

blueprints of our future civilization, and as such, airy structures though they are, they really play a bigger part in the progress of man than our more material structures of brick and steel. The habit of building utopias shows to a degree whether our race is made up of dull-spirited bipeds or whether it is made up of men who want to enjoy the full savoring of existence that comes only when they feel themselves working with the forces of nature to remake the world nearer to their heart's desire."

It is worth reflecting upon this comment, for it encompasses Wallace's answer to both those who would say science must be allowed to work its will regardless of the consequences, and to the critics of science who would rather forego knowledge than cope with change.

To scientists he said this:

"The cause of liberty and the cause of true science must always be one and the same. For science cannot flourish except in an atmosphere of freedom, and freedom cannot survive unless there is an honest facing of facts . . . Democracy—and that term includes free science—must apply itself to meeting the material need of men for work, for income, for goods, for health, for security, and to meeting their spiritual need for dignity, for knowledge, for self-expression, for adventure and for reverence. And it must succeed."

In other words, the ends of science must always be mankind. Scientists, no less than the rest of us, must every day ask themselves; What is worthwhile?

To the anti-scientists, Wallace said this in 1933:

"I have no patience with those who claim that the present surplus of farm products means that we should stop our efforts at improved agricultural efficiency. What we need is not less science in farming, but more science in economics . . . Science has no doubt made the surplus possible, but science is not responsible for our failure to distribute the fruits of labor equitably."

In other words, the answer to society's problems lies not in blocking progress but in guiding it to serve mankind's ends.

And to everyone he offered this warning:

"The attacks upon science stem from many sources. It is necessary for science to defend itself, first, against such attacks, and second, against the consequences of its own successes. What I mean is this: That science has magnificently enabled mankind to conquer its first great problem—that of producing enough to go around; but that science, having created abundance, has now to help men live with abundance. Having conquered seemingly unconquerable physical obstacles, science has now to help mankind conquer social and economic obstacles. Unless mankind can conquer these new obstacles, the former successes of science will seem worse than futile. The future of civilization, as well as of science, is involved."

Wallace also once observed "scientific understanding is our joy. Economic and political understanding is our duty." His concept of scientific research was a broad one and included the lifting of the social sciences to the same level as the natural sciences. In turn, he challenged these scientists to have a greater conscience concerning the implications of their work. Applied research would properly involve social planning, which would enable man to have more leisure time and thus better enjoy non-material things, such as "music, painting, literature, sport for sport's sake, and the idle curiosity of the scientist himself."

The New Republic, which he served briefly as editor after his retirement from politics, once described his concept of political democracy as ". . . that of a science which

would blend political freedom with the full use of resources, both of manpower and of technologies, for everyone's welfare."

It is intriguing to speculate about what Wallace might say if he were here today, about the state of agriculture in this country and around the world, about the movement for a sustainable alternative agriculture, about the role of science and the march of human progress. Probably his comments would surprise all of us, as they so often surprised audiences during his lifetime. His was a provocative and remarkably original mind, unfazed by popular opinion and conventional wisdom. The absence of "corn shows" testifies to that.

First, on a very contemporary note, we can assume Wallace would be appalled and disgusted by the attack now being made on the nation's conservation programs, especially those related to agriculture. The efforts made to preserve land—to remove marginal land from production and protect the remainder from erosion and abuse—were among his proudest accomplishments. "People in cities may forget the soil for as long as a hundred years, but mother nature's memory is long and she will not let them forget indefinitely," he wrote. "The soil is the mother of man and if we forget her, life eventually weakens."

Second, Wallace would admonish us to use our abundance more "virtuously and wisely." In the long run, Wallace believed, a healthy democracy could not tolerate the politics of scarcity. In his own time, Wallace saw the devastating consequences of scarcity run amuck; one-third of a nation ill-nourished, ill-clad, and ill-housed. Today, however, we might imagine that Wallace would see too much money, made in unproductive ways, in the hands of too few people, too many people without health insurance or secure and satisfying employment, and far, far too many people leading wasted lives in the poverty and degradation of our major cities. He would deplore the national priorities which call for huge defense budgets while reducing investments in education, environment, and job training. He would be greatly troubled by the lack of concern for the "general welfare," the widespread violence in our country, and the lack of civility and loss of community in our national life. He would urge creative social and economic planning to address these issues.

While he would welcome the liberalization of international trade, he would decry the enormous expenditure of scarce Third World resources on arms. He would advocate a stronger U.N. military force and greater foreign assistance through more efficient and reformed multilateral lending institutions.

Third, we might guess that Wallace would look upon the sustainable agriculture movement with considerable affection. This is speculative because Wallace, like all of us, was a man of his times, and no one would say he was close to being "certified organic" in his own practices. He used chemical pesticides and fertilizers liberally, and, some would argue, helped pave the way for a highly mechanized, industrialized agriculture through the introduction of hybrid seed to commercial farming.

Still, Wallace was a man who believed in facts. If the facts argued against chemical pesticides, he would have accepted them totally. What he sought, in his life's work, was not prosperity for corporations, but for the men and women living on farms, doing God's work, preserving their land and seeing "the fruits of their labor raise the living standards of mankind." Prosperity, he often warned farmers, was not an end but the means to an end. He wrote: "Can we remember that prosperity is worthless except insofar as it gives us more freedom and strength

to do good work, to love our fellow men and to take delight in the beauty of a world wonderful enough to give pleasure to the Workman who planned it?"

Finally, we can guess that he would say to farmers and scientists: "Small is good." When Wallace began his corn breeding experiments, he recalled, he "had only a fraction of an acre within the city limits of Des Moines on which to work. An inbred corn capable of unusually high yield came out of [this] backyard garden, which was but ten by twenty feet. . . ." He was concerned that breeders might substitute masses of data for real understanding and pointed out that James Logan, an 18th Century experimenter, had learned from four hills of corn, and that the principles of heredity were discovered by Gregor Mendel, growing peas in a monastery garden about 15 feet wide and 30 or 40 feet long, and finally, that George H. Shull, one of the inventors and developers of hybrid corn, used no more than one quarter of an acre each season in conducting his experiments.

He deplored that the modern trend in science is in exactly the opposite direction. "The present emphasis," he wrote, "is directed toward doing things in a big way, toward large numbers and multidisciplinary research. In many of our educational institutions, scientific progress seems to be measured in terms of the growth of departments and the number and size of financial grants that can be obtained for support of the work. . . . The great scientific weakness of America today," he said, "is that she tends to emphasize quantity at the expense of quality—statistics instead of genuine insight—immediate utilitarian application instead of genuine thought about fundamentals. . . . True science cannot be evolved by mass-production methods."

At 75 years of age and in outwardly remarkable physical condition, Wallace became afflicted with Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis, or Lou Gehrig's disease. This disease affects the nervous system and causes muscular atrophy. There is no cure. An experimenter to the end, he kept a careful record of his symptoms and reactions in a memo entitled, "Reflections of an ALSer." In the final weeks of his illness, in September 1965, Wallace was visited by a friend while a patient at NIH. The visitor noted that the flowers in his room had been sent by President Lyndon Johnson. Wallace, who, given the disease's progression, could no longer speak, wrote on a notepad, "I hope they think about decentralization as the hope of the future. Big cities will become cesspools."

Wallace always rose very early on his Farvue farm and, as long as his failing health permitted, continued to type his own correspondence with geneticists, plant breeders and others around the world before going out to the field in a mechanized wheelchair to work with his research plots.

One of his last letters was to a long-time friend and corn breeder:

"Your 3306 [a hybrid seed corn code] has me all excited. So glad you have 2,000 acres of it. . . . I was feeling rather blue when I got up this morning, thinking the end of the road was not far off. But when I got to thinking about 3306, I felt I just had to live to see how [it] would adapt to the tropical program, the Argentine program, and the South Georgia program. Yes, this is the most exciting letter I have ever received from you."

That was his message. Think big, plant small, work hard, seek the truth, glorify God, and have sympathy for the plant.●

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. INHOFE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

WAR CRIMES ACT OF 1996

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of H.R. 3680 which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3680) to amend title 18, United States Code, to carry out the international obligations of the United States under the Geneva Conventions to provide criminal penalties for certain war crimes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, this particular act is known as the War Crimes Act of 1996. This was called to my attention by a very articulate young Congressman from North Carolina, Walter Jones, Jr., whose father we served with for many, many years over in the House of Representatives.

He was very observant in discovering something, that after 40 years, after the ratification of the Geneva Conventions, that it was not self-enacting, and we actually have never passed the necessary legislation to accept jurisdiction within our Federal courts to prosecute war crimes that we were aware of.

So this legislation will correct that after this long period of time. It is kind of inconceivable to me that we would send out to battle and to various parts of the world our young troops, trying to equip them properly—I would say properly, that if we ever get our authorization passed—and have these people ready to do the work that they are trained to do, and yet if a crime is perpetrated against them, and that criminal happens to be in the United States, we cannot even prosecute them in our Federal courts. That is all going to come to a stop.

I think also this bill might even address another problem that is taking place right now in this country. As you know, I am from Oklahoma. And one of the worst terrorist acts took place just a little over a year ago in Oklahoma City with the bombing of the Murrah Federal Office Building. And with all of the terrorist acts recently, this could act as a deterrent, this War Crimes Act of 1996, for people who may be considering perpetrating some terrorist act that could be defined as a war crime.

So I believe this is something that should have been done some 40 years ago, but was not. So we will correct that tonight. This has been cleared by both sides.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, this bill will help to close a major gap in our Federal criminal law by permitting American servicemen and nationals,

who are victims of war crimes, to see the criminal brought to justice in the United States.

Before addressing the need for this legislation, let me thank and commend the distinguished WALTER JONES, who so ably represents the third district of North Carolina, for his commitment and hard work toward the passage of this bill. I'd also like to thank my distinguished colleague, Senator JAMES INHOFE, for his support of this important bill.

Many have not realized that the U.S. cannot prosecute, in Federal court, the perpetrators of some war crimes against American servicemen and nationals. Currently, if the United States were to find a war criminal within our borders—for example, one who had murdered an American POW—the only options would be to deport or extradite the criminal or to try him or her before an international war crimes tribunal or military commission. Alone, these options are not enough to insure that justice is done.

While the Geneva Convention of 1949 grants the U.S. authority to criminally prosecute these acts, the Congress has never enacted implementing legislation. The War Crimes Act of 1996 corrects this oversight by giving Federal district courts jurisdiction to try individuals charged with committing a grave breach of the Geneva Conventions, whenever the victim or perpetrator is a U.S. serviceman or national.

The bill would also allow an American, who is charged with a war crime, to be tried in an American court and to receive all of the procedural protections afforded by our American justice system.

Mr. President, at a time when American servicemen and women serve our Nation in conflicts around the world, it is important that we give them every protection possible. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill and reaffirm our commitment to our country's servicemembers.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the New York Times be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, June 25, 1996]

MS. MALONEY AND MR. WALDHEIM

(By A.M. Rosenthal)

For a full half-century, with determination and skill, and with the help of the law, U.S. intelligence agencies have kept secret the record of how they used Nazis for so many years after World War II, what the agencies got from these services—and what they gave as payback.

Despite the secrecy blockade, we do know how one cooperative former Wehrmacht officer and war crimes suspect was treated. We know the U.S. got him the Secretary Generalship of the U.N. as reward and base.

For more than two years, Congress has had legislation before it to allow the public access to information about U.S.-Nazi intelligence relations—a bill introduced by Representative Carolyn B. Maloney, a Manhattan Democrat, and now winding through the legislative process.

If Congress passes her War Crimes Disclosure Act, H.R. 1281, questions critical to history and the conduct of foreign affairs can be answered and the power of government to withhold them reduced. The case of Kurt Waldheim is the most interesting example—the most interesting we know of at the moment.

Did the U.S. know when it backed him for Secretary General that he had been put on the A list of war-crime suspects, adopted in London in 1948, for his work as a Wehrmacht intelligence officer in the Balkans, when tens of thousands of Yugoslavs, Greeks, Italians, Jew and non-Jew, were being deported to death?

If not, isn't that real strange, since the U.S. representative on the War Crimes Commission voted to list him? A report was sent to the State Department. Didn't State give the C.I.A. a copy—a peek?

And when he was running for Secretary General why did State Department biographies omit any reference to his military service—just as he forgot to mention it in his autobiographies?

If all that information was lost by teams of stupid clerks, once the Waldheim name came up for the job why did not the U.S. do the obvious thing—check with Nazi and war-crime records in London and Berlin to see if his name by any chance was among those dearly wanted?

Didn't the British know? They voted for the listing too. And the Russians—Yugoslavia moved to list him when it was a Soviet satellite. Belgrade never told Moscow?

How did Mr. Waldheim repay the U.S. for its enduring fondness to him? Twice it pushed him successfully for the job. The third time it was among few countries that backed him again but lost. Nobody can say the U.S. was not loyal to the end.

Did he also serve the Russians and British? One at a time? Or was he a big-power groupie, serving all?

One thing is not secret any longer, thanks to Prof. Robert Herzstein of the University of South Carolina history department. He has managed through years of perseverance to pry some information loose. He found that while Mr. Waldheim worked for the Austrian bureaucracy, the U.S. Embassy in Vienna year after year sent in blurry reports about his assistance to American foreign policy—friendly, outstanding, cooperative, receptive to American thinking. All the while, this cuddly fellow was on the A list, which was in the locked files or absent with official leave.

On May 24, 1994, I reported on Professor Herzstein's findings and the need for opening files of war-crime suspects. Representative Maloney quickly set to work on her bill to open those files to Freedom of Information requests—providing safeguards for personal privacy, ongoing investigations and national security if ever pertinent.

Her first bill expired in the legislative machinery and in 1995 she tried again. She got her hearing recently thanks to the chairman of her subcommittee of the Government Reform Committee—Stephen Horn, the California Republican.

If the leaders of Congress will it, the Maloney bill can be passed this year. I nominate my New York Senators to introduce it in the Senate. It will be a squeeze to get it passed before the end of the year, so kindly ask your representatives and senators to start squeezing.

If not, the laborious legislative procedure will have to be repeated next session. Questions about the Waldheim connection will go unanswered, and also about other cases that may be in the files or strangely misplaced, which will also be of interest.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be