

ethanol. And I would submit that the energy we have today is cheaper because of corn-based ethanol; and, that this equation works out very good for the farm bill, too, because, for example, in 2005, there is a government program, a subsidy that has been there since the 1930s, it paid out in 2005 \$6.8 billion in counter-cyclical and loan deficiency payments. The counter-cyclical and LDPs paid out a total of \$6.5 billion in 2005. By 2006, the subsequent year, commodity prices were up high enough that that zeroed out. There was no \$6.8 billion going into counter-cyclicals and LDPs. And if you charge that all to ethanol demand—and I have already made the argument you don't. But if you do, if you sustain and you are on the side of this argument, Mr. Speaker, that it really was the consumption of corn through ethanol that drove up the price, then you have to also argue that the \$6.8 billion in farm subsidies disappeared because of ethanol.

So, at no cost to the taxpayer and a program that had been there in some form or another since the 1930s, we did pay back in that same year \$3 billion in blenders credit. So there was a net savings to the taxpayers of \$3.8 billion out of the \$6.8 billion that was subsidized the year before. That is pretty good, too.

I don't know of a way that we can do this calculation in a macro national perspective and not come up with corn-based ethanol as a great big plus for the country. It is more energy. It doesn't reduce our food supply, at least by the numbers that we have. Now, if we go overboard, it can. And it doesn't taken away from our export of corn. We still exported more corn than ever before. We have more corn available on the market. It takes about half as much energy to produce a Btu out of corn at the ethanol plant as it does to produce a Btu of energy in the form of gasoline at a refinery out of crude oil.

All of these numbers that I produced here are based in fact, and I can anchor the foundation numbers down by laboratory numbers, Mr. Speaker. This is a picture of the real facts, and I challenge those folks who disagree to come up with something that is solid, a calculation. Give me something that is empirical. Don't give me your feelings, don't give me your senses. Don't say, gee, I just feel this or I feel that. Look at the whole picture, look at the big picture, but look at the composition of the numbers, build a formula there, and see what it does for America. We are on the right track, not the wrong track.

I recognize that the gentleman is here from Maryland who has the next special order. In that case, and out of deference to him, I would, Mr. Speaker, thank you for your attention here tonight and I yield back the balance of my time.

THE MIDDLE EAST

□ 2145

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNERNEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GILCHREST. I thank the Speaker for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, tonight I would like to talk to you and the American people about the troubled Middle East.

American troops are serving in Iraq and Afghan as we speak. They are stunningly competent and, to some extent, they are implementing a policy that is flawed.

America is behind the troops. Members of Congress are behind the troops. We want to bring independence, a sense of freedom and justice, certainly democracy to this troubled area of the world. But I think in order for us, the policymakers, to develop a policy that is as competent as those troops are competent that carry out the policy, then there is some knowledge that we need to acquire. So, what I would like to do tonight is talk a little bit about the present crisis in Iraq and the way forward.

In order to understand the present crisis in Iraq, and the way forward, which, yes, we can say, can lead to stability, can lead to peace, respect for the rule of law, human dignity, justice and democracy, we need to acquire information to have a better understanding of that region and the present crisis.

So what I would like to do is give a brief history of the Cold War and the United States' involvement in that, during the Cold War what was going on in the Middle East, touch on the present crisis that we are now seeing since 2003, and then, how do we solve this particular situation?

Before I get into that information, I would like to share with you, Mr. Speaker, and Americans where in part some of this information I will give to you tonight has come from. And so I would like the listeners, Mr. Speaker, and I will say this twice during my address this evening. I would like them to get a piece of paper and a pencil, because I want them to write down the name of some of these books. There are not a lot of books. I am not talking about 100 books or 50 books or 20 books, although there are many out there. I am just talking about 10 books that can be easily read in a relatively short period of time.

And what I would ask the readers to do, or in this case if they read the books, the listeners, out across the landscape: You support the troops. You may have a son, a daughter, a father, a brother, a cousin, some relative, a friend in Iraq or Afghanistan, and you want America to rise up and support the troops. You want America to rise up and have a shared sacrifice in this huge endeavor that we are now involved with.

But you are not quite sure how to do that. We are not collecting tin cans for the troops. We are not storing or sending cans of food. We are not using less gasoline, although we should, to support the troops. What specifically are we doing as individual Americans to support the troops and understand the policy in which those troops are implemented?

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the listeners starting tonight turn the television off every night for as long as it takes to really understand, deeply understand the policy in Iraq. Understand the history, the intrigue, the violence, the complexity of the troubled area, the Middle East. So I would ask the listeners, you might have some interesting shows you like to watch occasionally, but I would ask the listeners to put on your calendars two hours every night you are not going to watch television. What are you going to do for those two hours, you are going to support the troops. How are you going to support the troops? You are going to become knowledgeable in the issues in which the troops are involved. You are going to become knowledgeable in the issues that Members of Congress should know and debate and come to some resolution on.

Here are the books. Number one, "A Letter to America," very easily read. It is a message of hope through difficult times by a former Senator from Oklahoma, David Boren. "A Letter to America." Pick it up. You can read it in a day, but it will take a few nights. Take a look at it. You will have some understanding where this Nation is right now in the 21st century.

The next volume is a paperback by James Baker and Lee Hamilton, you've heard of it, Iraq Study Group. "The Iraq Study Group Report" gives a clear vision on the way forward in Iraq. Take a look at it. It is not very long either.

The next one is a little heavy reading by Thomas Ricks. It is called "Fiasco." It gets deep into the complexities of why there are still continuing difficulties in the war in Iraq especially.

Just a thought about that. A few years ago we saw "Mission Accomplished" on a huge aircraft carrier out in the Pacific Ocean. I am not going to make a comment about whether "Mission Accomplished" was appropriate or not appropriate, but there was a remark by a defense intelligence analyst right at that moment who said Israel won the war with the Arabs in 1967 in 6 days. They won that war in 6 days in 1967. Forty-one years later the struggle continues. Read "Fiasco." It gives you some sense of the problems and difficulties and mistakes that the policymakers made in Iraq that the troops, stunningly competent, are trying to implement.

The next is by a retired marine general, Tony Zinni, "The Battle for Peace." The struggle for peace in the Middle East will take everything we have: a strong military, a strong and

vibrant intelligence apparatus. But the thing that is vital in this particular conflict is dialogue, consensus, talking to your friends and foes.

Number five is "Violent Politics" by William Polk. He worked for President Kennedy and President Johnson. "Violent Politics." It is not what we see here arguing. "Violent Politics" is about wars of insurgency when there is no dialogue and diplomacy has failed and small groups of people supported by the population in the region continue to fight. It will give you an understanding what we are going through right now in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Number six is by Trita Parsi, "Traacherous Alliance." It is a fascinating book because it shows for 30 years the Israelis and the Iranians, the Iranians who are Persian, not Arab, speak Farsi, not Arabic, the Iranians had a quiet alliance where they traded oil for technology with Israel. Israel was allied with Iran mainly because they had similar enemies. Israel was an enemy of the Soviet Union; so was Iran. Israel was an enemy of many Arab countries; so was Iran.

Book number seven, "All the Shah's Men" by Stephen Kinzer. It is about Iran and its relationship with Britain and the United States in the 20th century, mainly the first half of the 20th century, where Britain and the Anglo-Persian Oil Company, which is now British Petroleum, extracted huge amounts of natural resources, mostly oil and natural gas from Iran without the Iranians knowing or being able to know how much was leaving and how much they were being paid. It is a fascinating book about how the United States made a mistake during the Cold War in its relationship with Iran which festered until 1979.

Number eight is "The Silence of the Rational Center" by Halper and Clarke. Scholars and diplomats from great institutions in the United States, universities, including retired diplomats, speak out about what America needs to do in the 21st century, and "The Silence of the Rational Center" are those people who have great information, have years and decades of experience in different areas of the world, especially the Middle East, have been silent about a better way, more and better sophisticated policy. It is not just enough to know something, you have to act on that knowledge.

Number nine is a fascinating book by a man called Archimedes Patti who was in the OSS. That is the Office of Strategic Services, the forerunner of the CIA, who met Ho Chi Minh in 1945 because Ho Chi Minh and the Viet Minh were helping the United States track Japanese troop movements in Southeast Asia because the French were not willing to do that for the United States. And Ho Chi Minh talked and discussed issues, including the wording of the soon-to-be-independent Vietnam about their declaration of independence which Ho Chi Minh, talking with Archimedes Patti, wanted it

to be very similar to our Declaration of Independence, much of the words written by Thomas Jefferson. The name of the book is "Why Vietnam?" It gives you an understanding of the intrigue, the complexity, the foreign policy issues, the conflict issues, the economic issues, the criminal issues, the deception that was perpetrated in that region of the world back in 1945. The book goes from 1940 to 1954, "Why Vietnam?" Archimedes Patti. It will give you a fascinating understanding, along with these other books, about the intrigue, the complexity, the violence and sometimes the tragedy of how these very complex issues are handled.

The last book, Mr. Speaker, is called "Human Options" by Norman Cousins. That is a book about choices and how we make them, how we make decisions.

I use that as the last book because I want to start our discussion tonight with two quotes from Norman Cousins' book "Human Options." The first quote is: "Knowledge is the solvent for danger." Knowledge is the solvent for danger. The more you know when you are going into any situation, you are going to benefit from that knowledge. Preparation, understanding, to develop a policy, is so critical.

The troops in Iraq are stunningly competent because they are prepared. They are trained. They learn things. They know things. The integration of integrity with their fellow soldiers, and now their fellow Iraqi soldiers, and the Iraqi citizens. The integration of integrity happens because they are prepared.

How prepared are the policymakers in their knowledge, in their information, in their ability to integrate their integrity with their fellow members in the international community? You as American citizens can be knowledgeable and help resolve this conflict.

The next quote by Norman Cousins in his book "Human Options" is: "History is a vast early warning system." I have heard for a long time about many conflicts we have experienced. Even in Iraq, I hear many of the people in the administration who are retired or have left the administration say, "If we only knew this in 2003." "Well, if we knew that, we would have done things differently." I have heard that about the Vietnam war for decades.

"Well, if we knew back then what we know now, things would be different." That is a bad excuse. That is a bad excuse because if you are knowledgeable, if you are prepared, if you want to know things, if you had a broad enough mind to view the majesty of this complex world in all of its dimensions, you would understand that hindsight is nothing more than understanding history to make better decisions.

Rudyard Kipling, a British writer whose son was killed tragically in World War II in northern France resolved his sadness by saying this: "Why did young men die because old men lied?"

We can take Robert Kipling's phrase to try to heal his soul because of the

loss of his son, we can paraphrase it today and say: Old men should talk before they send young men to die. And that is what we should do.

And it is not just talking to Maliki or our friends in Iraq, it is talking to all of the different factions in Iraq, whether they be Sunni or Shia or Kurds or any of the other factions that are there. And we should also be talking through dialogue with the Iranians and the Syrians. We should be talking to the full length and breadth of people in the Middle East because if we just focus on a few over-simplified issues in Iraq, the resolution will be long in coming.

The Israelis won the 1967 war in 6 days; 41 years later that conflict is still a tragedy.

Let's take a look at the Cold War and some of the incidents that occurred after World War II. We finally resolved the Korean War, at least to continue in a dialogue for decades, but only after 54,000 Americans were killed. And many, many more wounded.

In the 1950s, Khrushchev said on a number of occasions, the leader of the Soviet Union, pointing his finger at Americans in the U.N., in speeches around the Soviet Union and speeches around Eastern Europe he said we will bury the United States. Well, what was President Eisenhower's response to Khrushchev's volatile rhetoric? President Eisenhower invited Khrushchev to the United States to have a dialogue. They visited cities and the suburbs. They visited factories and farms. They went throughout the United States, and what was the sense of Americans when Eisenhower invited Khrushchev to the United States, our number one enemy with nuclear weapons pointing at America, what was America's response to Eisenhower inviting the enemy of this country here? America welcomed Premier Khrushchev. America was relieved because now we can have a dialogue and learn about each other. America responded in a positive fashion because they were sick of war, World War II and Korea on its heels.

When Kennedy found out that there were deployable nuclear weapons in Cuba pointing at the United States, 90 miles from our shore, those nuclear missiles were minutes from the United States. What was Kennedy's response? Let's quickly talk to the Soviets and see if we can resolve this issue without war and conflict, without bloodletting. Let's resolve the issue, and the issue was resolved and the missiles were removed.

Communist China Mao Zedong said many times it would be worth for half the population of China to die in a war with the United States as long as we could get rid of the United States. This was an enemy of the United States.

What was America's reaction when Nixon went to China? They were relieved. They were glad. The bloodshed, the violence, the sadness, the tragedy is avoided through a dialogue, through a conversation by learning how to see

the world through the Chinese eyes, by learning how to see the world through Khrushchev's eyes, by learning how to see the world in all of its complexities and difficulties.

□ 2200

The other conflict that I have to mention here, Mr. Speaker, is the Vietnam war. 58,000 Americans dead, well over 100,000 wounded. A million Vietnamese dead.

Ho Chi Minh, a small, frail, sickly old Vietnamese man, who wanted sovereignty from the French; he wanted his independence. He was tired of French colonial rule. He was tired of Japanese oppression. He didn't want the British to come in and colonize another section of Southeast Asia. He wanted his freedom.

Because of that misunderstanding, because we didn't go to Hanoi and talk to Ho Chi Minh; some Americans did but it never worked its way up to the White House, we had a conflict, we had tragedy, we had war. We had a problem.

The present crisis in Iraq, how do we see it?

Well, in the Middle East, three great religions, for centuries, these religions have lived together. They've shared joy and they've shared sorrow. For centuries there was laughter or there was blood letting. There was community or there was death. It's a complicated place.

Faith, to each of these three world religions, Judaism, Christianity and Islam, is an important part of everyday life throughout the Middle East. They all come together in Jerusalem. They all have an important part of that city that emanates throughout the Middle East.

In the Middle East, oil exports are the economy. Economic viability depends upon oil exports. Because of the war in Iraq, because of the crash of the Soviet Union, because of the war in Afghanistan, because of other problems, the geopolitical balance of power is fractured right now.

Who will be more influential in the Middle East? It's not going to be Europe. They pretty much left there after World War II. Most of the countries do not want Russia. They feel that Russia, an atheistic country, has not found its soul yet. The Middle Eastern countries don't want China to have that much influence, because China, they know, is after the resources.

The geopolitical balance of power is fractured. Who still do the countries of the Middle East look to for resolving this and creating a better climate for a balance of power for the economy, for an integrated security alliance similar to what we have in NATO or SEATO or the Organization of American States or the European Union or other places? They still look to the United States.

And the world is still waiting for the United States, since the focus of the Middle East came after 9/11. They're still waiting to see how we can not

only resolve the issues between the Shiia, the Sunnis and the Kurds in Iraq, but how do we bring all of the Middle East together.

How do we separate to the American mind the difference between the Shiia, the Kurds, the Sunnis, al Qaeda, and the Taliban and Wahhabiism? They're all very different forms of Islam.

The Iranians, for example, are bitter enemies of al Qaeda and the Taliban. The Wahhabis, mostly in Saudi Arabia, are not bitter enemies of al Qaeda or the Taliban. The government of Saudi Arabia may keep them at arm's length, but many of the Sunnis in Saudi Arabia, have a relationship with the Taliban and al Qaeda. Virtually nobody in Iran has a relationship with al Qaeda and the Taliban. A pretty complex place, the Middle East. The more we know about it the better able we are to deal with it.

The war in Iraq, it's a war. There's a war in Iraq. But ask this question. Where are the munitions factories that we can bomb like we did in Germany and Japan and Italy? Where are the large troop concentrations that can be decimated? Where are the supply lines that we can cut off?

It's not that kind of war it's a war of insurgency. It's a war of a few radical people who are supported by the vast population, by their tribes, by their relatives, by people across the vast reaches of the Middle East. Political violence is an insurgency, but it's a different kind of war.

The present crisis in Iraq has taken 34,000 American casualties. What does that mean? That means over 4,000 Americans are dead. Over 30,000 Americans are wounded and have lost limbs, have lost good brain function, cannot walk, have Post-traumatic Stress Syndrome.

And what's post-traumatic stress? It's when you see pretty violent acts. Someone is blown up, someone is shot and killed. You pull the trigger of your rifle and someone dies. That's a pretty traumatic act. Do you forget that? Not for the rest of your life. You come home and that image comes in the forefront of your thoughts because of a smell, a sound, something you see, something you feel that will be with you for the rest of your life.

Post-traumatic Stress Syndrome is virtually 100 percent of anybody in combat. Now, most are able to digest that and deal with it and go about their daily lives and compartmentalize those horrific incidents, but many are not.

Over \$600 billion so far in the war in Iraq. How engaged are the Americans in the war in Iraq? How often do they discuss the issue at the mall, at the movies, at the grocery store, at parties? How often is this issue discussed?

There's a sense of apprehension about the war in Iraq. Americans are disturbed. They want it to end. But how engaged are we in the war in Iraq?

There's global dissent. We look around the globe, we look at many of

our allies, many of them said we should not have gone in to Iraq. One of our strongest allies in the Middle East, Saudi Arabia, says that the U.S. war in Iraq is illegal. That's really interesting.

But we should understand, do we ever question them about that? Do we have a dialogue with the Saudis about that?

The present crisis is still very difficult. Now, should we leave Iraq right now? Should we send all the U.S. troops down into Basra, bring Navy ships up there, load them on the ships and bring them home? Should we do that right away?

Well, look what happened in Mogadishu some years ago when the Americans left. It was chaos. There was rape, murder and mayhem. The criminals took over. We don't want another Mogadishu in Iraq. So we shouldn't leave right away. We need to be responsible about how we deal with it. But as we gradually pull out, how many American troops do we leave?

And unless some of the politics are resolved, both in Iraq and the Middle East, we may have another French Dien Bien Phu, 1954 Vietnam, when the French pulled most of their troops out of Vietnam and the last remaining troops were surrounded by the Vietnamese, and many Frenchmen lost their lives.

General Petraeus says there's no military solution in Iraq. Is there a political solution under the present circumstances?

If we just look at Iraq, like many of us do, just Iraq, there is no political solution and there is no military solution. If we just look at Iraq in isolation, that's simply not going to happen.

What we need to do is look at Iraq in the broader context of the Middle East. American troops right now, it's understood, are the skeletal structure upon which the entire Iraqi society depends, so you can't pull them out. But how long do they stay?

And if there's no military solution, how do you deal with this politically?

Well, the first step is to understand the Middle East and what drives radicals to run to al Qaeda or the Taliban. What drives Arab and Islamic fundamentalists to hate the United States?

The Palestinian Israeli question has been going on since 1948. Palestine was created, Israel was created out of the region, the former British protectorate, Palestine, after the war, after the Holocaust, when the world felt that they needed to do something for the Jews who lost six million of their fellow citizens during World War II in Nazi concentration camps.

Since 1948, the Arabs and the Palestinians, the Palestinians and the Israelis have been fighting, since 1948. So the United States needs to engage, as we've started, but more fully engage as an objective arbitrator of the conflict between the Palestinians and the Israelis. And the Arabs need to see

that. We need to do that because it's the right thing to do. It's the ethical thing to do because both the Israelis and the Palestinians need and justly deserve peace, the rule of law and to raise their children out of harm's way. But the Arab world needs to see the United States working on this issue in a very objective fashion.

And we need to engage the Saudis, because the Saudis are Sunnis, and there are Sunnis in Iraq, but there are Shias in Iraq. And the Saudis have some fear that Iraq, if left unattended, can become an Iranian satellite. And the Iranians are Shias. This sounds all pretty confusing, but it shouldn't be confusing at this point. It's year 2008. The war started in 2002. And so Americans need to be more engaged in some of these issues.

The Saudis need to know that Iraq is not going to become an Iranian satellite. And we need to assure them that that's the case so they can work constructively with the Sunnis in Iraq.

The Iraqis need to know that the Americans aren't going to abandon them. But they also need to know we're not going to stay there for 100 years, certainly. They also need to know that militarily, this conflict which is an insurgency, is not going to be won unless there's a political solution.

And the Iranians, who we should talk to, need to know that the United States, eventually, will become one of their allies, and the United States will help the Iranians find a way to stabilize the mess in Iraq.

Eisenhower said that there were three things the United States needed to do in order to remain strong. Three. We needed a strong military, we needed the best intelligence of the world we could gather in the world, and the third leg of that stool was consensus and dialogue.

We have the strongest military in the world. We should not be afraid to talk to anybody. We have the best intelligence in the world, especially if it is objectively analyzed. But we need to engage our enemies, as well as our friends, in a conversation, in a dialogue.

When President Kennedy invited Khrushchev to the United States to talk about issues, this was not Chamberlain telling Hitler he could have a piece of Czechoslovakia. This was not a compromise that started World War II. When Kennedy brought Khrushchev to the United States it was from a position of strength, and it was a dialogue and we avoided tragedy and death and suffering. Eisenhower and Kennedy, Richard Nixon did the same thing.

We should talk to the Iranians without any preconditions. This is not giving in to the Iranians. This is showing the rest of the world who the Iranians are and what the Iranians are really like. The United States is bargaining from a position of power.

Consensus and dialogue are the third leg of that three-legged stool. Knowl-

edge is the solvent for danger. Knowledge. The more information we have, the better off we're going to be.

History is a vast early warning system. We know the things that have worked in the past. Kennedy and Khrushchev, it worked. It avoided war. The collapse eventually of the Soviet Union.

We did not have a dialogue with Ho Chi Minh. And if we did we could have avoided the tragedy of the war in Vietnam.

And what is our policy in Iraq now based on? What do you, the American people, understand our policy to be?

Let's take a look at Sam Rayburn, former Speaker of the House. Sam said, "Any mule can kick a barn door down, but it takes a carpenter to build one."

We need carpenters to build the dialog, the integration of integrity with all the world's peoples.

What did Rudyard Kipling say so many years ago when his son tragically died in Northern France? "Why did young men die? Because old men lied?"

And why did old men lie? Maybe they just didn't know enough.

To paraphrase Rudyard Kipling today, old people should talk. Old people should be carpenters, not mules, carpenters, before they send young men, young women, young people to die.

□ 2215

The landscape of human history is tragically filled with conflicts. What is the main reason for these conflicts? Ignorance, arrogance, and dogma. What does that combination lead to? I'm right and you are wrong. Monstrous certainty. Can you shoot your way through that? How do you get through that, that maze of complexity, of arrogance, ignorance, and dogma?

You replace ignorance with knowledge, and you do that with knowledge and you do a consensus and you do it with dialogue. Arrogance is replaced with humility. And generally, the more someone knows, the more humble they are. And you get rid of dogma with tolerance.

We need a diplomatic surge in the Middle East. That diplomatic surge means that we have the best and the brightest diplomats in the world right here and now employed in the State Department, employed in the Defense Department, retired diplomats, retired generals. And they can integrate themselves throughout the Middle East. They can talk about an economic alliance, a security alliance. They can talk about exchanging all kinds of medical and scientific and economic information.

We need to continue and let the world know the drawdown in a responsible, strategic fashion of our military presence in the Middle East. Work for reconciliation among the different factions in the Middle East by integrating those factions with a broader Middle East.

Let's look at some examples of the past.

1941. United States, Britain, and a number of other countries right at the very early stages of World War II signed something called the Atlantic Alliance. And what was the Atlantic Alliance? It was a commitment, an agreement among many countries around the world that people would live in freedom, they would work for economic prosperity in all the world, they would make sure people would live free of fear and want, and the list goes on.

The Atlantic Charter. What did the Atlantic Charter lead to? It led to the union of the many regions of the world, led to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It led to the Southeast Asian Treaty Organization. It led to the Organization of American States in Latin America. It was a commitment of nations that they would work together to have dialogue and rule out the use of force.

You know what Ho Chi Minh said about the Atlantic Charter in 1942 when he heard about it? He said, I hope it applies to Asians, meaning Vietnamese, because they were still under the iron fist of the Japanese and the French. You know what Ho Chi Minh said in 1945? He said, I guess the Atlantic Charter doesn't apply to the Vietnamese people.

To me, that's pretty sad.

1975, we signed the Helsinki Accords. A number of countries around Europe, including the Soviet Union and most of Eastern European countries except Albania. Helsinki Accords said basically the same thing as the Atlantic Charter: We would respect the integrity of the territory of all of the states that signed this; it would be peaceful settlement of disputes and not armed interaction; we would not interfere in the internal affairs of other countries; there would be freedom of thought, conscious, and religion; there would be equal rights for people.

The Helsinki Accords, 1975, what did that do to oppressed people in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union when they found out that the Soviet Union signed that? They gradually, the courageous ones, began to rise up, and eventually you saw the collapse of the Soviet Union. People in the Ukraine or Georgia or Poland or Czechoslovakia or the former Yugoslavia, they saw the Helsinki Accords, and they had a goal that they would reach out to. So the Helsinki Accords gradually integrated like-minded, peace-loving, freedom-loving people to begin exercising their God-given rights.

1949, one last comment about the past. The Geneva Conventions. The international community came together and signed the Geneva Conventions about the treatment of people in conflicts. Not just uniformed soldiers. This international agreement applied to anybody that was captured on a battlefield and how that person was to be treated and how they were to be interrogated and how they were to be imprisoned, and it was based on some pretty

fundamental human rights. An international agreement.

So people from around the world see these things. They understand that there is hope; the way forward is to have knowledge. It's to understand the complexity of this world and see it in all its vast, deep dimensions. Don't look at the world through a bent straw. That is the way too many of us see it. There's vast opportunities.

I'm going to quote from a book that you don't have to read, it's called "The Ascent of Man" by Jacob Bronowski. It's actually a book about the evolution of science and civilizations going back to pre-history. But there's a chapter in there about World War II. Many of Jacob Bronowski's relatives died in concentration camps in Auschwitz, and Bronowski has a paragraph: there are two parts to the human dilemma, one is the belief that the end justifies the means, that push-button philosophy that delivered deafness to suffering that has become the monster in the war machine.

When we go to the mall, do we think about the war in Iraq, or is it silent to us? Do we have conversations at the dinner table about the war in Iraq, or do we talk about other things? Do we ever talk about the war in Iraq, or do we have a sense of deliberate deafness to suffering? Do we think the war machine is going to take care of it?

The other aspect of human dilemma is that too often, tragically, nations become a nation of ghosts, obedient ghosts or tortured ghosts. That means you're not a whole human being. You go through life almost imperceptible. What is your value? What is your contribution? How do you make that contribution?

So those two dilemmas can be resolved by listening to the sound and the voices of tragedy and then becoming knowledgeable and begin learning that you, too, can do something.

So over the next few months, turn the television off. You want to commit yourself to helping the soldiers in Iraq, the people of Iraq, the people in Afghanistan, the tragedy of human history that plagues us so often where there is ignorance, arrogance, and dogma. "A Letter to America," David Boren. "A Letter to America." "The Iraq Study Group," James Baker, Lee Hamilton; "Fiasco," Thomas Ricks; "The Battle for Peace," Tony Zinni; "Violent Politics," William Polk; "Traitorous Alliance," Trita Parsi; "All the Shah's Men," Steve Kinzer; "The Silence of the Rational Center," Halper and Clarke; "Why Vietnam?" by Archimedes Patti; "Human Options," Norman Cousins.

I wish you well in your reading.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield the balance of his time?

Mr. GILCHREST. I yield the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DOGGETT (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week on account of medical reasons.

Mr. HIGGINS (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for April 23 through May 1 on account of a family emergency.

Mrs. DRAKE (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of touring Suffolk, Virginia, and other areas in southeast Virginia affected by yesterday's tornadoes.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALLEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SPACE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, May 5 and 6.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today and April 30.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, May 5 and 6.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today, April 30, and May 1.

Mr. FORBES, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WESTMORELAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, April 30 and May 1.

Mr. FLAKE, for 5 minutes, April 30.

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

A bill and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2829. An Act to make technical corrections to section 1244 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008, which provides special immigrant status for certain Iraqis, and for other purposes; the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 74. Concurrent resolution honoring the Prime Minister of Ireland, Bertie Ahern, for his service to the people of Ireland and to the world and welcoming the Prime Minister to the United States; the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Ms. Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3196. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 20 Sussex Street in Port Jervis, New York,

as the "E. Arthur Gray Post Office Building".

H.R. 3468. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1704 Weeksville Road in Elizabeth City, North Carolina, as the "Dr. Clifford Bell Jones, Sr. Post Office".

H.R. 3532. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5815 McLeod Street in Lula, Georgia, as the "Private Johnathon Millican Lula Post Office".

H.R. 3720. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 424 Clay Avenue in Waco, Texas, as the "Army PFC Juan Alonso Covarrubias Post Office Building".

H.R. 3803. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3100 Cashwell Drive in Goldsboro, North Carolina, as the "John Henry Wooten, Sr. Post Office Building".

H.R. 3936. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 116 Helen Highway in Cleveland, Georgia, as the "Sgt. Jason Harkins Post Office Building".

H.R. 3988. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3701 Altamesa Boulevard in Fort Worth, Texas, as the "Master Sergeant Kenneth N. Mack Post Office Building".

H.R. 4166. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 701 East Copeland Drive in Lebanon, Missouri, as the "Steve W. Allee Carrier Annex".

H.R. 4203. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3035 Stone Mountain Street in Lithonia, Georgia, as the "Specialist Jamaal RaShard Addison Post Office Building".

H.R. 4211. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 725 Roanoke Avenue in Roanoke Rapids, North Carolina, as the "Judge Richard B. Allsbrook Post Office".

H.R. 4240. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10799 West Alameda Avenue in Lakewood, Colorado, as the "Felix Sparks Post Office Building".

H.R. 4286. An act to award a congressional gold medal to Daw Aung San Suu Kyi in recognition of her courageous and unwavering commitment to peace, nonviolence, human rights, and democracy in Burma.

H.R. 4454. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3050 Hunsinger Lane in Louisville, Kentucky, as the "Iraq and Afghanistan Fallen Military Heroes of Louisville Memorial Post Office Building", in honor of the servicemen and women from Louisville, Kentucky, who died in service during Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom.

H.R. 5135. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 201 West Greenway Street in Derby, Kansas, as the "Sergeant Jamie O. Maugans Post Office Building".

H.R. 5220. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3800 SW. 185th Avenue in Beaverton, Oregon, as the "Major Arthur Chin Post Office Building".

H.R. 5400. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 160 East Washington Street in Chagrin Falls, Ohio, as the "Sgt. Michael M. Kashkoush Post Office Building".

H.R. 5472. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2650 Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Street, Indianapolis, Indiana, as the "Julia M. Carson Post Office Building".

H.R. 5489. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located