

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## COMMITTED TO REAL PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST REGION

**HON. NEWT GINGRICH**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 1997

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, the United States has been, and will continue to be, committed to seeing real peace in the Middle East region. All Americans need to look at the daily events in that region with as full an understanding as possible of what is happening and why. For that purpose, I enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my comments yesterday to the American-Israeli Public Affairs Committee.

REMARKS BY HOUSE SPEAKER NEWT GINGRICH TO THE AMERICAN ISRAELI PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Speaker GINGRICH. Thank you very, much for that remarkable welcome. Although I must warn you that one of the dangers of Washington is you sit here and you listen to the kind of introduction that Bubba Mitchell just gave me, is that as you—as it builds, you start to get excited and you get forward to hearing from the person, and then you realize it's yourself, and there's a sort of immediate letdown. So—(laughter).

One of the nice things about working with Bubba is that you always end up looking better than you remembered as he explains whatever the role was. But it is—it's great to be here and to have a chance to be with you, and to be with Melvin. And I appreciate very much all the leadership, the team that has come together here. We work very closely with Howard Core (sp). And as I think many of you know, Arne Christenson, who is the speaker's chief of staff, has a long record. Where's Arne? He's down there. Let me also say that it's great to be back—I look out—I don't want to go through a long list of names and start forgetting people. Ed Levy, who first came to me, I think in 1978, and helped us because he saw a commercial on what was then a brand new innovation called the Superstation, and said this is a guy we want to support. Larry Weinberg, who's been a great friend, out in Los Angeles—we were with recently.

I'm told that Harriet Zimmerman, who really has been, from an Atlanta standpoint, terribly important, had a back problem and is not here. So I hope those of you—I'm going to try to give her a call, but I hope all of you—I saw Herb Schwartzman was with us a few minutes ago. And just so many friends from all over the country who have been part of the extended family. Many of you have heard me say this before, but it bears repeating, particularly for the younger, newer members. AIPAC is extraordinarily vital to all of American foreign policy. You are the—You are the only institution I know of at the grassroots level which in an effective, consistent manner supports the role of America in the entire world, helps members get to learn about the world. Congressman John Linder took a group again in January and began the process of getting them to realize the realities of power, the realities of distance, and the uniquenesses of Jerusalem and of the Israeli experience of democracy in the Middle Eastern context.

And so, far from the foreign aid program and American military programs somehow being burdened by our relationship with Israel, I believe it is fair to say, as a congressional leader, that without your hard work and your grassroots effort and your education programs, the entire foreign aid program would dramatically decline. And it is indeed the aid to the rest of the world which rides on the back of the work you do, and not the aid to Israel which in any way affects what we do around the world.

So what you're doing strengthens America by educating members of Congress into the importance of our international role and into the importance of leadership, and into the principles that are at the heart of the survival of freedom.

And that's what I want to talk about today, because we need a principled debate over honesty versus appeasement, over a willingness to tell the truth versus a consistent and deliberate slanting, over keeping your word versus breaking your word and then simply moving on with the new demand. And I think the debate is that simple.

There are military threats and intelligence threats, and I want to talk about them briefly. But I think there's a much deeper threat facing Israel today, and I want to spend more time on that topic. Let me talk first, though, briefly about the military threat.

We have an absolute obligation to our young men and women in uniform and to our allies around the world to provide the best defense that science and engineering can develop. And we must not allow lawyers and diplomats to cripple our missile defense by setting phony standards based on a phony deal. This is exactly what happened in the '20s and '30s in the Pacific when we signed agreements with the Japanese which they violated while we kept them. It's exactly what happened in Europe where the Allies signed agreements which the Germans broke while the Allies kept them. And I don't want to lose a city, I don't want to lose a single soldier, sailor, airman or airwoman or Marine because we relied on lawyers and diplomats when, in fact, our engineers and scientists could have gotten the job done.

I also think it is tremendously important to look at the recent Helsinki agreement and understand how dangerous it is because we don't live in a world where the most likely threat is Boris Yeltsin's government. Now, you don't have to suggest that diplomacy is an inadequate protector when you look at how shaky that government is.

But forget Russia. Assume Russia didn't exist. An agreement that says the Russians won't threaten us is irrelevant if the largest threat on the planet's from Iran. Now, I don't want some legalese by a bunch of diplomats and lawyers, with Russians, preventing us from providing over Tel Aviv or providing over an American air base, or providing over an American expeditionary force, the finest technology that science and engineering can develop. We can defeat Iranian missiles if we allow our scientists and engineers to our job and if we work with the Arrow Program and Israel; and if we pay attention to capability, not promises.

I also believe we have to be honest about terrorism. Terrorism is not impossible to defeat, but it requires a couple of things. It requires a bigger investment in human intelligence. It requires a commitment to placing

people for a very long periods of time in very dangerous areas. It requires a deep commitment to keep secrets in the United States so people don't get killed because they're risking their lives to penetrate terrorist organizations while people back here babble. It requires principles that say, "If you're a terrorist, you should not expect to live very long." It requires a commitment to preemptive strikes when we deem them appropriate, to avoid weapons of mass destruction. And it requires a willingness to focus energy and resources on weak states, like Sudan, as a warning to stronger states not to mess with the forces of democracy and freedom.

Ronald Reagan understood the power of strength to multiply itself, which is why, when the United States Navy shot down two Libyan aircraft, the United States's sense of being insecure disappeared. And across the planet, people began to back off and realized we were determined. And we have to be prepared to use our strength, not just talk about it. And we need to be prepared to say, "No state terrorism will go unpunished on this planet, and we will take on those states that use terrorism as a tool."

Look, I take the military threat seriously. And most years, I would have come and focused on that. But I really want to break some new ground here today intellectually and talk about something which, interestingly, I mentioned first at the Foreign Diplomat School in Beijing a week ago, and that's the concept of information warfare and information diplomacy as the necessary new tools of the 21st century.

Now, many of you have read or seen things about information warfare, which all too often is defined by the military too narrowly in terms of computer systems and all that stuff.

I originally began working on information warfare in the early 1980s, based on the concept that with CNN in every living room on the planet in real time, you could lose the war on television, even if you won it on the battlefield. And the great challenge we face is that Arafat and the forces of terrorism are in a coalition, engaged in an information warfare campaign against Israel, a campaign in which the American news media is serving as the witting or unwitting ally of Arafat.

And if you want to see how successful—and I think this is, frankly, the fault of the Israeli government and the American government for not recognizing with sufficient intellectual rigor the new nature of the world in the information age. And I do not mean that as an attack on either President Clinton or Prime Minister Netanyahu, but I mean it as an institutional criticism of all of us. We are now in a world where our opponents plan long campaigns, campaigns that are vicious, dishonest and that exploit our vulnerabilities. We react to each incident. So something happens which they've thought through and moves the game a half-step their way, and we react only momentarily, then we forget. Then something happens and we react, and then something happens. And it's definition creep.

Consider the difference—you know, Marianne and I were in Israel weeks before the signing of the Oslo Accords. And while the secret agreement in Oslo took the world by surprise, in the weeks before it occurred there was a genuine sense of hope, a seed that something might happen.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Israel stood in a strong position in the region. Iraq had been shattered militarily by the Americans and the coalition forces. Syria, Israel's foe to the north, had lost its patron, the Soviet Union. While terrorists continued to operate out of Syria's vassal's state, Lebanon, Jordan seemed poised for a closer relationship with Israel. And the hope for progress, if not a breakthrough, with the Palestinians seemed very real.

Several weeks later, the Oslo Accords were announced to the world, and the ceremony on the White House lawn seemed to foreshadow a new era of hope and peace. I remember being in a meeting with Arafat in the Capitol and thinking maybe this truly is a breakthrough, maybe something real will happen. I stand before you today at a far more somber time. Today Israel is not enduring a cold peace. Israel is enduring war by other means. And that's what we're faced with.

And it's important to understand exactly what is happening in the Middle East. Israel's enemies in the region are attempting to achieve through terror and coordinated propaganda what their armies could not achieve in battle—the defeat of Israel. Their active accomplice in this campaign is Israel's so-called "partner" in the peace process, Yasser Arafat. What Arafat has failed to live up to is clear. More than three years after Oslo, he still has not fulfilled his promise to amend the PLO Charter and remove its call for the destruction of Israel.

And let me emphasize this for a second. How can you have a partner, who three years after the beginning of the partnership is still calling for your destruction? How can you treat seriously, how can the American government claim any possible sense of moral equality between a genuine democracy seeking peace at the risk of lives of its citizens, and a force which after three years has refused to renounce the destruction of Israel?

Arafat's most recent excuse, in a long career of excuses, is that Israel doesn't have a written Constitution. And, of course, neither does Great Britain. But that's not the point. Presumably, Arafat knew that before he signed the Oslo Accord. The fact is, we should not tolerate his making excuses. We should demand he keep his word, which he gave in Oslo three years ago.

But far more damaging than words have been actions. It is clear that Arafat has been unwilling to control terror. In the 3½ years since Oslo, over 230 Israelis have been killed in terrorist attacks, including the recent bombing of a Tel Aviv cafe that killed four Israelis and wounded 42. And notice the total lack of symmetry. Israel builds housing on empty land. Terrorists kill Israelis. Israel is to blame. A total lack of balance, a total lack of symmetry. And Arafat's involvement and responsibility in tolerating the existence of terrorism is clear. Far from just failing to act decisively in stopping terrorism, Arafat's recent actions have amounted to a green light for those who would kill and maim innocent civilians to achieve their political aims.

On March 7th, Arafat met with representatives of Hamas and three other radical groups that reject the peace process. Now remember, the people who accept the peace process have not given up their claim to destroy Israel, but the people who don't even like the peace process while destroying Israel are the ones we're talking about. These are the harder line of the hard line. Because it's important not to kid yourselves. There is at the present time no visible evidence of any serious commitment to a true peace in which Israel lives in peace and security and freedom in the region.

But here's what Arafat did. On March 10th, having met three days earlier with leaders of

Hamas, he released from prison the head of Hamas military wing—the exact opposite of what he should have been doing. The number one goal of the Palestinians should have been to end the terrorism so Israel could negotiate in security and comfort that it had a neighbor that cared about its lives, and Arafat has taken the opposite position. As tensions rose throughout March, Arafat did not use his public statements or his security forces to diminish the threat. Instead, he sinisterly raised the possibility of spontaneous outbreaks of terror that might occur if Israel did not change its policies. On March 21, a Tel Aviv cafe experienced such a spontaneous outbreak of violence. When the smoke cleared, four Israelis were dead, 42 wounded.

And what is the latest so-called "provocation" of which Israel is guilty? What has it done to make it responsible for the most recent spate of terrorism? Israel has begun the construction of a housing development on a barren hilltop in Jerusalem, situated between two existing Jewish neighborhoods. Israel is guilty of building on land owned by Jews within the boundaries of the city that every Israeli government, and the Congress of the United States, has recognized as Israel's eternal, undivided capital.

Let me be clear: Har Homa is not, as the media attempt to insist, a "settlement." It is a Jewish neighborhood in the city Israel has chosen as her capital. And let me say, I hope that no official of the American government, at any level, anywhere uses the term "settlement" to describe a legitimate housing development of the people of Israel. While Arafat ignores his commitments to change the PLO Charter and control terrorism, Israel is flogged in the international community for not making unilateral concessions beyond the demands of the Oslo Accord. As the columnist Saul Singer has said, "Israel is being asked to unilaterally abide by Oslo-Plus, while the Palestinians feel free to act as if they had signed Oslo-Minus." That is wrong, and we should reject that formulation. Every friend of Israel must recognize that her future does not rest solely on military preparedness and diplomatic toughness. It rests on how Israel and her friends combat a focused, coordinated campaign of propaganda to vilify Israel in the international community and through the worldwide media. When the American news media shows a rioting crowd and attributes the violence to Israel's decision on Har Homa, they undermine Israel's security.

When the American news media misrepresents the facts, speaking of Har Homa as a Jewish settlement in, quote, "Arab East Jerusalem," they undermine Israel's security.

And let me note that Charles Krauthammer, two weeks ago, wrote the definitive column on the falsehoods that I saw as recently as yesterday on the American television networks as they talked once again about "Arab East Jerusalem" which is false and should be opposed and complained about every single time it is used.

And frankly, when the Clinton-Gore administration treats with moral equivalence Palestinian violence and Israeli housing, they undermine Israel's security. There should be no question of any pressure on the Israeli government to make any concessions until Arafat has met the demands of 3½ years ago in Oslo, and the burden should be placed by the American government on Arafat and the Palestinian Authority to keep the word they already gave 3½ years ago before a word is said to Israel.

Let me try to formulate this as clearly as I can for a minute, because I think this—I think this is—no, there's core principle here that we have forgotten, that Ronald Reagan understood brilliantly because he had

learned it from Winston Churchill. It is extraordinarily dangerous to confuse the aggressor and the victim. It is extraordinarily dangerous to confuse the terrorist and the democracy. It is extraordinarily dangerous to always impose the burden on those who are your friends because you're too timid to tell the truth to those who are your enemies.

Ever since Beirut, the press has been increasingly willing to cover Israel with a bias and on a one-sided manner. We can't afford 10 more years of systematic misinformation in which somehow the Palestinians are always innocent, they are always totally free of guilt, they're always trying hard, their weakness becomes the excuse for their failure, their inability to deliver is proof of why they need further assistance, their willingness to scream loudly is proof of why they need to be pacified, and nothing is demanded of them.

While Israel, an open society with a free political system and honest elections, is somehow gradually drug into the mud so that any legitimate domestic activity of a free people becomes attackable, while any secret, sinister terrorism of a people who live in fear becomes defensible. And that's what is happening in the world today, and this is, I believe, the most desperate moment for Israel since Yom Kippur in 1973.

I think there are three principles that we need to impose. First, never allow a wedge to be driven between the United States and Israel. (Cheers, applause.) Second, hold Yasser Arafat to his promises. And third, take an active role in combating the false images of Israel in the press. Let me—let me very briefly explain what I mean.

First of all, we should never allow a wedge to be driven between the two democracies. And we certainly should not allow that wedge to be driven by those who condone and sustain terrorism.

Now, I was very disappointed—and we sent a letter expressing in advance our disappointment—that the United States would attend a conference convened by Yasser Arafat in March in Gaza, a conference that explicitly excluded Israel. I hope this administration will make clear that it will never again, ever attend a one-sided, anti-Israeli conference to the exclusion of Israel. If Israel can't be in the room, why should America walk in and teach the Arab world that they don't need to deal with Israel?

You know, last year we—last Congress we passed the legislation to move our embassy to Jerusalem. And certainly, one of the most moving moments, I think of my entire life, was the ceremony we had in the Rotunda at which Prime Minister Rabin—it was the last time I saw him—celebrated the 3000th anniversary of the founding of Jerusalem by King David. And you had the sense there that you were touching history in the deepest and most real sense. And if you've never read his speech that day, I would really commend it to you. It made the loss of his assassination much deeper and much more painful. I think it's important that the United States simply and unequivocally, as we have in the Congress, that we recognize the undivided unity of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, period, and end all this, I think fantasy on the part of the Palestinians that if only they make enough noise and have enough terrorism, somehow they will win diplomatically what they lost militarily. And I think we need to end any question of that and say within that framework of your accepting the existence of Israel and the unity of Jerusalem, peace can be found. But without those two steps, there can't in the long run be peace in the region.

Next week I will introduce a resolution with Dick Gephardt to recognize the 30th anniversary of the unification of Jerusalem. The message of the resolution is clear: The

United States Congress believes in one Jerusalem never again divided. It is the united capital of Israel.

While remaining unified with our democratic partner, we need to hold Yasser Arafat to his promises. The United States must force Arafat to choose. He must choose honest involvement in the peace process or clear hostility with the United States of America. The United States House will do its part. Congressman Jon Fox has informed me that he is drafting a resolution calling upon Arafat to keep his commitments now with no more excuses.

Finally, I urge every one of you, and all of your friends, to become a watchdog in the information warfare that is undermining Israel. Every time you see an article that refers to "settlements," write a letter to the editor. If you know the publisher, call them. If you know the editor, call them. If you don't know the reporter, get to know them by calling them. Every time you hear—you look at "Arab East Jerusalem," pick up the phone and call. We must become militant in defeating the effort by media to defeat that which cannot be defeated militarily, and that is precisely what the Palestinians are trying to do today, is to use the military to gain—the media to gain what they could never gain on the battlefield. And it takes the vigilance of individual Americans to stand up to that kind of pressure. And I believe it would take six months or a year and you would never again see those phrases, you would never again see that kind of bias, and we would have reeducated the American news media.

You know, this is a challenging period, but it's not a hopeless period. I had the opportunity about 10 days ago to be with the young men and women of the 2nd Infantry Division of the border with North Korea. My dad served in the Korean War. He was a career infantryman; spent 27 years in the Army. It was a marvelous thing at 6:30 in the morning to be with young men and women willing to risk their lives for freedom. It was an amazing thing to realize that 20 miles away, the 13 million people of Seoul, Korea were getting up in the morning, creating wealth, living prosperous lives, with a free press, chaotic, wide-open political system and all the values that, frankly, are what we're really about.

Similarly, all of you who have ever visited Israel, who have ever seen units of the Israeli defense forces, who have ever talked to the young men and women, or as you get as old as I am, you talk to the older men and women who tell you about when they were younger men and women. We can win the information struggle just as decisively as we have in the past won military struggles, if we will engage as civilian warriors, if you will, as information warriors. If we will be prepared to be militant and direct and clear, I believe in a year we will be in a different environment. The burden will clearly be on those it should be on: on Egypt to provide a positive, legitimate leadership role in favor of peace, instead of, frankly, the current terribly unsatisfactory role Egypt has chosen; on Arafat to have kept his word to lock up the terrorists, to police the area; on all of us who believe in decency to bring pressure to bear on Syria to get to a peaceful Lebanon and to get to a reasonable relationship. We don't have to fear. The coalition that defeated the Soviet empire, ended the Cold War and liberated a third of the planet is more than capable of sustaining democracy and freedom and achieving security. But we have to be prepared and we have to be willing to tell the truth, to insist on the truth, and to go nose-to-nose with any who by their propaganda and their disinformation would threaten the survival of our closest ally in

the region and would threaten the survival of millions of decent people who ask only that they be allowed to pursue happiness, live in freedom, and have their children grow up in security.

Thank you. Good luck, and God bless you.

IN RECOGNITION OF PATRICIA A. MEAD

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 1997

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Patricia A. Mead, whose lifetime of entrepreneurialism, fine business sense, volunteer service, civic action, and nonprofit leadership has earned her the respect and admiration of her peers.

Pat started Metro Relocation Services in 1971, the first independent relocation company in the world. She eventually merged this company into Realty One, where she served as president of Corporate Relocation Services, a division with a staff of 30 that produced revenues of \$275,000,000 per year.

Pat has been generous with her time and expertise, and over the years involved herself with many organizations including: Recovery Resources, American Lung Association; Cleveland Opera; Cleveland Branch of the English-Speaking Union where she chaired the Shakespeare Recitation Competition; Cleveland Rotary Club; YWCA where she was named Woman of Achievement, Federation for Community Planning; Cleveland Ad Club; Junior Achievement; Friends of the Cleveland Library; Better Business Bureau, and Cleveland Ballet. Pat also served on the board of COSE and the board of trustees and executive committee of the Greater Cleveland Growth Association, chairing their first executive network committee.

Pat is also a longtime member of the Women's City Club. She served on the board of trustees as vice president of membership and operations as well as numerous committees. She created the Executive Women's Network. Pat served as president of Cleveland Women's City Club Foundation for 2 years.

On May 23, 1997, Pat will receive the Margaret A. Ireland Award from the Cleveland Women's City Club. The award has been given each year since 1963 to local women who have achieved special stature because of their contributions in civic, social, and community service. They exemplify the leadership, commitment, and personal achievements of the award namesake.

Let us join the Cleveland Women's City Club in recognizing the talent, versatility, dedication, breadth of interest, and leadership exercised by Patricia A. Mead. Cleveland is better for her efforts.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 1997

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, April 9, 1997, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

There is surprisingly little pressure from constituents on Members of Congress to act on campaign finance reform, even though we have daily revelations of egregious excesses. The growing sense in American politics today is that dollars speak louder than ideas, access is bought and sold, challengers and third parties are often drowned out, and many of the best people are discouraged from running because of the fundraising burden.

PROBLEMS WITH SYSTEM

Campaign finance reform is a constant game of catch-up, with excesses followed by reforms followed by new ways to get around the reforms. The present campaign finance laws passed two decades ago have been simply overwhelmed by a flood of money—more than \$2 billion in the last election—and with every election the problem gets worse. The laws are more loophole than law, and politicians defend their practices by resorting to legal mumbo-jumbo.

Political campaigning has become distorted. Members spend large amounts of time making phone calls to raise money and attending fundraisers, which means a lot of time with people who already support them and too little time with ordinary voters who have not decided how to vote. So the system drives a wedge between the elected representatives and those they represent. When politicians become preoccupied with raising campaign money, that also crowds out other activities like writing laws and thinking about public policy.

Those who contribute money are very concerned about a "shakedown" atmosphere. They often feel they cannot get their view across unless they contribute generously to politicians they may dislike. The common feature of the great debates in Congress over the last few years—including health care reform, clean water, telecommunications, and regulatory changes—is that they were all awash with money. Members used these debates skillfully to get money from people who were interested in certain legislative outcomes.

The rising flood of money that flows into campaigns undermines public trust. Nothing is more important in our democracy today than the restoration of public confidence in the integrity of the political system. To many Americans it is money, not ideas and not principles, that reigns supreme in our political system. Many people tell me the political process is run by special interest groups, powerful organizations, and foreign donors, so they see little reason to vote. Cynicism is always the worst enemy of democracy and it has certainly been strengthened by the campaign finance system.

Getting campaign reform is terribly difficult. The blunt fact is that most Members of Congress and both political parties prefer the system under which they were elected over some untested scheme that might replace it. Moreover, it is very difficult to devise a system that will reduce the role of special interest money in politics and still not trample on constitutional rights to express political views. It is easy to be cynical and assume that nothing will happen on reform, but we really do have a chance to break the cycle of fundraising that demeans our politicians and our political system.

CURRENT SYSTEM

Some progress in campaign finance reform has been made in recent years. After the Watergate scandals, Congress instituted public financing of presidential campaigns, limits on contributions, and more disclosure of where money comes from. These were major and important changes. But it is clear the reforms did not go far enough, and means were devised to get around existing law.