

Finally, the Cretan people participated in one of the most daring operations that brought shame and humiliation to the German occupation forces and exhilaration and hope to the enslaved peoples of Europe. Major-General Von Kreipe, Commander of all German forces in Crete, was abducted from his own headquarters in April 1944 and transferred to a POW camp in England.

The German troops had never encountered such resistance. Hitler had initially sent 12,000 troops to Crete, thinking that the occupation would be swift. By the end of the three-and-a-half years of occupation, Hitler had sent a total of 100,000 troops, to confront a little more than 5,000 Cretan Andarte fighters. These German troops could have been deployed somewhere else. More German troops were lost during the occupation of Crete than in France, Yugoslavia and Poland combined.

Most importantly, as a result of the battle in Crete, Hitler's master plan to invade Russia before the coming of winter, had to be postponed, which resulted in the deaths of many German troops who were not properly prepared to survive the harsh Russian winter.

As we Americans know from our history, freedom does not come free. For their gallant resistance against the German invasion and occupation of their island, Cretans paid a stiff price. Within the first five months of the Battle of Crete, 3,500 Cretans were executed and many more were killed in the ensuring three-and-a-half years of occupation.

Mr. Speaker, there are historical reasons why we Americans appreciate the sacrifices of the Cretan people in defending their island during the Battle of Crete. We have a history replete with similar heroic events starting with our popular revolt that led to the birth of our Nation more than two centuries.

We must always remember that as long as there are people willing to sacrifice their lives for the just cause of defending the integrity and freedom of their country, there is always hope for a better tomorrow. May we take inspiration from the shining example of the people of Crete in ensuring that this is indeed the case.

SMART SECURITY AND ABU GHRAIB SCANDAL

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, amidst all the debate about the defense bill, we seem to have forgotten one very, very important thing, which should be the driving force behind every decision we make with regard to Iraq. Mr. Speaker, nearly 800 young men and women have lost their lives as a result of the conflict. Eight hundred.

We must never forget that people are dying as a result of the decisions of this House. Many of our brave soldiers will never again walk this Earth because of the choices we have made. Many more will be lame for life. Clearly, something is wrong with our Nation's policies when 800 of our soldiers have died in Iraq, most of them after our flight-clad President declared an end to major combat operations.

Something is most certainly wrong when events occur such as the abuses

in Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq, or even events like the deaths of five Iraqi prisoners in war-torn detention camps, as the Denver Post recently reported. The fact that these actions occurred in separate places, under the command of different interrogators, demonstrates that this is a systemic problem.

The Pentagon's response has been to court-martial the young soldiers directly responsible for these instances of torture, calling them bad apples. And what has been the response by the leaders of this country? Two weeks ago, President Bush appeared on Arab television condemning the abuses by American servicemembers and private American contractors. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld testified before the Senate and House Committee on Armed Services for the same purpose. Both men in their respective addresses tried to distance themselves from the crimes.

Mr. Speaker, President Harry Truman made famous the quote "The buck stops here." President Bush would be well served to take notice of this quotation, which President Truman thought was so important that he kept it as a sign on his desk in the Oval Office.

In fact, it is becoming more apparent every day that all along both President Bush and Secretary Rumsfeld may have known more than they were letting on and that the crimes committed at the prisons could have originated in the Pentagon and passed through the Oval Office.

An investigation by Newsweek magazine provides evidence that President Bush and Secretary Rumsfeld, along with Attorney General John Ashcroft, may have personally agreed to a secret system of detention interrogation designed to circumnavigate the Geneva Conventions. This information was substantiated by a New Yorker magazine article, which similarly detailed a Pentagon operation known inside the intelligence community as Copper Green, which encouraged physical coercion and sexual humiliation of Iraqi prisoners in an attempt to produce intelligence about the post-war insurgency in Iraq.

Are we really to believe that the Secretary of Defense had no knowledge of the actions being taken by the soldiers under his command? And if the Secretary of Defense had absolutely no knowledge of this abuse, is that not a gigantic problem in and of itself? And if Secretary Rumsfeld did know of Copper Green, are we really to believe that nobody shared this information with the President? And if not, why not?

The buck stops with the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States. The buck does not stop with the young soldiers interrogating Iraqi prisoners. The buck does not stop with Brigadier General Janis Karpinski, the U.S. general in charge of running the prisons in Iraq. The buck does not even stop with Donald Rumsfeld, the Secretary of Defense. The buck stops with

the President and only with the President.

There has to be a better way, because the Bush doctrine of passing the buck has been tried and it has failed. It is time for a new national security strategy, one that emphasizes brains instead of brawn, one that is consistent with the best American values.

I have introduced H. Con. Res. 392, legislation to create a SMART security platform for the 21st century. SMART stands for Sensible Multilateral American Response to Terrorism. SMART treats war as an absolute last resort. It fights terrorism with stronger intelligence and multilateral partnerships. It controls the spread of weapons of mass destruction with a renewed commitment to nonproliferation. And it aggressively invests in the development of impoverished nations with an emphasis on women's health and education.

The buck stops with the President of the United States. No more denials, no more passing the buck.

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.)

AMERICAN INVESTMENT IN INDIA

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, because the issue of American investment in India has been a particular point of debate here in the Congress, I want to say a few words about the recent elections in India and what they portend for Americans and Indians alike.

□ 1945

For many months now I have been talking about how our Nation's success in a 21st century economy is going to hinge on companies that are successfully able to invest and compete globally. It is these companies, the ones who invest in emerging overseas markets, that use global investment to maximize their efficiencies and create new opportunities right here in the United States.

Economic isolationists have tried to claim that investment in India is bad for Americans. They have claimed that new job opportunities in cities like Hyderabad and Mumbai mean job losses here at home. They have tried to tell the American people that we cannot compete with a growing Indian middle class.

As economic news from India, such as the 10 percent GDP growth rate last year, grew brighter and brighter, the isolationists' predictions of gloom grew darker and darker.

Then something unforeseen happened. Contrary to predictions, the Indian parliamentary elections resulted in the defeat of the BJP and Prime Minister Vajpayee, who had made market reform a pillar of his economic policy. A new party now claims the seat of prime minister and is working to build a majority coalition in the legislature.

The sudden, unexpected change made investors nervous and sent them into a large selling spree, in fact, the largest sell-off in the 129-year history of their market. The Sensex, the Bombay Stock Exchange's benchmark index, shed over 11 percent of its value on Monday, following 6 percent losses on the previous Friday. The 2-day loss to investors was over \$65 billion.

Now, I am certainly not prepared to write off economic growth in India just yet, and despite the recent dismal days for the market there, I do not believe the Indian people are either; but the sudden uncertainty over India's long-term economic outlook reveals what this debate on foreign investment should have been about all along. The threat to the U.S. economy was never, never that the India economy is growing too much. The danger is that it might not be able to sustain and continue such economic growth.

This was a lesson we all learned, or should have been learned, in the 1980s. The economic isolationists told us that the rapidly expanding German and Japanese economies were going to devastate us, leaving America in the economic dust. But we soon discovered that if those two countries posed any economic threat to the U.S., it was that they were not able to sustain their economic growth.

Although the economic prophets of doom may have substituted India or maybe China for the Germany and Japan of the 1980s, the fundamental economic lesson is the same today as it was 20 years ago: Rapid and sustained growth by emerging trading partners is unquestionably in our best interest. A strong and growing Indian economy provides opportunities for U.S. companies to invest and become more competitive and create jobs right here at home. A growing Indian middle class demands more and more U.S. goods and services. And a prosperous India helps bring stability to that region of the world.

Most important, growth and job creation is helping to lift millions out of poverty in India, another compelling reason for us to encourage a thriving Indian economy, not a weakened one.

It is vitally important that we encourage India's new leadership to continue the market reforms that have successfully put India on the path to economic strength. So far, there have been some promising signs. The new governing Congress Party has pledged to continue the economic liberalization efforts of their predecessors. It is worth noting that this is the party that first introduced market reforms under Mr. Singh, who will likely be the new prime minister, back in the early 1990s.

Like the U.S. workers and consumers who have benefited from a stronger Indian economy, the 250 million Indians who are living in poverty have everything to gain from opening their markets even further. India has made tremendous strides in liberalizing its economy, but the fact is that India's economy is still not open enough. Significant obstacles to U.S. participation in India's economy persist: nontariff trade barriers, high tariffs, and weak protection of intellectual property rights, to name just a few.

The greater liberalization of the Indian economy will have a significant and positive impact on Americans and Indians alike. As the new government organizes and sets an economic agenda, I urge them to continue the work they began over a decade ago.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 17, 2004]

INDIA DIMMING?

(By Swapna Dasgupta)

The Indian election upset that has unseated Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee may have one unintended victim: John Kerry. After making the loss of American jobs from outsourcing to countries like India a key part of his presidential campaign, the Democratic challenger may no longer have an easy scapegoat to rail against. Now, his suspicion of tech-savvy Indians who are speeding up their country's global integration will be shared by the new government in Delhi.

The world's largest democracy has given an astonishing verdict in an election whose outcome was thought to be a foregone conclusion. The voters rejected the Bharatiya Janata Party-led alliance that had governed since 1998. The winner was a combination of the Congress Party led by the Italian-born Sonia Gandhi, a doctrinaire Marxist bloc, and a motley group of regional outfits that have come together to assemble an alternative government.

India is no stranger to crazy coalitions forged out of sheer expediency. Since 1989, when Rajiv Gandhi was voted out of power, it has witnessed a series of coalition governments. What marks the latest experiment is not merely the uniqueness of a naturalized citizen at the helm—a development that has contributed to a flurry of Italian jokes being circulated on the mobile phone circuit—but the circumstances of its creation.

In the past, incumbents have been voted out for either their high-handedness or the perceived corruption of their governments. This was the case with Congress Prime Ministers Indira Gandhi in 1977, Rajiv Gandhi in 1989, and Narasimha Rao in 1996. This time, the rejection of Mr. Vajpayee was grounded in policy. The 2004 election was dominated by two themes: his leadership and the slogan "India shining." This last may have been the creation of a clever copywriter, but it reflected the difference the Vajpayee government made over the past six years.

Aimed at kindling patriotism with feel-good economics, "India Shining" stressed India's IT and telecom revolutions, the roads program that will link the four corners of India, and the promise of becoming a global power by 2020. Deputy Prime Minister L.K. Advani, the government's ideologue, went on a bus journey across India publicizing "India Shining" and promising a government that would unleash India's potential and creative energies. To gum-chewing 21-year-olds working in call centers and poor farmers in drought-affected India, he invoked the same vision of India as one of the five largest economies in the next 20 years.

Traditionally, capitalism in India has lacked political advocacy. The BJP, a party that built itself on Hindu nationalism, tried to break the mold by grafting the image of a tremendously successful 79-year-old Mr. Vajpayee onto a buoyant economy. For years, intellectuals had complained about development not featuring on the election agenda. The BJP leadership tried to talk real economics to an electorate used to being promised state jobs and welfare schemes.

The outcome was a debacle on a scale that baffled pollster and politician alike: Mr. Vajpayee was swept out of office. In simultaneous local polls held in the southern states of Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka, two of India's most ardent champions of the IT industry, chief ministers Chandrababu Naidu and S.M. Krishna, were roundly defeated. Mr. Naidu was attacked for having more time for Bill Gates than for farmers and mocked for having transformed the state capital Hyderabad into "Cyberabad."

As the results poured in, the political class seemed united in treating the verdict as a resounding rebuff of "India Shining" and its symbols. On the TV, commentators joined politicians in interpreting the verdict as a rejection of the Vajpayee government's pro-business policies. "You can't build highways bypassing the slums," concluded one critic of the BJP. Even the BJP's own allies were scathing. Dripping with sarcasm, Bal Thackeray, chief of the ultra-Hindu Shiv Sena, thanked Finance Minister Jaswant Singh and privatization czar Arun Shourie for contributing to the Congress victory.

Predictably, the left is gung-ho. With the Congress dependent on its 60 legislators for a majority, the two Communist parties are expected to put their regressive stamp on economic policy. Even before the celebrations were over, leftists called for an end to the privatization of the public sector, the abolition of the Disinvestment Ministry and a review of the reforms program. Regardless of whether or not the left joins in government, it will leave its antediluvian mark on the policies of the new regime.

An already jittery stock market panicked. On Friday, the Bombay Sensex fell 6% in one day and wiped out \$22 billion of investors' wealth. Since the specter of political uncertainty and a possible defeat for Mr. Vajpayee first appeared on the horizon, the Sensex has fallen from 5712 and April 27 to 5069 on May 14. Foreign institutional investors have pulled out millions of rupees from the markets since the election results.

The fear of capital flight may quiet the left for a bit, but it is going to be a temporary respite. The manner in which the verdict has been interpreted will also encourage the old-style socialists within the Congress to press for higher taxes on corporate profits and luxury goods, as well as for more subsidies and government expenditure on welfare projects. The Vajpayee government's initiatives for the creation of world-class highways, reduction of the role of government and the cautious initiation of labor reforms look set to be modified, if not completely junked.

Over the past six years, India has tried to dance to a different tune. The Vajpayee government encouraged modernity and entrepreneurship, and boosted the self-confidence of a growing middle class. It tried to turn the country away from a Third World trajectory, from the sloth and mediocrity of the past, into a new India that is so feared by protectionists in the U.S. and Europe. Well, those protectionists can breathe a little easier now. India's ancient regime has struck back with a vengeance.

A DRAFT BY ANY OTHER NAME

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KING of Iowa). Under a previous order