

city of Phoenix, the surrounding communities, and the State of Arizona thank you all.

But, Mr. Speaker, we will never forget Jay Bell crossing the plate in the bottom of the 9th Inning of Game 7, with the winning run. We will never forget Luis Gonzalez, after hitting 57 home runs during the season, dropping a bloop single over second base—one of his shortest hits of the year, but his longest hit in the hearts of Diamondback fans—to drive in that winning run. Who can forget Tony Womack's clutch hit to drive in the tying run.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the three Most Valuable Players. Craig Counsell was selected the MVP of the National League Championship Series. Craig's performance throughout the post season was outstanding. His clutch hitting and tenacious defense served as an inspiration to his fellow players and helped to propel the Diamondbacks to victory after victory.

However, the Diamondback pitching tandem who garnered World Series MVP honors will go down in history as one of the greatest pitching combinations of all time. The names Johnson/Schilling will be synonymous with each other in baseball, just as Ruth/Gehrig and Koufax/Drysdale. Curt Schilling and Randy Johnson are both masters of their craft who dominated pitching this year. They were first and second in the National League this year in both strikeouts and earned run average, and they set a record for combined strikeouts by teammates.

Mr. Speaker, November 4, 2001 will be a day long remembered by Arizonans. It was a day in which we shared the joy and glory of a Diamondback victory and welcomed the first World Championship to Arizona. The City of Phoenix, the State of Arizona, and the whole country congratulate these World Champions on a job well done!

COMMENDING COMMANDER CARLOS DEL TORO

HON. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 2001

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, on December 8, 2001, Commander Carlos Del Toro will take command of the USS *Bulkeley*, the newest Aegis Guided Missile Destroyer.

The USS *Bulkeley* is named in honor of Vice Admiral John D. Bulkeley. Vice Admiral Bulkeley was a true hero, serving our nation through 55 years of active duty. From his role in the landing at Normandy to his role as Commander of the U.S. Naval Base at Guantanamo, he served our country with loyalty and honor.

It is only appropriate that the commander of the USS *Bulkeley* embody the same exceptional characteristics of the ship's namesake. Commander Carlos Del Toro immigrated to the United States in 1962 from Cuba. He left a land sadly beset by oppression and dictatorship, and has devoted his life to defending liberty and democracy.

After graduating from the U.S. Naval Academy in 1983, Commander Del Toro began his honorable military career serving aboard the USS *Koelsch*, later serving on the USS *Preble*, and the USS *America*. While serving as the Assistant engineer on the USS *America*

aircraft carrier, he was deployed to the Persian Gulf twice in support of Operation Desert Storm.

Commander Del Toro has received a Masters Degree in Space Systems Engineering and Electrical Engineering from the Naval Postgraduate School, and served as Space Systems Program Manager at the Pentagon. He was responsible for managing a satellite ground station in support of our nation's national security. Following his work at the Pentagon, Commander Del Toro received a Master's Degree in National Security and Strategic Studies from the Navy War College, and served as Executive Officer of the USS *Vincennes*, a guided missile cruiser homeported in Japan.

Commander Carlos Del Toro has spent his Naval career preparing for his next assignment leading the USS *Bulkeley*. He honors the United States Navy, and he honors the United States of America. As a fellow Cuban-American, Mr. Speaker, it is a special privilege for me today to congratulate Commander Del Toro for his multiple career successes and to wish him and the crew of the USS *Bulkeley* Godspeed as they set to sea to defend America.

TRIBUTE TO EMILY MASAR

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 2001

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Miss Emily Masar of La Junta, Colorado. Emily has been selected as this year's National Philanthropy Day Outstanding Youth for her exceptional community service. For this, Mr. Speaker, the United States Congress commends her.

Emily is a student of La Junta High School and first became interested in volunteer activities in 1999. Since then Masar has started the Respite Nights program and has recruited numerous volunteers. The Respite Nights program provides services and support to adults and children with developmental disabilities. Currently, Masar and other volunteers have contributed over 350 hours to the program.

In a recent edition of the *La Junta Tribute-Democrat*, Kat Walden of the Arkansas Valley Community Center said, "Emily is a shining light that, as a young woman, has not only been willing to volunteer her time but also take the added responsibility of coordinating the Respite Nights program." Emily's strong work ethic and dedication to community service remind us of the strength of America's youth. It is reassuring to know we have people like Emily to lead us into the future.

As a constituent of Colorado's Fourth Congressional District, Emily Masar is truly a positive role model for the youth of America. She not only makes her community proud, but also her state and country. I ask the House to join me in extending our warmest congratulations to Ms. Emily Masar.

PATRIOTIC POEM WRITTEN BY
SARAH BETH SOENDKER

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 2001

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to share with the Members of the House this excellent poem written by 11-year old Sarah Beth Soendker, of Polo, Missouri. She is the granddaughter of Mr. and Mrs. Carl Soendker, of Lexington, Missouri. She wrote the poem in remembrance of the victims of the attack on America. The fine poem is set forth as follows:

AN AMERICAN PROMISE

We will stand tall if our soldiers die, if war starts again or if our hearts cry.

We will stand tall if our country should lose, if our men go to war, that's our news.

We will stand tall if our houses are burned, or if our country is attacked, we will still not be ruined.

We may be trapped in this world of sin, but at least we still have our pride, our courage and we can win!

An American Promise that we will make, we'll hold the flag high and this flag we won't let them take!

Sarah has also had two poems published in the 2000-01 editions of "Anthology of Poetry by Young Americans."

HONORING DESTINY FOLMER

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 2001

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize an exceptional and caring young woman, Destiny Folmer, who recently help raise \$400 for the Colorado Brian Injury Association. Destiny's mom is a brain injury survivor who helped inspire her to engage in this worthy cause. Destiny recently tried to ensure that others suffering brain injuries will survive and recover by participating in the Pikes Peak Challenge. At only fifteen years old, she and her father performed the fifteen-mile hike up Pikes Peak and, after nine long hours, finished the grueling hike. By completing the challenge, she was able to raise the \$400 for the Association. Mr. Speaker, not only is her family proud of her achievements, but her community is proud and appreciative of her charitable heart. Destiny Folmer has truly displayed a caring heart and the many that will benefit from her dedication are grateful for her selfless act. She is a special young woman that is worthy of the praise of this body of Congress. I would like to thank Destiny for being a role model to us all.

COMMEMORATION OF THE UKRAINIAN FAMINE

HON. MAURICE D. HINCHEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 2001

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, today, November 6, 2001, we remember one of the most

horrific events the world has ever seen: the induced famine that was forced on the Ukrainian people by the Soviet government between 1932 and 1933. Ukrainians live all over the world now, but their homeland was under a non-conventional attack whose purpose was to eliminate the Ukrainian nation from existence. Seven million people were killed through starvation while a surplus of grain sat in warehouses. Despite the magnitude of this crisis, the Ukrainian Famine remains largely unknown outside the Ukrainian community. The truth has been hidden from us for far too long and now it must be brought to light.

Under the reign of Josef Stalin, the Ukrainians resisted the unimaginable atrocities that befell them. After the heroic efforts of the Ukrainian independence movement toward the end of World War I, Stalin forced a famine on the "breadbasket of Europe," Ukraine. One-fourth of its population was killed during this horrendous act of genocide.

A reporter from the Manchester Guardian managed to slip inside the famine area and described it as, "A scene of unimaginable suffering and starvation." He witnessed the terror and suffering that the people endured and attempted to show it to the world. Until 1986, the Soviet government did not admit to the man-induced famine. For two years people starved to death and the survivors were forced to eat rodents, eat the leather from shoes, and in extreme cases they were forced to eat the dead. The seven million deaths over two years was the highest rate of death caused by any single event, including any war that the Ukrainian people have ever fought. There is no precedent of such a hideous act in recorded history.

Ukraine and the United States have witnessed human suffering and newly independent Ukraine is helping the United States during our time of mourning. Ukrainian Americans lost people in the attacks of September 11 who were as innocent as those that died in the famine. They will join together on November 17 at St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York to commemorate the terrible acts perpetrated upon Ukrainians nearly three-quarters of a century ago. The survivors will always remember the past in order to prevent such suffering from occurring ever again.

DR. HENRY KISSINGER'S EXCELLENT ANALYSIS OF OUR WAR ON TERRORISM

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 6, 2001

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, today's issue of the Washington Post includes an excellent op-ed by our nation's former National Security Adviser to the President and former Secretary of State, Dr. Henry Kissinger. He gives an outstanding strategic analysis of our current war on terrorism. In particular he emphasizes the importance of recognizing that our objectives in Afghanistan are limited, and we must realistically limit what we seek to do there. His analysis of our tasks beyond our action in Afghanistan is equally prescient.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to read Dr. Kissinger's brilliant article "Where Do We Go From Here?" and I ask that the full text be placed in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post Nov. 6, 2001]

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

(By Henry Kissinger)

As the war against the Taliban gathers momentum, it is important to see it in its proper perspective. President Bush has eloquently described the objective as the destruction of state-supported terrorism. And for all its novelty, the new warfare permits a clear definition of victory.

The terrorists are ruthless, but not numerous. They control no territory permanently. If their activities are harassed by the security forces of all countries—if no country will harbor them—they will become outlaws and increasingly obliged to devote efforts to elemental survival. If they attempt to commandeer a part of a country, as has happened to some extent in Afghanistan and Colombia, they can be hunted down by military operations. The key to anti-terrorism strategy is to eliminate safe havens.

These safe havens come about in various ways. In some countries, domestic legislation or constitutional restraints inhibit surveillance unless there are demonstrated criminal acts, or they prevent transmitting what is ostensibly domestic intelligence to other countries—as seems to be the case in Germany and, to some extent, the United States. Remedial measures with respect to these situations are in train.

But the overwhelming majority of safe havens occur when a government closes its eyes because it agrees with at least some of the objectives of the terrorists—as in Afghanistan, to some extent in Iran and Syria and, until recently, in Pakistan. Even ostensibly friendly countries that have been cooperating with the United States on general strategy, such as Saudi Arabia, sometimes make a tacit bargain with terrorists so long as terrorist actions are not directed against the host government.

A serious anti-terrorism campaign must break this nexus. Many of the host governments know more than they were prepared to communicate before Sept. 11. Incentives must be created for the sharing of intelligence. The anti-terrorism campaign must improve security cooperation, interrupt the flow of funds, harass terrorist communications and subject the countries that provide safe haven to pressures including, in the extreme case, military pressure.

In the aftermath of the attack on American soil, the Bush administration resisted arguments urging immediate military action against known terrorist centers. Instead, Secretary of State Colin Powell very skillfully brought about a global coalition that legitimized the use of military power against Afghanistan, the most flagrant provider of a safe haven for the most egregious symbol of international terrorism, Osama bin Laden.

The strategy of focusing on Afghanistan carries with it two risks, however. The first is that the inherent complexities of a trackless geography and chaotic political system may divert the coalition from the ultimate objective of crippling international terrorism. Though the elimination of bin Laden and his network and associates will be a significant symbolic achievement, it will be only the opening engagement of what must be viewed as a continuing and relentless worldwide campaign. The second challenge is to guard against the temptation to treat cooperation on Afghanistan as meeting the challenge and to use it as an alibi for avoiding the necessary succeeding phases.

This is why military operations in Afghanistan should be limited to the shattering of the Taliban and disintegration of the bin Laden network. Using U.S. military forces for nation-building or pacifying the entire

country would involve us in a quagmire comparable to what drained the Soviet Union. The conventional wisdom of creating a broadly based coalition to govern Afghanistan is desirable but not encouraged by the historical record. The likely—perhaps optimum—outcome is a central Kabul government of limited reach, with tribal autonomy prevailing in the various regions. This essential enterprise should be put under the aegis of the United Nations, with generous economic support from the United States and other advanced industrial countries. A contact group could be created composed of Afghanistan's neighbors (minus Iraq), India, the United States and those NATO allies that participated in the military operations. This would provide a mechanism to reintroduce Iran to the international system, provided it genuinely abandons its support of terrorism.

The crucial phase of America's anti-terrorism strategy will begin as the Afghanistan military campaign winds down, and its focus will have to be outside Afghanistan. At that point, the coalition will come under strain.

So far the issue of long-term goals has been avoided by the formula that members of the global coalition are free to choose the degree of their involvement. A la carte coalition management worked well when membership required little more than affirming opposition to terrorism in principle. Its continued usefulness will depend on how coalition obligations are defined in the next phase. Should the convoy move at the pace of the slowest ship or should some parts of it be able to sail by themselves? If the former, the coalition effort will gradually be defined by the least-common-denominator compromises that killed the U.N. inspection system in Iraq and are on the verge of eliminating the U.N. sanctions against that country. Alternatively, the coalition can be conceived as a group united by common objectives but permitting autonomous action by whatever consensus can be created—or, in the extreme case, by the United States alone.

Those who argue for the widest possible coalition—in other words, for a coalition veto—often cite the experience of the Gulf War. But the differences are significant. The Gulf War was triggered by a clear case of aggression that threatened Saudi Arabia, whose security has been deemed crucial by a bipartisan succession of American presidents. The United States decided to undo Saddam's adventure in the few months available before the summer heat made large-scale ground operations impossible. Several hundred thousand American troops were dispatched before any attempt at coalition building was undertaken. Since the United States would obviously act alone if necessary, participating in the coalition became the most effective means for influencing events.

The direction of the current coalition is more ambiguous. President Bush has frequently and forcefully emphasized that he is determined to press the anti-terrorism campaign beyond Afghanistan. In due course he will supplement his policy pronouncements with specific proposals. That will be the point at which the scope of the operational coalition will become clear. There could be disagreement on what constitutes a terrorist safe haven; what measures states should take to cut off the flow of funds; what penalties there are for noncompliance; in what manner, whether and by whom force should be used.

Just as, in the Gulf War, the pressures for American unilateral action provided the cement to bring a coalition together, so, in the anti-terrorism war, American determination