

History was made by public statements of public figures. Before pollsters, media consultants and ghost writers, great orators like Daniel Webster, Henry Clay and John C. Calhoun mesmerized their audiences in the halls of Congress, thus securing their roles in the nation's history. People rushed to the Capitol, filled the galleries and watched the great debates in person. Of those, Daniel Webster's speech on the Senate floor for a united country, one liberty and one people, is among the most famous in American history. Webster proclaimed that public speech, while it may be manipulated or sculpted, "[i]t must exist in the man, the subject, and in the occasion."

But are those principles of dialogue maintained in modern times? How public speech is delivered, and reported has changed dramatically over time. Modern reporting is instantaneous and relentless. Papparazzi pursue celebrities with cameras and microphones, while news is beamed continuously to households around the world, around the clock. To cope with modern reporting, media advisors and press secretaries craft skillful, but evasive, replies for their bosses. Throughout the Monica Lewinsky scandal, President Clinton has emerged as a master of evasiveness and media "spin" on the political battlefield. Why don't public figures just speak their minds? They may be taking their lessons from what rash public statements have done to others before them.

On the real battlefield, General George S. Patton, Jr. swept the Third Army through Europe and helped secure an allied victory in World War II. Characterized by his gruff personality and hard demeanor, Patton demanded strength and discipline from his men. Inwardly, he studied philosophy and wrote poetry; but outwardly he was ruthless and offensive. He may have carried his troops more than once by determination alone. Never afraid to speak his mind, Patton once was asked by a preacher whether he ever managed to read from the Bible he kept on his nightstand. "Every—damned day," Patton replied.

At times hated and loved by his men, Patton commanded loyal troops who performed the impossible during the war. His fierce determination to pursue and conquer the enemy, coupled with his unapologetic prose was at times glorious and disastrous. He was one of the greatest tacticians and generals the United States has ever seen. General Patton led his armored units with speed and daring, his philosophy: "Catch the enemy by the nose and then kick him in the pants." This philosophy carried the Third Army across more territory and captured more prisoners than any other army in American history.

Patton, as battlefield commander, enjoyed unparalleled success. Patton, as a public figure, suffered greatly. Many times his brash, unapologetic statements, made off the record, ended up as newspaper headlines. His statements about fighting the Russians to free Eastern Europe and using ex-Nazi's during reconstruction were hotly criticized. Those controversial, but matter-of-fact statements were said quietly, or in private. But they eventually cost one of our guest generals his command of the Third Army.

It is no wonder today's public figures sometimes hesitate to speak their mind. Modern reporting, often geared towards sensationalism, creates that need for evasiveness and spin in

public speaking. This dichotomy fuels public cynicism and distrust. But sensationalism sells. So long as it does, public figures will guard their words, and the public long for heroes, like Patton, whom are unafraid to speak their minds.

TRIBUTE TO PROFESSOR SUSAN  
PFUEHLER

**HON. DAVID E. BONIOR**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 18, 1998*

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute and congratulate Susan Pfuehler on a distinguished career as a Theatre Professor at Eastern Washington University in Cheney, Washington. I have come to know Susan as the mother of one of my staff members, and have had the privilege to learn and hear about her from her son. I know that he is very proud of her.

From Susan's days as a child, growing up on a small turkey farm in rural western Illinois, she displayed a flair for the dramatic. Her reading about a "runty" pig earned her local accolades and launched her career in theatre. Susan was one of those rare individuals who knew her calling at a young age and pursued it full tilt. Once she graduated from her local college in Monmouth, Illinois, she headed across the Mississippi River to the University of Iowa for her masters degree. Although she was there a few years before me, we are proud to count her among our alumni.

After a short teaching stint at the University of Arizona, Susan and her husband found themselves in the small town of Cheney where she made her career as a professor and raised her family. Some might say Susan was among the original feminists—those strong and pioneering women who launched successful careers in the early 1950's. While Susan returned to the job a mere ten days after her son was born and her work often kept her in the theatre into the wee hours, she still possessed an amazing ability to find time for her family and include them in the activities at her workplace. As is, unfortunately, all too common today, it was not easy for women to succeed professionally. But Susan had deep resolve and drew strength from her family to have an outstanding career.

From setting up the first ever costume production facility and academic program at, then, Eastern Washington State College, to creating a dynamic costume program at the Interlochen Center for the Arts, to being named among Who's Who in Entertainment for the past two years, Susan has forged ahead heartfelt passion and steadfast determination.

I was once told that Susan's definition of successful teaching was to draw that one quiet kid in the classroom out and inspire them to do great things. I think it's safe to say that Susan has been successful time and time again. Teaching is a noble profession. But perhaps it is those teachers who are indeed humble in their contributions who are truly our national treasures. Susan certainly belongs in that category.

Over nearly 50 years of service to the job she loved—teaching our young people—Susan has inspired thousands of students in thousands of ways. From the classroom po-

dium, Susan found a comfortable forum from which both to teach and to learn. As she looks forward to her next stage, I know that she will dearly miss that platform from which to speak and to listen.

Indeed the educational community has lost a great friend, but if I know Susan, she will be active in retirement and will, hopefully, have a little fun along the way. I wish all the best to you, Susan, on your well-deserved retirement.

EXPRESSING UNEQUIVOCAL SUPPORT FOR MEN AND WOMEN OF OUR ARMED FORCES CURRENTLY CARRYING OUT MISSIONS IN AND AROUND PERSIAN GULF REGION

SPEECH OF

**HON. MARSHALL "MARK" SANFORD**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, December 17, 1998*

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today very reluctantly to voice opposition to H. Res. 612. If this resolution is truly about honoring our servicemen and women, I would vote differently. However, it is clear to me that voting for this resolution is tantamount to endorsing the President's capriciously-timed, to use a euphemism, invocation of the War Powers Act. That is something my conscience cannot allow.

I have the most profound respect for our nation's military and it is for just this reason that I cannot support this resolution. I have come to this floor on innumerable occasions to provide for my unconditional support of those initiatives which prudently and honestly promote our armed forces. My support of H. Res. 322 in November of last year which urged military action to assure full Iraqi compliance with U.N. Security Council resolutions, for example, delineates my record on the use of military force in the Persian Gulf.

It is the right thing to do at the wrong time. The timing of Wednesday's air strikes on Iraq raised too many red flags for me. I am left with too strong a perception that our men and women of the military are being put in harm's way for political reasons. I say this for several reasons:

Red Flag #1—On several occasions over the past few years, we have walked to the brink of further military engagement with Iraq. In every instance, we have walked away from that brink. Yet on the eve of a historic vote, one that has not occurred for the last 130 years in the House, we choose to cross the line? For thirteen months, the President has watched and dithered, then, after 400 days of inaction, hours before the House vote, the President decides that this is the day to take America to war. The President declared Saddam Hussein a "clear and present danger". But, he has been a clear and present danger for 400 days. Now all of a sudden, kowtowing is out and the danger is present.

Red Flag #2—There seems to be discrepancy in the messages that we get out of the White House. Rowan Scarborough's article in The Washington Times pointed out that the White House notified the Joint Chiefs of Staff on Sunday that President Clinton would order air strikes this week. Now that's a full 48 hours before he saw the United Nations report declaring Iraq noncompliant. However, on