

Mr. Chairman, during a debate on the Senate floor in February 1990, your colleague Robert Dole championed another resolution commemorating the Armenian Genocide (S.J. Res. 212), and declared, "it's finally time for us to do what is right. Right. We pride ourselves in America" for "doing what's right, not what's expedient."

In this case, doing what is right does not exact a big price. The frequently heard argument that a commemorative resolution will harm American-Turkish relations is not credible. It ignores the fact that the relationship is much more in Turkey's favor than America's. Not doing what is right, on the other hand, is tantamount to rejecting mountains of documents in our National Archives, testimonies that refute the denial arguments generated in Ankara and, most disturbingly, promoted in prestigious academic circles here in America.

This denial recently spurred over 100 prominent scholars and intellectuals, including Raul Hilberg, John Updike, Norman Mailer, Kurt Vonnegut, and Arthur Miller, to sign a petition denouncing the "intellectually and morally corrupt . . . manipulation of American institutions" and the "fraudulent scholarship supported by the Turkish government and carried out in American Universities."

A typical example of the powerful evidence in the US Archives is a cable to the State Department from Ambassador Henry Morgenthau: "Persecution of Armenians assuming unprecedented proportions. Reports from widely scattered districts indicate systematic attempts to uproot peaceful Armenian populations and through arbitrary arrests" and "terrible tortures," to implement "wholesale expulsions and deportations from one end of the Empire to the other," frequently accompanied by "rape, pillage, and murder, turning into massacre . . ."

And the persecutions continued even after World War I ended in 1918. "It was like an endless chain," reported Edith Woods, an American nurse, in 1922. "The children would often be dead before I had taken their names. Forty to fifty of the older women died each day. . . . Their mouths were masses of sores, and their teeth were dropping out. And their feet, those poor feet, bleeding feet. . . . Deportation is sure death—and a far more horrible death than massacre. Unless one sees these things it is difficult to believe that such monstrous cruelty and barbarity exist in the world."

Ms. Woods' testimony ripped to shreds the web of denial being woven by Turkish officials in the early 1920's. She also exposed the new atmosphere of insensitivity at the American Embassy in Istanbul which contradicted the overwhelming sentiment of American public opinion and the spirit of Congressional resolutions in favor of Armenians that were passed during those days. This American woman made the personal choice to speak up against the response at her own Embassy, a policy imposed by acting ambassador Admiral Mark Bristol, who, driven obsessively by commercial interests, was colluding in a cover-up crafted by Turkish authorities.

Allen Dulles, the State Department's Near East Division chief (and later CIA Director), found it hard to keep things under wraps as Bristol requested. "Confidentially the State Department is in a bind," Dulles cautioned in April 1922.

Our task would be simple if the reports of the atrocities could be declared untrue or even exaggerated but the evidence, alas, is irrefutable and the Secretary of State wants to avoid giving the impression that while the United States is willing to intervene actively to protect its commercial interests, it is not willing to move on behalf of the Christian minorities.

And the evidence mounted. In May 1922, four American relief workers, Major Forrest D. Yowell of Washington DC, Dr. Mark Ward of New York, Dr. Ruth Parmalee of Boston, and Isabel Harely of Rhode Island, were all expelled from their posts in Turkey because they too chose to do what is right, they protested the ongoing persecutions. Major Yowell said Armenians in his district were "in a state of virtual slavery," with "no rights in the courts."

Dr. Ward quoted Turkish officials. One Turk declared: "We have been too easy in the past. We shall do a thorough job this time." another remarked: "Why do you Americans waste your time and money on these filthy Greeks and Armenians? We always thought that Americans knew how to get their money's worth. Any Greeks and Armenians who don't die here are sure to die when we send them on to Bitlis, as we always choose the worst weather in order to get rid of them quicker."

Not all Turks were so cruel. A British diplomat reported that another American in Turkey, Herbert Gibbons, knew of prominent Turks who protested the "unparalleled inhumanity:" but they were "beaten and sent away" for intervening. The Mayor of the Black Sea city of Trabzon had no sympathy with the government's policy and did what little he could. The Governor also opposed the "massacres and persecutions," but was powerless to stop it. His predecessor tried and was removed.

Gibbons thought the government's policy was "a calumny upon the good Turks, of whom there are many." Massacres never broke out spontaneously, since "Christians and Moslems ordinarily get along very well." The massacres were ordered, as part of a plan "to make Turkey truly Turkish."

Yet there are "humane and kind hearted Turks," Gibbons stressed, and there are "Mohammedans who fear God and who are shocked by the impious horrors of the extermination policy."

Revisionists today say in effect that Americans like Forrest Yowell, Mark Ward, Ruth Parmalee, Isabel Harely, Edith Woods, Herbert Gibbons, and Ambassador Henry Morgenthau were either liars or misguided.

Remembering the atrocities against the Armenians would show respect for those Americans who spoke up, and respect as well for Turks like Senator Riza who also chose to oppose the injustice. A recognition of the Armenian Genocide by the US Congress would be a step toward helping erase this important ally's image problem, which Turkish poet Nazim Hikmet described in 1951 as "this black stain on the forehead of the Turkish people."

Encouraging Turkey to face the facts of its history would help lift the cloud of controversy which haunted it for decades. It would help eliminate the deep roots of Armenian-Turkish enmity, paving the way to normalized relations, and it would give Armenia the sense of security many Armenians feel is necessary if they are to respond to Russia's regional policies with more independence and balance. The prospects for American commerce and regional stability would be strengthened by a recognition of the Armenian Genocide.

Acknowledging the Armenian Genocide also would show that Congress cannot condone the brazen contradiction of its own Archives and the dangerous corruption of America's academic institutions. It would send a strong signal to all deniers of genocide, especially to deniers of the Holocaust. Mr. Chairman, taking a stand against the denial of the Armenian Genocide would be entirely consistent with the successful resolution "Deploing Holocaust Deniers" which you so wisely introduced last December, in

which you too did what is right, by calling denial efforts "malicious." Such language is applicable to the denial of the Armenian Genocide as well.

Mr. Chairman, when weighing the merits of the arguments on both sides of this issue, it would be useful to keep in mind a letter sent to Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes in 1924 by Admiral Bristol, a man who was called "very pro-Turk" by Joseph Clark Grew, Washington's first Ambassador to Ankara. Even the pro-Turk Admiral acknowledged "the cruelties practiced upon the Armenians by Turks acting under official orders, and in pursuance of a deliberate official policy." For that policy, wrote Admiral Bristol, "there can be no adequate excuse."

## MONETARY POLICY

### HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 16, 1998

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, a world-wide financial crisis is now upon us.

For 2 years, I have called attention to this predictable event hoping the Congress would deal with it in a serious manner.

Although many countries are now suffering more than the United States, in time, I am sure our problems will become much greater.

A world-wide system of fiat money is the root of the crisis. The post-World War II Bretton Woods gold-exchange system was seriously flawed, and free market economists from the start predicted its demise. Twenty-seven years later, on August 15, 1971, it ended with a bang ushering in its turbulent and commodity-driven inflation of the 1970's.

Now, after another 27 years, we are seeing the end of the post-Bretton Woods floating rate system with another bang as the financial asset inflation of the 1980's and 1990's collapses. A new system is now required.

Just as the Bretton Woods system was never repaired due to its flaws, so too will it be impossible to rebuild the floating rate system of the past 27 years. The sooner we admit to its total failure, and start planning for sound money, the better.

We must understand the serious flaw in the current system that is playing havoc with world markets. When license is given to central banks to inflate (debase) a currency, they eventually do so. Politicians love the central bank's role as lender of last resort and their power to monetize the steady stream of public debt generated by the largesse that guarantees the politician's reelection.

The constitutional or credit restraint of a commodity standard of money offers stability and non-inflationary growth but does not accommodate the special interests that demand benefits bigger and faster than normal markets permit. The only problem is the financial havoc that results when the unsound system is forced into a major correction which are inherent to all fiat systems.

That is what we are witnessing today. The world-wide fragile financial system is now collapsing and tragically the only cry is for more credit inflation because the cause of our dilemma is not understood. Attempts at credit stimulation with interest rates below 1 percent is doing nothing for Japan's economy and for good reasons. It is the wrong treatment for the wrong diagnosis.

If the problem were merely that there were not enough money, then money creation alone could make us all millionaires and no one would have to work. But increasing the money supply does not increase wealth. Only work and savings do that. The deception comes because, for a while for the luck few, benefits are received when government inflate the currency and pass it out for political reasons.

But in time—and that time is now—it comes to an end. Even the beneficiaries suffer the inevitable consequences of a philosophy that teaches wealth comes from money creation and that central banks are acceptable central economic planners—even in countries such as the United States where many pay lip service to free markets and free trade.

The tragedy in the end is far more damaging to the innocent than any benefit that was supposed to be delivered to the people as a whole. There is no justifiable trade-off. The costs far exceed the benefits. In addition, the economic chaos leads too frequently to a loss of personal liberty.

A program to prevent this from happening is necessary.

First, the Federal Reserve should be denied the power to fix interest rates and buy government debt. It should not be central economic planner through manipulation of money and credit.

Second, Congress should legalize the Constitutional principle that gold and silver be legal tender by prohibiting sales and capital gains taxes from being placed on all American legal tender coins.

Third, we must abandon the tradition of bailing out bad debtors, foreign and domestic. No International Monetary Fund and related institution funding to prop up bankrupt countries, and no Federal Reserve-orchestrated bailouts such as Long Term Capital Management LP. Liquidation of bad debt and investments must be permitted.

Fourth, policy elsewhere must conform to free markets and free trade. Taxes, as well as government spending, should be lowered. Regulations should be greatly reduced, and all voluntary economic transactions in hiring practices should be permitted. No control on wages and prices should be imposed.

Following a policy of this sort could quickly restore growth and stability to any filing economy and soften the blow for all those about to experience the connections that have been put in place by previous years of mischief, mismanagement and monetary inflation.

Short of a free market, sound money approach will guarantee a sustained attack on personal liberty as governments grow more authoritarian and militaristic.

IN HONOR OF FENN COLLEGE

**HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 16, 1998*

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Cleveland State University's Fenn College on its 75th anniversary. With its Cooperative Education program, this institution has provided its students with an exceptional education.

Founded in 1923, Fenn College began an ambitious mission to make quality education

affordable for any student who wanted to attend college. The College's academic core of the School of Art and Sciences, the School of Business Administration and the School of Engineering evolved into Cleveland State University in 1965.

Despite the change, Fenn College and its Cooperative Education program have remained a staple of the University. One of the first in the nation, the program partners with area corporations to help students gain work experience in their chosen fields and become valuable employees upon graduation. Students conclude their education prepared and willing to enter the competitive marketplace.

Today, Cleveland State University continues the Fenn tradition of excellence. Fenn and Cleveland State graduates create the solutions that drive business, industry, culture, and academics, throughout Northeast Ohio, our nation and the world.

My fellow colleagues, please join me in commemorating the 75th anniversary of Fenn College. This fine institution has opened its doors to many young minds, educating them in preparation for their future.

STATEMENT CONGRATULATING  
SERGEANT VINCENT FARRI OF  
THE U.S. CAPITOL POLICE FORCE

**HON. SCOTT McINNIS**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 16, 1998*

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to stand this day to congratulate and recognize the achievements of a dear friend and confidant. His demeanor, attitude and efforts make a positive difference in the lives of all national legislators and American citizens from around the country.

Vincent Farri was promoted on September 30, 1998 to the rank of Sergeant in the United States Capitol police force. This recognition was rightfully bestowed after 10½ years of diligent service on behalf of the public at large. I have known "Vinnie" since I arrived here in Washington, D.C. in 1992 and can attest to his fortitude, honesty, and integrity in the line of duty. Vincent Farri possesses the heart of a giant. He has earned the respect and admiration of all who know him. I was privileged to share his excitement when I learned last month that he had gotten his stripes.

Sergeant Farri also excels in his responsibilities outside his professional life. He has been happily married for 6½ years to his wife Christina. Together they have one child—"one so far" as Vinnie puts it—a beautiful young son, Richard, born March 15, 1997.

Vincent Farri represents all that is good in American society. Please join me in congratulating and applauding the achievements of this great Sergeant, friend, husband, and father.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE LOUIS  
REDDING, ESQ.

**HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE**

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 16, 1998*

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of Louis Redding, Esq., a

pioneer of the civil rights movement who died earlier this month at the age of 96. Louis Redding's legal efforts changed the very fabric of our society. He played a key role in the historic Brown versus Board of Education case, which held that the underlying principle behind racial segregation, separate but equal, was unconstitutional.

Louis Redding's life had a particularly profound impact in Delaware. After graduating from Brown University and Harvard Law School, Louis Redding was admitted to the Delaware Bar in 1929 as the State's first black lawyer. Despite tremendous hatred and numerous death threats, he went on to integrate the University of Delaware. In 1961, Redding won a U.S. Supreme Court case that ended segregation at Wilmington's Eagle Coffee Shoppe.

Historians debate among themselves whether history is made by courageous individuals or broader social forces. I believe underlying social forces create opportunities for courageous individuals to seize. There is no doubt that Louis Redding was one of those rare individuals who clung to his principles and carried Delaware on his shoulders to a new level of social understanding and mutual respect.

Delaware and the nation are without Louis Redding today, but the memories of his strong leadership, moral courage, integrity, and devotion to the equality of mankind will live on in our hearts and be an example to follow.

UKRAINE'S FAMINE

**HON. LUIS V. GUTIERREZ**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 16, 1998*

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, for many Americans, the years of 1932 and 1933 conjure up memories of depression, bank failures, "Hoovervilles" and unemployment lines. This was the reality our nation faced as we were challenged by the greatest financial crisis in our history.

We know that we were not alone in our suffering throughout the 1930s. The economies of Western Europe collapsed as well, sending Europe down the slippery slope toward totalitarianism, genocide and war.

However, what is often not discussed when we endeavor to recall the era leading to World War II is the great hardship visited on the people of Ukraine by the Soviet government.

Our great depression is often called the greatest crisis of modern capitalism.

The famine of the 1930s in Ukraine has been called the first great tragedy of modern absolutism.

I have learned of this tragedy from people in my district who remember this terrible event. They are the descendants of Ukrainian immigrants to Chicago, people who lost relatives under the oppression of Joseph Stalin.

They remember the stories their parents told of the great famine just as many Americans remember the stories their parents told about the great depression.

What is important then is that we not forget.

In 1929, Joseph Stalin devised a plan to force industrialization on the people of Ukraine.

He attempted to strip the land from the peasants of Ukraine to terminate their agrarian lifestyles and traditional values.