

moral standpoint, but Japan is one of the strongest economies in the world.

From the State I represent, Louisiana, we are their second largest trading partner as a State. The people of Louisiana and all of our States have a vested interest in Japan getting back on its feet, getting better and stronger. We are still in the process of rebuilding New Orleans and the Lower Ninth Ward. New Orleans East, Gulfport, and Waveland are still struggling to come back—an important economic center for the country. But most certainly this coastal and industrial community around Sendai and other coastal communities are very important, not just to Japan but to the world.

I hope, with this 9.0 earthquake that hit, I hope people know this is 1,000 times worse than an 8 point on the Richter scale. It is not slightly worse; it is 1,000 times worse. This is a huge earthquake and shift in the Earth's plates—and then the subsequent tsunami.

On behalf of the people of Louisiana, we send special condolences and best wishes to the people of Japan as they recover and bury their dead, heal their injured, and begin to rebuild their cities and communities stronger than they were before. I hope we will all be as generous as we can.

One final point. This is a wake-up call to our country. As chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security, this is a wake-up call because we have not funded adequately our disaster response fund, the DRF. We are actually about \$1.6 billion below where we should be. This is not a wise policy given what happened over the weekend. Catastrophes can strike without warning at any time. If we leave just the amount of money that is in the DRF and something like Katrina or this event were to happen, that money would be used up in 3 days. We have not replenished that fund.

I have called on the President to send a supplemental emergency bill. We can't pay for current disasters out of future preparedness money. That is what the continuing resolution in the House basically does. I strongly object to taking money we have set aside in the event that catastrophes happen to pay for past disasters. That is another reason I voted against the House concurrent resolution.

Now with the visual of this horrific tragedy unfolding in Japan, with the tsunami, the destruction of the cities, the two nuclear powerplants under extraordinary pressure, it does no good to take money out of paying for current disasters, paying for the past damage.

I have sent a letter to the President asking him to send up an emergency bill. It would be wise for us to pay for past emergencies off-budget and then to use our homeland security bill to budget as effectively and as appropriately as we can for disasters that may occur.

I am proud to say that the Democratic leadership has doubled the

amount of money we are setting aside in case these things happen. It used to be only \$800 million a year. Now we are budgeting close to 1.8 or 1.9, thinking that in the event that something happens, we want to be prepared.

In 48 States, disasters have been declared in the last 2 years, not just along the gulf coast. We have had flooding up in the Northeast. We have had flooding in the Midwest. We could potentially have—we had some flooding this weekend. I am not sure how widespread it was, but in New Jersey, there were scenes throughout the weekend about rivers overflowing as the spring approaches.

So let us, as we mourn for Japan and are in solidarity with them through this crisis, use this as a reminder to get our business straight, to get our budget straight and not mess around with our disaster relief fund. Let's pay for past disasters we owe the communities—we have pledged to help them rebuild—and set aside the appropriate money in the regular budget to take care of things that might happen this year as we advance.

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

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed in morning business for 20 minutes instead of 10.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. And, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after my opening statement, my colleague from Connecticut be allowed to give his statement, and then I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Connecticut and I be allowed to engage in a colloquy. And I understand the Senator from Connecticut may be using his 10 minutes. Is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Thank you, Mr. President.

LIBYA

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, today my colleague, Senator LIEBERMAN, and I are preparing to submit a resolution on the situation in Libya.

Mr. President, is it allowed to send to the desk a resolution even though we are in morning business and its consideration be delayed until the appropriate time?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will then be received and appropriately referred.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the wording of the resolution is a sense of the Senate. It is pretty simple and straightforward. It calls for a recognition of the provisional revolutionary government in Libya, and it calls for placing as rapidly as possible a no-fly zone over Libya. It has some other language associated with it, which I would go into later on. But the fact is, what it does is urge the President of the United States to take long-overdue action to prevent the massacres that are taking place in Libya as we speak. At this moment, opponents of Colonel Qadhafi and his supporters are fighting for their very survival.

The demands of the Libyan people began much like those of their neighbors in North Africa and the Middle East—for the protection of their universal rights, for greater political freedom and representative government, for justice and opportunity. But the response of Qadhafi and those still loyal to him stands in stark contrast to the inspiring events of what some are calling the Arab spring. Qadhafi has unleashed a merciless campaign of violence against the Libyan people, including civilian noncombatants, using every tool at his disposal, from artillery barrages, to airstrikes, to the employment of foreign mercenaries. As President Bill Clinton correctly stated last week, "It is not a fair fight."

It is not a fair fight, and now the hour is growing dark. Over the past week, the momentum has increasingly shifted away from the opposition and toward Qadhafi—showing once again what a lot of us understand about warfare: that a smaller well-trained, well-equipped force can usually prevail over a larger less-trained and less-equipped force.

One by one, towns that had been liberated by the opposition are now falling to Qadhafi's forces. We are only now beginning to learn the savage cost of those losses, especially on the civilian population—the women, children, and elderly who could neither fight nor flee Qadhafi's rampage and, of course, those brave Libyan rebels, or the many suspected of aiding their cause, who face certain death or perhaps a fate worse than death. We are horrified by what we have learned already, but what we have yet to learn and what we could still witness if Qadhafi's forces are allowed to finish this unfair fight will shock and offend the conscience of the entire world.

Last week, in a hearing in the Committee on Armed Services, the Director of National Intelligence said that absent outside assistance to the opposition, "I think over the long term that the [Qadhafi] regime will prevail." And yet it is the policy of the United States, as stated by the President, that "Qaddafi must step down from power and leave." That is the right policy, but it is increasingly at odds now with the facts on the ground.

So we face a stark choice: either the President and the United States take

greater action to achieve the objectives he has laid out or we allow events to play out as they are, meaning that Qadhafi reclaims control of their country.

The resolution Senator LIEBERMAN and I are submitting calls on the President to take a number of steps immediately to reverse this impending disaster.

First, the President should recognize Libya's Transitional National Council, which is based in Benghazi but representative of communities across the country as the sole legitimate governing authority of Libya—just as the government of France has done. President Sarkozy and the French have recognized the sole legitimate government in Libya as the provisional government which is based in Benghazi.

Some continue to say we do not know who the opposition is and, thus, we cannot assist them. That is ridiculous. They have been organized for weeks. Their senior leaders consist of longstanding critics of Qadhafi as well as officials who recently broke with his regime. They even have a Web site. And they are asking—they are pleading; they are pleading—for international support.

Qadhafi has forfeited the right to power through his vicious actions. We must recognize the opposition government.

Second, the President should take immediate steps to implement a no-fly zone in Libya with international support. Not only has the Libyan opposition government called for this, the Gulf Cooperation Council has called for a no-fly zone. The head of the Organization of the Islamic Conference has called for a no-fly zone. On Saturday, the Arab League called for a no-fly zone. The French and British Governments have voiced their support and have drafted a U.N. Security Council resolution to implement a no-fly zone. It is long past time for the President of the United States to answer these calls for international leadership. The United States of America must lead.

A no-fly zone was never going to be the decisive action that tipped the balance against Qadhafi, even when Senator LIEBERMAN and I called for it nearly 3 weeks ago, but it remains the case that a no-fly zone would take one of Qadhafi's most lethal tools off the table and thereby boost the confidence of Libya's opposition. It is Libyans themselves who want to do the fighting against Qadhafi, but they want it to be a fair fight, and so should we.

Finally, the President should develop and implement a comprehensive strategy to accomplish the stated U.S. objective of Qadhafi leaving power. Beyond a no-fly zone and beyond those actions such as sanctions and humanitarian assistance that we are already taking, there are many actions we could consider, from sharing intelligence on Qadhafi's forces with the opposition, to providing them with support for command and control, to tech-

nical assistance, and even forms of security assistance if they request it—we could jam Qadhafi's communications and his television—and if we can provide it in a responsible way.

Our window of opportunity to support the Libyan people is closing quickly, and this country has a choice to make. Are we going to take action to support the people of Libya in their fight for freedom or are we going to stand by doing more than nothing but less than enough to achieve our stated goal of Qadhafi leaving power?

We all say we support the universal rights of the Arabs and Muslims in countries across the Middle East and North Africa who are inspiring us all in their quest for greater freedom, opportunity, and justice. But Libya is the real test. It is the test of whether we will provide our support not just when it is easy but when it is difficult, when it requires more of us than just speeches and expressions of solidarity. If Qadhafi is allowed to prevail in Libya and crush his opponents, it will send a signal throughout the region that force is the way to respond to peaceful demands for a better life, and it will cause all of our expressions of support for the universal rights of all people to ring far more hollow.

Before I yield to my friend from Connecticut, I would like to point out that now we have former President Clinton, we have the Arab League, we have the French, the British, other nations throughout the world, and organizations in the region and without that are saying—crying out—that we need to help these people. And when President Obama says the noose is tightening around Colonel Muammar al-Qadhafi, in fact, it is tightening around the Libyan rebels. And the way he is doing it and what he is doing to his own people are crimes against humanity.

It is time we stood up. It is time we read from the New York Times this morning an article by Anne-Marie Slaughter entitled "Fiddling While Libya Burns." It is time we read again, from Saturday, the Wall Street Journal's lead editorial entitled "The Obama Doctrine, Libya is what a world without U.S. leadership looks like."

"This is the Obama conception of the U.S. role in the world—to work through multilateral organizations and bilateral relationships to make sure that the steps we are taking are amplified."

That was by National Security Council spokesman Ben Rhodes, as quoted in the Washington Post.

"They bombed us with tanks, airplanes, missiles coming from every direction. . . . We need international support, at least a no-fly zone. Why is the world not supporting us?"

That is from Libyan rebel Mahmoud Abdel Hamid, on March 10, as quoted in the Wall Street Journal.

These people are crying out for help. They are fighting for freedom. They are fighting an unequal situation on the battlefield. The least we can do—

the very least we can do—is recognize them in their struggle for freedom and give them some assistance; otherwise, as the President's National Security Adviser stated on Friday: Qadhafi will prevail. That will send a signal throughout the world that we will have Tiananmen Squares in this world, not Tahrir Squares.

I yield to my colleague from Connecticut.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague from Arizona. It is my honor to join with him in submitting this resolution. I hope in time that we will gather the support of Members on both sides of the political aisle and that we will make a statement, an urgent statement, that the Members of the U.S. Senate are ready, across party lines, to take a stand because we understand we are at a turning point in history and we cannot stand back and hope it goes in the right direction. In fact, today, as we watch events unfolding in Libya, I think we have reason to believe it is going in exactly the wrong direction.

Let me read the first two paragraphs of this resolution Senator MCCAIN and I are submitting because I think it sets what is happening in Libya in a context and also explains why we think America has a national interest in how the conflict in Libya ends.

The first paragraph of the resolution we are submitting reads:

Whereas peaceful demonstrations, inspired by similar peaceful demonstrations in Tunisia, Egypt, and elsewhere in the Middle East, began in Libya with calls for greater political reform, opportunity, justice and the rule of law and quickly spread to cities around the country.

The second paragraph:

Whereas Muammar Qaddafi, his sons, and forces loyal to them have responded to the peaceful demonstrations by authorizing and initiating violence against civilian non-combatants in Libya, including the use of airpower, foreign mercenaries, helicopters, mortar and artillery fire, naval assets, snipers and soldiers.

I read those two paragraphs because they set exactly in context what is happening in Libya. The fact is that Libya is occurring in the context of these extraordinary, peaceful, democratic uprisings in Tunisia and Egypt that have been described—and I think correctly—as the Arab spring.

For too long, we accepted an argument that there were only two choices for the United States and most of the rest of the world in the Arab world. There was a choice between secular dictatorships that were cordial to us on one side and on the other side radical Islamist regimes that despised us and were threatening to us. We made our peace with those secular dictatorships, but it was inherently uncomfortable and inconsistent with our basic democratic values going back to the Declaration of Independence.

Beginning in Tunisia and spreading to Egypt and then to Libya and other

countries, the Arab people themselves rose up and said: No, there is a third way. And the third way is democracy. We want political freedom. We want economic opportunity. We want into the modern world. We don't want extremism of any kind.

Those revolutions, those uprisings resulted in the end of the rule of two longstanding rulers, Ben Ali in Tunisia and Mubarak in Egypt, and they happened peacefully for a lot of reasons. Part of it was that those two leaders did not order their militaries to turn on their own people, and the militaries, perhaps, in those two cases would not have done it in any case. So that is the Arab spring.

But now, in Libya, because Qadhafi has taken exactly the opposite position and turned his guns and his military power on his own people as they peacefully demonstrate for change, for universal human rights, there is a danger that what is happening in Libya is essentially a wall being put up which says: This peaceful democratic revolution in the Arab world ends here. To put it another way, the Arab spring may be going the way of the Prague spring of 1968 when the people of then-Czechoslovakia rose up and Soviet tanks and armaments suppressed their revolution. We simply cannot let that happen.

Senator McCAIN and I were in Tunisia and Egypt a couple of weeks ago, and one of the messages we got, particularly from the young people who have been at the head of this remarkable uprising in these two countries, was: Don't stand by. Please, America, don't stand by and let Qadhafi bludgeon his own people who are asking for the same rights and opportunity and freedoms we have been asking for. If you do, it will end the movement of freedom and opportunity across the Arab world. In some sense, the Tunisians and Egyptians said to us: It may set back our own cause, even though we have been successful thus far. That is why it has been so frustrating, really infuriating, to watch as Qadhafi has moved with increasing brutality and force against his own people, pushing his opponents back, threatening to totally suppress their uprising.

I have been struck as I have watched that the world community—most of it—is spending so much time discussing and debating, and as the world discusses and debates what to do in Libya, Libya descends back into Qadhafi's darkness. We simply cannot let that happen.

The Libyan people are not asking us to come in and fight for them. The Libyan people don't want our troops on the ground. That is not what this resolution would authorize. The Libyan people want us to come to their aid in the sense of enabling them to fight Qadhafi's forces and Qadhafi to carry on as freedom fighters. They want recognition as the established and legal authority, sovereignty for their coun-

try. They would like some military assistance. They would like weapons. They would like the kind of intelligence and electronic assistance we can give, and they would like us in some way—a no-fly zone or using our capacity to fire missiles from offshore—to protect them from what has turned the tide in their struggle for freedom against Qadhafi and Libya, which is the brutal use of Libyan air power against the Libyan people. If we don't do this, I fear this Arab spring will turn to winter—a winter of darkness and suppression—again, too quickly, and the world will regret it.

People have said to Senator McCAIN and me: What is the American national interest in getting involved in Libya? Let me just give a few reasons I think we do have an interest.

First, we have a clear national interest—a humanitarian interest—in not standing idly by and watching tens of thousands of people slaughtered by their own government. As I have said, if we stand by and do nothing, if this happens, it will be devastating to America's image in the Arab world and to our moral leadership throughout the world. Some people have argued: Why would we want to get involved in yet a third Arab or Muslim country, thinking of Iraq and Afghanistan before that. But this is more like 1990 and 1991 and the first gulf war when the Arab world itself was calling out to us: Please help us get Saddam out of Kuwait. The Arab world, as Senator McCAIN said, is pleading with us: Help stop Qadhafi from slaughtering his own people, the blood of our brothers and sisters in Libya.

Second, we have a clear national interest in preventing Libya from becoming a failed state that al-Qaida and other Islamist groups will exploit, and that is precisely what will happen if this becomes a bloody and protracted civil war and then descends into chaos.

Third, if Qadhafi is able to defeat this uprising, it will send a message, as Senator McCAIN has said, to every dictator in the world that the way to stop peaceful democratic protest is through brutal violence.

Fourth, I don't mean this quote literally, but remember the old phrase from earlier times in history: If you go after the king, make sure you eliminate him. Don't leave him wounded. If Qadhafi survives this, he is going to cause no end of trouble for the United States and anyone else in the world who stood with the freedom fighters. So let's not think we can stand idly by and that we will not pay ourselves the consequences of Qadhafi surviving.

Finally, there is a relationship between what is happening in Libya today and the instability it has caused throughout that region of the world and the skyrocketing price of gasoline at the pump that does concern the American people every day. In fact, with all that has been discussed, I think the best we can do to stabilize the price of gasoline in America is to

stabilize Libya and to enable the Libyan opposition to Qadhafi to fight the fair fight they want to fight.

So that is the intention of this resolution. It is, as the French would say, a "cris de coeur." It is a cry from our hearts because I fear we have let so much time go by that it may be impossible to enable the freedom fighters in Libya to wage a fair fight.

I hope their cause is not lost because it is our cause, and the least we can do is help them fight for that cause against the man who has suppressed that cause under his rule.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask my friend from Connecticut if we couldn't review a few of the facts as they are now. Despite the fact that the President made a statement that I am still bewildered by—I believe it was Saturday or Friday when the President said the noose is tightening around Colonel Muammar Qadhafi.

I think the facts on the ground indicate that with superior firepower, the ability to strike from the air, even if those strikes are not particularly effective—although, apparently, they are becoming more effective—and well-trained and well-equipped small forces, Colonel Qadhafi has been able to reverse the tide on the battlefield rather dramatically. All of the news reports are that the military situation on the ground has shifted dramatically in favor of Qadhafi's forces.

General Clapper, our Director of National Intelligence, said on Thursday that Qadhafi is likely to win in the long term. Then, on the other side of the coin, the President of the United States has said Qadhafi must go.

So I guess my first question to my colleague is—as the Wall Street Journal says, if Qadhafi survives, after Mr. Obama has told him to go, the blow to U.S. prestige and world order would be enormous. Dictators will learn that the way to keep America from acting is to keep its diplomats and citizens around while mowing down your opponents as the world debates contingency. By the time the babblers make a decision, it will be too late. This is a dangerous message to send at any time but especially with the Middle East in the throes of revolution.

American prestige is now on the line. The battlefield situation is that the tide is obviously against the prodemocracy forces. Wouldn't the message be sent to any dictator in any region of the world that rather than accept a situation such as happened in Egypt and Tunisia, send in the tanks, send in the military, slaughter people without consequence? Is that the lesson we would be sending, I ask my friend from Connecticut?

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague from Arizona. I fear that is exactly the message we would be sending if the United States and our allies stand back and let Qadhafi, through the force of his arms, suppress political dissent from his own people.

One of the inspiring qualities to the uprisings in Tunisia and Egypt was that they were peaceful. Incidentally, they were not anti-American. They were pro-Tunisia, pro-Egypt. The people of Tunisia and Egypt were pleading for a better life. So the model there and one of the most powerful examples of peaceful protests, which is part of American history, was established. It changed those two governments, Tunisia and Egypt.

Now we have another model being set; that is, when your people rise up and peacefully protest, you don't respond, you don't negotiate, you don't listen to them, you don't react. You turn your firepower on them. You kill them wantonly, and you keep doing that until that dissent ends. One, in a world that is increasingly dangerous, that is a terrible message to send.

Two, in a world in which—well, let's just go back a little bit to what were false choices in the Arab world. But in the uprisings in Tunisia and in Egypt, there has been expressed the strongest possible repudiation of al-Qaida on the one hand, and Iran on the other—that is the Government of Iran—both of which have followed an Islamist extremist ideology and used violence to achieve their ends.

So we have the Tunisia-Egypt model of peaceful protest, democracy, economic opportunity, and now we have the other model of Qadhafi, which is violence, which will beget more violence and will cost us dearly.

I say to my friend from Arizona, as we say in our resolution, President Obama has made clear that he believes Qadhafi must go. If, after that clear statement of American policy by our Commander in Chief, Qadhafi does not go, and it is seen not just in the Arab world but throughout the wider world that the United States was not able to mobilize action in the world community to make sure Qadhafi went, but in fact he stayed, it inevitably has an effect on the credibility of American leadership in the world.

None of us want that to happen, including President Obama. So it is not too late. The actions we have taken, significant as they are—sanctions on Qadhafi and some people close to him, the threat or the plan to refer others close to him to the International Court of Justice—all are important. But, unfortunately, what is more important now is what is happening on the ground in Libya. On the ground in Libya, the power of the forces of Qadhafi are winning in a fight that is not fair.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I say to my friend that I think that is a strong and eloquent statement. I admit to the fact that the terrible tragedy that has transpired in Japan is one that has riveted the attention of our Nation and the world. Our hearts go out to the Japanese people and their government in this terrible time of trial. There is no way we can diminish the tragedy they are experiencing. But it is a natural disaster that was the catalyst for that terrible situation.

Meanwhile, in Libya, we have a human catalyst named Muammar Qadhafi. I admit and I will confess to having such a dull life that I watch a lot of cable television. I see expert after expert come before the cameras and give us reasons the United States should do nothing.

I commend to my colleagues for reading an article in today's New York Times by Anne-Marie Slaughter, formerly in policy planning at the State Department, as I understand it, in this administration or in another. It does respond to what we will hear continuously. The article is entitled "Fiddling While Libya Burns."

At the beginning, she points out that the Organization of the Islamic Conference, the Gulf Cooperation Council, and now the Arab League have all called for imposing a no-fly zone. She runs through the objections raised by various individuals and "experts." One part is entitled "It's Not In Our Interest." One is entitled "It Will Be Counterproductive." Another is "It Won't Work." Another is "If It Does Work, We Don't Know What We Will Get." The last is "Let's Arm The Rebels Instead."

It addresses most of the main arguments. The only one I think should be added to this list is the likelihood that things are happening in Libya today, as we speak, that will remind us that several times in the last century—and even in this one—we said never again. We said never again after Srebrenica, after Rwanda, after the Holocaust, and on several other occasions when nations stood by while slaughter was taking place.

Is there anyone who believes that Qadhafi has not practiced in the past, is practicing now, and will practice in the future unspeakable cruelties which will be inflicted upon his people who dare to stand up to him? So I say to my friend: Here we are.

We know what happened in Tripoli and what happened with air attacks that are taking place on defenseless individuals. We watch these brave young people go out there with the Kalashnikovs and other things and fight against the tanks and air power. As former President Clinton said so eloquently: It is not a fair fight. It is not a fair fight.

I guess there will be other consultations with our allies that we will undertake. I am glad to see that the Secretary of State is meeting with the leadership of the provisional government. I hope she will, as a result of that meeting, ask for the U.S. recognition of that organization as the legitimate government of the country of Libya. I hope all these things will happen. But, meanwhile, events are unfolding on the ground every second and minute, and the longer we wait to act, more Libyans will die. This is a preventable situation.

The events in Japan, we can argue, were not preventable. It was an act of God. What is happening in Libya is an

act of a brutal tyrant and sadist who is willing to butcher his own people. We are doing everything we can, and we will do everything we can to help the people of Japan. We ought to be doing what we can to keep the people of Libya from a fate that, in some cases, to some individuals, may be worse than death.

I hope the majority leader will allow a vote on this sense-of-the-Senate resolution as soon as possible. I understand there will be those who may like to see slightly different language. We would be glad to change the language somewhat, but we will not change the message. The message is that the United States of America—the Senate of the United States is standing on the side of people who are standing up for freedom and democracy, a universal value that we treasure. We will not stint in our obligations. Those who say the most powerful Nation in the world is incapable of helping these people by installing a no-fly zone, I think that is not substantiated by the facts.

GEN Raymond Odierno said the other day that we could install a no-fly zone in just a few days. We could have naval power offshore that could enforce it in a variety of ways, from the sea as well as from the air. Also, it is very clear to me that if Libyan pilots are told if they fly they are going to die, a lot of them would not fly.

I don't want to focus so much attention on the no-fly zone as I do on what is happening to the people of Libya as we speak and the repercussions that could take place throughout the globe. I hope we can vote on this sooner rather than later. I ask my friend from Connecticut—I believe we are nearly out of time.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I just want to conclude by saying this: In our history in this country we have, again, been quite fortunate, and it may be that—as a friend of mine said to me, it is hard for people to imagine themselves in a position where they would need to be rescued from danger, from death. Senator MCCAIN cited some of the episodes, dark times in recent history, where people needed that help from outside—the Holocaust, Srebrenica, the Balkans, Rwanda. We acted. This is of that same type.

But when we think about Japan, there is this parallel to the United States. There have been natural disasters in this country—earthquakes, hurricanes. Katrina is an example. When the people of the gulf coast region pleaded with us, the central government, the National Government, the Federal Government, for help, we gave it to them. I will never forget what the Coast Guard did in rescuing lives on the gulf coast after Katrina. In some ways I think we have to perhaps see it as a manmade disaster, as a natural disaster. It is a basic rescue. In this case they are not asking us to fight their fight. They are asking us to leave them the weapons, the cover, so that they can fight their fight. That is the

intention of this resolution—bottom line—to recognize the opposition to Qadhafi in Benghazi as the government and legitimate suffering government of Libya, and then work with our allies in the world community, including not only our NATO allies but in the Arab League and the Gulf Council to protect the Libyan people from Qadhafi's air force.

I join with Senator MCCAIN in saying that I hope Senators REID and MCCONNELL can agree on a way to bring forth this resolution quickly. Every moment that passes without us helping the Libyan opposition to make it a fair fight is a moment in which darkness descends over Libya.

Again, Senator MCCAIN said we are willing to discuss changes to the resolution because we would like this to be a resolution that has the broadest possible bipartisan support in the Senate.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Wall Street Journal editorial entitled "The Obama Doctrine," the New York Times article, "Fiddling While Libya Burns," and, from the Daily Beast, an interview with the Libyan resistance leader, entitled "Rebel Leader: Give Us A Chance," be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Mar. 13, 2011]

FIDDLING WHILE LIBYA BURNS

(By Anne-Marie Slaughter)

President Obama says the noose is tightening around Col. Muammar el-Qaddafi. In fact, it is tightening around the Libyan rebels, as Colonel Qaddafi makes the most of the world's dithering and steadily retakes rebel-held towns. The United States and Europe are temporizing on a no-flight zone while the Organization of the Islamic Conference, the Gulf Cooperation Council and now the Arab League have all called on the United Nations Security Council to authorize one. Opponents of a no-flight zone have put forth five main arguments, none of which, on close examination, hold up.

IT'S NOT IN OUR INTEREST

Gen. Wesley K. Clark argues that "Libya doesn't sell much oil to the United States" and that while Americans "want to support democratic movements in the region," we are already doing that in Iraq and Afghanistan. Framing this issue in terms of oil is exactly what Arab populations and indeed much of the world expect, which is why they are so cynical about our professions of support for democracy and human rights. Now we have a chance to support a real new beginning in the Muslim world—a new beginning of accountable governments that can provide services and opportunities for their citizens in ways that could dramatically decrease support for terrorist groups and violent extremism. It's hard to imagine something more in our strategic interest.

IT WILL BE COUNTERPRODUCTIVE

Many thoughtful commentators, including Al Jazeera's director general, Wadah Khanfar, argue that what is most important about the Arab spring is that it is coming from Arabs themselves. From this perspective, Western military intervention will play right into Colonel Qaddafi's hands, allowing him to broadcast pictures of Western bombs falling on Arab civilians. But these argu-

ments, while important, must be weighed against the appeals of Libyan opposition fighters for international help, and now, astonishingly, against support for a no-flight zone by some of the same governments that have kept their populations quiescent by holding up the specter of foreign intervention. Assuming that a no-flight zone can be imposed by an international coalition that includes Arab states, we have an opportunity to establish a new narrative of Western support for Arab democrats.

IT WON'T WORK

The United States ambassador to NATO, Ivo H. Daalder, argues that stopping Colonel Qaddafi's air force will not be decisive; he will continue to inflict damage with tanks and helicopters, bombing oil refineries and depots on his way to retaking key towns. But the potential effect of a no-flight zone must also be assessed in terms of Colonel Qaddafi's own calculations about his future. Richard Downie of the Center for Strategic and International Studies argues that although Colonel Qaddafi cultivates a mad-dictator image, he has been a canny survivor and political manipulator for 40 years. He is aware of debates with regard to a no-flight zone and is timing his military campaign accordingly; he is also capable of using his air force just enough to gain strategic advantage, but not enough to trigger a no-flight zone. If the international community lines up against him and is willing to crater his runways and take out his anti-aircraft weapons, he might well renew his offer of a negotiated departure.

IF IT DOES WORK, WE DON'T KNOW WHAT WE WILL GET

Revolutions are almost always followed by internal divisions among the revolutionaries. We should not expect a rosy, Jeffersonian Libya. But the choice is between uncertainty and the certainty that if Colonel Qaddafi wins, regimes across the region will conclude that force is the way to answer protests. And when Colonel Qaddafi massacres the opposition, young protesters across the Middle East will conclude that when we were asked to support their cause with more than words, we blinked. Americans in turn will read the words of Mr. Obama's June 2009 speech in Cairo, with its lofty promises to stand for universal human rights, and cringe.

LET'S ARM THE REBELS INSTEAD

Some commentators who agree with the analysis above say we could better accomplish our goals by providing intelligence and arms to the opposition. That would, of course, be much easier for us. It undoubtedly appeals to Mr. Obama as a neat compromise between the desire to help the protesters and the desire not to overrule his defense secretary's reluctance to participate in a no-flight zone. However, we would be providing arms not to a disciplined military, but to ragged groups of brave volunteers who barely know how to use the weapons they have. They need action that will change the situation on the ground for Colonel Qaddafi, as well as his calculations. Moreover, by the time arms and intelligence could take effect, it is quite likely that Colonel Qaddafi will have retaken or at least besieged Benghazi, the opposition stronghold.

The United States should immediately ask the Security Council to authorize a no-flight zone and make clear to Russia and China that if they block the resolution, the blood of the Libyan opposition will be on their hands. We should push them at least to abstain, and bring the issue to a vote as soon as possible. If we get a resolution, we should work with the Arab League to assemble an international coalition to impose the no-flight zone. If the Security Council fails to

act, then we should recognize the opposition Libyan National Council as the legitimate government, as France has done, and work with the Arab League to give the council any assistance it requests.

Any use of force must be carefully and fully debated, but that debate has now been had. It's been raging for a week, during which almost every Arab country has come on board calling for a no-flight zone and Colonel Qaddafi continues to gain ground. It is time to act.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 12, 2011]

THE OBAMA DOCTRINE

Libya is what a world without U.S. leadership looks like.

"This is the Obama conception of the U.S. role in the world—to work through multilateral organizations and bilateral relationships to make sure that the steps we are taking are amplified."

—White House National Security Council spokesman Ben Rhodes, March 10, 2011, as quoted in the Washington Post

"They bombed us with tanks, airplanes, missiles coming from every direction. . . . We need international support, at least a no-fly zone. Why is the world not supporting us?"

—Libyan rebel Mahmoud Abdel Hamid, March 10, 2011, as quoted in The Wall Street Journal

* * *

Whatever else one might say about President Obama's Libya policy, it has succeeded brilliantly in achieving its oft-stated goal of not leading the world. No one can any longer doubt the U.S. determination not to act before the Italians do, or until the Saudis approve, or without a U.N. resolution. This White House is forthright for followership.

That message also couldn't be clearer to Moammar Gadhafi and his sons, who are busy bombing and killing their way to victory against the Libyan opposition. As the U.S. defers to the world, the world can't decide what to do, and the vacuum is filled by a dictator and his hard men who have concluded that no one will stop them. "Hear it now. I have only two words for our brothers and sisters in the east: We're coming," said Gadhafi's son, Saif al-Islam, on Thursday.

Three weeks into the Libyan uprising, here are some of the live action highlights from what Mr. Obama likes to call "the international community":

The United Nations Security Council has imposed an arms embargo, but with enough ambiguity that no one knows whether it applies only to Gadhafi or also to the opposition. Even the U.S. State Department and White House don't agree.

The U.N. has referred events to the International Criminal Court for a war crimes investigation. Mr. Obama said yesterday this sent a message to Gadhafi that "the world is watching," as if Gadhafi didn't know. But it also sends a message that leaving Libya without bloodshed is not an option, because he and his sons will still be pursued for war crimes. Had Reagan pursued this strategy in the Philippines, Marcos might never have gone into exile.

France has recognized the opposition National Council in Benghazi, though the U.S. is only now sending envoys to meet with the opposition for the first time. Dozens of Western reporters can get rebel leaders on the phone, an opposition delegation has visited French President Nicolas Sarkozy in Paris, but the U.S. is still trying to figure out who these people are. The American envoys better hurry because the rebels may soon be dead.

The French want a no-fly zone, but the Italians and Germans object. NATO is having

"a series of conversations about a wide range of options," as President Obama put it yesterday, but NATO Secretary-General Anders Fogh Rasmussen emerged from a meeting of defense ministers in Brussels on Thursday saying that "We considered . . . initial options regarding a possible no-fly zone in case NATO were to receive a clear U.N. mandate" (our emphasis). The latter isn't likely because both China and Russia object, but no doubt NATO will keep conversing about the "range of options" next week.

Even as opposition leaders were asking for help, U.S. Director of National Intelligence James Clapper told the world on Thursday that Gadhafi is likely to win in the long-term. The Administration scrambled to say this was merely a factual judgment about the balance of military power, but the message couldn't be clearer to any of Gadhafi's generals who might consider defecting: Do so at your peril because you will join the losing side.

We could go on, but you get the idea. When the U.S. fails to lead, the world reverts to its default mode as a diplomatic Tower of Babel. Everyone discusses "options" and "contingencies" but no one has the will to act, while the predators march.

This was true in Bosnia and Kosovo in the 1990s until the U.S. shamed Europe and NATO into using force with or without a U.N. resolution. And it has been true in every case in which the world finally resisted tyrants or terrorists, from the Gulf War to Afghanistan to Iraq. When the U.S. chooses to act like everyone else, the result is Rwanda, Darfur and now Libya.

* * *

One difference in Libya is that the damage from a Gadhafi victory would not merely be humanitarian, though that would be awful enough. The only way Gadhafi can subdue Benghazi and the east now is with a door-to-door purge and systematic murder. The flow of refugees heading for Southern Europe would also not be small.

If Gadhafi survives after Mr. Obama has told him to go, the blow to U.S. prestige and world order would be enormous. Dictators will learn that the way to keep America from acting is to keep its diplomats and citizens around, while mowing down your opponents as the world debates contingencies. By the time the Babelers make a decision, it will be too late. This is a dangerous message to send at any time, but especially with a Middle East in the throes of revolution.

There is still time for Mr. Obama to salvage his Libya policy, though the costs of doing so are rising every day. Libya today is what a world without U.S. leadership looks like.

[From the DailyBeast.com, Mar. 14, 2011]

REBEL LEADER: GIVE US A CHANCE

With the Libyan resistance in retreat, opposition leader Mustafa Abdul Jalil tells The Daily Beast's Fadel Lamen that his side needs a no-fly zone and a naval blockade to create a fair fight.

Muammar Gaddafi gave an official face to his diffused opposition on Thursday by placing a \$400,000 bounty on the head of Mustafa Abdul Jalil, Gaddafi's former justice minister who has now emerged as leader of Libyan National Transitional Council. And ever since, the dictator's forces have seemingly been trying to collect, overtaking city after city in the past few days, putting the rebels in full retreat.

The resistance's only hope seems to be some kind of intervention—most critically a no-fly zone, which the Arab League endorsed Saturday. That issue is expected to be taken up at the United Nations imminently, and Hillary Clinton is also flying east this week to meet with Jalil and other rebel leaders.

With that as a backdrop, The Daily Beast secured an exclusive interview with Jalil this weekend. He thanked the Arab League for their vote, terming it "a first and important step and a basis for an international decision." Regarding Gaddafi's issuance of the \$400,000 bounty against him (in doing so, the dictator labeled him an agent of the Italians, the British, and Libya's deposed royal family), Jalil refused to return the favor, saying only that "he has no place in Libya anymore, if he leaves now we will not pursue him . . . the council and the Libyan people have no choice but to fight Gaddafi till the end."

Jalil also touched base on the battlefield map, the makeup of the opposition, and the role of al Qaeda:

We have heard conflicting messages about international intervention, and whether the Libyan rebels want outside help or not. What is it that you want from the rest of the world?

We want a no-fly zone, and a naval blockade. Gaddafi has been using his air force and navy to destroy the country and all the cities. All we want is to have the international community level the playing field. We don't want boots on the ground. We can fight to liberate our own country with our own blood and that will be our honor.

We need the international community to recognize our council as the sole representative of the Libyan people. No Libyan so far disputed the legitimacy of the council except Gaddafi and whatever is left of this regime.

We need humanitarian help, like food and medicine. The lack of international decisiveness is sending Gaddafi and his gang the wrong message, it emboldened him and makes him feel free to commit more war crimes against the Libyan people.

We expect tough and hard days as the world saw what Gaddafi did in Zawiya and how he bombed the oil installations in Ras Lanuf. Gaddafi will use anything to stay in power and the Libyan people made the decision that he must go and genocide will be committed if the world community doesn't get its act together and help us.

Gaddafi's forces are clearly on the offensive, with the rebels in retreat. How do you evaluate the military situation right now?

What we see is not a war between two armies, but revolutionaries trying to free their country. They started peacefully but were attacked with violence and bullets, anti-aircraft machine-guns, and rockets and of course mercenaries. They are defending themselves and trying to free the rest of the country that is held hostage under Gaddafi.

The balance of power in the battlefield is not equal, but the sheer will of the Libyan people to rid the country of Gaddafi's regime, which like a cancer, requires sacrifice and blood like any other major surgery. We will prevail.

What about al Qaeda in Libya? Gaddafi blames the uprising on al Qaeda and there were several reports mentioning some kind of al Qaeda presence in Libya.

There is no al Qaeda in Libya. Gaddafi is using this as a scare tactic to create fear and distrust between us the international community, but the world learned a long time ago not to trust or believe Gaddafi. There is no place for al Qaeda in Libya, now or in the future. The Libyan people are moderate Muslims and do not subscribe to these extremist ideologies. Libya is and will be a moderate Muslim country where democracy and rule of law will be supreme.

The Libyan people suffered so much for over 41 years from Gaddafi's extremist ideology and will not replace it with anything but democracy and the rule of law. Libya is part of the Mediterranean basin and has a rich history and will always be a source of

moderation and stability. We will respect all international laws and cooperate with the world community and bring the respect and trust that Libya enjoyed with the rest of the world before Gaddafi's 41 years of darkness.

There have been many reports in the Western press about the lack of a central opposition. How did you come up with the council and does it represent the Libyan people?

The council derives its legitimacy from the local councils that were organized by the local revolutionaries in every village and city, political councils organized to administer the local people's affairs like providing services, food, law and order.

Each locality nominated representatives to be members in the National Transitional Council, according to their population ratio of the total Libyan population. The main role of the council is to represent the interest of the Libyan people locally and internationally. Members of the council were chosen with no regard to the political views or leaning.

How long will this council last?

The role will end with the end of Gaddafi's regime. A transitional government will be formed around the members of the crisis team, of whom we named only two of its members: Ambassador Ali Issawi and Omar al-Hariri, head of the military affairs. The council withheld names of members in other cities like Zawiya, Nalot, Musrata, Zentan, Zawara, Tripoli, Jado.

Given the unwieldy nature of such an organization, what's your decision-making mechanism?

We use wide consultations within and outside the council, we debate and discuss and try to reach consciences as we keep our goals. We don't suffer from any real disagreements or conflict within the council. We have developed several committees and teams to deal with legal, political, social, humanitarian, defense, oil, economy that we hope to become the seeds for the transitional government.

Should you prevail, what's your vision of the new Libya?

We are striving for a new democratic, civil Libya, led by democratic and civil government that focuses on economic development, building civil society and civil institutions and a multi-party system. A Libya that respects all international agreements, is good to its neighbors, stands against terrorism, with respect for all religions and ethnicities.

How would you the transition to a democratic Libya?

We will be seeking a smooth peaceful transition, with a drafting of a new constitution that will lead the country to a free and fair legislative and parliamentary elections as well as presidential election. No member of the transitional council will have the right to run for any of these elections. There will be peaceful conference of governance according to elections, under the observation of the international organizations.

TRAGEDY IN JAPAN

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I want to take a minute to say what came to my mind over the weekend about Japan. Prime Minister Kan of Japan described this earthquake and tsunami as the worst thing to happen to Japan since World War II.

I suppose what struck me and struck probably a lot of other Americans was, of course, Japan and the United States were at war with each other in World War II. Today, the U.S.-Japanese relationship is extremely close. I believe