

colleagues again on the floor at a further time.

□ 2115

ENERGY CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, tonight, I want to talk about a couple of subjects.

First of all, I cannot help but reflect upon some of the prior speakers and what they have talked about, especially in terms of our energy crisis. I will only spend a couple of minutes on that, because I addressed it a couple of times in the past also.

It is undeniably true we have an energy crisis in the United States. It is undeniably true that gas prices are rising, that blackouts, rolling brownouts, all kinds of things are occurring throughout the United States, but especially in California and on the West Coast.

We spend a great deal of time in this body debating as to exactly why that has occurred, and, in fact, there are a number of reasons, of course. They deal mostly with supply problems. We just do not have enough energy. We do not produce enough.

AMERICA'S POPULATION GROWING AT A RAPID RATE DUE TO IMMIGRATION, LEGAL OR ILLEGAL

Mr. TANCREDO. There is a basic problem and there is something below even all of that, which we must identify and talk about from time to time, and that is the fact that America's population is growing at a rapid rate.

That population growth is a result, not just of the birth rate of the people who have lived in the United States for some period of time, it is the result that over 50 percent of that population growth in the last decade is a result of immigration into the United States, both legal and illegal.

California is a prime example of the problem. It has an enormous population. It has enormous growth in the population primarily as a result of immigration. The United States Congress has a responsibility. It is to establish immigration standards, immigration quotas.

We are the only body that can do that. No State can do it. California cannot determine how many people it will let in. It has to deal with however many people come in, and in dealing with it, it has to build more power plants, whether they like it or not.

It has to encourage conservation, and it has to, in fact, tap the natural resources available to it. We will be doing that throughout this Nation as a result of the dramatic increase in population brought about primarily by immigration both legal and illegal.

No one likes to talk about this. It is an issue that oftentimes evokes a lot of

emotion on both sides of the issue. There are people who would suggest that even to bring it up is an indication of some sort of ulterior motive that is akin to and always likened to racism.

I have said here on the floor many times, I will repeat it tonight. It is not where we come from, it is the number of people who come. In fact, we must deal with it.

We may not like having to deal with it, but we may not like the debate that will ensue as a result of any change in our immigration policy, but it must be done. It is for the good of the country, and it has absolutely nothing to do, as far as I am concerned, anyway, with racial-related issues. It is a matter of quality of life. It is a matter of energy resources that we have been talking about here.

As I sat here and prepared my remarks, I listened to others speak. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. McINNIS) talked for an hour about the energy crisis. Although, he is absolutely correct in all of the things he said in terms of why we are here, I must admit to the gentleman that the one thing that he left out, which I think is extremely important, is the fact that the reason we have this crisis and the reason it will grow throughout the United States is because of the number of people we have in the country and the number of people coming in.

A little over, I will repeat, a little over 50 percent of the growth of this Nation in the last decade was a result of immigration, legal and illegal; 50 percent of the cars on the road; 50 percent of the houses that are popping up in neighborhoods all over the country and what was at one time a pristine landscape; 50 percent of the problem you have getting in to national parks, any of the other kinds of issues come about as a result of population pressures are, in fact, a direct result of this immigration issue.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot come before the House tonight without bringing that particular issue to the attention of the Speaker and to those who may be listening.

LIMIT GOVERNMENT FUNDING RELATING TO ART

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, but that was not the original intent, that was not the original purpose I asked for this time period to address the House.

A short time ago, Mr. Speaker, in Colorado, there was a rock star, "an artist" of some sort, and I put the term "artist" in quotation marks, by the name of Marilyn Manson.

I admit I do not have any of this person's, I was going to say gentleman, but I am really not positive what he or she or it is, I am just saying, I do not have their particular records in my cabinet. I had read something about this person's particular "artistic" accomplishments.

I had a call one day, this was about 2 weeks ago or 3 weeks ago, I guess, from

a gentleman in Colorado who was concerned about the fact that this person Mr. Manson, Mrs. Manson, Ms. Manson, whatever, was coming in, and he was concerned. Because in the past, this particular rock idol had offered to come in and do some sort of concert for the people who were responsible for the deaths of the children at Columbine High School.

Hear me, Marilyn Manson would come in to do a concert for the people who killed them. There was concern about this kind of individual coming to Colorado again and spewing his filth. So this person called our office here. The gentleman that called, I believe, was Jason Janz.

Mr. Janz said, look, we are trying to organize some sort of boycott. We think that people should just avoid going to hear this particular performer. He said, can we use your name in our, ad or whatever they were going to do, and I cannot remember now whether it was as a person who would support our efforts or not.

I said to Mr. Janz, well, yes, you can. I can certainly understand why you would be concerned. I do not think people should go myself; whether they do or not is, of course, their own decision to make.

Anyway, Mr. Janz used my name in some sort of advertising or publication, I do not know what it was, saying that these people have also suggested that people should not go to this particular concert.

We had a storm of reaction to that. There was a lot of protests, a lot of people called our office here and in Colorado, in Littleton and said, how dare you? How dare you, a Member of Congress, try to censor this particular performer?

I was, in a way, shocked, because, of course, censorship is a term that can be defined. It is defined in the dictionary. It is pretty clear what censorship is. It means someone preventing someone from expressing themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I tried to explain to the people who called my office that, in fact, I really was not trying to censor this particular "artist"; that I really could not care less what he or she or it did. It was just that when I was asked whether people should participate in this kind of garbage, I would say, no, they should not. That is my opinion.

Their point of view was that I should be censored; that I should not be allowed to say such a thing; that I should not be allowed to criticize this particular performer or anybody else, I suppose, that they felt was a particularly important personage in the entertainment world.

This whole thing was a fascinating sort of phenomenon, because eventually Manson came to Colorado. It was just last week or so, did his or her thing. I am sure there was a large crowd and everything was, you know, just pretty fine.

I do not know if people enjoyed it or not. I do not know, and I truly do not

care. But the debate surrounding this whole event was characterized, I think, perfectly in an article that was in the Rocky Mountain News last week.

I am going to read it here. It is relatively short. It was written by a friend of mine, his name is Mike Rosen. He does a daily radio show in Colorado and writes a weekly column for the Rocky Mountain News.

And it goes as follows: "Greet Manson with due scorn," that is the title. It says "personally, I think the rank demagoguery of Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle is far more dangerous to the well-being of our republic than the sordid rantings of shock rocker Marilyn Manson. But the thing I'd do is silence either of them."

If you're going to allow free speech, you must take the risk that someone might listen. While incitement-to-riot, slander, and yelling 'fire' in a crowded theater are not tolerated in our society, the expression of ideas that are merely offensive is.

If we voted on who could speak and who couldn't, Billy Graham would probably win and Marilyn Manson probably would lose. But we don't put it to a vote because this isn't a democracy. Our constitutional republic protects the rights of individuals, even unpopular ones.

Actually, Manson's June 21 Denver appearance at Ozzfest is not really a First Amendment issue. The First Amendment restricts government's abridgement of free speech.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all Members that the rules of the House prohibit characterization of Members of the Senate even though not their own remarks.

Mr. TANCREDO. "The First Amendment restricts government's abridgement of free speech. But government hasn't threatened to muzzle Manson. He will not be barred from performing by any government officials.

The opposition to his performance here has come from private groups led by Baptist youth minister Jason Janz, and others, employing moral persuasion, as is their right, to discourage and disparage Manson's act.

I'm no fan of Manson, or, for that matter, his inspirational namesake Charles Manson. I don't like his music, his lyrics or his message. I've heard and read enough of it, dutifully, to get the point. This from his newest CD 'Antichrist Superstar.' I will bury God in my warm spit. I went to God just to see. And I was looking at me. When I'm God everyone dies." Very enlightening.

□ 2130

"I find Manson neither thought-provoking nor profound. He offers mostly sophomoric dribble (not that the work of Dion and the Belmonts, from my era, was exactly Shakespeare, but it was good to dance to and at least it wasn't destructive.) To be sure, there's demand for Manson's kind of bilge from

troubled, confused, angry, defiant, depressed, macabre, antisocial and sociopathic adolescent and arrested-adolescent audiences. And when you're high on drugs, gibberish can pass for wisdom.

"If it weren't for Manson playing this role, someone else would, and others do. He claims to be an artist, crafting a poetic, philosophical message. More likely, he's just another crass entertainment opportunist capitalizing on a market niche. You might say the same of Alice Cooper, but Cooper has always done his thing with a wink, not to be taken seriously. It was obvious shtick. Heck, Cooper's a Republican, a big baseball fan, and a 4-handicap golfer. Compared to Manson, Alice Cooper is Dr. Laura. In his heyday, Cooper sold the bizarre; Manson spews the depraved. (And I'll throw in my psychological diagnosis of Manson: he's screwed up in the head, too.)

"Is Manson's influence on troubled and impressionable young minds potentially destructive? I imagine it is for some. While for others, listening to Manson may be benign, providing an outlet for emotional venting that might substitute for acts of physical destructiveness. Teen-agers are attracted to Manson as an act of rebellion against conventional society precisely because he appalls their parents. I have no remedy for this. It's one of the tradeoffs we make in a free society.

"It's not a question of whether Manson should be condemned or allowed to perform. Of course, both of these things should happen. Manson debases our values, culture and civil conventions. Jason Janz's criticism of him is wholly appropriate. Someone needs to say that. Our indifference would be more disturbing. To most who attend, Ozzfest will be little more than a fun summer concert featuring a variety of performers. The Manson acolytes there will be in the minority. And while they snigger at the establishment's attack on their idol, it still serves a purpose. They may understand when they grow up."

Again, that is Mike Rosen in the Rocky Mountain News.

Now, this leads to another issue and even a much bigger issue than this particular event in Denver Colorado in last week. This leads us to a debate we were having on the floor of the House here last week. It was a debate on whether or not we should be funding the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities.

It was fascinating from a number of standpoints. We have done this every year. The debate occurs every single year. Much of the same objections are heard over and over again as to whether or not government funds should be used to support "art".

Now, what if this had happened in Colorado, everything that I just described, and this particular event had been paid for entirely with tax dollars? Would there not have been a different kind of debate? Would we not have

been able to enter into the discussion an argument that, although, certainly, this person, Manson, should be allowed to perform, no one, certainly I would never prohibit him from doing his thing by law. But the question remains is whether or not someone should be forced to pay for it through the taking away of their tax dollars, providing it for this experience.

Certainly there would have been an outcry. Certainly people would have said absolutely not. You know, I do not care whether this person does its thing on the stage and spews forth its bilge, I do not care about that. If people want to do it, want to see it, that is their business, and I certainly agree. But making me pay for it through my tax dollars, that is something else entirely.

Now, that would have been an interesting debate, and I wonder how it would have come out. I wonder if the City of Denver, I wonder if the mayor of the City of Denver had agreed to something like that, had put tax dollars into it, I wonder whether or not the mayor would not be in political trouble the next election.

Would not people in the City say, how could you possibly make me pay for something like this? I think it is horrible. Or even, I do not have an opinion on it, I just have absolutely no desire to fund this particular expression of this particular "artist".

Well, I think that that would be a legitimate argument. Do my colleagues not, Mr. Speaker? I think that, in fact, that would be a legitimate debate had we paid for that with tax dollars. I think there would have been significant political ramifications and repercussions to such a decision made by the political leaders in Denver.

But it did not happen that way. It was totally voluntary. People went, paid their price at the door, and went in; and I say, of course, that is fine. They can do what they want to do. If you ask me whether someone should do it, I would tell you no. It does not matter. I would never stop anyone from either going to see this person or, on the other hand, I would never try to stop this person from actually getting on stage and doing whatever it is it does.

So the question, then, comes as to how we can, every single year, take money from Americans, hard-working Americans, many of whom have to make decisions about, you know, if they are going to pay the rent this month or if they are going to pay their gas bill.

How can we take money from them to support the, quote, artistic endeavors of others of a similar, well no matter what. No matter if there was absolutely no argument as to the value, quote, value of the art. It is still absolutely wrong for any of us here to make that sort of elitist decision for all members of society, that we would take away their money and give it to a particular kind of art or a particular kind of artist. How can we justify that?

I guess, to a certain extent, I am going to have to actually talk about

what we have been funding over these years. I almost hate to say it, but I wish we could put up here one of these signs that say "be careful, the following may not be suitable for viewing by young people" or whatever, because it is certainly some of the nastiest sort of thing. I will try to avoid being too incredibly graphic, but I guess it is pretty hard to suggest that this is not appropriate for us to discuss here since we paid for it, since we took money from Americans, from hard-working citizens and paid for this stuff that I am going to tell my colleagues about.

Let us start with 1998, the National Endowment for the Arts was criticized for funding this New York theater which staged the play "Corpus Christi", a blasphemous play depicting Jesus having sexual relations with his apostles.

By the way, a great deal of what has happened here, a great deal of what the NEA chooses support has a decidedly homo-erotic, anti-Christian, and certainly not just anti-Christian, but a hatred of Christianity, and the most bizarre kind of sexual connotation, not just connotation, but aspects that you can imagine. That really a lot of this stuff that they choose to do. Okay.

One would have thought that the NEA might refrain from funding the Manhattan Theater Club ever again given the theater's decision to present "Corpus Christi". Not so. The very next year, the theater was awarded another grant of \$37,000. This year, the theater received, not one, but two separate grants, each for \$50,000.

In 1996 and 1997, the NEA received sharp rebukes for funding this group, the Women Make Movies, that is what it is called, by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

At the time, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) noted that the NEA gave over more than \$100,000 over a 3-year period to Women Make Movies, that is the name of this organization, which distributed numerous pornographic films such as "Sex Fish", "Watermelon Woman", and "Blood Sisters". These films included depictions of explicit lesbian pornography, oral sex, and sadomasochism.

In 1997, the American Family Association distributed to most Members of Congress clips of some of these and other pornographic films distributed by Women Make Movies.

Criticism of the NEA for funding a group that distributes pornographic works was dismissed by the agency which continue to fund Women Make Movies as late as 1999, giving two grants, one for \$12,000, one for \$30,000. The Women Makes Movies continues to distribute hard core pornography.

Then there is the Wooly Mammoth Theater Company, a Washington, D.C. theater, a frequent recipient of NEA money, generated controversy in the past for NEA when it staged Tim Mil-

ler's one-man performance titled "My Queer Body". This play describes what it is like to have sex with another man, climbs into the lap of a spectator. I do not even want to read this.

Shrugging off the controversy this year, the NEA gave the theater \$28,000. Wooly Mammoth's 2000 season, this was last year actually, will include the production "Preaching to the Perverted", written and performed by Holly Hughes, who herself has been the cause of controversy.

Hughes sued the U.S. Government for refusing to fund her indecent work and lost. The Supreme Court ruling was that NEA was not obliged to fund pornography. Despite this Court's ruling, the NEA is still choosing to pay for Holly Hughes' offensive work through its support of Wooly Mammoth. In the Wooly Mammoth's Internet catalog.

"Preaching to the Perverted" is described as follows: "If you loved the solo extravagances of Tim Miller", the fellow I just mentioned, "you won't want to miss this unique and irreverent evening of legal and sexual politics."

Then there is the Whitney Museum of American Art. It has been a regular recipient of NEA funds for over the years and several times provided fodder for the critics. This in recent years included a work by Joel-Peter Witkin titled "Maquette for Crucifix", a naked Jesus surrounded by sadomasochistic obscene imagery and many grotesque portrayals of corpses and body parts.

Another Whitney exhibit was a film by Suzie Silver titled "A Spy". It depicts Jesus Christ as woman standing naked with breasts exposed.

Again, this is hard it even go through, it is certainly hard to describe. But we paid for it. We appropriated money in this House. We took money from citizens in this country and paid for this. So it is only right that we should be forced to have to hear what we paid for as grotesque as it is. It is hard for me to read it. I am sure it is hard for many people to hear it. I do not like having to do it. But, in fact, you paid for it, America. You might as well understand what you bought.

Incredibly, Whitney also included "Piss Christ", Andres Serrano's photograph of a crucifix in a jar of urine, the very same work which began the NEA controversy in 1989, as well as a film by porn star Annie Sprinkle entitled "The Sluts and Goddesses Video Workshop or How to be a Sex Goddess in 101 Easy Steps", on and on and on.

Walker Art Center, a performance at this Minneapolis theater and NEA recipient outraged Senator BYRD even, Democrat from West Virginia, and many other Members of Congress.

To make a statement about AIDS, artist Ron Athey, who was HIV positive pierced his body with needles, cut designs into the back of another man, blotted the man's blood with paper towels and set the towels over the audience on a clothes line. Then NEA

chair Jane Alexander defended the performance, and the Walker Arts Center has continued to receive NEA funds for several years. This year's take, this was a couple years ago, this year's take for the avant-garde center is \$70,000.

The NEA was criticized in 1997 for funding the Museum of Contemporary Art in New York because of the work of Carollee Schneeman, an artist credited with inspiring Miss Sprinkle whose pornographic funding have caused a lot of problems for the NEA also. I hesitate to even go into what that one was about.

Franklin Furnace, New York. This New York theater frequently receives NEA funds. The theater's performance often promotes homosexuality and blast traditional morality. Its year 2000 grant, \$10,000.

The Theater for New York City, the Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights brought this New York's theater to national attention recently because of its anti-Catholic bigotry. The theater staged the play "The Pope and the Witch", depicting the Pope called John Paul, II, as a heroin-addicted paranoid advocating birth control and the legalization of drugs. The theater received a grant in 1997. The Americans paid for this, \$30,000 in 1997 and \$12,000 in the year 2000.

Really, I have just pages and pages of this kind of thing. I will enter them into the RECORD, but I will not go on with that in description here audibly tonight. It is just too revolting even for me to deal with.

But my point is this, that all of this I consider to be absolute garbage. That is my opinion. I cannot imagine anyone wanting to see it. I cannot certainly imagine wanting to participate in it. I certainly cannot believe that anyone would have the audacity to suggest that we have to take money from people who have the same feeling as I do about this and give it to these performers in order for there to be a good art thriving in America.

□ 2145

It is ridiculous. It is idiotic.

We have had an interesting discussion, as I say, over the whole issue as it came through the Congress of the United States, and there are many aspects of this that I think need to be discussed. Now, by the way, I suppose I should mention, that those of us who were opposed to funding for National Endowment for the Arts failed in our attempt to reduce the funding of \$150 million. But it is not just this kind of pornographic trash that it funds with which I take exception. I believe it is absolutely wrong for us to be making a decision in this body as to what is appropriate, what is good art or what is good television programming or radio. I refer now, of course, to National Public Radio, National Public Television, which we again take money from everyone in America and we fund.

Now, I happen to listen to National Public Radio. I enjoy many, many of

its programs. My point is, however, the idea that my taste in either television or radio is something that should be the standard for the Nation. Because I happen to enjoy National Public Radio I will tax everyone in this country to help support it. Is that not somewhat bizarre?

Let me read from the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia August 18, 1787. This is incredibly amazing and profound in a way because, as we see, the Founding Fathers dealt with all the problems that we confront every single day and they really had an insight that bears reflecting upon. 1787, August 18. Charles Pinckney of South Carolina rose to urge that Congress be authorized to "establish seminaries for the promotion of literature and the arts and sciences." Modest proposal; right? He suggested that the Congress of the United States be authorized to establish seminaries for the promotion of literature and the arts and of science.

Now, remember, seminaries had a different connotation in this particular time period. We are not talking about necessarily religious institutions. In this case he was talking about intellectual pursuits, educational institutions solely. His proposal was immediately voted down. In the words of one delegate, the only legitimate role for government in promoting culture and the arts was "the granting of patents, i.e. protecting the rights of authors and artists to make money from their creations." That, he said, was the only legitimate role for government in promoting culture and the arts.

The framers treasured books and music, but they treasured limited government far more. A federally approved artist was as unthinkable to them as a federally approved church or newspaper. This is why the Constitution does not so much as have a hint at subsidizing artists or cultural organizations. It is why Americans have always been skeptical about the entanglement of art and State. And it is why so many artists have snorted at the notion that art depends upon the patronage of a Washington elite.

And that is a very good way of portraying what happens here. It is incredibly elitist for us to say we know in this body, the 435 Members of the House, the 100 Members of the Senate and the President of the United States, we know, at least a majority of us know, what is the best kind of art for the American citizens to observe or participate in. Incredibly elitist. Incredibly elitist for us to suggest that the particular television programming that we believe to be uplifting or stimulating or whatever is appropriate enough to tax everybody to support.

What gives us this incredible attitude? It is the fact, of course, that we make many decisions here all the time that tend to make us all feel, I suppose, pretty omnipotent and omniscient, because we know everything and we have power over everything and, naturally,

we should be able to determine what is good art; what is good television; right?

The argument for television especially is the one that confounds me. Every year people come into my office and talk about the need to support, publicly support, public television. We need to take tax dollars away from people and do that. And I always suggest to them that maybe, maybe 20 years ago they could have made an argument for some sort of alternative television programming, because there were only three major broadcasting systems and relatively little choice, I suppose, among those three different broadcasting systems. They could have perhaps made the point, well, there is just a need for a different kind of television programming and no one is going to produce it, so, therefore, let us go ahead and take tax dollars away from people and provide it.

They could have made that point. I would not have agreed with them, but it would have been a much more logical position to take than coming in here today, today, to this House, in this year of 2001, and saying there is not enough diversity on television; we need to take money from everybody in America to fund my brand of television because it is better, it is better for people, it is more intellectual, more highbrow, it is good for people to have this available to them, when there is, what, 150, or heaven knows how many actual stations there are out there with cable television. I certainly have lost count myself. All I know is there is no one, I believe, no one that can argue that there is not diversity in programming on television today. And yet our particular brand, our particular idea of what good television is is what we say in this body everyone is going to pay for. Again, it seems a bit peculiar to me.

I actually did a program in Colorado on public television, a sort of talking head show. I used to do it every Friday, and I enjoyed it. And every year they had a period of time that the station would devote to fund-raising, and all the participants and everybody that wanted to, I suppose, could come on for an hour or two and stand up in front of people and ask for money, ask for support for the station. I called it a begathon. And I would do it. Every single year I would go on and say, if you want to support this, if you think that we in fact are doing something good enough in terms of television that you believe it should be continued, then I encourage you to get out your checkbook and send this station money. And I am more than willing to do that. I did that, as I say, every single year, because that is exactly the way "public television" should be funded, by donations.

They then would come to me, the same station would come to me as a Member of Congress and say, how could you not then vote for funding for our station when you were on it? And I

would always say, look, if the program I was on was not worth it, if we could not get people to watch that program and we could get them to contribute, then of course it was not good programming and I probably should have been kicked off and you should have found somebody else.

But the idea that I would come here to the Congress and vote for money to make sure that that particular station stayed on the air is crazy, any more than I would vote for money for any other particular station to stay on the air. Again, it is certainly not because I am particularly opposed to the kind of programming they have. It is maybe fine. Some of it is fine, some of it is lousy from my point of view. But that does not matter. It is just my opinion. But it is absolutely wrong for me to come to this body and vote to force everyone in this country to support my brand of programming.

Dr. Robert Samuelson said some time ago that the funding of cultural agencies by the Federal Government is highbrow pork barrel, and I certainly agree. We are taking from the poor to subsidize the rich. It is the reverse Robin Hood theory here. In fact, most of the programming on these stations, even a lot of the "art" of the NEA has absolutely no appeal whatsoever to the bulk of America, the majority of Americans, certainly Americans of low income. They are not really interested by and large in that kind of entertainment. Again, if they are, that is fine. They can make their own decisions about it, but it is incredible to me that we can do this; that we can take money from them and provide support for materials and for programming that is only really enjoyed, I say only, but primarily enjoyed by a different group of people, and most of the time people more well off.

There is also the issue of the corruption of the artists and scholars that we fund. It is I think absolutely true, no one I think who has been around here for any length of time disagrees with the fact that government funding of anything involves government control. That insight of course is part of our folk wisdom. He who pays the piper calls the tune, as they say. And it is quite true. We never give out a dollar here in this body without also saying how it should be spent. Those are the strings we attach to it. And when we do that for the "arts," it has a corrupting influence on it. Artists and want-to-be artists begin to gravitate toward what they think the government is going to fund and find themselves sort of chasing the government dollar.

The influence of government funding of the arts is a negative one and a corrupting one. The politicization of whatever the Federal cultural agencies touch was driven home by Richard Goldstein, a supporter of the National Endowment for the Humanities himself. But he pointed out that "the NEH has a ripple effect on university hiring and tenure, and on the kinds of research undertaken by scholars seeking

support. Its chairman shapes the bounds of that support. In a broad sense he sets standards that affect the tenor of textbooks and the content of curriculum. Though no chairman of the NEH can single-handedly direct the course of American education, he can nurture the nascent trends and take advantage of informal opportunities to signal department heads and deans. He can 'persuade' with the cudgel of Federal funding out of sight but hardly out of mind."

Then, finally, every time we debate this issue we are confronted by people who will say that we must do this, we must in fact provide money for the arts community, the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, because of the effect that the arts have on our spirit, the soul, the uplifting nature of the arts; that to provide public funding for this is a good because of the way it in fact changes the culture, and they would suggest, for the positive. Well, what if, Mr. Speaker, I came before the body and suggested that there was another kind of experience that does exactly that; that provides a tremendous amount of benefit to the Nation; that does amazing things for the soul, uplifting in nature; that it can change a person's attitude about life; that it can motivate you to do great things, all these things I have heard on the floor as to the reason why we have to fund the arts?

□ 2200

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that there is another argument I could make using exactly the same logic. What if I were to come before the body and say, I know something that we should be doing that does all of the things I have just said, is an incredible influence on our lives, that provides an outlet for emotional needs of millions of people, and it is called religion and I am going to ask this body to appropriate \$150 million this year for religion.

Now, the first thing that someone would say is we cannot do this because there is this wall of separation that exists in the minds of many, but nowhere in the Constitution, by the way, that separates church and State. But the real reason why we cannot do it and the reason I would never suggest it because the minute we decide to fund religion in this body, we will then begin to decide whose religion, what brand of religion. What about this particular denomination? Why should they not be funded as opposed to that denomination?

Someone somewhere would have to make a decision. So we would establish an Endowment for Religion, and we would appoint some people to it. We would say we will give them the money because Congress does not want to get into the battle about which religion to fund. We will give \$150 million to the National Endowment for Religion, and they will make the decision because they are the experts. They know what is best. If they give it all to the Bap-

tists, that is fine. If they split it up with the Jews, the Catholics, the Presbyterians, whatever, it is their decision to make. It is their \$150 million. They will make the decision. How many Members in this body would agree with such a thing? No one. I suggest that we would not get very many votes for such a proposal. And rightly so.

It is not our place because the minute that we start doing that, we are automatically discriminating if we pick one over another, which must be done. There is absolutely no difference, Mr. Speaker, none whatsoever, in the funding of the arts and the funding of religion. Each one of those things has its particular brand. It appeals to certain individuals and not others. Somebody has to make a decision about which one of these things gets funded, and then we will come to the House and hold up a list of things that has been funded by that organization and some people will be outraged by it, as I imagine there were some tonight as I was reading through the list of things that we have funded that the government has paid for. Some people will listen and say that is great stuff. I wish a billion dollars was put into it.

What happens is there is discrimination in this because every time somebody gets one, every one artist gets funded, some artist does not, and that means somebody is making a decision about which is better. I suggest that is an impossible decision to make for everyone. It is absolutely appropriate for me to do it for myself; it is not appropriate for me to do it for all of my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, the hypocrisy that rears its head here, certainly daily, but on this particular occasion when we debate the NEA, the National Endowment for the Arts, public broadcasting and all of the rest, this hypocrisy is overwhelming. It is so stark.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we are undeniably in the middle of a culture war. We have heard that term many times. It is a war of competing ideas and world views. On one side we have people who believe in living by a set of divinely moral absolutes; or the very least, they believe that following such a moral code represents the best way to avoid chaos and instability.

On the other side, we have people who insist that morality is a moral decision and any attempt to enforce it is viewed as oppression. That war is a real one which is carried out every single day in the halls of our schools, around the watercooler of our businesses, in the newspapers of the Nation, on television. In every form of communication, the culture war is ongoing. There is a battle for the soul, for the mind, for the actual personality, if you will, of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is pretty much accepted as being true. We know that there are these competing sets of values out there trying to grab us and get us on their side, whatever that might be.

Now, I happen to believe completely that there is such a thing as good art, good music. I believe that it can be all of the things that people say. I believe we can be inspired by it. We can be motivated by art to do wonderful things. But I also suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if there is such a thing as good art, good music, good literature, then there is such a thing as bad art, bad music and bad literature. And it has the opposite effect of the good art. I believe that is true. That is my personal observation, my personal belief.

I choose not to impose that belief on anyone by law, but I will make the case when I am allowed here on the House floor, allowed to debate this issue in any public forum, I will talk about the fact that I believe we are in the midst of a culture war and there are competing sides in that war that are actually grappling for the soul of the Nation. I will try my best to defend what I believe to be the good side as opposed to the bad side, but that is my decision to make. And it rests on my ability to convince my friends or relatives, as well as it does with any one of us here as to who is right and who is wrong.

Even as a Member of the Congress of the United States, it is not in my authority to force anyone out there to agree with it by the power that is vested in me as a Member of this House to vote for a tax to enforce my particular view of who should be helped in those culture wars. We have to do it through the power of persuasion.

This place, Mr. Speaker, is the place in which the battle occurs oftentimes, maybe even daily. Because this is the place in which we have determined that a great debate should go on about the nature of our society, about the kind of people we are. It is the place of ideas. It is certainly the free marketplace of ideas. And we are allowed to come before the body as I have tonight to express our opinions. I hope that we have to a certain extent, anyway, even a small extent tonight, made a case for allowing that debate to occur without the influence of the power of government to tax and help one side in it as opposed to another.

Let us simply talk about it here, but, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that there again is no more hypocritical thing that we do here in the Congress of the United States than to take money away from people in support of a particular brand of art or music and then argue about whether or not that should happen with regard to religion.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. THOMAS (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today after 2:00 p.m. on account of attending a funeral.