If there is a silver lining for the schools, it is that Senate Democrats have taken note of the states' retrenchment on education spending, and are trying to use the schools plight to wring more money from the Bush administration and the Republicans who control the House of Representatives.

Senate and House leaders have been deadlocked for months over how much to spend on elementary and secondary schools in the next year. House leaders have agreed to spend nearly $30 billion, an increase of about $5 billion over the current year. But Senator Edward M. Kennedy, the Massachusetts Democrat who is chairman of the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee, has called that figure at least $10 billion too low.

To buttress his argument, Mr. Kennedy's aides released their own study of state education budgets on Nov. 16, which predicted that states will spend $11 billion less on schools this academic year than is needed, when inflation and enrollment growth are taken into account.

Representative George Miller, a California Democrat whose staff worked with Mr. Kennedy's said, ''The faltering economy is putting at risk the advancements that many states are making to improve the quality of their educational systems.''

Given the realities of the economy, few districts have sought to challenge the state and local governments that are often ordering the cuts.

''What are we going to say?'' said Anthony Shorris, the deputy chancellor of the New York City Board of Education. ''This is a terrible catastrophe that hit New York. Our goal is to live with what we've got, and still help our students meet these new demands.''

In California, the more than $800 million in school budget cuts identified by Governor Davis have jolted systems that had grown accustomed to receiving more money from Sacramento each of the last few years.

Ms. Anderson, the principal of Harvey Elementary, a wood-beam-and-stucco building that is crammed to four times its intended capacity, said she was sometimes inclined to agree with those researchers who have found that more money does not necessarily lead to improved student achievement, But, she said, the $300,000 the school spent on its afternoon literacy program in each of the last two years—it now serves 150 students, most of them Mexican-American—was followed by a relatively steep rise in reading scores.

Last year, the school's students, who are among the most disadvantaged in the state, exceeded the overall scoring target set for them by state officials by a factor of five. Driving that improvement were the school's fourth graders, 25 percent of whom were found to be reading above grade level last year, compared with 7 percent three years ago.

Amy McDonald, a third-grade teacher who sends 16 of her 19 students to the intensive after-school program, said that the impact on their English in just three months this year had been remarkable. She said that her students arrive in class in the morning eager to discuss what they learned the previous afternoon.

Lizbett Mejia, 9, whose mother was born in Mexico and can barely communicate in English, said she had become hooked by her after-school teachers on a popular collection of books known as the ''Little Sister'' series.

''I didn't know that much of reading,'' Lizbett said. ''Now I know how to read more.''

By replacing certified teachers with local college students, Ms. Anderson said, she believe she can keep this year's after-school program running at full capacity. But when the proposed state cuts, including those to badly needed subsidies for school electrical payments, are combined with anticipated reductions in public and privately financed grants, Ms. Anderson estimates that she will have no more than $90,000 to spend next year on the program, which would probably cut enrollment in half.

''These last few years have been heaven,'' she said. ''Hopefully we've learned enough to be able to sustain what we think works without having the money we thought we needed to pay for it.''

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

IN HONOR OF 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF UNITED STATES ARMY WAR COLLEGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 100th anniversary of the United States Army War College located in Pennsylvania's 19th Congressional District, which I am privileged to serve. President Theodore Roosevelt's Secretary of War, Elihu Root, founded the War College on November 27, 1901. Secretary Root wished to establish a place where senior leaders of our Armed Forces would study and strategize problems of national defense, military science, and responsible command.

Among the many graduates of this pristine institute are former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, 1927; General Omar N. Bradley, 1934; General H. Norman Schwarzkopf, 1973; and General Richard Myers, 1981, our current chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

In July of 1951, the Army War College relocated to Carlisle, Pennsylvania, where it has continued to serve our Nation, our allies, and the military in the capacity envisioned by Secretary Root. Under the exceptional command of Major General Robert Ivany, the Army War College strives to face the defense challenges of today while adhering to its long time motto, ''Not to promote war but to preserve peace.''

Mr. Speaker, it is a true pleasure and privilege to recognize and commend the United States War College on its 100th anniversary.

MORE THAN A WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, this evening, as our Marines are on the ground in Afghanistan, I would like to posit that the United States is engaged in more than a war. Indeed, we are engaged in the middle of a revolution.

Today, Thomas Friedman, New York Times News Service, wrote an editorial entitled ''Shedding the Veil of bin Laden,'' which I will submit for the RECORD, and I will only read a small part of it. Mr. Friedman is traveling in that part of the world, in the United Arab Emirates, and he says: ''Over coffee the other day here in the gulf, an Arab friend confided to me something that was deeply troubling to him. He said, My 11-year-old son thinks bin Laden is a good man. For Americans, Osama bin Laden is a mass murderer. But for many young Arabs, bin Laden, even in defeat, is still Robin Hood. What attracts them to him is his sheer defiance of everything young Arabs and Muslims detest,'' Friedman goes on, ''their hypocritical rulers, Israel, U.S. dominance, and their own backwardness.''

He then goes on to quote Steven Cohen, the Middle East analyst, who says, ''We in America can't just go on looking at the Arab world as a giant gas station, indifferent to what happens inside. Because the gas is now leaking and all around people are throwing matches. Every day,'' he says, ''I see signs that this war of ideas is possible.''

And, indeed, we are involved in a war of ideas. I would like to commend again the book ''Sacred Rage'' by Robin Wright, as a very important contribution to our own understanding of the revolution in which we are engaged. In 1986, when this book was first published, and is now being updated, the author, Robin Wright, quotes Sajib Salom, the former Lebanese Prime Minister, who said, ''The growth of Islamic fundamentalism is an earthquake.''

She recounts from her own personal experience living in the Middle East the turning point of this revolution, centering it in Iran. Of course, the government that the United States of America had supported collapsed in Iran in 1979, the Shah of Iran deposed, something that the United States had not anticipated. And, in fact, his government at that time, serving as policeman for the entire gulf region. Well, shortly thereafter, in March of 1982, there was a huge conference in Tehran, where some 380 men with various religious and revolutionary credentials met at the former Hilton conference ballroom. Their goal was to help to create the ideal Islamic government.

As the government of Iran switched from a monarchy to a theocracy, they had many declarations that came out of that seminar, and she recounts this going back to the mid 1980s. The conclusions of the seminar in some ways were vaguely worded and riddled with rhetoric, but revolutions are that way, and Islamic militants, mainly Shi'a but including some Sunnis, and more recently even more of them, would launch a large-scale offensive to cleanse the Islamic world of the Satanic Western and Eastern influences