

I think it is fair to say—and I make this judgment on the basis of having been on the intelligence committee for 13 years now—that the very important and worthwhile efforts to protect our national security after the terrorists murdered more than 3,000 of our people on 9/11 were also accompanied by a lot of overreaching by the intelligence leadership.

In recent years I think it is fair to say reformers have made some real progress in our efforts to address that overreach, and now with the PATRIOT Act and other measures coming before us—and the country truly understanding what is at stake—I think it is going to be possible to make additional progress.

The reason I have come to the floor to discuss whistleblowers and the ability of intelligence employees to speak out is a lot of the progress we have seen recently would not have happened without whistleblowers and without some of the intelligence agency employees who are willing to risk their very careers to draw attention to real and serious problems. I also make note of the fact that there were journalists, journalists who worked hard to report the facts responsibly to ensure an informed public debate that is so essential to our democracy.

Here is why the whistleblower issue is so important: There are existing laws and regulations that say employees of American intelligence agencies who are concerned about possible misconduct, such as waste and fraud and illegal activity, are allowed to report that, and these laws and regulations lay out channels for doing it.

The reality is these principles—and the idea is that if there is misconduct reported to one of these entities, the oversight entity would have some opportunity to do something about it. Unfortunately, reporting misconduct by your colleagues or by your agency does not always work out so well. That is why rocking the boat and reporting misconduct can sometimes be hazardous for an individual's career.

If a government employee thinks about blowing the whistle on possible misconduct, but can see that their supervisor or someone in their chain of command is condoning or participating in that misconduct, the employee is rightly going to be concerned about possible retaliation and will not get that promotion and might not even be able to retain their security clearance.

So title VI of this year's Intelligence Authorization Act strengthens the ability of those whistleblowers to come forward. It prohibits retaliation against intelligence whistleblowers who report misconduct using approved channels, and it includes disclosures to the Congress or to an inspector general. It requires the executive branch to establish an appeals process for whistleblowers who have their security clearance unjustifiably revoked. Establishing these protections in statute—in statute—in my view is an important

advance forward. So we are making some progress there with respect to whistleblowers, but we are not doing so well with respect to making sure we are protecting the ability of our employees in the intelligence field to speak out.

Recently the head of National Intelligence issued a new policy directive regarding agency employees' contact with the media. I will tell you, I am troubled by how sweeping in nature this is. At the outset, this is supposed to prevent disclosures of genuinely sensitive information. That is obviously an important goal, but it is also important to make sure that as we carry out that provision, we do not keep employees, for example, from being able to talk about nonclassified matters.

The new policy makes it clear that intelligence agency employees can be punished for having "contact with the media about intelligence-related information." Make no mistake about it, that is so broad it could cover unclassified information. It does not lay out any limits on this extraordinarily broad term that I have described.

For example, is an employee's opinion about the scope of the NSA's domestic surveillance activities intelligence-related information? Are publicly available assessments about developments in Syria or the Ukraine intelligence related? This new directive does not say that, but it certainly points in that direction.

It becomes even more problematic if we read further down into this new policy and review the definition of the word "media." It includes any person or entity "engaged in the collection, production or dissemination to the public of information in any form related to topics of national security, which includes print, broadcast, film and Internet." This is extraordinarily broad. It goes well beyond professional news gatherers to include anyone who uses the Internet—the Internet—to disseminate any information at all relating to national security topics. So if someone is an employee of an intelligence agency and if they have a family member who likes to post or retweet articles about national security, suddenly having a conversation with that family member about important issues, such as NSA surveillance or the war in Afghanistan, could lead to them getting punished for having unauthorized contact with the media, which this directive says "will be handled in the same manner as a security violation" regardless of whether any classified information is disclosed.

So I am willing to give everyone the benefit of the doubt; that some of the authors of this policy did not intend to have this happen. I know that trying to make definitions of who is and is not a member of the media is going to be a challenge with these new media technologies, but that does not remove the fact that this policy is too broad, is too sweeping. It incorporates too much of what we want in Montana, in Oregon,

which is to make sure our people can talk about the policy issues that afford them the information so they can cast a ballot.

My hope is we can get this corrected because I think it is going to have a chilling effect on intelligence professionals who simply want to talk about unclassified matters on important national security issues—such as how to reform domestic surveillance or whether our country should go to war.

In closing—and I thank my colleague from Iowa—we have made progress. Back in 2012 there was an overly broad antileaks bill reported by the intelligence committee. It came out of the committee on a 14-to-1 basis. I was the opposing vote. At that time I knew it was a flawed policy, but I did not even know how flawed it was because we were not able at the time to talk to outside parties. When it was ready for the floor, the country and journalists and citizens saw how sweeping it was, saw how flawed it was and the damage it would have done, again, to discussing nonclassified matters, and we got it corrected, but suffice it to say, we are going to have a host of challenges in the years ahead. While we have won victories—such as against that overly broad antileaks policy, when we were able to derail what would have been the biggest invasion of privacy in our country's history, the Total Information Awareness Program, which was derailed because a young person in our office found a memo that demonstrated how sweeping it was—while we have made progress, we have a lot to do.

We are in better shape this morning because of the passage of that intelligence authorization bill and the additional measure of protections for whistleblowers, and Senator COLLINS and the chair of the committee, Senator FEINSTEIN, deserve enormous credit. But make no mistake about it; we have a lot of work to do, and certainly that new media policy that has come from the Director of National Intelligence—that is so broad, so broad it could make it difficult to talk about unclassified matters on the Internet—is just one example of the kind of issue we are going to have to zero in on in the days ahead.

I also note that our next speaker, Chairman HARKIN, has been a great advocate on these kinds of issues as well.

I thank him for his courtesy so I could go ahead.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

#### WORLD DAY AGAINST CHILD LABOR

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, today, June 12, 2014, is the day set aside by the International Labor Organization to bring attention to the tragic predicament of millions of children across the globe who continue to be trapped in forced and abusive labor, often in extremely hazardous conditions.

So today is the World Day Against Child Labor. It is a day set aside every year globally for people to take a look at what is happening to kids around the globe who are forced into very abusive and exploitative labor conditions.

I think we should obviously think about these children more than just 1 day a year. We should think about them every day.

In my travels I have seen the scourge of forced and abusive child labor firsthand. Previously on the floor—going back for almost 20 years—I have spoken about how shocked I was to see the deplorable conditions under which some of these kids are forced to work. I have witnessed this personally in places from South Asia to Latin America, to Africa.

These pictures I have in the Chamber are, as a matter of fact, pictures I took myself. This picture was taken in a rug-making place in Kathmandu, Nepal. We were told there were no children being forced into this kind of labor, but under the cover of darkness, on a Sunday night—it was probably after about 8 o'clock in the evening—we were able to make entry into one of these back-alley places, and this is what we came across: young people, girls and boys, some as young as 8 years of age, working at these looms. I remind you, this is at 8 p.m. on a Sunday night. They lived in barracks. They were housed, kind of stacked in barracks, so they could not leave, they could not go anywhere, they could not see their families.

Here is another picture of some older girls. These are young teenage girls working at the same place. I did not take that picture because this is me in the picture. This picture was taken by Rosemary Gutierrez, my staff person.

So I witnessed this firsthand. Even though we were told no such thing existed, we found it did exist.

This witnessing I have done in all these places has also been a call to action, a call to become a voice for these kids. Since 1992, when I first introduced the first bill to ban all products made by abusive and exploitative child labor, I have been leading this effort in the Senate.

Since the introduction of the bill in 1992, we have made progress in raising awareness about abusive and exploitative child labor, and we have significantly reduced the number of kids working in these hazardous conditions.

This effort received a big boost through the International Labor Organization's Convention 182, a treaty calling for the elimination of the worst forms of child labor.

In June 1999, President Clinton traveled to Geneva to support and sign this treaty. I was proud to accompany him on this historic trip when, for the first time in history, the world spoke with one voice in opposition to abusive and exploitative child labor. Countries from across the political, economic, and religious spectrum came together to proclaim unequivocally that abusive

and exploitative child labor is a practice that will not be tolerated and must be abolished.

After returning from that trip with President Clinton, I worked with Senator Jesse Helms in the Senate—he was then chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—to bring this treaty before the full Senate. Just 5 months later, the Senate unanimously gave its advice and consent, in a 96-to-0 vote, to ratify this treaty.

I have to digress for a minute. We have another treaty that hopefully we will be bringing up soon; that is, the U.N. treaty on the rights of people with disabilities—the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. There has been a lot of talk about sovereignty, that we can't give up our sovereignty. That is just a red herring. I would say that many Senators who are here today voted on that 96-to-0 vote and nobody ever raised an issue about sovereignty. Have we lost our sovereignty since we joined that treaty? Not one speck. So why is it we are so concerned about some sovereignty issue when it deals with people with disabilities but we weren't in 1999 when we voted unanimously, Republicans and Democrats, when it dealt with exploitative child labor? So I just want to make that point for people to consider when we, hopefully, bring up the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities sometime this summer.

With that historic treaty on exploitative child labor, the global community rejected the argument that abusive and exploitative child labor is a practice that can be excused by a country's poor economic circumstances.

In pushing the United States to lead by example, I worked with the Clinton administration to issue Executive order 13126, the "Prohibition of Acquisition of Products Produced by Forced and Indentured Child Labor." This Executive order, in effect since 1999, prohibits the U.S. Government from procuring items made by forced or indentured child labor.

I have always believed that trade agreements—on the right terms—promise many broadly shared benefits and opportunities for all. That is why I have worked hard to improve the labor provisions in various trade measures, concentrating particularly on combating abusive and exploitative child labor.

Thereafter, in 2000, during consideration of the Trade and Development Act, I again worked with Senator Helms to amend the Generalized System of Preferences—GSP—so that "efforts to eliminate the worst forms of child labor" would be included as a criterion and condition for receiving trade benefits. That is in the law.

Additionally, that amendment also mandated that the Department of Labor's International Labor Affairs Bureau—called ILAB—the U.S. Government's foremost authority on child labor, must produce an annual report in which our government formally

monitors and documents the effort or lack of effort of 144 countries and territories receiving U.S. trade benefits to meet their international commitments to eliminate the worst forms of child labor. This amendment enshrined into law something I had been working on for years through the previous Department of Labor reports.

I intended for this report to bring countries to account, to shine a spotlight on their need to reform their national laws, and to put in place safety nets for those trapped in the worst forms of child labor. The aim is not punitive but, rather, to jump-start individual and collective action. I wanted this report to be equal in stature—and in impact—to the State Department's human rights report, and we are well on our way to achieving that status.

On the technical assistance side, ILAB has funded 269 technical cooperation projects to combat exploitative child labor in over 90 countries around the world. Think about that. We have funded 269 projects to combat child labor in over 90 countries around the world. As a result of these efforts, about 1.7 million children have been rescued from child labor through the provision of education and training services and livelihood support for their families.

Let's be clear. Whether we are talking about trafficking of children for sexual exploitation or for purposes of forced labor in dangerous, abusive circumstances, the outcome is the same. These children are robbed of their childhood, robbed of their education, robbed of their future. And in the countries where this takes place, the cycle of poverty is perpetuated.

A nation can neither achieve nor sustain prosperity on the backs of its children. In the global economy, the exploitation of children must not be tolerated under any circumstances or for any reason.

When children are exploited for the economic gains of others, everybody loses—the children lose, their families lose, their country loses, the world loses. When even one child is exploited, every one of us is diminished. That is why in 2001, after reading investigative reports by Knight-Ridder exposing the magnitude of forced child labor on cocoa farms in West Africa, I resolved to do what we could to end this tragic exploitation of children.

Together with Congressman ELIOT ENGEL of New York, we engaged the major chocolate companies in lengthy, intense negotiations. The result is what has become known as the Harkin-Engel Protocol—a public-private partnership to tackle the problem of child labor on nearly 1.5 million small cocoa farms in four African countries, beginning with Ghana and the Ivory Coast.

One might ask why we are so interested in that. Think about this: 60 percent of all of the chocolate consumed in America—think about our Hershey bars, the chocolates we eat, the cocoa we make, chocolate that goes into

cakes, whatever it is—60 percent of all of that we consume in America comes from two countries: the Ivory Coast and Ghana. How many people, when they bite into that chocolate or eat that chocolate bar or that piece of chocolate cake or drink some cocoa in the morning, know they got that through abusive child labor—kids 10 years of age with knife cuts, machetes taking off their fingers, not being allowed to go to school, forced to work in terrible conditions in these cocoa fields just so we can have chocolate to eat. Is that something we are proud of?

So we developed this protocol to begin the process of getting them out of this kind of work.

Again, we have made some progress. The joint efforts of the stakeholders failed to rise to a level to match the magnitude of the challenge. This is what an independent study by Tulane University in 2010 concluded:

Despite the concerted efforts of the various stakeholders—

One of them being us—

it is evident that much more work is required and the majority of children exposed to the worst forms of child labor remains unreached by the remediation activities currently in place.

That was reported by Tulane University. The study noted that over 1 million children were trapped in exploitative labor in the cocoa sector of just those two countries.

I was determined to take steps to accelerate our progress. To that end, in September of 2010 we worked—again with ILAB—to develop a framework of action that sets the goal of reducing the worst forms of child labor in the cocoa industry in those two countries, Ivory Coast and Ghana, to reduce it by 70 percent by 2020. The framework is a cooperative effort by the governments of the United States, Ivory Coast, Ghana, the international labor organizations, the cocoa industry, and civil society groups, including labor unions. To initially fund this effort, the U.S. Government agreed to provide \$10 million in new funding. In turn, the international chocolate and cocoa industry has committed an additional \$20 million toward this endeavor.

This is truly a historic step with the key stakeholders—the national governments, the industry, the Department of Labor—working as partners to intensify efforts to combat the scourge of child labor in the cocoa fields. Together, key stakeholders have undertaken a sustainable remediation process that includes better schooling and training opportunities for these young people, measures to improve occupational safety and health related to cocoa production, and livelihood services to vulnerable families.

Additionally, the framework creates true accountability. It establishes benchmarks with audits and puts in place a credible, transparent monitoring system in 100 percent of cocoa-growing regions in the two countries. The stakeholders also produce an an-

nual report documenting programs in the field.

I am proud of ILAB's determined work in reducing the worst forms of child labor. We should all be proud of these efforts. We and our partners around the world have made significant progress in the monumental task of eliminating this scourge of child labor. Since the year 2000, we have reduced the number of child laborers from 246 million to 168 million—a reduction of almost one-third, or 78 million.

I especially wish to thank former Secretary of Labor Hilda Solis for her great leadership during this period of time that we were hammering out these agreements and these frameworks. I also thank the present Secretary of Labor Tom Perez for his continued support and leadership of ILAB. I might also mention Carol Pier, who heads the International Labor Affairs Bureau, for her dynamic leadership in working to reduce these worst forms of child labor not just in Ghana and the Ivory Coast but around the world.

I might also add that we began, annually—actually, sometimes semiannually—with the governments of Ghana and the Ivory Coast, as well as with the cocoa industry—and I must say I am very encouraged by both of these countries.

I might especially point out Ghana. Ghana has done remarkably well. They are moving in the right direction in reducing this child labor and providing support for education. The Ivory Coast has now come—Cote d'Ivoire, as they call it, is now coming along really well. They have had some problems in the past. They have had some civil wars, disruptions in their economy. Now the new President and especially the First Lady of the Ivory Coast have really taken on this goal of reducing child labor in the Ivory Coast. I compliment both countries for their work with us and with the cocoa industry.

I compliment the cocoa industry as well. They are working as a true partner to try to meet that goal of reducing child labor by 70 percent by the year 2020.

I thank Tulane University for their investigations—for their monitoring. I should say, more than investigations—their monitoring of this process and getting us the true picture of what is happening.

I think all of this demonstrates that when we work together in a bipartisan way, we can confront some of the worst human rights abuses that exist. On the issue of forced and abusive child labor, we are resolved to act without regard to party affiliation and with high regard for the interests of children trapped in abusive labor.

As we are all aware, I am retiring from the Senate next year, but I assure my colleagues that I am not retiring from this fight. I will find some way to continue to be involved, to help make sure we reach those goals of reducing child labor by 70 percent by 2020 in both of those countries, and to use that

also as a springboard for further kinds of cooperative efforts with governments around the world to get kids out of this terrible scourge of child labor.

Again, we have to ensure that ILAB has the resources to continue effective U.S. efforts. I look forward to working with my colleagues later this year to finally authorize ILAB so that it has the tools it needs to get children out of these abusive circumstances and into schools where they can gain the knowledge and skills they need not only to build a decent life for themselves but to break the cycle of poverty in the countries in which they live. It has been a vicious cycle of poverty and using and exploiting these kids. They don't learn, they don't go to school, they become impoverished, and the cycle just continues and continues. We have to break that.

In countries where they break that cycle, we have seen they then enter a virtuous cycle where the kids go to school. They learn. They become educated. They are then able to perform jobs with higher skills. They then bring in people to do some of these jobs that are paid a decent wage. They are adults. And we find that the whole country progresses because it is a virtuous cycle, not a vicious cycle.

Again, on this day, June 12, which is, as I said, called World Day Against Child Labor, it is good for us to pause and think about our own policies in this country and what we are doing to help the rest of the world, not in a punitive way of hitting someone over the head but by working together to solve what people thought was an intractable problem of kids not going to school, being forced into terrible labor conditions. It is time for us to think about how we work with other countries to help solve this problem.

If we read the history of the United States, we know we had terrible child labor problems in this country back in the 19th century. In the 1800s we can see all kinds of pictures of kids working in our mills, working on road crews. Again, when we finally stopped it—and it is amazing that the arguments we heard then against stopping child labor are some of the same arguments we hear now about stopping it in other countries. We entered a virtuous cycle of educating our youth, getting them into schools. That led to higher incomes, led to a better gross national product, enabled us to become the most powerful, well-educated country in the history of the world. There are so many countries that would like to do that. They need our help. They need our support. Through our Department of Labor and the International Labor Affairs Bureau we can give them that kind of help and that kind of support so other countries can finally put an end to this scourge of child labor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER.). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator GRAHAM be allowed to engage in a colloquy with me and that we may take such time as we may consume.

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

### IRAQ

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor this morning with great sorrow and great concern and an even deeper alarm about the events that are transpiring rapidly in Iraq.

ISIS, the most extreme Islamist organization, radical terrorist organization, now controls at least one-third of Iraqi territory. It is rapidly gaining more. The areas of Fallujah, Mosul, Tikrit, they are on the outskirts of Samarra. With these victories, ISIS controls a swath of territory that stretches from the Syrian-Turkish frontier in the north, down to the Euphrates River, all of the way down to the Iraqi city of Fallujah, just 40 miles west of Baghdad. Of course, hourly they are experiencing greater gains while the Iraqi military and police seem to be dissolving before our very eyes.

ISIS social media published pictures of their fighters demolishing the sand berm which hitherto marked the border between Syria and Iraq, an interesting symbolic gesture. ISIS released footage of large numbers of weapons and armored military vehicles being received by members in eastern Syria, confirming fears that the looted weapons would fuel the insurgency on both sides, both Syria and Iraq.

Sources in the Syrian city of Hasaka confirmed that large numbers of trucks, convoys of trucks, carrying weapons, arrived late on Tuesday and were met by a senior ISIS figure Omar al-Chechani. General Keane, the architect of the surge said:

This organization [speaking of ISIS] has grown into a military organization that is no longer conducting terrorist activities exclusively but is conducting conventional military operations. They are attacking Iraqi military positions with company—and battalion—size formations. And in the face of that the Iraqi security forces have not been able to stand up to it.

The most frightening part is that ISIS's strength will only grow after today. It will use the cash reserves from Mosul's banks, the military equipment seized from military and police bases, and the release of 3,000 fighters from local jails to bolster its military and financial capacity.

ISIS has now become the richest terrorist group ever, even after looting \$429 million from Mosul's central bank. The governor confirmed Kurdish television reports that ISIS militants had stolen

millions from numerous banks across Mosul.

Most disturbing is as the Iraqi security forces are collapsing, Kurdish and Shia militias are, to some degree, filling the vacuum.

The story goes on and on, including the fact that the International Organization for Migration says that as many as 500,000 citizens have fled Mosul. There are reports of tens of thousands of citizens forced from their homes in other areas as fighting escalates across northern and central Iraq.

Then the question arises: Could all of this have been avoided? The answer is absolutely yes—absolutely yes.

I think it is probably the height of ego to quote one's self, but I think it is important to have again on the record what I said during this whole process when the only goal of the President of the United States was to leave Iraq and Afghanistan—and he is about to make the same mistake in Afghanistan that he did in Iraq.

Those of us who knew Iraq, who knew Al Qaeda, who knew how vital and how fragile the Iraqi Government is—the day the President announced that all U.S. troops would leave Iraq by the end of the year, I said on October 21, 2011:

Today marks a harmful and sad setback for the United States in the world. I respectfully disagree with the President: this decision will be viewed as a strategic victory for our enemies in the Middle East. . . . Nearly 4,500 Americans have given their lives for our mission in Iraq. Countless more have been wounded. I fear that all of the gains made possible by these brave Americans in Iraq at such grave cost are now at risk.

On November 15, 2011, in the Senate Armed Services Committee, when Ambassador Crocker said it was a mistake, I said—and I will not give the whole statement, but I said:

We cannot avoid the fact that Iraq's progress is now at greater risk than at any time since the dark days before the surge, and that it did not have to be this way.

Finally, on December 14, 2011, the day the President triumphed, visited Fort Bragg to mark the end—in his view, the end of the Iraq war—I said:

Over 4,000 brave young Americans gave their lives in this conflict. I pray that their sacrifice is not in vain. . . . Unfortunately, it is clear that this decision of a complete pull-out of United States troops from Iraq was dictated by politics, and not our national security interests. I believe that history will judge this President's leadership with the scorn and disdain it deserves.

Of course, we know the United States rebuffed, according to the New York Times today, in an article by Michael Gordon and Eric Schmitt, the United States refused Maliki's request to strike against the militants' strategic disaster, assisted by withdrawal from Iraq.

Iraq's terrorists are becoming a full-blown army.

One of the smartest guys I have encountered, a man named Dexter Filkins, has great experience. He has an article in the New Yorker, "In Extremists' Iraq Rise, America's Legacy."

When the Americans invaded, in March, 2003, they destroyed the Iraqi state.

He continues:

The negotiations between Obama and Maliki fell apart, in no small measure because of a lack of engagement by the White House. Today, many Iraqis, including some close to Maliki, say that a small force of American soldiers—working in non-combat roles—would have provided a crucial stabilizing factor that is now missing from Iraq. Sami al-Askari, a Maliki confidant, told me for my article this spring, "If you had a few hundred here, not even a few thousand, they would be cooperating with you, and they would become your partners." President Obama wanted the Americans to come home, and Maliki didn't particularly want them to stay.

The trouble is, as the events of this week show, what the Americans left behind was an Iraqi state that was not able to stand on its own. What we built is now coming apart. This is the real legacy of America's war in Iraq.

If I sound angry, it is because I am angry, because during this whole period of time, for example, the Washington Post, in an editorial this morning called "The Iraq success."

Denis McDonough, then deputy national security adviser and now White House chief of staff, told reporters in 2011 that Mr. Obama "said what we are looking for is an Iraq that's secure, stable and self-reliant, and that's exactly what we got here. So there's no question this is a success."

Sometime we are going to hold people responsible for their policies as well as their words. To declare that a conflict is over does not mean it necessarily is over.

There is a great piece by Daniel Henninger this morning in the Wall Street Journal entitled, "While Obama Fiddles."

Meanwhile, Iraq may be transforming into (a) a second Syria or (b) a restored caliphate. Past some point, the world's wildfires are going to consume the Obama legacy. And leave his successor a nightmare.

What needs to be done now? Every hour the options become fewer and fewer as ISIS, the most radical Islamist terrorist group alive, sweeps across Iraq and now, according to the latest reports, is even threatening Baghdad, that there are signs of further deterioration of the Iraqi military.

What do we need to do now?

Obviously, the first thing I think we need to do is call together the people who succeeded in Iraq, those who have been retired, and get together that group and place them in positions of responsibility so they can develop a policy to reverse this tide of radical Islamist extremism, which directly threatens the security of the United States of America, and it is time the President got a new national security team.

It is time he got a group of people together who know what it is to succeed in conflict. I would say the leader of that would be General Petraeus. I would say General Mattis is one. I would say General Keane is another one. I would say Bob Kagan is another one.