

world and that the plight of the Baha'is in Iran is a poignant example of injustice. On behalf of my Baha'i constituents, I ask that you lend your voice to mine, so that we may create a chorus of diverse voices against the type of blatant religious persecution that we are witnessing in the unjust treatment of Baha'is in Iran.

**COUNTERING IRAN'S NUCLEAR & TERRORIST THREATS, THE OPPOSITION'S ROLE: WHAT ARE THE U.S. POLICY OPTIONS?**

**HON. TOM MCCLINTOCK**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, December 22, 2010*

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to insert into the RECORD excerpts of remarks made at a symposium sponsored by Executive Action, LLC: "Countering Iran's Nuclear & Terrorist Threats, The Opposition's Role: What Are the U.S. Policy Options?" held at the Willard Intercontinental Hotel in Washington, DC on Friday, December 17, 2010.

MICHAEL MUKASEY, FORMER ATTORNEY  
GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

This is one of those moments in history when we know that future generations are going to ask what we did to advance good and what we did to resist evil . . . .

I'm a lawyer, and lawyers make their cases with facts and law and policy. So let's look at some facts, and some law, and some policy, and see whether the case is there. The history of the relationship between the United States and the Iranian regime since the 1979 revolution can be summed up as a series of attempts by the United States to, as the diplomats say, engage the Iranian regime, each attempt less successful than the one that preceded it. I'm not going to go through that entire history, but an important part of it begins in the 1990s, during the Clinton administration, when the People's Mojahedin Organization of Iran, also known as the MEK, was designated by the Secretary of State under U.S. law as a foreign terrorist organization and that designation regrettably continues to this day . . . .

The MEK is the only organization of Iranians, both inside Iran and outside Iran that opposes the current regime that favors a government in Iran that is democratic, secular, non-nuclear, and a republic. Again, this is not one of the few organizations that fit that description; it is the only one . . . .

If in fact MEK has renounced violence, as it has; if in fact it presents no threat to any U.S. personnel or interest, in fact it presents no such threat; and if in fact it has been of affirmative assistance to the United States, as it has; and is not regarded as a terrorist organization in the United Kingdom or the European Union, then why was it placed on that list and why does it continue to remain on the list of such organizations that is kept by the Secretary of State? Well, I think, it's pretty openly acknowledged that the reason MEK was placed on that list during the Clinton administration was to curry favor with Iran, and to use the designation as a way of entering into dialogue with the Iranian regime. And I am sorry to say that even during the administration that I served in, it is reported that MEK continued to remain on the list for the same misguided reason . . . .

The Iranian regime is now in the enviable position of having the United States designate as a terrorist organization a group of Iranians who are a threat to that regime,

and of limiting that group's activities. In other words, the Iranians now have the great Satan working for them . . . .

The continued designation of MEK as a terrorist organization gives great comfort and legitimacy to the Iranian regime, by putting on the sidelines an organization that is potentially a grave threat to the regime. What's to be done? Well as I'm sure many of you know there is an ongoing case in which MEK has challenged the designation. In July, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia circuit issued an opinion essentially sending the matter back to the State Department and to the Secretary of State and asking her to re-evaluate whether MEK should be on that list. But the court did something more than that. It expressed a good deal of skepticism at least about the non-classified information that was put before the court and shared with MEK, and which MEK could therefore rebut. Without getting into a whole lot of detail, the Secretary of State may choose to base her determination entirely on classified information if she wants, and then nobody knows why she made the decision, but she didn't do that in this case. She said she based her decision on both the classified information and the non-classified information and the court discussed in some detail some of the non-classified information, and it showed that a lot of it consisted of unsubstantiated, anonymous rumor, whose reliability was unknown and could not be tested. And all we can say is that if the classified part of the record, which MEK has not been allowed to see and to which it cannot therefore respond to directly, consists of the same kind of information as the non-classified part, then the Secretary of State's decision would be based on absolutely nothing substantial. Time will tell. But this is about more than a case in the District of Columbia and more than MEK. This is about the posture of the United States toward the Iranian regime . . . .

When succeeding generations consider the question I presented at the beginning of these remarks, of what we did to advance what is good and to resist what is evil, they will find an answer that we and they can live with.

TOM RIDGE, FORMER SECRETARY OF HOMELAND  
SECURITY

At one point in time, we talked about and we put the MEK on the terrorist list because we thought it might enhance and improve the dialogue, change the dialogue. There might be some noticeable improvement in our relationship with Iran and I think history concludes so far in the past several years since we put that organization, which by the way disarmed itself, consolidated itself and has been a source of some very important intelligence for this country's use and the rest of the world's knowledge. If the goal was to improve engagement and to solicit a different response from the Iranian government, that hasn't worked out very well either. So, you say to yourself at the end of the day, these efforts during the past several years have been fruitless, and some say through some organizations that are basically feckless, not terribly effective. What happens if they become even further emboldened by having nuclear capability? One, we know what it says about Iran—if you think that part of the world is unstable now, we can only imagine what the consequences will be then . . . .

And you know what is probably even more alarming is that we're starting to see more and more analysts accept in their writings the notion of a nuclear Iran and how we would deal with it. Think about that, ten years ago we were worried and trying to fig-

ure out how we could make sure that didn't happen and now we have some pundits and some analysts in the international community saying, it's almost a fait accompli, "now what are we going to do?" Let's just pause for a moment and think what that means to the rest of the world vis-a-vis America. What does it say about our ability to influence geopolitical events? What does it say about how our allies and friends in that region look to us, and our ability to affect change that affects their lives and the security of that particular region. . . . ?

So how do we go forward? What do we do next? I think the Attorney General very clearly identified probably one of the most significant things we can do and that is delist as the UK has done, and the European Union has done, MEK. They did consolidate. They did disarm. They were a source of considerable intelligence for us, and if we are to look for peaceful means of encouraging a regime change, it seems to me that one of the first and most significant steps we could take, I guess it's under review right now by the State Department, but as you well know in January of this year I think the DC Circuit Court of Appeals said that, based on the information you presented in this court right now (and unfortunately you had to go to court, everybody goes to court in the United States, but to get them delisted from the State Department) the court said preliminarily, the information that you've at least shared with us in court today doesn't warrant them being listed as a terrorist organization. I think the consequences of that particular decision, the State Department as I understand it and perhaps others on this panel can give us a more enlightened and more recent point of view that they're actually honestly and actively considering that outcome.

What's the benefit of that outcome? First of all it's the strongest possible signal that our approach toward Iran is changing. It's saying that 30 years of peaceful engagement hasn't been effective, and I think everybody around the world knows that. But I'm going to give you a different perspective if I might because I think it has as much to do as how we're viewed around the rest of the world and why I think we should do it as soon as possible. I've always thought that, if America was considered to be a product that we look to sell around the world then our brand is based on our value system. Think about that for a moment. For 200+ years, more recently we have tried to promote the notion of civil society, and civil institutions, and believing that in the heart of all men and women everywhere around the world there is a desire to be free, a desire to control your own destiny, to raise your own family, to share in hopefully, the opportunities that your society and your government would provide for you. In inheriting all of that, we have many of those discussions as it relates to how we are engaged in our effort against terrorism around the world. We challenge ourselves around Abu Ghraib, we challenge ourselves around Guantanamo, we challenge ourselves with regard to due process. We know what we stand for. It's part of the American brand. We are our strongest allies; we're also our strongest critics. We know what we believe in and when we seem to deviate, if some of us seem to think we deviate from that brand, we take a close look at ourselves in the mirror and ask ourselves "What are we doing?" Well, part of that American brand I think is being consistent with our values overseas as well. And when we see a repressive theocracy, day in and day out, imprisoning, torturing, executing men, women, entire families because they've been brave enough, courageous enough to stand in opposition to the theocracy. In their hearts, not

necessarily looking to the institutions of government like America but looking to the value system of freedom and liberty, speech, assembly, peaceful opposition. So I frankly think one of the most important things this country can do, and hope we will do it as soon as possible is to delist. Delist the People's Mujahedin of Iran. It's not a terrorist organization. And after that, be part of a sustained, public, rhetorical, and as well diplomatic embrace of our brand, with the hope of convincing the rest of the world that the loyal opposition, those pro-democracy warriors, individuals and families in Iran can at least look to the United States not with casual and occasional criticism of the Iranian government and how it treats its citizens, but a sustained clamor for change, aggressive diplomatic efforts to at least pull some of our friends and allies into the chorus of opposition to this regime. Time is running out. There aren't too many options left.

FRANCES FRAGOS TOWNSEND, FORMER ADVISOR  
TO PRESIDENT GEORGE W. BUSH ON HOMELAND  
SECURITY

Our policy goals in this country really must be a reflection of our values. It must be consistent and it must be fundamental to how we build a policy process. It struck me, when you go back and look at the current, when we heard Tom Ridge and others talk about the sanctions regime, we can debate its efficacy we can debate its impact, but the statement of the goal right now as we sit here today in Washington the goal of the sanctions, which have not been yet successful, is to get the regime to the bargaining table. Is that really all? To describe that is as humble and modest in terms of an objective, that's not enough. So, when you look at all the other things we've talked about just so far this morning that the MEK is still listed as an FTO all of that stems from "what are you trying to achieve." If you're not clear, and you're not ambitious, and your goals don't represent your values, you are doomed to failure. . . .

The FTO designations, as you can imagine during my time in the government (I was in the Justice Department for many years and then in the White House), monitoring the FTO process, the Foreign Terrorist Organizations designation process, working with the State Department was among my responsibilities. I must tell you that having traveled throughout the Middle East and around the world, talking to our allies, the FTO designation process (we should just be honest) is disrespected by our allies. It is ineffective. It is corrupted by politics, and I don't mean, "corrupted" in the criminal sense, but it has been pervaded by political debate, which is part and parcel of a foreign policy discussion when you're setting foreign policy goals. The fact that we permit domestic politics in foreign policy concerns to come into what is supposed to be an objective process, that is the designation of a foreign terrorist organization, undermines US credibility. . . .

Not only, having disarmed, and renounced violence and assisted the United States, should the MEK come off the list, the US Congress should abolish the list because I frankly think in many respects because of how it's operated, it does more to undermine our credibility on these subjects. So, I would both take MEK off the list and I would ask Congress to abolish it. . . .

The other thing that I would say and hasn't been spoken about, again I'm sensitive to this because of my responsibilities in the White House is, I frankly think, as part of the delisting process one of the things that would enable or open the potential for is permitting MEK leaders who are outside of Iran to get visas and come to the

United States. That's an entirely, again, separate process. It would be treated separately. Delisting does not necessarily mean that those leaders would be able to apply and get such a visa that ought to be part of this process. Those people ought to be able to come here and speak about the atrocities, they ought to be able to speak about the human rights abuses and what's happening inside Iran to those advocates for democracy and freedom. And they ought to be able to be their own advocates. Right now, we are their advocates, but they are entitled to make their own case both before the American Congress and the American people, to raise money, to raise support, and to raise awareness. So, for me, it's: take them off the list, abolish the list and grant visas to expatriates and exiled MEK leaders so that they can come and make their own case.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

#### HON. DEAN HELLER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, December 22, 2010*

Mr. HELLER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 661, I was unavoidably detained.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

#### HONORING THE EXEMPLARY SERVICE OF SANCTUARY, INC.

#### HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, December 22, 2010*

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the exemplary service of Sanctuary, Inc., a community based non-profit organization that aims to improve the quality of life for Guam's families and youth. Through their 24-hour crisis intervention, Sanctuary promotes mediation services during times of family conflicts while also providing temporary safe refuge to youth in need of further supportive counseling. In addition, Sanctuary fosters the development of responsible community members and assists in preserving and promoting family unity through their outreach, education and prevention programs.

Founded in 1971 by Father Robert Phelps and Mr. Luis Martinez, with the goal of creating a safe refuge for Guam's youth, Sanctuary originated in southern Guam, with seven families volunteering their time and homes to provide temporary housing to troubled youth who are not suitable for youth correctional facilities. Sanctuary has since relocated to central Guam and now provides shelter and services at three dedicated buildings: an emergency shelter, a transitional living program, and substance abuse program. They have made tremendous strides over the years and annually provide safe haven for over 300 youth and also provide assistance through outreach and prevention programs to over 3,000 troubled teens. These services and programs, such as alcohol and drug treatment programs, provide safe alternatives to detention or youth correctional facilities and are instrumental in helping troubled youth turn their lives around and contribute to society.

It is on the occasion of Sanctuary's 39th anniversary that I join our community in com-

mending their humanitarian services and outreach efforts in helping Guam's youth. I commend the efforts of Interim Executive Director, Millie Lujan; Staff members and Volunteers who have dedicated and contributed their time over the past 39 years and I look forward to many more years of continued service by Sanctuary Guam.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

#### HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, December 22, 2010*

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I missed rollcall votes 657 through 663 on Tuesday, December 21st. Had I been present I would have voted "aye" on rollcall vote 657 on H. Res 1771, rollcall 658 on H.R. 6540, rollcall 659 on agreeing to the Senate amendments to H.R. 5116, rollcall 660 on agreeing to the Senate amendments to H.R. 2142, rollcall 661 on agreeing to the Senate amendments to H.R. 2751, rollcall 662 on agreeing to the Senate amendments to H.R. 3082, and rollcall 663 on H.R. 6547.

#### BARBARA ROOSE-CRAMER

#### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, December 22, 2010*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and applaud Barbara Roose-Cramer for her outstanding service to our community.

Barbara has been married 47 years, is the mother of three and grandmother of seven. She is an accomplished athlete, writer, motivational speaker and volunteer. Barbara has been the recipient of numerous awards including California's Outstanding Athlete and Most Inspirational Athlete, the YWCA's Most Courageous Athlete and a two time Olympic Gold Medalist. Since the onset of polio at age eight, Barbara has been in a wheelchair.

In addition to her accomplishments as an athlete, Barbara has served on numerous committees for organizations dedicated to those with disabilities. She is currently writing for major publications on issues concerning those with disabilities. Being a sports enthusiast she has written a book about the history of the Denver Broncos and donated all the profits to a local wheelchair basketball team.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Barbara Roose-Cramer for her well deserved recognition by the West Chamber serving Jefferson County. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all her future accomplishments.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

#### HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, December 22, 2010*

Mr. BECERRA. Madam Speaker, on December 17, 2010, I was unavoidably detained