

10th Mountain Division—headquarters and two brigades at Fort Drum, NY.

25th Infantry Division—headquarters and two brigades at Schofield Barracks, HI, one brigade at Fort Lewis, WA.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield the last 2 minutes of the special order to our friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAPPAS).

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I take my job as a Member of Congress very seriously. No responsibility is more important than Congress' role to provide for the Senate defense. This responsibility, before all others, is why we are here. Yet, today, we face threats. Our troops face threats. Our allies face threats. Our interests face threats.

The May 1, 1998 Washington Times reported that China has at least 13 intercontinental ballistic missiles aimed at American soil. We cannot defend against an attack because we cannot afford national missile defense. Our troops in Korea and elsewhere have missiles of mass destruction with chemical and biological weapons aimed at them. We cannot protect them either. It is not just missiles.

New technology poses new threats. For example, computer hackers in a rogue nation can break into our computers and cripple our military communications systems.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for arranging this special order today to focus on the plight of the Department of Defense (DoD) and its ever declining budget. This is the 14th straight year that DoD funding has decreased. Readiness is suffering because DoD does not have enough funds to train its soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines. Readiness is suffering because military personnel are leaving the force because they are away from their families too often and when they are home, their quality of life is declining. If the force is not ready, it cannot protect this nation.

Bedsies readiness concerns, the force also cannot protect the nation if its equipment is not the best in the world. The planned budgets do not provide sufficiently to upgrade the military's equipment. How can we send these young men and women to battle without the best equipment?

The Army in particular is suffering greatly under the current and future budget plans. The Army is doing much more with much less. Since the end of the Cold War, the size of the force has shrunk by 300,000. At the same time, however, Army deployments have increased by 300%. Sixty percent of the forces committed to the multiple operations across the world is Army. Even so, the Army receives less than one fourth of DoD's funding. The Army simply does not have the funding necessary to complete all of the missions being required of it.

Due to insufficient budgets planned for the future, the Army is being forced to make cuts that are unacceptable and it is being forced to make these cuts in ways that do not make sense. Just today, I was in a meeting concerning civilian cuts to Army training posts. We were told that cuts have to be made because—bottom line—the budget is too low. At the same time, the Army is looking at ways to privatize some of its activities. The Army is

supposed to study which jobs can be outsourced and maintain the personnel for the jobs which cannot be outsourced. Due to budgetary constraints, however, the Army is cutting in a haphazard manner—losing many of those civilians who really may be essential to Army activities.

The vast decline in the national security budget is requiring these cuts to be made in ways that do not make sense. We are eating our seed corn. The average age of a DoD civilian is now close to 50 years old. Within five years, it would seem that all those with experience and knowledge will make it to retirement and leave. This will leave our defense department without individuals with any institutional knowledge.

I urge the President and my colleagues in Congress to increase the defense budget. As a Vietnam veteran, I understand the need for quality equipment. I understand the need for high morale in soldiers. As a former civil servant, I understand the importance of civil servants to running an agency and the need for high morale among their ranks to operate well. If the defense budget is not increased in the outyears, the military's equipment will be insufficient and the personnel—both uniformed and civilian—will continue to be demoralized. And—we will no longer be able to claim to be the best and strongest military in the world.

Without our strong military, we would not be the country that we are today. Remember that we could actually have lost several wars this century and we could all be speaking German.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

RWANDAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, during World War II, the world stood by and watched as innocent men, women, and children were exterminated for no other reason than their ethnicity. The world said never again.

Well, 50 years later in Rwanda, the world stood by and watched as innocent men, women, and children were exterminated for no other reason than their ethnicity. Knowing that a genocide was about to occur, the world turned away or said this is not my problem. During the genocide, many said this is bad, but they did not act. After the genocide, the world offered reasons and apologies for its inaction.

Mr. Speaker, the world forgot the promise it made right after World War II. Indeed, the promise of "never again" was left tragically unfulfilled.

In 1994, close to 1 million people were killed in a planned and systematic genocide.

Today the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights of the Committee on International Relations held an important hearing to begin answering some important questions. How could the world tolerate such violence? Who is responsible? Why did the international community fail to respond? How can we stop the continuing cycle of violence in the Great Lakes region?

I would like to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey, (Mr. SMITH) for his courage and compassion for addressing this important issue. I think it is important that people understand the history of the relationship between the indigenous peoples of Rwanda.

Prior to the 20th century colonialism, Rwandan Hutus and Tutsis were identified, not by their ethnicity, but by their economic status. For example a Tutsi was considered a wealthy and prominent person in the community, while Hutus were often poor. However, if a Tutsi were to lose his or her wealth, they would then be considered a Hutu. Similarly, a Hutu who had climbed an economic ladder would then be considered a Tutsi. Thus, a distinction was not based on ethnicity but by standing in the community.

However, after centuries of living together in relative peace, Rwandan Hutus and Tutsis were taught to fear and mistrust one another because of disparaging treatment at the hands of Belgian colonialists.

The Belgians treated Tutsis as an upper class, providing them with an education and important government positions, while relegating the majority Hutu population to agricultural work and manual labor. Furthermore, the Belgians began requiring Hutus and Tutsis to carry identification cards, further creating an atmosphere of fear and hatred.

The strong animosity created by the colonialists was maintained after independence as extremist Hutu leaders sought to strike back at Tutsis by removing them from all positions of power and refraining from punishing those who committed acts of violence against Tutsi civilians.

The ethnic cleansing of Tutsis in the early 1960s led to an exile population that was spread across Uganda, Zaire, Burundi, and Tanzania. Persecution and expulsion of minority Tutsis and moderate Hutus continued throughout the 1980s and early 1990s until the tragic events unfolded that led to the 1994 genocide.

I provide this history, Mr. Speaker, to enlighten those who find it convenient to attribute the Rwandan genocide to the irrational, quote, "tribal hatred and bloodthirstiness of Africans." Rather, what subsequent investigations have revealed is that the killings

were not spontaneous expressions of inevitable hatred, but a well-orchestrated, patterned genocide planned for and prepared by extremists, indeed, ethnic extremists to be sure, but essentially extremists concerned with holding on to power and wealth that they had come to control after 20 years in power.

The tribal card was played by these extremists who accused any Hutu who did not join in their cause of betraying Hutus and using propaganda and fear, the twin tactics of Nazis and Fascists in Europe, to intimidate many to join them in killing. Those who resisted, many of them being moderate Hutus, were themselves murdered.

What makes the genocide even more tragic, Mr. Speaker, is that the United States, United Nations as well as the United States and its allies, could easily have prevented this slaughter.

After the death of 10 Belgian United Nations peacekeepers at the hands of extremist militias known as Interahamwe, Belgium decided to remove all of their troops. To keep from appearing as if they were acting alone, the Belgian Foreign Minister telephoned U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher and asked if the United States would call for the withdrawal of all UNAMIR troops.

The United States agreed, and despite the calls for additional assistance from General Romeo Dallaire, the United Nation's Supreme Commander in Rwanda, the Security Council voted to withdraw all but a few of the peacekeepers.

Most of the Interahamwe were armed with nothing more than machetes and clubs. Thus, a well-armed force of a few thousand strategically placed peacekeepers could have stopped or at least greatly reduced the killing.

Regardless, eventually the truth will be known.

It is interesting that Secretary General Kofi Annan will be in Kigali tomorrow. Perhaps his visit will shed some light on the reasons why the United Nations and the international community abdicated its responsibility in 1994.

Mr. Speaker, there is a definition for the word genocide. However, just as the Holocaust can only be appreciated after viewing the tragic footage taken during and immediately after World War II, I have brought some visual aids that truly define the Rwandan genocide. These photographs are the result of the inaction of the United States, the United Nations, and U.S. allies.

□ 2015

Mr. Speaker, I have personally seen images like the ones that I will show when I traveled to Rwanda. And as disturbing as these photographs are, I assure my colleagues that the effect in person is much greater.

I would like to thank the witnesses that testified in our hearing today, some of whom traveled great distances to be with us. They came because of

the tragedy that the world knows as Rwanda. They came because they viewed the hearing as an important step in informing the Congress and the American people of what went wrong in Rwanda and how we can help to make things right. But although these witnesses traveled great distances to be with us, I regret that the United States Department of State deemed the hearing investigating this tragedy, the death of 1 million men, women, and children, unworthy of their traveling just across town.

In the weeks leading up to today, State Department officials telephoned my office on more than one occasion expressing their displeasure with the idea of this hearing. One person actually raised their voice at my staff, asserting that this hearing was completely unnecessary. All of this opposition raises the question as to whether certain State Department officials believe that such efforts are truly unworthy of their participation, or perhaps there is another reason why they did not want the event of today to take place.

Mr. Speaker, I must state that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and I, along with the other members of the committee, are not engaging in this exercise simply to embarrass specific leaders and individuals; rather, we proceed with the recognition that to change the future one must first recognize the mistakes of the past.

President Clinton's historic trip to Rwanda was an important first step toward the United States rehabilitating itself for abdicating its leadership and morality in 1994. However, we must go further. We must begin to work in partnership with the Rwandan Government so that its people and the people of central Africa can begin to recover from this horrendous chapter in world history.

Formulating an effective policy can only be accomplished through learning from previous mistakes, from rehabilitation. And so it must be clear that our purpose for asking how and why is not simply to condemn, but rather to ensure that never again really means never again.

The Great Lakes region has vast natural and human resources, offering enormous economic potential. Crafting an effective partnership with this region will benefit the people of central Africa and the United States.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize a colleague of mine who serves on the House Committee on International Relations with myself, the gentleman from the great State of Alabama (Mr. EARL HILLIARD).

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) for yielding to me.

I am deeply disturbed, and I have been deeply disturbed, about the position and the policy that our country takes as it pertains to certain countries. And I would like to draw a con-

trast between various countries and just look at the position that our country has taken.

We have spent, since 1945, more than a trillion dollars in the Middle East dealing with the so-called peace or warring situation between basically four or five countries that involve perhaps less than 50 million people. We have spent in the last 5 years more than \$200 million in Bosnia. And, once again, we are trying to participate in, I guess, a peace effort. If one looks at the situation as it is occurring now in Ireland, in England, we realize that our country has been involved in trying to work out a peaceful accord.

I applaud the effort of our country in each one of those situations, and I am glad that my country is in a position to make an effort and to be so important that either we can come in and work for peace or be invited to come in and participate in the peace process in each one of those instances.

But I recall, as a member of the Alabama House of Representatives and as a member of the Alabama Senate, when I had to come to Washington, and colleagues who were similarly situated had to come and force our country or to lobby our country, the State Department, and other governmental officials, to get involved, and I am speaking of the very early sixties, in the South Africa situation on the side of democracy and on the side of justice. It took us many years, and even then it was a very difficult situation.

I also recall just recently, in the last 5 years, since I have been in the United States Congress, when the Congressional Black Caucus had to lobby our State Department and our government to get involved with a situation just a couple hundred miles from our shores, in Haiti, on the right side, on the side of democracy and on the side of justice.

And if we look at those two situations and look at the total of five situations that I have mentioned, Bosnia, the Middle East, Ireland, South Africa, and Haiti, we could somewhat draw a contrast and understand why our country did not go to the aid of Rwanda; why we did not get involved and do the right thing.

I will leave it to the viewers to draw what I would consider a logical conclusion, but any time we get involved with countries that are predominantly of the white race, immediately we shower them with all kinds of aid, assistance and money, and we get involved with our Army, our Air Force, and any other type of weapon we have at our disposal. But when it comes to countries that might have any lineage of an African situation, maybe like South Africa or like Haiti or like Rwanda, we have to, those of us who are interested, have to beg our country to come in, even though it might be in its interest.

Now, there are those of us who wish to get away from the old situation that existed in our country a couple hundred years ago, from the situation of segregation that existed a few decades

ago, or from the situation of discrimination based on color and race that exists now. Unfortunately, when we have situations that recur, like Rwanda, like Haiti, and when we see what is happening in Bosnia and the Middle East, it is difficult for us to walk away without looking at the contrast.

And I lay the blame on our State Department. First of all, it does not recruit fairly. It does not have diversity. And if we look at the State Department, we can understand why it discriminates continuously against African Americans and against any nation that may have Africa as a base, whether it is Haiti or Jamaica or any other country.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I would just like to draw the gentleman's attention to the fact that the African-American foreign service officers have filed a lawsuit against the State Department, because they have reached a point where they are frustrated with their inability to be promoted and the inability of the State Department to move African Americans up through the system and utilize all of their talents.

As a result of that, unfortunately, rather than trying to settle this lawsuit, the State Department is fighting the lawsuit, is fighting settling the lawsuit. And so that would be one indication of an attitude that may exist at the State Department, that might explain why it is that it is so difficult for certain decisions that would benefit the people, the world, of people of color to be made.

Mr. HILLIARD. The gentlewoman is very kind when she says a situation that "may" exist. I would go further and say a situation of discrimination and still continual segregation that does exist. But even so, let me go back to the Rwanda situation, because that is the one that we are speaking about now.

I have here a letter of May 4, 1994, from the then chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DONALD PAYNE), where he invited our government as a world leader to get involved in the Rwanda situation. And he writes this letter as chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus. He stated that a vote had been taken and that this not only was the consensus but it was the position of the Black Caucus that our country should intervene, and he outlined things that could be done.

He received, and no other members of the Congressional Black Caucus received a reply. Did not receive a reply. That was May 4, 1994. June 16, 1994 he wrote back and reminded them of the first letter he had sent and he outlined once again the atrocities that were taking place and the need for the help, and that was also consigned by then Congressperson Kweise Mfume. He did not receive a letter from the State Department. Not even a letter saying we received your letter or any type of notation.

Then, on July 20, 1994, in frustration, the Congressional Black Caucus sent

the President a letter, and the State Department, stating our frustration with not being able to get an audience with the President or those persons at the State Department who would have jurisdiction over the matter dealing with Rwanda. So that there was total inaction as it pertained to Rwanda.

Now, let me tell my colleagues something. I do not need people who profit from segregation and discrimination to come and apologize to me for something that was done years ago and something that is continuing to exist.

□ 2030

And it does not benefit the hundreds of thousands of Hutus and the Tutsis that were killed in Rwanda for someone to belatedly go, years later, and say, "I was sorry that we did not get involved." We do not need those type expressions anymore.

I thought that after World War II and after what had been done to the Jews that we were tired of apologizing and that we were interested in action. And we have the means and everything that is necessary to prevent, and we had it in 1994, to prevent genocide; and we failed to act. My colleagues cannot forgive and forget inaction. It was unnecessary.

We should have gotten involved, and there was a request by more than 35 Members of this body to get involved. Our country failed to do so. And excuses now equate to zero as far as I am concerned.

Never again should we permit this to happen. But in order to make sure it does not happen again, we have got to change the policies and the complexion of our State Department. If they are going to be there and not be sensitive to a third of the world's population, then there is no use for them to be there. There is a need for equal treatment throughout this world. And if we are going to set up ourselves, this country, as the world's policemen, then we ought to do it fairly and not like it was done.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, we have been joined by our colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS). But before I yield to my colleague, I would like to just point to my map so that we can be clear as to exactly what we are talking about.

The country of Rwanda is a very, very small, densely populated country in the Great Lakes region of Africa, in east central Africa, bordered on the north by Uganda, here on the east by Tanzania, on the south by Burundi, and in the west by the Democratic Republic of Congo.

We have got an active war situation that is going on in Burundi and in Rwanda; and unfortunately, with the instability that is emanating basically from Rwanda, it is spilling over into all of these other countries in the region. We know that the Democratic Republic of Congo, formerly Zaire, sits in the heart of Africa. And, therefore, if we are interested in stability, rehabilita-

tion, democratization in central Africa and the Democratic Republic of Congo, we have got to do our level best to contain the instability in this region. Because it is this instability that caused the instability and the march westward of Laurent Kabila who eventually overtook Mobutu in the first place.

So I wanted to point out exactly the area that we are talking about and why this is so important. Because literally all of central Africa depends on peace, stability, rehabilitation, economic development in this area right here and settling this question once and for all.

I now yield to my colleague the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Georgia for sharing this special order. It brings a whole lot of light to a situation that is still very clouded in a lot of minds. Certainly, as a person who does not serve on the Committee on International Affairs and who is not familiar with the details, I found some of her remarks that she made so far very enlightening.

I am very concerned and would like for my colleague to clarify in a few minutes the situation with respect to the fact that when this conflict broke out, there were a lot of people who absolved themselves by saying, this is an internal matter in Rwanda. It is a matter of them establishing law and order. It is their business. Or they would say, it is a civil war between two groups. It is up to them. The sovereign state of Rwanda should be left to solve its own problems, people would say.

But my colleague, in her opening remarks, indicated, and I read a few articles in the past few days, indicated there was involvement already by outside powers to a great extent. First of all, there was involvement by the French on an ongoing basis; and I would like to know just what their role was. There was involvement by the Belgians, as they were the largest part of the peacekeeping force. And the United Nations was there officially to carry out a certain purpose.

This was not just a matter of letting law and order take its course inside the sovereign state of Rwanda. We already had involvement there, whereas, in the final analysis, yes, the people who went out and took the machetes and hacked the people to death or stabbed them to death, God will hold them guilty for that. They are the primary perpetrators of the murder and the genocide.

But let us take a look at what the involvement was, because I am concerned about the judgment that is always passed down on Africa. My colleagues know, "What happened in the Congo was all the Congolese fault. It is the fault of black people not being able to govern themselves," et cetera. And yet we know from history that what happened in the Congo was very much shaped by the interference of outside powers, that Mobutu was maintained by the Central Intelligence Agency of

the United States; that Lamumba was not murdered by somebody who was an employee of the Central Intelligence Agency; probably he was murdered probably by an agent of Moey Shumbi. After somebody in Washington made a comment that they did not care about what happened to Lamumba, they made it clear they wanted Lamumba out of the way.

So in the history of these conflicts, repeatedly, even in Somalia, where it is said the Cold War powers were out of it, they did not care what happened in Somalia and there was no interest the United States had, particularly; it turns out Italy and some oil companies based in Italy had some great interest there and some oil companies in this country had some great interests too.

So I think it is important, going back to Rwanda, that we get clear that there was involvement already by powers outside of Rwanda. If my colleague does not mind recapitulating some of the things she alluded to.

Ms. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, throughout the 20th century there has been outside involvement on the continent of Africa; and unfortunately, the African peoples are dealing today with the ramifications and the effects of that outside intervention.

Even the lines that are drawn that represent country boundaries are nothing in relation to the boundaries of the kingdoms that were existent before the arrival of the European colonialists. And, unfortunately, the history of U.S. involvement on the African continent has always been a nod and a wink to our European allies to allow them to work their will, to do whatever they wanted to do on the African continent; and they knew that as long as they were acting in their national interest that they would have the backing of the United States.

That is why the United States, my friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. HILLIARD), was at first on the wrong side in South Africa's fight. They were on the wrong side in Mozambique and in Angola. They were on the wrong side in countless example after example of interaction on the African continent to suppress the voices of those authentic African voices that were struggling for nationalism and liberalization from the colonial yoke and to promote those that would become mere puppets of the colonial empires.

Mr. OWENS. If the gentlewoman would continue to yield for just a minute, the French, I admired their politics domestically, the French people do not let their government push them around right now. They are not allowing themselves to be put in a situation where large numbers of unemployed people are just left out there to suffer. They have got a lot of involvement. And the Government of France is certainly responsive to its people.

How could the French do something dirty or something oppressive in Africa? Were the French in Rwanda responsible for any of this?

Ms. McKINNEY. Well, absolutely. What the French are doing right now is having an investigation of what their role was.

Mr. OWENS. Of their own foreign policy?

Ms. McKINNEY. That is right. Because there were members of parliament who did not know, who were uninformed about what the French Government was actually doing on the ground.

And then, of course, we have read in newspaper reports emanating from France that the attitude of the Mitterand government was that these are just black people killing each other and that is what black people do. And so then, of course, it was all right for the French to continue to arm the Rwandans despite the fact that this is the kind of thing that was happening. This is genocide.

Mr. OWENS. The French continued to arm the Hutus after the genocide started?

Ms. McKINNEY. Yes.

Mr. HILLIARD. Continued to arm them?

Ms. McKINNEY. They continued.

This is an example of what was happening. Here is a baby that was hacked to death, as my colleagues can see, its limbs hacked off. This is one genocide site. And people went to seek shelter and refuge in churches and in schools because they were told that this was a place of safe haven. Even in the churches they were shot to death, macheted to death, hacked to death by the thousands. Here we can see the remaining skulls at one of these genocide sites, obviously a school or a church.

Here is a young woman who has been hacked. This is what was happening on the ground while we in Washington and in Belgium and in Paris looked the other way. This is what was happening on the ground in Rwanda.

Mr. OWENS. Did we really look the other way? If the French were continuing to arm the Hutus, did they not choose sides and consider that they wanted to be on the side of the victim and they really wanted the Hutus to succeed? I am not saying the French Government, knowingly, from Paris, but certainly the representatives of the French Government in Rwanda. And the Belgians, I think they withdrew in order to make it easier for the Hutus to slaughter the people they wanted to slaughter. So they were all choosing the Hutus as the winners, obviously.

Ms. McKINNEY. This was a civil war as well as a genocide.

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will continue to yield, this may have been a civil war. But it was also a civil war in Bosnia. And the European countries got involved, and this country got involved; and we have had troops there, and we still have got troops there.

Mr. OWENS. If the gentlewoman would yield further, we did not just get involved in Rwanda. We were already involved. The United Nations was al-

ready there. We did not have to go get involved; we were there already.

Mr. HILLIARD. We did not wait on the United Nations. We took the lead in Bosnia after the Europeans got involved, before the United Nations made a declaration. And that is what is so ironic about all this.

But let me tell my colleagues this. The United Nations had made a declaration in the Rwanda situation, but yet the Western powers stood back except for France. And after Belgium pulled out, they just left it to those who were powerful. And these pictures my colleague showed, did she realize that they were not of soldiers, they were not of males with guns, that the victims were women and children?

□ 2045

Ms. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I visited Gekangordo, which is a site of genocide at a school. In Gekangordo, the stench of death hangs in the air. This is 3 years after the killing. At Gekangordo, there are 27,000 bodies that have been unearthed thus far. There may be more there. When you go there and you see what happened, it is impossible to walk away from that and not be deeply, deeply affected. Unfortunately, at the hearing today, the New Yorker article that came out, the New Yorker article came out yesterday about the genocide facts. This article was written by Phillip Gorovich, who talks about the fact that General Dallaire, who was the United Nations representative, general on the ground, sent a fax up to the United Nations and said, we have got an informant who only requires safe haven asylum in either France, the United States or Belgium. This informant has told us that there are plans for an extermination of the Tutsi people. I am going to go in and remove the weapons caches within 36 hours. We now know that the chief of staff to Kofi Annan sent a response back to General Dallaire to not go, to not remove those arms caches, and instead go tell the extremist Rwandan government that we know what you are going to do. So the United Nations itself now then becomes complicit because the United Nations had the information.

Mr. HILLIARD. And failed to act.

Ms. McKINNEY. And failed to act. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. HILLIARD. If the gentlewoman will yield, I have some facts. The first one I am going to talk about a minute. It says genocide occurred primarily between April and June of 1994. If you recall, the first letter that the Congressional Black Caucus sent to the President and to the State Department was May 4. We had reported to them what was taking place. We continued to send letters and did not receive any answers. More than 1 million persons were killed. That means during the time that our State Department filed the letters from the Congressional Black Caucus in file 13 probably as many as 300,000 people were killed each

month. They failed to even acknowledge that anything was occurring. More than 400,000 women were raped.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Further, I would just like to add that the United Nations allowed a general to testify in the Senate and talk about the success of the United Nations in Bosnia. We for our hearing today requested that General Dallaire be allowed to testify at our hearing. General Dallaire was willing to testify at our hearing, but the United Nations declined an acceptance or declined permission for him to testify and so he did not testify at our hearing today. Nor did General Dallaire or Kofi Annan appear before the Belgian parliament and its own inquiry of what happened. They invoked diplomatic immunity.

Mr. HILLIARD. If the gentlewoman will yield, how many more times will this occur? If we are going to use the resources of this Nation to police the world, we ought to do it fairly. If we are going to withdraw from that position, then we ought to do that. But we should not discriminate. And we should fairly participate in every situation whether it directly or indirectly affects us.

There was a slogan that I did not agree with, but it says something that he who has power should use it. I often think that if you use it wisely, then perhaps you would not have to use it. Just the thought that you have power and that it would be used wisely and fairly would prevent situations like Rwanda from occurring. But if you have got it, if you have it and you selectively use it, then you will invite situations like Rwanda, because they always would calculate that we do not have to worry. There is not enough oil in Rwanda for them to be concerned. So we can do that and be successful.

Mr. OWENS. I would just like to say that I agree with 99 percent of what you are saying. But the thrust of us being the policeman to the world, I do not think we want to make it that directly.

Mr. HILLIARD. We have assumed that role.

Mr. OWENS. The power of the United States should be used in concert with other forces, primarily in concert with the United Nations. We should try to strengthen and create the United Nations and create the world order where we do not have to always be the power that serves the function of policeman. We should look at public policy.

Right now we have a United Nations arrears that this Nation owes that it is not paying. For the country that has the largest responsibility with the United Nations not to pay weakens the United Nations a great deal, and we do not create that world order which would send a message to people out there that they should not get involved in this kind of activity. The leaders of Rwanda probably thought they could under the cloak of Rwandan sovereignty get away with it and they probably would have gotten away with

it if there had not been a guerilla war force that came in and took over. They may be sitting there right now and justifying the genocide just as Saddam Hussein is sitting there justifying himself in Iraq.

Mr. HILLIARD. What the gentleman says is correct. The United States should react as it deals with world situations through organized bodies, such as the United Nations. However, even as late as one and a half months ago, the United States indicated if Saddam Hussein did not allow the inspectors to come in, it would not wait on any United Nations resolution or any other body. It would take it on its own to intervene. We did that in Korea. We did not wait on the United Nations. We got involved. We did it in Vietnam. We did not wait on the United Nations. We got involved.

When it is in the interest of this country or when the powers to be at the State Department and at the very top decide that they are going to do something, they do not wait on the world body. What you say ought to be the case, that should be our policy, but in actuality it is not our policy.

Mr. OWENS. We should establish a war crimes tribunal so that these people know that they are going to be brought to justice in the end. We want to send a message to people like the dictators in Nigeria right now that we are not going to sit by and tolerate them having sovereign immunity to do whatever they want to do. The whole world should have some kind of standard that is clear out there and we ought to move in the direction of supporting that kind of thing through the United Nations and the World Court and make it clear that you are not going to get away with it. By doing that, we would prevent a lot of the kind of genocides that are taking place, too many have taken place, we have this one that happens to be the biggest one, but we are leaving out Cambodia and Yugoslavia and Serbia. They were about to destroy one of the oldest cultured cities in the world, Sarajevo. So it could break out anywhere. We have got to send a clear message that the world will not tolerate it. Part of the reason that message will be accepted as meaningful is that the United States stands behind it, with its force and its power, stands behind a doctrine which says we will not tolerate sovereign predators wiping out whole groups of people or doing other kinds of things that really are just not acceptable in this civilization.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I would like to mention and commend other Members of Congress who at least spoke out on this issue at the time. We know that from the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) submitted those three letters to the President three times and to the State Department, and three times he received absolutely no response. But the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Mica) also spoke out on this issue and the

need for U.S. intervention to stop the genocide, to stop what was happening, to save those innocent lives. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) also spoke out against what he saw as inaction on the part of the administration. I would also like to thank the people who came to the hearing today and testified.

Mr. Dick McCall from USAID was the only person who was given authorization to show up at the hearing today. And so the absence of the State Department then raises more questions than it answers. Because as we got testimony from all of the witnesses, we understand that there are some answers that reside within the highest levels of the State Department, and the American people and the Members of Congress and the Congressional Black Caucus and all of the people who did speak out and the countless Americans who were concerned at the time and who are now concerned deserve to know the answers.

We also had Ambassador Shaharyar Khan travel all the way from Pakistan to be with us. Senator Alain Destexhe, who promoted the investigation in Belgium, traveled all the way from Belgium to be with us. Kathi Austin, Holly Burkhalter, Alison Des Forges, Jeff Drumtra and Mr. Francois-Xavier Nsanzuwera all came from various points around the globe to be with us today at today's hearing. Yet the State Department could not emerge from Foggy Bottom to tell us what the heck was going on, what did they know, and when did they know it.

Mr. OWENS. Again, I hope that the committee that the gentlewoman sits on will seriously push for some remedies that would help avoid these situations in the future that they would never happen again with the United States sitting on the sideline, that we would have a clear way to intervene and we send a clear message that President Clinton has called us an indispensable Nation. One reason we are is that we have the economic power and the military power. We will use our power in concert with the rest of the world to guarantee that there will never be any millions of people being killed while the rest of the world sits by and watches without intervening.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I would just like to say that we know what happened in Rwanda. I have not made it through all 1,180 pages of this book, *Rwanda, Death, Despair and Defiance*, which was written by Rakiya Omaar at African Rights in London. I went to London to meet with Rakiya, to hear firsthand what she had to say as she interviewed hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of genocide survivors and of the genocide there in the prisons in Rwanda. We know what happened in Rwanda, thanks to Rakiya Omaar.

□ 2100

Thanks to Senator Alain Destexhe in Belgium we know what happened in Belgium. We know why the Belgian

troops withdrew, and he has come to the United States to help us to understand what happened in Belgium. Thanks to French parliamentarians we are beginning to understand what happened in Paris, what motivated Paris French behavior on the ground in Rwanda. Three governments were forewarned, and two of them are now asking themselves why they stood by and let 1 million people be slaughtered. The United States and the United Nations must do the same.

Senator Destexhe delivered a letter to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) today and to our committee requesting that the United States hold a similar investigation; since the United States was one of three countries privy to the information that a genocide was about to take place, that the United States ought to look at it in critical self-examination to make sure that never again means never again.

I yield to my colleague from Alabama.

Mr. HILLIARD. Thank you very much. You gave credit to those persons who were properly due; however, you failed to mention one, and that is the Congresswoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY). Let me personally thank you for your hard work and for your forthrightness and for your determination to come forth without any type of political fear of repercussions and let this country know what it should have been doing at the time and even now.

It has been 4 years since about a million persons were killed in 90 days when our country failed to react, and I thank you for not letting this country forget its inaction. Never again, I agree with you, but I thank you.

And I have for the RECORD something that I will submit, but I would like to just read the last paragraph:

I would like to acknowledge the hard work of my good friend from Georgia and thank her for making time for us to speak out on such a horrifying issue. We should not sit idly by while people are being slaughtered. Never ever again.

So I thank you and I commend you for a job well done.

COMMENT ON RWANDAN GENOCIDE

Never . . . again!

Never again!

Those two simple words are used when referring to the Holocaust.

However, I come to the House floor this evening with a heavy heart to speak on something that should have never happened again. I am here to speak on what is the fourth anniversary of the Rwandan genocide.

It has been four years since one million Rwandan people were slaughtered by their former friends and neighbors. I am talking about the loss of one million people in the span of just 90 days.

One million people murdered in 90 days.

To reach this number in 90 days required Hutus (who-toos) to butcher 463 Tutsis (toot-sees) and moderate Hutus every hour of every day for 90 straight days.

The total pre-genocide population of Rwanda was about 7 million people. After only three

months, one-seventh of Rwanda's population—men, women and children—lay dead in the streets. To put this massacre in some type of perspective. . . . The killings would be the same as slaughtering every African-American man, woman and child—approximately 37 million people—or one-seventh of the United States population in just 90 days.

We can discuss how terrible it is that this event even took place, but what really must be discussed is whether it ever had to happen at all.

It has been discovered that the international community, including the United States Government, was aware that genocide in Rwanda was imminent. A hearing was held just this morning in the House International Relations Committee on this very issue. And in that hearing, witnesses who were on the front lines in Rwanda reported that the United Nations, and the governments of the United States, France, United Kingdom, Belgium, and other countries, were fully apprised of not only escalating tension between Hutus and Tutsis, but more importantly, the United Nations and these governments were made aware of plans for mass genocide by the Hutus against the Tutsis.

Even with knowledge of the planned genocide, the United Nations peace-keeping troops were reduced from 2,500 to only 270.

I repeat . . . only 270 troops were retained, even with knowledge of a planned mass genocide.

I cannot accept that the State Department and the administration would have knowledge of this situation and not inform members of Congress. I am further angered by the fact that the State Department failed to appear at our hearing this morning, hiding behind ridiculous department rules.

The value of African lives cannot . . . and will not, be so easily cast aside. I will not allow the administration of this country to serve lip service to its commitment to African issues—but more importantly African lives.

I, with other members here tonight, plan to get to the bottom of this issue, and determine exactly who knew what, and when they knew it. Belgium, France, and the United Nations are all currently going through some form of truth-seeking process. It is high time the United States did the same.

We will find out who knew in advance that genocide was imminent. And where there was knowledge of any inaction, we must speak out and hold those people and governments accountable—even those here in the United States.

I would like to acknowledge the hard work of my good friend from Georgia, and thank her for making time for us to speak out on such a horrifying issue. We should not sit idly by while people are being slaughtered.

Never . . . ever . . . again!

Ms. MCKINNEY. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this time to make this presentation to our colleagues and the Congress and to our audience, the American people.

Never again is supposed to mean never again, and we now must demand that we understand fully what happened and why it happened.

Unfortunately, the State Department chose to not show up at a very important hearing. They chose to duck the

answers of the people who came to present their questions. And in response to that, then, I have to add my voice to the tens of other people who were at that hearing today who were calling for an investigation.

I now call for an investigation of what happened so that indeed when we say never again the world community will know that never again means never again.

Bruxelles, Belgium, May 5, 1998.

Hon. BENJAMIN GILMAN,
Chairman, House Committee on International Relations, Rayburn Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GILMAN: I am writing to recommend that the United States Congress undertake an investigation into the events surrounding the 1994 genocide in Rwanda. During that time, I was the Secretary General of Médecins sans Frontières (Doctors without Borders). In this capacity, I visited Rwanda just before and just after the genocide. In 1995, I became a Member of Parliament and initiated the Belgian Senate Committee of Inquiry on the Rwanda genocide.

Our Committee of Inquiry heard testimony from 95 witnesses, including Belgian Ministers, Diplomats and members of the Military. The Committee also consulted all documents from 1993 and 1994 in the Foreign Affairs and Defense Ministries, including all correspondence between Kigali and Brussels.

Two main questions were addressed: Before the genocide, were the Belgian authorities and others aware of the fact that it was under preparation? After the genocide started on 7 April, 1994, why did the UN decide to withdraw almost all its forces from Rwanda?

Concerning the period before the genocide, our Committee concluded that: ". . . at the latest in mid-January 1994, the Belgian authorities had a series of relevant information regarding, if not the preparation of genocide, at least the existence of the preparation of large scale massacres. . . . On the other hand, several actors (UN, other states . . .) that had the same type of information did not give it the necessary importance. . . ." (page 506)

Although the Committee decided not to be more specific about the "other states," this is clearly a reference to France and the United States. We based that conclusion on various evidence, in particular documents from the files of the Belgian Ministries of Defense and Foreign Affairs. Among others, we found 19 documents in which there is mention of a Machiavellian plan of destabilization and massacres. There is no reason to believe that similar information was not at the disposal of the American and French Ambassadors and the UN Representatives. Most important is a cable sent on January 11, 1994, almost three months before the genocide, by General Dallaire, the Commander of the UN forces in Rwanda (UNAMIR), to the UN Headquarters in New York, based on information provided to him by a key informer. This cable revealed a fairly detailed plan explaining how the genocide was organized in Kigali. It mentions that the principal aim of Interhamwe (the militia of the President's party) in the past was to protect Kigali from the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF). He noted that a campaign was under way by Interhamwe to register all Tutsi in Kigali, he says he suspected that this was for their extermination. He quotes an Interhamwe informant as saying that in twenty minutes his personnel could kill up to 1,000 Tutsi.

This cable's importance cannot be overestimated. How many times has the United

Nations received from its Force Commander in a country a warning of a possible, even probable, extermination?

In the cable, General Dallaire announced his intention to take action within 48 hours and requested protection for his informer. UN Headquarters answered that the action he had planned to take was not authorized because it did not fall within the UNAMIR mandate. Dallaire was instructed to contact the three ambassadors from Belgium, France and the United States, and ask them to intervene with President Habyarimana of Rwanda. He was also instructed to request from these countries protection and asylum for his informer.

The contents of the cable shared with the American, French and Belgian Ambassadors in Kigali. According to the special representative of Secretary General Boutros Ghali, "They expressed serious concern and indicated that they would consult with their capital and would act accordingly." On January 13, 1994, all three ambassadors met President Habyarimana and expressed their concern that the Arusha Peace Agreements (which were supposed to bring a peaceful transition in Rwanda) were being violated by his political party and his supporters. Apart from this, very little was done to stop the perpetrators of the genocide. I strongly believe that if General Dallaire's cable had been widely publicized at the time, the genocide could have been avoided.

We should remember that nearly one million people were killed in less than three months in Rwanda in 1994. We should also recall that the Rwandan killings were an attempt to eradicate an entire people, and as such constitute one of very few unequivocal genocides in the twentieth century. A crime of this nature and scale demands full investigation. The Rwandan genocide demonstrated that the lesson of the Holocaust still has not been learned. At the end of the day, everyone is accountable for their actions when genocide crimes against humanity are at stake.

Belgium, France, the United States and the United Nations also share a responsibility for not doing more—indeed, doing almost nothing—to prevent or stop the killings. The genocide of the Tutsi in Rwanda took place in a country where 2,500 UN blue helmets were deployed and supposed to maintain peace and protect human lives. They could have prevented the killings, both before and during the genocide.

The role of Belgium in this tragedy has been fully examined by the Belgian Senate Committee. That of France is currently being investigated in the French Parliament. The victims, but also humanity at large, deserve to know the full truth concerning the two others major international players—the United States and the United Nations.

To conclude, I would first like to note that I fully welcome the initiatives of the Clinton Administration to prevent further genocide and bring justice in the Great Lakes region, initiatives which were taken after the presidential trip to Africa.

However, more needs to be done. A full investigation on the part of the United States can help to improve the chances that such suffering will not be repeated. In attempting to move forward, the past must be taken in account. The 1994 genocide remains a central issue to understanding the situation in the Great Lakes region. It also highlighted the deep inadequacies in the way the international community responds to signs of impending crisis. We cannot prevent future tragedies if we do not come to terms with the past; in the United States as in Belgium,

that process must involve examining the role this government played in Rwanda in 1994.

Sincerely,

ALAIN DESTEXHE,

*Member of the Parliament of Belgium,
President, International Crisis Group*

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, the gentlelady from Georgia, Ms. MCKINNEY, for organizing this Special Order. Her dedication to Africa is exemplary.

Mr. Speaker, four years ago the people of Rwanda suffered unimaginable horror. Up to one million Rwandans were slaughtered by their countrymen in only three months. Radicals associated with the Government of Rwanda organized the killings of Tutsis and moderate Hutus. The killing only stopped when the Rwandan Patriotic Front, now the government of Rwanda, overthrew the genocidal regime.

The atrocious events of 1994 will scar Rwanda for generations. Indeed, the entire world has become a less humane place because of them. Earlier today, the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights of the Committee on International Relations, chaired by our distinguished colleague, CHRIS SMITH, held a hearing on many aspects of the 1994 Rwandan genocide. The genocide remains relevant today, Mr. Speaker, because the conditions in Central Africa make another genocide possible.

Ethnic and cultural rivalries are still deadly in the Democratic Republic of Congo, Burundi and Rwanda. Innocent men, women and children—in all three countries—are being killed today because of the groups to which they belong.

The United States failed to intervene in the 1994 genocide, Mr. Speaker. I hope that by reflecting on the events of those horrible three months, we can do more to avert tragedy next time.

Again, let me thank the gentlelady from Georgia, Ms. MCKINNEY, for organizing this special order, and also the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. SMITH, for holding his hearing earlier today.

FREEDOM OF RELIGION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to the House and other citizens about a major issue which we will have on the floor of this body in 1 month.

Mr. Speaker, we have a great reverence and respect in the United States of America, and properly so, for the Constitution that was assembled and ratified by the States some 200 years ago, and the very first liberty that was put in the Bill of Rights, added to the original Constitution, is religious freedom.

The first amendment begins, Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, and with those plain simple words the Founding Fathers intended to establish two basic simple concepts. First, that this land would not have any official church so designated by an act of the Federal

Government; secondly, that we would have the maximum of religious liberty in the United States of America.

Why did so many people come to this country if not seeking a land where they could freely exercise their religious beliefs and where they could exercise it right next to someone who might have some differences of faith but who would have not only a tolerance but a respect for those differences; who would say to one another, you may have your belief and I may have mine, and we believe that all men have a God-given right to acknowledge God according to the dictates of their own conscience; worship who, where, or how they may, and we respect that right, and we are not offended by the fact that someone may have a differing religious belief.

But, Mr. Speaker, it started 36 years ago that the Supreme Court took that very plain and simple language, that very plain and simple meaning, and they started to twist it, they started to distort it, they started to make misdirected rulings and basically said that if you are on public property, like a school, if you are on public property and you engage in an act of prayer or other religious expression, that that is the same as if this Congress had said that we are going to select for the American people what their faith must be. They said basically that an individual or a group of people coming together when they are on public property is the same as telling people what their beliefs must be as establishing a national church, an official religion. They are not the same thing at all.

But in 1962 the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that even when, even when students voluntarily choose to recite a prayer together, even when there was no compulsion that was involved, that was unconstitutional. And so began the controversy that has continued for a generation over voluntary prayer in public schools.

It has gotten so bad, Mr. Speaker, that the add-on decisions from the U.S. Supreme Court just made it worse. For example, in 1985, and Mr. Speaker, this was a decision that came from your home State of Alabama; the State of Alabama had passed a law that said, well, the Supreme Court says we cannot have vocal prayers by groups of students in public school, but we will permit students to have a moment of silence. A moment of silence was permitted by the Alabama law, and in 1985 the United States Supreme Court, just across the street from the Capitol building over here, the United States Supreme Court said permitting a moment of silence was unconstitutional because it could be used by students for silent prayer.

Now I thought the Constitution at least guaranteed the right to remain silent, but not if you are using that silence in a school to offer a prayer. That was the U.S. Supreme Court. That is part of the warped rulings that have so