

about all that we were told about Vietnam and about the mystical war against communism.”

The larger struggle against communism commonly referred to as the Cold War was both just and necessary. Yet the furies evoked by irresponsible (or cowardly) politicians more interested in partisan advantage than in advancing the common good transformed the Cold War from an enterprise governed by reason into one driven by fear. Beginning with McCarthyism and the post-1945 Red Scare and continuing on through phantasms such as the domino theory, bomber gap, missile gap, and the putative threat to our survival posed by a two-bit Cuban revolutionary, panic induced policies that were reckless, wrong-headed, and unnecessary, with Vietnam being just one particularly egregious example.

The mystical war against communism finds its counterpart in the mystical war on terrorism. As in the 1960s, so too today: mystification breeds misunderstanding and misjudgment. It prevents us from seeing things as they are.

As a direct result, it leads us to exaggerate the importance of places like Afghanistan and indeed to exaggerate the jihadist threat, which falls well short of being existential. It induces flights of fancy so that otherwise sensible people conjure up visions of providing clean water, functioning schools, and good governance to Afghanistan's 40,000 villages, with expectations of thereby winning Afghan hearts and minds. It causes people to ignore considerations of cost. With the Long War already this nation's second most expensive conflict, trailing only World War II, and with the federal government projecting trillion-dollar deficits for years to come, how much can we afford and where is the money coming from?

For political reasons the Obama administration may have banished the phrase “global war on terror,” yet the conviction persists that the United States is called upon to dominate or liberate or transform the Greater Middle East. Methods may be shifting, with the emphasis on pacification giving way to militarized nation-building. Priorities may be changing, Af-Pak now supplanting Iraq as the main effort. But by whatever name, the larger enterprise continues. The president who vows to “change the way Washington works” has not yet exhibited the imagination needed to conceive of an alternative to the project that his predecessor began.

The urgent need is to de-mystify that project, which was from the outset a misguided one. Just as in the 1960s we possessed neither the wisdom nor the means needed to determine the fate of Southeast Asia, so today we possess neither the wisdom nor the means necessary to determine the fate of the Greater Middle East. To persist in efforts to do so—as the Obama administration appears intent on doing in Afghanistan—will simply replicate on an even greater scale mistakes like those that Bruce Palmer and John Kerry once rightly decried.

I further read and want to close and then make a few comments with this. This is the last paragraph. Let me say about Andrew Bacevich, he, himself, was a Vietnam veteran. He, himself, was a veteran of Desert Storm. He, himself, taught at West Point. He lost a son in 2007, a young lieutenant who was killed in Iraq. So I think he brings great credibility to this article that he has written.

This is the last paragraph in the article. “The urgent need is to demystify that project, which was from the out-

set a misguided one. Just as in the 1960s we possessed neither the wisdom nor the means needed to determine the fate of Southeast Asia, so today we possess neither the wisdom nor the means necessary to determine the fate of the Greater Middle East.

“To persist in efforts to do so—as the Obama administration appears intent on doing in Afghanistan—will simply replicate on an even greater scale mistakes like those that Bruce Palmer and JOHN KERRY once rightly decried.”

Madam Speaker, I bring this forward because my friend from Massachusetts, JIM MCGOVERN, has put a bill in that would say simply to the Secretary of Defense: You need to come to the Congress and tell the Congress what the exit strategy is for Afghanistan. Some people would say end point.

Let me briefly explain, having an exit strategy and saying that to the Congress, you don't have to say in 2009, 2010, or 2015 or 2020, but tell the American people where we are going when we send our young men and boys and girls to die in Afghanistan without a plan, without benchmarks.

So, Madam Speaker, I don't know if Mr. MCGOVERN's amendment has been approved for debate tomorrow on the Armed Services bill, but I want to thank Mr. MCGOVERN for bringing this to the attention of the American people and the Congress, because we need to have benchmarks. We need to have an end point to the strategy in Afghanistan.

The military, I know, from marines down in my district, will tell you that our military is tired. They're worn out. They'll keep going back and forth, back and forth because they love this Nation and they love defending America. But we've got to be realistic about breaking the military, because we have got North Korea over here threatening. We've got the Chinese. We don't know what they might do. Yet we need to have a plan for victory in Afghanistan. We cannot do what the Bush administration did in Iraq and keep going on and on.

Madam Speaker, as I close, as I do every night on this floor, I have signed over 8,000 letters to families and extended families who have lost loved ones in Afghanistan and Iraq. I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform. I ask God to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform, and I ask God in his loving arms to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Madam Speaker, I ask three times; God, please, God please, God, please continue to bless America.

REPORT ON H.R. 2997, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Ms. KAPTUR, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privi-

leged report (Rept. No. 111-181) on the bill (H.R. 2997) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### THE AMERICAN CLEAN ENERGY AND SECURITY ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. From its very beginning in the House Energy and Commerce Committee, H.R. 2454, the American Clean Energy and Security Act of 2009, has been forced upon Members of Congress with little time to consider the significant and potentially damaging consequences of this legislation.

On June 12th of this month, the Committee on Agriculture, on which I serve, held a 7-hour hearing to review this bill. We quickly learned that there is little solid economic analysis on how this legislation will affect our economy. Preliminary evidence makes it clear it will increase the cost of energy and, with it, the cost of everything we use in our lives on a daily basis.

We do know that the Congressional Budget Office has said this bill will raise government revenue by \$846 billion over the next 10 years. In everyday terms, that means a huge tax increase. \$846 billion, however, is just the beginning.

H.R. 2454 is permanent, and after the 10-year period analyzed by the CBO, free carbon allowances are phased out, auctioned carbon allowances are phased in, and total allowances are reduced. This means that future generations will be forced to pay much more than that indicated in the initial 10-year budget estimate.

Although billed as cap-and-trade, in reality Waxman-Markey is a cap-and-tax bill. Instead of government directly levying a tax, this legislation disguises that tax as a carbon allowance auction that subsequently requires electrical generation companies, petroleum, and other biofuel refiners, manufacturers, and others to collect the tax through increased costs.

The consequences go far beyond the price and our ability to turn on the lights in rural America. Kansans, who

must always travel great distances to work, to school, and to receive their medical care, will pay disproportionately compared to those who have shorter distances to travel and can use public transportation.

Some had hope that agriculture and rural America would actually benefit, somehow be made whole under this legislation. Under Waxman-Markey, this clearly is not the case.

Despite great potential for agriculture to sequester carbon, agriculture is not mentioned once in the section that defines offsets. Instead, H.R. 2454 directs the EPA to define the world of carbon offsets. This will lead to few benefits for farmers and ranchers and will allow the EPA to further intrude upon our farms.

EPA has consistently made harmful decisions that fail the test of common sense. Unless agricultural offsets are expressly defined and sole authority is given to the Department of Agriculture, farmers will never see benefits from this legislation.

But even if those offsets are defined and USDA is given that authority, it is difficult to see how agriculture will overcome the increased cost of inputs caused by this cap-and-tax system. In the best case scenario under Waxman-Markey, a farmer could mitigate 10 to 50 percent of the cost of the legislation. In the worst case scenario, farmers and ranchers could find themselves unable to access the carbon offset market at all and be forced to bear the full cost of this legislation. Either way, any hope for profitability in agriculture is bleak.

I am especially concerned about the livestock sector. Unlike crop farmers, ranch operations and feed yards have few opportunities to accumulate carbon offsets.

Much emphasis has been placed upon our Nation's economic recovery since the market collapse of last fall. This bill is almost certain to destroy any chance of economic recovery if enacted in its current form.

Congress should be allowed to obtain sound technical and economic analysis and address this legislation's many, many, many flaws. If further legislative debate is denied, then we must do what common sense demands and defeat this bill. Congress rarely gets things right when we have ample time to properly consider policy changes, but it has never made good decisions when rushed by arbitrary timetables.

Congress should abandon the current pace set by the Speaker of the House. Otherwise, Members of Congress will have abdicated their responsibilities and farmers and ranchers, rural America, and in fact, the entire country will suffer the consequences.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HER NAME WAS NEDA: A GENERATIONAL CHANCE FOR FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McCOTTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCOTTER. Her name was Neda. In Farsi, it means "the voice." True to her name, she loved music, sought freedom, and she's dead, shot down in the streets by the Iranian regime's state-sanctioned murderers. She must not have died in vain.

Today, Iranians and Americans face a generational chance for freedom—one that ensures a rogue regime's implosion prevents a nuclear confrontation.

Regrettably, our President's "post-American" foreign policy presumes talk can thaw the murderous mullahs' hearts and attain a "grand bargain" for peace in our time; consequently, while Iranians demanded their freedom from a barbarous regime, the President rapidly opined: "It is up to Iranians to make decisions about who Iran's leaders will be. We respect Iranian sovereignty."

Then, as the crisis escalated, the President optimistically noted, "You've seen in Iran some initial reaction from the supreme leader that indicates he understands the Iranian people have deep concerns about the election. And my hope is that the Iranian people will make the right steps in order for them to be able to express their voices, to express their aspirations."

Tragically, the supreme leader's deep concern drove him to step on the throats of pro-democracy protestors, like Neda.

Next, on June 20, the President stated, "The universal rights to assembly and free speech must be respected, and the United States stands with all who seek to exercise those rights." It was painfully evident just how far behind them he stood. "The last thing that I want to do is to have the United States be a foil for those forces inside Iran who would love nothing better than make this an argument about the United States."

With these contradictory statements of support and appeasement, the President returned to square one. "The Iranian people will ultimately judge the actions of their own government. If the Iranian Government seeks the respect of the international community, it must respect the dignity of its own people and govern through consent, not coercion."

In truth, the Iranian people have already judged the regime and found it wanting. The supreme leader, his cleric cronies and their puppet government have never respected the dignity of the Iranian people or governed through consent. This is why the regime stole the election and shoots peaceful, pro-democracy demonstrators. Implying otherwise mocks the Iranians risking and losing their lives for liberty.

As for the claim that American "meddling" in support of the dem-

onstrators plays into the mullahs' hands, the Iranian regime will claim this regardless, for as our President noted, "That's what they do."

Yet, what matters is not what the regime says about America, but what the demonstrators think about America. Presently, brave Iranians watch as our President still holds an open hand to the regime that opened fire on them, that opened fire on Neda.

This is the passive, disastrous policy of Jimmy Carter that led to the rise of this rogue regime, not the courageous policy of Ronald Reagan that led to the demise of an evil empire.

□ 2015

The surest, safest termination of Iran's nuclear weapons program and support of terrorism is to hasten this fanatical tyranny's collapse by supporting its people's liberty. Taking its rightful place amongst the community of free nations, a democratic Iran will necessarily realize and reverse the insanity of this terrorist regime's homicidal obsession with nuclear weapons. Thus, for their and our security, the United States and the world must do everything in our power to further the Iranian demonstrators' sacred claim to freedom. We know Neda did.

Further, in the grand strategy of our war for freedom over terrorism, how we aid pro-democracy Iranians will remind the world of who we are. We are Americans, the revolutionary children of freedom who have lived and died defending our liberty and extending it to the enslaved and oppressed. We will do no less today in support of our Iranian brothers and sisters.

Today Neda's voice calls to our consciences and warns that the fate of Iranians' liberty is entwined with the fate of America's security. We must not miss this generational chance for freedom; again, one that ensures a rogue regime's implosion, prevents a nuclear confrontation, and ensures that Neda and all of liberty's martyrs shall not have died in vain. As Americans, we must seize this moment and help Iranians seize their freedom. That's what we do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### HAYNESVILLE SHALE HYDRAULIC FRACTURING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Speaker, like most of America, I support an all-of-the-above solution to this Nation's energy needs. I believe we can have it all