

the entire Persian Gulf war. Surveillance cameras to monitor weapons activities were installed. This is a regime imposed by the United Nations of weapons inspection that has and can yield real results. But, as we now stand on the verge of yet another military confrontation, it is necessary to face the unmistakable and painful truth that there is no reason to believe that anything has changed in Baghdad.

This week, the Washington Times revealed that Saddam Hussein has been intending to buy five electronic warfare systems that would allow him to detect and destroy radar-evading aircraft.

The weapons markets of the world have routinely been contacted by Iraqi agents and representatives still seeking military technology.

This is important lest we fail to understand that the strategy of frustrating U.N. inspectors and noncompliance is not happening in a vacuum. It is part of an ongoing strategy to restore military capability.

The lessons of the Persian Gulf war and our experience through our sacrifices have yielded more than simply the destruction of these weapons. There is another great lesson that the Persian Gulf war has left the United States, the United Nations and the international community. It is, first, that the international community is capable of acting in concert for common purpose, but it is also that there is by definition a class of nations with leaders who are easily identifiable who are so irresponsible by their actions, who act in such contempt of international normal standards of conduct and international law that the international community will take it upon itself to deny them aspects of their own sovereignty.

Of all the things that Saddam Hussein failed to learn about us and our resolve and our capability or the international community's ability to act in concert it is the single lesson that is the foundation of the current crisis. Saddam Hussein will not be allowed to have weapons of mass destruction or wage war on his own people or regain great military capability because as a consequence of the Persian Gulf war and the invasion of Kuwait, the international community has decided to deny him that sovereign right of other nations to possess certain weapons and conduct their own affairs today, tomorrow and potentially forever.

It is not only a lesson of the Persian Gulf war; it is a gift of this generation to succeeding generations that something has been learned by the history of the 20th century. And the primary pupil of this lesson will be Saddam Hussein, in life or in death, today or tomorrow, one way or another.

I know every Member of this Senate, indeed, the entire U.S. Government, is in prayerful hope that military confrontation is avoided. In an age when military weapons hold such power and the destructive capability is so great,

conflict must always be avoided when possible. That is our nature. It speaks well of our people that this is our resolve.

Saddam Hussein, with so many miscalculations, so many mistakes that caused so much harm for your people, do not miscalculate again.

There is in this Senate, I know, nothing but affection for the people of Iraq, an abiding hope that there will be a day when not only we can meet them again in friendship but the Members of this Senate may vote to send an ambassador of good intention and good will to Baghdad to normalize relations. Between this day and that is either the learning of a fundamental lesson by Saddam Hussein against all odds and all experience or that the people of Iraq take their future in their hands against extraordinary odds and regain responsible leadership.

I do not know, Mr. President, how this crisis will be resolved. Indeed, no one could predict. Only that somehow we be understood and that somehow the United Nations obtain the strength and resolve to see its judgments fulfilled. All the frustration of these years and all the sacrifice from the international community can still have real meaning if this lesson will be learned not simply by Saddam Hussein but by all the dictators, all the despots to come who would abuse their people and wage war. If we can stand together here, finally have the lesson learned, all this will have had real meaning.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. COATS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AL-LARD). The Senator from Indiana.

#### EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. COATS. I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until 3 p.m. under the same terms as previously ordered.

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

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask that I may speak in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

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

#### REMARKS OF SARA LISTER

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week, our Nation celebrated Veterans Day. I had the pleasure of returning to Indiana and talking to some of our veterans and speaking to an important group about the meaning of Veterans Day and the contributions veterans have made to our country and their sacrifices. We honor Americans on that day, both men and women, who served in both peace and war, as watchmen and women on the wall of freedom. We honor them by remembering their heroism, passing stories of their character and courage from generation to generation.

It is disappointing and extremely unfortunate that in this very same week

the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Ms. Sara Lister, made some remarks to a group to whom she was speaking at Harvard, referring to members of the U.S. Marine Corps as "extremists." I quote her. She says the Marines are "extremists. Wherever you have extremists, you've got some risks of total disconnection with society. And that's a little dangerous."

Now, subsequently, Ms. Lister has penned a letter of apology to the Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Krulak, in which she says it's unfortunate that my remarks were taken out of context. It's unfortunate that they were misinterpreted.

Now, all of us in the business of politics have had occasion to pick up the paper in the morning and seen our remarks taken out of context and be misinterpreted. So I appreciate that this sort of thing often takes place. I truly hope that in this case these remarks were taken out of context and that they were misinterpreted. I am concerned that they were not. I have asked for a tape or transcript of the presentation by Ms. Lister at the Harvard group so that I can understand the context. It is not really understandable or discernible at this particular point.

I am disturbed that one of our top civilian appointees at the Pentagon could make such a statement. It is hard for me to construct any context in which the use of the word "extremism," and the phrase a "total disconnection between our society" and the U.S. Marine Corps is appropriate. I don't understand in what context that could be presented that would explain the use of those remarks and the statement that this is a "dangerous" situation.

And so I rise today to raise serious questions about the continued leadership of Ms. Lister as Assistant Secretary of the Army. By her remarks, she has offended not only the 174,000 active duty members of the Marine Corps but the 2.1 million Marine Corps veterans and, frankly, all Americans.

The Marine Corps teaches truths and convictions which are becoming more rare in today's society, and it is the continuity of these values in the Marine Corps which has produced men and women of character and honor who are ready and willing to sacrifice their lives in defense of their country.

I would commend to Ms. Lister a piece which appeared in the Sunday Parade magazine, probably in most Sunday papers across our country. It featured a very insightful story of recruits in the Marine Corps and what we can learn from the Marine Corps. The article correctly shows that the Marine Corps teaches and trains young people important values.

If these values are extremism, then I suggest that is what we need more of in this country. Let me just quote a few things from the article.

In a society that seems to have trouble transmitting healthy values, the Marines stand out as a successful institution that unabashedly teaches those values . . .

For the first time in their lives, many encountered absolute standards; tell the truth. Don't give up. Don't whine. Look out for the group before you look out for yourself. Always do your best . . . Judge others by their actions, not their words or their race. . . . Don't pursue happiness; pursue excellence. Make a habit of that, and you can have a fulfilling life.

The recruits learned that money isn't the measure of a man; that a person's real wealth is in his character.

The recruits generally seemed to find race relations less of an issue at boot camp than in the neighborhoods they'd left behind.

The author of the article goes on to say:

If America were more like the Marines, argued a recruit from New Jersey, there would be less crime, less racial tension among people, because Marine Corps discipline is all about brotherhood.

With their emphasis on honor, courage and commitment, they offer a powerful alternative to the loneliness and distrust that seem so widespread, especially among our youth.

Well, Mr. President, if those values are a disconnect from American society, then it is not the Marine Corps that is in deep trouble. It is American society that is in deep trouble. These are the values to which we should be aspiring. I think under the leadership of General Krulak—and the tradition and the history of the Marines—the Marine Corps has demonstrated a continuing commitment to values to which we should all aspire.

General Krulak responded to Ms. Lister's remarks—I will just briefly quote that—by saying that "honor, courage and commitment are not extreme."

Mr. President, as I said, I hope that these comments were taken out of context. I hope that they were misinterpreted. Again, I cannot conceive of a context in which they would be considered as appropriate. The use of the term "extremists", the statement that the Marine Corps is disconnected from American society reflects, unfortunately, an attitude and a belief about the Marine Corps and perhaps about others in uniform that is inappropriate for an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

I note that Ms. Lister earlier had announced that at some point she was going to retire from her position. Perhaps it wouldn't be too early for her to think about accelerating that retirement so that the position could be turned over to someone who is able to present his thoughts in a better context, in a way that will not be misinterpreted. Perhaps then we will not have this difficult explanation of why one of our most honorable branches of military service has been labeled in such a way.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GREAT ALASKA SHOOTOUT

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the day before Thanksgiving the Univer-

sity of Alaska's Athletic Department marks a milestone—the 20th anniversary of the Great Alaska Shootout.

The shootout is a basketball tournament that began as an impossible dream of Bob Rachal, a coach who wanted to put his fledgling University of Alaska Anchorage basketball team on the map.

Now, the shootout continues under Charlie Bruns and Tim Dillon, athletic director and has become an annual Thanksgiving tradition for Alaskans and basketball fans across our Nation.

In the 20 years since the shootout began, our Nation's greatest college teams have traveled to Alaska over the Thanksgiving break to vie for the tournament trophy.

Twenty former NCAA champions have taken part in the shootout over the two decades; last year marked the fifth time the defending national champion has participated in the shootout.

The first game, 20 years ago, was played in a drafty field house on Fort Richardson, a military post in Anchorage, to about 2,500 fans.

Now, the shootout fills our state-of-the-art Sullivan Sports Arena in Anchorage, and is televised live nationwide via ESPN. Sportswriters from the wire services, newspapers and magazines regularly travel to Anchorage to cover the shootout.

Because the teams that participate are the best, the games are invariably closely contested; 60 of the previous 228 games have been won by margins of five points or less. Six have been settled in overtime; four in double overtime, and one in triple overtime.

It isn't only the games that are important in the shootout, it is the opportunity players, coaches, and the families of the players and coaches, have to experience the greatness of Alaska and Alaskans, and the opportunity Alaskans have to meet these young athletes, their coaches, and their families from across our Nation.

Volunteers open their homes to shootout participants and support the players and the guests in countless other ways, including transportation, entertainment and other special events. Our largest Alaska grocery chain, Carr's, provides important corporate support.

The National Collegiate Athletic Association recognizes the special place this tournament holds by its votes over the years to allow the tournament a special place in American collegiate sports.

The teams represent the finest programs in NCAA basketball history, and the University of Alaska Anchorage has gained a reputation for hosting one of the best tournaments in college basketball.

The players and coaches and all who work to make the shootout a success bring credit to the University of Alaska, to Anchorage and to Alaska. Mr. President, I commend Chancellor Lea Gorsuch and the University of Alaska

as it observes the 20th anniversary of a very special sports event. I know Dr. Lee Piccard, the former vice chancellor, who has seen every shootout game during all 20 years will enjoy it again.

A. MICHAEL ARNOLD, M.A. CANTAB., M.A. OXON, F. INST. D., F. INST. P.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I want to recognize the assistance I have received over the years from a longtime friend, A. Michael Arnold, whose intellectual capacity and international insights have proven to be of significant value to me and others. I have often passed on Mick Arnold's comments to many Members of Congress including our leaders. Since the early eighties, Mick and I have corresponded regularly, and occasionally have had the opportunity to meet either here or in Britain. He is a resident of Great Britain. We are both blessed with wonderful wives. Mick's wife Wendy is a respected author in her own right. My wife, Catherine, and Wendy share in our friendship.

These insights in Mr. Arnold's correspondence have run the gamut from the 1980's arms buildup in South America, to the current conflict in Bosnia with its implications for world peace, the internal convulsions in Russia, the tensions between Israel and the Arab world, the threats from Iran and Iraq, and to the reason d'etre of the United Nations. Mick's observations have been provocative, accurate, and full of sage advice. He has not sought recognition for his efforts. He told me that knowing that his observations may help to bring clarity to a confused world scene was sufficient to him.

I recall several specific instances of Mick's perceptiveness in international affairs. Mick's assessments in 1983 and 1984 of the political scene in the Soviet Union: He anticipated that Chernenko would stabilize his power base and advance Gorbachev as one of his key deputies. By early 1984 Chernenko had made Gorbachev his No. 2. Noting Chernenko's precarious health, Mick then anticipated that Gorbachev would succeed Chernenko. History records the accuracy of that assessment. That advice was very helpful to those of us who were working on Soviet affairs in the 1980's.

In 1991 Mick expressed anguish over the potential for a conflagration in Yugoslavia \* \* \* one that could envelope Bosnia-Herzegovina. Once again Mick's international instincts proved accurate. Many times that he shared his worries in papers I then passed on to others, those fears were realized in what did take place in Bosnia.

In April of this year, Mick commented on the upcoming Presidential elections in Iran and observed that Mohammed Khatemi would, if elected, be