

Two Congressional Voices Against War

March 31—By the end of the Congressional session last week, both Houses of Congress had “debated” and passed bills approving Barack Obama’s war-confrontation policy against Russia. The virtual unanimity of support for the Administration’s lies about Russian aggression qualified both Houses to be dubbed Houses of Prostitution, not government.

The Senate passed its bill by voice vote, and the House also passed it, overwhelmingly. However, unlike the March 6 vote of condemnation of Ukraine, 19 Congressmen (two Democrats) gave “no” votes, and 13 abstained.

The floor debate, both in the bill’s markup and in the final debate, was shockingly one-sided, in favor of the war sentiment. Below, we highlight two notable exceptions, Rep. Alan Grayson (D-Fla.), during the March 25 markup in the Foreign Affairs Committee, and Rep. Dana Rohrabacher (R-Calif.) during the House floor debate March 27.

Grayson

The following excerpt was published by theblaze.com:

“You may say that [Yanukovych] was thrown out of office for good reason. There are allegations against him that he was corrupt; there are allegations against him that he used the military against his own people to stay in power. But the fact is that from the perspec-



Creative Commons/House Committee on
Education and the Workforce

Florida Rep. Alan Grayson

tive of the Crimeans, *their leader, the one* that they placed in charge of their country, was thrown out of power. So it should come as no surprise—as Secretary Kerry recognized—that the Crimeans had had enough, and they wanted to leave this artificial entity called the Ukraine.

“Now, in fact, the Russians *did assist*, they assisted by disarming the local Ukrainian army and navy. That’s what they did. They did it virtually bloodlessly. They did that so that the Ukrainian army and navy could not interfere with the referendum that was held. That is the fact of the matter.

“Why are we pretending otherwise? Why are we speaking about *naked aggression*? Why are we speaking about stealing Crimea, why are we speaking about bullying, or the new Soviet Union, or thuggery, or audacious power-grabbing, or *bully-bear* Putin, or Cold War II? I’m surprised [Rep.] Judge Poe [R-Tex.] didn’t tell us that an *Iron Curtain* has descended over Sevastapol.

“This is not some new Cold War that’s occurring. In fact, it’s quite the contrary. We should be *pleased* to see; pleased to see, when a virtually bloodless transfer of power establishes self-determination for two million people somewhere in the world—anywhere in world. And in fact, what we’re seeing here instead, is the vilification of Putin; the vilification of Yanukovych; the vilification of *anybody* that we try to identify as our enemy. Before that it was Saddam Hussein; since then it’s Assad. This does not help. The basic principle here is self-determination. That’s what’s happened in Crimea, and it’s not for us to determine otherwise” (emphases in original).

Rohrabacher

Rohrabacher is the head of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats.

“Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation, and I realize that I am a lone voice—or almost a lone voice—in this discussion today. I see this legislation as a bipartisan green light to reigniting the cold war. Unfortunately, many of my friends and colleagues, both colleagues today and my friends from the time when I spent in the Reagan White House, 7 years, many of these people feel that the cold war is not over, that it never did end. They are more comfortable with treating Russia as if it were still under Communist rule.

“Well, Putin is not a Communist leader. Putin is a nationalist who loves his country and he is looking out for the national interests of his country. For us to try to demonize him and to try to suggest that he is doing this as he did in the cold war and he is still KGB, et cetera, is not doing the cause of peace any good.

“This is what started this whole slide in the wrong direction toward the type of confrontation we are having today. In Ukraine, a democratically elected President was removed from power, and that was a democratically elected President who is more inclined towards better relations with Russia. He was removed from power. And then the Russian Government, under Mr. Putin, decided to ensure the people of Crimea the right to self-determination. Because even Secretary of State Kerry has verified and testified before our committee that the people of Crimea obviously want to be part of Russia; this is not a power grab. This is defending their right to self determination, and certainly the people of Crimea have the right to make that determination just as the people of Kosovo had their right to leave Serbia behind.

“Our military action there to try to protect the right of self determination of the Kosovars, it cost many, many lives. This Russian military move, with all this power grab, et cetera, has resulted in the loss of one life. That is in stark contrast to when we bombed Belgrade, we bombed Serbia.

“No, we should not permit ourselves to reignite a cold war. We should make sure that we realize that the actions we are taking here suggesting the United States must rush in and be the arbiter in every one of these type of conflicts is always stretching our budget. But in this particular bill, we are going to put our name on a loan of \$800 billion to a country that we are going have to borrow the money from China to get.

“The United States can no longer afford to right every wrong in the world and be the arbiter. In this case we would be arbitrating in the wrong direction.”



Creative Commons/Lingjing Bao
California Rep. Dana Rohrabacher