.S. was just different. You are respectful and you want to help us."

"If you have ever held the ideal of compassion for your neighbor, then it is easy to understand that Afghanistan and her people are well worth the sacrifice. I am thankful to have been a part of a stronger future for Afghanistan."

And here he says some complimentary things about me which I will leave from my presentation but leave in the printed RECORD and conclude with:

"As I said before, our efforts in this region are worth it. I encourage all to take a longer view. The compassion and the patience of the American servicemember make up a large part of their sense of duty. This is a fight between good and evil." Sean P. O'Brien, First Lieutenant, Field Artillery, United States Army, Purple Heart Recipient.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully enter this into the RECORD.

For: O'Brien County Republican Newsletter, Iowa

There are few things that a professional military officer can attribute to editorial statements; however, I would like to share some of the ideas that more than represent what my tour of duty in Afghanistan meant to me. This "ethos" is to help put these personal feelings—which all soldiers have—into a tangible rallying point.

I am an American Soldier.

I am a Warrior and a member of a team. I serve the people of the United States and live the Army Values.

I will always place the mission first.

I will never accept defeat.

I will never quit.

I will never leave a fallen comrade.

I am disciplined, physically and mentally tough, trained and proficient in my warrior tasks and drills. I always maintain my arms, my equipment and myself.

I am an expert and I am a professional.

I stand ready to deploy, engage, and destroy the enemies of the United States of America in close combat.

I am a guardian of freedom and the American way of life.

I am an American Soldier.

This is called the Warrior Ethos. Every soldier can recite it. It means everything.

I cringe when I say this aloud. Those words have such weight. As far as service, I understand now. When I shake hands with a veteran, there is a silent conversation that takes place that transcends all words. You can never understand this without experiencing it.

I cannot deny the power of facing the enemies of truth with truth. The population was the center of gravity, and we systematically engaged in separating these bullies from the population; usually by simply not leaving.

The stability created by our presence allowed civil leadership to stop focusing on being brutalized and start focusing on fostering a better way of life for the people; education, medical aid, commerce. When the population realized that these ideas were worth having, they would generally take on

the responsibility of denying safe-havens for the bad guys.

Those people (the Afghans) are just like you and me. They want their children to have a safe place to grow. They are extremely thankful that we are making the sacrifice we are for their nation. It is very humbling to be told that by a common villager.

These people have known war as a way of life for 2,000 years. That being said, it is important to know that in every town, there was an elder that stated:

"The U.S. was just different, you are respectful and you want to help us". If you have ever held the ideal of compassion for your neighbor, then it is easy to understand that Afghanistan and her people are well worth the sacrifice. I am thankful to have been a part of a stronger future for Afghanistan.

I was honored by the personal efforts of 5th District Congressman Steve King. He actively followed our efforts and through personal correspondence offered his support. I enjoy the fact that there is adequate moral "top cover" that actively engages in seeking the truth. Thank you Steve, you are as much a patriot as I ever hope to be.

As I said before, our efforts in this region are worth it. I encourage all to take a longer view. The compassion and the patience of the American Service Member make up a large part of their sense of Duty. This is a fight between good and evil.

Sean P. O'Brien, 1st Lieutenant, Field Artillery, U.S. Army, Purple Heart Recipient.

#### THE COUNTDOWN CREW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 months, myself and others have been coming to the floor to talk about the impending tax increase that we face in this country if the majority doesn't act in something just under 1,400 days, and we will see this huge tax increase and all the majority has to do is run out the clock. They have to do nothing to see this tax increase be put back in place when the tax cuts that we passed in early 2001, 2002, 2003 will expire.

But tonight we are coming to the floor, and we think it is fitting to talk about the fourth anniversary of Iraq and what is happening in Iraq and, most importantly, what is going to happen on this House floor we think this week but maybe not until next week.

It was fitting tonight that we had a moment of silence for our men and women in harm's way. It was very fitting. But it is also fitting that the United States Congress is very clear to the men and women in harm's way that we support them. And we don't just support them in standing up on the House floor talking about it, but we support them in a concrete way, and that is making sure that they are getting the funds that they need, making sure that the United States Congress is sending a message to our enemies around the world that we are behind

them; that we are not going to short-change them; that we are not going to pull the rug out from under them; that we are not going to put a time line in place that is going to allow our enemies to know when and what we are going to do, we let our enemies know that they just have to run out the clock.

And if they run out the clock, that we are going to be gone and they are going to be able to be back in Iraq, they are going to be back in other places around this world doing harm to many people, including Americans. So it is absolutely important that our men and women know, and this supplemental is going to be the key. It is going to be the key for our men and women to know that we are behind them. And what the majority party is putting forth, at least we think what the majority party is putting forward, has created a confusing and inflexible timetable for the Americans' withdrawal from Iraq.

From what they have said, and we only know in press accounts and I will read many of those press accounts, and I would encourage you to go to [www.gop.gov](http://www.gop.gov) and see last week's press conference with the leadership of the majority party, the Democratic leadership talk about their plan, and just watch it for about a minute and you will see just how confusing it was to not only the American people but to the leadership of the majority party.

As I said, they have put in place timetables for withdrawal, with forces leaving as early as July 1 and concluding their removal no later than August 2008. Now, we can talk and talk and talk, but our enemies see that, and they will just go back into the shadows and they will just wait until we are gone to be able to wreak havoc on Iraq and the Iraqi people.

An example of what is in the supplemental, at least that is what we have heard, we are not sure but this is what we have heard: that none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other act may be used to deploy any unit of the Armed Forces to Iraq unless the chief of the military department concerned has certified in writing to the Committees on Appropriations and on Armed Services at least 15 days in advance of deployment that this unit is fully mission capable.

Now, if that is not micromanagement, I don't know what is. I think the lessons of Vietnam have been lost on the majority party. That is micromanaging the war. That is what caused us great detriment in Vietnam.

The next thing is: the President certifies in writing to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Armed Services that the deployment to Iraq of a unit that is not assessed fully mission capable, he is required to fill a report detailing the particular reason or reasons why that unit's deployment is necessary. If that is not micromanagement, I don't know what is.