

Turkmen gas. The share of gas in the Caspian hydrocarbon reserves can be much higher than those suggested by the most optimistic forecasts. On the one hand, Caspian gas should be available when the industrial world needs it badly. On the other hand, Caspian gas won't be a rival for Russian gas and a source of contention between Russia and its neighbors in Central Asia.

Where the two huge pipelines run side by side, where a joint exploitation system exists, one will naturally expect to have a transcontinental highway and info-highway—a powerful communication line originating from Europe and going further to the south.

These prospects are both exciting and distant. However, they should be taken into account when addressing today's problems. No doubt, the global economy does have enough investment resources for such a large-scale project. The U.S. Congress has given \$40 billion for primary measures to safeguard national security. Much less investment is needed to ensure energy security of the industrial states. Especially as it is much more reasonable and profitable to invest in crisis prevention than in recovering from them.

A pipeline bridge between the Caspian region and Western Europe, Central Asia and the world's oceans will help solve the problem of the globalization of Eurasian energy resources. It could become a basis for an "arc of stability" in Europe. It not only shifts the so-called arc of tension running close to Russia from the Balkans via the Caucasus, Central Asia, Iran, and Afghanistan, but will also exclude the Caspian states—the critical link—from this chain. When involved in the global economy, these countries could turn into strongholds of stability in a part of Asia that today poses major threats to the world.●

#### IN HONOR OF LUCY S. CICILLINE ON HER 90TH BIRTHDAY

● Mr. REED. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to recognize a dear friend on her 90th birthday.

Lucy Cicilline, the daughter of Italian immigrants, was born Lucy Miragliuolo on December 26, 1911 in Providence, RI.

Lucy is the mother of four, the grandmother of twenty-one and the great grandmother of twenty-five. But more than this, Lucy is a vital, active personality who has always lent a helping hand to others.

When I was a boy, Lucy lived close to our family's summer home at Scarborough Beach in Narragansett, RI. Together with her husband, John, and her children, she was a wonderful friend to me and to my family. Always a kind and caring person, she showered her affection and attention on all her neighbors. As a nurse, it was Lucy who tended to my injured elbows and knees, and sometimes bruised spirit, during all the times I fell down and encountered the other mishaps of childhood.

As a Registered Nurse, employed at St. Joseph's Hospital in Providence, Lucy shared her kind and giving personality with her patients until her retirement.

But retirement did not stop her either. In 1980, at the age of sixty-nine and after the death of her husband of forty-seven years, Lucy decided it was time for her to learn how to drive.

Lucy approached this task with the same dogged determination and positive attitude that she has with everything in her life. She took driving lessons, received her license and continued to drive for the next ten years until her declining eyesight took her off the road.

Still, despite her eyesight and her getting on in years, Lucy is an important member of her community. For over fifty years, she has been contributing to the St. Joseph's Indian Tribe and has been named an honorary member of their community.

Now at the Village at Waterman Lake in Smithfield, RI, Lucy is an active adult who exercises and socializes with her fellow residents.

When I think of Lucy Cicilline, I recall the magic days of youth when I was surrounded and protected by adults like my parents and the Cicillines who set an extraordinary example of kindness and commitment to faith and family and country. At many moments in my life, I drew on those memories for inspiration and strength. Her example is with me today.

So today, I would like to thank Lucy for her kindness and her friendship and also wish her the happiest of birthdays.●

#### THE URGENT NEED FOR BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE

● Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I rise to submit for the RECORD an article written by Brian T. Kennedy, vice president of the Claremont Institute, entitled "The Urgent Need for Ballistic Missile Defense." Published in the *Imprimis* publication of Hillsdale College, Mr. Kennedy persuasively argues that "the United States is defenseless against [the] mortal danger . . . of a ballistic missile attack."

In view of the events of September 11, I commend this article to the Senate for review as a cautionary warning to the U.S. Government of the potential danger of failing to meet its fundamental constitutional obligation to "provide for the common defense."

The article follows.

[From *Imprimis*, Nov. 2001]

#### THE URGENT NEED FOR BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE

(By Brian T. Kennedy)

On September 11, our nation's enemies attacked us using hijacked airliners. Next time, the vehicles of death and destruction might well be ballistic missiles armed with nuclear, chemical, or biological warheads. And let us be clear: The United States is defenseless against this mortal danger. We would today have to suffer helplessly a ballistic missile attack, just as we suffered helplessly on September 11. But the dead would number in the millions and a constitutional crisis would likely ensue, because the survivors would wonder—with good reason—if their government were capable of carrying out its primary constitutional duty to "provide for the common defense."

#### THE THREAT IS REAL

The attack of September 11 should not be seen as a fanatical act of individuals like

Osama Bin Laden, but as deliberate act of a consortium of nations who hope to remove the U.S. from its strategic positions in the Middle East, in Asia and the Pacific, and in Europe. It is the belief of such nations that the U.S. can be made to abandon its allies, such as Israel, if the cost of standing by them becomes too high. It is not altogether unreasonable for our enemies to act on such a belief. The failure of U.S. political leadership, over a period of two decades, to respond proportionately to terrorist attacks on Americans in Lebanon, to the first World Trade Center bombing, to the attack on the Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia, to the bombings of U.S. embassies abroad, and most recently to the attack on the USS Cole in Yemen, likely emboldened them. They may also have been encouraged by observing our government's unwillingness to defend Americans against ballistic missiles. For all of the intelligence failures leading up to September 11, we know with absolute certainty that various nations are spending billions of dollars to build or acquire strategic ballistic missiles with which to attack and blackmail the United States. Yet even now, under a president who supports it, missile defense advances at a glacial pace.

Who are these enemy nations, in whose interest it is to press the U.S. into retreating from the world stage? Despite the kind words of Russian President Vladimir Putin, encouraging a "tough response" to the terrorist attack of September 11, we know that it is the Russian and Chinese governments that are supplying our enemies in Iraq, Iran, Libya, and North Korea with the ballistic missile technology to terrorize our nation. Is it possible that Russia and China don't understand the consequences of transferring this technology? Are Vladimir Putin and Jiang Zemin unaware that countries like Iran and Iraq are known sponsors of terrorism? In light of the absurdity of these questions, it is reasonable to assume that Russia and China transfer this technology as a matter of high government policy, using these rogue states as proxies to destabilize the West because they have an interest in expanding their power, and because they know that only the U.S. can stand in their way.

We should also note that ballistic missiles can be used not only to kill and destroy, but to commit geopolitical blackmail. In February of 1996, during a confrontation between mainland China and our democratic ally on Taiwan, Lt. Gen. Xiong Guang Kai, a senior Chinese official, made an implicit nuclear threat against the U.S., warning our government not to interfere because Americans "care more about Los Angeles than they do Taipei." With a minimum of 20 Chinese intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) currently aimed at the U.S., such threats must be taken seriously.

#### THE STRATEGIC TERROR OF BALLISTIC MISSILES

China possesses the DF-5 ballistic missile with a single, four-megaton warhead. Such a warhead could destroy an area of 87.5 square miles, or roughly all of Manhattan, with its daily population of three million people. Even more devastating is the Russian SS-18, which has a range of 7,500 miles and is capable of carrying a single, 24-megaton warhead or multiple warheads ranging from 550 to 750 kilotons.

Imagine a ballistic missile attack on New York or Los Angeles, resulting in the death of three to eight million Americans. Beyond the staggering loss of human life, this would take a devastating political and economic toll. Americans' faith in their government—a government that allowed such an attack—would be shaken to its core. As for the economic shock, consider that damages from the September 11 attack, minor by comparison, are estimated by some economists to be