

of the financial markets (or withdrawal of campaign financing). They allowed a last minute amendment that killed Dodd-Frank protections, and allowed U.S. taxpayers to be shaken down to cover Wall Street's shale gambling debacle.

The heavy-handed move by the financial industry has outraged progressives and libertarians alike. It seems that these Wall Street criminals, like junkies attached to their drugs of choice, just could not resist the high of easy cash from Ponzi scheme market bubbles, and so they have stuck it to the U.S. public once again: Preposterously huge bonuses, Porsches, pricey call girls, and million-dollar Manhattan condos were at stake. So hey, why should they kick the habit? After all, not a single one of those con artists went to jail last time.

Wall Street is now flooded with fracking industry derivatives contracts that protect the profits of oil producers from dramatic swings in the marketplace. Derivatives are essentially insurance policies taken out by the oil industry to guard against fluctuations in the cost of fossil fuel supplies. Dramatic swings rarely happen, but when they do they can be absolutely crippling.

Derivatives taken out to ensure prices don't go down are now creating billions in losses for those who sold such bets on the market; someone is going to have to absorb massive losses created by the sudden drop in oil on the other end of those insurance contracts. In many cases, it is the big Wall Street banks, and if the price of oil does not rebound substantially they could be facing colossal losses.

The big Wall Street banks did not expect plunging home prices to implode the mortgage-backed securities market in 2008, but their current models also did not have \$60 oil prices included in projections. The huge losses may send a shock wave into the entire financial industry. It has been estimated that the six largest "too-big-to-fail" banks control \$3.9 trillion in commodity derivatives contracts, those same gambling instruments that brought us the 2008 housing collapse. And a very large chunk of that amount is made up of oil derivatives. Combined with the huge flood of shale junk bonds on the market, the derivatives could initiate a bubble burst that could turn into a financial market implosion.

Meanwhile, the global climate change issue and energy market turbulence have morphed into geopolitical tensions over European fracking. Unsubstantiated allegations in a New York Times report by Andrew Higgins claim that the Russians are funding anti-fracking protests to maintain their hegemony over gas markets.

The allegations have infuriated environmentalists and climate justice activists. The last thing they want is to be made scapegoats for the fracking collapse and be played as the neo-Cold War dupes of the Russian empire. But memories of red-baiting suddenly hang in the air as (by seemingly coincidence) dozens of right-wing media sites regularly devoted to anti-Soviet slanders or climate change denial immediately picked up Higgins' Times piece, as if on cue.

There are now dozens more of such published reports. Even as the U.S. fracking industry collapses and tensions over control of Ukraine and other former Soviet satellites re-emerge, there seems to be a concerted right-wing effort to label fracking opponents Russian agents.

Vague innuendos dominate this narrative. In the Times piece, for example, former NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen is quoted: "I have met allies who can report that Russia, as part of their sophisticated information and disinformation operations, engage actively with so-called non-

government organizations." Others write, "Some in Sophia believe" or "Those who suspect Russian involvement" or "There's no smoking gun, yet . . ."

Critics in Romania accused the Times and Higgins of scapegoating environmentalists and acting as partisan players in a renewed Cold War.

"What, exactly, is the grand total of evidence that Russia is financing these anti-fracking protests?" asks American blogger in Romania, Sam C. Roman, in his article, "Pot vs. Kettle," pointing out that the first anti-Russia allegation came from a politician who owned land that Chevron planned to frack, and is thus losing money from the protests. "Not one allegation against Russia in the entire article is proven by a single document, piece of evidence or other direct proof. All that exists are shadowy insinuations and allegations." He asserts that accusations by Lithuanian, Romanian and NATO officials against Russia have not yet to be backed up by any proof.

"Add it up," Roman writes. "You've got two former NATO [secretary generals] stumping for Chevron (which competes with Gazprom, a Russian energy company that also conducts fracking operations in Europe) blaming the Russian government for protests. . . . And all of this tied up in a neat little bow by an American journalist who has already been caught publishing anti-Russian propaganda in his newspaper before."

This all leaves the United States somewhat schizophrenic. On the one hand, the United States and NATO's foreign policy hawks are delighted by the oil price collapse; it serves to isolate and subdue Russia, expand NATO's influence in Eastern Europe, and puts pressure on Iran to negotiate on nuclear aspirations. Not to mention that with gasoline at \$2 per gallon, consumer spending and economic growth will be enhanced. The U.S. economy grew by a comparatively robust 5 percent in the third quarter of 2014.

According to an article by Larry Elliott in *The Guardian*, "Stakes Are High as U.S. Plays the Oil Card Against Iran and Russia," the price drop was an act of geopolitical warfare by the United States, administered by the Saudis. Elliott suggests that U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry allegedly struck a deal with Saudi Arabia's King Abdullah in September. That might explain how oil prices dropped during the crisis caused by Islamic State in Iraq and Syria, which would normally have caused prices to rise.

It would also explain why the Obama administration allowed the financial industry the amendment to Dodd-Frank that effectively exempts financial institutions from liability associated with derivatives. Though shale derivatives were not specifically mentioned by the Wall Street lobbyists as they pressured their allies in Congress and the White House, it is becoming increasingly clear that the too-big-to-fail banks were beginning to panic as dark clouds gathered on the horizon in the shale derivatives trade.

Most bank customers and voters don't know that Congress has already written into finance regulations that, in the case of insolvency, financial institutions could grab the assets of depositors and "bail-in"—which means they can save themselves from their losses in gambling operations at their investment divisions by grabbing cash assets of depositors, even those that are FDIC guaranteed, and legally convert them to bank stocks. That means that in the event of another market crash, Chase and Citi could take their depositors' cash in savings accounts or CDs, and give the customers back a bank stock certificate (of questionable value) instead.

There are also those who scratch their heads and ask, "Why did the TBTF banks

push for a deletion of the Dodd-Frank provision now, instead of waiting for the friendlier Republican-controlled Congress to pass this legislation?" The only answer that seems to make sense, and explain their urgency, is that the collapse is imminent.

In the 1990s dot-com craze, every new Silicon Valley start-up company was advertised as the next Microsoft. What followed was the crash of 2000, when the NASDAQ dropped 4,000 points (80 percent) in months. This chart below is what the crash looked like in 2000 to 2002 after the market had reached 5,000 (almost exactly where it stands today).

Having learned their lesson well from the last bailout, and knowing that they will have a much harder time coming to Congress hat-in-hand after a collapse, the TBTF banks probably decided not to wait, pushing their minions in the Beltway to inoculate them as soon as possible from the potential market explosion. In the meantime, they were probably dumping their own stocks on unsuspecting investors. Based on year-end reports for March 31, 2014, for 127 major oil companies, cash input for the fracking industry was \$677 billion, while revenues from operations only totaled \$568 billion—a difference of almost \$110 billion. And this was before the price of oil started dropping six months ago.

In three out of seven major fracking fields in North America, companies are already reporting losses, with closures particularly acute in Canada. It's not clear whether economists fully appreciate what's about to transpire. This decline in rig count is just the beginning. Perhaps the end will come as early as this winter or spring, as fiscal reports for 2014's fourth quarter are published, operations shut down, crews are laid off, and many unprofitable oil and gas rigs are mothballed.

So, whom will the banks, brokers and investors scapegoat for this upcoming crash? Some predict that they will likely use every available media outlet to blame community activists, Democrats and Obama for stopping the Keystone pipeline and for opposing the fracking industry. And as in the climate change denial movement, the narrative will probably use "communist" and "socialist" rhetoric, which is why the Russian card is so important to play: Hence the Higgins article.

The pundits on Fox will likely play on the patriotism of the right and use their Big Lie ploy (say something enough times, it becomes the truth) to the hilt. Six months from now, while studiously avoiding mention of our "allies," the Saudis, or the Wall Street banks, they will likely be vociferously defending those poor "beleaguered U.S. oilmen" who could have made our country strong and independent again in energy, but were broken by the Democrats and those "commie environmentalists" working for Putin. The market crash will be blamed on the "climate hoax."

NORTH KOREA IS A STATE  
SPONSOR OF TERROR

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the saga with North Korea and its band of tyrants has gone on far too long.

On November 24th, Sony Pictures Entertainment was attacked. No its headquarters were not bombed, nor did anyone storm the buildings. This was a cyber attack.

It is believed to be the worst of its type on a company on U.S. soil. Hackers released

personal data of Sony employees, disabled Sony's IT systems, and destroyed data.

Shortly after, anonymous emails threatened movie-goers hoping to see the Sony film, "The Interview". These threats warned about "9/11-style" terrorist attacks.

A little over a month later, on December 29, the FBI said North Korea was responsible for the cyber attack.

Contrary to what the President has called "cyber vandalism", this cyber terrorism deserves a bold, immediate response.

The world's dictators and terrorists must know without a doubt that an attack—cyber or physical—on the U.S. will result in a devastating response. This starts with the little dictator of Pyongyang, Kim Jong-Un.

It needs to immediately put North Korea back on the State Sponsors of Terrorism list. Representative ROS-LEHTINEN has a bill that puts tough sanctions on North Korea and urges the Administration to put North Korea back on the list. I am an original cosponsor of the bill.

There is no doubt that North Korea belongs on the State Sponsors of Terrorism list.

In July 2009, UAE officials discovered a North Korean ship full of weapons heading to Iran.

Iran has been on the state sponsor of terrorism list since 1984 because it provides hundreds of millions of dollars and tons of weapons to terrorist groups like Hezbollah and Hamas. So when one hears about North Korea sending weapons to Iran, it is not a typical transfer of weapons. This is about giving a recognized state sponsor of terrorism more guns to put in the hands of known and designated terrorist groups.

Five months after the UAE seizure, Thai authorities found 35 tons of North Korean weapons on a plane, also traveling to Iran and ultimately bound for delivery to foreign terrorist organizations Hezbollah and Hamas.

In April 2010, South Korean officials apprehended two North Korean military-trained agents who had orders to assassinate a defector from North Korea.

On March 26, 2010, North Korea sunk a South Korean naval vessel, killing 46 sailors.

On November 23, 2010 North Korea repeatedly bombed a small South Korean island, killing two civilians and two marines.

So far, as punishment for the cyber attack on Sony, the President sanctioned ten individuals and three organizations tied to North Korea's intelligence, arms supply, and defense research.

These sanctions are not enough. Other people or organizations not sanctioned by the U.S. can easily take over the same work.

Reinstating North Korea on the State Sponsors of Terrorism list would deepen existing sanctions and could deliver a crippling blow to the little dictator of Pyongyang.

This Administration cannot allow the United States to be bullied again and again.

The West allowed Putin into Ukraine. We have watched ISIS behead our journalists. We have seen Americans die in Israel at the hands of Hamas.

Now, we have let North Korea silence us.

To have a country on the other side of the world not just threaten but actually take away one of America's most fundamental rights is outrageous.

It is time to stop appeasing our enemies.

And that's just the way it is.

IN HONOR OF OUR BRAVE MEN  
AND WOMEN ON LAW ENFORCE-  
MENT APPRECIATION DAY

### HON. AL GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 9, 2015*

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I believe in the rule of law. For that reason, today on the first annual Law Enforcement Appreciation Day (L.E.A.D.), I would like to honor our brave men and women in both state as well as federal law enforcement agencies. In our nation, we have approximately 900,000 law enforcement officials. Without these hard-working individuals, who constantly risk their lives, the rule of law would not be possible. According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), 76 law enforcement officers lost their lives in the line-of-duty in 2013, 27 deaths were the result of felonious, criminal acts by perpetrators. My own home state of Texas has lost more officers than any other state in the U.S.

Mr. Speaker, throughout my life I have been truly inspired by the professionalism and devotion to public safety of those in law enforcement. I know I speak for many people of good will when I say I wholeheartedly support the efforts of law enforcement officers to serve and protect our communities and our country. Additionally, we will not let the questionable actions of a few individuals acting under the color of law besmirch the reputation and legacy of all law enforcement officers in our great nation.

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. GREGORY W. MEEKS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 9, 2015*

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, 2015, I missed recorded votes #1–7 as I was attending the funeral of Governor Mario Cuomo in New York.

I would like to reflect how I would have voted if I were here and sworn into office:

On Roll Call #1 I would have voted present (Quorum Call).

On Roll Call #2 I would have voted for NANCY PELOSI for Speaker.

On Roll Call #3 I would have voted no (Motion to Table).

On Roll Call #4 I would have voted no (Previous Question).

On Roll Call #5 I would have voted yes (Motion to Commit).

On Roll Call #6 I would have voted no (Passage of House Rules Package).

On Roll Call #7 I would have voted yes (Passage "Hire More Heroes Act of 2015" H.R. 22).

I would also like to reflect that I would have voted for the Honorable NANCY PELOSI for Democratic Leader.

RECOGNIZING U.S. AMBASSADOR  
TO BANGLADESH DAN MOZENA

### HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 9, 2015*

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, as he retires from the Foreign Service next week, I rise today to recognize the outstanding work of the U.S. Ambassador to Bangladesh Dan Mozena. He led a distinguished career of public service to the United States, capped by his impressive efforts over the past several years to promote workers' safety and advance fundamental labor rights in Bangladesh.

Following a string of tragedies in the Bangladesh garment industry, including the collapse of the Rana Plaza factory that took the lives of 1,138 workers in 2013 and the factory fire at Tazreen Fashions that took the lives of 112 workers in 2012, Ambassador Mozena has advocated for workers' safety and their right to freedom of association. He has urged Bangladesh to transform its garment sector from a model based on a race-to-the-bottom in labor standards, to one where a "Made in Bangladesh" becomes a label valued for the country's commitment to workers' rights and high standards for safety.

Following the U.S. Government's decision to suspend trade preferences and issue an Action Plan focused on labor rights and factory safety, Ambassador Mozena convened the embassies of other garment importing countries (Netherlands, Canada, the United Kingdom, and the European Union) with the responsible Bangladesh Government Secretariats on a monthly basis to track progress. This model for joint advocacy is one that merits recognition and replication as our Embassies work to elevate labor rights in developing economies.

Ambassador Mozena worked with the U.S. Department of Labor to bring the first Labor Attaché to Bangladesh, and he leaves an institutional framework to help advance labor rights in this young and developing country. Under Mozena's leadership the U.S. Embassy became a place where workers could turn to for help when they faced coercion, repression, and anti-union violence.

Of course, there is a tremendous amount of work that still needs to be accomplished in Bangladesh to ensure that workers are safe and that their fundamental rights are respected in the workplace. Ambassador Mozena has fought to ensure that momentum is going in the right direction in Bangladesh—we must continue this work moving forward.

Ambassador Mozena's accomplishments extend beyond labor rights. Since presenting his Letters of Credence to the President of Bangladesh on November 24, 2011, Ambassador Mozena has strengthened relations between the United States and Bangladesh by promoting a Bangladesh that is peaceful, secure, prosperous, healthy, and democratic. He emphasized understanding the diversity of Bangladesh, making visits to each of the country's 64 districts. In the United States, he has visited Bangladeshi-Americans across the country.

During his time as Ambassador, Mozena oversaw the largest aid budget in Asia outside of Afghanistan and Pakistan, bolstering Bangladeshi food security and nutrition, improving health, and increasing capacity to