

These awards are presented only to those who possess the qualities that make our nation great: commitment to excellence, hard work, and genuine love of community service. The Gold Awards represent the highest awards attainable by junior and high school Girl Scouts.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the recipient of this award, as her activities are indeed worthy of praise. Her leadership benefits our community and she serves as a role model for her peers.

Also, we must not forget the unsung heroes, who continue to devote a large part of their lives to make all this possible. Therefore, I salute the families, scout leaders, and countless others who have given generously of their time and energy in support of scouting.

It is with great pride that I recognize the achievements of Danielle, and bring the attention of Congress to this successful young woman on her day of recognition.

ONE MAN STOOD ALONE AGAINST HATE

HON. EARL F. HILLIARD

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 2002

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Honorable Judge and State Representative Charles Nice, Jr.

In the hate-filled atmosphere in the all-white Alabama State legislature after the decision in 1954 known as *Brown vs. the Board of Education of Toledo, Kansas*, which ruled illegal the segregated school systems of America, Charles Nice was a Democratic freshman Representative from Birmingham. A resolution was introduced which condemned the Supreme Court for the decision, and an amendment to the Alabama constitution was introduced to which would abolish the public school system in any county which was "threatened" with integration.

Charles Nice was the only member of the legislature to have the moral courage to vote against the resolution and the amendment. Had John Kennedy written a book about state government as he did about federal, he would have included Charles Nice in that "Profiles of Courage."

He was not reelected, of course. But he did not quit or ameliorate his morality. Unbending before the gales of hate, he continued his commitment to public service by accepting appointment to the Circuit Court in 1974.

Soon, Alabama reinstituted the death penalty, and Judge Nice presided over four capital cases in which the jury prescribed the death penalty. Again, Charles Nice withstood the storms of hate and vengeance and commuted the sentences to "life in prison without parole."

In a state in which it is common for a judge to give the death penalty to a convicted person whom the jury has recommended for life in prison, he was condemned and transferred to the Family Court of Alabama, where he could hear no capital cases. "At last," the system thought, "Charles Nice could do no good."

However, in this court any juvenile 15 years or older charged with a serious crime could be

transferred to adult court for trial as an adult and given the death penalty. Standing firmly on higher ground, Judge Nice refused to transfer juveniles to adult court. "No youth," he said, "should be given the death penalty."

Smearred in the media, he was defeated for reelection in 1998, but remained victorious in principle. This good man continued to be active in the Alabama Democratic Party until his death at 82 on December 5, 2001.

Standing against hate, he planted his feet firmly on higher ground. Now he is pressing on the upward way, going to even higher ground. He will be missed, but never forgotten. His service is printed upon the social system of Alabama. We are not as good as he would have us be, but we are better for his having been by here.

May he be ever honored by those who serve this nation and its highest principles.

LYNNE CHENEY SPEAKS AT
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY ON
"TEACHING FOR FREEDOM"

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 2002

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with our colleagues a speech delivered late last year at Princeton University by Lynne V. Cheney, the wife of the Vice President of the United States, about the importance of knowing history and teaching it well. An expert on education, Mrs. Cheney is a senior fellow at the American Enterprise Institute and holds a doctorate degree from the University of Wisconsin.

"TEACHING FOR FREEDOM", ADDRESS BY
LYNNE V. CHENEY, JAMES MADISON PRO-
GRAM, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, NOVEMBER
29, 2001

It's a great pleasure to be here this afternoon as part of the James Madison Program in American Ideals and Institutions. Professor George, you deserve congratulations for the excellence of this program's efforts, and let me praise Princeton University as well. By giving this program a home, Princeton is setting an example of how people of differing viewpoints can, in a university setting, debate important issues with seriousness and civility.

For someone who loves American history, this part of New Jersey is a remarkable place to be, a place rich with stories of our country's past. Next month, on Christmas night, it will be two hundred twenty-five years since George Washington crossed the Delaware, and in a surprise attack on the Hessian mercenaries manning the British post at Trenton, managed to kill dozens and capture more than nine hundred while sustaining not a single fatality on the American side.

The wonderful painting by Emanuel Leutze of Washington crossing the ice-choked Delaware hints, but barely, at the significance of this victory. The men in the boat with Washington are dressed in a motley assortment of clothes. One does not imagine that Washington has a highly trained and disciplined force. But the men in the boat do not look nearly as ragged and miserable as the historical record suggests Washington's troops were. The painter Charles Wilson Peale, observing Washington's army in early Decem-

ber, as they were retreating before the advancing British, had been struck with horror at the sight of the sick, exhausted, and half-naked men. One soldier approached Peale. He was a man who "had lost all his clothes. He was in an old, dirty blanket jacket, his beard long, and his face so full of sores he could not clean it." Only when the soldier spoke, did Peale realize that it was his much-loved brother James.

These Americans, going up against superior numbers of British forces, who were better equipped and better trained, had, not surprisingly, spent most of the war thus far in retreat. And that is why Trenton mattered so much, because suddenly, in the depths of icy winter, there was a victory, and Washington was determined to build on it. He moved his troops back to Pennsylvania, waited until the commissary wagons could bring provisions, and then on December 30th, crossed the Delaware into New Jersey again and entrenched his troops near Trenton. Since the enlistments of most of his men expired at year's end, his first job was to persuade a significant number of them to stick with him, which he did with rousing speeches—and \$50,000 raised by Philadelphia financier Robert Morris.

Some of Washington's men may have regretted the decision to stay on when, on January 2, 1777, General Cornwallis and 5000 well-trained, well-equipped men advanced on Trenton from Princeton. Washington's pickets had to fall back across a creek. With shot and shell flying overhead, scores of men had to make their way across a narrow stone bridge, and while there was no doubt fear, there was no panic. At the end of the bridge, Washington, on horseback, had taken up a position where his men could see him, firm, composed, resolute. One of his men forever remembered pressing "against the shoulder of the General's horse" and touching Washington's boot.

Cornwallis was convinced that he had Washington, whom he called "the old fox," trapped, but Washington, leaving his campfires burning as a diversion, moved most of his men around the British left flank and headed for Princeton. The first encounter between an American brigade approaching Princeton and British troops leaving it to join their main force in Trenton did not go well for the Americans. Many were wounded and killed in a bayonet attack. The survivors fell back, bloody, dazed, confused, but Washington rallied them and after more troops arrived, led them himself toward the British. Displaying astonished bravery, he took his men to within thirty yards of the British lines and ordered them to fire. One staff officer was so sure Washington would be killed that he pulled his hat over his eyes to escape the sight, but when the smoke cleared, the General was unharmed. The staff officer wept in relief. Washington clasped his hand and then led the charge after the fleeing British.

As I'm sure everyone living near Princeton knows, this story has a pretty dramatic ending. The British took refuge in Nassau Hall, which the Americans then fired upon. The result was not only to persuade the British to surrender, but, legend has it, to decapitate, with a well-fired cannonball, a portrait of King George the Second.

Now, I tell this story in part because it is a wonderful story, and it is an important one as well. Demoralized as Washington and his countrymen were, news of these victories, James Thomas Flexner has written, "traveled across America like a rainstorm across a parched land, lifting bowed heads everywhere." But I also tell this story because it

makes the point—as so many of the stories of our country's beginnings do—that this nation was not inevitable. The founders had the odds stacked very much against them. No one had ever thrown off a colonial power before. No one had ever established representative government over a vast expanse of land. The Americans were going up against the mightiest military force in the world, and so much of the success they did experience depended on individuals, particularly on Washington, whose legendary bravery—so inspiring to his men—might easily have gotten him killed.

During one battle in the French and Indian War, he had two horses shot out from under him, one bullet had gone through his hat and three ripped through his uniform. A few years later, in 1757, when two detachments of Virginians mistakenly began firing upon one another, he rode his horse between the firing troops and used his sword to knock the gun barrels skyward. Fourteen men were killed, but Washington was untouched. If it had turned out otherwise, who would have commanded our troops in the Revolutionary War? Who could have lent similar prestige to the Constitutional Convention? Who could have been trusted to be the first president—and to give up power at the proper time?

We are very lucky that things turned out as they did, and so is the world. Jefferson believed that the American Revolution would set the ball of liberty so well in motion that it would roll round the globe, and he was right. Inspired by what happened here, people in other parts of the world began to struggle for freedom and many of them succeeded. But freedom, as the study of our history shows, is not our inevitable heritage, nor is it humankind's. This realization should make our freedom all the more precious to us, all the more worth defending. Were we to lose it, liberty might not come our way again.

The concern I would like to bring before you tonight is that we haven't done a very good job of teaching our history. We haven't given young people the knowledge they need in order to appreciate how greatly fortunate we are to live in freedom or, indeed, to have much insight at all into the American past. A 1989 survey of college seniors showed that more than half did not understand the purpose of The Federalist papers. One out of four was unable to distinguish Karl Marx's words from the ideas of the United States Constitution. A 1999 survey of elite college seniors—that is seniors at schools like Princeton and Yale and Stanford—showed that only one out of five knew that the words “government of the people, by the people, for the people” came from the Gettysburg Address. Forty per cent did not know that the Constitution established the division of power between the states and the federal government. To the question of who was the American general in command at Yorktown, the most popular answer was Ulysses S. Grant.

Now one cannot attribute this lack of knowledge solely to a failure of colleges and universities. Indeed, the questions asked on these surveys are the kinds of things we should expect high school seniors to know. But surely a contributing factor to the lack of knowledge highlighted by the survey is that no one—not a single one—of the fifty-five elite colleges and universities whose students were polled required a course in American history.

I have been concerned about lack of historical knowledge for well over a decade, long enough so that I understand that the institu-

tional reforms that would help remedy the problem are difficult to achieve. One important reason that American history is not required is because if it were, faculty members would have to teach it—and there is very little professional incentive for them to do so. Advancement in academia comes from publishing, and there is little market in academic journals for articles on subjects that are broadly conceived. What is wanted are specialized articles that are compatible with teaching specialized courses. In not wanting to take on general education, people in accordance are doing what people in every profession tend to do: avoiding activities for which there are few if any professional incentives.

Changing the reward system of higher education is likely to take a very long time—and that's the optimistic view. So, too, is it likely to take a long time for every state in the union to put in place history standards—and the tests to match them—that will ensure that youngsters in grade school, middle school, and high school gain essential knowledge of our nation's past. The fact that the improvement of historical education in our schools and colleges and universities won't happen overnight is no reason to quit the struggle. I certainly intend to keep working on it—and applauding the efforts of groups like the National Association of Scholars and the American Council of Trustees and Alumni that have spoken out forcefully in favor of well-rounded general education. But we should recognize that until long-term efforts succeed, American history will remain largely mysterious to many graduates of our finest institutions. They will continue to place Ulysses S. Grant at Yorktown—unless we come up with extracurricular ways to encourage them to know the men and women and events and ideas that have shaped this country.

I began thinking about this when I read there were teach-ins on our campuses, not very well attended events, according to what I've read—and little wonder. They fit an old paradigm when this country was involved in a war with which large numbers of Americans disagreed, in which many, rightly or wrongly, thought vital American interests were not at stake. None of that applies now. This is not a war in which we get to choose whether or not to fight. Thousands of Americans were killed on the very first day of conflict here at home. We don't have the luxury of not getting involved.

It's time for gatherings of a new kind, it seems to me, in which we remind ourselves of exactly what it is we are defending, in which we talk about exactly what it is we have at stake. Let us talk to one another about freedom, asking, perhaps as a start, why the founders—Jefferson and Madison, in particular—were so determined that government would have no role in determining how people worship. We might take the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom for our text. Jefferson wrote it, Madison got it through the Virginia legislature. In this remarkable time in which we live, any of us can get it off the Internet and see that for Jefferson the issue was not just religious freedom, but intellectual freedom. “Truth is great,” he wrote, “and will prevail if left to herself. She is the proper and sufficient antagonist to error, and has nothing to fear from the conflict, unless by human interposition (she is) disarmed of her natural weapons, free argument and debate. Let us engage in conversations in which we explore how the clash of ideas has benefitted this country and how the ability to follow a thought wherever it

may lead has brought the flourishing of invention and business and art.

We might also meet to talk about valor and use as one of our resources the web site of the Congressional Medal of Honor Society. There are so many stories of heroism on it, so many stories of men throwing themselves on grenades or exposing themselves to enemy fire in order to save those near them. The honor roll of heroes is in the thousands now, but reading through it is a reminder of the enormous sacrifices that have been made for the sake of freedom. And listen to just some of the names: John Ortega, Joshua Chamberlain, Abraham Cohn, Daniel Inouye, Joseph Timothy O'Callahan, Joe Nishimoto, Mitchell Red Cloud, Jr., Riley Pitts, Roy Benavidez, Jack Jacobs, Gary Gordon, Randall Shughart. Our liberty has depended on the valor of Americans whose forebears came from every part of the world. Let us remember their bravery with awe and talk about the inspiration we should take from it, not just to be brave ourselves in the much smaller ways our lives are likely to demand, but also to recognize what they so heroically illustrated: that great deeds are not the province of any particular race, creed, or class. Let us talk about how our nation has grown better and stronger as this realization has become ever more central to our national life, and let us talk about the growing we still have to do.

I have been thinking of these gatherings as teach-ins for freedom, but they needn't take place just on campuses. Public libraries would be a good place for them—and so would homes. Indeed, in their private lives millions of Americans have shown their hunger to know more about our nation's history. They buy Stephen Ambrose's books. They watch TV series like the HBO production of *Band of Brothers*. Edmund Morris's *Theodore Rex* is unlikely to make it onto many college or university reading lists, but books of this kind and their older equivalents—I think of Daniel Boorstin's *The Americans*—can be entryways into our nation's past for young adults as well as their parents.

In the weeks since September 11, I've had some very well-credentialed, relatively recent college graduates confess to me how little they know about American history. “Is there a ‘History for Dummies’ book?” one asked, half-jokingly. There may well be, but my recommendation would be to start with some of the thoughtful, well-written books that have received wide acclaim. David McCullough's John Adams would be first on my list for the amazing job McCullough does of simultaneously conveying the significance of Adams' accomplishments and the warmth of his humanity.

As for the children, let us continue the efforts to improve history instruction in our schools, but while we work on that, let us also tell them the stories that might otherwise go untold. At our Thanksgiving table we talked to our grandchildren about the pilgrims and how hard it was to cross the ocean to an unfamiliar land and how the difficulty of their voyage was a measure of how much they wanted to worship God as they chose and have their children grow up in a way they thought was right. At our Christmas table, we will, to be sure, talk about the baby born in Bethlehem and the angels who sang and the shepherds and kings

who came to visit him. But we will also remember George Washington and how, on a dark December 25th he led his improbable army across an ice-choked river to give a people struggling for independence hope that they might one day be free.

Thank you very much, Professor George, for having me here this afternoon. James Madison told us, in words that I understand are now inscribed in Corwin Hall, that a well-instructed people alone can be permanently a free people. The gatherings you have here at Princeton under the auspices of the James Madison Program in American Ideals and Institutions contribute to our instruction—and to our freedom.

HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF JOHN “CHIP” ROBERTS

HON. THOMAS G. TANCREDO

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 2002

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the retirement of John “Chip” Roberts, Director of the Colorado Division of State and Veterans Nursing Homes.

John “Chip” Roberts retired on January 15, 2002. He served older Americans for nearly twenty-two years. For the past eleven years, Chip worked for the Colorado Department of Human Services as Director of the Colorado Division of State and Veterans Nursing Homes. Previously, he worked in the private sector as both a nursing home administrator and a regional director. As Division Director of the Colorado State and Veterans Homes, Mr. Roberts oversaw the operations of five State nursing facilities totaling 582 beds. Four of the State homes provide skilled nursing care to military veterans and their spouses and widows. Under Mr. Roberts’ leadership, the State homes program made numerous improvements in service delivery. Chip was always quick to credit the dedicated staff at each facility for the overall success of the program.

Since 1997, in response to legislation authorizing the construction of a new State veterans home at the former Fitzsimons Army Medical Center in Aurora, Colorado, Chip was deeply involved in the design and development of the new 180 bed facility. Throughout the project, Chip continually encouraged the need to be highly flexible in the design in order to allow for the future health care needs of the residents. In addition, to skilled nursing care, the Fitzsimons facility will offer dementia services and adult day care.

During his years of service to the State of Colorado, Chip’s dedication to veterans and their families was readily apparent. He made frequent presentations to publicize the State and veterans homes programs and to inform various organizations of the services available. He has been steadfast in his commitment to “serve those who have served.”

Chip and his wife of twenty-seven years, Judith, are looking forward to retirement with the shared desire to continue serving others, especially in their local church and the city of Arvada. The Roberts’ have one daughter, Vanessa, a recent graduate from the University of Colorado at Boulder. Besides volunteer service, Chip is looking forward to enjoying the great Colorado outdoors: hiking, hunting, and fishing. I wish them Godspeed.

IN COMMEMORATION OF INDIA’S REPUBLIC DAY

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 2002

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to rise today in commemoration of India’s Republic Day. As the adoption of our constitution and declaration of Independence in the 18th Century are among the most important days in the history of the United States, so too is January 26, 1950 in India. In the Central Hall of Parliament in New Delhi, India joined the community of democratic nations by adopting its Constitution that embodied many of the principles, including equality and secularism, put forth by our own founding fathers.

It gives me great pleasure to celebrate this event, as this is not simply a day for Indians, but for Indian-Americans as well. The streets of my district in Jackson Heights, New York will be filled tonight with thousands of my constituents honoring this important day.

The bond that India and the United States share is not simply rooted in the democratic foundations, but also in democratic practices. Allying the world’s oldest democracy with the world’s largest democracy is a natural fit. I believe that India’s Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee said it best when he spoke of the adoption of India’s Constitution: “There is one great test for a Constitution, for any system of Governance. It must deliver and it must be durable. Our Constitution has stood this test. And one reason it has been able to do so is that it embodies a mastery balance: between the rights of the individual and the requirements of collective life; between the States and the Union; between providing a robust structure and flexibility. Our Constitution has served the needs of both India’s diversity and her innate unity. It has strengthened India’s democratic traditions.”

The shared history and common conception for the future of our relationship has allowed our nations to cooperate in times of prosperity and assist each other in times of tragedy. This year’s Republic Day is bitter-sweet as it also commemorates the one-year anniversary of the devastating earthquake that struck India on January 26, 2001. The earthquake, centered in India’s state of Gujarat and measuring 7.9 on the Richter scale, killed more than 20,000 people. During those difficult times, we were there for India both in spirit and in practice. Shortly after the earthquake, the United States Congress adopted a Resolution expressing condolences for the victims and support for providing assistance. I am proud to report that Congress also responded to my efforts in increasing the funding for the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance, specifically targeting the efforts in India.

Just as we came to the aid of India, they were among the first to condemn the attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001. Since that horrific day, high-level contacts between the U.S. and India have increased, reflecting the close cooperation between the world’s two largest democracies in the struggle against international terrorism. Unfortunately, the scourge of terrorism is another characteristic that our countries now have in common.

The December 13, 2001 attack on India’s Parliament hit very close to home. As nine police officers and a Parliament worker were killed we were forced, once again, to redefine the scope and definition of the war on terrorism. This attack sought to destroy the heart of India’s democracy, but will fail in that endeavor.

The common interests of the United States and India transcend the boundaries of the international war on terrorism. There has been ever-increasing cooperation in dealing with the proliferation of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery, preserving stability and growth in the global economy, protecting the environment, combating infectious diseases and expanding trade.

As a member of the Indian Caucus with a growing Indian constituency, my interest in the region has grown exponentially during my time in Congress. I have to say, however, that nothing was more eye-opening than my visit to India a few weeks ago. To get a true sense of the interests of the people and the government on the ground was invaluable, and will surely help me represent the views of my constituents more completely in the future.

With that, I wish to salute India for fifty-one years of work in pursuit of preserving democracy. It is my honor to join you as you continue that journey into the new millennium.

KAHLI RIES: A YOUNG PATRIOT FOR A BETTER FUTURE

HON. JAMES A. BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 2002

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Kahli Ries of Mayville, Michigan, upon the occasion of her winning the 2001–02 statewide Voice of Democracy Program speech-writing contest sponsored by the Department of Michigan Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary.

At a time when our country is engaged in a war against terrorists who threaten our American way of life, it is especially gratifying to honor Kahli for displaying in the words she has written a brand of patriotism to which all citizens should aspire. In her award-winning essay, Kahli expresses the hopes and dreams of our nation’s younger generation and she calls on her peers to take the responsibility to shape a better future. Her simple yet powerful words are reassuring to those of us in older generations that the future is in good hands.

Kahli, a ninth-grade student at Mayville High School, stands as a shining example of why America has time and again come together in times of crisis and risen to even the most difficult challenges. In her speech, Kahli has reached back in our history to capture the same sense of freedom and responsibility that our forefathers and many patriots since our founding have relied upon to build a better future for their descendants and others who followed.

Let me share an excerpt of her essay: “I hope America will be a place where not only we will be physically safe and morally safe, but our freedoms will be preserved as well. I see a place where people won’t be afraid to walk down the streets or open their mail. I believe in our country and our dedication to our