

willing to take that creativity and that risk and to work hard. That is why we are the most productive.

So in some of these areas, we need to remove the barriers and let American workers and American companies excel. We are setting the standard today. We need to make sure that we recognize what our skills are, what makes us different, so we can step out of the way and let those skills and those differences bloom, so we can continue to lead the world because of the quality of American workers.

Those are the kinds of challenges we will take up when we come back in September. Those are the kinds of challenges that we can now get our hands around and have a constructive dialogue and debate, as we have kind of changed the shift. We are moving power back to the American people with the bills we have passed today, the bills from today and yesterday, by reducing taxes, by getting the deficit under control and hopefully being at a surplus budget within the next year or two.

We have turned the ship around by saying we are not going to keep moving more power to Washington and getting in the way. We recognize that there is a limit to the kinds of solutions and the extent of the solutions that Washington can bring, and we have come back to recognize the real beauty of America, which is individuals and freedom and opportunity and creativity and entrepreneurship.

We are going to get Washington out of the way, and we are going to go after some of these chronic problems. We are going to move forward. We are going to reassess some of the assumptions that we have had for the last 30 years of moving power to Washington as the way to solve the problems and saying maybe we have gone too far, and it is time to continue to move some of that power back to parents, to school districts, to move it back to workers and management at a local level, providing some wonderful opportunities.

That is why I think that the balance of this Congress and future Congresses, because we have that monkey off our back of the deficit, perhaps we have the monkey off our back of partisan politics, that we have now found a way to work in a bipartisan way, that we are going to have some great days in front of us. We are going to be able to pass some legislation and some new initiatives that really will start to address some serious, nagging problems.

If we do not address them, it will create some huge problems for us in the future. But if we address them, and we no longer have 30 percent of our kids going into college needing remedial education, just think, in 4 years if we went down from 30 percent needing remedial education, think about it; I do not even know how we as a society accept that today, K through 12 turning out 30 to 40 percent of our kids who are illiterate. How do we accept that? Just think, if in 5 years and 8 years we move

that down to 5 percent, it is still too high, but boy, we will have come a long way.

Think of the energy, the positive energy and the positive influence that that will bring into our whole economy and our whole society if we raise the threshold from 70 percent literacy to 95, 98 percent literacy, and the positive benefits that we will all receive from those kinds of changes.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 138. Concurrent resolution to correct technical errors in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 2014.

The message further announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2014) "An Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to subsections (b)(2) and (d) of section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998."

#### IMPROVING CIVIL-MILITARY RELATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, when he was chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Colin Powell often described the men and women he led as an exquisite military force. I do not believe he was overstating the situation. Soldier for soldier, sailor for sailor, airman for airman, marine for marine, the U.S. military today is as fine a fighting force as has ever been assembled, perhaps the best ever.

It is a force that is well trained and well led. It is equipped with modern weapons. It has worked hard to devise and implement a body of military doctrine that multiplies its effectiveness.

The military services are more and more able to work jointly to carry out their missions. It is, above all, a high quality force made up of well-educated, carefully selected, disciplined volunteers. When called upon, the members of this force have served with as much bravery and distinction as American soldiers ever have.

A large part of the reason for this exquisite character of this force is that it is comprised of professionals. As virtually all senior military officers now acknowledge, the all volunteer force, or AVF, that was instituted in 1973 has been a remarkable success.

The all volunteer force, to be sure, took some time to fulfill its promise. In its early years the all volunteer

force was plagued by a host of difficulties. Like the country as the whole, the military had to recover from the fissures of the Vietnam era, and adjust to sweeping cultural changes as the baby boom generation grew up.

Both the country and the volunteer force got through it. Nurtured by a cadre of military leaders that matured after the war in Vietnam, the all volunteer force today has shown, first, that a high-quality personal military force can be recruited and sustained by a democratic Nation, and second, that a professional force can exploit modern technology and carry out an extraordinarily broad range of military missions with great loyalty and dedication.

One of the concerns that people had when the all volunteer force was instituted, however, seems to me to deserve some additional attention today, especially as the country makes a transition from the Cold War era to a new period in world affairs. This is the issue of civil-military relations, by which I mean the relationship between the professional military force and the broader society from which it is drawn and which it serves.

Let me be clear at the outset that I am not worried about a loss of civilian control over the military. On the contrary, it is built into the very fabric of the U.S. military to be dedicated to the defense of democratic institutions.

I am only slightly more concerned about the supposed politicization of the military, a situation in which many members of the Armed Forces feel themselves at odds with their elected and appointed leaders in the executive branch. Though this could become a problem, it is incumbent on senior officials in the executive branch and on senior officers in the military to prevent a serious rift from growing.

What I am mainly concerned about is that the professional military may be becoming more and more isolated from the rest of society, to the detriment of popular understanding of the needs of defense. The result will not be the evolution of a rogue military force, but rather, the loss of public support for necessary military preparedness.

Indeed, for most Americans, the military is an institution, as a rule, simply off the screen, unless an international crisis develops, or some military scandal gets on the front pages. Because the military is off the screen for most Americans, it is also increasingly off the screen for Congress.

The solution to this problem, it seems to me, has to be addressed mainly by the military itself. Above all, the military has to try harder to establish and maintain better ties to the communities in which it works.

Mr. Speaker, the reasons for a gap between the professional military and the rest of society are deep-rooted. For most of American history the peacetime standing army was very small, and sometimes quite isolated. After World War II and the Korean conflict,

that changed. For the first time in peacetime, the United States maintained a large standing army, with the bulk of its personnel provided through conscription. As a result, a large part of the male population had direct experience in the military, and, in almost every American family, someone had served.

□ 1945

Moreover, millions of Americans continued their direct involvement with the military after active duty by serving in the National Guard and Reserves.

At least until the war in Vietnam, the large standing force and the draft enjoyed widespread public support. Indeed following World War II, our sense of identity as a Nation involved pride in the global role that our military played in preserving peace. Service in the military was accordingly also a matter of pride. It was a way of serving the Nation as a whole. Pride in the military was a fundamental element of our social and political makeup. Moreover, a key result of the draft was that the service in the military cut across cultural, socioeconomic and regional lines. It was, therefore, an important source of national unity.

Perhaps the most lasting damage caused by the war in Vietnam was that it reversed the unifying effects of military service and aggravated social divisions. The children of the economically and educationally better off often avoided service in the military during the Vietnam War while the children of less privileged families were called up and sent to fight. This left a social and cultural gash across the country which has never completely healed.

The decision to abandon conscription after Vietnam was necessary and ultimately good for the military. The all-volunteer force has been a success, but it has come at a price in civil-military relations. Now the number of people with military service has declined steadily over the time. Many, both within and outside the military, regard the professional military force as something different from the rest of society. As a Nation, we have slowly lost our sense of the military's global role and of service in the military as a key part of our national identity.

In the meantime, public attitudes toward the military have evolved over the years, largely for the better but also in a way that is more difficult to discern, partly for the worst.

After Vietnam many Americans looked on the military in a negative way, even many who supported a strong defense were disdainful, wrongly, I think, of the military's performance in the war while others distrusted anyone in uniform. During the 1970's, military leaders, to their everlasting great credit, resolved to fix what was broken and to make the new all-volunteer force work. But it was a task made all the more difficult by budget constraints and by hurdles to recruiting top-notch people.

A turning point in public attitudes, I think, came in 1980, with the failure of the Iran hostage rescue mission in Desert One. After that many Americans resolved never again to allow the Nation to be in such a position of apparent weakness. Public support for the military grew dramatically stronger and with public support a rejuvenated officer corps was able to bring to fruition the developments in doctrine, education and training, weapons technology and jointness that had been initiated in the darkest days after Vietnam. The result was a string of military successes, though not without some shortfalls along the way, culminating in the American led victory of coalition forces in the Persian Gulf War. The outpouring of popular enthusiasm following the war was heartening, especially to those who had worked to rebuild the military after Vietnam. General Schwartzkopf said for him that the public reaction to the Persian Gulf War finally healed the psychic wounds he had suffered with ever since Vietnam. It was a moment of national unity that recalled for me the closeness between the military and the public that those of us in the post-World War II generation grew up with. But it is not quite the same.

The difference, I think, lies in the lack of deeper understanding between the professionals who serve in the military and the public that admires the military but does not fully identify with it. The danger is not that any significant part of the public distrusts or disdains the military, as was the case after Vietnam, but that the public does not really know what it is like to serve in the military and therefore neglects things that are necessary to keep the military focused and strong and effective.

Many symptoms of the civil-military gap are apparent. Recently Tom Ricks, an outstanding military affairs reporter for the Wall Street Journal, wrote an excellent article in the Atlantic Monthly entitled *The Widening Gap Between the Military and Society*. He began by relating interviews with young men and women who had recently begun military service. Overwhelmingly their reaction on returning home for visits was a sense that the military was in many ways different from and, most importantly, better than the civilian world that they had left behind. Repeatedly his respondents cited public disorder, lack of discipline, drug and alcohol use, sloppy appearance, a lack of direction among former peers and a score of other flaws in civilian society.

Ricks acknowledged that the results were due in part to the fact that the military services trained new recruits to have a sense of uniqueness as an aspect of pride in their service.

He sees something deeper in the sentiments of these military recruits, and I agree with his conclusion, that the military increasingly sees itself as apart from and in many respects better

than the society it protects. For my part, however, I have been concerned less with the implications of military perceptions of civilian society than with the implications for civilian perceptions of military society.

One implication is this, in the long run a military that sees itself as a cultural elite will at best foster misunderstanding and at worst create public resentment. At the very least, the public will begin to regard unique features of military life as somehow peculiar. Consider the recent public reaction to cases of adultery in the military. From the military's perspective, rules against adultery are not simply a puritanical anachronism. Rather, they follow from the critical requirement that members of the services refrain from activities that undermine good order and discipline. Good order and discipline are essential to a system of command that must be effective when matters of life and death are at stake. That rules against adultery are enforced in some cases and not in others is not necessarily a result of preferential treatment. Rather, the rules are enforced when good order and discipline are threatened.

To many civilians however, these notions are entirely alien. The military for its part has not done a good job of diffusing the sensationalism of much reporting about the issue in part, I believe, because it has not thought it necessary to explain why and how its rules must be unique. For many in the military, it was sufficient to say simply that we have a higher and better standard.

Another symptom of the civil-military gap lies in the sense of grievance that some members of the military services harbor about various issues that affect them. As those who served in the military in the past always knew, it is a deep rooted and innate feature of military life to gripe about almost everything. The old comedy series *Mash* is as much about the apparent arbitrariness of life in the military and constant griping about it as anything else.

Today, however, there is often something deeper in the complaints in the ranks. Often people in the military today feel that they are being made objects of social experimentation because of sexual integration, rules against sexual and racial harassment or even changes in health care for military dependents and other measures. In fact, the military has done an excellent job over the years in responding to changes in social norms.

Witness the relatively successful racial integration of the military compared to the rest of society. For good or ill, the military is never going to be insulated from battles over changes in social relations, including relations between the sexes. These changes will necessarily create frictions. But if the military feels itself as somehow unique, as if it should be insulated from these social changes, then the

battles themselves will be unnecessarily destructive both within the military and between civilians and the military.

To be sure, there is much for service members to feel aggravated, if not aggrieved about. For my part, I believe the current pace of military operation is putting too much of a strain on military families. I think the solution is to be more selective in committing forces abroad and to maintain an adequate force structure. But legitimate complaints from within the ranks will be unnecessarily divisive if the civil-military gap does not narrow.

Solutions to some of these problems cannot be found solely within the military. For their part senior civilian officials in the executive branch must constantly be aware of the need to prevent the gap from growing wider. For its part, the Clinton administration deserves some credit for working so hard at this when its relations with the military could easily have soured.

Early in the administration, the conflict over gays in the military, apparent disrespect for military officers among some younger White House staff members and I believe, most importantly, a failure to be clear on the military role in Somalia, all created a potentially disastrous lack of trust to develop within the military.

Secretary of Defense Perry, especially, did much to reduce the tension, above all with his focus on the quality of life of people in the service. Moreover the administration has learned that the use of military force abroad must be thought through carefully. In Haiti, in Bosnia, whether one agrees with the mission or not, it is clear that the administration worked to define the goals of the military actions carefully. I am still concerned that the administration is asking too much of people in uniform but at least it is not lightly taking risks with the lives of military service members.

Congress also has a role to play in keeping the civil-military gap in check. Perhaps most importantly it is incumbent upon Members of Congress to seek consensus on social and political issues that might otherwise have a polarizing effect within the military. I think we have done a good job of that in recent years.

For the most part, however, I do not believe the military can look elsewhere to narrow the civil-military gap. Instead it is incumbent on the military leadership to work at reducing this civil-military gap as assiduously as it has worked at leadership development, recruit training, doctrinal improvements, jointness or other key aspects of organizational management. The public is not going to become more understanding of military concerns and the military requirements on its own, rather, the military itself must reach out to the public to create better understanding, even among those who have never served in the military. In carrying out this responsibility, there

are several things the military should continue doing and some things it should do much better.

One thing it must continue doing is to educate its own leadership in civilian affairs. One thing that is especially striking to me is the growing portion of the military, both officer and civilian, that comes from military families. According to Professor Eliot Cohen of the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, roughly 25 percent of the current force comes from families of service members. This is a startling figure which suggests that the professional military could in time become almost a separate caste unless measures are taken to broaden the experience of military service members to include educational, cultural and social contacts within the civilian community.

I am also struck by the fact that an increasing proportion of the officer corps is being drawn from the military service academies relative to the proportion from ROTC or officer candidate schools. According to a recent Congressional Research Service report, if we exclude officers serving in the health care professions, chaplains and some other categories, about 22 percent of the officer corps in 1995, was comprised of graduates of the military academies, a dramatically higher portion than in the past, when ROTC and OCS sources were relatively greater sources of officers.

Among general and flag officers the proportion from the service academies is even greater, about 36 percent in 1995. I would not suggest because of this that we close or significantly reduce the size of the academies. I do think, however, that it becomes more and more imperative that as a military officer advances, he or she receive education in nonmilitary institutions and that military training institutions make it a point of broadening the intellectual and cultural perspectives of their students.

□ 2000

Most importantly of all, I believe that the military must take steps to ensure that the military commanders are held accountable for building much better relations with the civilian community.

In my own experience representing a congressional district with large military bases, I know that some military officers are excellent at community relations and others are not. Increasingly there is no substitute for having commanders who are good at it. Even the most mundane community activities are profoundly effective in building public identification with an understanding of the military.

Participation in Lion's Clubs, sponsorship of Little Leagues, and of Boy and Girl Scout Troops, involvement on school and other similar affairs are essential. Community relations should be made a prominent factor in officer efficiency report ratings that determine whether an officer will be promoted.

Military leaders should also vastly expand programs to educate civilians about the military. There should be many more opportunities for civilian community leaders to visit military facilities and interact with military personnel.

One final step is also critically important, and that is for the active duty Army and the National Guard relations to improve. National Guard and Reserve troops are truly a national treasure for the simple reason that they remain true citizen soldiers.

Relations between the active duty force and the National Guard and the Army, however, are laden with distrust. This rift must be healed. The active Army leadership must work on ways to integrate the Guard forces into military plans, and must genuinely rely on the Guard as a key element of the force.

Mr. Speaker, the professional U.S. military force of today is by every measure the best in the world and perhaps the best in history. It is, however, a difficult matter for democracy to maintain a large professional military establishment. To make it work requires that military leaders pay serious attention to the social and political issues that arise.

Both the military and the society as a whole will greatly benefit from the military leadership if the military leadership works more assiduously to prevent a widening rift from developing between civilian and military societies.

#### A LOOK BACKWARD, A LOOK FORWARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUTCHINSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHERMAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, as probably the last Speaker of this session, at least that portion of the session before we go back to our districts for the summer, I am grateful to have this opportunity to speak tonight.

I know we are all anxious to go back to our districts, and yet we ought to reflect a little bit on some of the things that have gone on in this House over the last 6 months. I am especially grateful for a sufficient amount of time to review these events, because during more hectic parts of our legislative business we are recognized for 1 minute or for 2 minutes, which is often not enough time to go even into one topic, and I have several topics I would like to address.

I know that very few of my colleagues are here in the Chamber. I expect that many are back in their offices finishing things up, perhaps watching these remarks on C-SPAN or cable, and I really have not had a chance to introduce myself to all of my colleagues, only most of them, so I would like to take a minute to do that.

I represent proudly the 24th Congressional District in California, which