

IN MEMORY OF LT. GEN. WILLIAM E. ODOM

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, I rise to pay tribute to Lieutenant General William E. Odom, a great American and a true patriot. General Odom passed away last Friday at the age of 75 after a lifetime of service to the Nation. General Odom was a soldier and a scholar. He was a teacher and the author of seven books on history and international relations. He served Presidents of both parties. He was one of our Nation's top experts on military intelligence. He was a great visionary. And he was among the first to correctly and courageously warn that invading Iraq would be folly.

I am proud to say that he was a friend. He generously shared his insight and counsel with me, and I found what he told and shared to be invaluable.

General Odom was born in Tennessee and graduated from West Point. He received a Ph.D. from Columbia University and became a leading author on the Soviet Union. After teaching at West Point and Columbia, he served in the Carter administration as assistant to the President for national security affairs. Neither a Democrat nor a Republican, he also served in the Reagan administration as director of the National Security Agency. After retiring from the military, he became a professor at Yale University and a senior fellow with the Hudson Institute.

General Odom was a patriot in every sense of the word. He served in Vietnam, and his family has continued to serve. His son was wounded in Iraq. But General Odom also understood that true patriotism meant disagreeing with your government's actions when you think they are wrong.

He opposed the invasion and occupation of Iraq long before it began when it was not the popular thing to do and long before most of the rest of the country opposed it. His boss in the Carter administration, Mr. Brzezinski, had this to say of his early opposition to the invasion, "Among senior military people, (Odom) was probably the first to consider the war in Iraq a misbegotten adventure. He believed that we're just stoking hostility to the United States in that region and developing an opposition that cannot be defeated by military means."

In September of 2006, I and several of my colleagues in the House invited General Odom to speak at one of a series of ad hoc Congressional hearings and forums hosted by the Progressive Caucus on Iraq. General Odom described how al Qaeda's recruitment efforts had been seriously weakened by our efforts in Afghanistan, but he said that al Qaeda's recruitments soared after the invasion of Iraq. General Odom said, to (Osama bin Laden), the invasion must have been manna from

heaven, probably saving his organization." I can't think of any more powerful argument against the invasion and continued occupation of Iraq than what he said.

General Odom did not just oppose the administration's policy. He offered a real alternative that could both end the conflict in Iraq and lay the foundation for regional peace. He said, "No effective new strategy can be devised for the United States until it begins withdrawing its forces from Iraq. Withdrawal is the pre-condition for winning support from countries in Europe that have stood aside, and, other major powers including India, China, Japan, and Russia. It will also shock and change attitudes in Iran, Syria, and other countries on Iraq's borders making them more likely to take seriously new U.S. approaches to restoring regional stability."

Everyone who knew General Odom knew that he was a tireless worker and a straight shooter. He continued to oppose war virtually up until the day that he died. Just 3 days before he passed away, an op-ed article he co-authored on Iran appeared in the Washington Post. The article opposed the drumbeat of war against Iran and offered a policy of diplomacy that can stop Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. I hope every Member of this House will read that article.

General William Odom was a military man who worked hard for peace. If we had listened to him about Iraq in 2002, we could have saved tens of thousands of lives. I hope we will listen to his words now, because they can save many more lives in the future. General Odom was a great inspiration while he was alive, and I know that he will continue to inspire us in the days ahead.

[From the Washington Post, May 27, 2008]

A SENSIBLE PATH ON IRAN

(By Zbigniew Brzezinski and William Odom)

Current U.S. policy toward the regime in Tehran will almost certainly result in an Iran with nuclear weapons. The seemingly clever combination of the use of "sticks" and "carrots," including the frequent official hints of an American military option "remaining on the table," simply intensifies Iran's desire to have its own nuclear arsenal. Alas, such a heavy-handed "sticks" and "carrots" policy may work with donkeys but not with serious countries. The United States would have a better chance of success if the White House abandoned its threats of military action and its calls for regime change.

Consider countries that could have quickly become nuclear weapon states had they been treated similarly. Brazil, Argentina and South Africa had nuclear weapons programs but gave them up, each for different reasons. Had the United States threatened to change their regimes if they would not, probably none would have complied. But when "sticks" and "carrots" failed to prevent India and Pakistan from acquiring nuclear weapons, the United States rapidly accommodated both, preferring good relations with them to hostile ones. What does this suggest to leaders in Iran?

To look at the issue another way, imagine if China, a signatory to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and a country that has deliberately not engaged in a nuclear arms

race with Russia or the United States, threatened to change the American regime if it did not begin a steady destruction of its nuclear arsenal. The threat would have an arguable legal basis, because all treaty signatories promised long ago to reduce their arsenals, eventually to zero. The American reaction, of course, would be explosive public opposition to such a demand. U.S. leaders might even mimic the fantasy rhetoric of Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad regarding the use of nuclear weapons.

A successful approach to Iran has to accommodate its security interests and ours. Neither a U.S. air attack on Iranian nuclear facilities nor a less effective Israeli one could do more than merely set back Iran's nuclear program. In either case, the United States would be held accountable and would have to pay the price resulting from likely Iranian reactions. These would almost certainly involve destabilizing the Middle East, as well as Afghanistan, and serious efforts to disrupt the flow of oil, at the very least generating a massive increase in its already high cost. The turmoil in the Middle East resulting from a preemptive attack on Iran would hurt America and eventually Israel, too.

Given Iran's stated goals—a nuclear power capability but not nuclear weapons, as well as an alleged desire to discuss broader U.S.-Iranian security issues—a realistic policy would exploit this opening to see what it might yield. The United States could indicate that it is prepared to negotiate, either on the basis of no preconditions by either side (though retaining the right to terminate the negotiations if Iran remains unyielding but begins to enrich its uranium beyond levels allowed by the Non-Proliferation Treaty); or to negotiate on the basis of an Iranian willingness to suspend enrichment in return for simultaneous U.S. suspension of major economic and financial sanctions.

Such a broader and more flexible approach would increase the prospects of an international arrangement being devised to accommodate Iran's desire for an autonomous nuclear energy program while minimizing the possibility that it could be rapidly transformed into a nuclear weapons program. Moreover, there is no credible reason to assume that the traditional policy of strategic deterrence, which worked so well in U.S. relations with the Soviet Union and with China and which has helped to stabilize India-Pakistan hostility, would not work in the case of Iran. The widely propagated notion of a suicidal Iran detonating its very first nuclear weapon against Israel is more the product of paranoia or demagoguery than of serious strategic calculus. It cannot be the basis for U.S. policy, and it should not be for Israel's, either.

An additional longer-range benefit of such a dramatically different diplomatic approach is that it could help bring Iran back into its traditional role of strategic cooperation with the United States in stabilizing the Gulf region. Eventually, Iran could even return to its long-standing and geopolitically natural pre-1979 policy of cooperative relations with Israel. One should note also in this connection Iranian hostility toward al-Qaeda, lately intensified by al-Qaeda's Web-based campaign urging a U.S.-Iranian war, which could both weaken what al-Qaeda views as Iran's apostate Shiite regime and bog America down in a prolonged regional conflict.

Last but not least, consider that American sanctions have been deliberately obstructing Iran's efforts to increase its oil and natural gas outputs. That has contributed to the rising cost of energy. An eventual American-Iranian accommodation would significantly increase the flow of Iranian energy to the world market. Americans doubtless would

prefer to pay less for filling their gas tanks than having to pay much more to finance a wider conflict in the Persian Gulf.

TEXAS SHERIFF OMAR LUCIO

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, during the last week I had opportunity to go to the Texas Rio Grande Valley and visit with some relentless lawmen that represent the State of Texas down on the Texas-Mexico border. I had the privilege to be the guest of Valley Sheriff Omar Lucio. We call it the Valley. It's really the Rio Grande Valley that separates the United States from Mexico. And he is the Sheriff in the tip of Texas where it meets Brownsville and Metamoras.

This map here has a photograph or a drawing of where Sheriff Lucio is Sheriff in Cameron County, the red area. Most of his county borders the water. Some of it borders the Gulf of Mexico. Some of it borders the Rio Grande River. And he's been Sheriff there for 3 years.

I went there as his guest to see the way it really is on the Texas-Mexico border and how the violence and the crime is causing a tremendous problem to the locals who live in that area.

Sheriff Lucio is from the Valley. He was born in San Benito, Texas, and he started his law enforcement career in Harlingen, Texas, as a peace officer; and he retired as a captain of police from Harlingen. He's an educated individual from Pan American University. He has a degree in criminal justice and a degree in sociology, and he's also a graduate of the FBI academy at Quantico.

Prior to being Sheriff, he was also the Chief of Police of the City of Mercedes, and he is on the Texas Sheriff's Association, and more importantly, the Texas Border Sheriff's Coalition. What that is, Mr. Speaker, is the Sheriffs, the 16 county Sheriffs that border Mexico and Texas, all the Sheriffs form a coalition because of the tremendous problems they have as law enforcement officers protecting their communities.

Let me try to explain it to you this way: When a crime is committed in a county, even if it is committed by some outlaw that has crossed the border illegally into the United States, the people affected do not call the border patrol, they call the local Sheriff, whether it is a burglary, auto theft, robbery, or a murder. The Sheriffs are the ones who are called because of the crimes that are committed in those counties and not the border patrol.

The border patrol patrols, as the law says, 25 to 30 miles inside the Texas-Mexico border. Most of the Texas counties are a lot bigger than 25 miles. In fact, Cameron County, where Sheriff Lucio is Sheriff, is 1,300 square miles. Now, 300 miles of that is water border. And his biggest concern is the drug

cartels that infiltrate the United States from Mexico.

I want to mention that some of the information I received from Sheriff Lucio was quite remarkable, and I'm very impressed with the intelligence-gathering network that he has. Without going into that—it would not be proper for me to tell you how he gathers his information—but he gathers information from all sources, and he knows as much as anybody, including Homeland Security, as to what is taking place with the drug cartels that are infiltrating especially his county.

And he's concerned about the turf wars in Juarez, Mexico, and Laredo, and concerned that they will spread down further south into Metamoras, which is across the border from his main town of Brownsville, Texas. He says that the illegal criminals that come into his county are the biggest threat to not only national security but the security of the folks who live in that area. And he was very concerned about some of the proposals that the Homeland Security has for trying to protect that area.

There are 70 miles of fence proposed in that area, and Homeland Security is even proposing a fence so far inland that it cuts part of Texas' southmost college in half. Half of that college will be on the southern side of this fence. And that is probably not a good idea, and I would invite the Homeland Security chief to go down to that area and see some of the area and why it's impractical in that area to have a fence. Maybe in other parts of Texas, but certainly not in this particular part of the area.

His deputy sheriffs, Mr. Speaker, make \$24,000 a year, \$24,000 a year patrolling this rugged territory between Mexico and the United States. And I met a good number of those deputy sheriffs and some of his lieutenants, and I insert the names of The Posse, as I call them, into the RECORD at this point.

Gus Reyna, Jr., Chief Deputy; Javier Reyna, Captain; Lt. Carlos Garza, Investigations; Mike Leinart, Chief Jail Administrator; Lt. Domingo Diaz; Lt. Tony Lopez; Lt. Rick Perez; Lt. Dionicio Cortez; Sgt. Andy Arreola; Inv. Alvaro Guerra; Inv. Leo Silva.

And to a man, they are all determined to protect the citizens of Cameron County, Texas, from criminals from any source.

But they talk about the biggest problem they have is the fact that the border is not secure, that criminals come across the border, whether it is drug cartels or just old-fashioned robbers, and then they go back home across the border. And he is asking that he and other border Sheriffs get more manpower down on the border.

I told him that fence was going to cost \$1 million a mile. He said he would rather take that \$70 million that's going in his county for fences and have more personnel, more equipment, because the drug cartels have better equipment, more money, better fire power than he does.

In fact, speaking of equipment, I noticed that he didn't really have a lot of patrol vehicles. The way they get their vehicles, because they don't have a budget for vehicles, is they have to confiscate the drug dealers' vehicles, and they turn those over and become part of his operation.

So I want to thank him for his work down on the Texas-Mexico border, and the Cameron County folks are safer because of Sheriff Lucio and his relentless deputy sheriffs.

And that's just the way it is.

□ 1930

NATIONAL MEN'S HEALTH WEEK

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to thank my colleagues for just a few minutes ago passing unanimously H. Con. Res. 138, which I introduced recognizing June 9 through 15, 2008, as National Men's Health Week.

The need for this legislation could not be more evident, as far too many of our friends, brothers, uncles, cousins, grandfathers and fathers die each day from illnesses and diseases that are treatable.

Despite the advances in medical technology and research, men continue to live an average of almost 6 years less than women, and African American men have the lowest life expectancy of all groups.

Further, all of the 10 leading causes of death, as defined by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, affect men at a higher percentage rate than women.

Men simply are not getting the care they need. Women are 100 percent more likely to visit the doctor for an annual examination and to get preventive care.

This happens for a variety of reasons, including fear on the part of men, lack of health insurance, a macho attitude, thinking that they cannot be harmed, lack of information and cost factors. The disparity in men's health has led to increased risk of death from heart disease and cancer. But these problems do not only affect men.

More than one-half of elderly widows now living in poverty were not poor before the deaths of their husbands, and by age 100, women outnumber men eight to one.

We simply must get more men the early care and education they need to lead long, healthy lives. That is why I sponsored this resolution that recognizes June 9 through June 15 as National Men's Health Week. We need to educate both the public and health care providers about the importance of early detection of male health problems to reduce rates of mortality for common diseases.

Appropriate use of tests such as prostate specific antigen, PSA, exams,