

Ryan Crocker, the veteran diplomat nominated by President Obama to be the next U.S. ambassador in Kabul, gave a realistic assessment of the war in testimony Wednesday before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Here I'm using "realistic" as a synonym for "bleak."

Making progress is hard, Crocker said, but "not impossible."

Not impossible.

What on earth are we doing? We have more than 100,000 troops in Afghanistan risking life and limb, at a cost of \$10 billion a month, to pursue ill-defined goals whose achievement can be imagined, but just barely?

The hawks tell us that now, more than ever, we must stay the course—that finally, after Obama nearly tripled U.S. troop levels, we are winning. I want to be fair to this argument, so let me quote Crocker's explanation at length:

"What we've seen with the additional forces and the effort to carry the fight into enemy strongholds is, I think, tangible progress in security on the ground in the south and the west. This has to transition—and again, we're seeing a transition of seven provinces and districts to Afghan control—to sustainable Afghan control. So I think you can already see what we're trying to do—in province by province, district by district, establish the conditions where the Afghan government can take over and hold ground."

Sen. Jim Webb (D-Va.), a Vietnam veteran and former secretary of the Navy, pointed out the obvious flaw in this province-by-province strategy. "International terrorism—and guerrilla warfare in general—is intrinsically mobile," he said. "So securing one particular area . . . doesn't necessarily guarantee that you have reduced the capability of those kinds of forces. They are mobile; they move."

It would require far more than 100,000 U.S. troops to securely occupy the entire country. As Webb pointed out, this means we can end up "playing whack-a-mole" as the enemy pops back up in areas that have already been pacified.

If our intention, as Crocker said, is to leave behind "governance that is good enough to ensure that the country doesn't degenerate back into a safe haven for al-Qaeda," then there are two possibilities: Either we'll never cross the goal line, or we already have.

According to NATO's timetable, Afghan forces are supposed to be in charge of the whole country by the end of 2014. Will the deeply corrupt, frustratingly erratic Afghan government be "good enough" three years from now? Will Afghan society have banished the poverty, illiteracy and distrust of central authority that inevitably sap legitimacy from any regime in Kabul? Will the Afghan military, whatever its capabilities, blindly pursue U.S. objectives? Or will the country's civilian and military leaders determine their self-interest and act accordingly?

Democrats on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee issued a report this week warning that the nearly \$19 billion in foreign aid given to Afghanistan during the past decade may, in the end, have little impact. "The unintended consequences of pumping large amounts of money into a war zone cannot be underestimated," the report states.

The fact is that in 2014 there will be no guarantees. Perhaps we will believe it incrementally less likely that the Taliban could regain power and invite al-Qaeda back. But that small increment of security does not justify the blood and treasure that we will expend between now and then.

I take a different view. We should declare victory and leave.

We wanted to depose the Taliban regime, and we did. We wanted to install a new gov-

ernment that answers to its constituents at the polls, and we did. We wanted to smash al-Qaeda's infrastructure of training camps and havens, and we did. We wanted to kill or capture Osama bin Laden, and we did.

Even so, say the hawks, we have to stay in Afghanistan because of the dangerous instability across the border in nuclear-armed Pakistan. But does anyone believe the war in Afghanistan has made Pakistan more stable? Perhaps it is useful to have a U.S. military presence in the region. This could be accomplished, however, with a lot fewer than 100,000 troops—and they wouldn't be scattered across the Afghan countryside, engaged in a dubious attempt at nation-building.

The threat from Afghanistan is gone. Bring the troops home.

[From the Washington Post]

#### TIME TO GET OUT OF AFGHANISTAN

(By George F. Will)

"Yesterday," reads the e-mail from Allen, a Marine in Afghanistan, "I gave blood because a Marine, while out on patrol, stepped on a [mine's] pressure plate and lost both legs." Then "another Marine with a bullet wound to the head was brought in. Both Marines died this morning."

"I'm sorry about the drama," writes Allen, an enthusiastic infantryman willing to die "so that each of you may grow old." He says: "I put everything in God's hands." And: "Semper Paratus."

Allen and others of America's finest are also in Washington's hands. This city should keep faith with them by rapidly reversing the trajectory of America's involvement in Afghanistan, where, says the Dutch commander of coalition forces in a southern province, walking through the region is "like walking through the Old Testament."

U.S. strategy—protecting the population—is increasingly troop-intensive while Americans are increasingly impatient about "deteriorating" (says Adm. Mike Mullen, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff) conditions. The war already is nearly 50 percent longer than the combined U.S. involvements in two world wars, and NATO assistance is reluctant and often risible.

The U.S. strategy is "clear, hold and build." Clear? Taliban forces can evaporate and then return, confident that U.S. forces will forever be too few to hold gains. Hence nation-building would be impossible even if we knew how, and even if Afghanistan were not the second-worst place to try: The Brookings Institution ranks Somalia as the only nation with a weaker state.

Military historian Max Hastings says Kabul controls only about a third of the country—"control" is an elastic concept—and "our" Afghans may prove no more viable than were "our" Vietnamese, the Saigon regime." Just 4,000 Marines are contesting control of Helmand province, which is the size of West Virginia. The New York Times reports a Helmand official saying he has only "police officers who steal and a small group of Afghan soldiers who say they are here for 'vacation.'" Afghanistan's \$23 billion gross domestic product is the size of Boise's. Counterinsurgency doctrine teaches, not very helpfully, that development depends on security, and that security depends on development. Three-quarters of Afghanistan's poppy production for opium comes from Helmand. In what should be called Operation Sisyphus, U.S. officials are urging farmers to grow other crops. Endive, perhaps?

Even though violence exploded across Iraq after, and partly because of, three elections, Afghanistan's recent elections were called "crucial." To what? They came, they went, they altered no fundamentals, all of which

mitigate against American "success," whatever that might mean. Creation of an effective central government? Afghanistan has never had one. U.S. Ambassador Karl Eikenberry hopes for a "renewal of trust" of the Afghan people in the government, but the Economist describes President Hamid Karzai's government—his vice presidential running mate is a drug trafficker—as so "inept, corrupt and predatory" that people sometimes yearn for restoration of the warlords, "who were less venal and less brutal than Mr. Karzai's lot."

Mullen speaks of combating Afghanistan's "culture of poverty." But that took decades in just a few square miles of the South Bronx. Gen. Stanley McChrystal, the U.S. commander in Afghanistan, thinks jobs programs and local government services might entice many "accidental guerrillas" to leave the Taliban. But before launching New Deal 2.0 in Afghanistan, the Obama administration should ask itself: If U.S. forces are there to prevent reestablishment of al-Qaeda bases—evidently there are none now—must there be nation-building invasions of Somalia, Yemen and other sovereignty vacuums?

U.S. forces are being increased by 21,000, to 68,000, bringing the coalition total to 110,000. About 9,000 are from Britain, where support for the war is waning. Counterinsurgency theory concerning the time and the ratio of forces required to protect the population indicates that, nationwide, Afghanistan would need hundreds of thousands of coalition troops, perhaps for a decade or more. That is inconceivable.

So, instead, forces should be substantially reduced to serve a comprehensively revised policy: America should do only what can be done from offshore, using intelligence, drones, cruise missiles, airstrikes and small, potent Special Forces units, concentrating on the porous 1,500-mile border with Pakistan, a nation that actually matters.

Genius, said de Gaulle, recalling Bismarck's decision to halt German forces short of Paris in 1870, sometimes consists of knowing when to stop. Genius is not required to recognize that in Afghanistan, when means now, before more American valor, such as Allen's, is squandered.

#### AMERICAN ANGELS ABROAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have a group of people in the United States who are all volunteers that I call the American Angels Abroad. They are those thousands of Peace Corps volunteers throughout the world that are helping Third World countries in many different ways. They go to remote areas of the world, far from home, far from their families. They work in very primitive conditions. Yet there are those angels that are trying to help other people throughout the world, and they are called the Peace Corps volunteers.

The Peace Corps started as an idea of President Kennedy back in 1960 when he spoke to the University of Michigan and encouraged those students to volunteer to help America abroad. Finally, in 1961 he started the Peace Corps. Since then, over 200,000 Americans, mainly young people, mainly females, have volunteered to go around the world representing the United States.

It is very hard work being a Peace Corps volunteer. They deal with issues that most Americans never deal with. Just simple basic necessities such as of electricity and water and matters such as that, they do without, or they are difficult to find in the remote areas where they are because they are helping other people that don't have those things we have in the United States. Generally, they work alone when they are in foreign countries.

But all is not well with the Peace Corps, Mr. Speaker, because during the time since President Kennedy started the Peace Corps and those wonderful people go overseas, many times those volunteers, those young Americans, become victims of crime in these foreign countries; and when they become victims of crime, in some cases our own country abandons them.

Between 2000 and 2009, the Peace Corps itself says there were over 221 rapes and attempted rapes, almost 150 major sexual attacks and 700 other sexual assaults. That is 1,000 crimes against American Peace Corps volunteers. Recently, the Peace Corps has announced that there is an average of 22 rapes a year against American Peace Corps volunteers somewhere in another country.

This is not acceptable, Mr. Speaker. We are talking about real people. They are real stories and they are real victims.

I would like to mention just one of those persons that I know personally. I have got to know Jess Smochek since this crime against her has occurred. She joined the Peace Corps in 2004. On her first day as a Peace Corps volunteer in Bangladesh, a group of men started sexually groping her as she was walking to the house that she was to live in. But no one in the Peace Corps did anything about this assault. She told the Peace Corps staff over and over again that she felt unsafe in Bangladesh and the situation she was in, but the Peace Corps didn't do anything.

Months later, she came in contact with the same men, who then kidnapped her. They beat her. They sexually assaulted her. But they weren't through. They abandoned her and threw her in an alley somewhere in Bangladesh. And no one did anything.

According to Jess, the Peace Corps did everything they could to cover this up because they seemed to be more worried about America's relationship with Bangladesh than they were about this American volunteer that was assaulted, a victim of crime. Jess says that the Peace Corps not only didn't do anything, they blamed her for the conduct of others. They blamed her for being a sexual assault victim.

Mr. Speaker, a rape victim is never to be blamed for the crime that is committed against her. It is the fault of the criminal offender, whether it occurs in the United States or abroad. We need to understand that these precious people who go overseas and represent

us somewhere in the world, when a crime is committed against them, we need to take their side. We need to be supportive of those individuals. And we don't assume they did anything wrong, because they did not do anything wrong when they became a victim of crime. They were just victims of crime, and the person that should be held accountable is the criminal, and not to blame the victim.

Mr. Speaker, rape is never the fault of the victim. It is always the fault of the perpetrator.

But Jess got no satisfaction from the Peace Corps. No one did anything. When she got home, she was told to tell other people that she was coming back to the United States for medical reasons, to have her wisdom teeth pulled, not for the sexual assault that was committed against her.

□ 1030

This was Jess's case. A few others were brought to light recently by ABC News and 20/20. And now, more and more of these Peace Corps volunteers over the years are coming forward and telling us about their stories. Mainly, they are women. We recently had a hearing in Foreign Affairs about this situation. Their stories were heart-wrenching. So now it's time to pass legislation to protect these women and to give them basic victim services, and that is what we will be doing in the next few days, along with the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, people cry, Peace, peace, but there can be no peace for American angels abroad until they are treated with the dignity that they deserve and the support of the United States. We need to help the Peace Corps readjust itself to become a better institution.

And that's just the way it is.

#### A MISSED OPPORTUNITY FOR AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, like many Americans, I was profoundly disappointed in President Obama's announcement last night. I had hoped that he would offer an Afghanistan troop drawdown that was significant, swift, and sizable. Sadly, the proposal failed on all three counts. Now is the time for bold action and decision-making to bring our Nation's Afghanistan policy in line with what the American people want, while recognizing the deep and grave toll this war has taken on our global credibility and our national security. Instead, the administration's choice was to largely stay the course. Instead, President Obama chose to perpetuate a war that is not only bankrupting us morally but fiscally as well. The loss of blood and treasure cannot be underestimated.

The American people have been enormously patient, Mr. Speaker. They

have endured great sacrifice. But after nearly a decade of war, they're weary of losing their bravest men and women and their hard-earned tax dollars to a policy that simply has not achieved its goals.

We are not more secure. The Afghanistan leadership wants us out and their people do not appreciate our sacrifice. This is not a partisan issue. When asked, the majority of Americans want our troops to come home. And not several years into the future. No, they want our troops to come home now.

Abandoning this military policy does not mean that we will abandon the people of Afghanistan. A smart security plan would provide for development and reconciliation. It would bring the international community together and help the Afghan people move towards a sustainable future through economic and domestic support, among other means.

Mr. Speaker, more than 1,600 lives have been lost. Where will it end? When will our sons and daughters, mothers and fathers, friends and people we know in the community come home from Afghanistan? How many empty chairs are there at the dinner table tonight? When will the heartbreak end?

Let's talk about the economic cost. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle like to talk about dollars and cents, about how this and other actions we take are costing us too much money. Well, while we stand here, money is flying out of our Treasury to support this war. Try \$10 billion a month. Imagine what we could do with \$10 billion a month. Just last week, this House voted to take food from the mouths of pregnant women and their children. We're supposed to pinch pennies on important investments like our children and other American projects while we waste huge sums on a failed war. This boggles the mind and it shortchanges the needs we have right here at home.

It is long past time, Mr. Speaker, that we put an end to this madness. It is time to bring our troops home—all of our troops—safely home.

#### VICTORY IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. There's something that I'll personally never forget. That occurred in April, 2007. I'll get to why that is something I'll never forget in a second. That's when the majority leader, Senator HARRY REID, said of Iraq, "I believe myself that the Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense and—you have to make your own decisions as to what the President knows—know this war is lost and that the surge is not accomplishing anything, as indicated by the extreme violence in Iraq."

As in 2007, Senate Majority Leader REID was in a rush to the exits in Iraq and a rush to declare the war had been