

but also to reflect on what America was like, how people reacted to that scene in Little Rock, AR, and how they reacted to Dr. Martin Luther King. It is easy now, some 50 years later, to suggest everybody knew it was the right thing to do in Little Rock and that everyone understood Dr. Martin Luther King's message was consistent with our values as Americans. But we know better. We know America was divided—some cheering those students and some cheering the crowds.

We learn from experience. I believe in redemption, personal and political. I think as each of us makes mistakes in our lives, we are oftentimes given a chance to correct those mistakes. I think when our Nation has made a mistake, whether it is slavery or racism, we are given a chance to correct that mistake. Today, as we celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Little Rock Nine, let us reflect on how far we have come.

Melba Patillo Beals, a member of the Little Rock Nine, went on to a distinguished career as a journalist and author. In a book about her role in history, she wrote:

If my Central High experience taught me one lesson, it is that we are not separate. The effort to separate ourselves—whether by race, creed, color, religion or status—is as costly to the separator as to those who would be separated. The task that remains is to see ourselves reflected in every other human being and to respect and honor our differences.

The best way we can honor the courage of the Little Rock Nine is to follow their example—to have the vision and the courage to confront the injustices of our time.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WEBB. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

Mr. WEBB. Mr. President, I would like to express my concern about amendment No. 3017, the Kyl-Lieberman amendment, which among other things—and most troubling—would designate the Iranian Revolutionary Guard as a foreign terrorist organization under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

I think we all have a great deal of concern about the activities of Iran. We as a nation have stood strongly and will continue to speak strongly about those activities. We have taken no op-

tions off the table. I fully support all of those precepts.

At the same time, I do not believe that any serious student of American foreign policy could support this amendment as it now exists. We know there are problems in Iraq. We are trying to decipher the extent of those problems as they relate to Iranian weapons systems and the allegations of covert involvement. We also know that in Iraq other nations are playing covertly. The Saudis, for instance, are said to have the plurality of the foreign insurgents operating in Iraq and the majority of the suicide bombers in Iraq. We also know there is potential for volatility in the Kurdish area of Iraq with respect to the relations with Turkey.

We are addressing these problems. In fact, the “whereas” clauses in this amendment speak clearly as to how our troops on the ground are addressing these problems.

I fought in Vietnam. We had similar problems throughout the Vietnam war because of the location of Vietnam, the propinquity of China. I think it can fairly be said that in virtually every engagement in which I was involved in Vietnam, we were being shot at with weapons made either in China or in Eastern Europe. There is a reality to these kinds of wars, and we are addressing those realities. But they need to be addressed in a proper way.

Probably the best historical parallel comes from the situation with China during the Vietnam war. China was a rogue state, had nuclear weapons, would spout a lot of rhetoric about the United States, and had an American war on its border. We created the conditions in which we engaged China aggressively, through diplomatic and economic and other means. And we have arguably succeeded, along with the rest of the world community, in bringing China into a proper place in that world community.

That is not what this amendment is about. The first concern I have, when we are talking about making the Iranian Revolutionary Guard a terrorist organization, is, who actually defines a terrorist organization? The Congress, to my knowledge, has never defined a terrorist organization. The State Department defines terrorist organizations. At last count, from the information that I have received, there are 42 such organizations that have been identified by the State Department in accordance with the laws the Congress passed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this list be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CURRENT LIST OF DESIGNATED FOREIGN TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS

1. Abu Nidal Organization (ANO)
2. Abu Sayyaf Group
3. Al-Aqsa Martyrs Brigade
4. Ansar al-Islam
5. Armed Islamic Group (GIA)

6. Asbat al-Ansar
7. Aum Shinrikyo
8. Basque Fatherland and Liberty (ETA)
9. Communist Party of the Philippines/New People's Army (CPP/NPA)
10. Continuity Irish Republican Army
11. Gama'a al-Islamiyya (Islamic Group)
12. HAMAS (Islamic Resistance Movement)
13. Harakat ul-Mujahidin (HUM)
14. Hizballah (Party of God)
15. Islamic Jihad Group
16. Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan (IMU)
17. Jaish-e-Mohammed (JEM) (Army of Mohammed)
18. Jemaah Islamiya organization (JI)
19. ai-Jihad (Egyptian Islamic Jihad)
20. Kahane Chai (Kach)
21. Kongra-Gel (KGK, formerly Kurdistan Workers' Party, PKK, KADEK)
22. Lashkar-e Tayyiba (LT) (Army of the Righteous)
23. Lashkar i Jhangvi
24. Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE)
25. Libyan Islamic Fighting Group (LIFG)
26. Moroccan Islamic Combatant Group (GICM)
27. Mujahedin-e Khalq Organization (MEK)
28. National Liberation Army (ELN)
29. Palestine Liberation Front (PLF)
30. Palestinian Islamic Jihad (PIJ)
31. Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP)
32. PFLP-General Command (PFLP-GC)
33. al-Qa'ida
34. Real IRA
35. Revolutionary Armed Forces of Columbia (FARC)
36. Revolutionary Nuclei (formerly ELA)
37. Revolutionary Organization 17 November
38. Revolutionary People's Liberation Party/ Front (DHKP/C)
39. Salafist Group for Call and Combat (GSPC)
40. Shining Path (Sendero Luminoso, SL)
41. Tanzim Qa'idat al-Jihad fi Bilad al-Rafidayn (QJBR) (al-Qaida in Iraq) (formerly Jama'at al-Tawhid wa'al-Jihad, JTJ, al-Zarqawi Network)
42. United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (AUC)

Mr. WEBB. The second concern I have is that we as a government have never identified an organization that is a part of a nation state as a terrorist organization. From the statement of the Senator from Connecticut yesterday, there are potentially 180,000 people in the Iranian Revolutionary Guard who are part of a military force of an existing state. Categorizing this organization as a terrorist organization is not our present policy of keeping the military option on the table. It is for all practical purposes mandating the military option. It could be read as tantamount to a declaration of war.

What do we do with terrorist organizations? If they are involved against us, we attack them. What is a terrorist organization? Traditionally, we have defined a terrorist organization as a nongovernmental entity that operates along the creases of international law and does harm to internationally protected people.

By the way, it is kind of interesting to note that last week the Iraqi Government claimed that Blackwater is a terrorist organization for the way it operates inside Iraq. I am not making that allegation. I am giving an example of how people categorize these groups.

The Revolutionary Guard is part of the Iranian Government. If they are attacking us, they are not a terrorist organization. They are an attacking army. But are they? I am not sure about that. If they were, we would be hearing some pretty strong expressions of support.

Last weekend we had Admiral Fallon, who is General Petraeus's operational commander, responsible for all of the nations in that region, not simply Iraq, saying:

I expect there will be no war and that is what we ought to be working for.

We should find ways through which we can bring countries to work together for the benefit of all.

This constant drumbeat of conflict is what strikes me—

Says Admiral Fallon—

which is not helpful and not useful . . . I expect there will be no war. . . .

We have General Petraeus, whose comments are widely quoted in the "whereas" clauses.

When he was testifying in front of the Foreign Affairs Committee in his official testimony, he did mention that Iran was using the Quds Force to turn Shiite militias into a Hezbollah-like force to fight a proxy war, et cetera. But then when he was asked a question about it, General Petraeus said: The Quds Force itself, we believe, by and large, those individuals have been pulled out of the country as have been the Lebanese Hezbollah trainers who were being used to augment that activity.

We have the statement of Prime Minister Maliki in today's Washington Post. He said: Iran's role in fomenting violence diverges from the administration's. His opinion. His government has begun a dialogue with Iran and Syria, according to him, and has explained to them that their activities are unhelpful. Our relations with these countries have improved, he said, to the point they are not interfering in our international affairs.

Asked about the Revolutionary Guard forces, which the U.S. military charges are arming, training, and directing Shiite militias in Iraq, Maliki said:

There used to be support through borders for these militias. But it has ceased to exist.

Now, I am not saying all of this is factually 100 percent right. I am not saying the other side is right. Here is what I am saying: We haven't had one hearing on this. I am on the Foreign Relations Committee, I am on the Armed Services Committee. We are about to vote on something that may fundamentally change the way the United States views the Iranian military, and we have not had one hearing. This is not the way to make foreign policy. It is not the way to declare war, although this clearly worded sense of the Congress could be interpreted this way. These who regret their vote 5 years ago to authorize military action in Iraq should think hard before sup-

porting this approach, because, in my view, it has the same potential to do harm where many are seeking to do good.

The constant turmoil that these sorts of proposals and acts are bringing to the region is counterproductive. They are a regrettable substitute for a failure of diplomacy by this administration. This kind of rhetoric will only encourage the Iranian people to rally around bad leadership because of the fear of foreign invasion. Fear of the outside is the main glue that authoritarian regimes historically use when they face trouble on the inside.

Admiral Fallon agrees with this view. The Baker-Hamilton report was adamant about the need to engage these nations. The facts of our economy say so. Going back to the beginning of the Iraq war, in the fall of 2002, 5 years ago, oil was \$25 dollars a barrel; it is \$82 a barrel today. The price of gold was below \$300, yesterday it was \$740.

The value of our currency is at an all-time low against the Euro, at parity for the first time in 30 years with the Canadian dollar. This proposal is DICK CHENEY's fondest pipe dream. It is not a prescription for success. At best it is a deliberate attempt to divert attention from a failed diplomatic policy. At worst it could be read as a backdoor method of gaining congressional validation for military action without one hearing and without serious debate.

I believe this amendment should be withdrawn so we can hold sensible hearings and fulfill our duty to truly examine these far-reaching issues. If it is not withdrawn, I regrettably intend to vote against it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, would the Chair have the bill reported that is now before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1585, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1585) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe

military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Nelson (NE) (for Levin) amendment No. 2011, in the nature of a substitute.

Warner (for Graham/Kyl) amendment No. 2064 (to amendment No. 2011), to strike section 1023, relating to the granting of civil rights to terror suspects.

Kyl/Lieberman amendment No. 3017 (to amendment No. 2011), to express the sense of the Senate regarding Iran.

Biden amendment No. 2997 (to amendment No. 2011), to express the sense of Congress on federalism in Iraq.

AMENDMENT NO. 2064

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I call for the regular order with respect to the Graham amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is now pending.

AMENDMENT NO. 3035 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2064

(Purpose: To provide Federal assistance to States, local jurisdictions, and Indian tribes to prosecute hate crimes, and for other purposes)

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I do have an amendment at the desk and ask it be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], for Mr. KENNEDY, for himself and Mr. SMITH, proposes an amendment numbered 3035 to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2064.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a cloture motion at the desk and ask it be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on amendment No. 3035 regarding hate crimes.

Gordon H. Smith, Chuck Schumer, Bernard Sanders, Robert Menendez, Sheldon Whitehouse, Frank R. Lautenberg, Hillary Rodham Clinton, Chris Dodd, John F. Kerry, Patty Murray, Barack Obama, Jeff Bingaman, Ben Cardin, Evan Bayh, Tom Harkin, Ted Kennedy, Dianne Feinstein.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and the morning business be until 12:30 today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.