

must involve our allies and friends around the world.

One critical aspect of this War involves what I believe can best be labeled as "Strategic Communication." Strategic Communication is not marketing; it is not simplistic slogans; it is not simply looking for better ways to tell the world how good we are. Strategic Communication is deeper and more sophisticated than that. It is how we communicate with—and thus relate to—the rest of the world.

It includes public diplomacy (how we communicate with people outside of the United States), public affairs (how we communicate with Americans and the media), international broadcasting, and various governmental information operations programs. It must, of course, utilize and take into account ever-evolving technologies.

Any communication begins with listening and understanding, which is certainly where Strategic Communication must begin. We cannot conduct a poll or two and assume we know what the people think. We have to understand history, culture, traditions, values, and anxieties. Without that understanding, any attempt at communicating, much less influencing, will be futile. Our understanding must extend to networks of influence within societies and to the factors which influence human behavior.

In addition to understanding attitudes and cultures, Strategic Communication involves engaging in a dialogue of ideas, advising policy makers of the implications of various decision choices, and developing and implementing communication strategies that can help shape attitudes and behaviors. It involves the work not only of the Department of State, but also the Department of Defense, the Intelligence Community, and others.

Needless to say, Strategic Communication is a massive job that directly affects the national security of the United States for generations to come.

A number of studies since the 9/11 attacks—and some even prior—have emphasized the importance of Strategic Communications and have also found that the United States efforts have been quite deficient. One recent report, which I found particularly helpful, was issued by the Defense Science Board Task Force on Strategic Communication, chaired by Mr. Vincent Vitto.

The Defense Science Board report provides a context for the importance of Strategic Communications, and it offers a number of recommendations require action by the Executive Branch, but some require Congressional action as well. The report's bottom line is that the U.S. needs a "dramatically more disciplined, methodical, and strategic approach to global communications."

In considering the many aspects of Strategic Communications, there are some things only government can do. But, government does not have all of the answers or all of the expertise needed to successfully wage this War. Those outside government have much to contribute. To be truly successful, there must be a cooperative partnership between government and the private sector.

The bill I am introducing today, H.R. 1869, the "Strategic Communication Act of 2005," will help provide a framework for that partnership. Implementing one of the recommendations of the Defense Science Board study, the

bill creates a nonpartisan, non-profit Center for Strategic Communication to be at the intersection of government and private sector efforts in Strategic Communication. As a nongovernmental entity, the Center can take advantage of the experience and expertise of those outside of government who may be unwilling or unable to work within government but would like the opportunity to contribute. It would also allow greater flexibility than government regulations sometimes permit.

While no one wants to duplicate essential governmental functions, the Defense Science Board's report suggests that a non-profit Center would have three primary purposes:

1. To provide information and analysis to civilian and military decision-makers;

2. to develop plans and programs to create and implement U.S. communication strategies; and

3. to support government strategic communications. Among the areas in which the Center can contribute are: polling and analysis, cultural influence analysis, media influences analysis, fostering cross cultural exchanges, sub-contracting to the commercial and academic sectors for a range of products and programs, mobilizing non-government initiatives, such as temporary communication teams, and continually monitoring and evaluating effectiveness.

Mr. Speaker, let me make clear that I understand, as did the Defense Science Board, that the War of Ideas is about much more than communications strategies. It is also about policies and actions, some of which are not popular in various regions of the world. The Defense Science Board report noted that policies and strategic communications cannot be separated.

But effective communication is also an essential part of any effort to make the world a safer place. As the Defense Science Board noted, "Strategic Communication is a vital component of U.S. national security. It is in crisis and must be transformed with a strength of purpose that matches our commitment to diplomacy, defense, intelligence, law enforcement, and homeland security."

I believe that this proposal and the entire list of recommendations by the Defense Science Board can make a major contribution to this effort.

ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2005

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, the so-called Assault Weapons ban passed in 1994 has now been expired for seven months and our nation has yet to feel the ill effects proponents of the '94 legislation predicted. The following article by Deborah Sontag of the New York Times, provides a great description of how little has changed since the ban was lifted. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert this article into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 24, 2005]

MANY SAY END OF FIREARM BAN CHANGED
LITTLE

(By Deborah Sontag)

Despite dire predictions that the streets would be awash in military-style guns, the

expiration of the decade-long assault weapons ban last September has not set off a sustained surge in the weapons' sales, gun makers and sellers say. It also has not caused any noticeable increase in gun crime in the past seven months, according to several metropolitan police departments.

The uneventful expiration of the assault weapons ban did not surprise gun owners, nor did it surprise some advocates of gun control. Rather, it underscored what many of them had said all along: that the ban was porous—so porous that assault weapons remained widely available throughout their prohibition.

"The whole time that the American public thought there was an assault weapons ban, there never really was one," said Kristen Rand, legislative director of the Violence Policy Center, a gun control group.

What's more, law enforcement officials say that military-style weapons, which were never used in many gun crimes but did enjoy some vogue in the years before the ban took effect, seem to have gone out of style in criminal circles.

"Back in the early 90's, criminals wanted those Rambo-type weapons they could brandish," said Jim Pasco, executive director of the Fraternal Order of Police. "Today they are much happier with a 9-millimeter handgun they can stick in their belt."

When the ban took effect in 1994, it exempted more than 1.5 million assault weapons already in private hands. Over the next 10 years, at least 1.17 million more assault weapons were produced—legitimately—by manufacturers that availed themselves of loopholes in the law, according to an analysis of firearms production data by the Violence Policy Center.

Throughout the decade-long ban, for instance, the gun manufacturer DPMS/Panther Arms of Minnesota continued selling assault rifles to civilians by the tens of thousands. In compliance with the ban, the firearms manufacturer "sporterized" the military-style weapons, sawing off bayonet lugs, securing stocks so they were not collapsible and adding muzzle brakes. But the changes did not alter the guns' essence; they were still semiautomatic rifles with pistol grips.

After the ban expired in September, DPMS reintroduced its full-featured weapons to the civilian market and enjoyed a slight spike in sales. That increase was short-lived, however, and predictably so, said Randy E. Luth, the company's owner.

"I never thought the sunset of the ban would be that big a deal," Mr. Luth said.

No gun production data are yet available for the seven months since the ban expired. And some gun-control advocates say they don't trust the self-reporting of gun industry representatives, who may want to play down the volume of their sales to ward off a revival of the ban.

Indeed, a replica of the ban is again before the Senate.

"In my view, the assault weapons legislation was working," said Senator Dianne Feinstein, Democrat of California, a chief sponsor of the new bill. "It was drying up supply and driving up prices. The number of those guns used in crimes dropped because they were less available." Assault weapons account for a small fraction of gun crimes: about 2 percent, according to most studies, and no more than 8 percent. But they have been used in many high-profile shooting sprees. The snipers in the 2002 Washington-area shootings, for instance, used semiautomatic assault rifles that were copycat versions of banned carbines.

Gun crime has plummeted since the early 1990's. But a study for the National Institute of Justice said that it could not "clearly credit the ban with any of the nation's recent drops in gun violence." Research for the

study in several cities did show a significant decline in the criminal use of assault weapons during the ban. According to the study, however, that decline was offset by the "steady or rising use" of other guns equipped with high-capacity magazines—ammunition-feeding devices that hold more than 10 rounds.

While the 1994 ban prohibited the manufacture and sale of such magazines, it did not outlaw an estimated 25 million of them already in circulation, nor did it stop the importation of millions more into the country.

Senator Feinstein said she wished she could outlaw the "flood of big clips" from abroad, calling that the "one big loophole" in the ban. But that would require amending the bill, and Republicans like Senator John W. Warner of Virginia and Senator Mike DeWine of Ohio are willing to back it only without amendments, she said.

Some gun-control advocates say it is pointless to reintroduce the 1994 ban without amending it to include large magazines and a wider range of guns. They see more promise in enacting or strengthening state or local bans. Seven states—California, Connecticut, Hawaii, Massachusetts, Maryland, New Jersey and New York—already have bans, most based on the federal one. The model ban, gun-control advocates say, is a comprehensive one in California (referred to as "Commieformia" on some gun enthusiast Web sites).

The Fraternal Order of Police has not made a new federal ban a legislative priority, either. Mr. Pasco, the organization's director, said he could not recall a single "inquiry from the field about the reauthorization of the ban—and we have 330,000 members who are very vocal."

"In 1994, I was the principal administration lobbyist on this ban," said Mr. Pasco, who then worked for the federal Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms. "But here we are 10 years later, and these weapons do not appear to pose any more significant threat to law enforcement officers than other weapons of similar caliber and capability."

The ban made it illegal to possess or sell a semiautomatic weapon manufactured after September 1994 if the weapon accepted a detachable magazine and contained at least two features from a list that included protruding pistol grips and threaded muzzles. The ban outlawed 19 weapons by name, among them some foreign semiautomatics already banned under the 1989 firearms importation law, which still stands.

But gun manufacturers increased production of assault weapons while the ban was being debated. Then, by making minor changes in design, they were able to produce, as they called them, "post-ban" assault weapons that were the functional equivalent of the originals.

Colt came out with a "sporterized" version of its popular AR-15 semiautomatic rifle, leaving off some military features that were "meaningless as far as its lethality," said Carlton S. Chen, vice president and general counsel for Colt.

"People might think it looks less evil," Mr. Chen said, "but it's the same weapon. It was a hoax, a Congressional hoax, to ban all these different features."

Mr. Pasco of the police organization disagreed. "We knew exactly what we were doing by trying to ban guns with certain features," he said. "While it didn't affect their function or capability, those features, at that point in time, seemed to make those weapons more attractive to those who wanted to commit crimes."

Gun-control advocates say military-style semiautomatics do not belong in civilian hands. "They are weapons of war," Senator Feinstein said, "and you don't need these assault weapons to hunt."

Gun makers, however, say the weapons do have sporting uses, in hunting and in target shooting. "People buy these rifles because they're fun to shoot and they perform well," Mr. Luth of DPMS said. "They also like them because you can jazz them up like you can your car. You can custom-paint them, put on a multitude of handguards or buttstocks."

Some collectors simply admire certain guns. Charles Cuzalina, a gun dealer in Oklahoma who specializes in banned weapons, is taken with the Colt AR-15.

"I just like the look of the weapon," Mr. Cuzalina said. "When I bought my first, I went out on the farm shooting at a pie plate, and I realized how accurate it makes you. You think you're the world's best shot."

Mark Westrom, owner of ArmaLite Inc., a gun maker in Illinois, said prey hunters and target shooters did not miss bayonet lugs and other features that disappeared with the post-ban rifles. Collectors looking for an exact civilian replica of a military rifle, however, consider the removal of a bayonet lug "a matter of design defacement," Mr. Westrom said.

Several manufacturers are offering factory conversions or selling kits so gun owners can retrofit their post-ban weapons. They are also increasing their production of pre-ban weapons and decreasing production of post-ban weapons.

Many gun store owners say that sales of assault weapons spiked briefly in September and October. Gun dealers sought to capitalize on the ban's sunset and, during the presidential campaign, to raise the specter of a tougher ban if John Kerry won.

"We view this time as a 'pause' and urge you to take advantage of the opportunity to exercise your Second Amendment rights," Tapco, a shooting and military gear company, said on its Web site last fall. "Anti-gun politicians learned much over the past 10 years. They will surely not leave as many loopholes in future legislation."

After President Bush was re-elected and the novelty of the ban's expiration waned, sales leveled off at many gun shops. But Mike Mathews, the owner of Gunworld in Del City, Okla., said sales had been holding steady at a higher level.

Norm Giguere of Norm's Gun & Ammo in Biddeford, Me., on the other hand, said that he had not sold any military-style semiautomatic rifles since right after the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks, and that the gun business in general was "going down the tubes."

Mr. Luth of DPMS, however, said that his sales had been increasing for years, to the law enforcement community, the civilian market and an unexpected new clientele. "We've picked up new customers with the troops returning from Iraq," he said, "who had never shot an AR-15 before and now want one."

The war in Iraq has had another unintended consequence for the marketplace. Colt, one of the biggest manufacturers, has decided against putting its AR-15 back on the civilian market because the company is backlogged with military orders.

Unlike assault weapons, high-capacity magazines, which are used with many guns, have been selling briskly since the ban ended because prices have dropped considerably.

"The only thing Clinton ever did for us was drive up the price of magazines," said a weapons specialist named Stuart at TargetMaster, a shooting range and gun shop in Garland, Tex. (He declined to give his last name.) "A 17-round Glock magazine crept up to \$150 during the ban. It's \$75 now."

Since September, the Web site of Taurus International Manufacturing Inc., a major maker of small arms, has celebrated the demise of the prohibition on magazines, flash-

ing in red letters, "10 years of 10 rounds are over!"

HONORING MAJOR GENERAL GEORGE W. KEEFE IN RECOGNITION OF HIS SERVICE AS ADJUTANT GENERAL OF THE MASSACHUSETTS NATIONAL GUARD

HON. MICHAEL E. CAPUANO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2005

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the career of Major General George W. Keefe, who recently retired from his post as the 41st Adjutant General of the Massachusetts National Guard. Major General Keefe, appointed interim Adjutant General on July 24, 1999, and Adjutant General January 7, 2000, was the first Air Force officer to hold this position.

Born and raised in Northampton, Massachusetts, Major General Keefe attended Holyoke College, where he received an Associate in Business degree. He joined the Massachusetts Air National Guard in 1956 as a Crash Fire Rescue Specialist and rose to the enlisted rank of Master Sergeant in Westfield's 104th Tactical Fighter Group.

Upon becoming an officer, Major General Keefe served in various capacities within the Massachusetts Air National Guard, including the 104th Combat Support Squadron Personnel Officer, Base Supply Operations Officer, Comptroller, and Chief of Supply. His leadership abilities elevated him to the positions of Commander of the 104th Resource Management Squadron, and Deputy Commander for Resources for the 104th Tactical Fighter Group. In 1993, the Major General became the Group's Vice Commander. Major General Keefe was selected as the Vice-Commander for the Massachusetts Air National Guard in 1994 and assumed the position of Assistant Adjutant General for Air in 1995.

As Adjutant General, Major General Keefe was the Governor's senior military advisor responsible for protecting life and property, preserving peace, order, and public safety in times of natural disaster and civil emergency. He also had a responsibility to the Chief of the National Guard Bureau for providing operationally trained, equipped and mission-ready forces to support national security objectives.

Major General Keefe is enshrined in the U.S. Air Force Enlisted Heritage Hall at Maxwell AFB as one of the only general officers who enlisted as an E-1, was promoted through the ranks to E-7, and then rose through the officer ranks from First Lieutenant to Major General. He holds several distinctions, including being the last member in uniform who served in the Berlin Call-up, serving at Plattsburg AFB from October 1961 to September 1962.

Among his awards and decorations, Major General Keefe has received the Legion of Merit, Meritorious Service Medal, Air Force Commendation Medal, Air Force Outstanding Unit Award (with three oak leaf clusters), Air Reserve Forces Meritorious Service Medal, National Defense Service Medal (with Bronze Star), Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal, and Armed Forces Service Medal. The Major General also has been awarded the Air Force Longevity Service Ribbon (with nine oak leaf clusters), Armed Forces Reserve Medal (with gold