YOU CAN'T LEAD BY FOLLOWING

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, in going over some old newspapers that I missed while I was in Illinois over the Christmas/New Year holiday, I came across an op-ed piece by Robin Gerber, a senior fellow at the University of Maryland's Center for Political Leadership and Participation.

It comments on what I consider to be a fundamental weakness in our political process today, that people are trying to follow the polls in how they respond to problems.

There is a great quote in the op-ed piece from our House colleague, STENY HOYER, for whom my admiration has grown through the years. Congressman HOYER states: ''What polls do is confuse us. We're not trying to figure out what's right but what is the passion of the day. Polls make us sloppy intellectually. They are a substitute for thinking.''

I ask that the Robin Gerber item be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

YOU CAN'T LEAD BY FOLLOWING

(By Robin Gerber)

There is much talk now of governing from the ''center,'' of how centrist politics can overcome the debacle of the Nov. 8 election and put the president and his party on a true course for reelection in 1996. But it is the moral center that must be found before the political one can be explored.

This quest for defining political vision is imperiled by the misplaced reliance by politicians of both parties on public opinion polls.

Pollsters' authoritative declamations and directions, gleaned from the complex science of gauging the public interest, corrupt the straightforward instincts needed to govern from the gut. Rep. Steny Hoyer, past chairman of the Democratic Caucus, puts it this way, ''What polls do is confuse us. We're not trying to figure out what's right but what is the passion of the day. Polls make us sloppy intellectually. They're a substitute for thinking.''

In an unprecedented effort to lead by following, politicians of the 1990s use polls to support a new form of hyper-interactive governing. Like some collective psychoanalysis on living room couches across the nation, Americans are being probed and prodded as never before. But you can't legislate by the numbers. From the field of war to the football field, no general or quarterback has led by following the combined opinions of the troops or the tight-ends.

Pollsters argue that polls are valuable market assessment tools, a means to focus policy and message on voters' concerns. Even the Founders acknowledged that candidates who depend on the suffrage of their fellow citizens for election should be informed of those citizens' ''dispositions and inclinations and should be willing to allow them their proper degree of influence.'' But polling in 1994 has gone beyond an ancillary tool for governing or campaigning. Rather than a point of departure for sensitive and thoughtful leaders, polls have become a point of no return that overshadows the imperative for leadership. As James MacGregor Burns wrote in his classic text on leadership, ''the transforming leader taps the needs and raises the aspirations and helps shape the values—and hence mobilizes the potential—of followers.'' To be transforming leaders, today's politicians cannot afford to drift, absent the anchor of ideals, in a sea of percentage points.

Two hundred years ago, the Federalist papers expressed our belief as a nation that ''the public voice pronounced by the representatives of the people, will be more consonant to the public good, than if pronounced by the people themselves.'' Measuring and articulating substantive discontent should serve the purpose of keeping elected representatives' debate and decisions in tune with their constituency, not in automatonic lock-step. Pollster Celinda Lake reads the electorate as wanting to raise the pitch of technologically steered democracy so that citizens could directly bestow their opinion on major legislative issues. In that case, perhaps we should give up on our founding ideal of a republic and elect the pollsters directly.

Representative democracy is our greatest national heritage and gives us our greatest national challenge. We seek leaders who will listen and interpret sometimes incoherent, sometimes inchoate messages into policies greater than the sum of our collective consciousness. Political leaders who will transform this country, rather than be transfixed by shifting techno-derived edicts, must lead and govern from the center of their own hearts and minds. No poll has yet been devised that can substitute.●

EDUCATION CHIEF DECLARES WAR ON TV VIOLENCE

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, the problem of television violence, which I have addressed on a number of occasions in committee and on the floor of the Senate, has recently been addressed by a group of psychiatrists and other social leaders in Great Britain, where the standards are appreciably tighter than ours. And in reading the Jerusalem Post the other day, I came across an article titled, ''Education chief declares war on TV violence.''

The reaction in Israel to too much violence on the television screen is like ours and the British reaction.

At this point, I ask that the Jerusalem Post article be printed in the RECORD. The article follows:

EDUCATION CHIEF DECLARES WAR ON TV VIOLENCE

(By Liat Collins)

Education Minister Amnon Rubinstein last week declared war on TV violence, telling the Knesset that if networks do not demonstrate self restraint in screening movies, he would submit a bill to the cabinet.

Rubinstein's statements came at the end of a discussion on the distribution of ''snuff'' and violent movies in Israel. ''Snuff movies'' document the deliberate torture and murder of a victim for ''entertainment.''

''This type of film goes beyond all acceptable moral boundaries; we're talking about an evil and sick phenomenon. Therefore we must enforce the existing laws, and if need be I will equip myself with extra penal measures,'' Rubinstein said.

''Freedom of expression and civil liberties do not stretch to filmed murders and violence as entertainment,'' he added.

The discussion was initiated by MKs Anat Maor (Meretz), David Mena (Likud), Elie Goldschmidt (Labor) and Shlomo Benizri (Shas), who filed motions for the agenda following an interview in *Yediot Aharonot* with two youths who collect and view these films.

The two adolescents laconically describe how victims have been disembowelled and dismembered alive. One noted that one of the two teenaged killers of taxi driver Derek Roth had seen such movies. He also said he regretted not being awake in time to see the screened footage of the Dizengoff bus bomb.

While condemning the movies, Rubinstein warned of trying to turn two adolescents into representatives of an entire generation.

Benizri, on the other hand, called the phenomenon ''the result of a sick society.'' All the MKs spoke of the need for police cooperation in rooting out the films, and called for strict punitive measures against both distributors and viewers of these movies.●

P.S./WASHINGTON

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, for more than 40 years, since I was a young newspaperman in suburban St. Louis, I have written a weekly newspaper column on the topics of the day.

I hope my colleagues will find the newspaper columns I wrote in January of interest, so I ask that they be printed in the RECORD.

The columns follow:

THE VALUE OF THE CARTER MISSIONS

There has been some editorial sniping—as well as criticism from political leaders, most of it not in public statements—about former President Jimmy Carter's efforts in North Korea, Haiti and Bosnia.

''We can have only one person making foreign policy for the United States—and that should be the President, is the argument.

What these nay-sayers miss is the reality that Jimmy Carter does not make any pretense of speaking for the United States. If he were to travel abroad and claim to speak for the President when he has no authorization to do so, that would be wrong.

In the case of Haiti, he went on the mission at the request of the President.

But Jimmy Carter is a person of international stature who can do more to bring people together than any person other than Secretary General Boutros Boutros Ghali of the United Nations.

Carter is regarded as well-motivated and not trying to promote any private agenda or any national agenda other than helping to bring about a world of peace and stability.

When he has gone at the request of other nations to be an observer of elections, where countries are moving to democracy, there has been no criticism.

When he helps bring the two sides of a civil war together in Liberia in Africa, no one pays any attention.

At the Carter Center in Atlanta, he gets people from various nations together to discuss frictions and hopes, and there is hardly a paragraph in any newspaper about it.

But when he moves onto a more visible problem, then the critics emerge.

Part of this is because foreign policy has not been a strong suit of President Clinton. He is better at foreign affairs than he was a year ago and a year from now he will be still better.

It is difficult to move from being Governor of Arkansas to overnight being the most influential person in the world on foreign policy.

Because of a partial foreign policy vacuum in the current administration, some believe that the visibility of a former President doing creative things causes Clinton political embarrassment.

My strong belief is that President Clinton should continue to welcome Jimmy Carter's leadership, as he does that of the United Nations Secretary General, but simply make clear that ordinarily Jimmy Carter is acting on his own, not speaking for the United States.

Whether the former President's activities in Bosina will produce long-term gains is still unclear. But they have done no harm, and may do great good.

In North Korea and Haiti there is no question of the significant contribution of Jimmy Carter.

With the possible exception of John Quincy Adams, no former President has served as effectively as has Jimmy Carter. I would also give high marks for post-president leadership to Thomas Jefferson and Herbert Hoover—Jefferson largely through correspondence and Hoover in a variety of public endeavors.

My hope is that Jimmy Carter will ignore the critics and continue to serve the cause of world peace.

We are indebted to him.

INCHING TOWARD A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

The nation is inching toward having a balanced budget amendment to the U.S.Constitution, and that is good news for the generations to come.

We have been living on a huge credit card and when the time comes to pay for it, we say blithely: ''Send the bill to our children and grandchildren.'' It is morally indefensible.

Both political parties share the blame.

For 26 years in a row we have been spending more than we take in, and we are already paying for it. A New York Federal Reserve Bank study shows that between 1978 and 1988 the deficit cost us 5 percent of our national income. The Congressional Budget Office suggests that the loss of 1 percent of our national income means the loss of 600,000 jobs.

The deficit has eaten away at our savings, sending interest rates up, reducting our productive capacity because it makes investment too expensive, ultimately reducing the growth of our national income. As late as 1986, the average manufacturing wage per hour was higher in the United States than any other nation. Now 13 nations have exceeded us.

Studies indicate that between 37 percent and 55 percent of our trade deficit has been caused by the budget deficit. That means that the single biggest cause of sending our jobs overseas has been the budget deficit, but the issue is complicated enough that it is not generally understood.

The General Accounting Office in 1992 reported that if we continue on the course of deficit spending we would have a gradual decline or stalemate in our standard of living, but if by the year 2001 we would balanced the budget, by the year 2020 the average American would have an increased income of 36 percent.

Worst of all, the history of nations is that if we continue piling up debt, eventually we will do what the economist call ''monetizing the debt.'' That means that to ''solve'' our problem we will start printing more and more money and our dollars would be less and less valuable. Among other things, that would devastate all private savings as well as things like Social Security.

On top of all that, more and more of our debt is owed to other nations. We now owe more than $800 billion to people outside the United States and that makes our international situation somewhat precarious. The greater our debt, the less independent we can be. It's true of a family; it's true of a country.

It now looks like the proposal, narrowly defeated in the past, will pass. It has been advocated by many people over the years, the first being Thomas Jefferson.

It will include a provision that if there is a 60 percent vote of the House and Senate, we can have a deficit, for there are years in a recession or war when it may be necessary.

Today interest spending by the federal government is ballooning, squeezing out our ability to respond to great needs. In 1949 we devoted 9 percent of the federal budget to education; today it is 2 percent. In 1950 we were paying interest on the debt of World War II and we spent $5.8 billion. This year we will spend more than $300 billion.

To their credit, President Clinton and a bare majority in Congress reduced the deficit in 1993, but that was only the first step needed.

If we adopt the balanced budget amendment and it is approved by 38 state legislatures, we will all have to sacrifice a little.

But I face a choice of sacrificing a little, or harming the future of my three grandchildren. I don't have a difficult time making that choice, and I don't believe most Americans do.

CULTURAL CHASMS THAT DIVIDE US

Madeleine Doubek, political editor of the Daily Herald, the widely circulated newspaper based in the northern and western Chicago suburbs, noted that at a recent news conference I answered a reporter's question by saying: ''We have to reach . . . across the borders of race and religion and ethnic background and economic barriers. We have to communicate to people in the suburbs that they have something at stake in the fate of those who are less fortunate in our society.''

She called me and asked whether that implied racism and classism in the suburbs, and I responded that it did.

I do suggest that those evils are a monopoly of the suburbs. Prejudice rears its ugly head in the central cities, and in the rural areas, as well as in the suburbs.

But there has been a flight from the problems of the cities, a flight to better schools and less crime. Sometimes those two understandable causes have also been confused with flight from African Americans and Latinos.

But whatever the cause, the result is a growing gulf between urban America and suburban America, and that's not good for anyone. We don't want this nation to develop into a Bosnia or Northern Ireland. The harm that comes from the deepening divisions in our society should be obvious.

What can we do about it? More specifically, what can suburbanites and all of us do about it? Let me suggest a few things:

(1) Religious institutions play a powerful role in American life. Ask the question at the appropriate meeting, or to the right people, what your church or temple is doing to bring greater understanding across the barriers that divide us. I would be interested in hearing of specific actions that are planned or are being taken.

(2) Rotary Clubs, business and professional women's groups, teachers' associations and other civic and business-related groups can sponsor programs that help to create greater sensitivity. The myths that are believed about another race or religion or ethnic group often can be demolished in this type of setting. When business and professional people understand that it is good economics not to discriminate, everyone wins.

(3) Individuals can make sure that their children are exposed to people of differing cultural backgrounds in a positive way. Too few white families have ever had an African American or Latino or Asian American family to their homes for dinner. Too few African American families have ever had a white family to their home for dinner. The same can be said across too many ethnic and religious barriers. What seems like a small thing for your family to do can be immensely important for the future of your children, and the future of your community and our nation and our world.

I spoke at three events honoring Martin Luther King Jr.'s birthday this year, and what disturbed me about two of them is that I spoke only to African Americans.

Dr. King wanted us to reach out to one another, understand one another, and replace hatred and prejudice with love and understanding.

That message is needed in the suburbs, but also in our cities and rural areas.

''One nation, indivisible'' we recite when we say the pledge of allegiance to our flag.

Do we mean it? Are we willing to do concrete things to make it a reality?

RELIGIOUS ZEALOTRY CAN TURN GOOD INTO EVIL

There is much that is good about people who have religious beliefs and practice their religion, however imperfectly we all do it. But religion can be abused when people are too zealous—and can be abused when there is a shell of religion that translates into hostility to others.

Almost all religions, if not all, suggest that we should be concerned about those less fortunate. According to a poll conducted for the Center for the Study of American Religion at Princeton University, those who attend religious services weekly in the United States are significantly more likely to think seriously about their responsibilities to the poor.

Many other examples of the good that religious belief provides our society should be given.

But when people are so zealous that they kill people at abortion clinics, or try to impose their beliefs on others, then what is good can become an evil. Many of the most bloody wars have been conducted in the name of religion, usually simply used as a tool by ambitious rulers, but sometimes out of genuine belief by the leaders.

There is also the problem where faith has almost diminished to nothing, except hostility to others who do not share the same religious heritage.

My impression is that most of those involved in the violence of the Protestant-Catholic struggle in Northern Ireland are not necessarily people of deep religious commitment, but people who have grown up with one heritage and have learned to hate the other side.

During my years in the Army I was stationed in Germany, and I remember the young German who told me with great pride that no one in his family had married a Roman Catholic for over a century. I asked what church he attended, and he told me that while he was proud of being a Protestant, he didn't attend any church.

But he had learned to hate.

Hitler had only nominal Christian ties. He believed little, and practiced nothing in the way of religion, but his religious heritage somehow left him with a hatred of Jews.

In Bosnia, nations with strong Orthodox ties are generally much more sympathetic to the Serbian cause than other nations, not for genuine religious reasons but for heritage reasons. Serbia is largely Orthodox Christian.

Muslim countries believe that the reason Europeans and Americans have not responded more to the plight of the Bosnian Muslims is precisely because they are Muslims. I do not believe that is true for the United States, but unfortunately it contains some truth for the more tradition-bound European nations, even though the actual practice of religion is much less evident in Western Europe than in the United States. The

empty shell of Christianity too often only has hostility toward non-Christians.

One of several good things about what we did in Somalia (incorrectly labeled a disaster by those who look at it superficially), in addition to preventing starvation by hundreds of thousands of people, is that a nation labeled by the world as Christian/Jewish, the United States, came to the rescue of a people almost totally Muslim. How would we have looked if the world's most powerful nation had done nothing about massive starvation in a desperate country! But many Muslim nations were permanently surprised that we responded.

The lesson of history is that the genuine practice of religion is wholesome, good for the individual and good for a community and nation. But extreme caution is in order when leaders try to impose their beliefs on others through government.

And the ''stop'' sign should go up when political leaders who share a heritage call on others to hate or kill those who do not share the same faith.●

NOMINATION OF DR. HENRY FOSTER, TO BE SURGEON GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I want to speak briefly about two important issues facing the Senate. The first is the nomination of Dr. Henry Foster, to be Surgeon General of the United States, and the second is the continuing impasse over the baseball strike.

With respect to the Foster nomination, Dr. Henry Foster has had an extraordinary, distinguished career in medicine and public health. And I believe that the forthcoming hearings on his nomination will demonstrate that he is well qualified to be Surgeon General.

I would like to take this opportunity to make three brief points. First, and most important at this stage of the debate, I reject the view that Dr. Foster's participation in abortions should disqualify him from this high position. Abortion is not a numbers game. It is a legal medical procedure and a constitutionally protected right.

Second, the American Medical Association enthusiastically supports Dr. Foster's nomination because of his distinguished service as Dean of Meharry Medical College, his record of achievement in medical research, his impressive leadership on issues such as preventive health care for women and children, for reducing infant mortality and teenage pregnancy and fighting drug abuse.

Third, Dr. Foster has had and deserves to continue to have strong bipartisan support. As recently as 1991, he was honored by President Bush as one of the President's Thousand Points of Light for his innovative I Have A Future Program to reduce teenage pregnancy. I look forward to the consideration of Dr. Foster's nomination by the Senate Labor Committee.

BINDING ARBITRATION TO SETTLE BASEBALL STRIKE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, yesterday, I introduced legislation proposed by President Clinton to require the major league baseball players and owners to submit to binding arbitration to settle the baseball strike.

Generally, Congress is reluctant to inject itself in labor disputes. All of us hope that the parties will find a way to end the impasse and settle their differences voluntarily. But there are rare instances in which Congress has a role to play in settling such disputes, and this may well be one of those times.

There is no doubt that Congress' constitutional authority to regulate interstate commerce gives us the power to enact legislation to settle this dispute. Many aspects of major league baseball affect commerce between the States. The strike has caused significant disruptions, especially in the cities where the 28 major league teams play and is about to cause significant additional disruption in Florida and Arizona where spring training is supposed to begin next week.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors estimates that the major league cities lost an average of $1.16 million per home game and 1,250 full- and part-time jobs because of the strike in 1994. Hard-pressed cities with substantial investments of tax dollars in municipal stadiums are losing substantial revenues. The cancellation of the 1994 league playoffs and the World Series was especially damaging to whichever cities would have hosted the playoff games and the World Series.

Obviously, Congress does not intervene in every labor dispute that burdens interstate commerce, but baseball is different and unique. It is more than a nationwide industry. It is our national sport. Baseball is part of American life.

We in Congress as representatives of fans throughout the country should not remain silent while baseball is damaged by a strike that the owners and players seem unable to resolve themselves. Clearly, Congress has the power to act. The question is who speaks for Red Sox and millions of other fans across America. At this stage in the deadlock, if Congress does not speak for them, it may well be that no one will.

For all these reasons, Congress can act and should be prepared to act. Legislation to end the strike would not set a precedent for injecting Congress into other labor disputes. There is still time for the owners and players to resolve this dispute on their own or to act voluntarily to establish a safety mechanism for doing so. The players union is willing to agree to voluntary binding arbitration. It is hard to see why the owners are not willing to do so as well. In that event, Congress would not have to be involved.

The parties can quickly agree to a process that would result in a settlement. If both sides are confident that the merits are on their side, they should be willing to submit to binding arbitration and do it now so that spring training can begin on schedule next week. If the parties do not agree on such a mechanism, it is reasonable and appropriate for Congress to act.

We in Congress may be the last and best hope to salvage the game that means so much to Red Sox fans of all ages in Massachusetts and to the fans of all the other teams in all parts of the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that a table prepared by the U.S. Conference of Mayors on the economics of the strike may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the data were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BREAKDOWN OF ECONOMIC IMPACT BY MAJOR LEAGUE CITY

City, State	Team name	Total loss per game	Stadium revenues	Local taxes	Local business revenues	Jobs lost	Stadium ownership
Anaheim, CA	Angels	$1.9 million	$61,000	$441,000	$1.417 million	600	city.
Arlington, TX	Rangers	2 million	private	incl. in total	incl. in total	2,500	private.
Atlanta, GA	Braves	3 million	2 million	incl. w/stad	1 million	6,350	county.
Baltimore, MD	Orioles	1.2 million	100,000	incl. in total	1.1 million	2,000	commission.
Boston, MA	Red Sox	50,000	private	10,000	40,000	400	private.
Chicago, IL	Cubs	736,181	636,000	30,000	70,000	1,000	commission.
Chicago, IL	White Sox	852,038	780,000	39,000	33,157	1,000	commission.
Cincinnati, OH	Reds	700,000	76,416	10,138	640,700	600	city.
Cleveland, OH	Indians	2.04 million	1.2 million	600,000	240,000	2,000	commission.
Denver, CO	Rockies	2.04 million	43,000	39,600	1.96 million	1,944	city.
Houston, TX	Astros	1.04 million	400,000	40,000	600,000	1,000	county.
Kansas City, MO	Royals	540,740	265,000	23,456	250,000	350	commission.
Minneapolis, MN	Twins	922,600	282,600	366,000	640,000	900	commission.
New York, NY	Mets	2.06 million	2 million	52,500	incl. in total	850	city.
New York, NY	Yankees	2.06 million	2 million	62,500	incl. in total	850	city.
Oakland, CA	Athletics	986,197	32,395	9,358	944,444	438	county.
Philadelphia, PA	Phillies	250,000	125,000	42,000	83,000	500	state.
Pittsburgh, PA	Pirates	460,000	20,000	20,000	400,000	350	city.
St. Louis, MO	Cardinals	432,480	private	30,320	402,160	1,180	private.
Seattle, WA	Mariners	204,745	101,245	23,500	80,000	327	county.
San Diego, CA	Padres	203,000	18,000	5,000	180,000	825	city.
San Francisco, CA	Giants	1,766,000	535,000	136,000	1,095,000	800	city.

Cities not responding: Detroit, Los Angeles, Miami (Dade County), Milwaukee.
Canadian cities not surveyed: Montreal, Toronto.