

less sophisticated manipulation techniques as well, some of which seem quite pointless to me. In the Gulf War you'll recall reporters were not permitted to interview soldiers, sailors, and airmen without a military press agent present at all times. This was done naturally to discourage the troops from making any offhand or calculated criticisms of US policy, of their living conditions, of their fears of going into battle, in short, anything that might have suggested that their morale wasn't anything but 100% A-OK. Today at the Aviano airbase in Italy, not only do you still need a military escort present, but you can't use the name or hometown of your interview subject. The bizarre justification for this is allegedly to protect the families of the servicemen, or the servicewomen, from Yugoslav hate mail. I'm wondering if this is a military security matter or some weird form of political correctness in which the receivers of the bombs aren't permitted to express their hatred for those who deliver the bombs. But actually I think it's more likely just propaganda, because we're inevitably going to kill Serb and Albanian civilians and we don't want to associate actual names and faces with the killing. That would be bad for morale, both within the air force and outside the air force. It's pure and simple PR.

This brings up the larger question of war coverage and propaganda. NATO and Serbia are currently engaged in a propaganda war that hinges to some extent on accurate or inaccurate war coverage. Paradoxically, the side that is cast as the villain in the war, the enemy of freedom and tolerance, is the side that is permitting and encouraging the best war coverage. The Serbs think bad news helps their case because nobody on our side wants to see the blood of civilians on our hands. NATO realizes this and is trying to mitigate the propaganda value of dead civilians with allegations of atrocities committed by the Serbs against innocent Albanians. NATO and its supporters in the media are hyping Holocaust analogies in particular. Fred Hiatt in the Washington Post threw all caution and sense of proportion to the winds last week, making an explicit comparison between the expulsion and flight of the Albanians and the Auschwitz extermination camp. NATO talks about the rape camps, mass graves, and summary executions. They cite as evidence spy satellite photographs, but won't show us these photographs.

Meanwhile, thanks to the Yugoslav political imperative, correspondents like the outstanding Paul Watson of the Los Angeles Times report things like: "Something strange is going on in [this Kosovar Albanian village] in what was once a hard-line guerrilla stronghold, where NATO accuses the Serbs of committing genocide." He goes on to report that by their own accounts the Albanian men are not living in a concentration camp, or being forced to labor for the police or army, or serving as human shields for Serbs. I think you've probably seen other stories saying that these Serbs for whatever reason are encouraging Albanians to move back into their homes. This of course in no way excuses the expulsion of the hundreds of thousands who are in the refugee camps, but there is a battle of propaganda going on now of epic proportion.

I would, I suppose immodestly, ask you to ask yourselves and your elected representatives and maybe your local newspaper editors why it is that our memories are so short on the question of successful propaganda. Just seven years ago, John Martin of CBS News and I revealed elements of an atrocity that allegedly occurred during the Gulf War, which had a great deal to do with the Senate vote in favor of going to war, the Senate War Resolution. I am referring to the baby incu-

bator murders of 1990 and 1991 allegedly committed by Iraqi soldiers in Kuwaiti hospitals. I hope you remember that it was entirely false, entirely fraudulent. Not one baby was killed by Iraqi soldiers. It's possible that babies died from neglect, because most of the foreign medical staff had fled the Kuwaiti hospitals, but there was no looting of incubators. At one point President Bush, sounding very much like President Clinton, declared that babies were being "scattered like firewood" across the hospital floors. More famously, in this case, the daughter of the Kuwaiti ambassador, Naira Al Sabah, testified as an anonymous refugee before House Human Rights Caucus, saying that she herself had witnessed 15 babies being removed from incubators. Everybody believed it. By the end of it, Amnesty International, which got suckered into the story as well, had declared that 312 babies had been killed this way. Another hearing was held in front of the UN Security Council, where a surgeon—he called himself a surgeon—said that he had personally supervised the burial of 40 babies outside the hospital where they had been killed. After the war, he recanted. He turned out to be a dentist, not a surgeon, and so on and so forth. This was not just in the august chambers of the House of Representatives, but before the United Nations Security Council. So I am astonished that there is so little skepticism about the atrocity stories.

The exaggeration of atrocities, or the invention of atrocity stories, has the paradoxical effect of minimizing the real horror of a war. In other words, because there's a Holocaust going on, well, if a few hundred civilians have to die, it's not such a big deal. I think that's one of the propaganda motives of NATO right now, to hype the atrocities and push the Holocaust analogies as much as possible in order to minimize the horror over the deaths of hundreds of civilians, Albanians and Serbs, caused by our side.

HONORING MELVYN S. BRANNON

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1999

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to recognize and honor the achievements of a man who has given much to the community on behalf of civil rights. On June 27, local officials and civic leaders will join family and friends to pay tribute to Mr. Melvyn Brannon of Burton, MI, who is retiring as president of the Urban League of Flint, after more than 30 years of dedicated service.

Melvyn Brannon was born in Memphis, TN, and went to studies at the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff. He then moved to Michigan, where he pursued postgraduate studies at Eastern Michigan University, the University of Michigan-Flint, and Harvard Business School. During this time, he also participated in the National Urban League Management Training and Development Program. This served as just the beginning of a long standing relationship with the Urban League.

Throughout the years, Mel worked at Flint Osteopathic Hospital as a radiologic technologist, and then moved on to lengthy and rewarding tenure with Flint Community Schools, which included positions such as teacher, special counselor, and job development and placement specialist. In September of 1968, Mel was appointed deputy executive director of the Urban League of Flint, and held

the position until November of 1970, where he became president, a position he has held until this day.

In addition to his extensive work with the Urban League both locally and nationally, Mel has benefited many members of the community with his vision and insight. In the past, he has served on such boards as Genesee County Commission on Substance Abuse Services, the Coalition for Positive Youth Development, the Urban Coalition of Greater Flint, and the Hurley Hospital Board of Managers, to name a few. Currently he has been involved with the boards of Disability Network, Priority 90's, the Hurley Medical Center Human Resources Committee, and he serves as Chairman of the Bishop International Airport Authority. Mel has also been found working with groups such as the NAACP, the Rotary Club, and the Genesee County Sickle Cell Anemia Foundation, among many others.

Mr. Speaker, the Flint area, as well as the entire state of Michigan has prospered due to the efforts and leadership of Melvyn Brannon. I ask my colleagues in the 106th Congress to please join me in congratulating him on his retirement.

FLAG DAY 1999

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1999

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to a great symbol of our nation, the flag of the United States of America on this Flag Day 1999. I wonder how frequently we take for granted this symbol, how often we fail to consider what it is and indeed what it represents.

The flag contains 13 stripes and 50 stars. Those 13 stripes represent the first thirteen states, each of which emanating from colonies of British America. These 13 colonies came together because they were opposed to continued oppression by the British executive and the British parliament. After numerous and significant entreaties seeking reconciliation, the British American came to understand that political independence and local self-government was the only way to insure against the most dangerous of tyrannies.

Was this eternal truth forgotten immediately upon the founding of our nation? Hardly. From the Articles of Confederation through to the original U.S. Constitution a clear understanding of the necessity of the separation of powers was maintained. And the genius of that division of powers lay only so partially in the three federal branches, each reliant upon some different direct authority but all resting government finally on the consent of the governed. Indeed, it has rightly been said that "the genius of the constitution is best summed up in that clause which reserves to the states or to the people those powers which are not specifically delegated to the federal government."

So those states came together to form a compact, indeed to form a nation and, they gave specific but limited powers to the federal government. From those original thirteen stars and stripes, representing the individual states, came one. *E pluribus unum*. And this is what the flag and those stripes represent.

Today the flag contains 50 stars to represent the 50 current states. From 13 came 50