

despite the unanimous assessment of the Trump administration's DOD, State Department, and IC, she rejected the conclusion that Syrian dictator Bashar al-Assad used chemical weapons against his own people.

Now, I don't know if her intent in making those statements was to defend those dictators or if she was simply unaware of the intelligence and how her statements would be perceived. In either case, it calls into question her judgment and if she has what it takes to build and develop the trust relationships necessary to give not only our IC workforce but, equally important, give our allies confidence that they can share their most sensitive intelligence with us.

Make no mistake about it, if our allies stop sharing that intelligence, we will be less safe. To offer just one example, last summer, intelligence sharing between the United States and Austria saved countless lives by disrupting a terrorist attack at a Taylor Swift concert, underscoring the importance of these relationships.

Ms. Gabbard has also been publicly outspoken in her praise and defense of Edward Snowden—someone who betrayed the trust and jeopardized the security of our Nation. The vast majority of the information he stole and leaked—before, I would remind you, he ran off and hightailed it to both China and Russia—most of this information, I can assure you, had nothing to do with America's privacy but did compromise our Nation's most sensitive collection sources and methods. In many ways, we are still paying a price for Snowden's betrayal, and it is beyond dispute that his actions put our men and women in uniform in places like Iraq and Afghanistan at risk. Yet Ms. Gabbard has celebrated Snowden as a "brave whistleblower" and advocated for his pardon. This is someone that my friend TOM COTTON, who is the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, called a "traitor" who should "rot in jail for the rest of his life."

A week ago, at the hearing, member after member—particularly my Republican friends—gave her chance after chance to just be willing to call out Snowden as a traitor. She repeatedly declined. Instead, she said:

The DNI has no role in determining whether or not Edward Snowden is a lawful whistleblower.

Not only does she seem to believe that someone who divulged sensitive national secrets to Russia and China should be celebrated as "brave" and not denounced as a "traitor," she also does not seem to understand the DNI's role in whistleblower determinations, because, in fact, the DNI has a significant role in transmitting lawful whistleblower complaints to the Intelligence Committees. It would be irresponsible to confirm someone who cannot distinguish between complaints that are made lawfully and those that are not.

Further, it is the statutory responsibility of the DNI to "protect intel-

ligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure." What message would it send to an intelligence workforce to have a DNI who would celebrate staff and contractors deciding to leak our Nation's most sensitive secrets as they see fit?

Now, let me move to another issue of pressing relevance to this nomination, and that is section 702 of FISA. This bill, this tool—it is really hard to overstate the importance. The information we derive from this tool is responsible for about 60 percent of the intelligence in the President's Daily Brief, and it has been instrumental in disrupting everything from terrorists attacks, to fentanyl trafficking, to foreign cyber attacks.

Many in Congress have at various points supported reforms to 702 to better balance security and civil liberties, but, again, Ms. Gabbard has gone so much further. Not only did she vote against reauthorizing 702, she introduced legislation to repeal the whole thing and called its very existence a "blatant disregard for our Fourth Amendment constitutional rights."

I do understand that after she was nominated to be DNI, she had a conversion—a confirmation conversion—and expressed a change of heart. Now, that is welcome, but it is just not credible. Just last May, she criticized the reforms put into 702. Just last May, she criticized those very reforms she now credits with changing her mind. Again, the reforms, she claimed, "made the law many, many times worse."

The DNI is responsible for making annual certifications under section 702, without which all collection under the law will cease, and the law itself is up for reauthorization in just over a year—a process typically led by the DNI. I have no confidence in Ms. Gabbard's commitment to either task.

Nor is it the only issue where she has demonstrated poor judgment that should be disqualifying for the role. During an ill-advised trip to Syria and Lebanon in 2017, Ms. Gabbard exercised terrible judgment and elected to meet with Bashar al-Assad amid a conflict in which Assad was using gas and other chemical weapons against his own people. On that same trip, she also met with Ahmad Badreddin Hassoun. Many Americans may not be familiar with Mr. Hassoun, but in 2011, he threatened to commit suicide bomb attacks against the United States.

At her confirmation hearing, Ms. Gabbard claimed not to know about Hassoun's past, but reporting following the hearing makes it clear that her staff made her aware of that at the time of her trip in 2017, to say nothing of the fact that if she had simply googled this guy, that would have revealed his past.

What does it say about her judgment and experience that she would willingly meet with someone who has very publicly issued threats against the United States of America?

Nor is this an isolated lapse. Just last summer, she accepted a trip to

Italy that was paid for by the foundation of Pierre Louvrier—a man with deep connections to sanctioned Russian oligarchs.

At her confirmation hearing, she seemed unable to recognize why the national security interests of the United States might be better protected if TikTok—a social media app that reaches into the homes of millions of Americans—was actually under American ownership rather than being subject to the controls of the PRC and ultimately the Communist Party of China.

The world today is more complex and more dangerous than ever before, and we need serious people with the experience, expertise, and judgment to navigate that complexity. Unfortunately, Ms. Gabbard is not such a nominee.

A vote in favor of her confirmation is an endorsement of President Trump's lawless efforts to hollow out our national security workforce, and her confirmation will further strain the alliances that have kept our country safe for decades; therefore, I urge my colleagues to oppose Ms. Gabbard's nomination.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MORENO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the Gabbard nomination be waived.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 18, Tulsi Gabbard, of Hawaii, to be Director of National Intelligence.

John Thune, John R. Curtis, Tommy Tuberville, Kevin Cramer, Ashley Moody, Mike Crapo, Markwayne Mullin, David McCormick, Mike Lee, Ron Johnson, John Barrasso, Pete Ricketts, James C. Justice, Jon Husted, Bernie Moreno, Josh Hawley, Tom Cotton.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Tulsi Gabbard, of Hawaii, to be Director of National Intelligence, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 49 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Banks	Graham	Moreno
Barrasso	Grassley	Mullin
Blackburn	Hagerty	Murkowski
Boozman	Hawley	Paul
Britt	Hoeven	Ricketts
Budd	Husted	Risch
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cassidy	Johnson	Schmitt
Collins	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Sheehy
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tuberville
Curtis	McConnell	Wicker
Daines	McCormick	Young
Ernst	Moody	
Fischer	Moran	

NAYS—46

Alsobrooks	Hirono	Sanders
Baldwin	Kaine	Schatz
Bennet	Kelly	Schiff
Blumenthal	Kim	Schumer
Blunt Rochester	King	Shaheen
Booker	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Cantwell	Lujan	Smith
Coons	Markey	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warnock
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Gallego	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	
Hickenlooper	Rosen	

NOT VOTING—2

Fetterman Tillis

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RICKETTS). On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 46.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I am grateful to be on the floor here tonight with my colleague from California, Senator SCHIFF, and others to talk about the nomination of Tulsi Gabbard—now the successful nomination, I guess, of Tulsi Gabbard—to be the Director of National Intelligence.

To say the least, I never thought that we would see a moment in the history of the United States, in the history of our attempt as a Congress to ensure that the American people and that the President get the intelligence they need. In all of these years and over all of these decades, I never imagined we would see someone like Tulsi Gabbard approved on the floor of the U.S. Senate for that job, and I wanted to speak tonight, just briefly, to say why I think that was the wrong direction for the Trump administration and, more importantly, the wrong direction for the American people.

Let me say, first of all, intelligence—and being a member of the Intelligence Committee, I know this is unlike anything else we do around here, because a lot of what happens—my colleague Senator KING from Maine is here—is done in secret. One of the great privileges of being on the Intelligence Committee is that—I think, in part—because it is in secret, there isn't the kind of partisanship that you see on a

lot of the other committees. There isn't the jockeying for position or for political notoriety; that people on that committee are very serious about our work. In part, it is because we all have a responsibility, on behalf of all of the Senators who are not on the committee, to be able to transmit, as well as we can, the intelligence needs of our country, the intelligence findings of the intelligence community, and to play a very important role in oversight, because if we didn't provide that role, the intelligence Agencies could run amuck without the American people ever knowing about it or their Representatives knowing about it.

In fact, the whole reason we have the Intelligence Committee in the Senate is because so many terrible decisions were made by the intelligence Agencies in the postwar period, in the 1950s and 1960s—some of it well-intentioned, you know, during the Cold War, but a lot of it were really bad judgments—that included things like, you know, the attempt to assassinate foreign leaders and to plot revolutions around the globe. This Congress, this Senate, decided that we needed to have oversight for the American people, and we created the Intelligence Committee to do that. It means that we have an institutional structure that ensures that the American people get the best service out of the intelligence community and that the President gets the best intelligence. And that structure was put in place by people who thought it was important for intelligence Agencies not to run amuck and for the President to get the best intelligence possible.

Now we are putting somebody in the job of Director of all of the intelligence Agencies, in a sense, the ODNI, so-called—that is sort of the clearinghouse and the coordinator for all of the intel that the President gets—Congresswoman Tulsi Gabbard.

Now, look, she has had a record of public service in the Congress and in the military. I don't dispute that, and I am not calling into question whether or not she is serving the interests of other countries. But I do want to say—and I will be brief—that I think her judgment has been extraordinarily—I would say, exceptionally—bad.

I share her view that there were profound intelligence errors in the lead-up to the Gulf war and in the lead-up to the war in Afghanistan. In the Gulf, in particular, you will remember, you know, the weapons of mass destruction that Saddam Hussein was supposed to have had. He didn't have them. It was a terrible, terrible failure of our Intelligence Committee and a terrible failure of oversight from this Congress, and she is right about that.

The problem is she has, I think, learned the wrong lesson from that, and over and over and over again, when she has the opportunity to support the interests of the United States—I hate to say it—versus those of our adversaries', time and time again, she picks our adversaries or even our allies.

I have heard her say how worried she is about what she describes as the remilitarization of Japan, which, of course, Japan is doing because of the threat from China, with our very, very close cooperation. That is of concern to Tulsi Gabbard.

She went to Syria and famously came back disputing our own intelligence Agencies' findings about Assad's gassing of his own people. To this day, she hasn't really taken that back, and it makes no sense at all.

But the thing that drives me the craziest is that she has been an apologist for what Vladimir Putin has done since the day Vladimir Putin invaded Ukraine. Ukraine was a peaceful country with a peaceful border, and Vladimir Putin was the first tyrant since World War II ended. We had set up all of these multilateral institutions across Europe and across the world to prevent the kind of hostility that we had seen break out in World War II, and Vladimir Putin decided he would invade a peaceful country next-door to him. In his mind, he had a right to do that because Ukraine has been viewed by czars—going back hundreds and hundreds of years—as Russian territory.

That is not the way the Ukrainian people look at this. They think of themselves as an independent country. They think of themselves as living in a place where history actually has moved on over the last 500 years or 1,000 years, and they were sitting there, peacefully, when Vladimir Putin invaded them with no provocation at all.

On the evening that Vladimir Putin invaded Ukraine, Tulsi Gabbard tweeted out at 11:30 at night—her local time—referring to the war, Putin's invasion of Ukraine: This war and suffering could easily have been avoided if the Biden administration and NATO had simply acknowledged Russia's "legitimate security concerns" regarding Ukraine becoming a member of NATO, which would mean U.S.-NATO forces right on Russia's border.

Now, she gets mad when people read that stuff. That is what she said, and she says: Well, don't tell people that I am carrying propaganda for the Russian Government or for Putin. That is not fair.

I don't have to say that, but the Russian television put on TV, in the days after the aftermath of Putin's invasion, the very thing that Congresswoman Gabbard had said about his invasion because they saw it as something that ratified what they had done. And it was so consistent, so aligned with his position—and it continues to be his position today—that he thought it would muddy the waters with people around the world about what they were doing in Ukraine.

I believe Ukraine's battle, from the very beginning, has not been a battle for Ukraine. I think it is a battle for democracy. I think they are on the tip of the spear, you know, in a way that nobody has been since World War II.

The Ukrainian people have been unbelievable, and the Ukrainian soldiers have fought magnificently. There was a view, when Putin invaded Ukraine, that, in 3 days, they were going to be in Kyiv—the Russians—and because of the bravery of the Ukrainian people, because of the bravery of the soldiers, many of whom have given up their lives, they have succeeded beyond the wildest dreams of anybody on this floor, of any of the Monday-morning quarterbacking that has happened in this Capitol and in other capitols around the world. And our allies all around Europe—but also in the Pacific area, as well—all have seen what the Ukrainian people have accomplished.

When she had an opportunity to say something about the Ukrainians and when she had the opportunity to stand with the United States and stand with our allies, she made another choice. She is entitled to that choice. She is entitled to that choice, just as she is entitled to her views about the intelligence failures during the Gulf war. But the fact that she has the idiosyncratic views that she has, whether it is Putin's invasion of Ukraine or her writing a bill in the House to give Edward Snowden a pardon, doesn't qualify her to be the lead intelligence official for the United States of America.

As I said—and I will finish here—we work well in a bipartisan way on these issues. The American people need the President to get intelligence in a way that is trustworthy, that is not shaded in one direction or another, and we all need to be able to trust each other in the delivery of that intelligence.

I will say that I think the President, in nominating Congresswoman Gabbard for this position, has fallen short. I voted for the CIA Director. This is not an issue of his appointments to the intelligence Agencies. But in the case of Congresswoman Gabbard, I think he missed the mark.

I apologize to my colleague from California for going on for so long.

I will yield the floor to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. President, after Tulsi Gabbard was selected as Donald Trump's nominee for Director of National Intelligence, the Russian newspaper Komsomolskaya Pravda was overjoyed. They wrote: "The CIA and FBI are trembling." Sadly, the Russian newspaper is probably right about that.

Another Russian state outlet called her a "Comrade."

On a separate broadcast, top Putin mouthpiece Vladimir Solovyov, after gushing about Kash Patel, said: "And what about our girl? We have our girl there." "Our girl" is evidently the Kremlin's way of referring to our nominee Tulsi Gabbard. His guest asked, so as to be sure, "Intelligence?" The answer was yes.

RT, yet another Russian outlet that Ms. Gabbard "regularly read and shared articles from," took to Twitter to defend her: "We've got your back,

Tulsi." Yes, they certainly do. In September, it was revealed that RT was acting covertly on behalf of Moscow to spread propaganda in the United States. It is not a surprise that RT has Tulsi Gabbard's back. The question is, Should we?

The Director of National Intelligence is the nerve center of our Nation's intelligence network. It is the linchpin between 18 Agencies tasked with detecting and preventing threats to our national security and coordinating our intelligence resources. It is a job that requires judgment. It requires experience. It requires a high degree of trust. Above all, it requires a deep and unwavering commitment to the truth and a willingness to stand up to despots. Yet the nominee before us is stunningly lacking in all of these qualities.

Ms. Gabbard's record in Congress is not one of distinction in intelligence matters. She did not serve on the Intelligence Committee in the House and was not known for advancing meaningful legislation on intelligence in this space. When she did sign on to legislation, it was to eliminate critically important intelligence programs or it was to praise those who leaked classified information and did great damage to our Nation, like Edward Snowden.

She did not wrestle with the complexities of the intelligence-gathering analysis process. In fact, in the moments when her voice was heard on matters of foreign policy, it was in ways that should concern all of us. She has echoed, amplified, and at times outright defended the positions of autocrats and despots.

When now-deposed Syrian dictator Bashar al-Assad gassed his own people, she cast doubt on the findings of our own intelligence Agencies—cast doubt on them just like the Russian propaganda outlets did—this, after she engaged in her own form of freelance foreign policy, traveling to Syria to meet with Assad and get the full scoop on his government's narrative of that murderous crusade.

On her return, she positively crowed about how lovely this dictator was. "He wants to be seen as someone who cares for his country." Well, maybe if he wanted to be seen as someone who cares for his country, he shouldn't have gassed his own people. "He wants to be seen as someone who would not conduct these kinds of atrocities," Tulsi Gabbard said—except that he did. He did commit these kinds of atrocities.

When Vladimir Putin launched his brutal war against our ally Ukraine, she once again parroted Kremlin talking points about so-called "provocations" by NATO. She repeated Russian propaganda claims that the United States had set up secret bioweapons labs in Ukraine and argued that the United States, not Russia, is responsible for Putin's nuclear brinksmanship.

This is the nominee for our intelligence Agencies—not the Kremlin's; this is our nominee, Tulsi Gabbard.

This is who this President seeks to hand over the keys to our national security; to entrust her with the Nation's most closely held secrets; to be the final voice in the room advising the President on intelligence; to be, in the plain words of the law, "the principal adviser to the President, to the National Security Council, and the Homeland Security Council for intelligence matters related to the national security"—this, Tulsi Gabbard.

This nomination is not just unwise, it is dangerous.

Make no mistake, Ms. Gabbard is entitled to her own personal opinions. She can apologize for Assad or Putin or any other murderous dictator to her heart's content. But we are not considering Ms. Gabbard for some position in which her bizarre fondness for foreign despots is beside the point. She is not the nominee for Postmaster General. We are considering her for one of the most important jobs in our intelligence community. For that, Tulsi Gabbard is a walking five-alarm fire and must be rejected—must be.

There is a reason the Director of National Intelligence must have the confidence of both the intelligence professionals that they oversee and the national security establishment—because the job requires accountability; it requires trust; it requires truthfulness.

In 2015, Ms. Gabbard joined a congressional delegation trip to the Middle East, the kind that so many of us in this Chamber have participated in. She visited a Turkish town near the Syrian border where countless refugees were sheltering. Her guide took Ms. Gabbard to meet two Syrian girls, age just 9 and 4 years old, who had been badly burned in a bombing carried out by the Syrian dictator's warplanes. The children's parents had been killed in that attack. These brave, small children told their story to the then-Congresswoman.

In this situation, I think any of us would have roughly the same response: some form of sympathy, some form of empathy, some attempt to provide comfort to these children who saw their lives and their families destroyed in front of them. But Ms. Gabbard had a very different response.

By the account of the guide who was with her, she looked at the children and said: "How do you know if it was Assad? What if it was ISIS?"

I should note that ISIS, of course, has no air force. But, of course, that wasn't really the point, was it? The point was perhaps best illustrated by her guide who was with her that day and who said of that experience—those days with Ms. Gabbard—he said: "It dawned on me that Tulsi wasn't misinformed or ignorant." He said he worried instead that she "had a worldview that was adversarial to the United States"—"adversarial to the United States." Think about that: "adversarial to the United States." And consider whether this is the right person to be the Director of National Intelligence.

Where do we draw the line with Donald Trump? What level of unfitness in a nominee? What level of unconstitutionality in an Executive action? What level of abject disregard of our judicial system? What national security threat or risk will it take? What action could he commit where we would be joined by our Republican colleagues in saying we have had enough?

Where is the line? When is an action too egregious or an appointment too absurd, a risk or threat that is too big? Where is the line? Is it disobeying a lawful court order, which this administration seems to be laying the groundwork to do? Is it confirming a patently unqualified FBI Director who wants to close down FBI headquarters and makes music with felons who beat law enforcement? Is it a Director of HHS who doesn't believe in vaccines or a Director of National Intelligence who has sought to undermine vital intelligence operations and whom the Russians and others viewed as aligned with them instead of with us?

Where is the line? Because, for me, that line has been crossed a long, long time ago.

I cannot—I will not—support this nomination, and I urge my colleagues to think long and hard before they do because if Ms. Gabbard is confirmed, we will not need the luxury of hindsight. We already have the luxury of hindsight. The threats to our Nation are real. Those who wish us harm are busy plotting against us. There are plots to conduct attacks on U.S. soil. There are intelligence warnings about China's intentions to replace U.S. influence around the world and about Russia's relentless assault against our friends and allies.

At a moment when the world is watching, when our allies and our adversaries are questioning America's stability and leadership on the global stage, we cannot afford to confirm a Director of National Intelligence who lacks the qualifications, the judgment, and the credibility to lead. We cannot.

Remember that Russian broadcaster I mentioned earlier, Vladimir Solovyov? Here is some of the rest of that exchange with the guest on his show: "Well with Tulsi Gabbard it's not that simple," the guest replied. "It might not work because . . . what if it's not approved?" The Russians are worried that Tulsi Gabbard might not be approved by this body. That should tell us something.

People, please, do we need the Kremlin to spell it out for us, what they are hoping and, if they prayed, would be praying for us to do?

Solovyov seemingly answered that question for us live on Russian TV: "Why are you suddenly so doubtful?" he asked his guest. Solovyov seemed nervous about the chances for confirmation of the woman he described as "our girl," Tulsi Gabbard. Perhaps he fears that Congress has more common sense than to confirm someone who prefers Russia's worldview over mat-

ters like Ukraine's sovereignty to our own national security professionals. But do we? Do we possess that basic common sense? For the sake of our country, for the sake of our Nation's most sensitive classified information, and for the sake of the workforce that keeps us safe, I hope and pray that we do, that we possess the common sense to vote down Tulsi Gabbard. We will soon find out.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORENO). The majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business for debate only, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

REMEMBERING DANIEL LEVIN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, after the Great Fire destroyed much of central London in 1666, the city was rebuilt with even grander and stronger buildings than before. The most majestic building of all in the new London was St. Paul's Cathedral, designed by the great architect Sir Christopher Wren. There is no monument to Wren. But on the dome of St. Paul's, written in Latin, is an inscription. It says: "If you seek his memorial—look around you."

There is no monument in Chicago to Dan Levin, either. But if you want to see what he meant to Chicago—and what Chicago meant to him—just look around our great city. Daniel Levin was a visionary real estate developer, civic leader, and generous philanthropist who loved Chicago, its neighborhoods, and its people. Sadly, he died a few weeks ago.

Over half a century, Dan Levin's real estate development and management company, the Habitat Company, built structures that redefined Chicago's skyline. Drive into Chicago on the Kennedy Expressway, and you will see the Presidential Towers, four soaring skyscrapers of upscale condos and apartments in the West Loop. Take a cruise along the Chicago River, and you will pass the East Bank Club, one of the finest health and fitness clubs anywhere in America. Follow the river to where it meets Lake Michigan and you will come to Cityfront Plaza, another tower of apartments and condos surrounded by a bucolic green oasis of a park. He created other landmark buildings including South Commons, Columbus Plaza, ONE333, and many others.

But Dan Levin didn't build and manage only luxury properties. His faith in Chicago's people and their extraordinary potential led to Habitat's creation of nearly 25,000 rental housing units for people of all incomes.

His "North Star," his family says, was his belief that all people deserve to

live in a home and a neighborhood they can be proud of.

He described his business philosophy this way: "No project is only an investment in real estate. It is an investment in the future of the community and the lives of the people who live and work there."

His confidence and his love for Chicago led him to take risks and to invest in parts of the city that others overlooked. And time after time, those risks paid off. His buildings attracted other new investments that transformed once blighted areas into vibrant neighborhoods. Dan had a rare gift to see potential where others saw only problems. The Presidential Towers, for example, stand on what was once Chicago's Skid Row.

The East Bank Club was built on the site of an abandoned railroad yard. In a once-gritty neighborhood that many Chicagoans feared to drive through even during the day, Dan created a world-class fitness club and an outstanding restaurant, where he loved to host Seders every Passover. You never knew who you would see at the East Bank Club. You might find yourself in a Pilates class with Oprah when she was a member. Years ago, Dan became friends with a young law professor from the University of Chicago who used to come to the club to play basketball. That young hoopster-professor went on to become President of the United States, Barack Obama.

Dan Levin was a "social entrepreneur" decades before anyone had ever heard that term. He believed that he could make money and do good, and that is exactly what he did for 50 years.

He almost certainly would have made more money if he had concentrated exclusively on upscale buildings. But Dan Levin wasn't in business to make a killing; he wanted to make communities.

Probably his biggest professional challenge came in 1987 when a Federal judge appointed the Habitat Company to serve as a receiver for the then-bankrupt and badly mismanaged Chicago Housing Authority.

The job was massive: Manage all of Chicago's public housing, except senior housing, and rehab or replace thousands of dilapidated housing units.

The receivership lasted 23 years. 23 years. By the time it ended, hundreds of blighted apartment buildings across the city had been torn down, including high rises that had become towers of poverty.

With Dan as chairman and Valerie Jarrett as the company's CEO, Habitat replaced the high rises with townhouses and replaced concrete with green spaces. All told, the company built or rehabbed 4,000 units of public housing.

Many developers might have been intimidated by such a massive undertaking. But Dan Levin saw it as a civic responsibility and a chance to give back to a city that had given him so much.