

Kapalua, bringing the full fruits of tourism to bear on Maui's economy. That economic success story is certainly his chief legacy.

His first and only election loss came in November when his bid for mayor was turned back by Linda Crockett Lingle. Hokama again found himself bucking the odds by taking on the popular Republican incumbent, but as always he showed his resolve not to be cowed by the odds. He waged an aggressive and tireless campaign from day one, the only difference being that this time he lost.

That he didn't lose in any of the 20 elections between this one is both a tribute to the man Goro Hokama and a profit to the County of Maui. •

STAR WARS OR MAGINOT LINE? CONTRACT TO BANKRUPT AMERICA

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, the Republican contract calls for the old star wars program—the strategic defense initiative [SDI]—to be retooled, reinvigorated, and deployed “at the earliest possible date.” We have spent a fortune on this program since 1983, with next to nothing to show for it, except perhaps how wasteful and foolish our defense spending can sometimes be.

The following article, written by Robert Wright in the *New Republic* in December 1994, makes a clear case for discontinuing the high levels of treasure we spend on missile defense every year. President Clinton, who seems intent on spending far too much on defense over the next few years, must know that the new threats to our national security cannot be parried by building fanciful, expensive, uncertain missile defenses.

The President and Congress instead ought to acknowledge that SDI by any name remains nothing more than a 1990's version of the old French Maginot Line. The Maginot Line didn't work in World War I, and star wars can't work today, for reasons made clear over the past 10 years of congressional and public debate. Sadly, we are visiting an issue now that should have gone away in the late 1980's.

I commend the *New Republic* article to my colleagues, and I ask that it be printed in the *RECORD*.

The article follows:

CRAZY STATE

(By Robert Wright)

Gingrich argued that conservatives adopt space exploration and Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative, the so-called Star Wars program, as causes for tactical political gain. “Young people like space,” he said.—*The Washington Post*, 1985)

The Strategic Defense Initiative is back. It's right there in the Republicans' Contract with America—or, at least, in the exegesis. The National Security Restoration Act, one of ten bills the contract would bring to a vote by spring, demands “deployment at the earliest possible date” of an anti-ballistic missile defense. The Republicans haven't said whether that means a space-based defense or a land-based defense. Either way it means trashing the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, upping Pentagon spending by several billion a year for research and upping it by much more when deployment starts. Why aren't you excited?

A surprisingly large number of people are. The new SDI comes with a new post-cold war rationale that has attracted not just Republicans, but some centrist Democrats. Indeed, research for a land-based SDI has stayed alive—if barely, and under another name—during the Clinton administration. Accelerated research and early deployment are thus a real political possibility, even if space-based weapons are a long shot. But before we make that leap, could somebody explain why the post-cold war rationale deserves anything less than the derision that finally overwhelmed the cold war rationale?

The cold war derision had two pillars. First, there were firm doubts about technical feasibility. Nothing has since happened to undermine them. The Pentagon's initial claim of a 96 percent success rate for the Patriot Missile against Iraqi Scuds turned out to be fantasy.

Second, we realized that plain old deterrence worked just fine as a missile defense; so long as Leonid Brezhnev could count on tit for tat, he wouldn't attack. If anything, indeed, a missile defense could weaken the perverse logic behind deterrence by making mutually assured destruction less assured; the “protected” nation might feel too nervy and the unprotected nation too nervous.

Now, all of a sudden, we're told that deterrence won't work. Why? Because now we face not coolly rational, game-theoretical Soviets, but a different class of enemy: “rogue states”—Saddam Hussein's Iraq, Kim Jong Il's North Korea, Muammar Qaddafi's Libya. How does one qualify as a “rogue state”? So far as I can tell, it helps if your leader (a) doesn't have white skin, (b) dislikes the United States and (c) does not behave in genteel fashion (often failing, for example, to wear a necktie during affairs of state). The less polite term for “rogue state,” and its real meaning, is “crazy state.” But there is zero evidence that any of these leaders is “crazy” in the relevant sense: suicidal. Quite the contrary. Ronald Reagan gave Qaddafi the litmus test for sanity and he passed: we bombed his house, and he modified his behavior. Hussein has shown repeatedly that, once he knows where the brink is, he doesn't step over it.

Bear in mind that a nuclear attack on the United States would be more suicidal for these men than it would have been for the Soviets. Brezhnev might conceivably have weathered a firestorm and emerged from his bunker to inherit a world destroyed. If Saddam Hussein tried that, he would be squashed like a bug upon emerging. And he knows it.

Besides, if any “crazy” leader does want to blow up an American city, there are SDI-proof ways: drive a bomb across the Mexican border, sail it up the Potomac on a yacht or mail it. For a seventy-pound package, second-day UPS costs less than a ballistic missile.

Neo-SDI advocates also invoke fear of “accidental launch.” But, as John Pike of the Federation of American Scientists has written in this magazine, “Lots of things have to happen for a missile to fire. The chances of its leaping unbidden from its silo are about the same as the chances of a car starting itself up, opening the garage door and backing out into the driveway without human assistance.” Besides, how many missiles are aimed at America these days? Russia has agreed to point no missiles at us in exchange for our reciprocal pledge. And whether or not you trust the Russians, their own strategic logic argues increasingly for aiming elsewhere (e.g., at other former Soviet states). Similarly, North Korea's top two targets would be South Korea and Japan. That's the way tensions are in the post-cold war world: regionalized. The surest American defense

against “accidental launch” is to stay on good terms with Brazil.

Of course, however slight the chances of nuclear attack, and however real the chances that a missile defense would fail to repel it, a little insurance would be appealing if it were cheap enough. First of all, it isn't cheap (\$50 billion assuming meager cost overruns). Moreover, “insurance” conduces to solipsism; if we feel (however falsely) safe inside our little shell, waning support for internationalism will wane even faster.

I'm not saying the new SDI enthusiasm is driven by nascent Republican isolationism. But the enthusiasm accommodates and nourishes the party's isolationist strain. In the Republican summary of the Security Restoration Act, only one goal gets more prominent billing than SDI: “to ensure that U.S. troops are only deployed to support missions in the U.S.'s national security interests.”

We all care about “national security interests.” But some of us think that national security (in various senses) is increasingly tied to global stability. The Republicans' post-election rhetoric, in contrast, fixates on keeping U.S. troops out of peacekeeping roles, keeping U.S. dollars from supporting other peacekeepers and stifling the foreign aid that helps stabilize places like Russia and the Middle East.

Also, of course, the Republicans don't favor one-worldish projects like . . . well, like continued adherence to the 1972 ABM Treaty. And violating that treaty (which, alas, even the Clinton administration's battlefield missile-defense research program threatens to do) is itself a dangerous retreat from internationalism. What's scarier than an Indian-Pakistani border flanked by nuclear arsenals? An Indian-Pakistani border flanked by destabilizing ABMs as well. We might yet be able to head that prospect off, but not once we've built our own shell.

The United States is now uniquely positioned to lead the world in avoiding two bad things: a global race to build destabilizing missile defense systems, and a global race to carry destabilizing weapons into space—not just anti-missile weapons, but anti-satellite weapons. The Republicans are now on record as wanting to start the first of these races, and they are clearly inclined to start the second. It's time for President Clinton to crawl out of his bomb shelter, survey the wreckage and start fighting. •

PERES ON DESALINATION

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I will be reintroducing the desalination research bill, which I have introduced in two previous Congresses. It has passed the Senate twice. Unfortunately, it got caught up in the last-minute, partisan wrangling that had nothing to do with the desalination bill, and it did not pass.

The need for it becomes more and more clear every day.

Recently, I had the chance to read responses of Israeli Foreign Minister Simon Peres to questions at the National Press Club Forum on October 4.

In response to a question by Jim Anderson of the German Press Agency, Foreign Minister Peres said: “If you want to save your children from poverty, pay attention to the water. The rivers do not follow the frontiers and the rain doesn't go through the customs.”

Then, in response to another question from a reporter, whose name I do

not have, he said: "There are projects that cannot be postponed. For example, the production of water, which is a must in order to satisfy basic needs of—(inaudible)—and it must be done on a regional basis."

He talks about the need for supplying water for drinking, for industrial purposes, and for agricultural purposes and the need for desalination. The unfortunate reality is that desalination research has been minimal in recent years. When John F. Kennedy was President of the United States, he pushed it, but since that time, desalination research has been almost on hold. It is critical that we move ahead, and the Middle East is just one area where that is evident.●

BRITAIN JOINS AMERICANS IN ATTACKING TV VIOLENCE

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, we are slowly but solidly making progress to reduce television entertainment violence in our country.

We still have a long way to go, but I came across an Associated Press item reporting that even in Great Britain, which has much stricter standards on television violence than we do, there is concern about television violence.

I thought my colleagues might be interested in the Associated Press story about violence on British television and some of the things that are happening there.

I ask that the Associated Press article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

BRITAIN JOINS AMERICANS IN ATTACKING TV VIOLENCE

LONDON.—British television concerned over the soaring number of violent crimes in Britain, is moving to cut down on the amount of violence and brutality shown on TV screens here.

Both the British Broadcasting Corp. and the Independent Television Commission announced changes last week.

The ITC told commercial TV companies to cut the amount of violence they screen and said they will be monitored to ensure they comply.

Among competitor BBC's revised guidelines for programmers:

Viewers should be given more information about what programs contain before screening, so they can switch off if they wish.

Programmers should have sharper awareness of portrayals of sexual violence and violence against women.

U.S. programmers face a similar battle. The four U.S. broadcast networks, hoping to head off government intervention, have agreed to air parental warnings before certain shows.

The BBC included no enforcement provisions in its guidelines. But as a private network, financed by license fees paid by viewers, it could simply edit out offending segments or censor entire programs.

Companies who ignore the ITC guidelines can be reprimanded or fined. The commission, established by Act of Parliament, regulates Britain's Independent Television network.

David Glencross, chief executive of the ITC said in announcing ITC guidelines Thursday. "What we are seeing is a public revulsion

against violence in society which is feeding through to a desire for greater sensitivity by TV programmers and the makers of films and videos."

ITC guidelines tell program-makers to consider carefully in each case whether violent scenes are justified.

Programmers should not look at violent scenes in isolation but consider the accumulation of such scenes on viewers.

Program-makers should avoid programming which "appears to promote violence as a solution to problems or difficulties."

In the area of news, the guidelines note that "violent images are becoming increasingly available to news editors" and said TV news bulletins should take account of the time they are to be shown.

The ITC guidelines say no proof exists that violence on TV encourages violent crime in real life but state:

"Caution is required in the television portrayal of violence, given concern about the level of violence in society and the possibility of behavior or attitudes being influenced by what is shown on television. Broadcasters should therefore be especially vigilant about the amount of violence in their programs."

Will Wyatt, managing director of BBC network TV, said in announcing the BBC guidelines. "We must ensure that where violent scenes—in fictional programs or in news coverage—are felt to be editorially necessary, they are included only after careful and detailed consideration.

"Although we cannot control what happens in the home, we must ensure that before material is transmitted it is tested for suitability for the time and place of its transmission—or whether it should be transmitted at all."●

IN DEFIANCE OF DARWIN

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, no one doubts that the schools in our Nation should do better. What is still not widely known is that we really do understand how to do better, but we're not applying the knowledge we have.

Education simply has not become enough of a priority. Those of us in public life talk a good game, but too few of us do anything about it.

An illustration of what can happen is an article that appeared several weeks ago in Newsweek magazine titled "In Defiance of Darwin," written by Lynnell Hancock.

I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

[From Newsweek, Oct. 24, 1994]

IN DEFIANCE OF DARWIN—HOW A PUBLIC SCHOOL IN THE BRONX TURNS DROPOUTS INTO SCHOLARS

(By Lynnell Hancock)

It's a notorious corner in the South Bronx—once a grand address, now the hub of the nation's poorest neighborhood. Today, at 149th Street and the Grand Concourse, a public high school for at-risk children defies Darwin on a daily basis. Inside Hostos-Lincoln Academy of Science, a class of seniors grapples with "The Seafarer," an Old English poem about danger, survival and destiny. None of these teenagers was expected to ever navigate into the treacherous pages of medieval lit. In fact, their eight-grade counselors had written off most of them as probable dropouts, based on low reading scores and spotty attendance. That's how they landed at Hostos. Now, after four years

here, more than 80 percent are headed for college. And they engage in a lively discussion about the sailor who believes his imminent death at sea is a stark inevitability, written in foam. "The Anglo-Saxons thought every person's fate was predetermined," the teacher, Vincent Sottile, reminds the class. "But we know we have to help ourselves."

These 300 black and Latino students provide the basis for a strong retort to "The Bell Curve." Richard Herrnstein and Charles Murray argue that IQ is largely genetic and that low IQ means scant success in society. Therefore, they contend, neither effective schools nor a healthier environment can do much to alter a person's destiny. Yet, at Hostos, reading scores nearly doubled over two years. The dropout rate is low, and attendance is high. About 70 percent of the class of 1989 graduated on time, double the city's average. Among last year's graduates, one was accepted at Columbia University's School of Engineering. Others are attending Fordham University and Hamilton College.

Hostos was established by the city seven years ago for South Bronx children who live "stressing lives," as one student puts it, in broken families and dangerous neighborhoods that offer only huge, anonymous public schools. Hostos is small, attentive to individual students, and demanding. To ensure that no child goes astray, one teacher is assigned for four years to the same home-room class, which combines lessons in rudimentary social skills with those in computer and civics. Most students take honors and even college-level courses. "We threw out the Mickey Mouse curriculum and introduced [University of the State of New York] Regents-level courses," said Dr. Michele Cataldi, Hostos's founder and principal. Where students once had business math, they now have trigonometry. "At first we felt students couldn't do it, but we were wrong," says Cataldi. Teachers worked overtime to provide intensive one-on-one tutoring. The results were impressive. The number of students in each class who passed the state's regents biology test rose from 9 to 50 percent in two years. "You have to believe in them," says Donna Light-Donovan, a biology teacher. "Most kids don't have anyone at home who does."

Stanley Mustafa is one student who found a haven at Hostos. A few years ago he was stabbed on the street by a neighborhood teen. His life was saved by a trauma surgeon. That's the profession he now expects to enter some day. "It made me grow up faster," says Mustafa, 17, dressed in baggy jeans and an oversize Black Sheep T shirt. "I don't want to end up on the corner, hanging with the homeboys." He takes chemistry and cellular biology at Hostos, studies radiology at a local hospital and hopes to attend Atlanta's Morehouse School of Medicine or the University of Virginia.

Nationwide, more and more districts are establishing small "restructured" schools like Hostos that stress team teaching, a familylike environment and high expectations. New York City has more than 35 of them, with plans for about 50 more. Herrnstein and Murray argue that 30 years of such experimental schools for disadvantaged children have shown paltry improvements, and that federal money should be funneled away from them, and toward schools for the "cognitive elite." But a new study comparing 820 high schools—some big and traditional, others small and cooperative—proves otherwise. From eighth to 10th grade, students in the restructured schools showed 30 percent higher gains in math and 24 percent higher gains in reading compared with students in traditional schools.