

Nyangoma and his allies (i.e. Hutus) in the Bujumbura quarters of Mutanga Nord, Kinama, and the countryside.

(I) Lt. Col. Nzeyimana Dieudonne, a high-ranking officer in the gendarmerie, was assassinated on 20 April (reportedly by Sans Echee) in Bujumbura.

(J) The Hutu parliamentarian Gahungu Gerard, from the Province of Cibitoke—a moderate with a Tutsi wife, was killed by a gunman in Ngagara.

(K) On 20 April, at least 7 (perhaps more) Hutus were killed in the Bujumbura quartier of Nyakabiga, having been kidnapped and brought there from other parts of the city.

(L) Over 30 Hutus were massacred in the commune of Rutovo by Tutsi militias, assisted by the army.

(M) A secondary school (lycee) in Kayanza was attacked with grenades; two students were killed, others injured.

"Perhaps a million will die. . ."—a European diplomat

The above are a few illustrations of what is happening. They form but a fraction of the total picture. I have received reports of fighting during the past two weeks in Bubanza, Gatumba, Ngozi, Mutare, Karuzi, Gitega, Rutama, Bururi, and other locations. One reliable source said that at least 75-80% of the country is currently shaken by violence. A respected Western diplomat told me that every province except Bujumbura was now subject to attack by guerilla forces.

Perhaps most poignantly, I was asked by a very experienced European diplomat who once served in the USA and now serves in Burundi, "Please, I know the generosity of the American people. Do what you can to see that the USA remains concerned. I am afraid, (he continued) that most of the world is about to give up on Burundi. But if the world gives up, there is a risk that not just thousands, but perhaps a million will die in a rage that no one can justify."

I am not suggesting that I expect a million people to die. I do not. And I would be shocked if Burundi suffered carnage on anything approaching that scale. Nor do I believe Burundi has yet arrived at a situation similar to Rwanda on April 6, 1994.

But when I observe that the president of the majority political party and an experienced and balanced European diplomat foresee such possibilities, it should give us pause. Two years ago, very few people in Burundi used such severe terms. These two would not have. Today, many others might do so.

If asked whether I am predicting the imminence of a major civil war I would say: no. But with qualifications. During the months I was present in Burundi, I said confidently that no such event would occur within the next two months. I can no longer confidently say that. I don't know if the probability of such an event is 5%, 10%, 20% or higher. I do know it is no longer an impossibility.

Reports from every quarter describe the situation as more precarious than in 1994 or 1995. The capacity of the Burundi populace to absorb horrendous punishment and yet to persevere is awesome, but not infinite. I don't know the trigger point of national rage. And I have only the reports of others, not of my own eyes. But all their eyes see the situation as deteriorating more rapidly than before.

An unclassified cable is not the place to explore suggestions for possible ways to address all these problems. Yet, as ambassador, I want without delay and without reticence to offer a partial account of some of the events and attitudes that now prevail in Burundi. They sound the most threatening and dangerous toward peace, justice, democracy and human life that I have heard during the

period that I have been privileged to serve as ambassador to Burundi.●

HOWARD STRINGER

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, recently Howard Stringer, chief executive officer of Tele-TV, received the First Amendment Leadership Award presented by the Radio and Television News Directors Foundation at their annual banquet.

In his remarks, he comments about the need for sensitivity and realism in dealing with the problems of television violence.

In working with television executives on this problem, I have found none superior to Howard Stringer. He is both sensible and sensitive.

I urge my colleagues to read his remarks, which I ask to be printed in the RECORD.

The remarks follow:

RADIO AND TELEVISION NEWS DIRECTORS FOUNDATION ANNUAL BANQUET AND CELEBRATION OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT

(By Howard Stringer)

This is an interesting moment for any broadcaster to accept an award attached to the 1st Amendment. Just weeks ago, President Clinton and a number of television executives assembled in The White House to collaborate on a ratings system which would measure and proclaim the intensity of sex and violence on their programs. The President endorsed the V-chip as a device that would, "hand the remote control back to America's parents." It would be one small step for broadcasters, but a giant step for viewers. Some observers found the quid-pro-quo a little cynical—free use of the spectrum for digital compression on one side, election year political advantage for the other, but all in all, surely a positive gesture.

Some observers are concerned that the government has at least nudged its unholy way into content. Remembering President Nixon's use of the IRS as a weapon against political enemies, some day a President could recognize that in the digital future, whoever controls the chip not only controls V for Violence, but V for Voters.

In the near term, I'm more worried that this new political contract will do two things. Firstly, it will engender cynicism if it has no impact at all, and secondly, it will let programmers off the hook, especially if by gladly accepting the V-chip they abdicate further responsibility for content.

The cynicism factor is no small consideration. Since I came to America, successive governments have trumpeted a grand solution to whatever ails the country. The war to end communism in Vietnam, the war on poverty, the war on hunger, the war on racism, the war on drugs, all created a level of expectation, only to be followed by let down. After World War II, America became, in Robert Samuelson's words, "a nation of enthusiastic problem solvers" with the expectation that everything could be easily solved. When solutions fail, he observed, we sink into an atmosphere of "free floating gloom." The ranks of the cynical grow ever larger.

In 1993 I attended hearings on Capitol Hill on the subject of violence. With the valiant exception of Senator Paul Simon, most of my interrogators clearly hadn't watched television, couldn't differentiate between network and cable, and weren't terribly interested in debating the issue on its merits. One Congressman told me that he was going to vote for the V-chip because he was fed up

with network news reporters attacking Congressional junkets.

On the evening after the hearings, I received a telephone call from that remarkable reporter, Jimmy Breslin. He told me he'd just spent the night in Bedford Stuyvesant, where kids were out on the streets, armed to the teeth, dealing in drugs, joining gangs and dropping out of school. "Trust me" said Breslin, "those kids aren't watching your network." Of course he was right. The street kids of urban America aren't glued to "The Nanny," "Friends," "Touched by an Angel." We'd be a lot safer if they were. The gutter body count is more accurately represented in movies like "Die Hard" or "Terminator," which are 'R' rated, than on television, though even in those movies at least the good guys win and the bad guys lose.

Ratings systems are valuable to the child with responsible parents. They're not much of an obstacle to the latch-key kid with nothing but time on his hands. So even if we accept that the V-chip will help some parents, let's not fool ourselves that it will diminish violence on the street. Otherwise, the letdown will, as I've said, promote yet more cynicism all around.

My second point is that all of us in the broadcasting or cable or telephone programming community have a higher responsibility that the government cannot and should not enforce. Instead of debating the issue of TV's relationship to violence, let's turn the question on its head. Can we help society fight violence? Can we do more? Bill Moyers said recently, "What we need is a strategy of affirmation by society as a whole, from homes, schools, churches, synagogues and all the institutions that transmit values." What about from our entertainment institutions?

There has been violence in great literature and in great drama beyond Shakespeare to the ancient Greeks. Blood is the ink of much theatrical history, but great writers understand great consequences. Villains are doomed. Victims mourned. The audience is taught accountability, responsibility, sensitivity and compassion. It's not enough for the audience to leave the stage or screen just thrilled or amused. The true artist can teach us to care, and of course, to feel.

If the sociopaths who parade through our news clips show no remorse, then maybe our entertainment programs should. If the eyes of killers reflect only the chill of arctic wastes, then maybe we should offer warmer vistas. If dozens of people die unrecognized and unmourned in our movies, then maybe we should shed tears for them.

If we perceive the loss of life as unremarkable, then the absence of love will also be unremarkable. Death stings, pain hurts, loss devastates, fear terrifies. If we complain that television merely mirrors reality, then let us try to reflect our reality more skillfully and honestly. Violence is not poetic or balletic. It is ugly. Violence inspires more tears than cheers on the streets of our cities. True artists have the power to move not only their audiences, but also their times.

America won more than the Cold War. It's also winning the global infotainment war. We export popular culture to the world. With that victory comes some responsibility. We can give audiences only "What they want" and cynically wait for the cash registers to ring, or we can challenge our creative minds to reach further into their souls. We can certainly do more than shelter gratefully behind labels, and allow taste to evaporate.

In the end industry leaders must take personal responsibility for what goes on the screen. If we separate like church and state, our artistic values from our personal values, then we create programs for others we would not be willing to share with our own family

and friends. If we produce dreadful entertainment just because we automatically assume they, the viewers, will like it, eventually the viewers will turn on us, challenge our cynicism and demand not just the V-chip but the C-chip—C for censorship.

The greatest threat to all our hard won freedoms, whether freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press or the right to petition is cynicism. I accept this award on behalf of my colleagues, my collaborators and my comrades, especially those of you I know in this room who are anything but cynical. If all of you are to be custodians of the new world cultural order, then you have a clear duty to try to protect and cherish its citizens.●

COMMON SENSE, R.I.P.

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, Jeff Lyon had a brief observation under the title "Common Sense, R.I.P." in the Chicago Tribune magazine, which I ask to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD after my remarks.

It comments on the death of 7-year-old pilot Jessica Dubroff, but its real commentary is on our society and what we have permitted.

It is worth reading and reflecting upon.

The article follows:

COMMON SENSE, R.I.P.

(By Jeff Lyon)

Despite what legions of editorial writers have said, the real message in the death of 7-year-old pilot Jessica Dubroff is not that we're pushing our kids too hard, which, it goes without saying, we are.

It's that everywhere you look, the perishable human commodity known as common sense has died.

Of course, it's absurd that the FAA lets tots fly planes. But it's equally crazy that we can't get a ban to stick on guns that can kill a dozen people in a microsecond. Or that the government is allowed to spend more than it takes in for years, even though any imbecile know what happens when you charge up too much merchandise on your credit cards.

An entire generation celebrates sexual promiscuity, then is surprised when the harvest is AIDS, herpes, illegitimacy and marital erosion. An industry that makes billions selling a lethal, highly addictive drug like tobacco claims the stuff is harmless in the face of overwhelming evidence to the contrary and is allowed to get away with it.

We pile people into public housing, take the dignity of work away from them and are astonished when the result is a permanent underclass. We put our schools on short rations, then are shocked that our kids think like Beavis and Butthead. We let the rank-est, foulest programming spew out over the airwaves and wonder why there is moral decay.

There was a time when people recognized that certain behaviors had consequences. It was a lesson that sank in the first time you got sick after Mom warned against eating too many potato chips.

But that kind of wisdom has become another casualty of modern life. Maybe moms and dads aren't dispensing it anymore. Maybe moms and dads aren't even home anymore.

Whatever the cause, as a society we've forgotten our umbrella and now it's started to rain. Isn't it time we reacquired the sense to go inside?●

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 3, 1996

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate reconvenes under the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 60 at 1:30 p.m., on Monday, June 3, that immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, no resolutions come over under the rule, the call of the calendar be dispensed with, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, and there then be a period for morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 3:30 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each, with the following exceptions: the first 90 minutes under the control of Senator COVERDELL, or his designee; the second 30 minutes under the control of Senator DASCHLE, or his designee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. I further ask unanimous consent that at 3:30 p.m. the Senate resume debate on the motion to proceed to the Defend America Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, I recap, for the information of all Senators, that a cloture motion was filed on the motion to proceed to the Defend America Act. That vote occur on Tuesday June 4, at 2:15 p.m., unless we can work out some overall agreement. We would want to add to that—I have discussed this with the Democratic leader—health care reform. That package is in conference. That is something which I very much would like to do that week. I talked to both Senators KASSEBAUM and KENNEDY, and others. Hopefully, we might add to the list three or four things that we might complete action on that week.

If there is not any change, then that rollcall vote will occur after the policy luncheons, I understand, at 2:15.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I do not want to delay the distinguished majority leader, but I would also note that he and I have had the opportunity to discuss the issue of confirmation of judges, and I hope that we could continue to work on that and find some resolution. I know there is a great deal of interest on both sides in trying to figure out a way to break loose the logjam on what I believe are 17 or 18 judges that await some action here. A lot of families and a lot of futures are on the line. I am sure that the sooner we accommodate everyone's interest, the better it is for everybody concerned.

I appreciate the majority leader's interest in trying to resolve that matter as well. We will want to work with him to see that we get that done.

Mr. DOLE. I would say to the Democratic leader that if we cannot arrive at some agreement, I would be prepared to call them up one at a time. If someone wants to vote "no"—and I understand that at least one may take some time, one of the nominees. For others, there may be rollcall votes. But it seems to me that the Democratic leader is correct. We should not be holding people up. If we need a vote, vote them down or vote them up, or whatever, but they ought to be voted on because they probably have plans to make and there are families involved.

So I hope we can reach some accommodation to dispose of those as quickly as possible when we return.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 1:30 P.M., MONDAY, JUNE 3, 1996

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask that the Senate stand in adjournment under the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 60.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:47 p.m., adjourned until Monday, June 3, 1996, at 1:30 p.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 24, 1996:

PANAMA CANAL COMMISSION

MARKOS K. MARINAKIS, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF THE PANAMA CANAL COMMISSION.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

GINGER EHN LEW, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION.

THE ABOVE NOMINATIONS WERE APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE NOMINEES' COMMITMENT TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS TO APPEAR AND TESTIFY BEFORE ANY DULY CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

J. RENE JOSEY, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA FOR THE TERM OF 4 YEARS.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE U.S. AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE OF BRIGADIER GENERAL UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. WILLIAM WELSER III, 000-00-0000, REGULAR AIR FORCE.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR REAPPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. RICHARD B. MYERS, 000-00-0000, U.S. AIR FORCE.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR REAPPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JOHN P. JUMPER, 000-00-0000, U.S. AIR FORCE.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR REAPPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. RALPH E. EBERHART, 000-00-0000, U.S. AIR FORCE.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601: