

game; and Russo giving the elder George Bush putting tips on Air Force 2.

And one of Russo's newborn granddaughter.

No, Marty Russo doesn't take his famous friends or his family for granted.

"When I sit back and think about where I grew up, the neighborhood I came from and what a tough struggle my parents had, I am overwhelmed," the 58-year-old said. "I am a first-generation Italian American, and for me to have friends like the president of the United States is a pretty big deal."

Russo was elected to Congress in 1974 as part of the post-Watergate, reform-oriented class. In a win that Russo himself describes as "extremely lucky," the 6-foot-3 native of Chicago's Little Italy section embarked on what would become an 18-year stint in the House.

But what Russo deemed the "best years of my life" came to a bitter end in the 1992 Illinois primary. Redistricting forced him to run against fellow Democratic incumbent and commuting friend Rep. William Lipinski. After losing the tightest race of his career, Russo finished out his term while contemplating the inevitable: What next?

Following in the path paved by many before him, Russo entered the realm of lobbying by accepting a position with Cassidy & Associates, a government relations lobbying firm based in Washington.

"Two wonderful things happened to me in my life," Russo said recently. "One was winning an election, one was losing an election. I had the greatest job in the world when I was a Member in Congress, and now I have the second-greatest job in the world."

Prohibited by law from lobbying Members for a year, Russo advised clients on political strategy, while learning the ins and outs of business development and lobbying White House officials.

About making the transition to lobbying, Russo said, "The one thing you have to get good at is learning how to ask."

Although Cassidy boasts clients such as VoiceStream Wireless, Ocean Spray Cranberries Inc. and the Taiwan Studies Institute, it is the Chicago hospital where he was treated as a boy that he holds closest to his heart.

Rush-Presbyterian-St. Luke's Medical Center, located on Chicago's West Side, has been the beneficiary of many government dollars thanks to Russo's dedicated lobbying efforts. In a joint effort with Cook County Health Services of Chicago, the two hospitals created the Core Center, a four-story facility that provides outpatient care to individuals and families with HIV/AIDS. The center features a screening clinic, pharmacy, counseling services and children's playroom.

"I've seen [Cassidy & Associates] do a lot of good for a lot of people," Russo said. "And it's been great working with Jerry Cassidy, he's like the Tip O'Neill of the lobbying business."

In 2000, Russo was promoted to vice chairman, president and chief operating officer at Cassidy. The key to Russo's success? Drawing from the many lessons he learned during his days in the House.

"One of the critical things you learn when in Congress is that your word is very important," Russo said. "It's all you have around here. So when I talk to Members I tell them the truth, because if you don't, the next time you come back, they aren't going to listen to you."

Russo advocates bipartisanship, saying a Congressman's sole purpose is to make the government function better.

"One of the key things was that I had was friends on both sides of the aisle. We could argue and battle on the floor as much as we wanted, but then we got together after-

wards—went to dinner, played gold, baseball, basketball. Because we were all personal friends, we were able to get a lot more accomplished."

Stretching the idea of fraternizing with one's colleagues to the limits, Russo and three other Democrats lived together five days a week for 10 years. He was the first to move into his friend Rep. George Miller's (D-Calif.) two-bedroom house at 127 D St. S.E. in 1982, claiming the last bedroom. Shortly after, then Rep. Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.) abandoned his basement quarters to inhabit Miller's living room. Believing that three Congressmen in one house just wasn't enough, Miller moved his piano out of the bay window to make room for then Rep. Leon Panetta (D-Calif.).

"It was the best 10 years ever spent; it was like a little fraternity house with the four of us. Now Chuck is a Senator, George is still in the House, and Leon became Clinton's chief of staff. So I guess the house did all right."

Russo and his wife, Karen, moved to McLean, Va., in September 1997, capping off 24 years of weekly commutes.

Russo never believed that he would permanently make the move from his beloved hometown of Chicago. When his eldest son, Tony, moved to Washington to begin working with Sen. Joseph Biden (D-Del.) and his youngest son, Danny, was attending Georgetown University, both Russo and his wife realized it was an easy decision to make.

Now, less than a month after the birth of his first grandchild, the former lawmaker happily lives just six minutes from his son's family. An adoring grandfather, Russo finds himself stopping by every night on his way home from work.

"I am really enjoying my granddaughter," Russo said. "I saw this bumper sticker a couple of years ago that said, 'If I'd known grandkids would be this great, I would have had them first!' And now I feel the same way!"

#### FIVE QUESTIONS

What are you most proud of from your tenure in Congress?

One of my proudest moments was when I introduced the national health care bill in 1991, which then became a major issue in the 1992 presidential election.

I think it . . . helped Democrats take back the White House.

What do you miss the most?

I miss the friendship on the Hill. Whether you were a Democrat or a Republican, we really got a lot of stuff done, and we did it together. And I miss doing the policy. It's an enormous responsibility, but what a deal.

What do you miss the least?

I don't miss the travel, being away from home.

Was there a particular Member whom you admired the most?

The Member I admired most in the House was [then] Speaker Tip O'Neill [D-Mass.]. And a close second was Rep. Danny Rostenkowski [D-Ill.].

Do you have any advice for current Members?

The best advice I can give is to understand that compromise is very important. As Danny Rostenkowski always said, "You don't have to throw a touchdown pass every time you move legislation. You've just got to move it down the field and eventually get it in the end zone."

GERMAN FOREIGN MINISTER JOSCHKA FISCHER'S REMARKABLE DISCUSSION OF ANTI-SEMITISM AND GERMANY'S UNIQUE RELATIONSHIP WITH ISRAEL

#### HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2002

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues a particularly insightful article by Joschka Fischer, Federal Foreign Minister of Germany. He discusses the unique relationship between the Federal Republic of Germany and the State of Israel. The article was published on May 13 of this week in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, one of Germany's most distinguished newspapers.

The Federal Republic of Germany is not the Nazi Germany that perpetrated the Holocaust, and the democratic and pluralistic government that has emerged in Germany since 1945 is rightfully one of our closest and most important allies and friends. Nevertheless, because of Germany's history, the German government has a special responsibility and a special relationship with the state of Israel. It also has a special responsibility to fight against intolerance and racism.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to read Foreign Minister Fischer's perceptive comments thoughtfully and carefully. His sensitivity to the relationship between Germany and Israel and his criticism of the atmosphere of anti-Semitism welling up in western Europe reflects the finest of German culture and tradition. I commend Foreign Minister Fischer for his courageous and outspoken article. I wish with all my heart that there were other such prominent individuals who would be as bold and outspoken and honest as Joschka Fischer. I wish there were others who would speak out with such clarity and force against the anti-Israel hysteria that is fast becoming anti-Semitic frenzy in France and elsewhere in western Europe.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that Foreign Minister Fischer's article be placed in the RECORD, and again I urge my colleagues to read it thoughtfully.

The Question Facing Germany: Can We Criticize Israel?

(By German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer)

BERLIN.—Germany remained silent, conspicuously silent considering the unspeakable statements made recently by Jurgen Mollemann, the chairman of Free Democrats in the state of North Rhine-Westphalia and the head of the German-Arab Society, and those of like mind.

In his statements, Mr. Mollemann showed that he was a verbal resistance fighter against corporatism and bravely announced that he, of course, would also attack the aggressor in his own country. The heroic talk was directed at Israel, and Mr. Mollemann was referring to the Palestinian struggle against the occupation. We, therefore, can safely assume that he was not calling on Hamas to distribute leaflets to Israel, but justifying their terrorist bomb attacks. There was no national outcry, no resignation, nothing of the kind. Instead, Mr. Westerwelle said it should be possible to criticize Israel without being accused of anti-Semitism.

Something seems to have changed in Germany, and nobody notices this with greater

authority and distress than German Jews. They feel alone, again, and that ought not be so. Not in Germany.

"Given anti-Semitism in Germany and Europe that is becoming more manifest in the context of the Middle East conflict, the old Damocles sword question once again hangs over the heads of Jews living in Germany: Was it right to stay in Germany?" When this kind of warning comes from the pen of such an attentive and sensitive observer of German-Jewish relations as Solomon Korn (Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung on May 6), it raises a question for each and every one of us and, indeed, the question of whether German democracy is credible.

Mr. Korn, the leader of the Jewish community in Frankfurt, notes that many German Jews have felt abandoned in recent months. He describes how it feels to be viewed as "collectively liable" for any action taken by Israel against the Palestinians. And he also refers to the very understandable "old traumas" and "barely healed emotional wounds" that German criticism of Israel never ceases to evoke there. "Were the same criticisms of Israel expressed by Americans, for instance, it would hurt far less than when expressed by the Germans . . ." Why do such obvious things need to be explicitly stated again today?

Strictly speaking, what is at issue is the conflict between Israel and its Arab neighbors. But on a different level, whenever Israel is discussed in Germany, the fundamental debate about German identity is never far behind. "Can we criticize Israel?" The mere question raises suspicion because, of course, we can and indeed sometimes must criticize the politics of the Israeli government. Nowhere is this done more forcefully than in Israel itself. Every democratically elected government makes mistakes and is, by definition, subject to criticism.

In the Middle East, a tragic conflict is escalating. Two peoples are fighting for the same land, and only a historical compromise based on the formula "two states, one peace", will be able to solve this conflict. The current situation inspires little hope. Israel feels threatened by continuing Palestinian terror. At Camp David in the summer of 2000, so the Israeli view, Israel offered the Palestinians a state of their own and was given the second Intifada in return. Since then, Israel has been fighting for its survival once again, for a life in safety and in recognized borders. The Palestinians finally want an end to the Israeli occupation, to the continued building of Israeli settlements and to the loss of territory. They are fighting for their own state, for a life in dignity. However, after the Camp David talks broke down, the agonizing question in Israel remains whether the Palestinian leadership in the end does not want more and indeed something entirely different.

The right of pre-1967 refugees to return to Israel, the terror deployed to force Israel to accept false compromises, the demographic factor that works against Israel, the fear for the Jewish character of Israel and the fear of a bi-national Palestine and the dissolution of Israel as a Jewish state as the long term goal of Yasser Arafat's Palestine Liberation Organization—these are Israeli fears right across the political spectrum.

The Palestinians fear that Israel wants to force them to make further territorial concessions, though in their view, by accepting the borders of June 4, 1967, they are contenting themselves with 22 percent of the land. Land for peace is the only possible compromise formula. Radical Israelis want peace and land, while radical Palestinians want land without peace. Neither will work.

This tragic and extremely dangerous situation is not really appropriate for a German

identity debate, but for coordinated action by the international community, led by the United States and supported by Europe, to break the spiral of violence and lead the parties of the conflict back to the negotiating table step by step.

So why is there such fierce criticism of Israel here in Germany and in Europe? Why is there such widespread bias? This is exactly what Mr. Korn's warning addresses, and quite rightly. Given Germany's history, criticism of Israel always also reflects the mental state of our country.

Fifty years ago, West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and Israel's first prime minister, David Ben Gurion, laid the foundations for relations between Israel and a democratic Germany that still apply today. Since then, German democracy has—occasionally in the face of some resistance—accepted Germany's continuing historical responsibility for the genocide of German and European Jewry, and this responsibility is the firm and central founding stone of German democracy after 1945.

This was the only way for trust to grow between the former perpetrators and victims. Only on this basis could a chance for new co-existence emerge from what historian Dan Diner called the "negative symbiosis." No line can be drawn under Germany's historical and moral responsibility for the destruction of European Jewry. It forms the basis of Germany's social obligation to uphold the right of existence and security for Israel and its citizens. This responsibility is not a matter of current political constellations, but a permanent principle of German policy.

Israel can rely on democratic Germany as a partner and friend, now and in the future. Our obligations, our ties and the fact the ice remains thin even after 50 years must be respected by all criticism in Germany that does not aim to destroy what has been built since Konrad Adenauer and David Ben Gurion began.

Otherwise, criticism not only would cause harm, but also increasingly compromise Germany's capacity to help the search for a just peace in the Middle East. Or, to put it differently: Criticism is possibly only on the firm foundation of indelible solidarity—and there have been things in recent months that do compel Israel's friends to express criticism in the interest of Israel itself.

But there is a second issue that weighs just as heavily as Germany's special relationship with Israel. It concerns ourselves, Germany and us Germans. Do we actually comprehend what Nazi barbarism and its genocidal anti-Semitism did to us, to Germany, its people and its culture? What Hitler and the Nazis did to Germany's Jews they did first and foremost to Germans, to Germans of the Jewish faith! Albert Einstein was as much a German as was Max Planck. The Nazis excluded an entire group of our own people, deprived them of their rights, dispossessed them, humiliated and then finally expelled or murdered them.

This is why the question whether German Jews feel secure in our democracy and, though even today this can only be a hope, might one day be able to feel "at home" in it again, is not a minor one, but a question par excellence about the credibility of German democracy.

When Germany sent its Jewish citizens to Auschwitz and other extermination camps from platform 17 of the Berlin-Grunewald station and countless other ramps and enriched itself with their worldly good, it robbed itself, its culture and society. Germany has been unable to close this wound inflicted by the Nazis to the present day. The Holocaust monument will be a symbol of this loss that Germany inflicted on itself through its barbarity to its own citizens, the effects of which are still being felt today.

Jewish communities in Germany have grown perceptibly since German unification in 1990, largely as a result of immigration from the former Soviet Union. New Jewish schools are being built, German-speaking rabbis are once more being trained at the Jewish University in Heidelberg and the Abraham-Geiger College in Potsdam. And still Mr. Korn calls the Jews in Germany a "source of continuing unease that is hard to define." An unease, that some possibly try to overcome by unconsciously—on the issue of the Middle East crisis—turning the descendants of the victims into perpetrators, believing this could save one's conscience. But this is a dangerous misconception, that, under the slogan of presumed "normalization," can end only in the abyss of anti-Semitism.

The unconscious mechanism of transferring guilt to Israel's policy in the Middle East will not release Germany from responsibility for its history. One should not even attempt that, for it will end in disaster. The only response to our history must be a positive one: a growing Jewish community in Germany with Jewish people who can live here in freedom and safety as citizens—and not as "fellow citizens!"—of our republic. The extent to which we succeed in supporting and promoting the life and well-being of Jewish communities in Germany is also a yardstick of our ability to create an open and tolerant society. For that reason, each and every instance of anti-Semitism is not only a threat to Jews in Germany, but also to our society and our democracy as a whole. "Is it right to stay in Germany?" The ease or difficulty with which our Jewish compatriots are able to answer yes to this question depends crucially on whether they can live perfectly "normally" as Jews in Germany and as Germans.

Nevertheless, the German-Jewish relationship will always remain a very special thing. This is why there is a need for sensitivity and unrelenting self-scrutiny. Only once there is natural togetherness can there be criticism that does not attack the precarious German-Jewish relationship at its roots. And hence, silence about current events in the Middle East, Germany and Europe, which rightly distresses many Jews in Germany, is impossible.

Are the Jews in our own country strangers to us? Even today? What can we do against this mixture of unsparing frankness and speechlessness that Mr. Korn complains of between Jews and non-Jews in Germany? This challenge cannot be turned into a historical issue; it will not fade with time. On the contrary, criticism of Israel that is founded on the obligation imposed on us by our history, on trust and friendship is not anti-Semitism—and it does not force German Jews to unconditionally support everything that is democratically decided in Israel.

Under no circumstances can we permit the tragic conflict in the Middle East that pits the legitimate aspirations and rights of two peoples apparently irreconcilably against each other to be used as an instrument for domestic political ends. Those who practice such methods to capture a mood and votes, those who wish to dispose of German history, as it were, by a detour to the Middle East, and those who hit the wrong note by mis-conceived reaction must be opposed by all those who perceive German unity as freedom to accept responsibility and not act as an escape into a supposedly harmless "normality."