

The 1994 report also barely mentions the brutal eugenics policy under which the People's Republic of China regime has undertaken to reduce the number of defective persons. In December 1993 the Chinese Government issued a draft law on eugenics that would nationalize discrimination against the handicapped. That law is now going into effect. This policy of forced abortions against handicapped children, and forced sterilization against parents who simply do not measure up in the eyes of the state, is eerily reminiscent of Nazi Germany.

CHINA: REPRISALS AGAINST FORCED REPATRIATES

The report on China also states that escapees who are forcibly repatriated "are often detained for a short time to determine identity and any past criminal record or involvement with smuggling activities." The report adds that "[a]s a deterrent and to recover local costs incurred during the repatriation, the authorities in some areas levy a fine of \$1,000 or more on returnees."

This appears to be a deliberate attempt to put government reprisals against escapees in the most favorable possible light—perhaps because these reprisals have frequently been conducted against people who were forcibly repatriated by the United States Government. The report fails to mention that a \$1,000 fine amounts to several times the per capita income in rural areas of China. A fine of this amount is a clear indication that the People's Republic of China regime regards these people as its enemies, not as routine offenders. Nor does the report say what happens to people who are unable to pay these oppressive fines. Newspaper reports during 1993 state that hundreds of people repatriated by the United States have been imprisoned for more than a brief period and have been forced to serve on prison work gangs. The report does not say whether any of these people remained incarcerated during 1994.

CUBA: MASSACRES OF PEOPLE ATTEMPTING TO ESCAPE

Similarly, the report on Cuba describes two well-documented instances in which the Cuban Border Guard deliberately killed people who were trying to flee the country. These are the sinking of the *Olympia* and of the *13th of March*. The report goes on to state, however, that there have been no reports of such killings since the September 9 Clinton-Castro immigration agreement. The reports do not state how we would know whether such killings have taken place since the agreement, or what steps—if any—we have taken to make sure they do not. Rather, it leaves the clear impression—without any supporting evidence—that the Castro regime quickly changed its ways upon signing the agreement.

OTHER COUNTRIES: DISCONNECT BETWEEN HUMAN RIGHTS CONCERNS AND U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

I have already stated my concern about the incongruity between the well-documented human rights abuses in Bosnia and Chechnya and our policies toward those countries. The 1994 reports confirm the atrocities in these countries: in Bosnia, concentration camps, routine torture, and rape as an instrument of government policy; in Chechnya, the killing of thousands of civilians and the destruction of hospitals and an orphanage. The director of the Washington office of Amnesty International has commented that the administration's policy toward Chechnya amounted to giving Russia a green light to commit the brutality that is so well documented by the report. I raised this

same concern last month to an administration official who testified before the Helsinki Commission, which I chair. He dismissed it out of hand. This is part of an unfortunate pattern: After an initial period of encouraging rhetoric, the Clinton administration's human rights record has been marked by broken promises, weakness, retreat, inconsistency, and missed opportunities.

There is a similar incongruity between the administration's new friendship with the Government of North Korea and the 1994 report about the situation on the ground in that country. This is a rogue government that not only detains an estimated 150,000 political prisoners in concentration camps, but, also kidnaps citizens of other nations and causes them to disappear. The reports also state that "Political prisoners, opponents of the regime, repatriated defectors, and others * * * have been summarily executed." This is the regime to which the administration, amid much self-congratulation, recently arranged a \$4 billion multilateral aid package.

Other abuses, well documented in the 1994 reports, to which our Government's response has been inadequate or nonexistent include the "extrajudicial executions, torture, and reprisal killings" by Indian security forces fighting separatist insurgents in Kashmir, and the brutal persecution of Christian missionaries and others by the Government of Sudan.

CONCLUSION

Future country condition reports will be far more useful to congress, to the executive, and to the American people if they take care never to understate the extent of human rights abuses—especially when a thorough and honest account of such abuses might compel the reconsideration of United States Government policy toward the perpetrators. We must also work together to ensure that these reports are not just published and then forgotten. Rather, they must be regarded by those who conduct our foreign relations as an indispensable guidebook for a foreign policy worthy of the United States.

HISTORY STANDARDS ARE BUNK

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit an article from the February 6, 1995, U.S. News & World Report entitled "History Standards Are Bunk," to be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

HISTORY STANDARDS ARE BUNK

A funny thing happened to the National History Standards on their way to a famous forum: They were denounced by the United States Senate by a vote of 99 to 1.

This is a major turning point in the debate. The standards are, as Washington Sen. Slade Gorton said, a "perverse" document, loaded up with crude anti-Western and anti-Americans propaganda, but until now, the authors of this mess have been able to pose as bewildered moderates, set upon by a pack of crazed right-wingers.

A new spin will be needed now that the pack of irrational right-wingers includes Ted Kennedy, Carol Moseley-Braun and the entire Senate.

During a debate on other legislation, Gorton introduced an amendment to pull the

plug on funds for the history standards. That probably would have passed fairly easily in a closer vote. But several senators were queasy about pre-empting other concerned groups, including the nation's governors, who have led the effort to set voluntary standards. So a "sense of the Senate" condemnation was voted on instead and passed without dissent. Even the one "No" vote, by Louisiana Democrat Bennett Johnston, was a "Yes" in disguise. He wanted stronger action than simple condemnation.

How do you get all 100 senators to repudiate your standards? Easy. Just do it the way the major perpetrators, historians Gary Nash and Charlotte Crabtree, did it at UCLA's National Center for History in the Schools. Start the standards with the "convergence" gambit: America is not a Western-based nation but the result of three cultures (Indian, black and European) "converging." This subliminally puts the Founding Fathers, and whites in general, in their place as mere founders of a third of a nation.

TRASHING EUROPEAN CULTURE

Though two of these three founding cultures were preliterate, depict all three as equal in value and importance, except for the fact that European culture was worse and dedicated largely to oppression, injustice, gender bias and rape of the natural world.

Carry this theme through, trampling moderate opinion to the point where Albert Shanker of the American Federation of Teachers says: "No other nation in the world teaches a national history that leaves its children feeling negative about their own country—this would be the first."

Connecticut Sen. Joseph Lieberman took up this theme in the Senate debate, calling the standards "a terrific disappointment." We don't need "sanitized history," he said, but we certainly don't need to give our children "a warped and negative view" of America and the West, either.

How did these standards get to be so bad? After all, historians and teachers of all political persuasions (and none) took part in the discussions. But most of the power, and control of the drafting process, stayed in the hands of academics with a heavy ideological agenda.

Earl Bell, head of the Organization of History Teachers, and one of four K-through-12 teachers on the panel, felt run over by the ideological academics. He hates the view of the cold war in the standards as a clash that wasn't really about anything, just a quarrel between what he called "equally imperialistic nations." The companion World History Standards, he says are even worse, "unrelentingly anti-Western."

The fiasco over the American and Western history standards is a reflection of what has happened to the world of academic history. The profession and the American Historical Association are now dominated by younger historians with a familiar agenda: Take the West down a peg, romanticize "the Other" (non-whites), treat all cultures as equal, refrain from criticizing non-white cultures.

The romanticizing of "the Other" is most clearly seen in the current attempt to portray American Indian cultures as unrelentingly noble, mystical, gender-fair, peace-loving and living in great harmony with nature. All the evidence that doesn't fit is more or less ignored. The premise of the exercise makes it profoundly dishonest and propagandistic.

In the World History Standards, as Senator Lieberman noted in the Senate, slavery is only mentioned twice, and both times as practices of white cultures: in ancient Greece and in the Atlantic slave trade. The

long and well-documented worldwide slave trade, including Muslim and black slave traders, is not mentioned. It doesn't fit the agenda.

History textbooks, curricula and museum displays are becoming the carriers of the broad assault against American and Western culture. The same kind of gratuitous touches that turned up in the Enola Gay exhibit text (e.g., Japanese brave and noble, Americans racist and destructive) show up in many other Smithsonian exhibits now, and, to nobody's surprise, in the proposed history standards, too.

Don't be fooled by the argument that these standards are voluntary and nonbinding, so not much is at stake. Over 10,000 copies have already been distributed, and textbook publishers are poised to make them the basis of new texts. Any approval of these standards by a public body would give them more momentum. They are beyond salvage and need to be junked.

SO YOU WANT TO BE A DOCTOR

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, almost everyone today agrees that our health care system requires some reform and that encouraging more young people to choose a career in medicine, particularly primary care medicine, is a critical element of that reform.

One family physician in my district, Dr. Fred Hurst, is proving that we can pursue this goal without relying on the heavy hand of the Federal Government to set quotas for various medical specialties.

Last year, Dr. Hurst started a program called FutrDOCS, which enables talented high school students interested in medicine to get first-hand experience working with patients at St. Mary's Medical Center in Knoxville.

These students have the opportunity to observe and participate in various different types of treatments, from prenatal care to helping heart attack victims recover to complicated surgeries. This unique experience not only provides them with valuable insight into a potential future career, but also benefits the patients at St. Mary's, who clearly enjoy having them around.

FutrDOCS has been such an unqualified success that numerous other hospitals, both in Tennessee and across the country, are designing similar programs of their own. In my view, FutrDOCS is a perfect example of what enterprising individuals who care enough to make a difference can do without turning to the Federal Government to solve all of our problems for us.

I commend to my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD the following article describing the FutrDOCS program, which appeared in the Knoxville News-Sentinel's Sunday magazine on Christmas Day.

SO YOU WANT TO BE A DOCTOR
(By Michael Ryan)

When I was in high school, I wanted to be a doctor," Fred Hurst told me. "But nobody in my family had ever been a physician, and I lived in a small town about 40 miles from Knoxville." Hurst wanted to learn more about what a doctor does, but he was stymied. "To gain entry to the local hospital, I had to join the Future Nurses' Club," he recalled. "I decided then that, if I ever had the

chance, I would start a program to interest young people in primary care."

Encouraged by his parents, Hurst went to college, then medical school. Last year, at age 46, Dr. Hurst fulfilled the commitment he'd made as a youth. The need, as he saw it, was obvious: Only about one-third of the doctors in America today are primary-care physicians; almost two-thirds are specialists. The federal government and the American Medical Association agree that at least half of our physicians should be primary-care doctors. But four-fifths of today's medical students are planning to specialize, which will make the imbalance even worse.

"We had to show young people that they can have a gratifying future in service to their fellow humans—and handle 95 percent of the ailments of their patients—as primary-care physicians," said Hurst.

His solution was FutrDOCS, a program that brings talented high school juniors and seniors into St. Mary's Medical Center in Knoxville, where he is chief of staff. They see what doctors actually do and later serve in summer internships, where they "shadow" primary-care physicians in all of the many tasks doctors perform.

Last year, Trang Nguyen, 18, helped administer a sonogram at St. Mary's after Annette Neubert, a pregnant patient who is also a nurse, encouraged her to try her hand at the painless, risk-free procedure. Nguyen handled the sophisticated equipment as if she had performed the procedure before. "Can you find the baby's head?" asked Dr. Paula Peeden, 36, an obstetrician/gynecologist. The student expertly located the tiny head moving back and forth deep within Neubert's womb.

"Have you chosen a name yet?" Nguyen asked with an easy bedside manner. "Courtney," Neubert said with a smile.

Since FutrDOCS began last year, 125 students have completed the program. This year, about 70 Knoxville-area students took part. Each participating high school nominates four outstanding students, based on their academic record, their interest in pursuing a career in medicine and their desire to help people. FutrDOCS is funded solely by St. Mary's Medical Center.

I went to St. Mary's on a day when eight FutrDOCS were visiting. I was surprised to learn that these young people saw all sides of the medical practice—its failures and limits as well as its successes. They accompanied Dr. Hurst on his rounds, meeting a heart-attack victim headed for full recovery but also seeing a man who had been left semi-comatose and incoherent by a stroke, beyond the help of modern medicine. In an operating room, they watched surgeons struggle to repair the body of a drunk driver with a damaged kidney, pelvis, bladder and spleen. "Medicine isn't always glamorous," FutrDOC Emily Herbert, 17, a senior at Karns High School in Knoxville, told me after that experience. "But ultimately it's about helping people."

The patients seem to enjoy having the teenagers around. "Without a doubt," said Dr. Hurst, "the patients are thrilled to be visited by and see the concern of these students." Diane Holloway, the surgical nursing supervisor at St. Mary's, also thinks highly of FutrDOCS—even though it obliges her to shoehorn visitors into her crowded operating rooms. "It's good for them to get this kind of experience early," she said.

Students in the program also learn what doctors think. The group sat down for a meeting with Dr. Douglas Leahy, 46, an internist who began his medical career the hard way—as an orderly at St. Mary's 30 years ago. Doctors make a decent income, but there are a lot of things you can make a lot of more money in," he told the students. "Medicine is an opportunity to be a part of

people's lives. You can make their lives better. I think that's what drives most doctors."

FutrDOCS offers students a chance to see what they, as tomorrow's physicians, might want to do with their own careers. "It helped me to focus," said Mark Buckingham, 18, now a freshman at Notre Dame. For Trang Nguyen, FutrDOCS provided insight into a long-cherished dream. "I came to this country when I was 5, from Vietnam," she said. "It was my parents' dream that I become a doctor, and that was a challenge to me. This has helped me discover that I really want to be a pediatrician. I just love kids," Nguyen, now 19, is a freshman at the University of Tennessee.

Fred Hurst has received at least 100 inquiries about the program from more than 35 states. Next year, 15 additional schools in suburban and rural areas of Tennessee will join FutrDOCS. Institutions in New York and Pennsylvania, as well as several Tennessee medical centers, may start their own programs. "My goal is to expand this program throughout the nation," said Dr. Hurst.

Early in my visit, Bryce Bowling, a FutrDOC, approached me to say how terrific he thought the program was. Bowling, 18, is now a freshman at the University of Tennessee. "My dad has had two surgeries on his heart," he told me. "I owe a debt to medicine. Doctors saved his life." That, I realized, was the greatest thing FutrDOCS has to offer young people: It shows them a way to give something back.

VICTIM RESTITUTION ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 665) to control crime by mandatory victim restitution:

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, from 1973 to 1991, over 36 million Americans were injured as a result of violent crime. In 1991, crime against people and households resulted in an estimated \$19.1 billion in losses. Crime-related injuries typically account for more than 700,000 days of hospitalization annually.

Although current law requires restitution in Federal crimes of domestic violence, for most other Federal crimes, judges have the discretion to order restitution. However, H.R. 665, the Victim Restitution Act, makes such restitution mandatory. If H.R. 665 is enacted, those convicted of Federal crimes will have to pay full restitution to their victims for damages caused as a result of their crimes. Federal courts will also be able to order restitution for any person—not just the direct victim of the crime—who demonstrates, through a preponderance of evidence, that he or she was harmed physically, emotionally, or financially by the offense. If the defendant fails to comply with the restitution order, the court could revoke probation or parole, modify the conditions of probation or parole, hold the defendant in contempt of court, enter a restraining order or injunction against the defendant, order the sale of the defendant's property, or take any other action necessary to ensure compliance with the restitution order.