

If there is a silver lining for the schools, it is that Senate Democrats have taken note of the states' retrenchment on education spending, and are trying to use the schools plight to wring more money from the Bush administration and the Republicans who control the House of Representatives.

Senate and House leaders have been deadlocked for months over how much to spend on elementary and secondary schools in the next year. House leaders have agreed to spend nearly \$30 billion, an increase of about \$5 billion over the current year. But Senator Edward M. Kennedy, the Massachusetts Democrat who is chairman of the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee, has called that figure at least \$10 billion too low.

To buttress his argument, Mr. Kennedy's aides released their own study of state education budgets on Nov. 16, which predicted that states will spend \$11 billion less on schools this academic year than is needed, when inflation and enrollment growth are taken into account.

Representative George Miller, a California Democrat whose staff worked with Mr. Kennedy's said, "The faltering economy is putting at risk the advancements that many states are making to improve the quality of their educational systems."

Given the realities of the economy, few districts have sought to challenge the state and local governments that are often ordering the cuts.

"What are we going to say?" said Anthony Shorris, the deputy chancellor of the New York City Board of Education. "This is a terrible catastrophe that hit New York. Our goal is to live with what we've got, and still help our students meet these new demands."

In California, the more than \$800 million in school budget cuts identified by Governor Davis have jolted systems that had grown accustomed to receiving more money from Sacramento each of the last few years.

Ms. Anderson, the principal of Harvey Elementary, a wood-beam-and-stucco building that is crammed to four times its intended capacity, said she was sometimes inclined to agree with those researchers who have found that more money does not necessarily lead to improved student achievement. But, she said, the \$300,000 the school spent on its afternoon literacy program in each of the last two years—it now serves 150 students, most of them Mexican-American—was followed by a relatively steep rise in reading scores.

Last year, the school's students, who are among the most disadvantaged in the state, exceeded the overall scoring target set for them by state officials by a factor of five. Driving that improvement were the school's fourth graders, 25 percent of whom were found to be reading above grade level last year, compared with 7 percent three years ago.

Amy McDonald, a third-grade teacher who sends 16 of her 19 students to the intensive after-school program, said that the impact on their English in just three months this year had been remarkable. She said that her students arrive in class in the morning eager to discuss what they learned the previous afternoon.

Lizbett Mejia, 9, whose mother was born in Mexico and can barely communicate in English, said she had become hooked by her after-school teachers on a popular collection of books known as the "Little Sister" series. "I didn't know that much of reading," Lizbett said. "Now I know how to read more."

By replacing certified teachers with local college students, Ms. Anderson said, she believe she can keep this year's after-school program running at full capacity. But when

the proposed state cuts, including those to badly needed subsidies for school electrical payments, are combined with anticipated reductions in public and privately financed grants, Ms. Anderson estimates that she will have no more than \$90,000 to spend next year on the program, which would probably cut enrollment in half.

"These last few years have been heaven," she said. "Hopefully we've learned enough to be able to sustain what we think works without having the money we thought we needed to pay for it."

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### IN HONOR OF 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF UNITED STATES ARMY WAR COLLEGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 100th anniversary of the United States Army War College located in Pennsylvania's 19th Congressional District, which I am privileged to serve. President Theodore Roosevelt's Secretary of War, Elihu Root, founded the War College on November 27, 1901. Secretary Root wished to establish a place where senior leaders of our Armed Forces would study and strategize problems of national defense, military science, and responsible command.

Among the many graduates of this pristine institute are former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, 1927; General Omar N. Bradley, 1934; General H. Norman Schwarzkopf, 1973; and General Richard Myers, 1981, our current chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

In July of 1951, the Army War College relocated to Carlisle, Pennsylvania, where it has continued to serve our Nation, our allies, and the military in the capacity envisioned by Secretary Root. Under the exceptional command of Major General Robert Ivany, the Army War College strives to face the defense challenges of today while adhering to its long time motto, "Not to promote war but to preserve peace."

Mr. Speaker, it is a true pleasure and privilege to recognize and commend the United States War College on its 100th anniversary.

#### MORE THAN A WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, this evening, as our Marines are on the ground in Afghanistan, I would like to posit that the United States is engaged in more than a war. Indeed, we are engaged in the middle of a revolution.

Today, Thomas Friedman, New York Times News Service, wrote an editorial entitled "Shedding the Veil of bin Laden," which I will submit for the RECORD, and I will only read a small part of it. Mr. Friedman is traveling in that part of the world, in the United Arab Emirates, and he says: "Over coffee the other day here in the gulf, an Arab friend confided to me something that was deeply troubling to him. He said, My 11-year-old son thinks bin Laden is a good man. For Americans, Osama bin Laden is a mass murderer. But for many young Arabs, bin Laden, even in defeat, is still Robin Hood. What attracts them to him is his sheer defiance of everything young Arabs and Muslims detest," Friedman goes on, "their hypocritical rulers, Israel, U.S. dominance, and their own backwardness."

He then goes on to quote Steven Cohen, the Middle East analyst, who says, "We in America can't just go on looking at the Arab world as a giant gas station, indifferent to what happens inside. Because the gas is now leaking and all around people are throwing matches. Every day," he says, "I see signs that this war of ideas is possible."

And, indeed, we are involved in a war of ideas. I would like to commend again the book "Sacred Rage" by Robin Wright, as a very important contribution to our own understanding of the revolution in which we are engaged. In 1986, when this book was first published, and is now being updated, the author, Robin Wright, quotes Sajib Salom, the former Lebanese Prime Minister, who said, "The growth of Islamic fundamentalism is an earthquake."

She recounts from her own personal experience living in the Middle East the turning point of this revolution, centering it in Iran. Of course, the government that the United States of America had supported collapsed in Iran in 1979, the Shah of Iran deposed, something that the United States had not anticipated. And, in fact, his government at that time, serving as policeman for the entire gulf region. Well, shortly thereafter, in March of 1982, there was a huge conference in Tehran, where some 380 men with various religious and revolutionary credentials met at the former Hilton conference ballroom. Their goal was to help to create the ideal Islamic government.

As the government of Iran switched from a monarchy to a theocracy, they had many declarations that came out of that seminar, and she recounts this going back to the mid 1980s. The conclusions of the seminar in some ways were vaguely worded and riddled with rhetoric, but revolutions are that way, and Islamic militants, mainly Shi'a but including some Sunnis, and more recently even more of them, would launch a large-scale offensive to cleanse the Islamic world of the Sattanic Western and Eastern influences

that they viewed as hindering their progress, and they agreed to the following back in the early 1980s:

First, that religion should not be separated from politics; secondly, that the only way to achieve true independence, true independence, was to return to Islamic roots; third, there should be no reliance on superpowers or other outsiders, and the region should get rid of them; and, fourth, they recommended that the Shi'a should be more active in getting rid of foreign powers.

Dr. Marvin Zonis, at that time the director of the Middle East Institute at the University of Chicago, had a stunning comment about the Psychological Roots of Shiite Muslim Terrorism in a Washington seminar, in which he stated this message from Iran: No matter how bizarre or trivial it may sound on first, second, fourth or 39th hearing, is, in my opinion, the single most impressive political ideology which has been proposed in the 20th century since the Bolshevik Revolution. If we accepted Bolshevism as a remnant of the 19th century, then, he argues, that we have had only one good one in the 20th century, and I would put the word good in quotes, and it is this one: Islamic fundamentalism. This powerful message will be with us for a very long time, no matter what happens to Ayatollah Khomeini.

As I end this evening, I would just commend this book "Sacred Rage," and say I will continue with briefings on this as the days proceed, and I submit herewith, Mr. Speaker, the newspaper article I referred to above:

[From the Toledo (OH) Blade, Nov. 26, 2001]

SHEDDING THE VEIL OF BIN LADEN  
(By Thomas L. Friedman)

DUBAI, United Arab Emirates.—Over coffee the other day here in the gulf, an Arab friend—a sweet, thoughtful, liberal person—confided to me something that was deeply troubling him: "My 11-year old son thinks bin Laden is a good man."

For Americans, Osama bin Laden is a mass murderer. But for many young Arabs, bin Laden even in defeat, is still Robin Hood. What attracts them to him is not his vision of the ideal Muslim society, which few would want to live in. No, what attracts them to him is his sheer defiance of everything young Arabs and Muslims detest—their hypocritical rulers, Israel, U.S. dominance, and their own economic backwardness. He is still the finger in the eye of the world that so many frustrated, powerless people out here would love to poke.

The reason it is important to eliminate bin Laden—besides justice—is the same reason it was critical to eliminate the Taliban: As long as we're chasing him around, there will never be an honest debate among Muslims and Arabs about the future of their societies.

Think of all the nonsense written in the press—particularly the European and Arab media—about the concern for "civilian casualties," in Afghanistan. It turns out many of those Afghan "civilians" were praying for another dose of B-52s to liberate them from the Taliban, casualties or not. Now that the Taliban are gone, Afghans can freely fight out, among themselves, the war of ideas for what sort of society they want.

My hope is that once bin Laden is eliminated, Arabs and Muslims will want to do the same. That is, instead of expressing rage

with their repressive, corrupt rulers, or with U.S. policy, by rooting for bin Laden, they will start to raise their own voices. It's only when the Arab-Muslim world sheds the veil of bin Laden, as Afghans shed the Taliban, and faces the fact that Sept. 11 was primarily about anger and problems with their societies, not ours, will we eradicate not just the hardware of terrorism, but its software.

"We in the West can't have that debate for them, but we can help create the conditions for it to happen," remarked the Middle East analyst Stephen P. Cohen. "America's role is to show the way to incremental change—something that is not, presto, instant democracy or fantasies that enlightened despotism will serve our interest. We can't just go on looking at the Arab world as a giant gas station, indifferent to what happens inside. Because the gas is now leaking and all around people are throwing matches."

Every day I see signs that this war of ideas is possible: It's the Arab journalist who says to me angrily of the Arab world today, "We can't even make an aspirin for our own headache," or it's Ahmad al-Baghdadi, the Kuwaiti professor, who just published a remarkable essay in Kuwait's Al Anbaa and Egypt's Akhbar Al Youm titled "Sharon Is a Terrorist—and You?"

[Ariel] Sharon was a terrorist from the very first moment of the . . . Zionist entity," wrote Baghdadi. But what about Arab-Muslim rulers? "Persecuting intellectuals in the courtrooms [of Arab countries], trials [of intellectuals] for heresy . . . all exist only in the Islamic world. Is this not terrorism? . . . Iraq alone is a never-ending story of terrorism of the state against its own citizens and neighbors. Isn't this terrorism? . . . The Palestinian Arabs were the first to invent airplane hijacking and the scaring of passengers. Isn't this terrorism?"

"Arab Muslims have no rivals in this; they are the masters of terrorism toward their citizens, and sometimes their terrorism also reaches the innocent people of the world, with the support of some of the clerics . . .

"[Ours] is a nation whose ignorance makes the nations of the world laugh! The Islamic world and the Arab world are the only [places] in which intellectuals—whose only crime was to write—rot in prison. The Arab and Muslims claim that their religion is a religion of tolerance, but they show no tolerance for those who oppose their opinions.

". . . Now the time has come to pay the price . . . and the account is long—longer than all the beards of the Taliban gang together. The West's message to the Arab and Muslim world is clear: mend your ways or else" (translation by MEMMRI).

We must fight the ground war to get bin Laden and his hardware. But Arab and Muslims must fight the war of ideas to uproot his software. The sooner we help them get on to that war, the better.

Ask the folks in Kabul.

#### GENERAL CONCERNS ABOUT OUR BORDERS, LAND, AIR, AND WATER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to talk a little bit tonight about our north and south borders. We have general concerns in the United States about our borders, our land, air, and water, for any number of reasons; and our challenge is how to keep our trade flowing and our traffic flowing while still meeting our security concerns.

Drug issues are a big concern in this country, illegal immigration, and other products that are either illegal to come in, like Cuban cigars, or of particular importance in regional areas such as cheese or other products. And of course the big concern that all Americans have right now is terrorism. It is of particular importance on the northern and southern borders of the United States, where trade with Mexico and Canada have become vital to the economic systems of our nations.

My Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources of the Committee on Government Reform is conducting a series of hearings over the next few months in both the north and south borders. Our first hearings were held at the Highgate Springs, in Vermont, on the Montreal-Boston interstate corridor, and in Champlain, New York, on the Montreal-New York City corridor. In 2 weeks, we will be having a hearing in Blaine, Washington on the Vancouver-Seattle corridor.

In addition to these hearings, we have also been systematically meeting with the Coast Guard on Lake Champlain and will be in Puget Sound with the Border Patrol, with INS, with Customs and DEA. We also visit some of the lower traffic ports of entry in each of these areas. Some of these in the past have only been manned part-time with one person. There are many areas along our borders, both north and south, where you can just walk across. These are clear challenges as we try to control not only illegal drugs and immigration and products but also terrorists from entering our Nation.

With these hearings, because of the importance of working with our neighbors, we have invited participants from the parliaments as well as business representatives from Canada and plan to do the same with Mexico. As a result of our first hearings, in which Parliamentarian Denis Paradis from Quebec participated, he asked me to come to Ottawa to discuss with the numerous committees and other parliamentarians, as they enter into the final stages of their debate on anti-terrorism legislation and immigration bills what we have passed here in this House.

I returned from Ottawa a few hours ago, after spending a day and a half with our Canadian friends and our U.S. Embassy, and I would like to discuss a few of the important points tonight, and probably get a little bit into these again tomorrow.

Twenty-five percent of all trade from the United States is with Canada. To put this in perspective, the trade crossing the Ambassador Bridge between Windsor and Detroit, not all the trade that comes through Detroit, the tunnels and the other bridges, just the Ambassador Bridge alone, the trade over the Ambassador Bridge in Detroit is greater than all U.S.-Japanese trade. All the trade with U.S. and Japan does not equal what goes across one bridge in Detroit.