I appreciate

the gentleman very much. I have to

say, Mr. Speaker, I think all of the previous

speakers have covered critically

important points.

Before I give a statement related to

the European site primarily, I just

want to say I was struck by the chairman

or chairman-to-be, we hope, of the

Strategic Forces Committee, your

comments saying that the statement

that was made by the IAEA related to

Iran’s nuclear capability came on the

same day that the President decided to

abandon the European site, I thought

were profound. Because, in reality, this

ostensible alternative that the President

suggests that we can put in place

of the ground-based system, we were

going to build anyway.

That’s nothing new. All we have done

is to take out the equation of the

ground-based system that, as Mr. AKIN

says, would have had the actual capability

of interdicting ICBMs. That’s all

we have really done.

Of course, the system we were building

in Europe could have protected the

American homeland. Any ability to do

that in this so-called alternative that

we were going to build anyway will be

out around 2020.

I just appreciate the gentleman being

able to point out that critically important

point, because I believe, Mr.

Speaker, that the Obama administration’s

decision last week to abandon

the European site will go down in history

as a crossroads in European and

American relations.

I am afraid that this and future

American generations may be greatly

affected. When the administration decided

to abandon U.S. plans for a

ground-based missile defense site in

Europe, I believe the President fundamentally

disgraced and weakened

this Nation by breaking his word to our

loyal and courageous allies in the

Czech Republic and Poland.

Mr. Speaker, America has become

the greatest Nation in history because

our word has always meant something.

The announcement to abandon the protective

missile defense shield in Europe

has fundamentally altered that paradigm.

After the decision was announced,

the newspaper headlines in

Poland and the Czech Republic stated

the situation in the very starkest of

terms.

One Czech newspaper had the quote:

That’s an incredible statement.

In the Czech Republic, the daily

Lidowe Noviny commented, that’s one

of their major newspapers, Obama gave

in to the Kremlin. This has weakened

America’s place in the world.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama’s decision

to abandon our faithful allies and

instead placate Russian belligerence

came on the 70th anniversary to the

exact day of the Soviet Union’s invasion

of Poland after two of humanity’s

notorious monsters named Stalin and

Hitler insidiously agreed to divide the

nation of Poland between themselves.

Our allies deserve better than that,

Mr. Speaker, after they stood bravely

in the face of Russian aggression and

paid a tremendous price politically and

otherwise to stand by us. They had a

right to expect America to keep her

word and to stand by them. But, ironically,

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Obama’s terribly

flawed reasoning for the abandonment

of the European missile defense

site really has everything to do with

Russia, because Russia has always

hated the missile defense plan because

they don’t want American presence in

their quote former ‘‘empire.’’ Knowing

that this would diminish Russia’s influence

in the region, even though the

Russian military would not be threatened

in any way by the European site,

it would not be any real defense of any

kind against the Russian federation

strike.

Russia’s leaders know that if an

American radar is placed in the Czech

Republic and the American missile

interceptors are placed in Poland,

those two sovereign countries would be

stepping further away from the shackles

of Russian oppression in the East

and joining with the Americans in the

West for the cause of democratic independence

and human freedom.

Yes, sir. Of

course, as Mr. TURNER said, on the

exact day that the IAEA said that Iran

was gaining nuclear capability.

You are exactly

right. Here is the thing that is

most profound to me. Since the timeframe

that you mentioned is correct,

that means that any alternative system

could come far too late to have

any influence on Iran’s calculus to go

forward with its missile program or its

nuclear program.

The idea if we had the ability to

knock down anything they threw up,

anything that they should launch, if

they knew that America could interdict

those missiles, all of a sudden they

might say we are taking a tremendous

chance, maybe on a military intervention

here. You never know, and if the

Americans can knock this down anyway,

maybe we should reconsider. That

was the hope.

Well, I absolutely

do not. You know, we have had

a lot of Russian belligerence lately, as

you know. They have spoken against

this for a long time. But the report surfaced

in March of this year that the

President was going to offer Russia a

promise that the United States would

not build the missile defense site if

Moscow would commit to helping us to

discourage Iran’s nuclear program.

That was the so-called equation.

But you have to recall that Russia

was actually the one who has already

delivered nuclear fuel to Iran. They

were the one who was paid $800 million

to help build the Bushehr power plant

in Iran that could have implications

for building fissile material in the future.

Of course, they have been

complicit in helping them with their

missile program.

Moreover, it is just this week—I

think this is an important thing to

know—Venezuela’s Hugo Chavez announced

the purchase of more than $2

billion in arms from Russia, including

rocket technology, and has declared

that Venezuela will get started on a

nuclear program with Iran’s help. This

is some sort of unholy alliance here. To

somehow suggest that Russia is going

to be a help here, I think, is naive beyond

degree.

I agree. I

guess I just repeat that we were trying

to build out these systems anyway.

This was something that was already

on the drawing board. We want to have

a robust system that is able to interdict

short-range, medium-range, and

long-range. And THAAD and Aegis,

none of us on the Republican side

would argue one moment that those

aren’t important, but the challenge is

that we’re taking away our ground-based

system, which these other things

are still on the drawing board, in many

cases.

I thought that Mr. BISHOP made a

point that was so critical. It might be

my last point here, Mr. Chairman, if

you would let me make it, because it’s

really a quote to Mark Helperin in the

Wall Street Journal after the President’s

decision last week to abandon

the plans for the European missile defense

site. He stated it this way, kind

of that historic, 50,000-foot view thing

that we’re talking about. He said,

Mr. TURNER, I would just say this in

closing here. If the Obama administration

continues down this road of appeasement

and denial, the Nation of

Iran will gain nuclear weapons capability

and pass that technology on to

terrorists, as well as perhaps even the

weapons, and this generation and so

many to come will face the horrifying

reality of nuclear jihad.

Those of us who have been blessed to

walk in the sunlight of freedom in this

generation will relegate our children to

walk in the minefield of nuclear terrorism

in the next generation.

I just hope that somehow reason can

somehow be injected back into this

system and we can understand, from a

historical point of view, that when we

stood up to despotism in the past, it

was always a good thing. When we

counted on appeasement, it always

hurt us. I just pray that we can catch

it soon enough here.

I thank you for the opportunity.
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