

the Declaration. The lead sentence reads: "When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation." This sentence sets the stage for the body of the Declaration, which lists in some detail the abuses of power that drove the Founders to a war of secession.

Unlike the philosophical goals of life, liberty, and happiness, which Americans today readily understand and revere, the complaints listed in the Declaration rarely fire the popular imagination. But they should. The abuses of the King listed in the Declaration are the very issues that the Constitution strives to prevent. They are the issues that the Bill of Rights specifically protects us against. They are issues, and battles, still being fought today, as the recent debates and court actions over the rights of detainees and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, or FISA, demonstrate.

Reading the list of the colonists' grievances paints a vivid picture of life in those times. One can readily imagine the frustrations of a people trying to build a working society, ruled by laws, that welcomes new settlers and that promotes trade and commerce but is continually set back by contempt and indifference. The colonies' governments are dissolved or are forced to meet in out-of-the-way, uncomfortable places or at times that discourage part-time legislators from attending. Laws are arbitrarily suspended until the King, can rule on them, but he never does provide a ruling. New courts cannot be established unless the King, thousands of miles and months of travel away, will agree to them. Judges depend on the King's favor for their jobs and their salaries, so they rarely rule against him, anyway. New taxes and new rules from Britain are continually imposed upon the colonists, from stamp taxes to tea taxes, and their complaints about them are met with silence or violence. Large armies are camped among the colonies and take what they demand from the colonists, but they are immune from prosecution for any wrongs they commit. Mercenaries are brought in, and colonists are seized and forced into military service on behalf of the King.

The colonists complain, but the King does not care. The Declaration concludes, therefore, "A Prince, whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a Tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people." In the Constitution to come, the Founding Fathers will design a government that limits the power of the executive in order to prevent tyranny by one man, and will protect the rights of the individual

against the state. Courts will be independent, and taxes must be levied only by the representatives of the people.

Our Government was expressly designed to prevent anyone from having to live under the same conditions suffered by the colonists. As Thomas Jefferson wrote, "In questions of power then, let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

Ultimately, the colonists declared in their Declaration of Independence that ". . . these united Colonies are, and of Right ought to be Free and Independent States . . . Absolved from all Allegiance to the British Crown . . ." and held Britain, ". . . as we hold the rest of mankind, Enemies in War, in Peace Friends."

On this Independence Day, the current generation can look back upon those strong, resolute words with pride and gratitude. We would do well to remember the abuses that finally compelled our Founding Fathers to declare war, so that we never let the freedoms that were won for us to be lost. Remember the words of John Adams, who warned that "The jaws of power are always open to devour, and her arm is always stretched out, if possible, to destroy freedom of thinking, speaking, and writing." He further wrote, "Be not intimidated . . . nor suffer yourselves to be wheedled out of your liberties by any pretense of politeness, delicacy, or decency. These, as they are often used, are but three different names for hypocrisy, chicanery and cowardice." Those are the words of experience, speaking across the ages. This Independence Day, we best honor our legacy by caring for it with the same passion and vigilance that John Adams did.

Mr. President, I wish you, and everyone listening, a happy Independence Day.

DEATH OF NICOLE SUVEGES IN IRAQ

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have just learned of the death in Iraq of an extraordinarily brave woman from my State of Illinois who died this week in a bombing in the Sadr City section of Baghdad. Nicole Suveges was a civilian assigned to the 3rd Brigade Combat Team for the 4th Infantry Division.

She was a political scientist from Illinois and a doctoral student at Johns Hopkins University. She was participating in a program that embeds academics into military units to help personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan navigate difficult local environments.

She chose to go to Iraq for her employer, BAE Systems, because she was interested in learning how people make the transition from an authoritarian society to freedom; that was the focus of her doctoral dissertation. She hoped she might use her knowledge to help Iraqis develop the habits and institutions of democracy.

When she died in a bombing on Tuesday, she was helping local officials mediate disputes in Sadr City. Also killed in the blast were two U.S. soldiers and a State Department Foreign Service Officer.

Iraq was not the first war zone Nicole had worked in. She served as an Army Reservist in Bosnia in the 1990s.

Nicole graduated from the University of Illinois in Chicago in 1992. She was 38 years old. She was one of more than 180 American civilians to die in the war in Iraq. Their deaths are in addition to the 4,113 members of the U.S. military who have lost their lives in Iraq.

Nicole Suveges represented what is best about America. She used her considerable courage and knowledge to try to help heal a badly scarred nation and help Iraqis create for themselves a freer, more secure future. Her death is a loss to Iraq, to America, and to the world.

We extend our condolences to her husband and family, and her friends and colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that a CNN account of Nicole Suveges' life and work be printed in the RECORD.

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

AMERICAN GRAD STUDENT DIES IN IRAQ

An American graduate student who went to Iraq to find ways to help ordinary citizens persevere in a transitioning government was one of two American civilians killed in a Sadr City bombing.

Nicole Suveges, a married political scientist from Illinois, was part of a program that embeds academics into military units to help personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan navigate the local environment, according to her employer, BAE Systems.

Suveges, who started her tour with Human Terrain System in April, had been assigned to support the 3rd Brigade Combat Team for the 4th Infantry Division in "political, cultural, and tribal engagements," a statement from the program said.

She was one of four Americans to die in the Sadr City bombing Tuesday. Two U.S. soldiers and a State Department employee, Steven Farley, who worked with the provincial reconstruction team, also were killed in the blast.

"Nicole was a leading academic who studied for years on how to improve conditions for others," Doug Belair, president of BAE's Technology Solutions & Services, said in a written statement. "She came to us to give freely of herself in an effort to make a better world."

Suveges was the second BAE employee to die in a combat zone this year. Michael V. Bhatia, 31, a social scientist from Medway, Massachusetts, died in a roadside bombing May 7 in Afghanistan, BAE said.

Scott Fazekas, BAE's director of communications, said Suveges and Bhatia were among three dozen social scientists hired by the company and its subcontractors to support the program.

The Johns Hopkins University graduate student was also working toward a doctorate in political science with an emphasis on international relations. The focus of her dissertation was on the transition from an authoritarian regime to democracy and how it affects ordinary citizens, the university said.

"Nicole was committed to using her learning and experience to make the world a better place, especially for people who have suffered through war and conflict," William R.

Brody, president of the university, said in a message Wednesday to the campus community. "She exemplifies all that we seek to do at Johns Hopkins: to use knowledge for the good of humanity."

Mark Blyth, Suveges' primary faculty adviser, said that when Suveges came to Johns Hopkins, she planned to write her Ph.D. dissertation on how ideas move across borders from society to society, exploring how radical Islamic ideas filtered through Western European mosques.

After the outbreak of the Iraq war, Suveges decided to shift her focus to the experience of ordinary citizens under a transitional government, said Blyth, a topic that had interested Suveges since her experience in Bosnia with the SFOR/NATO Combined Joint Psychological Operations Task Force.

"She was a very bright, engaging, sweet person, very intellectually curious," Blyth said Wednesday.

BAE said Suveges' experience, which included a tour in Iraq as a civilian contractor and a stint in Bosnia in the 1990s as an Army reservist, made her especially valuable in efforts to improve the lives of Iraqis.

A Human Terrain System statement said Suveges and others were attending a meeting of the District Advisory Council on Tuesday to elect a new chairman.

The officials were helping mediate disputes among the Sadr City leadership and "facilitate the development of a more representative local government," the statement said.

The attack was blamed on a Shiite insurgent cell.

Suveges graduated from the University of Illinois at Chicago in 1992 and received a master's degree in political science from George Washington University in 1998.

She had delivered papers to international relations organizations and served as a graduate teaching assistant, the company said.

At Johns Hopkins, she was managing editor for the Review of International Political Economy, the university said.

Maj. Mike Kenfield, spokesman for the Army's training and doctrine command, said that the program was credited for "reductions in non-lethal operations" and that there had been talk about expanding the purview of the team to outside Iraq and Afghanistan.

ARMS CONTROL AND NON-PROLIFERATION BUREAUCRACY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss the U.S. arms control and nonproliferation bureaucracy and its impact on our national security.

Recently, I chaired two hearings of the Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee of the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee concerning the national security bureaucracy for arms control and nonproliferation. I examined several options for improving our ability to control proliferation. They included: Reestablishing an independent arms control and nonproliferation agency, creating a semi-autonomous arms control and nonproliferation agency within the State Department, and reestablishing an arms control bureau in the State Department. Other issues discussed were elevating the role of the head of the arms control and nonproliferation bureaucracy and ensuring that there are enough qualified arms control and non-

proliferation experts to protect our national security and meet our international obligations.

Witnesses for both hearings had decades of experience in managing our nation's arms control and nonproliferation issues. Ambassador Thomas Graham and Ambassador Norman Wulf, along with Dr. Andrew Semmel, who recently retired as Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Nuclear Nonproliferation Policy and Negotiations, provided perspective about the changes to this bureaucracy over the past decade and the need for reform. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed into the RECORD, following my remarks, a report submitted by Ambassador Wulf which represents consensus findings of a number of experts and former U.S. officials experienced in this field.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. AKAKA. The second hearing featured Ms. Patricia McNeerney, the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Security and Nonproliferation, and Ms. Linda Taglialatela, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Human Resources. They gave greater insight into the controversial, and damaging, arms control and nonproliferation bureaucracy reorganization at the State Department in 2005 and the ongoing human capital changes the bureaus involved continue to face today. The State Department's use of short-term, Band-Aid fixes to cover a loss of qualified civil servants and a lack of commitment by senior leaders to address the Department's cultural tensions, primarily between regional and functional issues, troubled me since these problems affect both human capital and organizational capacity to confront the evolving threat of weapons of mass destruction.

In 1961, when President John F. Kennedy entered office, the United States faced a perceived missile gap against its foe, the Soviet Union. The Kennedy administration, confronting the critical challenges of the day, advocated a new government "agency of peace" which would work toward "ultimate world disarmament." This agency, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, ACDA, helped craft and implement the policy decisions that would reduce the nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons threat to Americans through multiple, lasting, and verifiable treaties. The world was at a nuclear tipping point, where a small change could make a significant difference. The Kennedy administration challenged the conventional wisdom that argued for only an increase in nuclear weapons. It instead focused on controlling and limiting the spread of nuclear weapons by creating the small, but agile, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency that gradually began to increase international security.

The world appears to be at another nuclear tipping point. Today inter-

national security does not hinge on an arms race between two mighty superpowers. Rather, international security is increasingly threatened by the wide proliferation of nuclear programs, material, and knowledge. Countries such as India, Pakistan, North Korea, and Iran have either achieved a nuclear weapons program or have aspirations to create one. Others soon may follow. Along with these headline-grabbing nuclear proliferation concerns, many countries are seeking nuclear power and assured access to uranium to satisfy their growing energy demands. The peaceful application of civilian nuclear programs heightens the risk of diversion or the proliferation of plutonium and enriched uranium. Both presidential candidates have expressed their commitment to addressing proliferation and working with other nations to reduce the threat of nuclear conflict.

The next administration must confront this tipping point head on and solve the problem of our troubled arms control and nonproliferation bureaucracy. Along with its organizational structure, fundamental human capital issues must be resolved. They include: Addressing what is considered by some a cumbersome hiring process; recruiting, developing, and retaining a diverse and highly qualified workforce; involving key stakeholders during organizational changes; and making it desirable for Foreign Service Officers to serve in the fields of arms control and nonproliferation.

We need to consider the gravity of this issue now. I urge my colleagues to advocate an arms control and nonproliferation workforce and organization that will support effectively the policies of the next administration and prepare us for the nuclear threats developing throughout the world.

EXHIBIT 1

FOREWORD

This report was prepared by a volunteer task force. The task force solicited views from participants through two general meetings and from contributors via written comments.

These two groups included many former U.S. officials most with decades of experience in nonproliferation or arms control who graciously gave of their time to this project. They are named below—a short biography of each appears in the annex.

This report contains a general consensus that the Administration taking office in January 2009 should strengthen the organizational capacity of the State Department to meet critical nonproliferation and arms control challenges. Participants and contributors endorse the general thrust of this report though not necessarily every finding and suggestion.

Christopher Mitchell of the Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution (ICAR) of George Mason University served as convener of the two meetings that were held. Norman Wulf led those discussions and along with Dean Rust and Barclay Ward drafted the discussion papers and this report.

The task force also included Linda Gallini, Fred McGoldrick, and Sharon Squassoni.

Participants in at least one of the two meetings included members of the task force and Vic Alessi, Kevin Avruch, Joseph M.