

got the job done. There is no doubt that Earl Monholland will be missed by his friends and colleagues on the Grass-tenure staff.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Dr. Allan Goodman, President of the Institute for International Education, recently passed along a speech that Senator DICK LUGAR gave at Pembroke College in Oxford, England commemorating the 100th Anniversary of the Birth of J. William Fulbright.

Senator LUGAR is one of the finest statesmen in the Senate, and I have enjoyed working closely with him on a number of issues. His speech at Pembroke College highlights his leadership and insight on U.S. foreign policy.

I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all Senators can see these thoughtful remarks.

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

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

My Lords, Ladies, and Gentlemen, it is an honor to have the opportunity to deliver this address as we commemorate the 100th anniversary of Senator J. William Fulbright's birth and celebrate the achievements of a visionary statesman, humanitarian, and son of Pembroke College. It is particularly moving to be here in a place that meant so much to Senator Fulbright and means so much to me.

Last year, I joined 25 of my classmates for the 50th reunion of the entering Class of 1954 at Pembroke College, and we have continued that reunion through our correspondence. I was the only American in the College in 1954, but was elected President of the JCR the following year in a most generous spirit of Trans-Atlantic cooperation. The election provided a spur to my vivid imagination of what might happen in years to come.

THE EXAMPLE OF SENATOR FULBRIGHT

Soon after I arrived at Pembroke, my tutor in politics, Master R.B. McCallum, told me about his tutorial work with Senator William Fulbright of Arkansas. I did not have the pleasure of serving with Senator Fulbright in the Senate. He left office in 1974, two years before I was elected to represent Indiana. But his influence on my career and development was profound and permanent.

Senator Fulbright and I shared a remarkable number of common experiences, though generally these occurred decades apart. Both Senator Fulbright and I won Rhodes Scholarships after earning our bachelor's degrees. Both of us chose to study at Pembroke College. Both of us focused much attention on government and economics while at Oxford. And both of us were blessed with the same tutor, R. B. McCallum. Senator Fulbright studied under the Master near the beginning of his career, while I was tutored much later.

Both of us were elected to the Senate from our home states—Arkansas in his case, and Indiana in mine. Both of these states are in the interior of the United States and neither was typically associated with international interests a half-century ago. But both of us sought a seat on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which has oversight of U.S. foreign policy and diplomacy. Both of us, as-

cended to the chairmanship of this Committee. Senator Fulbright, in fact, holds the record as the longest serving chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, a remarkable tenure from 1959 to 1974.

Since the beginning of the United States Senate, there have been only 1884 Senators. Of these, only 48 have served five complete six-year terms. Senator Fulbright is a member of this exclusive club, having served from 1945 through 1974. At the end of next year, I would join this group of Senators who have served at least 30 years in the Senate.

Like Senator Fulbright, I discovered the extraordinary challenges and opportunities of international education at Pembroke College—my first trip outside of the United States. The parameters of my imagination expanded enormously during this time, as I gained a sense of how large the world was, how many talented people there were, and how many opportunities one could embrace.

In my first year of residence at Pembroke College, emboldened by Master McCallum's Fulbright stories, I decided to write to Senator Fulbright. He was in the midst of an embattled relationship with Senator Joseph McCarthy of Wisconsin, and he shared with me his thoughts about the McCarthy era in a series of letters as our correspondence expanded. I was deeply moved that he took the time to write to me and even more astonished to learn, years later, that he had kept my letters.

He was especially generous to me when I became chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee in 1985 for the first time. He wrote: "It is an unusual coincidence that two Rhodes men from Pembroke should be Chairmen of the Committee. I think Cecil Rhodes would be as pleased as the two Masters of Pembroke would be." He continued to offer encouragement during visits that we enjoyed at Senate receptions and reunions. In September 1986, I had the great pleasure to join Senator Fulbright at the University of Arkansas, where he had served as President, for a celebration of the Fulbright Scholarship Program.

THE FULBRIGHT PROGRAM AT WORK

Senator Fulbright is known throughout the world for the educational exchange program that bears his name. Each year, approximately 2,600 international students receive scholarships to study in the United States through the Fulbright program. Simultaneously, it provides about 1,200 American students the opportunity to study overseas. In addition, 1,000 American scholars and 700 international scholars teach and perform research each year under Fulbright grants. Since Senator Fulbright's legislation passed in 1946, the program has provided more than 290,000 participants the chance to study, teach, and conduct research in a foreign country. As Master McCallum declared in 1963, "Fulbright is responsible for the greatest movement of scholars across the face of the earth since the fall of Constantinople in 1453."

Fulbright students and scholars are selected according to academic achievement and leadership potential. Alumni of the program have received 35 Nobel Prizes, 65 Pulitzer Prizes, 22 MacArthur Foundation "genius" awards, and 15 U.S. Presidential Medals of Freedom.

The Fulbright Program's remarkable contributions to the development of the 290,000 participants provide ample justification for the program. But Senator Fulbright expected much more. He always was unabashed in his advocacy of the program as a foreign policy tool. For him, the Fulbright Program was not intended merely to benefit individual scholars, or more generally to advance human knowledge—though those goals

have been fulfilled beyond his original expectations. The program was meant to expand ties between nations, improve international commerce, encourage cooperative solutions to global problems, and prevent war. In his book, *The Price of Empire*, he wrote: "Educational exchange is not merely one of those nice but marginal activities in which we engage in international affairs, but rather, from the standpoint of future world peace and order, probably the most important and potentially rewarding of our foreign policy activities." He called the Fulbright Scholarship Program, "a modest program with an immodest aim—the achievement in international affairs of a regime more civilized, rational, and humane than the empty system of power of the past."

For Senator Fulbright, the program also was intended to give participants a chance to develop a sense of global service and responsibility. Alumni of the program are among the most visible leaders in their respective countries. Over the decades, they have explained to their fellow citizens why diplomacy and international cooperation are important. They have been advocates of international engagement within governments, corporations, schools, and communities that do not always recognize the urgency of solving global problems.

In August of this year, I traveled to Morocco, a key U.S. ally and a lynchpin in the development of democracy and liberalism in the Arab world. I was there following a humanitarian mission to finalize the release of the last 404 Moroccan POWs held by the Polisario Front since the Algerian-Moroccan conflict over the Western Sahara. While in Morocco, I asked our Embassy in Rabat to set up a meeting with Moroccan opinion leaders to discuss bilateral ties and regional issues. It has been my experience that in most nations, such groups of opinion leaders will contain Fulbright alumni. Sure enough, two of the seven guests had benefited from study in the United States through the Fulbright program—a college President who had done research at Princeton University and a law professor who had done research at George Washington University.

In my judgment, the impact of the Fulbright program as a foreign policy tool has extended well beyond the accomplishments and understanding of its own participants. It has been the most influential large-scale model for promoting the concept of international education, and it has been the primary validation of the American university system to the rest of the world.

In the United States, we have critiqued and even lamented some aspects of our public diplomacy since the end of the Cold War. But hosting foreign students has been an unqualified public diplomacy success. In numerous hearings and discussions on public diplomacy, the Foreign Relations Committee has heard reports of the impact of foreign exchanges. Of the 12.8 million students enrolled in higher education in the United States during the last academic year, almost 600,000—some 4.6 percent—were foreign undergraduate and graduate students. My home state of Indiana currently is the temporary home of about 13,500 foreign students. The success of American universities with foreign students would not have been as profound without the stimulation of foreign interest in American higher education provided by the Fulbright program.

Last year, I traveled to Georgia and met with its new president, Mikhail Saakashvili. President Saakashvili received his law degree from Columbia University, where he studied under the Muskie Fellowship program. In fact, almost every member of his cabinet had attended an American college or university during their academic careers.

The result was that the leadership of an important country had a personal understanding of the core elements of American society and governance. Perhaps more importantly, they had an understanding and appreciation of Americans themselves. These individuals were key participants in the "Rose Revolution" in Georgia, which is transforming that country.

NATIONAL PRIDE AND NATIONAL HUMILITY

Funding a great foreign exchange program is a sign of both national pride and national humility. Implicit in such a program is the audacious view that people from other nations view one's country and educational system as a beacon of knowledge—as a place where thousands of top international scholars would want to study and live. But it is also an admission that a nation does not have all the answers—that our national understanding of the world is incomplete. It is an admission that we are just a part of a much larger world that has intellectual, scientific, and moral wisdom that we need to learn.

In a speech on the Senate floor in 1966, during the Vietnam War, Senator Fulbright underscored his concern about our national humility by saying: "Power tends to confuse itself with virtue and a great nation is particularly susceptible to the idea that its power is a sign of God's favor."

Senator Fulbright understood that a great nation must continue to invest in its own wisdom and capabilities for human interaction. He understood that no amount of military strength or even skillful decision-making could make up for a lack of alliances, trading partners, diplomatic capabilities, and international respect. Maintaining alliances and friendships between nations is hard work. No matter how close allies become, centrifugal forces generated by basic differences in the size, location, wealth, histories, and political systems of nations tend to pull nations apart. Alliances work over long periods of time only when leaders and citizens continually reinvigorate the union and its purposes.

THE BUILDING BLOCKS OF FOREIGN POLICY

Often we need to pause to remember that the practice of foreign policy is not defined by a set of decisions. Unfortunately, reporters, politicians, and even most historians portray foreign policy as a geopolitical chess game or a series of great diplomatic events. This perception is reinforced by books and movies about dramatic moments in diplomatic history, like the Cuban Missile Crisis. These events capture our imagination, because we relive the struggles of leaders during times of great risk as they weigh the potential consequences of their actions. We ask whether Presidents and Prime Ministers were right or wrong in adopting a particular strategy.

But Senator Fulbright understood that crisis decision-making is a very small slice of a nation's foreign policy. He understood that a successful foreign policy depends much more on how well a nation prepares to avoid a crisis.

When a nation gets to the point of having to make tactical choices in a time of crisis—it almost always is choosing between a bad option and a worse option. Crisis decision-making is to foreign policy what a surgeon is to personal health. Whether a body will resist disease depends on good nutrition, consistent exercise, and other healthy preparations much more than the skill of a surgeon employed as a last resort after the body has broken down. The preparation for good health and for a strong foreign policy is the part that we can best control, and it is the part that must receive most of our energies and resources.

Earlier this week, I presided over a hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that was concerned with the potential threat from avian influenza. If the H5 N1 virus develops in a way that allows it to be efficiently transmissible between humans, tens of millions of lives worldwide will be at risk. No nation is likely to be spared the effects of such a pandemic. However, nations working together to detect the emergence of new strains and to contain quickly an outbreak could greatly mitigate the risk. In a very real and discernible way, our ability to communicate and work with each other across borders may well determine the fate of millions of people. The effectiveness of our response will depend on the investments we have made in knowledge, relationships, and communications.

The same can be said for cooperation in the disarmament arena. For fourteen years, I have been engaged in overseeing and expanding the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction program. This is the U.S. effort to help the states of the former Soviet Union safeguard and destroy their vast stockpiles of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, so that they do not fall into the hands of terrorists. Just as Senator Fulbright counted scholars who benefited from his program, I have made a point of counting the weapons eliminated by the Nunn-Lugar program. Currently, almost 7,000 nuclear warheads have been safely dismantled, along with hundreds of missiles and bombers. We are in the process of destroying vast stockpiles of chemical weapons, safeguarding numerous biological weapons facilities, and providing employment to tens of thousands of weapons scientists. Each weapon that is disabled represents a small step toward security.

Explaining and promoting the Nunn-Lugar program has been complicated by the fact that most of its accomplishments have occurred outside the attention of the media. Although progress is measurable, it does not occur as dramatic events that make good news stories. At Surovatikha, for example, Russian solid fuel SS-18 and SS-19 missiles are being dismantled at a rate of four per month. This facility will grind on for years, until all the designated missiles are destroyed. At Shchuchye, the United States and Russia are building a chemical weapons destruction facility that will become operational in 2007. It will destroy about 4½ percent of Russia's currently declared chemical weapons stockpile per year. This is a painstaking business conducted far away from our shores outside the light of media interest.

The destruction of a decaying nuclear warhead, the links between international epidemiologists, and the training of an individual scholar appear to be small matters in the context of global affairs. But these are exactly the kinds of building blocks on which international security and human progress depend.

THE SOURCE OF NATIONAL POWER

Since September 11, 2001, the United States has been engaged in a debate over how to apply national power and resources most effectively to achieve the maximum degree of security. Recent foreign policy discussions have often focused on whether to make concessions to world opinion or whether to pursue perceived national security interests unencumbered by the need to seek the counsel and support of the international community. But this is a false choice. National security can rarely be separated from the support of the international community, if only because American resources and influence are finite.

Throughout this process, I have been making the point that we are not placing sufficient weight on the diplomatic and economic

tools of national power. Even as we seek to capture key terrorists and destroy terrorist cells, we must be working with many nations to perfect a longer term strategy that reshapes the world in ways that are not conducive to terrorist recruitment and influence.

To survive and to prosper in this century, the United States must assign U.S. economic and diplomatic capabilities the same strategic priority that we assign to military capabilities. We must commit ourselves to the painstaking work of foreign policy day by day and year by year. We must commit ourselves to a sustained program of repairing and building alliances, expanding trade, fighting disease, pursuing resolutions to regional conflicts, fostering and supporting democracy and development worldwide, controlling weapons of mass destruction, and explaining ourselves to the world.

Very fortunately, leaders of the United Kingdom have been thinking with us and working with us during these years of worldwide terrorist threats and severe challenges to human values. Earlier this year, I enjoyed a breakfast meeting with Prime Minister Tony Blair at the British Embassy in Washington and later a second visit with him in his offices at 10 Downing Street. We discussed development assistance and debt forgiveness in Africa; democracy building in Iraq and the wider Middle East; terrorist threats to the United States, Great Britain, and many other places; and how to maintain U.S.-UK solidarity, even in the midst of political partisanship in both the House of Commons and the U.S. Congress. Foreign Minister Jack Straw has been a frequent visitor to my Senate office, and I will enjoy additional visits with British officials in London in the next few days.

In addition to the vision of William Fulbright, which we celebrate today, I am certain he would join me in celebrating, again, the vision of Cecil Rhodes as he established the Rhodes scholarships, which brought us to Pembroke. In the years of our selection, Senator Fulbright and I were one of 32 young Americans who were given an extraordinary opportunity through the generosity of the Rhodes Trust to come to Oxford University.

We both chose Pembroke College and were admitted to this College. That opportunity changed the horizons of our lives, our expectations of what we might achieve, and our obligations to assume more risks and to undertake more challenges in the service of others.

One of my Rhodes Scholar selectors put it very bluntly when he asked, "Why should we put Rhodes Trust money on you as opposed to any of the thousands of talented young Americans we could choose?"

A host of circumstances finally made it possible for both of us to serve as a U.S. Senator and as Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. In my case, I sincerely doubt that I would have enjoyed these opportunities without those remarkably formative two years at Pembroke College. I feel safe in saying that neither Senator Fulbright nor I would have approached international scholarships, international diplomacy, and a passionate quest for world peace with the same inspiration and tenacity without our Rhodes Scholar experiences at Pembroke College, Oxford University.

As Senator Fulbright explained in a 1945 Senate speech, just before the end of the war in Europe, "Peace does not consist merely of a solemn declaration or a well-drafted Constitution. The making of peace is a continuing process that must go on from day to day, from year to year, so long as our civilization shall last."

The success of such peacemaking will depend on our willingness to prepare for the long-term future as Senator Fulbright did—

through enlightened investments in people and relationships. And it will depend upon our devotion to movements exemplified by the Fulbright Program and the Rhodes Trust that reach out to the world with both pride and humility.

SOMALIA

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep concern regarding recent news reports about piracy off the coast of Somalia. As we all know, Somalia has been without a central, recognized government for well over a decade. It has been over 3 years since I chaired a series of hearings in the Foreign Relations African Affairs Subcommittee on weak and failing states in Africa, one of which focused on the dire situation in Somalia and inadequate U.S. policy there. Years later, U.S. policy is still stagnant, I am sorry to report, and the danger persists, as these news reports indicate. The time is long overdue for the U.S. to make a long-term commitment to addressing this potential trouble spot.

I have consistently urged the Administration to be vigilant in focusing on weak states as part of the global fight against terrorism. All the characteristics of some of Africa's weakest states—manifestations of lawlessness such as piracy, illicit air transport networks, and traffic in arms and gemstones and people—can make the region attractive to terrorists and international criminals. Regrettably, Somalia is still not on the administration's radar.

According to recent press reports, pirates off the coast of Somalia are building strength and growing comfortable in expanding their attacks. Despite a lull in pirate attacks over the last 2 years, in just the last 6 months there have been 25 attacks off the coast of Somalia, according to the International Maritime Bureau. Attacks are no longer confined to the coast but reportedly include raids on ships hundreds of miles from the coast of the Indian Ocean. The resources and the audacity of the pirates appear to be growing. The attacks pose a tremendous threat to stability and economic development in the region, including neighboring countries such as Kenya and Djibouti that rely on maritime trade and tourism. The more organized the pirates become, and the more lucrative their crimes, the more we are faced with another potential front in the fight against terrorism, one involving a state-less network of some of the worst international actors.

The State Department 2004 report on counter terrorism in Africa states that the Somalia-based al-Ittihad al-Islami, AIAI, "has become highly factionalized and diffuse, and its membership is difficult to define" and that "some members are sympathetic to and maintain ties" with al-Qaida. State Department officials also acknowledge that AIAI is financing basic civil society needs in Somalia, including schools and basic

health care. The international community is failing to empower Somali civil society. Without our attention and support, how long do we expect this community to refuse basic human needs funded by terrorist organizations? And what are the consequences of groups like AIAI being perceived by the Somali people as generous benefactors? The U.S. must work harder at providing an alternative to such extremist influences in Somalia.

We can no longer insulate ourselves from weak states. We must engage. It is in our own national security interests that we work to strengthen institutions and empower civil society in weak and failing states in Africa in order to curtail opportunities for terrorists and other international criminals.

A multifaceted approach is necessary for the future of Somalia and for the future of our own campaign against terrorism. We cannot stand by as terrorist threats cross borders and destabilize the Horn of Africa. The international community must intensify its maritime vigilance. The U.S. long-term policy should include coordinating with regional actors in Africa and the international community to aid positive actors working in Somalia, build institutional capacity and legitimacy, promote national reconciliation, and sever community dependency on terrorist funding for basic services. These are difficult challenges, but Somalia is not hopeless. A transition government and opposing factions are requesting international mediation and attention. They are asking us to act, and we must answer the call, for their sake as well as ours.

CSBG

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, no one is more committed to the Community Services Block Grant than I am. The Community Services Block Grant program helps to strengthen communities through services for poor individuals and families, assisting these low-income individuals to become self-sufficient.

CSBG provides critical services to poor families throughout the country. Services offered by CSBG entities can help support these important social services programs such as: Head Start, Low Income Home Energy Assistance Programs, LIHEAP, weatherization, literacy and job training programs, child health care, after-school programs, housing and homeownership services, financial literacy and asset development, and food pantries and meal programs. In FY 2002, the 1,100 community action network served more than 13 million individuals in more than 4 million families nationwide.

Over the past few months, I have received dozens of letters from Community Action Agencies from across the country, thanking me for my efforts on behalf on the Community Services

Block Grant. I, along with Senator Chris Dodd, spearheaded a letter, signed by 56 of our colleagues, Republicans and Democrats alike, urging Senate conferees to the Labor/HHS/Education Appropriations bill to uphold the Senate funding level of \$637 million. I understand that the conference report on the Labor/HHS/Education Appropriations bill includes \$637 million for CSBG.

I hope that the conference report on the Labor/HHS/Education Appropriations bill will be enacted soon and that these vital resources will be directed to important services for low income individuals.

However, I cannot support the Harkin amendment because if that amendment passed, it would result in an interruption of funding not only for CSBG, but for all the social spending programs that low income individuals depend upon. That is not a responsible course of action.

We should not make support for CSBG a partisan issue—we should work together to enact the Labor/HHS/Education Appropriations Conference Report so that money can be appropriately directed to fund these important services.

COMMERCE-JUSTICE-SCIENCE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I want to express my disappointment in the cuts that the conference report for H.R. 2862, the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2006, made to important grant programs that assist State and local law enforcement agencies. I voted in favor of H.R. 2862 because of the other important programs that it funds, but I have grave concerns about these particular grant funding cuts.

I believe that Congress, in partnership with States and local communities, has an obligation to provide the tools, technology, and training that our Nation's law enforcement officers need in order to protect our communities. I have consistently supported a number of Federal grant programs, including the Community Oriented Policing Services, COPS, Program, which is instrumental in providing funding to train new officers and provide crime-fighting technologies. I also have long supported funding for the Byrne Grant Program, which provides funding to help fight violent and drug-related crime, including support to multijurisdictional drug task forces, drug courts, drug education and prevention programs, and many other efforts to reduce drug abuse and prosecute drug offenders. I know how important these programs have been to Wisconsin law enforcement efforts, in particular with regard to fighting the spread of methamphetamine abuse. Both of these programs suffered major funding cuts in the conference report for H.R. 2682, which the Senate passed on November 16, 2005.