

Over the years, I have attended this wonderful concert many times. I am honored to have Sergio Franchi's memory preserved in my own community of Stonington, Connecticut. Sergio was, and Eva continues to be, a dedicated supporter of the arts. This foundation has been established to continue the dream Sergio had—that is to help fund talented and deserving musicians.

In the 10 years since the foundation's inception, Eva has been able to award more than 120 scholarships and awards to students of vocal studies, young tenors and sopranos, with the hope that through beautiful, romantic classical music, Sergio's spirit may be kept alive.

The great Scottish historian and essayist Thomas Carlyle wrote, "Music is well said to be the speech of angels."

Sergio Franchi was born with the gift of music and those of us who have heard him singing know very well what Mr. Carlyle was referring to.

Mr. Speaker, Eva Franchi lives by the commitment of her husband to promote and foster a love of music through young voices of the future. On behalf of the rest of my staff, I wish to express our gratitude to Mrs. Eva Franchi for her devotion to the arts and for her dedication to preserving the memory of her husband through the Sergio Franchi Music Scholarship Foundation.

Eva, speaking for all members of Congress, we thank you for your service to our community, and thank you for your service and dedication to the classical musicians of the future.

TRIBUTE TO CAMP GOOD GRIEF

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 2003

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise before this body of Congress and this nation today to pay tribute to an outstanding organization in my district. Camp Good Grief! in Cedaredge, Colorado provides children coping with the loss of a loved one with a place to grieve and interact with other children experiencing similar emotions. The camp's work is invaluable in the lives of its campers, and I am proud to bring it to the attention of my colleagues here today.

Camp Good Grief! offers kids a weekend retreat to help them deal with death, pairing them up with a counselor who provides support in sorting through their feelings. There are approximately forty-five staff counselors who offer companionship and serve as a friend while leading the children in their activities. Throughout the weekend, children participate in various arts and crafts that aim to help them to better cope with their loss and manage the grieving process. Camp Good Grief! invites children in grades three through eight to spend the weekend while also providing a teen retreat for high school aged kids.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the people who make Camp Good Grief! possible. Their altruistic pledge to helping kids in their time of need is truly commendable. Dealing with the loss of a loved one is not easy for anyone, let alone a child. This camp does a tremendous service in helping our kids cope with death. I want to recognize them for their commendable service.

THE IMPORTANCE OF NATIONAL SERVICE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 2003

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to share an excerpt from an important policy brief published by the Brookings Institute on the meaning of citizenship and national service.

What is our civic responsibility to this land, as people who enjoy the benefits of living in a vibrant democracy? How can we keep the social contract between all segments of society without a shared sense of sacrifice and duty? Authors E.J. Dionne, Jr. and Kayla Meltzer Drogosz provide a good overview of the subject and the importance of this issue to the future success of this country.

THE PROMISE OF NATIONAL SERVICE: A (VERY) BRIEF HISTORY OF AN IDEA

(By E.J. Dionne, Jr. and Kayla Meltzer Drogosz)

THE SERVICE IDEA AND THE AMERICAN EXPERIMENT

Divisions over the meaning of service are rooted deeply in our history. When the United States was founded, liberal and civic republican ideas jostled for dominance. The liberals—they might now be called libertarians—viewed personal freedom as the heart of the American experiment. The civic republicans valued freedom, too, but they stressed that self-rule demanded a great deal from citizens. The liberals stressed rights. The civic republicans stressed obligations to a common good and, as the philosopher Michael Sandel has put it in his book, *Democracy's Discontents*, "a concern for the whole, a moral bond with the community whose fate is at stake." In our time, the clash between these older traditions lives on in the intellectual wars between libertarians and communitarians. On national service, libertarians lean toward skepticism, communitarians toward a warm embrace.

America has changed since September 11, 2001. Respect for service soared as the nation forged a new and stronger sense of solidarity in the face of deadly enemies. What has been said so often still bears repeating: our view of heroes underwent a remarkable and sudden change. The new heroes are public servants—police, firefighters, rescue workers, postal workers whose lives were threatened, men and women in uniform—not the CEOs, high-tech wizards, rock stars, or sports figures who dominated the 1990s. At a time when citizens focus on urgent national needs, those who serve their country naturally rise in public esteem. Robert Putnam, a pioneer in research on civic engagement, captures the post-9/11 moment powerfully. He argues that because of the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon—and the courage shown by those on the plane that went down over Pennsylvania—"we have a more capacious sense of 'we' than we have had in the adult experience of most Americans now alive."

SEPTEMBER 11 AND THE SERVICE IDEAL

Accordingly, the politics of national service were also transformed. Even before September 11, President Bush had signaled a warmer view of service than many in his party. In choosing two Republican supporters of the idea—former Mayor Steve Goldsmith of Indianapolis and Leslie Lenkowsky, CEO of the Corporation for National and Community Service—to head his administration's service effort, Bush made clear he intended to take it seriously.

After September 11, service became a stronger theme in the president's rhetoric. In his 2001 State of the Union message, he called on Americans to give two years of service to the nation over their lifetimes and announced the creation of the USA Freedom Corps. It was a patriotic, post-September 11 gloss on the old Clinton ideas—and the ideas of John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, and Bush's father, the first President Bush, who offered the nation a thousand points of light.

There is also a new acknowledgment across the political divides that government support for volunteers can provide essential help for valuable institutions that we too often take for granted. It is easy for politicians to talk about the urgency of strengthening "civil society." But through AmeriCorps and other programs, the government has found a practical (and not particularly costly) way to make the talk real. Paradoxically, as the journalist Steven Waldman points out, AmeriCorps, a Democratic initiative, fit neatly with the Republicans' emphasis on faith-based programs. Democrats accepted the need to strengthen programs outside of government; Republicans accepted that voluntary programs could use government's help. This interplay between government and independent communal action may be especially important in the United States, where powerful and intricate links have always existed—long before the term "faith-based organizations" was invented—between the religious and civic spheres.

That national service has become a bipartisan goal is an important achievement. It is reflected in the White House's Citizen Service Act and in bills cosponsored by, among others, Senators John McCain (R-Ariz.) and Evan Bayh (D-Ind.). Sen. John Kerry (D-Mass.) has made an ambitious service proposal a centerpiece of his presidential campaign. These legislative ideas mirrored the spirit of the moment. As Marc Magee and Steven Nider of the Progressive Policy Institute reported a year ago, in the first nine months after September 11 applications for AmeriCorps jumped 50 percent, those for the Peace Corps doubled, and those for Teach for America tripled. Yes, a difficult private economy certainly pushed more young Americans toward such public endeavors. Nonetheless, their choices point to the continued power of the service idea.

CITIZENSHIP AND SERVICE

Citizenship cannot be reduced to service. The good works of faith communities and the private sector—or "communities of character," as President Bush has called them—cannot replace the responsibilities of government. Service can become a form of cheap grace, a generalized call on citizens to do kind things as an alternative to a genuine summons for national sacrifice or a fair apportionment of burdens among the more and less powerful or wealthy. But when service is seen as a bridge to genuine political and civic responsibility, it can strengthen democratic government and foster the republican virtues. Lenkowsky made this connection when he urged attendees at a Corporation for National and Community Service conference to turn "civic outrage into civic engagement" by increasing the reach and effectiveness of volunteer programs. No one can dispute visionaries like former Senator Harris Wofford, chairman of America's Promise, and Alan Khazei, cofounder and CEO of City Year, who have shown how AmeriCorps, VISTA, Senior Corps, and Peace Corps have transformed communities. But Paul Light of Brookings questions whether this transformation is sustainable. Can episodic volunteerism build the capacity and effectiveness of public and nonprofit organizations?

Will the new respect for service make government bashing less satisfying as a hobby? It is possible, but not likely.

Underlying the debate over national service is an argument over whether service is necessary or merely "nice." If service is just a nice thing to do, it's easy to understand the strong reservations about government-led service programs from critics such as Bruce Chapman who, in 1966, wrote *The Wrong Man in Uniform*, one of the earliest calls for a volunteer military.

But service has the potential to be far more than something nice.

Will Marshall and Marc Magee of the Progressive Policy Institute argue that the service idea could be a departure comparable to breakthroughs in earlier eras toward a stronger sense of citizenship. "Like settlement houses and night school, which helped America absorb waves of immigration," they write, "national service opens new paths of upward mobility for young Americans and the people they serve. And, like the G.I. Bill, national service should be seen as a longterm investment in the education, skills, and ingenuity of our people."

Service, then, is not simply a good in itself, but a means to many ends. It creates bridges between groups that have little to do with each other on any given day, and as the New Left's Port Huron Statement put it forty years ago, draws citizens "out of isolation and into community." Michael Brown, the co-founder of City Year, says service can activate "people's justice nerve," creating a thirst for social improvement. It could foster civic and political participation in a society that seems not to hold public service in the highest esteem.

But this very plurality of ends creates a certain skepticism about service. If it offers something for everyone, how serious can the idea really be? Michael Lind, a senior fellow at the New America Foundation, is right when he says that "within the small but vocal community of national service enthusiasts, there is far more agreement on the policy of national service than on its purpose." In the post-September 11 environment, he argues that the one compelling case for citizen service would rest on the need to expand the nation's capacity to prepare for and respond to domestic emergencies, notably those caused by terrorism.

ANSWERING THE CALL TO SERVICE

However one conceives of service, surely one of its ends—or, at least, one of the ends that wins the broadest assent—is the urgency of finding new ways to engage young Americans in public life after a long period of estrangement. In his 2000 campaign, Sen. McCain—initially a skeptic of national service, now a strong supporter—won a wide following among young people by urging them to aspire to things "beyond your own self-interest." Many surveys suggest that young Americans are deeply engaged in civic activity. One by Harvard's Kennedy Institute of Politics in October 2002 found that 61 percent of its national sample of undergraduates reported performing some form of community service in the past year. And as Paul Light has shown in a new survey, liberal arts college graduates from the Class of 2003 are eager to find jobs that provide opportunities to help people. However, when they hear the phrase "public service," they think of the kind of work they see in the nonprofit sector and not in government or politics. If we are to expand young people's understanding of public service, then service learning initiatives in public schools must continue to be linked with a heightened sense of civic responsibility and personal effectiveness.

If the new generation connected its impulses to service with politics, it could become one of the great reforming generations in American history. And service could become a pathway to a stronger sense of citi-

zenship. As the columnist Jane Eisner argues, service "must produce more than individual fulfillment for those involved and temporary assistance for communities in need." It should, she says, "lead to an appetite for substantive change, a commitment to address the social problems that have created the need for service in the first place." Eisner and others have suggested that as a nation, we should celebrate the first vote cast by young people with the same fanfare that greets other moments of passage to adult responsibility. The goal would be to encourage a new generation to make the connection "between service to the community and participation in the very process that governs community life."

A focus on the links service forges between the rights and responsibilities of citizenship could offer new ways out of old political impasses. For example, Andrew Stern, the president of the Service Employees International Union, suggests that a two-year commitment to national service could become a pathway for undocumented workers to legalize their status and for legal immigrants to speed their passage to citizenship. Stern also proposes that former felons now denied voting rights might "earn credits toward restoration of full citizenship" through service.

At its best, service is not make-work, but what Harry Boyte and Nancy Kari, in their book, *Building America*, have called "public work." It is work that "is visible, open to inspection, whose significance is widely recognized" and can be carried out by "a mix of people whose interests, backgrounds, and resources may be quite different." Service as public work is the essence of the democratic project. It solves common problems and creates common things. Public work entails not only altruism, but also enlightened self-interest—a desire to build a society in which the serving citizen wants to live.

SKEPTICISM, REALISM, HOPE

Service alone cannot build a stronger sense of citizenship. Citizenship is meaningless unless citizens have the power to achieve their goals and to change their communities and the nation. It is thus possible to be skeptical about the new call to service, and it is absolutely necessary to be realistic. Speeches about service can be a convenient way for politicians to call for sacrifice without demanding much of citizens. At little cost to themselves, advocates of both conservative and liberal individualism can use service to shroud their real intentions behind the decent drapery of community feeling.

William Galston, a scholar who has devoted years of energy to promoting research and action to excite young Americans to public engagement, worries that the failure to link post-September 11 rhetoric about service to actual calls for civic action could lead to the very sort of cynicism service advocates decry.

"Would Pearl Harbor have been a defining event if it had not been followed by a national mobilization and four years of war that altered the lives of soldiers and civilians alike?" Galston asks. "In the immediate wake of September 11, the administration's failure to call for any real sacrifice from citizens fortified my belief that the terrorist attack would be the functional equivalent of Pearl Harbor without World War II, intensifying insecurity without altering civic behavior."

Theda Skocpol, another wise student of American civic life, sounds an equally useful warning. "Absent organizational innovations and new public policies," she writes, "the reinvigorated sense of the American 'we' that was born of the travails of 9/11 may well gradually dissipate, leaving only ripples on

the managerial routines of contemporary U.S. civic life." In fact, as Skocpol and Galston suggest, mere exhortation to serve will do little to foster public—and especially political—participation if too many citizens see the public realm as broken.

The issue of whether Americans have been called to any real sort of sacrifice is, of course, the point of Rep. Rangel calling for a renewal of the draft. It is neither race-baiting nor class warfare—Rangel was accused of both—to suggest that a democratic society has a problem when members of its most privileged classes are not among the first to rally to the colors at a time of trouble.

This problem also worries Charles Moskos, the nation's premier student of service and the military experience. Moskos has explored ways of expanding the circle of commitment and promoting the idea of the "citizen soldier." This idea has caught on in a wide range of political circles. As Stanley Kurtz wrote in the *National Review* in April, "In a world of looming military challenges, the citizen-soldier program may be our last chance to expand the armed forces without a draft." John Lehman, the Navy Secretary under Ronald Reagan, has also offered helpful remedies short of a draft to overcome what he agrees is a fundamental problem: that "the burdens of defense and the perils of combat do not fall even close to fairly across all of our society."

FROM SERVICE TO CITIZENSHIP

If the problems of inequality are vexing where military service is concerned, they can also be troubling for service at home. Service, badly conceived, can distance citizens from public problems by seeing the server more as a missionary uplifting the needy than as a fellow citizen. Michael Schudson, a professor of sociology at the University of California, San Diego, sees President Bush's ideal citizen is a "Rotarian, moved by a sense of neighborliness, Christian charity, and social responsibility, but untouched by having a personal stake in public justice." Schudson's point is not to knock Rotarians. It is to argue that self-interest in pursuit of justice is a virtue. As Schudson notes in describing the civil rights movement, the most dramatic expansion of democracy and citizenship in our lifetime was brought about by citizens "driven not by a desire to serve but by an effort to overcome indignities they themselves have suffered." The point is brought home powerfully by Charles Cobb, who sees the civil rights movement as being best understood "as a movement of community organizing rather than one of protest." The civil rights movement performed a huge national service—and inspired many specific forms of service, including the registration of thousands of voters. This quintessentially civic, "good government" act, the registration of new voters, was also a powerful form of rebellion in places that denied African Americans the right to vote.

These are essential points. Yet it is also true that Rotarians are good citizens. Neighborliness, charity, and social responsibility are genuine virtues. And it is just possible that a nation responding to the call to service would, over time, become a nation deeply engaged in questions of public justice.

The debate over national service is a debate over how we Americans think of ourselves. It is a debate over how we will solve public problems and what we owe to our country and to each other. If our nation is to continue to prosper, it is a debate we will have in every generation. For if we decide that there are no public things to which we should be willing to pledge some of our time and some of our effort—not to mention "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor"—we will be breaking faith with our nation's

experiment in liberty rooted in mutual assistance and democratic aspiration.

IN HONOR OF THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF DALLAS SOUTHWEST OSTEOPATHIC PHYSICIANS INC.

HON. MARTIN FROST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 2003

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize Dallas Southwest Osteopathic Physicians Inc., as it celebrates its 20th anniversary.

In 1983, a group of doctors at Stevens Park Osteopathic Hospital decided to form a social welfare organization with the noble intention of investing in charitable causes in the Dallas community. With \$7 million in hand, the doctors invested their money, the returns on which led to large contributions to medicine, education, and community development initiatives. Over 20 years, the organization doubled its assets and has since contributed more than \$12 million in grants, scholarships, and financial assistance, to numerous community projects.

The Dallas Southwest Osteopathic Physicians have granted gifts to organizations and individuals in nearly every facet of life. Among their many gifts to the community, the Physicians have granted gifts to build a community center at the Oak Cliff YMCA; construct a playground for the handicapped; establish a Fire Safety House for the Dallas Fire Department; start a Bookmobile for the Dallas Public Library; and establish the Endowed Chair in Clinical Geriatrics at UNT Health Science Center at Fort Worth.

By benefiting the truly needy and encouraging philanthropy in Dallas, the physicians have made a significant and indelible imprint on Southwest Dallas.

Mr. Speaker, Dallas Southwest Osteopathic Physicians Inc. has helped over 150 beneficiaries over 20 years. I know my colleagues will join me in honoring them today, and wishing them the very best in their continuing efforts.

JOHN CZUCZMAN, INTERNATIONAL VICE PRESIDENT OF TWU RETIRES

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 2003

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer congratulations to John Czuczman upon his retirement from the Transportation Workers Union TWU. Before retiring, Mr. Czuczman served as International Vice President and Director of the Railroad Division for TWU representing employees throughout the Northeast and Midwest.

Mr. Czuczman began his career in the rail industry in 1955 as an employee of the Pittsburgh and Lake Erie Railroad and was a member of the TWU Local 1427. In 1968, he successfully ran for Local 1427 President and Grievance Chairman. He continued to serve the Local 1427 in those positions for the next 14 years. During his tenure as President, Mr.

Czuczman was an active member of the union's Policy Making Board for railroad members.

In 1980, TWU's late president William Lindner appointed Mr. Czuczman to the International Union's staff as an International Representative. While on the International's staff, Mr. Czuczman was involved in most of the Union's key negotiations and arbitrations. He served as TWU's representative on the task force that put Conrail together in the early 1980's. Additionally, he participated in the crucial TWU negotiations that led to the takeover of Conrail's commuter lines by SEPTA, Metro-North and the New Jersey Transit in 1982. Mr. Czuczman also served as Chairman of the Conrail Screening Committee and participated in a number of Conrail's contract negotiations. Since 1982, Mr. Czuczman has negotiated every contract with Amtrak involving the Joint Council of Carmen and the Amtrak Service Workers Council.

A tireless fighter for the rights of rail workers, Mr. Czuczman has been a strong advocate for the protection and improvement of the benefits provided by the Railroad Retirement Board. He also served as a member of the Board of Governors for Amtrak's Red Block Program which offers assistance, education and rehabilitation to those with alcohol and substance abuse problems.

Mr. Speaker, for almost 50 years John Czuczman has been a tireless advocate for the right of railroad workers. From negotiating contracts, to lobbying, to advocating for better benefits, to just simply being a friend to his fellow workers, John has served his fellow rail workers with dignity and class. Mr. Speaker, I hope that you will join me today in wishing John a long and happy retirement.

MISSOURI RICE MONTH

HON. JO ANN EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 2003

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize September as Missouri Rice Month and to urge all Americans to enjoy rice as part of a healthy, balanced diet.

Rice is the staple grain for more than 4 billion men, women, and children worldwide. Eight out of ten people depend on rice for 40 percent of their energy needs.

As a \$2 billion cash crop, rice is the fifth most valuable food crop in America. Rice is vital to the economic stability of agricultural producers across the nation. Moreover, America exports rice to more than 100 foreign countries, providing nearly 15 percent of the rice in the global market.

With 1.2 billion of the world's population living in poverty and 800 million undernourished, there is no more serious issue than hunger relief. Here in America, we have the rice supply to alleviate much of this suffering - and no continent in the world has been affected more by hunger than Africa.

In July, three rice farmers from Stoddard County, Missouri, accompanied me to Rome to learn more about how to get our Missouri products to African communities that desperately need food aid. Internationally, the World Food Programme and the Food and Agricultural Organizations of the United Nations

are working to implement commonsense programs to educate Africans on American agricultural products, to increase American exports and food aid to Africa, and to initiate school feeding programs.

By enabling America's thriving rice producers to meet the food needs of the starving and malnourished around the world, we can overcome hunger. But first we must raise awareness of America's quality agricultural exports. As more nations accept our food products for their own hunger relief, the demand for our rice will continue to grow. The satisfaction of improving and saving lives is the only reward America needs.

Missouri Rice Month will help us meet our humanitarian goals, and Missouri Rice Farmers will keep growing the grain that feeds the world.

WHAT DOES AMERICANISM MEAN TO ME?

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 2003

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with you the inspirational message of a perceptive eighth grader, Tess Spinola, winner of the Disabled American Veterans Auxiliary (DAVA) annual State Essay Contest. The contest, which began in 1948, was held throughout the East Bay Area of San Francisco. This year's question was "What does Americanism mean to me?" Tess attends St. Joseph's Elementary School in Alameda, CA in my district.

Founded on March 5, 1947, the Oakland Unit (#7) Auxiliary of DAVA brought together wives, sisters, daughters and mothers of those injured or disabled during wartime. The group of women decided at that time to dedicate their efforts to give back to the nation in a variety of ways. They work with local youth to bring more of America's young people to community service. Not all their work is purely organization, of course. DAVA created 100 baby quilts and gave them to nearby Highland Hospital, along with hand-made wheelchair bags and lap ropes for veterans. A few women in the Oakland Unit put on a party for people with Alzheimer's disease; others chair an Olympics for those with disabilities. In the words of Eva Mae Perakis, past state commander, "Our main purpose is to stimulate patriotism in the country and bring joy and awareness to the community."

Ms. Perakis described the essay contest as "overwhelmingly heart-warming." She said she receives letters from students who said it enriched their young lives to study and learn about veterans. "They realize they didn't really appreciate those freedoms they took for granted," she noted. Ms. Perakis also noted that the essays have "touched a few adult hearts as well."

"The contest causes our children to think and investigate inside themselves," Ms. Perakis said. "It's good for their minds. We're just trying to make our young students aware of what freedom really means. We hope they get that awareness as they write." Mr. Speaker, we all know that our children represent the future, and that someday they will be running this great country of ours. But, their impact frequently comes much before their maturation to