a bachelor's degree from Saginaw Valley State College in 1997.

Jerry could not have achieved these great accomplishments without the support of his loving family and including his mother Vanilla Prophet and his brothers and sisters, Graylon, Calvin Conrad, and Sharon Prophet, Sandra Jean Foster, Tonia Hickman, and Teri Atkins.

Although he is leaving the police force, I am confident that he will continue to serve and protect his community, I request that my colleagues join me in wishing Sergeant Prophet and his family best wishes as he enters a new phase of his life.

IN HONOR OF 32-YEAR CAREER OF MORRIE TURNER

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join the African American Advocate in celebration of Mr. Morrie Turner's dedication to art and education, and to chronicle his 32-year career as a prominent cartoonist and creator of the nationally syndicated cartoon strip ''Wee Pals.'' Morrie Turner is the first African-American to be a syndicated cartoonist and to publish a cartoon strip in a mainstream, metropolitan newspaper. He uses his skills and talents to educate children—and adults—about black history, community issues and services, health and safety.

For four decades, Morrie has produced ''Wee Pals.'' The multiethnic cast of characters are reflections of his childhood neighborhood. He highlights the cultural and historical accomplishments of African-Americans through ''Soul Corner.''

Morrie Turner is a native and resident of Oakland—San Francisco Bay Area, CA, born on December 11, 1923, one of four brothers to James Edward and Nora C. Turner. He attended Cole Elementary and McClymonds High School in Oakland; and graduate from Berkely High School in 1942. In 1943, he was drafted into the U.S. Army.

Morrie began to draw at an early age which provided him with joy and satisfaction. With the support of his family, wife Letha and son Morrie, Jr., he began to pursue a cartoon career. Though it was difficult to break into cartooning with black characters, Morrier's ''Wee Pals'' was syndicated in 1964. He began to receive fan mail from across the country. Many of his fans did not know he was black. One letter asked, ''Do you really know some Black people?'' Morrie responded, ''Just my mother, father, wife, and son, for starters.''

Morrie actively participates in the life of the community. In 1960, he was a delegate to the White House Conference on Children. In 1967, he entertained troops in Vietnam. He spends much of his time sharing with young people about cartooning and black history in schools across the country. He assists many nonprofit organizations and public agencies by producing books, T-shirts, and educational materials.

On February 24, 1996, at the Oakland Museum, Morrie Turner was honored by the African American Advocate and the bay area community for his significant contributions in promoting harmony, understanding, and acceptance of cultural diversity. The vision that ''Wee Pals'' characters may be used in classrooms and on the streets to promote cultural understanding and to provide our youth with role models will ensure ''Wee Pals'' as Morrie Turner's legacy to our children and our children's children.

CASTRO'S RUTHLESS ACT OF VIOLENCE

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my outrage over Fidel Castro's act of violence by shooting down two small unarmed civilian planes last Saturday.

Shooting down unarmed civilian planes is a flagrant violation of international law and a horribly inhumane act. There are legitimate ways for a country to protect their national borders, but the Cuban Government ignored every one of them last Saturday by shooting down these planes. International law dictates that civilian planes should not be fired upon even if they do fly into forbidden airspace. It requires warning off the approaching aircraft. But the Castro government decided to react in the most brutal way by ignoring American urgings to stay on a peaceful and legal path.

Mr. Speaker, Since Castro's rise to power, Cuba has surpassed every other Nation in the Western Hemisphere in human rights violations. Because we cannot rest in the face of the oppression of the Cuban people, I fully support the steps taken by the Clinton administration as well as the Helms-Burton legislation which imposes tighter sanctions on Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow these acts of violence to be perpetuated against any person, Cuban or American. Fidel Castro has no respect for the dignity of human life. Maybe the passage of Helms-Burton as well as additional steps taken by the administration will teach him, if not the value of human life, then the repercussions he faces when he kills unarmed American civilians.

THE NATIONAL MEDIA

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, February 28, 1996, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE NATIONAL MEDIA

Public respect for the national media has fallen in recent years. As the power of the media has shifted from local and state newspapers to national networks, I find people increasingly mistrustful of the media. Constituents ask whether they can believe what they read or see. Or, as one constituent asked, how can we know the truth? That's the most fundamental question of all.

American journalists have long had a reputation for independence and integrity combined with hardnosed reporting and sharp investigative skills. Americans have traditionally looked to the media, particularly the national media, to get basic factual information on national events. The national media often put the spotlight on difficult problems and can be an important force for change.

That pattern is changing. There are still many outstanding journalists today, and, at its best, American journalism can be very good indeed. Nonetheless, I am impressed by how many Americans are tuning out the national media, getting their information instead from non-traditional sources, such as talk radio and TV talk shows, tabloid newspapers or television shows, or special interest publications. They simply don't trust the national media anymore to give them basic facts or unbiased reporting. They find alternative media more accessible and more responsive to their concerns.

WHAT HAS CHANGED

It is hard to say why the national press is held in lower esteem today, but my suspicion is that many of its wounds have been self-inflicted. Some journalists appear to have trouble sorting out what's hot news and what's meaningful, what's topical and what really has consequences for the nation. My sense is that the press now seeks to shape public attitudes more than it questions, examines and describes the real world to the fullest extent possible.

Journalists are trained to seek out facts, but increasingly blur fact and opinion and infuse their stories with their opinions rather than objective facts. It often seems there are no reporters in Washington. That's an exaggeration, of course, but it makes a point that many in the media today seek to shape policy, rather than report the news. Many Washington journalists are striving to be colorful personalities. They want to get on the television talk shows. They will often make bombastic arguments and predictions and outrageous statements. What they do not exhibit is professional detachment.

Washington reporting has also become much more speculative, less factual. There is just too much careless reporting, too much cynicism, too much reliance on unnamed sources, too much instant analysis, too much of an effort to entertain, not enough effort to inform objectively.

I am astonished at the number of times I have found that journalists do not check facts, but simply write what they first hear. I wonder whether reporters are scrupulously accurate or whether they try to reshape a quote or ignore a fact or concoct a source in order to make the point they want to make. I have often had the experience of being interviewed only to discover that the journalist had already made up his mind about what to say in the piece, and was only searching for a quote to buttress his view; or have attended an event covered by the press, but find later what appears in print or on television is not the way it was.

The Washington media also show limited interest in promoting informed debate on important issues. In so many of the talk shows, squabbling and shouting matches replace dialogue and discussion. There seems to be a premium on fostering conflict rather than consensus, in encouraging extremes and discouraging moderation. The press also loves to report the misdeeds and the personal failings of public figures.

REPORTING ON POLITICS

Constituents ask overwhelmingly about the ''what'' of politics: what are we going to do about the health care system, what are we going to do to reform welfare. The national media, in contrast, often seem to think of politics as just a big game filled with players whose motive is to win, and picking the winners and the losers becomes their primary preoccupation. They see politics as a contest between political leaders, not as a clash of

ideas and proposals. They appear to have less to say about the substance and little interest in the impact of legislation on people's lives.

My impression is the Washington press corps often shows a lack of diligence, a follow-the-leader mentality. If one journalist writes about a topic, everybody writes about it. If one talks about it, everybody talks about it. If one states a ''fact,'' others accept it without checking. I often ask myself how many journalists out there think for themselves.

What worries me in all this (and other critics of the media) is that the media suggest that politics is little more than the struggle between ambitious politicians for power and has less to do with how we as a country deal with the serious problems confronting us. There are excellent members of the national press corps, but there just seems to be a very large gap between the way many journalists approach a story and the way other people do.

CONCLUSION

One important role of journalism in this country is to try to provide a common ground of knowledge and analysis, an effort to clarify the national debate and link it to people and their lives. The media in our society have a high mission and bear the responsibility to carry it out.

Fortunately, there is a self-correcting process in the media. The competitive instinct is very strong among the multiple sources of information and that sometimes leads to excess and inaccuracies, but also contributes to a corrective process whereby the facts eventually get out straight. If one news outlet reports a story badly, other rival organizations will try to set the record straight.

The proliferation of alternative news sources may also be a positive development. Some argue that the national press is responding to competitive pressures from the tabloid media by trying to imitate them, and this is certainly a concern. Competition, however, may also force the mainstream media to get back to basics—to do what they do best, namely solid beat reporting and in-depth investigative pieces. There has certainly been a trend in the regional press toward issue-oriented coverage of politics and news, and the national media could learn from this positive development.

MEMORANDUM ON THE BALLISTIC MISSILE THREAT

HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the President vetoed the defense authorization bill last December due primarily to the legislation's direction that a national defense system be deployed by the year 2003. As I commented during the veto override debate, on a political level, the veto did serve to more clearly define the stark differences between the Clinton administration and this Congress on key national security issues such as ballistic missile defense. It is unfortunate that an issue as fundamentally important as whether or not the American people should be defended against the threat of ballistic missiles in the decade ahead has become so controversial—but it is where we find ourselves.

Adding further to the controversy, the Department of Defense announced last week that they do not intend to spend all of the funding appropriated for national missile defense programs this fiscal year, as well as the surprising decision to delay several of the most promising theater missile defense programs—an area in which I did not believe there was much controversy until now. The combination of the President's strong opposition to deploying a national missile defense and now, an apparently conscious decision to scale back theater missile programs leaves us plenty to begin sorting through.

The National Security Committee has a responsibility to raise the visibility of important security issues and through discussion, debate and even disagreement, to hopefully inform and educate the citizens of this country. Today, we started that effort with the first in a series of full committee and subcommittee hearings on ballistic missile defense. In addition to hearings, I have prepared a short paper, ''Memorandum on the Ballistic Missile Threat,'' which I distributed to the members of the National Security Committee yesterday.

The text of the memorandum is as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON THE BALLISTIC MISSILE THREAT

(By HNSC Chairman Floyd Spence)

INTRODUCTION

As last year's debate and veto of the FT 96 National Defense Authorization Act (H.R. 1530) demonstrated, Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) has become a defining national security issue. Today, the United States has no defense against even a single ballistic missile. According to polls, this fact is not appreciated by the American people, who continue to believe that we have the means today to protect ourselves against ballistic missile attack. Although the technology exists to develop and field a limited defense against such threats, the American people remain hostage to a national strategy of conscious vulnerability, codified by the 1972 anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty and reinforced by Cold War notions of strategic stability.

The debate over whether deployment of a national missile defense is warranted ought to pivot in large part on forward looking assessments of the ballistic missile threat to the United States. In his December 28 veto message, the President stated that H.R. 1530's call for a national missile defense system addresses a long-range missile threat ''that our Intelligence Community does not foresee in the coming decade.'' The purpose of this memorandum is to address this issue and to provide a better understanding of the missile threats facing the United States now and in the future.

A CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGER

The Clinton Administration has acknowledged that the shorter-range, or theater, ballistic missile threat is real and growing. Secretary of Defense William Perry has stated that ballistic missiles ''are clearly becoming a common battlefield weapon.''[1] More than 15 countries currently possess ballistic missiles. Most are based on Soviet-derived designs like the SCUD, which was used by Iraq during the 1991 Gulf War. However, the types of theater missiles being sought and acquired by third countries today are of increasing range, lethality, and sophistication.

In addition, more than 25 countries currently possess, or are seeking to acquire, weapons of mass destruction (WMD), including nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons. According to unclassified estimates, some 24 countries currently have ongoing chemical weapons programs.[2] Ten countries are reportedly pursuing biological weapons research.[3] At least as many are reported to be interested in developing nuclear weapons.[4] The trend toward proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the missiles that can carry them is ''decidedly negative,'' with ''no limits on the ambitions of unstable actors to acquire the most advanced and deadly weapons available, either through internal or external sources.[5]

The Administration is less convinced, however, of the threat posed by longer-range missiles. In particular, a recently completed National Intelligence Estimate (NIE), prepared by the intelligence community, concludes that the threat to the United States posed by long-range ballistic missiles is lower than previously believed.[6] A letter by the CIA's Director of Congressional Affairs to Senators Levin and Bumpers, written on behalf of the Director of Central Intelligence (DCI), John Deutch, asserts that the previous intelligence community estimate of the missile threat to the United States, as reflected in the language of H.R. 1530, ''overstates what we currently believe to be the future threat.'' The letter states that it is ''extremely unlikely'' any nation with intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) would be willing to sell them; declares that the U.S. early warning capability is ''sufficient to provide many years in advance of indigenous development''; and judges the prospect of an operational North Korean ICBM within the next five years to be ''very low.''[7]

The Administration's conclusions on these issues are seemingly at odds with previous intelligence community estimates; are at variance with the view of other responsible experts within and outside the intelligence community; and have raised troubling questions concerning the politicization of intelligence.[8]

THE ALLURE OF BALLISTIC MISSILES

There are numerous reasons why a growing number of nations seek to acquire ballistic missiles and weapons of mass destruction. Such weapons provide a military edge against regional adversaries and serve as symbols of national power and prestige. Ballistic missiles offer small and medium powers—for the first time—a strategic weapon potentially capable of deterring great powers militarily and politically. An adversary armed with ballistic missiles and WMD may deter the United States from undertaking certain actions for fear of retaliation against U.S. regional assets of allies. Long-range ICBMs are even more attractive assets for hostile powers wishing to deter the United States from exercising its power projection capabilities by placing U.S. territory directly at risk and threatening our most valued asset: the American people. Importantly, the lack of any effective defenses against ballistic missiles may actually serve to encourage hostile states to acquire missile capabilities and makes them the weapon of choice for nations seeking to threaten others. As the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London has concluded, ''the ballistic missile, mainly on account of its range, speed and cost relative to that of a manned aircraft, is a favored delivery means for proliferating states and is likely to remain so until a proven anti-ballistic missile defense system has been deployed.''[9]

The proliferation of these weapons heightens the risk that adversaries will seek to use them or threaten their use against the U.S. or American allies and interests. For instance, in the Gulf War, Iraq used SCUD missiles against Israel as political weapons in an attempt to draw Israel into the conflict and fracture the allied coalition. Libya recently declared its willingness to fire ballistic missiles at Naples, Italy, the home of the U.S.

Footnotes at the end of article.