

A TRIBUTE TO GREG NELSON ON
THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIRE-
MENT

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 2008

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to honor Greg Nelson, a resident of your Congressional District who retires today, June 4, 2008, from the teaching of history for over 40 years.

Greg earned his BA in political science and history at San Francisco State in 1967, and soon after began his career at Arcata High School teaching government and geography. He also worked as a volunteer for Vista, a grassroots organization that worked for school and community relations in his hometown of Detroit, Michigan, before earning a master's degree in secondary education from the University of San Francisco in 1972. It was that autumn that Greg began teaching history at Lick-Wilmerding High School in San Francisco.

During his 35 years in the history department at Lick, Greg has built his reputation as an accomplished scholar of history and government, and a devoted mentor and advisor to students. His senior seminar in constitutional law remains one of the most popular offerings and helped spawn Constitution Day, which includes competitions and games for the entire student body to celebrate that glorious document. Greg possesses encyclopedic knowledge of U.S. history, to be sure, but always will be best known for his passion for teaching this history to his students year after year. During his tenure at Lick-Wilmerding, he has inspired over 2,500 students to become civically engaged and to take action in order to preserve the best in our democracy. How fitting, then, that the last student project that Greg led was an 8-day immersion in the workings of city government at San Francisco City Hall, which included opportunities for current students to work with many of his former students who now work in public service. What a gift!

Over the years, Greg also has been a beloved student advisor, a happy and willing chaperone, and retreat leader. He has served as Department Chair, and has been a caring mentor to new faculty. His contributions to the school and the larger community truly are legendary. And most of all, his gentle nature and generous nature will be missed.

Madam Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Greg Nelson for an extraordinary teaching career and thank him for honoring our Constitution, for enhancing our democracy, and for strengthening our community and our country.

IN MEMORY OF LT. GEN. WILLIAM
ODOM

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 2008

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I ask that the following article be inserted into the RECORD.

A SENSIBLE PATH ON IRAN

(By Zbigniew Brzezinski and William Odom)

Current U.S. policy toward the regime in Tehran will almost certainly result in an Iran with nuclear weapons. The seemingly clever combination of the use of "sticks" and "carrots," including the frequent official hints of an American military option "remaining on the table," simply intensifies Iran's desire to have its own nuclear arsenal. Alas, such a heavy-handed "sticks" and "carrots" policy may work with donkeys but not with serious countries. The United States would have a better chance of success if the White House abandoned its threats of military action and its calls for regime change.

Consider countries that could have quickly become nuclear weapon states had they been treated similarly. Brazil, Argentina and South Africa had nuclear weapons programs but gave them up, each for different reasons. Had the United States threatened to change their regimes if they would not, probably none would have complied. But when "sticks" and "carrots" failed to prevent India and Pakistan from acquiring nuclear weapons, the United States rapidly accommodated both, preferring good relations with them to hostile ones. What does this suggest to leaders in Iran?

To look at the issue another way, imagine if China, a signatory to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and a country that has deliberately not engaged in a nuclear arms race with Russia or the United States, threatened to change the American regime if it did not begin a steady destruction of its nuclear arsenal. The threat would have an arguable legal basis, because all treaty signatories promised long ago to reduce their arsenals, eventually to zero. The American reaction, of course, would be explosive public opposition to such a demand. U.S. leaders might even mimic the fantasy rhetoric of Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad regarding the use of nuclear weapons.

A successful approach to Iran has to accommodate its security interests and ours. Neither a U.S. air attack on Iranian nuclear facilities nor a less effective Israeli one could do more than merely set back Iran's nuclear program. In either case, the United States would be held accountable and would have to pay the price resulting from likely Iranian reactions. These would almost certainly involve destabilizing the Middle East, as well as Afghanistan, and serious efforts to disrupt the flow of oil, at the very least generating a massive increase in its already high cost. The turmoil in the Middle East resulting from a preemptive attack on Iran would hurt America and eventually Israel, too.

Given Iran's stated goals—a nuclear power capability but not nuclear weapons, as well as an alleged desire to discuss broader U.S.-Iranian security issues—a realistic policy would exploit this opening to see what it might yield. The United States could indicate that it is prepared to negotiate, either on the basis of no preconditions by either side (though retaining the right to terminate the negotiations if Iran remains unyielding but begins to enrich its uranium beyond levels allowed by the Non-Proliferation Treaty); or to negotiate on the basis of an Iranian willingness to suspend enrichment in return for simultaneous U.S. suspension of major economic and financial sanctions.

Such a broader and more flexible approach would increase the prospects of an international arrangement being devised to accommodate Iran's desire for an autonomous nuclear energy program while minimizing the possibility that it could be rapidly transformed into a nuclear weapons program.

Moreover, there is no credible reason to assume that the traditional policy of strategic deterrence, which worked so well in U.S. relations with the Soviet Union and with China and which has helped to stabilize India-Pakistan hostility, would not work in the case of Iran. The widely propagated notion of a suicidal Iran detonating its very first nuclear weapon against Israel is more the product of paranoia or demagoguery than of serious strategic calculus. It cannot be the basis for U.S. policy, and it should not be for Israel's, either.

An additional longer-range benefit of such a dramatically different diplomatic approach is that it could help bring Iran back into its traditional role of strategic cooperation with the United States in stabilizing the Gulf region. Eventually, Iran could even return to its long-standing and geopolitically natural pre-1979 policy of cooperative relations with Israel. One should note also in this connection Iranian hostility toward al-Qaeda, lately intensified by al-Qaeda's Web-based campaign urging a U.S.-Iranian war, which could both weaken what al-Qaeda views as Iran's apostate Shiite regime and bog America down in a prolonged regional conflict.

Last but not least, consider that American sanctions have been deliberately obstructing Iran's efforts to increase its oil and natural gas outputs. That has contributed to the rising cost of energy. An eventual American-Iranian accommodation would significantly increase the flow of Iranian energy to the world market. Americans doubtless would prefer to pay less for filling their gas tanks than having to pay much more to finance a wider conflict in the Persian Gulf.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALBIO SIRES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 2008

Mr. SIRES. Madam Speaker, I would like to state for the RECORD my position on the following votes I missed on June 3, 2008. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall 367 on H. Con. Res. 138; "yes" on rollcall 923 on H. Res. 923; and "yes" on rollcall 369 on H. Res. 1114.

TRIBUTE TO CAPT. AMY BARKIN
FOR 30 YEARS OF SERVICE WITH
THE UNITED STATES PUBLIC
HEALTH SERVICE

HON. JOHN W. OLVER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 2008

Mr. OLVER. Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to recognize CAPT Amy C. Barkin, who is retiring from the United States Public Health Service after a distinguished 30 year career. Her unique contributions as a nationally recognized clinician, public health expert, and skilled administrator have had a profound impact on health care in this country.

During her career, she made numerous contributions to the State of Massachusetts. CAPT Barkin planned and implemented three health care programs for retarded and mentally ill patients in state facilities in western Massachusetts (Belchertown, Monson and