open office to demonstrate their tolerance of human rights organizations. Now, even that Potemkin village has been pulled down by authorities bent on eradicating all criticism of Kurdish polices.

Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, seven leaders of the HRA chapter in Diyarbakir were arrested and charged with disseminating separatist propaganda. Prosecutors are seeking jail sentences of more than 10 years for these activists because of their publication which detailed human rights cases in 1992. One of those now in prison awaiting trail is Neymetullah Gunduz, an attorney who met with members of Chairman DeConcini's delegation and who visited the Helsinki Commission in 1993 while on a USIA grant. Mr. Gunduz is highly regarded and is considered a dedicated human rights lawyer and reliable source of information concerning rights abuses by both the Government and the PKK.

Mr. Speaker, just recently the Government abandoned a similar case brought against a group of well known Turkish activists. The move was widely hailed as a positive development in an otherwise bleak human rights picture. What this new case seems to indicate is that the recent acquittal stands merely as an aberration as opposed to a genuine effort to dismantle restrictions on free expression. I have said it before, and I reemphasize it now, Turkey cannot be considered a truly democratic nation as long as individuals like Neymettulah Gunduz, Mehdi Zana, Halit Gerger, former parliamentarians and other are jailed for exercising their rights to free expression.

Mr. Speaker, a recent commentary in a large Turkish daily purports that the Government has spent five times more money fighting terrorism than on the giant GAP water project supposed to be the cornerstone of development in southeast Turkey. Tens of billions of dollars have been used to institute policies which have left the region more devastated than ever and its population more resentful than ever. Meanwhile, Turkey continues to fact mounting economic and political crises tied directly to failed Kurdish policies. Unless Turkish leaders bit the bullet and seek political approaches to the Kurdish situation, there can be no hope for peace, prosperity or democracy in Turkey. As a friend and ally of Turkey, such a dismal prognosis can bring no happiness to anyone in this country either.

SALUTE TO A CIVIL RIGHTS PIONEER—ERNEST McBRIDE OF LONG BEACH, CA

HON. STEPHEN HORN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1995

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, during this week in which we commemorate the life and legacy of the Reverend Dr. Martin Lurther King, to honor a gentleman from my District, California's 38th, Mr. Ernest McBride, whose life and work embody the spirit and intent of Dr. King's message. Throughout his half century of residency in our community, Mr. McBride has been a crusader for civil rights and racial justice—and our community is a much better place for his dedication.

Mr. McBride, who is now 85 years of age, moved to southern California when he was 21 to seek a better life for himself and escape the racism and prejudice of his native South. Unfortunately, as an African-American, he did not find the California of the thirties much better. Arriving in a nearby community, he saw a sign that read, ''We don't serve coloreds here''. But instead of traveling on, Mr. McBride chose to remain. He recently told a Los Angeles Times reporter, ''I decided I had to stop and fight somewhere. And I decided Long Beach was where I was going to stop.''

Mr. McBride's determination to stay in Long Beach turned out to be a decision which has benefited many people. He fought prejudice and injustice wherever he saw it—not through violence and hatred, but with an attitude of determination and dignity. In 1932, he was hired as a grocery store janitor. Over the 8 years that he worked there, his requests for a raise were continually turned down—until he organized his fellow workers and eventually won a raise and a shorter workweek.

In the early 1940's, when a union at the Long Beach Naval Shipyard refused to allow African-Americans to join, Mr. McBride rounded up 180 people to petition President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The President responded by ordering the union to allow minorities to join or face losing its status as a bargaining agent.

As Dr. King began garnering national attention with his nonviolent efforts to end discrimination and prejudice, Mr. McBride led picketing against local grocery stores that refused to hire blacks and pressured Long Beach city leaders to open up more jobs for African-Americans. He organized a student revolt at a Long Beach high school that forced school officials to abandon minstrel shows and to drop a textbook that depicted African-Americans only as slaves.

Mr. McBride cofounded the Long Beach chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People [NAACP], and his house was often the chapter's gathering place where members discussed strategies for desegregating housing, ending discriminatory hiring practices, and ridding local schools of racially-biased textbooks.

Recently, Mr. McBride's home of many years—a modest bungalow which he purchased in the 1940's despite racially restrictive covenants and neighbors who petitioned to keep him out—was declared a historical landmark by the city council in honor of Mr. McBride's dedicated efforts to make our community a place that welcomes and encourages peoples of all races.

After the city council's unanimous vote, Long Beach City Council Alan S. Lowenthal, said, ''It's certainly too bad we can't designate Ernie and his late wife Lilly as a historic monument. He really is the landmark.''

Today I honor Mr. McBride and thank him. He stands as a model of the good that one man—with dedication and compassion—can accomplish for the generations to come.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY REQUIRES BIPARTISAN CONSENSUS BASED ON SOUND INTELLIGENCE

HON. STEVE GUNDERSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1995

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, our foreign policy must be bipartisan. However useful or inevitable our internal debates or expressions may be for domestic issues, we simply cannot continue to apply many voices to foreign affairs. Our goal in foreign affairs is to positively influence and shape foreign situations to our benefit. That is so whether it is a trouble spot in Chechnya, North Korea, Bosnia, or Iraq. It is so for whatever type of situation—be it impending trouble or opportunity—that may arise somewhere else.

That influence cannot serve U.S. interests, however, if it is founded on, and bespeaks, divisive and often petty partisan agendas. This is especially so when those agendas derive from domestic interests having little relevance to the situation. So doing confuses us. It confuses our constituents. It confuses foreign leaders who look to what we say and do to formulate their own policies and reactions. Confusion about what we are doing, or are likely to do, simply from too many voices, can itself harm the situation, can increase the dangers. Ultimately, many voices confuse—and dissipate—our ability to shape our national future relative to other countries. I submit to you that the more we cast about in the eddies and swirls of partisanship, blown hither and yon by polarization and parochialism, the more we will seem to lack any overarching, unifying vision at all for what we want our own future to be. A ship that has no clear port of embarkation, no compass, no rudder, and no articulated destination—how can it ever arrive? How can we even begin to advance on our national goals of peace and security when they are not what we have set before us?

Colleagues, we must get beyond our partisan differences. Our higher order national interests and visions—spoken with one voice—must guide. Random undertow denies our choices, traps us. Our foreign goals, policies, strategies and objectives—indeed the effects of all those on our future national security—simply cannot be left to such chance. We cannot permit our end points to forever recede.

Instead, we must together do the hard work of shaping foreign policy, and decide our strategy, for the reasons that are relevant to the specific situations at hand. We must begin the process with accurate and expert estimates of those situations, and how they might be affected by various events and courses of action. Our support for this work must come not from vested parochialism, but from U.S. intelligence agencies that we fund for this very purpose.

An additional point may pertain here. These agencies, as we speak, are reviewing and adaption their own visions, goals, and the organizations and processes that should flow from those. They are doing so to more effectively meet requirements that we and others place before them. In envisioning their future uses, purposes, character, and attributes, these agencies surely are telling themselves ''if we don't know where we are to be, then we won't get there.'' Clearly, in better defining