

wants them to become good-will ambassadors for Ireland. Rather than balk at the responsibility, they say that emotional and intellectual links are exactly what they expect to gain from their year here.

"I didn't feel pressure that I ultimately need to do some great work for Ireland," said Jeannie Huh, a West Point graduate who studied public health at Trinity College. "But I definitely do feel that over the course of the year I have built a spot in my heart for the country and the people. I think that's just inevitable."

Most Mitchell scholars try to blend into Irish society by complementing their studies with internships, part-time jobs and community work. In the last few years, three Mitchell recipients withdrew from the running for Rhodes Scholarships, and that multidisciplinary approach is one reason.

"It was more than just an academic program; it has that cultural element," said Georgia Miller Mjartan, who was a Rhodes semifinalist from Arkansas when she won a Mitchell Scholarship. She said that she realized at her Mitchell interview that she would accept the scholarship if it was offered.

"I knew that, as far as prestige, it would be good for me to go through with the Rhodes process, even if I didn't take it," she said. But Ms. Mjartan, who is 23 and lived in Carrickfergus, Northern Ireland, over the last year, withdrew her application after learning that her place, if she won, would not be awarded to an alternate candidate if she declined the scholarship. "That wouldn't be right, because I would be taking it away from someone else," she said.

The application process is intended to be friendly, with one short essay and interviews that focus on identity and personality instead of academic detail, Ms. Vargo said. Those who are accepted are encouraged to wait until they hear from other scholarship programs before deciding which to choose.

"You want them to have a reason to be here, and a really good understanding of why they're here," Ms. Vargo said.

Ms. Vargo, a former foreign policy adviser to Senator Edward M. Kennedy, knows Irish business and political circles well, and Mitchell scholars often use her network of connections. Last year, she introduced Mark Tosso to the top official in the prime minister's office, who found him a job conducting a review of communications systems for employees throughout the Irish government. "They had this project which was putting along, and they needed someone to take charge of it," Mr. Tosso said.

In the same way, Ms. Mark, the banjo player, met a Dublin lawyer who hired her to help set up a new fund-raising arm for Amnesty International. "Everyone just bowls themselves over to help you," she said. "As soon as you express an interest in something, the opportunity is there."

The scholars also improvised when they found Irish culture less familiar with the idea of internships or entrepreneurial volunteer work. With her professor at Trinity College, Ms. Huh approached a charity based in Dublin and ended up in Bangladesh for five weeks, doing research on malnutrition. Mariyam Cementwala, from Bakersfield, Calif., organized a conference on human rights for 120 people at the National University of Ireland at Galway.

With an allowance from an Irish travel company, the latest group of Mitchell scholars went on impromptu road trips around the country, visiting one another at their universities almost once a month, and some traveled together to Scotland. Also through Ms. Vargo, they went on a hiking trip in the Wicklow Mountains guided by a Dublin businessman, and they celebrated Thanksgiving together at a lawyer's Dublin home.

To use their own term, they bonded. They share an easy rapport (Ms. Mark called the group "the world's perfect dinner party") whether milling about at the program's closing ceremonies with political leaders like Senator Mitchell and Sinn Fein's president, Gerry Adams, or holding up the bar at the Europa Hotel.

The program's sponsors seem to feel that even that bar tab is money well spent. Gerry McCrory, 40, heads a venture capital fund in Dublin called Cross Atlantic Capital Partners that gives about \$30,000 a year to the Mitchell program. He said he looked forward to when the Mitchell Scholars would positively influence the relationship between the United States and Ireland.

"It's going to be at least another 20 or 30 years until they're in a position to make those decisions," he said, "but I think it's the right thing to do. It's a long-term investment."

INTELLIGENCE REPORT

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise today to commend the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence for their outstanding work in reviewing the intelligence community's activities related to the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001. The report, which was issued jointly last week by two committees, is the culmination of the hard work of the committees and their staff to inform the American people of the weaknesses in our intelligence community that need to be strengthened to prevent this type of event from occurring again.

One issue that I find particularly interesting is the focus of the Intelligence Committees' report on how the lack of employees with foreign language skills hampered the intelligence community's efforts to meet its mission. Finding Six of the report states:

Prior to September 11, the Intelligence Community was not prepared to handle the challenge it faced in translating the volumes of foreign language counterterrorism intelligence it collected. Agencies within the Intelligence Community experienced backlogs in material awaiting translation, a shortage of language specialists and language-qualified field officers, and a readiness level of only 30 percent in the most critical terrorism-related languages used by terrorists.

This finding is not surprising. Shortly after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, FBI Director Robert Mueller made a public plea for speakers of Arabic and Farsi to help the FBI and national security agencies translate documents that were in U.S. possession but which were left untranslated due to a shortage of employees with proficiency in those languages. The committees' report states that prior to September 11, the Bureau's Arabic translators could not keep up with the workload. As a result, 35 percent of Arabic language materials derived from Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, FISA, collection was not reviewed or translated. If the number of Arabic speakers employed by the Bureau remained at the same level, the projected backlog would rise to 41 percent this year.

Unfortunately, the U.S. faces a critical shortage of language proficient professionals throughout Federal agencies. As the General Accounting Office reports, Federal agencies have shortages in translators and interpreters and an overall shortfall in the language proficiency levels needed to carry out agency missions. Further, Director of the CIA Language School has testified before the Intelligence Committees that, given the CIA's language requirements, the CIA Directorate of Operations is not fully prepared to fight a world-wide war on terrorism and at the same time carry out its traditional agent recruitment and intelligence collection mission. The Director also added that there is no strategic plan in place with regard to linguistic skills at the Agency.

The inability of law enforcement officers, intelligence officers, scientists, military personnel, and other Federal employees to decipher and interpret information from foreign sources, as well as interact with foreign nations, presents a threat to their mission and to the well-being of our Nation. It is crucial that we work to strengthen the language capabilities and in turn the security, of the United States. Both the GAO review and the Intelligence Committees' report demonstrate that action is needed to help Federal agencies more effectively recruit and retain highly skilled individuals for national security positions.

Congress has long been aware of the Federal Government's lack of skilled personnel with language proficiency. In 1958, the National Defense Education Act, NDEA, was passed in response to the Soviet Union's first space launch. We were determined to win the space race and make certain that the United States never came up short again in the areas of math, science, technology, or foreign languages. The act provided loans and fellowships to students, and funds to universities to enhance their programs and purchase necessary equipment. After the NDEA expired in the early 1960s, Congress passed the National Security Education Act in 1991, which created the National Security Education program, NSEP. This program was intended to address the lack of language expertise in the Federal Government by providing limited undergraduate scholarships and graduate fellowships for students to study foreign language and foreign area studies, and providing funds to institutions of higher learning to develop faculty expertise in the less commonly taught languages. In turn, students who receive NSEP scholarships and fellowships are required to work for an office or agency of the Federal Government in national security affairs.

While NSEP has been successful, it is obvious that more needs to be done. To address the Federal Government's lack of foreign language personnel, I introduced S. 589, the Homeland Security Federal Workforce Act, on March 11, 2003.

I am pleased to have the support of Senators DURBIN, ALLEN, VOINOVICH, WARNER, BROWNBACK, CHAMBLISS, ROCKEFELLER, and COLLINS in this effort. Our bipartisan bill would enhance the Federal Government's efforts to recruit and retain individuals possessing skills critical to preserving our national security. Through a targeted student loan repayment program and fellowships for graduate students, this legislation would help eliminate the Government's shortfall in science, mathematics, and foreign language skills.

I am pleased to note that the Committee on Governmental Affairs favorably reported S. 589 in June. When this bill comes before the Senate for consideration, I urge swift passage so that Federal agencies with direct responsibility for protecting our homeland have personnel with foreign language and other necessary skills to deter and prevent another terrorist attack.

IRAQ AND AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I rise to call the Senate's attention to a very important address that my distinguished senior colleague, the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, delivered today on America's foreign policy and our ongoing operations in Iraq. I commend Senator BIDEN for his wise and eloquent words, and I hope that all of my colleagues will take note of this insightful address.

Senator BIDEN delivered this address today on the one-year anniversary of the bipartisan hearings he held last year as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, in which the committee explored many of the very questions that are bedeviling us today in post-war Iraq. Those hearings raised, before the war, all of the questions we are confronted with today with respect to how many troops we will need to maintain in Iraq and for how long, as well as how much the reconstruction of Iraq will cost and how we can best secure international cooperation to share the burdens of bringing peace and democracy to Iraq. Indeed, Chairman BIDEN said at the very first of those hearings last year, "We need a better understanding of what it would take to secure Iraq and rebuild it economically and politically. It would be a tragedy if we removed a tyrant in Iraq, only to leave chaos in his wake." One can only wish that the administration had paid more attention to the questions the committee raised and some of the warnings that the committee received from the distinguished witnesses that testified during those hearings.

Senator BIDEN's speech today was an unapologetic defense of the decision to go to war in Iraq. "Anyone who can't acknowledge that the world is better off without [Saddam] is out of touch," he said. "The cost of not acting against Saddam would have been much greater,

and so is the cost of not finishing the job." At the same time, Senator BIDEN's speech today was also a ringing affirmation of the historical tradition of bipartisan foreign policy that has been the hallmark of this institution and of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in particular. He suggests that today, and I quote, "the stakes are too high and the opportunities too great to conduct foreign policy at the extremes."

In very convincing terms, Senator BIDEN argues that we need to chart a sensible path between the prescriptions of neo-conservative purists, who affirm a strident unilateralism, and multi-lateral purists, who shrink from forcefully acting in the absence of international consensus. Again I quote: "What we need isn't the death of internationalism or the denial of stark national interest, but a more enlightened nationalism—one that understands the value of institutions but allows us to use military force, without apology or apprehension if we have to, but does not allow us to be so blinded by the overwhelming power of our armed forces that we fail to see the benefit of sharing the risks and the costs with others."

As Senator BIDEN argues, we need to act forcefully, but humbly in the world today. We need to be unapologetic in the post-9/11 world about fighting for the security of our people. But we need to pursue our goals, as Thomas Jefferson once said, "with a decent respect to the opinions of mankind." The course that Senator BIDEN outlined today is the course we should follow, Mr. President. Ultimately, I believe that most Americans will conclude that we were right to act in Iraq. We also need to see the job through. But we need to reengage with the international community and make them partners in the noble work of securing the peace in Iraq and spreading freedom and democracy throughout the region. Again, I commend Senator BIDEN's address to my colleagues' attention, and I ask unanimous consent that the full text of it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE NATIONAL DIALOGUE ON IRAQ + ONE YEAR
(By Senator Joseph R. Biden, Jr., The
Brookings Institute, July 31, 2003)

INTRODUCTION: AMERICA'S PLACE IN THE WORLD

Most Americans don't know what you and I know, that there's a war being waged in Washington to determine the direction of our foreign policy. It goes well beyond the ordinary skirmishes that are the stuff of politics and tactics. This war is philosophical. This war is strategic and its outcome will shape the first fifty years of the twenty-first century, just as the consensus behind containment shaped the last fifty years.

Right now, the neo-conservatives in this Administration are winning that war. They seem to have captured the heart and mind of the President, and they're controlling the foreign policy agenda. They put a premium on the use of unilateral power and have a set

of basic prescriptions with which I fundamentally disagree. Just as I disagree with those in my own Party who have not yet faced the reality of the post-9-11 world, and believe we can only exercise power if we act multilaterally.

I don't question the motives of either the neo-conservatives or the pure multilateralists. They genuinely view the world differently than I do. Suffice it to say, in my view the neo-cons and the pure multilateralists are both wrong. What we need isn't the death of internationalism or the denial of stark national interest, but a more enlightened nationalism—one that understands the value of institutions but allows us to use military force, without apology or apprehension if we have to, but does not allow us to be so blinded by the overwhelming power of our armed forces that we fail to see the benefit of sharing the risks and the costs with others.

In my view, the stakes are too high and the opportunities too great to conduct foreign policy at the extremes.

ONE YEAR AGO

Exactly one year ago today, when I was Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee we began a series of bipartisan hearings on America's policy toward Iraq.

Our purpose was to start a national dialogue and give the American people an informed basis upon which to draw their own conclusions. At that first hearing, I said "President Bush has stated his determination to remove Saddam from power a view many in Congress share . . ." and I was among them. I also said as clearly as I could "If [removing Saddam] is the course we pursue . . . it matters profoundly how we do it and what we do after we succeed."

Now, a year later, Saddam is no longer in power and that's a good thing. His sons Ouday and Qusay have been killed. That's another good thing. They deserve their own special place in hell. But the mission is hardly accomplished. The new day in the Middle East has not yet dawned.

We're still at war. American soldiers are still dying, one, two, three at a time. Iraq is still not secure. Still no one has told our troops that they'll have to stay for a long time in large numbers; that they'll have to tough it out. Most Americans still don't realize it's costing us a billion dollars a week to keep our troops in Iraq, and billions more in reconstruction, and revenue from Iraqi oil will not cover these costs.

And we still haven't heard a single clear statement from the President articulating what his policy is in general and, specifically, that securing Iraq will cost billions of dollars, require tens of thousands of American troops for a considerable amount of time, and that it's worth it. And, most importantly, why it's in our national interest to stay the course.

Some in my own Party have said it was a mistake to go into Iraq in the first place, and the benefit is not worth the cost. I believe they're wrong. The cost of not acting against Saddam would have been much greater, and so is the cost of not finishing the job. The President is popular. The stakes are high. The need for leadership is great.

I wish he'd used some of his stored-up popularity to make what I admit is an unpopular case. I wish the President, instead of standing on an aircraft carrier in front of a banner that said: "Mission Accomplished" would have stood in front of a banner that said: "We've Only Just Begun."

I wish he would stand in front of the American people and say: "My fellow Americans, we have a long and hard road ahead of us in Iraq, but we have to stay in Iraq. We have to finish the job. If we don't, the following will