

Smith Elementary School opened in 1956. At Smith, Mrs. Hanlon became a team teacher with Howard Schultz and together they introduced the school's class in astronomy. Their fifth grade classes would return to the school at night for star-gazing from the front lawn. Since the school had no library, the two teachers spearheaded the Library Club of America.

Mrs. Hanlon changed schools again in 1964, with the opening of Meadowbrook Elementary School. As a pioneer in team teaching, she was chosen as team leader for the fifth grade and developed a superior program in team teaching. She studied team teaching in Massachusetts and designed an open classroom and open media center at Meadowbrook.

During 28 years at Meadowbrook, Mrs. Hanlon established Colonial School Day, which evolved into Colonial Capers. She also established Explorer Day, the Heritage Fest and Pioneer Day. Mindful of the value of community cooperation and participation, she developed and orchestrated the Listening Mothers and Teacher Aide programs.

In 1992, with the reorganization of the Hillsdale schools, Mrs. Hanlon was transferred to George White Middle School as the fifth-grade team leader, continuing all the programs she developed at Meadowbrook.

Over the course of her career, Mrs. Hanlon was a finalist for the New Jersey Teacher of the Year and was a recipient of the Governor's Teacher Recognition Award. She has taught two generations of students, including those who have since become fellow members of the faculty, and prominent community members such as Karen Arrigot, wife of Mayor Timothy O'Reilly.

Members of the Hillsdale school system staff, members of the community and countless former students and their parents all have fond memories and deep debts of gratitude for the dedication to their lifetime learning of this outstanding teacher. I wish her much-deserved health and happiness and many years of continued community service.

THE DANGERS OF NEWTSPEAK

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1996

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there is an increasing agreement in America that we suffer from the excessively violent and negative tone of political rhetoric. As is often the case when people find something they dislike, there is a good deal of discussion as to how this unfortunate situation came about. In an excellent article in the Wednesday column of the March 6 issue of *The Hill*, reporter David Grann analyzes this issue and makes the point, persuasively and accurately, that Speaker GINGRICH bears a great deal of the responsibility for this situation, because of his creative efforts to encourage his fellow Republicans to escalate the vehemence of their rhetorical attacks on the Democrats. As Mr. Grann notes in the article, "In 1990, Gingrich's now-famous political action committee, GOPAC, sent out a leaflet to Republican candidates nationwide * * * (which) recommended 60 of the Speaker's favorite words to demonize Democrats and the establishment."

Speaker GINGRICH in his pre-Speaker days proved very effective in using extremely negative, demeaning language about his opposition, and unfortunately, in politics as in other ventures, success often breeds imitation.

We cannot effectively diminish the unfortunate excessive reliance on rhetoric of this sort without understanding what causes proliferation, and I therefore ask that David Grann's very thoughtful analysis be printed here.

THE DANGERS OF NEWTSPEAK

In 1989, Rep. Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.) declared that "nobody would notice if you decapitated the top 12,000 bureaucrats and started over." In 1994, sensing a GOP victory, the leader of the Republican revolution denounced the Democratic Congress as "the enemy of ordinary Americans."

Today, Pat Buchanan beckons his brigade of "peasants with pitchforks" to storm the corrupt establishment and "lock and load" their weapons.

But this time the insurgents' guns are pointing at Speaker Newt Gingrich. If ideas have consequences, then Buchanan's peasant rebellion is the logical culmination of Gingrich's relentless rhetorical warfare against Washington. And if lawmakers need to censor TV violence with a V-chip, then Americans may soon need a V-chip for politicians.

In 1990, Gingrich's now-famous political action committee, GOPAC, sent out a leaflet to Republican candidates nationwide titled: "Language, a Key Mechanism of Control." Saying many people "wish [they] could speak like Newt," it recommended 60 of the Speaker's favorite words to demonize Democrats and the establishment, including such poll-tested treats as "destroy," "traitors," "devour," "lie," "cheat" and "threaten."

"This list is prepared so that you might have a directory of words to use in writing literature and mail, in preparing speeches, and in producing electronic medium," the leaflet reads. "The words and phrases are powerful. Read them. [Emphasis added.] Memorize as many as possible. And remember that, like any tool, these words will not help if they are not used."

Republicans, like kids discovering matches, used them again and again. Gingrich, who lit the biggest torch, derided the House as a "corrupt institution." "There are two realities to the current system," he railed. "One is the government is trying to cheat you; and the second is the government is lying to you about what it's doing."

Other GOP candidates mixed and matched the words, finding rich new combinations: the "liberal" "welfare state" "devours" ordinary Americans with its "traitorous lies." These verbal assaults fueled Americans' distrust of, and disgust for, Democrats and paved the way for the Gingrich revolution. Who, after all, could trust "a trio of muggers" like former Speakers Jim Wright (D-Texas), Tip O'Neill (D-Mass.) and Tom Foley (D-Wash.)?

The problem is that talking "like Newt" has de-legitimized American democracy to the point that no one—not even Gingrich—can redeem it. Even as the GOP tries to reform the Washington culture and balance the budget, Buchanan decries the current establishment—to a standing ovation—as "hollow to the core."

In such an anti-Washington climate, protest candidates like Steve Forbes and Buchanan rise because they have never held public office, while the GOP freshmen, the insurgents of 1994, are suddenly derided as part of the problem.

Which begs the question: How can a country be governed if anyone who governs it is unworthy of governing?

Gingrich, realizing the consequences of his own words, has sheathed his rhetorical sword

and tried to muzzle the same freshmen who memorized his list. He understands, more than anyone, that burning down the establishment in 1996, as some of the upstart Republicans have suggested, "threatens" to "devour" a Republican Congress, not a Democratic one.

None of this seems to bother the bombastic Buchanan, who has his eye on the White House. The commentator of "Crossfire" has his own personal political dictionary. (Remember "pusillanimous pussyfooters?") But Gingrich, however ruefully, has given him something more important than words: a receptive audience.

The irony is that Gingrich's revolution, despite the rhetoric, is relatively mainstream: a balance budget amendment, a line item veto and tort reform are not exactly radical. Yet, as Gingrich has long noted, words have power. And political cries for revolution, however figurative or fashionable, eventually corrode even the healthiest democracy.

What can be done? To begin with, Republicans can turn to another list of words included in Gingrich's 1990 mailing. These "optimistic positive governing words," the leaflet says, "help define your campaign and your vision of public service. In addition, these words help develop the positive side of the contrast you should create with your opponent, giving your community something to vote for!"

Some gentle words for Buchanans: "share," "humane," "listen," "dream," "peace" and "common sense." But if Republicans keep barking from the other script, Gingrich may soon look out the Capitol window and see an army of peasants with pitchforks rising over the Potomac.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FORMATION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF FOOD AND DRUG OFFICIALS

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1996

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a milestone in the United States: the 100th anniversary of the formation of the Association of Food and Drug Officials.

During the latter half of the 19th century, a genuine need existed in the United States for an organization to work with the States, Federal regulatory officials, and industry representatives on the problems that existed within the food and drug industries. Numerous foods were adulterated with a variety of preservatives and chemicals, and, as a result, public safety was an omnipresent threat. The purity of drugs represented another health issue, for the promotion of fraudulent remedies was common practice.

As a consequence of these harmful practices, numerous States began to pass consumer laws, often with the support of manufacturers seeking relief from inequitable competition with the impure products. Despite the positive intentions of the laws, they were often deficient and unenforced due to a lack of control over out-of-State manufacturers. In addition, the manufacturers were subjected to varying State requirements, which led to difficulties with regard to interstate commerce. These problems introduced the need for Federal food and drug laws to impose uniform safety regulations in order to protect the citizens of every State.