

sample risk "scorecard" that would result in institutions with increased amounts of FHLB advances paying higher risk-based insurance assessments.

In my opinion, the use by the FDIC of risk-based assessment authority in this way would be contrary to Congress' clear intent to broaden access to FHLB advances in the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act of 1999. In the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, we wanted to ensure that community institutions and housing lenders would be able to obtain adequate, reasonably priced FHLB advances as a source of funds to serve the borrowing needs of their customers. Providing this source of liquidity may actually reduce risk. I would anticipate, should the FDIC place undue weight on FHLB advances for its risk-based assessment system, the agency will likewise account for the risks associated with depository institutions holding U.S. agency debt and securities.

As the principal House sponsor of the FHLB provisions in the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, I will follow very closely the FDIC's implementation of any new risk-based assessment standards to ensure such standards do not adversely affect the prudent use or cost of advances.

HONORING THE SAN LUIS OBISPO
VOCAL ARTS ENSEMBLE

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 2002

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the San Luis Obispo Vocal Arts Ensemble for the significant contributions their performances have made to the international community for a quarter of a century. This year marks the 25th Anniversary of the founding of this remarkable group. Their singing has created memorable experiences for countless listeners in America and around the globe.

Founded in 1977, the Vocal Arts Ensemble's first international concert was held in 1985 at Canterbury Cathedral. During this tour, the group was awarded third place at the Llangollen International Musical Eisteddfod in Wales. The group participated in a tour throughout Eastern Europe during which Ensemble members lived in the homes of Polish hosts for one week, gaining a greater insight into the lives of Eastern Europeans.

The San Luis Obispo Vocal Arts Ensemble was chosen by audition to be one of the world's finest choirs selected to represent their countries at the 35th Austrian Invitational Choral Competition. Out of eighty choirs from thirty different countries, the Vocal Arts Ensemble proudly placed fourth in this event.

The Vocal Arts Ensemble is comprised of singers throughout the San Luis Obispo County. Singers come from San Luis Obispo, Morro Bay, Creston, Paso Robles, Cambria, Santa Margarita, Atascadero, Santa Maria, Arroyo Grande, Grover Beach, Lompoc and Pismo Beach.

The San Luis Obispo Vocal Arts Ensemble has been funded in part by the California Arts Council and the National Endowment for the Arts. The California Arts Council Grant Evaluation and Selection Committee described the music of the Vocal Arts Ensemble as ". . .

truly superior and extremely fine quality." The Committee said the Ensemble's music demonstrated "an extraordinary breadth of repertory, an eclectic variety of choral styles." On June 1 and 2, the Vocal Arts Ensemble performed music from the Renaissance to the present to commemorate their 25th Anniversary. I am proud to congratulate them on this remarkable record of achievement.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO KITTY
ROBERTS

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 2002

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Superintendent Kitty Roberts, who is an individual who has selflessly led efforts to establish rules and regulations, that we abide by today. I applaud Kitty's efforts, and it is an honor to recognize her as a thoughtful, upstanding citizen, who gives so selflessly to our nation.

Kitty spent eight years of her career as the National Park Service's Assistant Director, actively involved with legislative and Congressional affairs. Her leadership provided a boost to many legislative programs, and her administration successfully created 230 laws, 15 of which were enacted by Congress. Kitty moreover, served as the NPS inaugural coordinator and she supervised the development of the East Executive Park, White House Visitor's Entrance. Since she arrived at the National Park Service in 1979, Kitty has excelled in many areas, and provided all she worked with the pleasure of experiencing her excellence.

Kitty deservedly received the Andrew Clark Hecht Memorial Public Safety Achievements Award, because she was influential in informing boaters about the threat of carbon monoxide poisoning. She illustrates the upstanding character of an individual who reaches out to help the community. Since 1994, Kitty has been at the forefront in providing ideas and solutions on how to eradicate boating fatalities due to carbon monoxide poisoning, and she has worked diligently with the United States Congress, Coast Guard, and the National Parks Service, to successfully alert the nation of this problem. In part because of her efforts, boating fatalities involving carbon monoxide have recently fallen. She illustrates the upstanding character of an individual who reaches out to help the community.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I praise the hard work and concern Kitty has exhibited in her work before this body of Congress, and this nation. Her attentiveness to many issues has helped enhance our communities and neighborhoods. Congratulations Kitty, thank you, and good luck in your future endeavors.

A TRIBUTE TO GRACE HAREWOOD

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 2002

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Grace Agard Harewood, a re-

markable woman in the senior citizen community, who is being honored at my Ecumenical Seniors Day.

Grace Agard Harewood was born in Barbados, West Indies, but pursued her education in the United States. Grace holds a Bachelor's degree in Sociology from Long Island University, and a Master's of Science Degree in Social Work from Columbia University.

Grace accomplishments do not cease with her educational pursuits, but extend into the senior community. In 1973 at the conception of the Fort Greene Senior Citizens Center, Ms. Harewood was appointed by the Fort Greene Senior Citizens Council to become the Director. She was later appointed to the position of Executive Director and Chief Operation Officer of the Council, where she is responsible for the supervision of senior centers, day care centers and a family day care program. Approximately 2500 elderly and children benefit from these programs.

Mr. Speaker, the woman that I am honoring today has been an exemplary example of leadership in the community, in which she has unselfishly extended a helping hand. Grace has served on numerous state commissions, including the Statewide Committee on Minority Participation in Aging Network Services and the Commission on Nutrition and Poverty. In 1981 she was a State Delegate to the White House Conference on Aging.

In addition to holding a number of positions, Grace is a member of the National Caucus on the Black Aged. She is a former member of the Board of Directors of the Council of Senior Centers and Services, and secretary of the Advisory Board for the Center for Nursing and Rehabilitation. She has also made historical strides to be one of the founding members of her high school association, the Harrison College/Queen's College Alumni (USA) Association.

Grace serves not only her neighborhood but her spiritual community as well. As a member of the St. Augustine's Episcopal Church, she serves as the Warden as well as a Lay Reader and Eucharistic Minister. I thank Grace for her diligence in serving the community and being a great leader. I am proud to honor her altruistic character this year at my Ecumenical Seniors Day.

NEWTON MINOW'S "THE WHISPER
OF AMERICA"

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 2002

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, recently the former Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Newton Minow delivered the Morris I. Liebman lecture at Loyola University in Chicago.

Mr. Minow's address are entitled "The Whisper of America," and is focused on the need for the United States to significantly increase the resources it devotes to international broadcasting.

I believe Mr. Minow makes a very thoughtful case for expanding our efforts in this area. In order that it may be available to a wider audience, and to call it to the attention of my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHISPER OF AMERICA

In World War II, when the survival of freedom was still far from certain, the United States created a new international radio service, the Voice of America. On February 24, 1942, William Harlan Hale opened the German-language program with these words: "Here speaks a voice from America. Every day at this time we will bring you the news of the war. The news may be good. The news may be bad. We will tell you the truth."

My old boss, William Benton, came up with the idea of the Voice of America. He was then Assistant Secretary of State and would later become Senator from Connecticut. He was immensely proud of the Voice of America. One day he described the new VOA to RCA Chairman David Sarnoff, the tough-minded and passionate pioneer of American broadcasting. Sarnoff noticed how little electronic power and transmitter scope the VOA had via short-wave radio, then said, "Benton, all you've got here is the whisper of America."

Although The Voice of America, and later other international radio services, have made valuable contributions, our international broadcasting services suffer from miserly funding. In many areas of the world, they have seldom been more than a whisper. Today, when we most need to communicate our story, especially in the Middle East, our broadcasts are not even a whisper. People in every country know our music, our movies, our clothes, and our sports. But they do not know our freedom or our values or our democracy.

I want to talk with you about how and why this happened, and what we must do about it.

First, some history:

At first, the Voice of America was part of the Office of War Information. When the war ended, the VOA was transferred to the Department of State. With the beginning of the Cold War, officials within the government began to debate the core mission of the VOA: Was it to be a professional impartial news service serving as an example of press freedom to the world? Or was it an instrument of U.S. foreign policy, a strategic weapon to be employed against those we fight? What is the line between news and propaganda? Should our broadcasts advocate America's values—or should they provide neutral, objective journalism?

That debate has never been resolved, only recast for each succeeding generation. In August 1953, for example, our government concluded that whatever the VOA was or would be, it should not be part of the State Department. So we established the United States Information Agency, and the VOA became its single largest operation.

A few years ago, Congress decided that all our international broadcasts were to be governed by a bi-partisan board appointed by the President, with the Secretary of State as an ex-officio member.

This includes other U.S. international broadcast services which were born in the Cold War, the so-called "Freedom Radios." The first was Radio Free Europe, established in 1949 as a non-profit, non-governmental private corporation to broadcast news and information to East Europeans behind the Iron Curtain. The second was Radio Liberty, created in 1951 to broadcast similar programming to the citizens of Russia and the Soviet republics. Both Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty were secretly funded by the Central Intelligence Agency, a fact not known to the American public until 1967, when the New York Times first reported the connection. The immediate result of the story was a

huge controversy, because the radios had for years solicited donations from the public through an advertising campaign known as the Crusade for Freedom. Such secrecy, critics argued, undermined the very message of democratic openness the stations were intended to convey in their broadcasts to the closed, totalitarian regimes of the East.

In 1971, Congress terminated CIA funding for the stations and provided for their continued existence by open appropriations. The stations survived and contributed to American strategy in the Cold War. That strategy was simple: to persuade and convince the leaders and people of the communist bloc that freedom was better than dictatorship, that free enterprise was better than central planning, and that no country could survive if it did not respect human rights and the rule of law. Broadcasting into regimes where travel was severely restricted, where all incoming mail was censored, and all internal media were tools of state propaganda, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty communicated two messages that conventional weapons never could—doubt about the present and hope for the future.

They did so against repeated efforts by Soviet and East European secret police to sabotage their broadcast facilities, to create friction between the stations and their lost governments, and even to murder the stations' personnel. In 1962, I personally witnessed an effort by Soviet delegates to an international communication conference in Geneva to eliminate our broadcasts to Eastern Europe. Because I was then Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, the Soviets assumed I was in charge of these broadcasts. I explained that although this was not my department, I thought we should double the broadcasts.

Listening to the radios' evening broadcasts became a standard ritual throughout Russia and Eastern Europe. Moscow, no matter how hard it tried, could not successfully jam the transmissions. As a result, communism had to face a public that every year knew more about its lies. In his 1970 Nobel Prize speech, Aleksander Solzhenitsyn said of Radio Liberty, "If we learn anything about events in our own country, it's from there." When the Berlin Wall fell, and soon after the Soviet Union crumbled, Lech Walesa was asked about the significance of Radio Free Europe to the Polish democracy movement. He replied, "Where would the Earth be without the sun?"

Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty continue to broadcast, from headquarters in downtown Prague, at the invitation of Valclav Havel. The studios are not guarded by tanks in the street to protect against terrorists.

With very little money, Congress authorized several new services: Radio Free Asia, Radio Free Iraq, Radio Free Iran, Radio and TVA Marti, Radio Democracy Africa, and World net, a television service that broadcasts a daily block of American news. After 9/11, Congress approved funding for a new Radio Free Afghanistan. What most people don't know is that this service is not new—Congress authorized funds for Radio Free Afghanistan first in 1985, when the country was under Soviet domination. Even the service was minimal—one half-hour a day of news in the Dari and Pashto languages. When the Soviets withdrew, we mistakenly thought the service was no longer needed. We dismantled it as the country plunged into chaos. We are finally beginning to correct mistakes with a smart new service in the Middle East called "The New Station for the New Generation."

Indeed, as the Cold War wound down, we forgot its most potent lesson: that totalitarianism was defeated not with missiles, tanks and carriers, but with ideas—and that

words can be weapons. Even though the Voice of America had earned the trust and respect of listeners for its accuracy and fairness, our government starved our international broadcasts. Many of the resources that had once been given to public diplomacy—to explaining ourselves and our values to the world—were eliminated. In the Middle East, particularly, American broadcasting is not even a whisper. An Arab-language radio service is operated by Voice of America, but its budget is tiny and its audience tinier—only about 1 to 2 percent of Arabs ever listen to it. Among those under the age of 30—60 percent of the population in the region—virtually no one listens.

As we fell mute in the Cold War's aftermath, other voices grew in influence.

AL JAZEERA

In the past few months, Westerners began to learn about Al Jazeera as a source of anti-American tirades by Muslim extremists and as the favored news outlet of both Osama bin Laden and the Taliban. The service had its beginnings in 1995, when the BBC withdrew from a joint venture with Saudi-owned Orbit Communications that had provided news on a Middle East channel. The BBC and the Saudi government clashed over editorial judgments, and the business relationship fell apart. Into the breach stepped a big fan of CNN, Qatar's Emir, Sheikh Hamed bin Khalifa Al Thani. He admired CNN's satellite technology and decided to bankroll a Middle East satellite network with a small budget. He hired most of the BBC's anchors, editors and technicians, and Al Jazeera was born. Jazeera means "the peninsula" in Arabic, and the name is fitting. Just as Qatar is a peninsula, the station's programming protrudes conspicuously into the world of state-controlled broadcasting in the Middle East. Several commentators, including many Arabs, have sharply criticized the service for being unprofessional and biased. CNN and Al Jazeera had a dispute this year and terminated their cooperative relationship.

Well before September 11, Al Jazeera had managed to anger most of the governments in its own region. Libya withdrew its ambassador from Qatar when Al Jazeera broadcast an interview with a critic of the Libyan government. Tunisia's ambassador complained to the Qatari foreign ministry about a program accusing Tunisia of violating human rights. Kuwait complained after a program criticized Kuwait's relations with Iraq. In Saudi Arabia, officials called for a "political fatwa" prohibiting Saudis from appearing on any Al Jazeera programming. In March 2001, Yasser Arafat closed Al Jazeera's West Bank news bureau, complaining of an offensive depiction of Arafat in a documentary. Algeria shut off electricity to prevent its citizens from watching Al Jazeera's programs. Other countries deny Al Jazeera's reporters entry visas.

And of course, our own country has plenty to complain about Al Jazeera.

Al Jazeera came to our notice first because a 1998 interview with Osama bin Laden called upon Muslims to "target all Americans." Al Jazeera broadcast the tape many times. As the only network with an office in Afghanistan, Al Jazeera was the only one the Taliban allowed to broadcast from the country. On October 7, 2001, the network's Kabul office received a videotape message from Osama bin Laden, which it transmitted around the world. Hiding in caves, Osama could still speak to the world in a voice louder than ours because we allowed our story to be told by our enemies.

Forty years ago, I accompanied President Kennedy on a tour of our space program facilities. He asked me why it was so important to launch a communications satellite. I

said, "Mr. President, unlike other rocket launches, this one will not send a man into space, but it will send ideas. And ideas last longer than people do." I never dreamed that the ideas millions of people receive every day would come from Al Jazeera.

THE GLOBAL MEDIA MARKETPLACE

Whatever one thinks of Al Jazeera, it teaches an important lesson: The global marketplace of news and information is no longer dominated by the United States. Our own government, because it has no outlet of its own in the area, is looking into buying commercial time on Al Jazeera to get America's anti-terrorism message out. And because of privatization and deregulation in the international satellite business, a huge number of Americans now have direct access to Al Jazeera through the EchoStar satellite service.

The point is simply this: Whether the message is one of hate or peace, in the globalized communications environment it is impossible either to silence those who send the message, or stop those who want to receive it. Satellites have no respect for national borders. Satellites surmount walls. Like Joshua's Trumpet, satellite blow walls down.

That was the last lesson of the Cold War. In Beijing, the Chinese government would not begin its brutal sweep through Tianamen Square until it thought the world's video cameras were out of range. In Manila, Warsaw and Bucharest, dissenters first captured the television station—the Electronic Bastille of modern revolutions. In Prague, a classic urban rebellion became a revolution through television. The Romanian revolution was not won until television showed pictures of the Ceausescus' corpses and scenes of rebels controlling the square in Bucharest. In the final days of the Soviet Union, the August 1991 coup against President Mikhail Gorbachev failed when video of the supposedly ill president was broadcast by satellite around the world. Those satellites, Gorbachev later said, "prevented the triumph of dictatorship." Now, we have the newer technologies of the internet and e-mail—technologies the Voice of America and the Freedom Radios use with enthusiasm without adequate support.

What we have failed to realize is that the last lesson of the Cold War is also the first lesson of the new global information age. We live now in a world where we are the long superpower, and the target of envy and resentment not just in the Middle East but elsewhere. Terror is now the weapon of choice.

But if you believe we are only in a war against terrorism, you are only half-right. Nation-states can sponsor terrorism and provide cover to terrorists, but the war against terrorism is asymmetric. This is my friend Don Rumsfeld's favorite word—asymmetric. This means that war is not waged by a state against another state per se, but against an ideology. Think of the campaign of the past few months. The enemy has been a band of religious zealots and the Al-Qaida terrorists they harbor, not the people of Afghanistan. President Bush has been emphatic and effective on this point, as have Prime Minister Tony Blair and other world leaders.

Asymmetry also refers to the strategies and tactics used by those who cannot compete in a conventional war. In an asymmetric war, it is not enough to have Air Forces to command the skies, Navies to roam the seas, or Armies to control mountain passes. Although the Cold War led to staggering advances in military technology to win the battles, there is not a corresponding change in our government's use of communications technology to win the peace.

Asymmetry, in other words, is not limited to what happens on the battlefield. While

U.S. Special Operations forces in Afghanistan use laptops and satellites and sophisticated wireless telecommunications to guide pilots flying bombing missions from aircraft carriers in the Arabian Sea, we still use obsolete, clumsy and primitive methods, such as short-wave radio, to communicate to the people.

Here is another incongruity: American marketing talent is successfully selling Madonna's music, Pepsi Cola and Coca Cola, Michael Jordan's shoes and McDonald's hamburgers around the world. Our film television and computer software industries dominate their markets worldwide. Yet, the United States government has tried to get its message of freedom and democracy out to the 1 billion Muslims in the world and can't seem to do it. How is it that America, a nation founded on ideas—not religion or race or ethnicity or clan—cannot explain itself to the world?

In the months since September 11, Americans have been surprised to learn of the deep and bitter resentment that much of the Muslim world feels toward us. Our situation is not just a public relations problem. Anyone who has traveled the world knows that much anti-American sentiment springs from disagreements with some of our economic and foreign policies. Our support of authoritarian regimes in the Muslim world has not endeared us to the people who live there. And there is no more poisonous imagery than that of Palestinians and Israelis locked in mortal and what seems to be never-ending combat.

Still, the United States has an important story to tell, the story of human striving for freedom, democracy and opportunity. Since the end of the Cold War, we have failed to tell that story to a world waiting to hear it on the radio and see it on television. We have failed to use the power of ideas.

Within days of the Taliban's flight from Kabul, television was back on the air in the country. The Taliban had not only banned television broadcasts, but confiscated and destroyed thousands of TV sets. They hung the smashed husks of TV sets on light poles, along with videocassettes and musical instruments, as a warning to anyone who might try to break the regime's reign of ignorance. And yet no sooner were the Taliban driven from the city than hundreds of TV sets appeared from nowhere. Even in the midst of a totalitarian, theocratic regime, there had been a thriving underground market for news and information. Television antennas were quickly hung outside of windows and on rooftops. The antennas are like periscopes, enabling those inside to see what is happening outside.

Where were we when those people needed us? Where were we when Al Jazeera went on the air? It was as if we put on our own self-created burka and disappeared from sight. The voices of America, the voices of freedom, were not even a whisper.

THE NEW CHALLENGE

I believe the United States must re-commit itself to public diplomacy—to explaining and advocating our values to the world. As Tom Friedman put it in his New York Times column not long ago: "It is no easy trick to lose a PR war to two mass murderers—(Osama bin Laden and Saddam Hussein) but we've been doing just that lately. It is not enough for the White House to label them 'evildoers.' We have to take the PR war right to them, just like the real one."

There are two leaders of both parties who need our support in this fight for aggressive, vigorous public diplomacy. Illinois Republican Congressman Henry Hyde, chairman of the House International Relations Committee, wants to strengthen the Voice of

America and the many Freedom Radio services that broadcast from Cuba to Afghanistan. Democratic Senator Joseph Biden, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is on the same page. He has developed legislation known as "Initiative 911" to give special emphasis to more programming for the entire Muslim world, from Nigeria to Indonesia. In November, Congress finally set aside \$30 million to launch a new Middle East radio network. The AM and FM broadcasts (not short wave) will offer pop music—American and Arabic—along with a mix of current events and talk shows. The proposal to fund Radio Free Afghanistan is for \$27.5 million this year and next, and will allow about 12 hours a day of broadcasting into the country. The goal is to make our ideas clear not just to leaders in the Muslim world, but to those in the street, and particularly the young, many of whom are uneducated and desperately poor, and among whom hostility toward the United States is very high.

These efforts are late and, in my view, too timid. They are tactical, not strategic. They are smart, not visionary. The cost of putting Radio Free Afghanistan on the air and underwriting its annual budget, for example, is less than even one Commanche helicopter. We have many hundreds of helicopters which we need to destroy tyranny, but they are insufficient to secure freedom. In an asymmetric war, we must also fight on the idea front.

Bob Schieffer put the issue well not long ago on CBS' "Face the Nation": "The real enemy is not Osama, it is the ignorance that breeds the hatred that fuels his cause." This is what we have to change. I realized what an enormous job that was going to be the other day when I heard a young Pakistani student tell an interviewer that everyone in his school knew that Israel was behind the attacks on the Twin Towers and everyone in his school knew all the Jews who worked there and stayed home that day.

What we have all come to realize now is that a large part of the world not only misunderstands us but is teaching its children to hate us. Steve Forbes, who once headed the Broadcasting Board of Governors, put the issue even more bluntly: "Washington should cease its petty, penny-minded approach to our international radios and give them the resources and capable personnel to do the job that so badly needs to be done right. . . . What are we waiting for?"

THE PROPOSAL

What are we waiting for? I suggest three simple proposals. First, define a clear strategic mission and vision for U.S. international broadcasting. Second, provide the financial resources to get the job done. Third, use the unique talent that the United States has—all of it—to communicate that vision to the world.

First, and above all, U.S. international broadcasting should be unapologetically proud to advocate freedom and democracy in the world. There is no inconsistency in reporting the news accurately while also advocating America's values. The real issue is whether we will carry the debate on the meaning of freedom to places on the globe, where open debate is unknown and freedom has no seed. Does anyone seriously believe that the twin goals of providing solid journalism and undermining tyranny are incompatible? As a people, Americans have always been committed to the proposition that these goals go hand in hand. As the leader of the free world, it is time for us to do what's right—to speak of idealism, sacrifice and the nurturing of values essential to human freedom—and to speak in a bold, clear voice.

Second, if we are to do that, we will need to put our money where our mouths are not.

We now spend more than a billion dollars each day for the Department of Defense. Results in the war on terrorism demonstrate that this is money well invested in our national security.

Whatever Don Rumsfeld says he needs should be provided by the Congress with pride in the extraordinary service his imaginative leadership is giving our country. As President Bush has proposed, we will need to increase the defense budget. When we do, let's compare what we need to spend on the Voice of America and the Freedom Radio services with what we need to spend on defense. Our international broadcasting efforts amount to less than two-tenths of one percent of Defense expenditures. Al Jazeera was started with an initial budget of less than \$30 million a year. Now Al Jazeera reaches some 40 million men, women and children every day, at a cost of pennies per viewer every month.

Congress should hold hearings now to decide what we should spend to get our message of freedom, democracy and peace into the non-democratic and authoritarian regions of the world. One suggestion is to consider a relationship between what we spend on defense with what we spend on communication. For example, should we spend 10 percent of what we spend on defense for communication? That would be \$33 billion a year. Too much. Should we spend 1 percent? That would be \$3.3 billion, and that seems about right to me—one dollar to launch ideas for every \$10 we invest to launch bombs. This would be about six times more than we invest now in international communications. We must establish a ratio sufficient to our need to inform and persuade others of the values of freedom and democracy. More importantly, we should seek a ratio sufficient to lessen our need for bombs.

Third, throwing money alone at the problem will not do the job. We need to use all of the communications talent we have at our disposal. This job is not only for journalists. As important as balanced news and public affairs programming are to our public diplomacy mission, the fact is that we are now in a global information marketplace. An American news source, even a highly professional one like the VOA, is not necessarily persuasive in a market of shouting, often deceitful and hateful voices. Telling the truth in a persuasive, convincing way is not propaganda. Churchill's and Roosevelt's words—"never was so much owed by so many to so few"—"The only thing we have to fear is fear itself"—were as powerful as a thousand guns.

When Colin Powell chose advertising executive Charlotte Beers as Under Secretary of State for public diplomacy and public affairs, some journalists sneered. You cannot peddle freedom as you would cars and shampoo, went the refrain. That is undoubtedly so, and Beers has several times said as much herself. But you can't peddle freedom if no one is listening, and Charlotte Beers is a master at getting people to listen—and to communicate in terms people understand.

So was another visionary in this business, Bill Benton. Before he served as Assistant Secretary of State, Benton had been a founding partner in one of the country's largest and most successful advertising firms, Benton and Bowles. To win the information war, we will need the Bentons and Beers of this world every bit as much as we will need the journalists. We have the smartest, most talented, and most creative people in the world in our communications industries—in radio, television, film, newspapers, magazines, advertising, publishing, public relations, marketing. These men and women want to help their country, and will volunteer eagerly to help get our message across. One of the first people we should enlist is a West Point grad-

uate named Bill Roedy, who is President of MTV Networks International. His enterprise reaches one billion people in 18 languages in 164 countries. Eight out of ten MTV viewers live outside the United States. He can teach us a lot about how to tell our story.

In 1945, a few years after the VOA first went on the air, the newly founded United Nations had 51 members. Today it has 189. In the last decade alone, more than 20 countries have been added to the globe, many of them former Soviet republics, but not all. Some of these new countries, as with the Balkan example, have been cut bloodily from the fabric of ethnic and religious hatred. Some of these countries are nominally democratic, but many—especially in Central Asia—are authoritarian regimes. Some are also deeply unstable, and thus pose a threat not only to their neighbors, but to the free world. Afghanistan, we discovered too late, is a concern not only to its region, but to all of us.

In virtually every case, those whose rule is based on an ideology of hate have understood better than we have the power of ideas and the power of communicating ideas. The bloodshed in the Balkans began with hate radio blaring from Zagreb and Belgrade, and hate radio is still common in the region today. The murder of 2 million Hutus and Tutsis in central Africa could not have happened but for the urging of madmen with broadcast towers at their disposal. The same has been true of ethnic violence in India and Pakistan.

I saw this first hand in the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962. President Kennedy asked me to organize eight American commercial radio stations to carry the Voice of America to Cuba because the VOA was shut out by Soviet jamming. We succeeded, and President Kennedy's speeches were heard in Spanish in Cuba at the height of the crisis. As we kept the destroyers and missiles out of Cuba, we got the Voice of America in because we had enough power to surmount the jamming. On that occasion, our American broadcasts were more than a whisper.

Last spring—well before the events of September 11—Illinois Congressman Henry Hyde put the need eloquently. I quote him: "During the last several years it has been argued that our broadcasting services have done their job so well that they are no longer needed. This argument assumes that the great battle of the 20th century, the long struggle for the soul of the world, is over: that the forces of freedom and democracy have won. But the argument is terribly shortsighted. It ignores the people of China and Cuba, of Vietnam and Burma, of Iraq and Iran and Sudan and North Korea and now Russia. It ignores the fragility of freedom and the difficulty of building and keeping democracy. And it ignores the resilience of evil."

Fifty-eight years ago, Albert Einstein returned from a day of sailing to find a group of reporters waiting for him at the shore. The reporters told him that the United States had dropped an atomic bomb on Hiroshima, wiping out the city. Einstein shook his head and said, "Everything in the world has changed except the way we think."

On September 11 everything changed except the way we think. It is hard to change the way we think. But we know that ideas last longer than people do, and that two important ideas of the 20th century are now in direct competition: the ideas of mass communication and mass destruction. The great question of our time is whether we will be wise enough to use one to avoid the other.

HONORING BUNNY AND JERRY FRANKEL FOR THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HOLLIS HILLS JEWISH CENTER

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 2002

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the House to join me in recognizing Bunny and Jerry Frankel. Bunny and Jerry represent a true New York mixed marriage: She's from the Bronx, he's from Brooklyn and, for the sake of *shalom bayit* (peace in the home), they reside in Queens.

For the past twenty-eight years they have given unstintingly of themselves to the Hollis Hills Jewish Center and the Jewish community in Queens. Currently, Bunny is serving her second term as Administrative Vice President of the Center. Previously, she served for fourteen years as the synagogue's executive director and during those years, thanks to her expertise and her tireless work, the Center has flourished.

In addition to her extraordinary business sense and management skills, Bunny's insight, sensitivity and gracious personality made her especially effective in dealing with the many people needed to keep the Center operating: clergy, officers, trustees, committee chairpersons, professional staff, assorted *machers* and *yentas*, and synagogue members at large. Bunny always found ways to enable each of them make their own unique contribution to the synagogue.

With Jerry's constant support, insight and encouragement, Bunny has been a calm, cool leader with a special gift for problem resolution. And all of these contributions have been made while they were raising three extremely active, bright children, their twin daughters, Sheryl and Wanda, and their son, Scott. All three have gone on to become leaders in their own respective professions of marketing, education, and computer technology.

To note all of Bunny's incredible achievements for the Hollis Hills Jewish Center is impossible—the list is endless. But just to begin, it would have to include implementing superior budgetary controls; facilitating synagogue programs; organizing, tracking and managing all of the many fund raising activities, like the Dinner Dance, the Goods and Service Auction, the Bazaar and the Art Auction, among others; writing grants; administering personnel procedures and policies; negotiating vendor contracts; and supervising the office staff.

Bunny has been responsible for administering every aspect of the Center. For the religious school, Bunny interviewed staff, helped plan and coordinate programs, such as consecration, graduation, Purim carnivals, religious science fairs, high school seminars, and out-of-state trips for teens; and arranged for housing, transportation and touring. She coordinated all the committees, the nursery school, the summer camp, the junior congregation, the nursery parent rap groups, the college outreach, the adult education programs, the Holocaust Torah Scroll renewal, the *Selichot* service, the Sukkah-mobile, the lunch-and-learn sessions, the blood drives, the Russian clothing and food drives, the singles program, the groundbreaking ceremony, the room rental requests, and the list goes on and on.