

they will be. Again to cite Huntington, "At some point . . . a few terrorists will be able to produce massive violence and massive destruction. Separately, terrorism and nuclear weapons are the weapons of the non-Western weak. If and when they are combined, the non-Western weak will be strong."

This was written in 1996. The first mass murder by terrorists came last September. Just last month the vice president informed Tim Russert that "the prospects of a future attack . . . are almost certain. Not a matter of if, but when." Secretary Rumsfeld has added that the attack will be nuclear.

We are indeed at war and we must act accordingly, with equal measures of audacity and precaution.

As regards precaution, note how readily the clash of civilizations could spread to our own homeland. The Bureau of the Census lists some 68 separate ancestries in the American population. (Military gravestones provide for emblems of 36 religions.) All the major civilizations. Not since 1910 have we had so high a proportion of immigrants. As of 2000, one in five school-age children have at least one foreign-born parent.

This, as ever, has had bounteous rewards. The problem comes when immigrants and their descendants bring with them—and even intensify—the clashes they left behind. Nothing new, but newly ominous. Last month in Washington an enormous march filled Pennsylvania Avenue on the way to the Capitol grounds. The marchers, in the main, were there to support the Palestinian cause. Fair enough. But every five feet or so there would be a sign proclaiming "Zionism equals Racism" or a placard with a swastika alongside a Star of David. Which is anything but fair, which is poisonous and has no place in our discourse.

This hateful equation first appeared in a two-part series in Pravda in Moscow in 1971. Part of Cold War "agit prop." It has since spread into a murderous attack on the right of the State of Israel to exist—the right of Jews to exist!—a world in which a hateful Soviet lie has mutated into a new and vicious anti-Semitism. Again, that is the world we live in, but it is all the more chilling when it fills Pennsylvania Avenue.

It is a testament to our First Amendment freedoms that we permit such displays, however obnoxious to our fundamental ideals. But in the wake of 9/11, we confront the fear that such heinous speech can be a precursor to violence, not least here at home, that threatens our existence.

To be sure, we must do what is necessary to meet the threat. We need to better understand what the dangers are. We need to explore how better to organize the agencies of government to detect and prevent calamitous action.

But at the same time, we need take care that whatever we do is consistent with our basic constitutional design. What we do must be commensurate with the threat in ways that do not needlessly undermine the very liberties we seek to protect.

The concern is suspicion and fear within. Does the Park Service really need to photograph every visitor to the Lincoln Memorial? They don't, but they will. It is already done at the Statue of Liberty. In Washington, agencies compete in techniques of intrusion and exclusion. Identity cards and X-ray machines and all the clutter, plus a new life for secrecy. Some necessary; some discouraging. Mary Graham warns of the stultifying effects of secrecy on inquiry. Secrecy, as George Will writes, "renders societies susceptible to epidemics of suspicion."

We are witnessing such an outbreak in Washington just now. Great clamor as to what the different agencies knew in advance of the 9/11 attack; when the President was

briefed; what was he told. These are legitimate questions, but there is a prior issue, which is the disposition of closed systems not to share information. By the late 1940s the Army Signal Corps had decoded enough KGB traffic to have a firm grip on the Soviet espionage in the United States and their American agents. No one needed to know about this more than the President of the United States. But Truman was not told. By order, mind, of Omar Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Now as then there is police work to be done. But so many forms of secrecy are self-defeating. In 1988, the CIA formally estimated the Gross Domestic Product of East Germany to be higher than West Germany. We should calculate such risks.

The "what-ifs" are intriguing. What if the United States had recognized Soviet weakness earlier and, accordingly, kept its own budget in order, so that upon the breakup of the Soviet Union a momentous economic aid program could have been commenced? What if we had better calculated the forces of the future so that we could have avoided going directly from the "end" of the cold War to a new Balkan war—a classic clash of civilizations—leaving little attention and far fewer resources for the shattered Soviet empire?

Because we have that second chance Riesenman and Glazer wrote about. A chance to define our principles and stay true to them. The more then, to keep our system open as much as possible, with our purposes plain and accessible, so long as we continue to understand what the 20th century has surely taught, which is that open societies have enemies, too. Indeed, they are the greatest threat to closed societies, and, accordingly, the first object of their enmity.

We are committed, as the Constitution states, to "the Law of Nations," but that law as properly understood. Many have come to think that international law prohibits the use of force. To the contrary, like domestic law, it legitimates the use of force to uphold law in a manner that is itself proportional and lawful.

Democracy may not prove to be a universal norm. But decency would do. Our present conflict, as the President says over and again, is not with Islam, but with a malignant growth within Islam defying the teaching of the Q'uran, that the struggle to the path of God forbids the deliberate killing of noncombatants. Just how and when Islam will rid itself of current heresies is something no one can say. But not soon. Christianity has been through such heresy—and more than once. Other clashes will follow.

Certainly we must not let ourselves be seen as rushing about the world looking for arguments. There are now American armed forces in some 40 countries overseas. Some would say too many. Nor should we let ourselves be seen as ignoring allies, disillusioning friends, thinking only of ourselves in the most narrow terms. That is not how we survived the 20th century.

Nor will it serve in the 21st.

Last February, some 60 academics of the widest range of political persuasion and religious belief, a number from here at Harvard, including Huntington, published a manifesto: "What We're Fighting For: A Letter from America."

It has attracted some attention here; perhaps more abroad, which was our purpose. Our references are wide, Socrates, St. Augustine, Francisus de Victoria, John Paul II, Martin Luther King, Jr., Alexander Solzhenitsyn, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

We affirmed "five fundamental truths that pertain to all people without distinction," beginning "all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights."

We allow for our own shortcomings as a nation, sins, arrogance, failings. But we assert we are no less bound by moral obligation. And finally, . . . reason and careful moral reflection . . . teach us that there are times when the first and most important reply to evil is to stop it.

But there is more. Forty-seven years ago, on this occasion, General George C. Marshall summoned our nation to restore the countries whose mad regimes had brought the world such horror. It was an act of statesmanship and vision without equal in history. History summons us once more in different ways, but with even greater urgency. Civilization need not die. At this moment, only the United States can save it. As we fight the war against evil, we must also wage peace, guided by the lesson of the Marshall Plan—vision and generosity can help make the world a safer place.

Thank you.

## COMMENDING THE KURDS AND TRADE

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2003

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member wishes to commend to his colleagues three editorials from the Omaha World-Herald.

First, the editorial from the December 11, 2002, edition of the paper, entitled "Kurds set an impressive example," correctly commends the economic, political, and social progress made by the Kurds in northern Iraq despite Saddam Hussein's concerted and well-documented efforts to annihilate Iraq's Kurdish population.

Second, the editorial from the December 16, 2002, edition of the Omaha World-Herald, entitled "Behind Mexico's farm woes," encourages Mexico to pursue new farm policies which fully utilize market opportunities created through the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) rather than simply continuing to blame U.S. farm subsidies for Mexico's continued ag sector problems.

Finally, the editorial from the January 2, 2003, edition of the paper, entitled "Open trade, open meetings," offers support for U.S. proposals to increase transparency within the World Trade Organization (WTO).

### KURDS SET AN IMPRESSIVE EXAMPLE

The Kurdish area of Iraq shows the progress that is possible once a dictator is freed from a dictator's rule. U.S. Sen. Chuck Hagel visited that zone last week, and he was on the mark in saying the Kurdish area has the potential to serve as a model for what a post-Saddam Iraq could become.

Saddam Hussein's regime devastated the Kurd's territory in the 1980s but lost its grip on the area in 1991 as a result of the Gulf War. Economic development began to surge there in 1996, when the United Nations began channeling a set portion of Iraq's oil revenues to the Kurds. Saddam's government is able to short-circuit or delay various development projects, but the Kurds have still made impressive progress.

Here is how Barham Salih, prime minister of the Kurdistan Regional Government, described that improvement, in an opinion essay this week in *The Washington Post*:

"In 11 years we have rebuilt some 4,000 villages, set up two universities and opened more than 2,700 schools. Protected by U.S. and British air power, we have created an environment of freedom unique in Iraqi history, in which Kurds, Turkomans, Assyrian

Christians and Arabs enjoy cultural and political rights. My home city of Sulaimani alone has more than 130 media outlets, including 13 TV stations and dozens of newspapers—as well as unrestricted access to the Internet and satellite TV.”

The currency in Kurdish-controlled areas is worth more than 100 times its counterpart in the rest of Iraq, the San Francisco Chronicle notes. A Chronicle article described the area’s newly paved highways as well as new hotels and open-air restaurants.

The child mortality rate among the Kurds, the Chronicle points out, is about 45 percent less than that for the rest of Iraq. Such a contrast strongly suggests that Saddam’s decisions in allocating medical resources are a major factor in bringing misery to average Iraqis.

The Kurds’ progress shouldn’t be exaggerated. Many Kurds eke out only a modest living, and the area’s political system still needs to achieve the orderliness and relative comity associated with democratic systems.

On balance, though, the Kurds’ achievement after only a few years offers tremendous hope. In certain respects, it can be a role model not just for Iraq but for many countries in that part of the world.

#### BEHIND MEXICO’S FARM WOES

Tariffs on agricultural trade between Mexico and the United States have fallen in dramatic fashion since the mid-1990s. That embrace of open trade has put pressure on many Mexican farmers, compelling many of them to get out of agriculture altogether.

Some farm activists and commentators are blaming the United States, arguing that its heavy subsidizing of agriculture puts Mexico at an unfair disadvantage.

It’s true that U.S. farm subsidies are wide-ranging and second only to those of the European Union (although Mexico’s corn subsidies average \$150 a ton, compared to \$85 in this country). But it is woefully simplistic to lay all responsibility at the feet of the United States. Many other important factors are also in play.

Critics tend to sidestep the fact, for instance, that much of the Mexican farm sector is thriving. Under NAFTA, Mexico’s agricultural exports have gone up significantly. That growth was made possible in part because many Mexican farmers invested and modernized in preparation for the impending changes.

Other farmers, in contrast, made no adjustments. They are now feeling pressure. True, many Mexican farmers have little flexibility because they own small plots or else communal ones lacking clear title. But that only underscores the reality that such farms have precarious financial prospects to begin with.

The Mexican farm sector has brought some problems on itself by failing, in many cases, to invest in improvements for irrigation and transportation. Mexico has hurt itself, too, by failing to curtail disease in livestock. Disease is so widespread for Mexican hogs, for example, that just two Mexican states are currently allowed to export pork—and only to Japan.

A sensible strategy would be to promote industrial development so that Mexican farmers and laborers can leave unsustainable plots and take on better-paying factory jobs—which, in fact, is the course the Mexican government has been attempting under NAFTA. Anti-globalization activists, regretfully, are trying to block the creation of factories in rural Mexico, arguing that the traditional farm economy needs to be preserved in its entirety.

Mexico’s farm sector has much to gain from the efficiencies and opportunities that

open markets create. Mexico will toss away those opportunities, however, if it allows farm interests and political activists to block crucial flexibility and diversification.

#### OPEN TRADE, OPEN MEETINGS

The World Trade Organization serves a vital function by overseeing the rules that govern the annual exchange of more than \$7 trillion in goods and services worldwide. Under the WTO’s direction, the world is moving slowly, if sometimes unsteadily, toward more open trade. The trend is healthy.

Critics raise a legitimate point, however, when they decry how the WTO conceals its deliberations from public scrutiny.

Defenders rationalize the closed-door nature of much of the WTO’s proceedings as necessary to protect companies’ proprietary information. But such an arrangement understandably leads to accusations that the deliberations are permitting private horse-trading that should more properly be conducted in public.

The United States, to its credit, has proposed a series of measures to open up the WTO process. Under the U.S. recommendations, hearings would be conducted openly. Legal briefs and final panel reports would be made available to the public in a timely fashion. Meanwhile, procedures would be put in place to ensure that proprietary information that legitimately deserves protection would receive it.

Those would all be positive steps. Some WTO members are balking but the call for greater openness should be heeded. The WTO, whose decisions have enormous ramifications for countries’ economic well-being, ought to move its operations into the daylight.

#### A BILL TO CREATE FEDERAL ADVERTISING PROCUREMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR MINORITY BUSINESS CONCERNS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

#### HON. CAROLYN C. KILPATRICK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2003

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, small, disadvantaged businesses have been denied access to prominent contracting and subcontracting opportunities across the spectrum of industry. Many entrepreneurs and small businesses have either been hurt or put out of business by the gross disparity between procurement opportunities they receive and those received by large, majority owned businesses. In response to this inequity, former President Clinton enacted an executive order in October 2000 to improve the situation and rectify the inequity. The executive order’s sole focus was to increase opportunities and access for disadvantaged businesses in relation to Federal procurement opportunities.

According to the executive order, each department and agency with procurement authority was to aggressively seek to ensure that small disadvantaged businesses, minority business enterprises and other types of small businesses were intimately involved in prime contracting opportunities. The underlying premise of the order was to contribute to a reduction of inequality within the realm of Federal procurement opportunities.

I want to codify former President Clinton’s executive order specifically as it relates to

Federal advertising contracts. My goal is to ensure that minority business concerns engaged in the advertising industry have ample Federal advertisement procurement opportunities. In addition, the legislation pinpoints minority business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals as businesses in drastic need of increased participation in Federal advertising procurement opportunities.

The advertising industry is an ever-expanding industry that exposes many products and services to a growing and diverse nation. There are more than 21,000 advertising agencies engaged in the business and thousands more that want to become engaged in the advertising industry. However, for various reasons, many smaller and disadvantaged businesses have found it difficult to obtain advertising contracts, particularly large Federal government contracts. This bill will eradicate the inequity by facilitating the following:

1. Aggressively seeking to ensure that minority business concerns are aware of the Federal advertising procurement opportunities by using the most effective forms of communication, including the Internet, specialty press and trade press;

2. Ensuring that procurement authorities will work with the Small Business Administration (SBA) to make sure that eligible small business concerns receive information regarding the contracts;

3. Ensuring that the price evaluation preference programs authorized by Section 7102 of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 are used to the maximum extent when granting Federal advertising contracts to minority business concerns;

4. Requiring that contractors meet the commitments required by this legislation and other related laws (i.e., Small Business Act); and

5. Ensuring that contracts involving commitments with minority business concerns include clauses that address the assessment of liquidated damages when commitments are not met.

I sincerely hope that Congress will consider the positive effect of this bill not only for minority business concerns, but also for the betterment of the advertising industry in general. This bill can cure an ill that has plagued the advertising industry for a long time. I look forward to the opportunity to discuss this issue with my many colleagues in Congress.

#### CELEBRATING THE WEDDING OF PETER DILLON CAIRNEY AND ANNA CHRISTINE LEE

#### HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2003

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to hail the upcoming wedding of my good friend Peter Dillon Cairney to Anna Christine Lee in Portland, Oregon on February 1, 2003. I bring this merger to the attention of the Congress because in addition to his other exploits, Pete Cairney served his country well as an infantry officer in the United States Marine Corps, rising to the rank of Captain and serving in Operation Desert Storm.

Pete Cairney is a true American and a true New Yorker, born in Queens where, like his literary soul mate Jimmy Breslin, he was born in