Madam Speaker, I yield

myself 5 minutes.

Madam Speaker, I sought the time in

opposition mainly because it is a very

opportune time to talk about our foreign

policy and the disadvantages that

intervention poses for us.

There are two types of foreign policy

we can have: interventionism, where

we tell other people what to do; and

the more traditional American foreign

policy of nonintervention and not

using force to tell other people what to

do. The policy of foreign intervention

has been around a long time, and it is

not only one party that endorses it. In

1998 we had a similar bill come up to

the floor. It was called the Iraqi Freedom

Act. And that was the preliminary

stages of leading to a war, which is a

very unpopular, very expensive, and

deadly war going on right now in Iraq.

So this is a similar bill moving in that

direction.

The 1998 resolution, which required

regime change and laid the plans out

for regime change, did not come up

under this administration. That occurred

with the previous administration.

But I have no qualms about the goals

of the authors of this legislation. They

would like to see freedom in Iran. I

would, too. It is just that I believe the

use of force backfires on us, and when

we use force such as sanctions and subsidizing

and giving money to dissidents,

what we really do is the opposite

of what we want. Those individuals

who are trying to promote more freedom

in Iran actually are forced to ally

themselves with the radicals, so instead

of undermining the system, it

has made it worse. It is always argued

that they will welcome us when we

march in as liberators, and Iraq proved

that that was not the case. Iran won’t

be much better.

But let me just say a few things

about interventionism. Interventionism,

which is essentially something

that was gradually developed

over the 20th century, led to a century

of war and killing and was very expensive

to the American people in costs. It

means that we assume the moral right

and the constitutional authority to be

involved in the internal affairs of other

nations, and yet there is no moral

right for us to get involved in the internal

affairs of other countries, and

there is no constitutional authority for

us to do so.

We are not designated as ‘‘the nation

builder.’’ No matter how well-intended

it is, it doesn’t work, and we don’t have

this authority to do this. We have not

been designated the ‘‘policeman of the

world,’’ although we have assumed that

role more so every year, and that has

been going on for several decades.

There are always more costs than

anybody imagines. Iraq was supposed

to cost $50 billion. It is now hundreds

of billions of dollars. There is economic

harm done. There is inflation that it

causes. Yet it continues, and instead of

coming to an end, it tends to spread.

That is why I fear this so much.

I see the way we are dealing with

Iran as just spreading a problem that

we contributed to in the Middle East.

Too many innocent lives are lost, innocent

American lives, GIs that go over

and are killed so needlessly, especially

since we don’t achieve the goal of

bringing freedom and liberty and democracy

to these countries.

Interventionism endorses the principle

that we have this authority to

change regimes. We have been doing it

for more than 50 years through activities

of the CIA in a secret manner, and

now we are doing it in a much more

open manner where we literally invade

countries. We initiate the force. We

start the war because we believe that

we have a monopoly on goodness that

we can spread and teach other people

to understand and live with.

There are too many unintended consequences,

too much blow-back. It

comes back to harm us in the long run.

At one time we were an ally of Saddam

Hussein. At one time we were an ally of

Osama bin Laden. These things don’t

work out the way we think they are

going to.

The one thing that interventionism

endorses, which I strongly disagree

with, it really deemphasizes diplomacy.

It deemphasizes it to the point

where if we don’t feel like it, we are

not willing to talk to people. When we

feel like it, we might demagogue it and

pretend we are talking. But it really

doesn’t encourage diplomacy.

Another reason why interventionism

is so bad for us, it encourages special

interests to get behind our foreign policy

and endorse what we are doing and

influence what we are doing, possibly

another country and possibly some industry

that might influence us.

Madam Speaker, I yield

myself 1 minute before I yield to the

gentleman from Iowa.

I want to quote from Article IV of

the NonProliferation Treaty of which

Iran is a signator: ‘‘Nothing in this

Treaty shall be interpreted as affecting

the inalienable right of all the Parties

to the Treaty to develop research, production,

and use of nuclear energy for

peaceful purposes without discrimination.’’

Our position is that they do not have

the right to enrich. Those who deny the

right to enrich are more in violation of

the NPT Treaty than Iran itself.

What do we do for those who are totally

in defiance to international law

in the NPT Treaty, like India and

Pakistan? We reward them and subsidize

them. At the same time, there is

no proof that there has been any violation

of this treaty by Iran, and yet the

rewards go to those who are in total

defiance.

Madam Speaker, I would yield 5 minutes

to the gentleman from Iowa

Madam Speaker, there

has been talk in the media and elsewhere

about the necessity of bombing

Iran, and we are talking today about

regime change, which is an act of force,

yet some of us believe we are acting

too hastily. Others deny that; that

something imminently is going to happen.

But I want to read a little quote

here from John Negroponte, Director of

National Intelligence. He says, ‘‘Our

assessment at the moment is that even

though we believe that Iran is determined

to acquire a nuclear weapon, we

believe that it is still a number of

years before they are likely to have

enough fissile material to assemble

into or put into a nuclear weapon; perhaps

into the next decade. So I think it

is important that this issue be kept in

perspective.’’ This is John Negroponte.

And I think those who are so eager to

pass this legislation and move toward

regime change are moving in the wrong

direction too hastily, and there are a

lot of analogies to this and to Iraq, so

we caution you about that.

Madam Speaker, I yield

myself 5 minutes.

Madam Speaker, there has been a lot

of talk here about what this bill is

doing and that it does not authorize

the use of force. As a matter of fact,

the language in the bill says this does

not authorize the use of force. But my

contention is it is a contradiction to

the bill itself because the bill itself

does authorize the use of force. No, not

tanks and airplanes and bombs yet, but

we know that all these options are still

on the table.

But what it does authorize is something

that is equivalent to force, and

that is sanctions. Sanctions are used as

an act of war.

Also, this bill has money in it, and it

is open-ended, an authorization of appropriation.

There is authorized to be

appropriated to the Department of

State such sums as may be necessary

to carry out this section. And what is

this section talking about? Subsidies

and funding of dissident groups to go in

there and undermine the Iranian government.

Yes, we quote Ahmadinejad about his

vitriolic statements, and they are horrible,

but how do you think they interpret

other statements when we say we

are going to wipe their regime off the

face of the Earth? We are going to have

regime change. So from their viewpoint

we are saying the same thing,

and we should not be blinded to that

and pretend, because our language is

not quite as violent. We are saying the

same thing, because look at the result

of the violence in Iraq as a result of our

efforts of regime change.

Now, one of the major authors of the

Iraqi war, a leader of the neoconservative

movement, came before the committee

when this resolution was debated

and when we had hearings on it.

I want to read a quote from him because

it clarifies this issue. The quote

comes from Michael Ledeen, and he

wants regime change. This is what he

had to say. ‘‘There is much that is

praiseworthy in the Iran Freedom Support

Act. I think it can be improved by

more openly embracing a policy of regime

change in Iran and allocating an

adequate budget to demonstrate our seriousness

in this endeavor. I know

some Members would prefer to dance

around the explicit declaration of regime

change as the policy of this country,

but anyone looking closely at the

language, and that is what I have done,

and content of the Iran Freedom Support

Act and its close relative in the

Senate can clearly see that it is, in

fact, the essence of the matter. You

can’t have freedom in Iran, that is, we

can’t have our way, without bringing

down the mullahs.’’

That is an outright threat. That is

the testimony of a neoconservative

who led us and promoted and pushed

the war in Iraq, and nothing would

please him and others who are behind

this type of resolution to see regime

change. There is no denial of that.

The question is how do we do it? Are

we going to do it pussyfooting around?

Or are we going to use force and violence?

We did, we used bombs for a long

time against Iraq. But we had a bill in

1998 that said explicitly we are going to

get rid of the Iraqi government, and it

took a few years to get the war going.

Both parties are involved in this. It

is not just this administration that has

promoted this type of foreign policy,

which, quite frankly, I see is not in the

best interest of our country. This is

why I am a strong advocate of minding

our own business. Don’t get involved in

nation building. Don’t police the world.

Don’t get involved in the internal affairs

of the other nations. Otherwise,

we have a big job ahead of us.

What about the fact that Kim Jong Il

is still in power? We are talking to

him. We talked to Qadaffi. Mao was in

power, and he had nuclear weapons.

What did we do; did we attack him? No.

What did we do with Stalin? Stalin and

Khrushchev had 30,000 nuclear weapons.

Were we ready to use force and intimidation

and yelling and screaming? And

Khrushchev was ready to wipe us off

the face of the Earth also.

But I am asking you to reconsider

the fact that moving in this direction

is the same thing as we did against

Iraq, and it won’t do us any good. It is

going to cost us a lot of money, and it

is going to cost a lot of lives, and it is

un-American. It is not constitutional.

It is not moral. We should not pursue

this type of foreign policy. We should

take care of ourselves, and we should

be more friendly with nations. We

should be willing to trade. And if you

are concerned about the world, why not

set a good example? When our house is

clean, when we have a good democracy

and a worthy Republic, and we do well,

believe me, they will want to emulate

us.

But attacking and intimidating other

nations, the way we go at it now, literally

backfires on us. What is it doing

to the dissidents, those who would love

to overthrow the Islamic radicals in

Iran right now? It unifies them. Did we

become unified in this country when

we were attacked on 9/11? Do you think

Republicans and Democrats were divided

on 9/11 and 9/12? No, it brings

them together. So this policy does exactly

the opposite of what you pretend

that you want to do, and that is encourage

those people who don’t like

their government. But by doing it this

way, you literally are doing the very

opposite.

So I just plead with you to be more

cautious. Negroponte says there is no

rush. Take some time. They are not

about to have a nuclear weapon. And

whether or not that is their plan or not

probably at this moment is irrelevant.

I mean, if we stood down all these nations

and all these nuclear weapons in

the past, why can’t we practice more

diplomacy to resolve our differences. I

was talking to somebody the other day

and they said, well, maybe in 10 years

they might have a nuclear weapon, so

we must act now. Get the bombs ready.

They are talking about a nuclear attack

on Iran in order to stop them

from producing a nuclear bomb. It is

time to step back and look at the policy.

The policy of nonintervention and

peaceful relations with the world and

peaceful trade is the American way to

go, and it will lead to peace and prosperity.