

statements relating to your "treason" remarks.

On September 28, I described your "treason" statement as follows:

In May 1998, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Weldon) made remarks on the House floor regarding allegations that the political contributions of the chief executive officer of Loral Corporation, Bernard Schwartz, had influenced the President's decision to authorize the transfer of certain technology to China. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Weldon) described this issue as a, "Scandal that is unfolding that I think will dwarf every scandal that we have seen talked about on this floor in the past 6 years." And said further, "This scandal involves potential treason."

You have not disputed this characterization of your remarks. You also did not dispute my statement that when a member of Congress makes such a sensational allegation, it can have tremendous impact. In your case, your "treason" remarks were not only part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but were publicized in national media reports.

You have, however, taken issue with two sets of facts that I put into the record on September 28 after describing your "treason" remarks. First, I said:

The Department of Justice examined the allegations relating to whether campaign contribution influenced export control decisions and found them to be unfounded. In August 1998, Lee Radek, chief of the department's public integrity section, wrote that "there is not a scintilla of evidence or information that the President was corruptly influenced by Bernard Schwartz." Charles La Bella, then head of the department's campaign finance task force, agreed with Mr. Radek's assessment that "this was a matter which likely did not merit any investigation."

You said on October 2 that my statement was wrong, pointing to a passage in a July 16, 1998, memo by Mr. La Bella that discussed two documents potentially relevant to the Loral/Schwartz allegations. My statement, however, quoted two subsequent Department of Justice memos—an August 12, 1998, memo by Mr. La Bella and an August 5, 1998, memo by Mr. Radek.

Further, Mr. La Bella himself said that his July 16 memo took the view that the Loral/Schwartz matter "likely did not merit any investigation." Discussing his July 16 memo (the "Interim Report") and Mr. Radek's August 5 memo (the "Review"), Mr. La Bella stated on August 12, 1998:

The Review shares the view expressed in the Interim Report that this was a matter which likely did not merit any investigation.

In May 2000, Los Angeles Times investigative reporters examined the Justice Department's investigation of the Loral/Schwartz matter. In a May 23, 2000 article entitled Internal Justice Memo Excuses Loral, They wrote:

During a May 2 hearing, [Senator] Specter commented that LaBalla has pushed, in his still sealed memo, to have an independent counsel investigate the Loral matter, suggesting that the case remained ripe for serious criminal inquiry. And Specter reinforced that impression, urging the Senate to subpoena Loral-related documents.

But the impression was wrong.

The LaBalla report and related documents, which were obtained earlier this year by The Times, tell quite a different story. In fact, by the time LaBalla delivered his report to Atty. Gen. Janet Reno in the summer of 1998, the task force had effectively excused Schwartz and Loral from the campaign finance investigation....

"Poor Bernie [Schwartz] got a bad deal," one former task force investigator said in an

interview. "There was never a whiff of a scent of a case against him."

As you can see, therefore, I was entirely accurate in my summary of the Justice Department's investigation. It is your description of the evidence—not mine—that distorts the facts.

You also took issue with the second set of facts I put in the record relating to your "treason" remarks. In my September 28 statement, I said:

The House select committee investigated allegations relating to United States technology transfer to China and whether campaign contributions influenced export control decisions. In May 1999, the committee findings were made public. The committee's bipartisan findings also did not substantiate the suggestion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania of treason by the President.

In your October 2 remarks, you asserted, "Now, in fact, our Cox committee did not even look at this issue." This statement is remarkable, particularly since you were a member of the Cox Committee yourself.

As support for your claim, you cited language in the Cox Committee report which notes that the Committee did not end up looking at attempts by the People's Republic of China (PRC) to influence technology transfers through campaign contributions. Your "treason" remarks, however, centered on allegations relating to contributions by Bernard Schwartz, not the PRC. And, indeed, the Committee did examine these allegations.

As the Committee report notes, Mr. Schwartz was one of the individuals interviewed or deposed by the Committee. The Committee also interviewed or deposed Loral Vice President Thomas B. Ross. As noted in a May 24, 1998, New York Times article regarding the Loral/Schwartz allegations, Mr. Ross was the author of a February 13, 1998, letter to national security advisor Sandy Berger that urged a swift decision on the waiver issue. In fact, you drew attention to this very letter by Mr. Ross in your October 2 remarks.

Your assertion that the Cox Committee "did not even look at this issue" is therefore simply wrong.

The fact is, the Cox Committee report expressly mentions the Loral/Schwartz allegations, but does not confirm your conclusions in any way. This lack of findings in the report underscores the fact that your "treason" remarks remain unsubstantiated even though several investigative bodies have examined the Loral/Schwartz matter.

When a member of Congress makes a wild allegation, the burden should be on that member to support it. It is tremendously unfair—and contrary to our system of justice—to presume that the burden is on the target of the allegation or others to disprove unsubstantiated allegations. In this instance, the facts show that you made an inflammatory statement about the President in 1998 using the word "treason" and your statement remains unsubstantiated.

I hope this helps clarify the record.

Sincerely,

HENRY A. WAXMAN,
Member of Congress.

LIBERTY COMMON SCHOOL, A COLORADO CHARTER AND CORE KNOWLEDGE SCHOOL, LAUDED IN REPORT

HON. BOB SCHAFER
OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, there is great change occurring in education today. Parents in the United States are frustrated with the results of their children's education, which largely is the result of government-owned schools' departure from teaching basic knowledge. The impressive results of Core Knowledge and charter schools are undeniable, and like all good ideas with conclusive results—people take notice.

Mr. Speaker, I submit excerpt from the Lexington Institute's September 2000, report by Robert Holland entitled, "Public Charter Schools and the Core Knowledge Movement." This report details the success of Core Knowledge schools. I am proud to say the report also references the success of Liberty Common School, located in Fort Collins, Colorado, in which my children are enrolled. Liberty Common is a Core Knowledge charter school which not only exceeds the State of Colorado's standards, but Liberty Common also leads its school district as well. Mr. Speaker, I submit the Lexington Institute's report for the record:

PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOLS AND THE CORE KNOWLEDGE MOVEMENT

A battle raged throughout the 20th Century over the best way to teach children—by teacher-directed, content-rich approaches or through a "progressive" method by which children direct their own learning.

It rages still, with progressivism continuing to exert a strong hold, despite mounting evidence that teacher-directed instruction using a core curriculum works best for most children.

Core Knowledge schools have risen to meet the need and demand for schools that teach children facts in a sequential manner, so that they gain the vocabulary and knowledge base for further learning. Implementation of a Core Knowledge Sequence started in 1991 with one school in Florida; this fall, there will be 1,100 Core Knowledge schools operating in 46 states. The parallel charter school movement offers opportunities for parents and teachers to start Core Knowledge schools.

A basic purpose of Core Knowledge and its founder, Dr. E.D. Hirsch Jr., is to advance equity in education by ensuring a full education for all, including children from low-income and minority homes.

PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOLS AND THE CORE KNOWLEDGE MOVEMENT

In the past 30 years ample research has made possible a definite conclusion: Tightly focused teacher-directed instruction is more effective for most children than is child-directed instruction in which the teacher acts purely as a coach, mentor, or facilitator. For instance, a 1999 American Institutes of Research look at two dozen models of "whole school" designs reaffirmed the superiority of largely teacher-directed approaches like Direct Instruction, Success For All, and Core Knowledge.

Yet despite repeated proof that this is so, large segments of the education world stubbornly ignore this reality. They remain wedded to the so-called progressive doctrine. In

her important new book, *Left Back: A Century of Failed School Reforms*, education historian Diane Ravitch documents how the progressive movement, championed most notably by philosopher John Dewey, has exerted a powerful hold on American education from the early days of the 20th Century to the present. Ms. Ravitch argues powerfully that American schools must return to their basic mission of teaching knowledge.

There can be little doubt that most parents prefer the traditional, structured approach over progressive ways. Public Agenda, a nonpartisan research organization, repeatedly asked parents during the 1990s what they expected from their children's schools. Invariably parents of all races and backgrounds wanted schools that taught the academic basics, with attention to children being able to speak and write standard English. Parents also wanted schools where children were expected to obey rules, such as being "neat, on time, and polite." But Public Agenda found quite different goals among professors in the teacher-training schools, where strains of progressivism still exert a powerful grip. True to the old-time gospel of John Dewey, most professional educators thought advancing "social justice" more important than teaching children knowledge. Unlike parents, these teachers of teachers wanted schooling that is less structured and more "learner-centered."

The Rise of Core Knowledge

In 1990, Dr. Hirsch and his allies convened a national conference at which 24 working groups finalized a draft Core Knowledge Sequence for use in elementary schools. The sequence was based on research into the content and structure of the highest-performing elementary schools around the world, as well as consultation with teachers, parents, scientists, curriculum specialists, and others.

In 1991, the Core Knowledge Sequence debuted in a year of implementation at Three Oaks Elementary in Ft. Meyers, Florida under the leadership of the principal, Dr. Constance Jones (who in 1999 became president of the Core Knowledge Foundation in Charlottesville, Virginia). The Core Knowledge schools were born. The interest in and spread of these schools devoted to content-rich direct teaching has been phenomenal. This fall, there will be more than 1,100 full-fledged Core Knowledge schools in 46 states. (Hundreds of additional schools use portions of the Core Knowledge program.)

Particularly in the very early stages, adoption of Core Knowledge depended on principals and teachers who had to make the case to an often-skeptical school administration for importing a curriculum that rubs against the grain of education progressivism. James Traub wrote about Jim Coady, a principal in liberal Cambridge, Massachusetts, who had to battle the administration's hostile curriculum supervisors to bring Core Knowledge to Morse Elementary School, which was a struggling school with a relatively high proportion of children from low-income and minority homes. The supervisors argued, among other things, that the Harvard Graduate School of Education was against the experiment. But Coady won the right to experiment and by 1998 all grades at Morse scored at or above the national norm in math and reading, and the first graders were third in the entire city in their reading scores.

With the emergence of the national charter school movement in 1992, Core Knowledge became a viable option for parents, teachers, and others seeking to secure charters to start their own schools. In Colorado, a state evaluation of the performance of 51 charter schools that have been in operation for at least two years found Core Knowledge distin-

guishing itself both in quantity and quality. Twenty-two of the public charter schools (or 42 percent) used the Core Knowledge curriculum. Among charter schools using a "whole-school" model Core Knowledge was clearly dominant—22 versus three for the next-most-used model. More important, Core Knowledge was delivering results. The evaluators concluded that 14 of the Core Knowledge schools "exceeded expectations set for their performance," and the remaining eight "generally met" expectations.

Furthermore, Core Knowledge schools were a significant part of the reason Colorado charter schools scored, on average, 10 to 16 percentage points higher on basic subjects than public schools with comparable demographics. There is considerable research indicating that Core Knowledge is bolstering academic success. But first let's look at what the program is all about.

The Core Knowledge Sequence

"Shared" is an important word in the Core Knowledge lexicon. In his 1996 book, *The Schools We Need And Why We Don't Have Them*, Dr. Hirsch emphasized the importance of shared knowledge. Citizens in a democracy need to share an extensive body of information in order to communicate and function fully in society. The same hold in the classroom: If students draw a blank at mention of the names "Lee" and "Grant" not to mention "Bull Run" and "Appomattox," how can they be expected to engage in critical thinking about the Civil War?

Education progressives claim that knowledge is changing so rapidly that what children learn today will be outdated tomorrow; that schools therefore can at best only teach them "accessing skills," such as how to surf the Internet. But such a rationale does a grave disservice to children, because there is a body of bedrock knowledge—pivotal events in world history, the development of constitutional government, principles of writing and mathematics. And there are masterworks of art, music, and literature—with which they should be familiar in order to be fulfilled individuals.

The Core Knowledge idea, as summarized on its Website (www.coreknowledge.org), is "that for the sake of academic excellence, greater fairness, and higher literacy, elementary and middle schools need a solid, specific, shared core curriculum in order to help children establish strong foundations of knowledge, grade by grade." The Core Knowledge approach is not to throw tidbits of information helter-skelter at children. Rather the program specifies important knowledge in language arts, history and geography, mathematics, science, and the fine arts, and lays out a sequence for children to master what they need to know grade by grade.

Evidence of Core Knowledge Success

As cited earlier, the 1998-99 Colorado Charter Schools Evaluation Study showed that Core Knowledge schools were contributing in a big way to the success of charter schools in that state. Core Knowledge schools accounted for almost half the charter schools that were studied. And the charter schools outperformed their home districts and schools with comparable socioeconomic profiles.

From other states and researchers evidence of the positive effects of Core Knowledge has begun tumbling in. One of the most impressive studies was done by Gracy Taylor and George Kimball of the Oklahoma City Public Schools. Their study paired 300 Core Knowledge students with 300 students in other schools who had the same characteristics as the CK students on seven critical variables: grade level, pre-score, sex, race/ethnicity, eligibility for free lunch, Title I

services, and special education. The control students were randomly selected via computer according to those variables.

The researchers studied the effects of implementing one year of Core Knowledge in grade 3, 4, and 5. The well-validated Iowa Test of Basic Skills was the measuring stick. Given the almost identical backgrounds of the two groups of students, one might have expected one-year differences to be less than pronounced. However, the study found that Core Knowledge students made significantly greater gains in reading comprehension, vocabulary, science, math concepts, and social studies. Moreover, the greatest gains, which came in reading, vocabulary, and social studies, were judged to be "highly significant." The effect of raising vocabulary—the best predictor of academic success—was particularly noteworthy, because it shows hope for closing the socioeconomic gap in student achievement.

The researchers remarked that "according to the literature and personal conversations with Dr. Hirsch prior to the analyses, the impact on student achievement related to Core Knowledge instruction should be most pronounced in vocabulary and comprehension. The implementation of the Core Knowledge scope and sequence is intended to provide and develop a broad base of background knowledge that children utilize in their reading. According to Dr. Hirsch's cultural literacy theory, the more background knowledge a child has, the greater facility in reading the child will have. The initial results of this study do appear to support that notion."

In other words, the evidence so far is that the Core Knowledge approach accomplishes what it sets out to do. And if its adherents are right that knowledge builds on knowledge, the results should only grow more striking over the years.

Liberty School

Liberty Common School opened as a Core Knowledge school in Fort Collins, a pleasant community in the Rocky Mountain foothills of northern Colorado, three years ago. Today it enrolls more than 540 students in grades K-9, with a waiting list of close to 1,000. "It is our goal," says headmaster Kathryn Knox, "to equalize the playing field for all students through a common and rich foundation of content and skills, high expectations and good citizenship."

Liberty's Board of Directors is composed of seven elected parents. The board establishes and oversees the school's educational and operational policies. It meets twice a month in sessions open to the public.

Liberty Common is serious about meeting its academic goals. One of them was that the school would exceed state standards as well as the district's, which it did. In all of the reading and writing tests for grades 4 and 7, Liberty Common School ranked No. 1 in the local school district.

THE PAST YEAR IN INDO-AMERICAN RELATIONS

HON. JIM McDERMOTT OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, as we draw to the close of this legislative year, I wanted to highlight what has been perhaps the best year in U.S.-India relations. This first year of the new century has been a year of record setting in a wide range of categories, all highlighting the steadily improving relationship between two of the world's great democracies.