

than light, needs to see this issue more widely understood.

I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD, and I urge my colleagues to read it.

The article follows:

[From Black Issues in Higher Education, May 4, 1995]

TRANSRACIAL ADOPTIONS—IN THE CHILDREN'S BEST INTERESTS

(By Dr. Rita J. Simon)

The case for transracial adoption rests primarily on the results of empirical research. The data show that transracial adoptions clearly satisfy the "best interest of the child" standard. They show that transracial adoptees grow up emotionally and socially adjusted, aware of and comfortable with their racial identity. They perceive themselves as integral parts of their adopted families, and they expect to retain strong ties to their parents and siblings in the future.

The findings in our study are neither unique or unusual. All of the studies—even those carried out by researchers who were initially skeptical—arrived at the same general conclusions.

Indeed, when given the opportunity to express their views on transracial adoption, most people—Black and white—support it. For example, in January 1991, "CBS This Morning" reported the results of a poll it conducted that asked 975 adults, "Should race be a factor in adoption?" Seventy percent of white Americans said no, and 71 percent of African Americans said no. These percentages are the same as those reported by Gallup in 1971 when it asked a national sample the same question.

THE SIMON-ALTSTEIN STUDY

In 1971-72, Simon contacted 206 families living in five cities in the Midwest who were members of the Open Door Society and the Council on Adoptable Children (COAC) and asked whether she could interview them about their decision to adopt nonwhite children. All of the families but two (which declined for reasons unrelated to adoption) agreed to participate in the study. The parents allowed a two-person team composed of one male and one female graduate student to interview them in their homes for 60 to 90 minutes at the same time that each of their children, who were between four and eight years old, was being interviewed for about 30 minutes. In total, 204 parents and 366 children were interviewed.

The number of children per family in our surveys ranged from one to seven; this included birth as well as adopted children. Nineteen percent of the parents did not have any birth children. All of those families reported that they were unable to bear children.

The most important finding that emerged from our first encounter with the families in 1971-72 was the absence of a white racial preference or bias on the part of the white birth children and the nonwhite adopted children. All of the children (adopted and birth) had been given a series of projective tests including the Kenneth Clark doll tests, puzzles, pictures etc., that sought to assess racial awareness, attitudes and identity.

Unlike all other previous doll studies, our respondents did not favor the white doll. It was not considered smarter, prettier, nicer, etc., than the Black doll either by white or Black children. Neither did the other tests conducted during the same time period reveal preferences for white or negative reactions to Black. Yet the Black and white children in our study accurately identified themselves as white or Black on those same tests.

Thus, contrary to other findings reported up to that time, the children reared in these

homes appeared indifferent to the advantages of being white, but aware of and comfortable with the racial identity imposed by their outward appearance. By and large, the parents of these children were confident that the atmosphere, the relationships, the values and the lifestyle to which the children were being exposed would enable successful personal adjustments as adults.

Over the years, we continued to ask about and measure racial attitudes, racial awareness and racial identity among the adopted and birth children. We also questioned the parents during the first three phases of the study about the activities, if any, in which they as a family, engaged to enhance their transracial adoptee's racial awareness and racial identity. We heard about dinner-time conversations involving racial issues, watching the TV series "Roots," joining Black churches, seeking Black godparents, preparing Korean food, traveling to Native American festivals and related initiatives. As the years progressed, it was the children, rather than the parents, who were more likely to want to call a halt to these types of activities.

"Not every dinner conversation has to be a lesson in Black history," or "we are more interested in basketball and football than ceremonial dances" were comments we heard frequently from transracial adoptees as they were growing up.

In the 1991 phase of the study, transracial adoptees were asked how they felt about the practice of placing nonwhite—especially Black—children in white homes, what recommendations they might have about adoption practices and what advice they might have for white parents who are considering transracial adoption. We also asked the respondents to evaluate their own experience with transracial adoption.

We opened the topic by stating, "You have probably heard of the position taken by the National Association of Black Social Workers (NABSW) and several councils of Native Americans strongly opposing transracial adoption. Do you agree or disagree with their position?" All of the respondents were aware of NABSW's position. Eighty percent of the adoptees and 70 percent of the birth children disagreed with the NABSW position. Among the latter, 17 percent agreed and 13 percent were not sure. Only 5 percent of the transracial adoptees agreed with NABSW's position; the others were not sure how they felt about the issue. The reasons most often given for why they disagreed were that "racial differences are not crucial," "TRA is the best practical alternative," and "having a loving, secure relationship in a family setting is all-important."

One Black male adoptee said, "My parents have never been racist. They took shit for adopting two Black kids. I'm proud of them for it. The Black Social Workers' Association promotes a separatist ideology."

Another Black female commented, "It's a crock—it's just ridiculous. They [the NABSW] should be happy to get families for these children—period. My parents made sure we grew up in a racially diverse neighborhood. Now I am fully comfortable with who I am."

Another commented, "I feel lucky to have been adopted when I was very young [24 days]. I was brought up to be selfconfident—to be the best I can. I was raised in an honest environment."

We then shifted to a more personal note: "How do you think being Black (or, where appropriate, Korean or Native American) and raised by white parents has affected how you perceive yourself today?" One-third of the transracial adoptees thought the adoption had a positive effect on their self-image. One-third thought it had no effect, and one-

third did not know what effect the adoption had on their self-image.

One male adoptee said, "Multicultural attitudes develop better children. I was brought up without prejudice. The experience is fulfilling and enriching for parents and children."

The results of 20 years of study show that transracial adoptions serve the children's best interests. None of the families aborted any of their adoptions. As they moved from childhood to adolescence to adulthood, the transracial adoptees were clearly aware of and comfortable with their racial identity. Today, those who are Black laugh at being labeled "oreos," Black on the outside, white on the inside, by some members of the National Association of Black Social Workers. The Black adoptees stress their comfort with their identity and their awareness that although they may speak, dress, and have different tastes in music than some other Blacks, the African American is wonderfully diverse.●

MRS. CLINTON'S SPEECH TO THE UNITED NATIONS FOURTH WORLD CONFERENCE ON WOMEN

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, earlier today, First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton spoke at the United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women. I urge my colleagues to read this important and thoughtful speech.

The First Lady spoke eloquently about the main themes of the Conference—women's education, health care, economic empowerment and human rights. These are issues that matter to every family in America and around the world. If we don't address these issues, all our talk about family values is meaningless.

In addition, Mrs. Clinton did not shy away from addressing China's serious human rights violations—or their meddling in the content and management of the Conference.

I commend the First Lady for participating in this important Conference and ask that her speech be printed in the RECORD.

The speech follows:

FIRST LADY HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON'S REMARKS FOR THE UNITED NATIONS FOURTH WORLD CONFERENCE ON WOMEN

BEIJING, CHINA, SEPTEMBER 5, 1995

Mrs. Mongella, distinguished delegates and guests:

I would like to thank the Secretary General of the United Nations for inviting me to be part of the United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women. This is truly a celebration—a celebration of the contributions women make in every aspect of life: in the home, on the job, in their communities, as mothers, wives, sisters, daughters, learners, workers, citizens and leaders.

It is also a coming together, much the way women come together every day in every country.

We come together in fields and in factories. In village markets and supermarkets. In living rooms and board rooms.

Whether it is while playing with our children in the park, or washing clothes in a river, or taking a break at the office water cooler, we come together and talk about our aspirations and concerns. And time and again, our talk turns to our children and our families.

However different we may be, there is far more that unites us than divides us. We

share a common future. And we are here to find common ground so that we may help bring new dignity and respect to women and girls all over the world—and in so doing, bring new strength and stability to families as well.

By gathering in Beijing, we are focusing world attention on issues that matter most in the lives of women and their families: access to education, health care, jobs, and credit, the chance to enjoy basic legal and human rights and participate fully in the political life of their countries.

There are some who question the reason for this conference. Let them listen to the voices of women in their homes, neighborhoods, and workplaces.

There are some who wonder whether the lives of women and girls matter to economic and political progress around the globe. . . . Let them look at the women gathered here and at Hairou . . . the homemakers, nurses, teachers, lawyers, policymakers, and women who run their own businesses.

It is conferences like this that compel governments and peoples everywhere to listen, look and face the world's most pressing problems.

Wasn't it after the women's conference in Nairobi ten years ago that the world focused for the first time on the crisis of domestic violence?

Earlier today, I participated in a World Health Organization forum, where government officials, NGOs, and individual citizens are working on ways to address the health problems of women and girls.

Tomorrow, I will attend a gathering of the United Nations Development Fund for Women. There, the discussion will focus on local—and highly successful—programs that give hard-working women access to credit so they can improve their own lives and the lives of their families.

What we are leaning around the world is that, if women are healthy and educated, their families will flourish. If women are free from violence, their families will flourish. If women have a chance to work and earn as full and equal partners in society, their families will flourish.

And when families flourish, communities and nations will flourish.

That is why every woman, every man, every child every family, and every nation on our planet has a stake in the discussion that takes place here.

Over the past 25 years, I have worked persistently on issues relating to women, children and families. Over the past two-and-a-half years, I have had the opportunity to learn more about the challenges facing women in my own country and around the world.

I have met new mothers in Jojakarta, Indonesia, who come together regularly in their village to discuss nutrition, family planning, and baby care.

I have met working parents in Denmark who talk about the comfort they feel in knowing that their children can be cared for in creative, safe, and nurturing after-school centers.

I have met women in South Africa who helped lead the struggle to end apartheid and are now helping build a new democracy.

I have met with the leading women of the Western Hemisphere who are working every day to promote literacy and better health care for the children of their countries.

I have met women in India and Bangladesh who are taking out small loans to buy milk cows, rickshaws, thread and other materials to create a livelihood for themselves and their families.

I have met doctors and nurses in Belarus and Ukraine who are trying to keep children alive in the aftermath of Chernobyl.

The great challenge of this conference is to give voice to women everywhere whose experiences go unnoticed, whose words go unheard.

Women comprise more than half the world's population. Women are 70% of the world's poor, and two-thirds of those who are not taught to read and write.

Women are the primary caretakers for most of the world's children and elderly. Yet much of the work we do is not valued—not by economists, not by historians, not by popular culture, not by government leaders.

At this very moment, as we sit here, women around the world are giving birth, raising children, cooking meals, washing clothes, cleaning houses, planting crops, working on assembly lines, running companies, and running countries.

Women also are dying from diseases that should have been prevented or treated; they are watching their children succumb to malnutrition caused by poverty and economic deprivation; they are being denied the right to go to school by their own fathers and brothers; they are being forced into prostitution, and they are being barred from the ballot box and the bank lending office.

Those of us who have the opportunity to be here have the responsibility to speak for those who could not.

As an American, I want to speak up for women in my own country—women who are raising children on the minimum wage, women who can't afford health care or child care, women whose lives are threatened by violence, including violence in their own homes.

I want to speak up for mothers who are fighting for good schools, safe neighborhoods, clean air and clean airwaves . . . for older women, some of them widows, who have raised their families and now find that their skills and life experiences are not valued in the workplace . . . for women who are working all night as nurses hotel clerks, and fast food chiefs so that they can be at home during the day with their kids . . . and for women everywhere who simply don't have time to do everything they are called upon to do each day.

Speaking to you today, I speak for them, just as each of us speaks for women around the world who are denied the chance to go to school, or see a doctor, or own property, or have a say about the direction of their lives, simply because they are women.

The truth is that most women around the world work both inside and outside the home, usually by necessity.

We need to understand that there is no formula for how women should lead their lives. That is why we must respect the choices that each woman makes for herself and her family. Every woman deserves the chance to realize her God-given potential.

We also must recognize that women will never gain full dignity until this human rights are respected and protected.

Our goals for this conference, to strengthen families and societies by empowering women to take greater control over their own destinies, cannot be fully achieved unless all governments—here and around the world—accept their responsibility to protect and promote internationally recognized human rights.

The international community has long acknowledged—and recently affirmed at Vienna—that both women and men are entitled to a range of protections and personal freedoms, from the right of personal security to the right to determine freely the number and spacing of the children they bear.

No one should be forced to remain silent for fear of religious or political persecution, arrest, abuse or torture.

Tragically, women are most often the ones whose human rights are violated. Even in

the late 20th century, the rape of women continues to be used as an instrument of armed conflict. Women and children make up a large majority of the world's refugees. And when women are excluded from the political process, they become even more vulnerable to abuse.

I believe that, on the eve of a new millennium, it is time to break our silence. It is time for us to say here in Beijing, and the world to hear, that it is no longer acceptable to discuss women's rights as separate from human rights.

These abuses have continued because, for too long, the history of women has been a history of silence. Even today, there are those who are trying to silence our words.

The voices of this conference and of the women at Hairou must be heard loud and clear:

It is a violation of human rights when babies are denied food, or drowned, or suffocated, or their spines broken, simply because they are born girls.

It is a violation of human rights when women and girls are sold into the slavery of prostitution.

It is a violation of human rights when women are doused with gasoline, set on fire and burned to death because their marriage dowries are deemed too small.

It is a violation of human rights when individual women are raped in their own communities and when thousands of women are subjected to rape as a tactic or prize of war.

It is a violation of human rights when a leading cause of death worldwide among women ages 14 to 44 is the violence they are subjected to in their own homes.

It is a violation of human rights when young girls are brutalized by the painful and degrading practice of genital mutilation.

It is a violation of human rights when women are denied the right to plan their own families, and that includes being forced to have abortions or being sterilized against their will.

If there is one message that echoes forth from this conference, it is that human rights are women's rights. . . . And women's rights are human rights.

Let us not forget that among those rights are the right to speak freely. And the right to be heard.

Women must enjoy the right to participate fully in the social and political lives of their countries if we want freedom and democracy to thrive and endure.

It is indefensible that many women in non-governmental organizations who wished to participate in this conference have not been able to attend—or have been prohibited from fully taking part.

Let me be clear. Freedom means the right of people to assemble, organize, and debate openly. It means respecting the views of those who may disagree with the views of their governments. It means not taking citizens away from their loved ones and jailing them, mistreating them, or denying them their freedom or dignity because of the peaceful expression of their ideas and opinions.

In my country, we recently celebrated the 75th anniversary of women's suffrage. It took 150 years after the signing of our Declaration of Independence for women to win the right to vote. It took 72 years of organized struggle on the part of many courageous women and men.

It was one of America's most divisive philosophical wars. But it was also a bloodless war. Suffrage was achieved without a shot fired.

We have also been reminded, in V-J Day observances last weekend, of the good that comes when men and women join together to combat the forces of tyranny and build a better world.

We have seen peace prevail in most places for a half century. We have avoided another world war.

But we have not solved older, deeply-rooted problems that continue to diminish the potential of half the world's population.

Now it is time to act on behalf of women everywhere.

If we take bold steps to better the lives of women, we will be taking bold steps to better the lives of children and families too. Families rely on mothers and wives for emotional support and care; families rely on women for labor in the home; and increasingly, families rely on women for income needed to raise healthy children and care for other relatives.

As long as discrimination and inequities remain so commonplace around the world—as long as girls and women are valued less, fed less, fed last, overworked, underpaid, not schooled and subjected to violence in and out of their homes—the potential of the human family to create a peaceful, prosperous world will not be realized.

Let this conference be our—and the world's—call to action.

And let us heed the call so that we can create a world in which every woman is treated with respect and dignity, every boy and girl is loved and cared for equally, and every family has the hope of a strong and stable future.

Thank you very much.

God's blessings on you, your work and all who will benefit from it.●

IT'S NOT FOR WHITE MEN TO DECIDE

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, we have heard a lot of talk about affirmative action, much of it designed to attract votes rather than to contribute any light or rational discussion.

Recently, I was on a radio discussion program with our former college, Pete Wilson, now the Governor of California. His position is one that I am sure is supported by a majority of Republicans and may be temporarily politically wise. But I do not believe it serves the Nation well.

In an appearance on the David Brinkley program, he quoted Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. It was of interest to me then to pick up the Los Angeles Times and read Arthur Schlesinger's response.

Like most things Arthur Schlesinger writes, it is loaded with good sense, and I ask that his response be printed in the RECORD.

The response follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Aug. 3, 1995]

IT'S NOT FOR WHITE MEN TO DECIDE

(By Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.)

On Sunday, July 23, while I was befogged in Dark Harbor, Me., Gov. Pete Wilson of California seemed even more befogged on "This Week With David Brinkley." On this program, he cited me and my small book "The Disuniting of America" in support of his crusade against affirmative action. "[Schlesinger] uses a phrase," Wilson said, "that various policies are, in fact, tribalizing America, and, in fact, that is unhappily the case, and we need to end it."

Wilson is quite correct in noting my concern about the campaign by "multicultural" ideologues to promote and perpetuate separate ethnic and racial communities. But he is quite wrong in suggesting that I am, for

that reason, opposed to affirmative action. On the contrary, affirmative action has been, in my view, a valuable and potent means of moving the republic away from ethnic and racial separatism and toward a more integrated and unified society.

Before affirmative action, the labor market and the educational system were encrusted with barriers, antipathies and conditioned reflexes that systematically excluded women and non-white minorities. Affirmative action has played an indispensable role in breaking these terribly well-entrenched patterns in employment, college admission and other arenas of recruitment and upward mobility. The goal of affirmative action is precisely to destroy racial and gender barriers; and it is the free intermingling of peoples that provides that basis for a common culture and an embracing national identity.

Unquestionably, some reforms are in order. Rigid application of "diversity" standards often leads to bad results, especially in government employment. Programs carried out in the name of affirmative action, especially preferences for what purport to be minority business enterprises, have been sorely abused. Still, affirmative action in the main has served as an agency for the uniting, not the disuniting, of America.

I regard affirmative action as a transitional program. I do not expect it to become a permanent feature of the labor market. When should the transition end? It should end when our white male ruling class no longer automatically discriminates against women and against nonwhite minorities. And the decision as to when the point is reached surely belongs to those whose needs affirmative action is intended to meet.

Already some beneficiaries are growing increasingly uneasy. Affirmative action seems to cast doubt on their own credentials, competence and worth. They have become partners in the firm or professors in the university, others might think, not on their merits but because of racial or gender preference.

Affirmative action can thus become a means of undermining self-esteem and dignity. It can imply that, without affirmative action, women and minorities could not survive and compete in the world of affairs. It may carry with it a flavor of condescension and patronage. And it inevitably and understandably arouses the resentment of those who feel that affirmative action discriminates against them.

When enough beneficiaries regard affirmative action with embarrassment and discomfort, the time will have come to roll up the policy. And the more white male America practices policies of inclusion rather than exclusion, the sooner that time will come.

But until women and nonwhite minorities see affirmative action as more a handicap than a help, the case for its continuation in some form seems strong. And surely the decision about continuation is not one to be made for hapless minorities by politically ambitious white governors. Such overweening presumption by powerful white men is the true road to the disuniting of America.●

IN HONOR OF KITE SOCIETY OF WISCONSIN WEEK

● Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to announce that this year the 17th annual Frank Mots Memorial Kite Festival will be held on September 16 in Milwaukee, WI. Kite flying is one of the most beautiful and relaxing hobbies around. Many of us can still remember when we were children, building our first kite and watch-

ing with excitement as it became airborne. Today children of all ages can experience this thrill again during the Kite Society of Wisconsin Week, which will take place the week of September 11-17.

Frank Mots was a kite flying enthusiast, and it was in his memory that the Kite Society of Milwaukee was created in 1976. The festival that bears his name was founded in 1978 and has drawn people from around the country every year. I invite everyone to celebrate this event on September 16 and take some time out to enjoy the simple pleasures of kite flying. The Frank Mots Memorial Kite Festival has something for everyone, and I am proud of the kite society's accomplishments.●

BIG MAC TO GO; HOLD THE LIES

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, one of the most thoughtful observers in the Nation today is Felix Rohatyn, an investment banker, who has had considerable leadership experience at both the local, State, and Federal levels.

He was chairman of New York's Municipal Assistance Corp., from 1975 to 1993 and helped put the pieces together when New York City was in such desperate straits.

He had an article recently in the Washington Post that comments specifically about the District of Columbia and New York City, but it is really much more than that. He is really talking about what our priorities are as a Nation and what we must do to revitalize urban American and revitalize the Nation.

To the timid souls in the House and Senate and the administration who are afraid to face our problems and come up with realistic answers to those problems, because realistic answers are not going to be immediately popular, I would note his comment:

Many of our actions were deemed to be political suicide when first considered, but it is worth noting that Governor Carey's approval rating was the highest ever in December 1975 when we had carried out the most painful parts of the restructuring.

The American public yearns for genuine leadership, not public relations talk. Instead to much too great a degree, we are providing the public relations talk but not genuine leadership.

I ask that the Felix Rohatyn article be printed in the RECORD, and I urge my colleagues to read it.

The article follows:

BIG MAC TO GO; HOLD THE LIES; NEW YORK'S RECIPE FOR RECOVERY—AND WHAT D.C. CAN TAKE FROM IT

(By Felix Rohatyn)

Watching the evolution of the District of Columbia's fiscal crisis inevitably brings to many of us here in New York City memories of our own brush with bankruptcy in the 1970s. There are too many differences between our situation 20 years ago and the District's today to draw direct parallels. Still, there are lessons in our successes—and in our failures—that may provide some useful insights to those trying to direct the District's future.