

York (Mr. MEEKS) in that commendation to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK).

Mr. MEEK of Florida. If the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) could yield while I call my mother so she can watch. Both of the gentlemen are saying these wonderful things about me. Go ahead.

Mr. CONYERS. This has been very important; and, of course, it is very clear that this is the beginning of our inquiries into U.S. activities, conduct, action, in front of and behind the scenes with regard to this poor, distraught, economically strapped nation.

We have a much wider obligation than has been employed so far, and I think the Congressional Black Caucus, the Hispanic Caucus which has joined with us, the Progressive Caucus, the Pacific-Asian caucus, the Native American Caucus, we have all been working together with a number of people. The gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) is in at least one of those caucuses, but there are a number of other people that are coming in to join us because democracy is being tested by what we do and what we say.

It is very important. We met with the CARICOM leaders and its chairman, just before we met in the United Nations; and it was very obvious to them that if this could happen to Haiti, it could happen to them.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Just on that point, because, I think it is important, on the whole western hemisphere because the first statement that we heard from President Chavez from Venezuela is indicating that Venezuela is not Haiti. Because just in April of 2003, there was an attempted coup there, again, threatening democracy; and we stood idly by. And but for the people of Venezuela who decided that they were not going to allow the coup to stand and put the president back, we were silent on that.

Our hands were kind of caught, the administration's hands I should say, because the gentleman is correct. I do not think the Congress would have acted that way, but the administration's hand was caught in a cookie jar. Here we come just a few months, we move from that, and we have the same kind of coup. There is a lot of similarities in that, whereas we seem to disregard the institution of democracy because of the dislike of who happens to be the democratically elected president. What we should be doing is looking to see how we can strengthen those institutions of democracy, how we can be helpful to strengthen those institutions as opposed to saying that the way you do that is to have a coup d'etat which gets rid of government altogether and causes mayhem.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Let me just say this, there is a footprint of drug activity in the Caribbean. So that means that you have well-financed individuals that have guns that have now been green-lighted by this administration, that it is okay. And if I were the prime

minister of any country in that area, I would be very concerned.

You would assume that the U.S. would help put a stop to this kind of thing. This is the vacation capital of the Caribbean. They are not used to worrying about coups and all these little different things. But if they watch very slowly over a 4-week period, drug dealers, known criminals, thugs going through Haiti and if you notice as they are starting to progress, they are getting body armor, helmets, fully automatic AR-15s, M-16s.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Where do they come from?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. They say they came from the Dominican Republic. Also, there was a question about the U.S. selling arms to the Dominican Republic, some of those same arms that ended up in Haiti.

So I am not a man with conspiracy theory here. And take it from my good friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), this is not the Kendrick Meek Report. This is factual. So we have a lot to be worried about. And like I am saying to Americans, what this administration is doing as it relates to putting our armed services and making the job harder, we could have had peacekeeping troops in there. We could have stopped the violence, and we could have come up with a peaceful solution.

Mr. CONYERS. Under the Special Orders that we will be taking tomorrow evening, I will be able to report to you the whereabouts of young Duvalier, who is reported today to be planning to return to Haiti. And there is a young gentleman evicted from Haiti named Constant in New York.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. He is in my district.

Mr. CONYERS. We have to watch where he is at all times. His record is bloody and long and unsavory. And so I am very glad that both of the gentleman, who have enormous Haitian constituents, are here not just because of their numbers, but because American democracy is on trial in Haiti.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. As we close, Mr. Speaker, and I want to thank the Members of the House and the Democratic leader for allowing us to have this moment to address not only Members of the House, but the American people and that we think long and hard about the decisions that the President is making. We think we should not automatically give instant credibility to Saturday-night decisions.

I am pretty sure there is a strong argument to justify the reason why we went in and we told President Aristide what we told him when we told him. I am pretty sure that there is a strong argument when we said you have to sign this letter of resignation not once, but twice, before you board the plane to save your own life. I am pretty sure there is an argument. But I will tell you as we look on the annals of history of this country and how we treat democracies, like it or not, there has to

be a better way. For us to make sure that we assure the safety of those peacekeeping troops that are there, some that are Americans, some that are do-gooders at the United Nations, we need to make sure that we do not put them in harm's way.

Mr. Speaker, I pray and I hope that we do not have any harm come to any of the peacekeepers that are there. I pray and hope that the killings stop on both sides of the ball as it relates to Haitian people.

Mr. Speaker, with that I will close. I am proud to be a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, and I hope in the future that we can change some of the mistakes that have been made in the last 84 hours.

REWRITING AMERICAN HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, as I sit and listen to my colleagues discuss the events in Haiti, I cannot help but think about the fact that although they are quite concerned about the recent events and that Mr. Aristide has been ousted, it is important I think for us all to recognize that it is the people of Haiti that ousted Mr. Aristide; and whether our colleagues in the House of Representatives do not like that or not, it is really irrelevant.

He was, in fact, a socialist and rather incompetent administrator; and it is not surprising that his regime came to an end.

At any rate, let me pose a question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, would you believe that in the textbook in a school district in New Mexico, an introduction to that textbook which is, by the way, called "500 Years of Chicano History In Pictures," states that, and remember, this is a textbook in a public school in the United States of America, specifically now in New Mexico. And this is not a question being posed. What I am going to read here is not what somebody just suggests.

□ 1945

This is what the textbook purports to be true. It said that this textbook was written "in response to the bicentennial celebration of the 1776 American Revolution." You think good, nice idea, "and it's lies." Its stated purpose is to "celebrate our resistance." Who are they talking to here? Celebrate our resistance to being colonized and absorbed by racist empire builders?

The book describes defenders of the Alamo as slave owners, land speculators and Indian killers, calls Davey Crockett a cannibal, and it said that the 1857 war on Mexico, not war with Mexico, war on Mexico was an unprovoked U.S. invasion.

Chapters include headings like Death to the Invader. This is the chapter

heading: U.S. Conquest and Betrayal. Here is another chapter heading: We Are Now a U.S. Colony in Occupied America, and They Stole the Land.

Now this is a textbook. This is what has been printed. This is what has been adopted. This is what is being used in schools in New Mexico. I do not know how widespread this is. I do not know how many other schools have adopted it. I do not know whether it is on anybody's recommended reading list for children, but I do know that, as bizarre as all of this sounds, it is not unique. This is not an aberration. This kind of revisionist history, this kind of venomous descriptions of the United States is not unique.

That should concern us all, I think, and it is what I want to talk about to some extent this evening: What is happening to the teaching of our history, our culture and the heritage we call Western civilization, and why I think it is important to address this issue in this body.

There was an old chant during the 1970s, I think it was, maybe late 1960s, early 1970s. College campuses in reference to maybe Ho Chi Minh. Students would chant Ho Ho Ho, Western Civ has got to go. I remember that on my campus as a matter of fact, and it has gone by the way. It has gone. Seventy percent of all of the elite institutions of higher education in this country have dumped it from their course list and from the curriculum. They will not teach Western civilization anymore, and quite frankly, if this is a reflection of the way Western civilization is taught to students, not just in high schools but colleges, which of course it is, then I am glad they are not teaching it anymore because they are not teaching Western civilization. They are teaching a hatred for Western civilization and a hatred for everything we are as a Nation because, Mr. Speaker, we are a reflection of that civilization, a Judeo-Christian heritage about which we can be very proud, the story of which we should pass on to the children who come into our schools and the immigrants who come into this country.

Let us go through some other interesting examples of what we have found in the textbooks of America and why today at 10 o'clock across the street I and several other Members gathered to announce that we have introduced a resolution into this body. Simply put, the resolution says that children graduating from schools in this country should be able to articulate an appreciation for Western civilization. That is it. That is it. Does not mandate anything on schools. Does not demand that we change textbooks. Does not do anything. It just says that we think, as a body, that children graduating from our schools should be able to articulate an appreciation for Western civilization.

Would you think, Mr. Speaker, that that is a contentious amendment or resolution? Would you think that that

is something where people would respond vitriolically and say how dare you? But they did. But they did.

The National Education Association thinks it is deplorable. By the way, there were similar press conferences held throughout the country today by State legislators or press releases they sent out saying they were introducing similar resolutions in their State legislature. We have probably, I do not know, 10 or 15 State legislatures that have agreed to take on this challenge. We have hundreds of individuals who have gone to our Web site on their own. I mean, it was amazing that even before we announced this today, we had all kinds of folks who had gone to the Web site, www.house.gov/tancredo, pulled up, and when the pop up came up, it is called Our Heritage, Our Hope. They went to that page, and they saw the resolution. They saw the resolution that the State legislature was going to introduce, and they saw a resolution they could bring to their school board, a similar resolution, asking that the board actually prepare students who would be able to articulate an appreciation for Western civilization. There is plenty of opposition to this. It is just amazing but there is.

People ask me why did I do this, why did I find it necessary to actually take this action and introduce a resolution. Well, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues know that I spend a great deal of time on the floor of this House and talking to you and other Members about immigration related issues and my concerns that our country is being divided up, it is being balkanized, that we are not encouraging assimilation, that we are encouraging this fragmentation of America by telling people who come here that they should not become part of the American experience; there is nothing really good about it; that they should keep their own languages. We should teach those languages in the school instead of English. We should encourage them to stay separate. We should encourage them actually to even keep their own political affiliation with the country they came from. We tell them they can become dual citizens. We send all kinds of messages to them that there is nothing good about America. Why would they want to attach themselves to this kind of a country?

We tell them this and we tell their children that when they come to school, and we wonder why we are having a hard time actually creating a homogenous society. We really wonder what is happening to us. This is one reason why I address this issue, because I believe that we are telling our children and the children of immigrants that there is nothing of value in Western civilization or in the United States of America.

I went to a school in my district about 2 or 3 weeks ago when we were on break. It was a high school, brand new high school, good principal, good teachers, as far as I could tell certainly, kids

that had been relatively well-schooled in math maybe and reading. I do not know. I cannot tell you that I saw their CSAT scores or anything, but it seemed like a good school. Brand new, all the best accoutrements of education, and all these kids came to talk in an auditorium with me, and we had a really great kind of discussion, and then they started sending questions up to me.

One question that was posed to me was this. They said, what do you think is the most severe problem we face in this country, and I said, let me ask a question here, and then I can tell you what I think that problem is. I said how many people here in this auditorium, 150 I would say, 150 to 200, I am not sure how many, I said how many people here would say that you believe you live in the best country in the world. Simple question. There was a pause. A few hands began to go up. Maybe two dozen eventually raised their hand out of 150 to 200 people. I said, well, let me ask you about Western civilization. Do you realize you are a product of that and do you think by and large it is a good thing? Are you proud of that? Well, of course, no response to that one really. I said, well, then I can answer your question about what I think is the biggest problem we face. This is it.

Now, there were other kids in that room, Mr. Speaker, that I felt wanted to say, yes. You could tell that they were. I have been a teacher, was a teacher for years, and I have seen that look on their face. It is, I put my hand up, he may call on me, and I will be able to actually defend this proposition. That was the feeling I got that held them back, not necessarily that they did not like America, they did not think it was a good country, the best country to live in. It was, they could not defend it, they could not defend that proposition.

You wonder why. You wonder how it could be that by the time a child gets to high school that they would feel uncomfortable with saying, yeah, yeah, man, this is great, it is a country of freedom and we have got the Bill of Rights and just some things that you maybe reel off that you think are pretty good things and the reason why you live here, but they could not.

Not too long thereafter I met with a whole group of teachers. These were teachers from the Cherokee Creek schools. They were all social studies teachers. It was one of those in-service days. They were all supposed to come and hear me speak as part of their in-service. Some of them boycotted, would not come, because I was the speaker, understandable, but I would say again maybe 75 to 100 teachers.

I brought this issue up, and I told them what had happened in the other school. I said, do you believe it? Do you believe it? Again, maybe a couple of dozen, and I thought to myself, no wonder, of course. It is not a surprise then if the teachers in this room do not believe that they live in the best country

in the world, why would they teach their children that? Why would they teach students that? But what they teach them is to be critical of everything.

I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, I do not want us to tell children that all of our history is of glory and promise and hope. Certainly that is not true. Certainly there are many things we have done wrong, but let me suggest, Mr. Speaker, there is something absolutely unique about this country that deserves to be told, a story that deserves to be told and it is this.

Of all the countries on this planet, one, just one, started on the basis of ideas and ideals back in the 1700s. Every other country came about because somebody carved it up, conquered it, drew the lines or whatever, but we started the whole concept of starting a country with an idea. And where do these ideas come from? They are the ideas of Western civilization. They are the products of literally thousands of years of human development, starting with the Greeks and the Romans.

Certain concepts are uniquely Western. No other civilization can claim them. How about the concept of the rule of law as opposed to the rule of man? Uniquely Western. It is ours. It is good. It is a good thing. We are trying our best to right now plant those seeds in far off lands and are spending treasure, both monetary and human, in pursuit of that goal. The rule of law over the rule of man, not a dictator, not Saddam or Qusay or Uday, but the rule of law. That is what we are trying to do.

It is a noble cause. The men and women who are trying to plant those seeds are being fired on every day, some losing their lives, seems like every day.

□ 2000

But it is for a noble cause, Mr. Speaker. I believe that.

But how long would I believe those things if I had been taught every single day things like this: in a textbook called "Across the Centuries," which is used for seventh grade history, and, boy, I have to put the word history in quotation marks there. That is my editorial comment. The book defines the word jihad as, "To do one's best to resist temptation and overcome evil." So now this is what children are taught the word jihad means.

When this child watches a program on television and this word is used, and it is a word used in conjunction with someone who has just blown himself or herself up, and a lot of other innocent human beings around them, this kid is supposed to think that that is what somebody is doing in order to resist temptation and overcome evil. And if we condemn jihad against the United States, then we are condemning someone who is just simply trying to overcome evil. This is what we tell our children?

In 2002, the "New Guidelines for Teaching History" in New Jersey's public schools failed to even mention America's Founding Fathers, the Pilgrims, or the Mayflower. In the Prentice Hall history textbook, used by students in Palm Beach County high schools, titled "A World Conflict," the first five pages of the World War II chapter focus entirely on topics such as gender roles in the Armed Forces, racial segregation and the war, internment camps, and women and the war effort.

This is the way we introduce World War II to the students. It is all about this stuff, and not about trying to save civilization from a dark age; not about trying to stop a psychopathic killer who would have in fact destroyed the world. No, no, World War II was what do we think about the gender roles in the Armed Forces.

We have this list and many, many others on our Web site; and again I am going to say, Mr. Speaker, that it is www.house.gov/tancredo, and one can go to "Our Heritage, Our Hope." Mr. Speaker, there are people who can help us out there. They can sign up and help us take a resolution to their school board. It is all on there, and we will give them all the help they want.

Now, here is McDougal's textbook. And, by the way, I used a textbook 30 years ago by McDougal that is completely different from this one when I taught seventh, eighth, and ninth grade civics at Drake Junior High in Arvada, Colorado.

Here is what this one says about American history. It teaches that Sitting Bull had strength of character while Custer was a fool and rode to his death. Now I am not saying Sitting Bull did not have strength of character and purpose; but, again, look at the way all these things are presented. It discusses U.S. soldiers killing Indian women and children in Sand Creek and Wounded Knee, but fails to mention the Indian killings and the kidnapping of white women and children the summer before Sand Creek.

It devotes 180 lines of text to discrimination in the United States in the late 1800s and 1900s, 180 lines of text. It notes in the context of the Nazi Holocaust that George Custer used the term "final solution." It devotes 107 lines to the racist internment of Japanese during World War II, but nothing on the Japanese rape of Nanking or the 1942 Bataan death march. Not a word. It claims that anybody who opposes unlimited immigration is influenced by racism; that they were influenced by racism, especially in the 1920s, and were anti-immigrant.

Further, it editorializes that George W. Bush's conservative administration and policies are extreme. This is a textbook. It states that the Reagan-Bush "conservative agenda" limits advances in civil rights for minorities and that the conservatives' bid to dismantle Great Society social programs could be compared to abandoning the Nation.

I am telling you, Mr. Speaker. I mean, yes, I expect that here on the floor of the House. I expect to hear that from our opponents. Understandably, this is the place where this kind of tussle goes on. I expect to see it on the editorial pages of the papers in my district. They are all pretty liberal. I expect to see it by commentators in those newspapers, in the Wall Street Journal, in the New York Times, and The Washington Post. Yes, I expect to see all of this. But in a textbook? In a history textbook?

It also states that communism had potential totalitarian underpinnings. Potential? It contrasts Chiang Kai-Shek's repressive rule in China with Mao Zedong's benevolence toward peasants in the 1940s. It fails to mention the death of about 65 million Chinese after Mao came to power in 1949.

It classes sex roles in marriages with slavery as instances of inequality. It states that sex roles in marriage and in the family foster discrimination and inequality.

The Prentice Hall textbook "America: Pathway to the Present" contains references to Ngo Dinh Diem's repression in South Vietnam, but no references to the purge by Communists in North Vietnam from 1951 to 1956, which killed about 50,000 Vietnamese.

It states that Bush's 1,088 ads attacking Dukakis created a nasty contest, alienating some voters and contributing to low voter turnout.

It discusses the introduction of Old World diseases into the New World in the Colombian Exchange, but it does not discuss American diseases brought back to Europe. In fact, a lethal strain of syphilis, probably from America, killed many Europeans in the early 1500s.

Now, all these things are factual. And I am not suggesting for a moment that we should not talk about the problems that happened when Columbus came and the clash of civilizations. Would it be, I wonder, chauvinistic here and too one-sided to suggest that in the course of world history that whenever two civilizations clash the one with the greater technology is almost always, in fact always is the victor. And in the case of the clash of civilizations here on this continent, the fact is that the greater technology, the civilization with the greater technology, was the victor.

It does not excuse all of the problems that were inherent in that time frame and in that manifest destiny that we were pursuing. It does not excuse it and should not be overlooked. But is it the only story? Is that the only way to project American history and Western Civilization? Is that the only context we can actually think of to discuss this in for students? Is there anything that has happened here worthy of note from a positive standpoint?

The same "Pathways to the Present" argues that traditional sex roles deny women full equality because it does not empower them to perform as men. It

fails to mention in the brief reference it has to Thanksgiving that the Pilgrims were thanking God.

Now, there is Holt Rinehart Winston's "American Nation in the Modern Era."

And why I want to go through these, Mr. Speaker, I know it is lengthy, but I want to show the things I have pointed out were not aberrations. They were not just radical examples of this radical multiculturalist philosophy that actually permeates our system and our schools. It is the norm.

I talked yesterday to an editor at the Rocky Mountain News about this issue, and he said, well, you know, I do not know. I look at my kid's textbook and, admittedly, she is in a private school, so I am not sure it is the same thing, but I do not see a lot of this stuff. But he said, I do notice they are just not being taught American history, not any kind. Not this kind, but not any kind.

That certainly may be the case, but the problem here is there is simply a lack of American history or Western Civilization being taught all together. Whatever is the problem, whether it is this kind of revisionist history that is being taught, whether it is these kinds of skewed examples of who we are and what we are, or the fact that there is nothing at all, there is a problem. There is a problem because when we ask children, as I did, if they believed in who we are and what we are, they could not defend it. This is problematic, and it is something we should try to address.

Holt Rinehart Winston's "American Nation in the Modern Era" includes an exercise calling for students to criticize but not to defend nativists' support for immigration restrictions in the 1800s.

Again, could it be possible that some people during that period of time were concerned about things other than the race of the people coming in to the United States? Could it possibly be?

This links anybody who is opposed to immigration reform as racist and discriminating. It associates immigration restrictions with intolerance and discrimination.

I am surprised I did not get a mention in this book, but it is a little too early, I guess, for me.

It contains the theme that the only cause of violence in America, especially in the South in the Reconstruction area, were white racists. No other objection to radical reconstructionism. It devotes 1,456 lines to social protests by ethnic and other groups from the 1950s to the 1970s, but far fewer lines to U.S. involvement in World War I and II.

These things are not unique to just textbooks, by the way. At our colleges and universities there are a lot of awards that are given every year, called the Pollys, and they are for outrageous activities or behaviors or whatever on college campuses. They are as follows:

These are some of the events on college campuses: University of California at Berkeley. Student radicals broke into a Berkeley student office, stole the entire 2,000 press run of a conservative newspaper, the California Patriot, then threatened the editors with death when they filed a police report. It is believed the crime was committed by members of MeChA, a Mexican liberation group at Berkeley.

At Tufts University, hooded leftists assaulted a conservative student. The university let the attackers off with only a warning.

At San Diego State and at the University of North Carolina, campus administrators blame campus patriots and America for the terrorist attacks on September 11.

That was 2002.

The University of Oregon. Elements of the so-called Animal Liberation Movement specializes in "liberating lab animals and destroying private property through vandalism and arson" have an office at the University of Oregon in Eugene. Their newspaper, paid for by student fees, is The Insurgent. The December 8 issue, which contained an 8-page insert titled "The ALF Primer: Your Guide to Economic Sabotage and the Animal Liberation Front". It talks about arson and what else you can do to push this particular idea and agenda. A simple way to burn a vehicle is to place a sheet or blanket on top or underneath and soak it with a flammable liquid.

The university does not go after this group. They let them stay on campus.

□ 2015

The textbooks, of course, and professors at universities, things that are said about America and our involvement in Iraq, it is all absolutely incredible and absolutely one-sided. So that certainly does not help.

What one would hope is that children coming out of high schools in this country would have what is often referred to in the parlance in edu-speak as critical thinking skills. That is what we are supposed to teach children, critical thinking skills, so they are able to look at two sides of an argument and make some intelligent decision about which side is correct. But you can only have critical thinking skills if you are taught both sides of an issue, if you are shown there are two sides to these issues.

When children come out of our high schools and into these kinds of institutions, and we have literally scores of examples of things that happen and are stated on campuses all over the United States, it is no wonder that we see strange and bizarre reactions. For example, Antonin Scalia, a noted jurist speaking recently at an ivy league college almost was not allowed to speak. The students and professors protested the fact that he was allowed to speak on a college campus. They had big demonstrations outside. He is a member of the U.S. Supreme Court, a noted jurist;

and we had people in our country at institutions of higher education, and I have to put that in quotes, too, saying that he could not speak because what he said they did not agree with. It did not fit the model, this radical multiculturalist model that they had been force-fed for years. It is intolerance that we are, in fact, promulgating; intolerance for any other kind of idea other than that pushed by the radical left and the cult of multiculturalists out there.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is problematic, and I believe there are things that we can and should do about it. If nothing else, we should simply start a debate about this. I hope that our resolution today helps generate some discussion and does help generate a debate about what exactly it is we expect from the students that are in our schools and what we expect from people coming into this country.

Mr. Speaker, I had occasion to talk to a bishop, a Catholic bishop in Denver, Colorado, named Bishop Gomez. We had a breakfast meeting awhile back. During the course of the discussion which naturally revolved around the issue of immigration, and I say naturally because that seems to be the issue I find myself discussing more and more often, Bishop Gomez said something to me and the other people at the table that I thought was quite incredible. He said, Congressman, I do not know why you are worried about the Mexicans coming into this country. He said, They do not want to be Americans. That was his comment.

I said, Bishop, that is the problem, of course. That does not make me feel good. If you think I am relieved by the fact that we have people coming into the country by the millions who do not want to be Americans, combined with the fact that everywhere they go in our society we tell them they should not be, if you believed what was in the textbooks that I just quoted, why would you want to connect with this country? You would want to take the benefits of a good job and send money back home, but you would not want to connect with it emotionally or politically. You would say, no, I think I will keep my citizenship in my country of origin. And between 5 and 10 million, huge numbers of people, are claiming dual citizenship in this country, which never happened before.

There are several great books, of course, but one is called "The Clash of Civilizations" by Samuel Huntington. I found it to be quite profound and quite provocative, and I certainly recommend it. But I harken back to another book I read a long time ago. It is called "The Disuniting of America," and the author was a guy by the name of James Schlesinger, Jr. Mr. Schlesinger is not known as a conservative pundit or author, and he is not. He is a liberal. But the book was, I thought, quite compelling. Again, I recommend it to anyone. It is a great book, "The Disuniting of America." He talks in

ways far more articulate than I, and he talks about this phenomenon. He talks about dividing this country and what we are doing to ourselves and what is happening to us. Why is it so hard for us to think about America and Western Civilization as a place and a civilization respectively of value? Is it because we are afraid to be patriots or to teach children to be patriots?

There is a fascinating article by Donald Kagan in "The Intercollegiate Review" in the spring 2002 called "Terrorism and the Intellectuals." He says, "Free countries like our own have had even more powerful claim on the patriotism of their citizens than do others, and our country has an even greater need of it than most. Every country requires a high degree of cooperation and unity among its citizens if it is to achieve the internal harmony that every good citizen requires. Unity and cooperation must rest on something shared and valued in common.

"Most countries have relied upon the common ancestry and traditions of their people as the basis of their unity, but the United States of America can rely on no such commonality. We are an enormously diverse and varied people, almost all immigrants or the descendants of immigrants. We come from every country on the face of the Earth. Our forebears spoke, and many of us still speak, many different languages. And all the races and religions of the world are to be found among us. The great strengths provided by this diversity are matched by great dangers. We are always vulnerable to divisions among us that can be exploited, to set one group against another and thus to destroy the unity that enables us to flourish.

"We live in a time when civic devotion has been undermined and national unity is under attack. The individualism that is so crucial a part of our tradition is often used to destroy civic responsibility. The idea of a common American culture, enriched by the diverse elements that compose it but available equally to all, is under assault. Attempts are made to replace our common culture with narrower and politically divisive programs that are certain to set one group of Americans against another."

Mr. Speaker, it is called the textbooks of American public education.

He continues, "The answer to these problems and our only hope for the future must lie in education, which philosophers have rightly put at the center of the propagation of justice and the good society. We rightly look to education to solve the pressing current problems of our economic and technological competition with other nations, but we must not neglect the inescapable political and ethical effects of education. We in the academic community have too often engaged in miseducation. If we encourage separatism, we will get separatism and the terrible conflicts in a society that it brings. If we encourage rampant indi-

vidualism to trample on the need for a common citizenship, if we ignore civic education, the forging of a single people, the building up of a legitimate patriotism, then we will find ourselves a Nation of selfish individuals heedless of the needs of others. We will have the war of all against all, and we will have no common defense.

"The civic sense America needs can come only from a common educational effort. In telling the story of the American political experience, we must insist on the honest search for truth. We must permit no comfortable self-deception or evasion, no seeking of scapegoats; but the story of this country's vision of a free, democratic republic and of its struggle to achieve it need not fear the most thorough examination. Our country's story can proudly stand in comparison to that of any other land, and that story provides the basis for a civic devotion we so badly need.

"In spite of the shock caused by the attacks on New York and Washington and the discovery of anthrax in the mail, I am not sure we really understand how serious is the challenge that now faces us. We are only at the beginning of a long and deadly war that will inflict much loss and pain, one that will require sacrifice and steady determination during the very dark hours to come. We must be powerfully armed, morally as well as materially, if we are to do what must be done. That will take courage and unity, and these must rest on a justified and informed patriotism to sustain us through the worst times.

"A verse by Edna St. Vincent Millay provides a clear answer to the question of why Americans should love their country:

Not for the flag
Of any land because myself was born there
Will I give up my life.
But will I love that land where man is free,
And that will I defend.

"Ours is such a land.

"Up to now, too many American intellectuals and too many faculty members of our greater universities have been part of the country's problem. If we are to overcome the dangers that face us, we will need them to become part of the solution. My hope is that the natural, admirable, vitally necessary patriotism that is now gaining strength and expression among ordinary people of our land will help to educate those among us who feel intellectually superior to them. We will need that patriotism in the long, dangerous, and difficult struggle that lies before us."

Certainly I cannot say it better than Mr. Kagan. Again, that was Donald Kagan from "The Intercollegiate Review" in the spring of 2002, "Terrorism and the Intellectuals."

My little attempt, Mr. Speaker, to do what Mr. Kagan is suggesting is the resolution I mentioned earlier today. Again, it simply says that all children graduating from schools in this coun-

try should be able to articulate an appreciation for Western Civilization. It will be interesting to see and hear the debate. It will be interesting to see and hear people say, no, they should not.

IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I must begin by thanking the staff of the House of Representatives for enduring these long nights so we have a chance to speak our minds about the important subjects of the day. We certainly appreciate the Speaker and the staff who stay here into the wee hours.

I also extend my appreciation to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) for the intense causes in which he believes and for his patriotism. I must say, one of the reasons I love my country so much is we have the academic freedom that decisions about what we teach and how we teach it are made by educators and teachers and not by those of us in this Chamber, and I hope that is always the case.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about a challenge to the values that I just made reference to, probably the most important challenge to these values that we have faced in many generations in this country.

□ 2030

In the 1970s a young man named Gholam Nikbin came to the United States from Iran. He came here to study at an American university. While he was here, the fundamentalist revolution in Iran took place and in 1979 his country changed dramatically and he chose not to return to Iran. At the time he came to the United States he was a person who practiced the Islamic faith. While he was in the United States, he met an American citizen who was a member of the Mormon faith and he married this American citizen and he converted. Mr. Nikbin converted to the Mormon faith himself. That marriage subsequently ended in divorce and in 1991, Mr. Nikbin returned to his native Iran to live his life. While there, he met another woman and they decided to get married and he had a wedding. During his wedding, members of the police force in Iran raided the wedding because the men and women at the wedding were engaged in dancing. Men were dancing with women. For this hideous offense, Mr. Nikbin was publicly lashed 40 times with a whip to punish him for his transgression against the prevailing culture.

Things grew worse for Mr. Nikbin in Iran. He was a suspicious person because he had converted to the Mormon faith and then attempted to convert back to his native Islamic faith. So in 1995 he tried to leave the country. As he was at the airport, he was intercepted by Iranian authorities who refused to let him leave the country. He