Thank goodness, I can come to the floor of the House and speak my piece. And as long as C-SPAN cameras are running, well, it will not be cut off, but I understand there is even an effort to try and limit C-SPAN’s access to American households.

But I have to tell my colleagues something. As I saw the African Americans, mostly African American families ripped apart, I could only think about slavery, families ripped apart, herded into what looked like concentration camps, mostly African American families. I was reminded of a Miami Herald article written on July 5, the day after Freedom Day, 1987.

The title of the article was “Reagan Aides and the Secret Government,” and here is a quote from that article: “A copy of the memo was obtained by the Herald. The scenario outlined in the Brinkerhoff memo resembles somewhat a paper Gliufreda had written in 1970 at the Army War College in Carlyle, Pennsylvania, in which he advocated martial law in case of a national uprising by black militants. In which he advocated martial law in case of a national uprising by black militants. The paper also advocated the roundup and transfer of two ‘assembly centers or relocation camps of at least 21 million Negroes.’”

Now, I did not write that; the U.S. Government wrote that. They were going to round up 21 million Negroes because they were afraid of freeing black people. A story of neglect? I am not surprised about any story of neglect of the people that comes from this body with this set of priorities, that passes these kinds of budgets on the backs of the American people, these kinds of tax cuts on the backs of the American people.

I want to commend my sister Congresswoman, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Lee), who has said that it is time for us to get serious about poverty in this country. It is time for us to frame a proud cognizant of legislation with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Lee). I will just conclude by saying that on the United States State Department Web site is “How to identify misinformation.” Does the story fit the pattern of a conspiracy theory?

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. King of Iowa). The Chair must remind the gentlewoman from Georgia that it is out of order in debate to ascribe unworthy motives to the President.

U.S. AGGRESSIVE INTERVENTIONISM POLICY IS MISGUIDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Doggett) was recognized for 60 minutes. Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, many reasons have been given for why we fight and our youth must die in Iraq. The reasons now given for why we must continue this war bear no resemblance to the reasons given to gain the support of the American people and the United States Congress prior to our invasion in March of 2003.

Before we were told we faced an imminent threat to our national security from Saddam Hussein. This rationale, now proven grossly mistaken, has been changed. Now we are told we must honor the fallen by completing the mission. To do otherwise would dishonor the sacrifice of those who have died or been wounded.

Any lack of support for completing the mission is said by the promoters of the war to be unpatriotic, un-American, and detrimental to the troops. They insist the only way one can support the troops is to never waver on the policy of nation-building, no matter how ill-founded that policy may be.

The obvious flaw in this argument is that the mission of which they so frequently speak was ordered constantly from the very beginning.

Though most people think this war started in March of 2003, the seeds were sown many years before. The actual military conflict involving U.S. troops in the Middle East began in 1981. The prelude to this actually goes back over 100 years when the value of Middle East oil was recognized by the industrialized West. Our use of troops to eject Saddam Hussein from Kuwait was the beginning of our current conflict with the Muslim fundamentalists who have been, for the last decade, determined to force the removal of American troops from all Muslim countries, especially the entire Arabian peninsula, which they consider holy. Though the strategic and historic reasons for our involvement in the Middle East are complex, the immediate reasons given in 2002 and 2003 for our invasion of Iraq were precise. The only problem is, they were not based on reality.

The desire by American policymakers to engineer regime change in Iraq had been smoldering since the first Persian Gulf conflict in 1991. This reflected a dramatic shift in our policy since, in the 1980s, we maintained a friendly alliance with Saddam Hussein as we assisted him in his war against our arch nemesis, the Iranian Ayatollah.

Most Americans ignore that we provided assistance to this ruthless dictator with biological and chemical weapon technologies. We heard no complaints in the 1980s about his treatment of the Kurds and the Shiites or the ruthless war he waged against Iran. Our policy toward Iraq played a major role in convincing Saddam Hussein he had free reign in the Middle East, and the results demonstrate the serious shortcomings of our foreign policy of interventionism that we have followed now for over 100 years.

In 1998, Congress capitulated to the desires of the previous administration and overwhelmingly passed the Iraq Liberation Act, which stated quite clearly that our policy was to get rid of Saddam Hussein. This act made it official, quote: “The policy of the United States is to support efforts to remove the regime headed by Saddam Hussein.” This resolution has been cited on numerous occasions by neoconservatives as justification for the preemptive and deliberate invasion of Iraq.

When the resolution was debated, I saw it as a significant step toward a war that would bear no good fruit. No legitimate national security concerns were cited for this dramatic and serious shift in policy.

Shortly after the new administration took office in January 2001, this goal of eliminating Saddam Hussein quickly morphed into a policy of remaking the entire Middle East, starting with regime change in Iraq. This aggressive interventionist policy surprised some people, since the victorious 2000 campaign indicated we should pursue a foreign policy of humility, no nation-building, reduce deployment of troops overseas, and a rejection of the notion that we serve as the world’s policeman.

□ 1915

1915 The 9/11 disaster proved a catalyst to push for invading Iraq and restructuring the entire Middle East. Although the plan had existed for years, it quickly was recognized that the fear engendered by the 9/11 attacks could be used to mobilize the American people and Congress to support this war. Nevertheless, supposedly legitimate reasons had to be given for the already planned preemptive war; and as we now know, the intelligence had to be fixed to the policy.

Immediately after 9/11, the American people were led to believe that Saddam Hussein somehow was responsible for the attacks. The fact that Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden were enemies, not friends, was kept from the public by a compliant media and the lazy Congress. Even today many Americans still are convinced of an alliance between the two.

The truth is Saddam Hussein never permitted al Qaeda into Iraq out of fear that his secular government would be challenged. And yet, today, we find that al Qaeda is now very much present in Iraq and causing chaos there.

The administration repeatedly pumped out alarming propaganda that Saddam Hussein was a threat to us with his weapons of mass destruction, meaning nuclear, biological and chemical. Since we helped Saddam Hussein obtain biological and chemical weapons in the 1980s, we assumed that he had maintained a large supply, which, of course, turned out not to be true. The people being frightened by 9/11 easily accepted these fear-mongering charges.

Behind the scenes many were quite aware that Israel’s influence on our foreign policy played a role. She had argued for years along with the neoconservatives for an Iraq regime change. This support was nicely coordinated with the Christian-Zionist enthusiasm for the war.
As these reasons for the war lost credibility and support, other reasons were found for why we had to fight. As the lone superpower, we were told we had a greater responsibility to settle the problems of the world lest someone else get involved.

Maintaining and expanding our empire is a key element of the neoconservative philosophy. This notion that we must fight to spread American goodness was well received by the neo-Jacobins. They saw the war as a legitimate moral crusade, arguing that no one should be allowed to stand in our way. In their minds, using force to spread democracy is legitimate and necessary.

We also were told the war was necessary for national security purposes because of the threat Saddam Hussein presented, although the evidence was fabricated. Saddam Hussein’s ability to attack using administration in the United States was not properly explained to the American people were ripe for alarming predictions by those who wanted this war.

Of course, the routine canard for oil need finance, and middle around the world ever since the Korean War was repeated incessantly. U.N. resolutions had to be in forced lest the United Nations be discredited. The odd thing was that on this occasion the United States itself did everything possible to stop our preemptive attack. As it turned out, Saddam Hussein was a lot closer to compliance than anyone dreamed.

It was not long before concern for the threat of Saddam Hussein became near hysterical, distracting or any reasoned opposition to the planned war. The one argument that was not publicly used by those who propagated for the war may well be the most important: oil. Though the author, himself, did everything possible to stop our preemptive attack, as it turned out, Saddam Hussein was a lot closer to compliance than anyone dreamed.

World War I changed all this, allowing the French and the British to divide the oil wealth of the entire Middle East. The Versailles Treaty created the artificial nation of Iraq, and it was not long before American oil companies were drilling and struggling to participate in the Middle East Oil. But it was never smooth sailing for any occupying force in Iraq.

After World War I, the British generals, upon arriving to secure their oil, said, “Our cars come into your cities and lands as conquerors or enemies, but as liberators.” Not long afterwards a jihad was declared against Britain, and eventually they were forced to leave. The more things change, the more they stay the same. Too bad we are not better at studying history.

After World War II, the U.S. emerged as the number one world power and moved to assume what some believe was our responsibility to control Middle Eastern oil wealth of the entire Middle East. The Versailles Treaty created the artificial nation of Iraq, and it was not long before American oil companies were drilling and struggling to participate in the Middle East.

This role prompted us to use our CIA, along with the help of the British, to oust democratically elected Mohammad Mosaddeq from power in Iran and install the Shah as a U.S. puppet.

We not only supported Saddam Hussein against Iran; we also supported Osama bin Laden in the 1980s, aggravating the situation in the Middle East and causing unintended consequences. We did not only support Saddam Hussein against Iran; we also supported Saddam Hussein against the Soviets. This role prompted us to use our CIA, along with the help of the British, to oust democratically elected Mohammad Mosaddeq from power in Iran and install the Shah as a U.S. puppet.

We were told that the war was tragic to watch; but the notion that Saddam Hussein, a Third World punk, without an air force, navy and hardly an army, or any anti-aircraft weaponry, was an outright threat to the United States 6,000 miles away tells you how hysterical fear can be used to pursue a policy of needless war for quite different reasons.

Today, though, all the old reasons for going to war have been discredited and we are no longer used to justify continuing the war. Now we are told we must complete the mission, and yet no one seems to know exactly what the mission is or when it can be achieved. By contrast, when war is properly declared against a country, we can expect an all-out effort until the country surrenders. Without a declaration of war, as the Constitution requires, it is left to the President to decide when to start war and when to stop.

We had sad experiences with this process in Korea and especially in Vietnam.

Pursuing this war merely to save face or to claim it is a way to honor those who have already died or been wounded is hardly a reason that more people should die.

We are told that we cannot leave until we have a democratic Iraq. But what if Iraq votes to have a Shiite theocracy, which it looks like the majority wants as their form of government, and women, Christians and Sunnis are made second-class citizens?

It is a preposterous notion and points out the severe shortcomings of a democracy where a majority rules and minorities suffer. Thankfully, our Founding Fathers understood the great dangers of a democracy. They insisted on a constitutional Republic with a weak central government and an executive branch beholden to the legislative branch in foreign affairs.

The same is true of us. We cannot afford this war, the better. We have gotten ourselves into a civil war within the Islamic community. But could it
be, as it had been for over a hundred years prior to our invasion, that oil really is the driving issue behind a foreign presence in the Middle East?

It is rather ironic that the consequence of our intervention has been skyrocketing oil prices, with Iraqi oil production significantly below pre-war levels. If democracy is not all it is cracked up to be, and a war for oil is blatantly immoral and unproductive, the question remains, why do we fight? More precisely, why should we fight, given the potential for much killing enough? Why does man so casually accept war, which brings so much suffering to so many, when so little is achieved?

Why do those who suffer and die so willingly accept the excuses for the wars that need not be fought? Why do so many defer to those who are enthused about war and who claim it is a solution to a problem without asking them why they themselves do not fight? It is always other men and other men’s sons that must sacrifice their life and limb for reasons that make no sense, reasons that are said to be our patriotic duty to fight and die for. How many useless wars have been fought for lies that deserved no hearing? When will it all end?

Since no logical answers can be given for why we fight, it might be better to fight about why we should not fight. A case can be made that if this war does not end soon it will spread and engulf the entire region. We have already been warned that war against Iran is an option that remains on the table for reasons no more reliable than those given for the preemptive strike against Iraq.

Let me give you a few reasons why this war in Iraq should not be fought. It is not in our national interest. On the contrary, pursuing this war endangers our security, increases the chances of a domestic terrorist attack, weakens our defenses, and motivates our enemies to join together in opposition to our domineering presence around the world. Does anyone believe that Russia, China, and Iran will give us free rein over the entire Middle East and its oil?

Tragically, we are setting the stage for a much bigger conflict. It is possible that this war could evolve into something much worse than Vietnam.

This war has never been declared. It is not a constitutional war; and without a proper beginning, there can be no proper ending. The vaguinesstills doubts in all Americans, both supporters and non-supporters, as to what will be accomplished. Supporters of the war want total victory, which is not achievable with a vague mission.

We should not fight because it is simply not worth it. What are we going to get for nearly 2,000 soldier deaths and 20,000 severe casualties? Was the $350 billion worth it? This is a cost that will be passed on to future generations through an expanded national debt. I will bet most Americans can think of a lot better ways to have spent this money.

Today’s program of guns and butter will be more damaging to our economy than a similar program was in the 1960s which gave us the stagflation of the 1970s. The economic imbalances today are much greater than they were in those decades. Eventually we will come to realize that the Wilsonian idealism of using America’s resources to promote democracy worldwide through force is a seriously flawed policy.

Wilson pretended to be spreading democracy worldwide, and yet women in the U.S. at that time were not even allowed to vote.

Democracy where the majority dictates who is to be the rule of the country, and individual rights. In addition, using our force to impose our will on others almost always backfires. There is no reason that our efforts in the 21st century to impose a Western-style government in Iraq would be any more successful than the British were after World War I. This especially cannot work if democracy is only an excuse for our occupation and the real reasons are left unrecognized.

It boils down to the fact that we do not really have any sound reasons for continuing this fight. The original reasons for the war and the new reasons are not credibility. We hear only that we must carry on so those who have already suffered death and injury did not do so in vain.

If the original reasons for starting the war were false, simply continuing the same reason for it makes no sense. More loss of life can never justify earlier loss of life if they died for false reasons. This being the case, it is time to reassess the policies that have gotten us into this mess.

The mess we face in the Middle East and Afghanistan and the threat of terrorism within our own borders are not a result of the policies of this administration alone. Problems have been building for many years and have only gotten much worse with our most recent policy of forcibly imposing regime change on Iraq. We have allowed that the stalemate in Korea, the loss in Vietnam, and the quagmire in Iraq and Afghanistan all result from the same flawed foreign policy of interventionism that our government has pursued for over 100 years.

It would be overly simplistic to say that the current administration alone is responsible for the mess in Iraq. By rejecting the advice of the Founders and our early Presidents, our leaders have drifted away from the admonitions against entangling alliance and nation-building. Policing the world is not our calling or our mandate. Besides, the Constitution does not permit it. Undeclared wars have not enhanced our national security.

The consensus on foreign interventionism has been pervasive. Both major parties have come to accept our role as the police of the world. Periodic campaign rhetoric notwithstanding. The media in particular, especially in the early stages, propagate in favor...
of war. It is only when the costs become prohibitive and the war loses popular support that the media criticize the effort.

It is not only our Presidents that deserve the blame when they overstep their authority and lead the country into inappropriate wars. Congress deserves equally severe criticism for acquiescing to the demands of the executive to go needlessly to war. It has been known throughout history that kings, dictators, and the executive branch of government has been overly eager to go to war. This is precisely why our Founders tried desperately to keep decisions about going to war in the hands of the legislature. But this process has failed, failed, failed us for the last 65 years.

Congress routinely has rubber-stamped the plans of our Presidents and even the United Nations to enter into war through the back door. Congress at any time can prevent and stop all undue foreign entanglements pursued by the executive branch merely by refusing to finance them.

The current Iraq war now going on for 15 years spans the administration of three Presidents and many Congresses controlled by both parties. This makes Congress every bit as responsible for the current quagmire as the President. But the real problem is the acceptance by our country as a whole of the principle of meddling in the internal affairs of other nations even when unrelated to our national security.

Intervention, no matter how well intended, inevitably boomerangs and comes back to haunt us. Minding our own business is not only economical, but it is the only policy that serves our national security interests and the cause of peace.

The neoconservatives who want to remake the entire Middle East are not interested in the pertinent history of this region. They are writing an artificial Iraq after World War I as a unified country is like mixing water and oil. It has only led to frustration, anger and hostilities with the resulting instability creating conditions ripe for dictatorships.

The occupying forces will not permit any of the three regions of Iraq to gov- ern themselves. This is strictly motivated by a desire to exert control over the oil. Self-determination and independence are two concepts that never mingled. The result of an artificial Iraq after World War I as a unified country is like mixing water and oil. It has only led to frustration, anger and hostilities with the resulting instability creating conditions ripe for dictatorships.

The occupying forces will not permit any of the three regions of Iraq to govern themselves. This is strictly motivated by a desire to exert control over the oil. Self-determination and independence are two concepts that never mingled. The result of an artificial Iraq after World War I as a unified country is like mixing water and oil. It has only led to frustration, anger and hostilities with the resulting instability creating conditions ripe for dictatorships.

The occupying forces will not permit any of the three regions of Iraq to govern themselves. This is strictly motivated by a desire to exert control over the oil. Self-determination and independence are two concepts that never mingled. The result of an artificial Iraq after World War I as a unified country is like mixing water and oil. It has only led to frustration, anger and hostilities with the resulting instability creating conditions ripe for dictatorships.

The occupying forces will not permit any of the three regions of Iraq to govern themselves. This is strictly motivated by a desire to exert control over the oil. Self-determination and independence are two concepts that never mingled. The result of an artificial Iraq after World War I as a unified country is like mixing water and oil. It has only led to frustration, anger and hostilities with the resulting instability creating conditions ripe for dictatorships.
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American people realize that war dealing with foreign affairs will change months, not years. States as soon as possible, within control of the oil must be trans- on the Arabian peninsula must be for a long time to come. expect to be in Iraq and running Iraq future in Baghdad sends a message, like billion, must be cancelled. This struc- ward us.

lim Nations only elicit more hatred to- promote security, while bases in Mus- mote their superior way of life. Is it in the United States in order to pro- tary edge on us and laid claims to the troubled land. go a long way to bringing peace to a

tory. Sophisticated weapons and the use of unlimited military power is no substitute for diplomacy designed to promote peace while reserving force only for defending our national interests. Changing our policy of meddling in the affairs of others will not come easi- ly or quickly, but a few signals to indi- cate a change in our attitude would go a long way to bringing peace to a troubled land.

First, we must soon, and Congress can do this through the budget process, stop the construction of all permanent bases in Iraq and any other Muslim country in the region. Think of how we would react if the Chinese had the military edge on us and laid claims to the Gulf of Mexico and building bases within- in the Eni'ji States in order to pro- mote their superior way of life. Is it not ironic that we close down bases here at home while building new ones overseas? Domestic bases might well promote security, while bases in Mus- lim Nations only elicit more hatred to- ward us.

Second, the plans for the biggest U.S. embassy in the world, costing nearly $1 billion, must be cancelled. This struc- ture in Baghdad sends a message, like the military bases being built, that we expect to be in Iraq and running Iraq for a long time to come.

Third, all military forces in Iraq and on the Arabian peninsula must be moved offshore at the earliest time possible. All responsibility for security and defense of the oil must be trans- ferred to the Iraqis from the United States as soon as possible, within months, not years.

The time will come when our policies dealing with foreign affairs will change for the better, but that will be because we can no longer afford the extra- vangance of war. This will occur when the American people realize that war causes too much suffering here at home and the benefits of peace again become attractive to us all. Part of this rec- ognition will involve a big drop in the value of the dollar, higher interest rates, and rampant price inflation.

Though these problems are serious and can be announced and way of life, there is every reason to work for the traditional constitutional foreign policy that promotes peace over war, while not being tempted to mold the world in our image through force. We must show our will did not achieve by military force in Vietnam was essentially achieved with the peace that came from our military failure and withdrawal of our Armed Forces. Today, through trade and peace, U.S. investments and economic cooperation has Westernized Vietnam far more than our military efforts ever could have.

We must remember, initiating force to impose our will on others negates all the goodness for which we profess to stand. We cannot be fighting to secure our freedom while we impose laws like the PATRIOT Act and the national ID card on the American people.

Unfortunately, we have lost faith and confidence in the system of govern- ment with which we have been blessed. Today, too many Americans support, at least in the early stages, the use of force to spread our message of hope and freedom. They too often are confused by the rhetoric that our armies are needed to spread American goodness. Using force injudiciously, instead of spreading the worthy message of Amer- ican freedom through peaceful means, antagonizes our enemies, alienates our allies and threatens personal liberties here at home while burdening our econ- omy.

If confidence cannot be restored in our American traditions of peace and trade, our influence throughout the world would be enhanced just as it was once we rejected the military approach in Vietnam.

This change in policy can come easi- ly once the people of this country de- cide that there is a better way to con- duct ourselves throughout the world. Whenever the people turn against war as a tool to promote certain beliefs, the war ceases. That is what we need today. Then we can get down to the business of setting an example of how peace and freedom brings prosperity in an atmosphere that allows for excellence and virtue to thrive.

A powerful bureaucratic military state negates all efforts to preserve these conditions that have served America so well up until recent times. That is not what the American dream is all about. Without a change in atti- tude, the American dream dies. A sim- ple change that restates the principles of liberty enshrined in our constitu- tion will be well in solving all the problems we face. The American people are up to the task. I hope the Congress is as well.

Therefore, the greater number who have died, the greater is the motiva- tion to complete the mission. This de- fies logic. This argument to persevere has been used throughout history to continue wars that could and should have ended much sooner. This was es- pecially true for World War I and Viet- nam.

A sad realism struck me recently reading how our Marines in Afghan- stan must now rely on donkey trans- portation in their efforts at Nation building by occupying. Inde- dently, the Taliban is alive and well, as Osama bin Laden remains in this re- gion. But does this not tell us some- thing about our naive assumption that our economic advantages and our tech- nical knowledge can subdue and con- trol anybody?

We are traversing the Afghan moun- tains on donkeys and losing lives daily in Baghdad with homemade, primitive bombs. Our power and dominance clearly limited by the determination of those who see us as occupiers, prov- ing that just more money and sophisti- cated weapons will not bring us vici- tory. Sophisticated weapons and the use of unlimited military power is no substitute for diplomacy designed to promote peace while reserving force only for defending our national inter- ests.

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN TERRORIST ATTACKS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 109-54)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid be- fore the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emer- gencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1622(d), provides for the automatic termination of a na- tional emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the Federal Reg- ister and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniver- sary date. Consistent with this provi- sion, I have sent to the Federal Register the closed notice, stating that the emergency declared with respect to the terrorist attacks on the United States of September 11, 2001, is to continue in effect for an additional year.

The terrorist threat that led to the declaration on September 14, 2001, of a national emergency continues. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue in effect after September 14, 2005, the national emer- gency with respect to the terrorist threat.

WASHINGTON, D.C., September 8, 2005.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE.

SUSPENDING CERTAIN PROVI- SIONS OF UNITED STATES CODE IN RESPONSE TO NATIONAL EMERGENCY CAUSED BY HURRICANE KATRINA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 109-55)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid be- fore the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together