

Madoo has lost roughly half its population, villagers say. In addition to the dozens killed by U.S. airstrikes, many others lost their homes and moved away. The people who remain are destitute. They live crowded in the few stone and timber homes they've managed to rebuild on their own. They subsist on bread and the vegetables they grow. Several children look slight and frail.

Half of world away in Washington, finding ways to help people in such desperate need became an immediate priority for some policymakers and a dangerous precedent to others.

Congress directed that an unspecified amount of money be spent to assist innocent victims of U.S. bombing in Afghanistan, just as it recently called on the Bush administration to identify and provide "appropriate assistance" to civilian victims in Iraq. But the money has not yet reached any of the intended recipients, U.S. officials acknowledged.

"The money is there," said Tim Rieser, an aide to Sen. Patrick J. Leahy (D-Vt.). "Mistakes were made. Mistakes are made in wars. We all know that. But we have yet to see the administration take action to carry out the law in Afghanistan."

The U.S. Agency for International Development, for example, had \$1.25 million in last year's budget to help Afghan civilians who suffered losses as a result of U.S. military action, according to the U.S. Embassy in Kabul. But the agency has not spent any of that money helping Afghans who had their relatives killed, their children maimed, their homes leveled or their livestock and livelihoods destroyed by American bombing, several U.S. officials in Afghanistan conceded this week.

The biggest obstacle to delivery of the aid, officials say, has been a prolonged debate over how to assist bombing victims without compensating them. To policymakers, the distinction between easing the plight of suffering innocents and compensating the victims of war is more than semantic. Both the U.S. military and the State Department are leery of setting legal precedents for compensation and have declined to establish programs that either systematically document civilian losses or give Afghans any opportunity to apply for reparations.

Short of that, military civil-affairs units in Afghanistan have, in isolated instances, provided general humanitarian assistance to communities that happen to have suffered as a result of U.S. bombing. They are, for example, helping rebuild Bamian University—but only, officials insist, because Bamian needs a new university, not because U.S. bombs destroyed the old one.

"Claims have never been processed for combat losses," said Col. Roger King, U.S. military spokesman at Bagram air base near Kabul, the Afghan capital.

The policy debate has gone on too long, Rieser said. "It's tricky," he said. "We don't imagine going around handing out dollar bills to people. We are sensitive to the issues. If we were to announce some kind of a claims program, every single person in Afghanistan would sign up. It's just not feasible."

"But we do know about a lot of these bombing incidents. We know there is a real need there. Why not start doing something about it in the context of our overall aid program? All Congress is saying is, don't leave out the people who suffered serious losses on account of our mistakes. It should have happened already."

There are no official estimates of how many Afghan civilians have been killed by U.S. bombs. A survey published last year by the human rights group Global Exchange estimated the number at more than 800.

A year and a half after the U.S.-led coalition ousted the Taliban and al Qaeda, bombs

are still falling on Afghan civilians as U.S. forces combat a resurgence of terrorism aimed at destabilizing the government of President Hamid Karzai. In eastern Afghanistan this month, a U.S. warplane mistakenly killed 11 members of one family when a 1,000-pound laser-guided bomb missed its intended target and landed on a house.

And Madoo still lies in ruins. The village, 25 miles south of Jalalabad, is not accessible by road. It is a short but arduous hike through mountain gorges from the Pakistan border. On the horizon jut the black peaks of Tora Bora, home of the cave complex where an estimated 1,000 of bin Laden's fighters are believed to have gathered after the defeat of the Taliban last fall.

It was late afternoon on Dec. 1, 2001, when U.S. warplanes appeared over Madoo. The people of Madoo were observing Ramadan, the Muslim holy month of fasting.

"It was the time of breaking fast, and we were just sitting together to have dinner," Munir, 12, recalled. "We heard the voice of the planes, and we went out to see what was happening. A bomb landed on our home. There weren't any Taliban or Arabs with us. For nothing they dropped bombs here."

After the first bombers left, Munir's mother and 8-year-old sister were dead. His infant brother, Abdul Haq, was buried alive. Relatives spied the boy's foot sticking out of a mound of dirt and dug him out.

The bombers returned three times, villagers said. In all, the people of Madoo say they buried at least 55 loved ones.

Many bodies were too damaged to identify. Some of the dozens of mounds in Madoo's hillside burial ground are marked with two and three pieces of wood, signifying that the remains of more than one person are interred there.

The people of Madoo remain puzzled by Americans. A retired Ohio lawyer, who read about one Madoo boy injured in the bombings, was so moved that he visited and gave each survivor about \$300. People bought tents and clothes and wheat seeds to plant. But Madoo's losses outstripped one man's largess.

Munir's youngest brother, now a toddler, coughs frequently and swipes at his runny nose. His family, whose home and meager possessions were destroyed in the bombing, lives with relatives.

"Before, it was good here," Munir said. "The people and my father worked on the land. Life was better than it is now. We have lost everything."

Munir's father, Shingul, 55, who is raising his four surviving children alone, tried to talk about his late wife and daughter but could only turn away and weep.

"If we were doing something wrong, I could understand this," he said when he regained his voice. "But it was Ramadan and we were breaking the fast. The main problem we have now is that we have nothing. We would really appreciate it if someone could help."

#### SCHOOL VOUCHERS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I believe all of our colleagues in the Senate will be interested in an article from today's New York Times entitled "What Some Much-Noted Data Really Showed About Vouchers" by Michael Winerip, pointing out the shocking flaws in a widely cited study released in 2000 by Paul E. Peterson on the benefits of private school voucher programs.

It is clear that no research on vouchers has conclusively shown that private school students outperform public

school students. Private school vouchers are not proven to work and should not be supported by Congress. Public funds should be used for public schools, not on dubious experiments to pay for a small number of students to attend private schools.

The No Child Left Behind Act—passed last year with the strong support of President Bush and strong bipartisan support in Congress—is the best hope for improving elementary and secondary education. Its reforms ask more of schools, teachers, and students in communities across the country. Schools need as much funding and support as possible to ensure that no child is left behind. Every dollar in public funds that goes to private schools is a dollar less for public schools.

Congress should support public schools, not abandon them. Proven effective reforms should be made—not just in a few schools, but in all schools; not just for a few students, but for all students. I urge my colleagues in Congress to reject voucher proposals and grant increased funds for public schools, and I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The New York Times, May 7, 2003]

WHAT SOME MUCH-NOTED DATA REALLY SHOWED ABOUT VOUCHERS

(By Michael Winerip)

In August of 2000, in the midst of the Bush-Gore presidential race, a Harvard professor, Paul E. Peterson, released a study saying that school vouchers significantly improved test scores of black children. Professor Peterson had conducted the most ambitious randomized experiment on vouchers to date, and his results—showing that blacks using vouchers to attend private schools had scored six percentile points higher than a control group of blacks in public schools—became big news.

The Harvard professor appeared on CNN and "The NewsHour With Jim Lehrer." Conservative editorial writers and columnists, including William Safire of The Times, cited the Peterson study as proof that vouchers were the answer for poor blacks, that Al Gore (a voucher opponent) was out of touch with his black Democratic constituency and that George W. Bush had it right.

"The facts are clear and persuasive: school vouchers work," The Boston Herald editorialized on Aug. 30, 2000. "If candidates looked at facts, this one would be a no-brainer for Gore."

Then, three weeks later, professor Peterson's partner in the study, Mathematica, a Princeton-based research firm, issued a sharp dissent. Mathematica's report emphasized that all the gains in Professor Peterson's experiment, conducted in New York City, had come in just one of the five grades studied, the sixth, and that the rest of the black pupils, as well as Latinos and whites of all grades who used vouchers, had shown no gains. Since there was no logical explanation for this, Mathematica noted the chance of a statistical fluke. "Because gains are so concentrated in this single group, one needs to be very cautious," it said.

Several newspapers wrote about Mathematica's report, but, coming three

weeks after the first round of articles, these did not have the same impact.

And Professor Peterson, a big voucher supporter, continued, undaunted. His 2002 book, "The Education Gap," largely ignored Mathematica's concerns and ballyhooed voucher gains for blacks. "The switch to a private school had significantly positive impacts on the test scores of African-American students," he wrote.

While he still couldn't explain why only blacks had gained, he offered theories. Perhaps heavily black public schools were even worse than urban Latino or white schools. Or, since most vouchers in New York were used in Catholic schools, perhaps a religious "missionary commitment is required to create a positive educational environment" for blacks.

David Myers, the lead researcher for Mathematica, is hesitant to criticize Professor Peterson. ("I'm going to be purposely vague on that," he said in an interview.) But he did something much more decent and important. After many requests from skeptical academics, he agreed to make the entire database for the New York voucher study available to independent researchers.

A Princeton economist, Alan B. Krueger, took the offer, and after two years recently concluded that Professor Peterson had it all wrong—that no even black students using vouchers had made any test gains. And Mr. Myers, Professor Peterson's former research partner, agrees, calling Professor Krueger's work "a fine interpretation of the results."

What makes this a cautionary tale for political leaders seeking to draft public policy from supposedly scientific research is the mundane nature of the apparent miscalculations. Professor Krueger concluded that the original study had failed to count 292 black students whose test scores should have been included. And once they are added—making the sample larger and statistically more reliable—vouchers appear to have made no difference for any group.

Some background. In 1997, 20,000 New York City students each applied for a \$1,400 voucher to private school through a project financed by several foundations. A total of 1,300 were selected by lottery to get a voucher, and 1,300 others—the controls, who had wanted a voucher but were not selected—were tracked in public schools. When the first test results came back, the vouchers made no difference in test scores for the 2,600 students as a whole. So the original researchers tried breaking the group down by ethnicity and race, and that's when they noted the sixth-grade test gains for the black voucher group.

But there was a problem. The original researchers had never planned to break out students by race. As a result, their definition of race was not well thought out: it depended solely on the mother. In their data, a child with a black mother and a white father was counted as black; a child with a white mother and a black father was counted as white.

When the father's race is considered, 78 more blacks are added to the sample. Professor Krueger also found that 214 blacks had been unnecessarily eliminated from the results because of incomplete background data. These corrections by Professor Krueger expanded the total number of blacks in the sample by 292, to 811 from 519.

In recent weeks, Mr. Myers, of Mathematica, has reviewed Professor Krueger's critique and found it impressive. Mr. Myers has now concluded that Professor Krueger's adjustments mean that "the impact of a voucher offer is not statistically significant."

It is scary how many prominent thinkers in this nation of 290 million were ready to make new policy from a single study that ap-

pears to have gone from meaningful to meaningless based on whether 292 children's test scores are discounted or included. "It's not a study I'd want to use to make public policy," Mr. Myers said. "I see this and go 'whoa.'"

Professor Krueger of Princeton (who also writes a monthly business column in *The Times*) said, "This appeared to be high-quality work, but it teaches you not to believe anything until the data are made available."

As for Professor Peterson of Harvard, the star of newspapers and TV news in 2000 remains curiously mum these days. In a brief interview, he decline to comment on Professor Krueger's or Mathematica's criticisms. He said he stood by his conclusion that vouchers lifted black scores, and would "eventually" respond in a "technical paper." But he said he would not discuss these matters with a reporter.

"It's not appropriate," he said, "to talk about complex, methodologies in the news media."

---

#### TRIBUTE TO DR. ROBERT C. ATKINS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, today I come to the floor to pay tribute to a great person, a long-time friend and a true pioneer, Dr. Robert C. Atkins. Dr. Atkins, cardiologist, physician, and author, among many other endeavors, passed away tragically on April 17 from injuries suffered in a fall in New York City.

A leader in both natural medicine and nutritional pharmacology, Dr. Atkins majored in pre-med at the University of Michigan and then went on to receive his medical degree from the Cornell University Medical School in 1955. He was the founder of The Atkins Center for Complementary Medicine, Atkins Nutritionals, Inc, and cofounder and past president of the Foundation for the Advancement of Innovative Medicine. But as accomplished as he was a physician and researcher, Dr. Atkins was best known for his controlled carbohydrate approach to weight management known as the "Atkins Diet."

In addition to researching and developing what has become one of the leading weight control methods, Dr. Atkins also wrote 13 books, including "Dr. Atkins' New Diet Revolution" and "Atkins for Life," both of which have been and remain on *The New York Times* bestseller list. His commitment to revolutionizing medicine and nutrition and determination to stand by his research led *People* magazine to name him one of the "25 Most Intriguing People," and *Time* magazine to add him to their list of "People Who Matter".

Dr. Atkins invested millions of his own money in the Dr. Robert C. Atkins Foundation, endowing institutions with the necessary funding for research and education.

I knew Bob Atkins for many years. He was a good friend and we saw eye to eye on many important issues including dietary supplements, alternative medicine, and medical research. As the lead proponent in the formation the National Center for Complementary

and Alternative Medicine, I was always grateful with Dr. Atkins tireless effort to educate law and policymakers. Dr. Atkins helped to bring national attention and credibility to complementary medicine as a serious and effective medical approach.

Dr. Atkins will always be remembered for having the courage and foresight to challenge conventional wisdom on nutrition. His tireless efforts to point out ways to lose weight and prevent and manage diabetes and heart disease in ways conventional medicine had ignored or were unaware are irreplaceable and have forever changed how Americans, and the world, view nutrition, weight loss and diet. During his life he treated thousands of patients, including Members of Congress and their families.

My condolences go out to his wife Veronica and mother Norma, and all the people who had the pleasure to work for and with him. His legacy and lifetime achievements will continue to guide policy makers and doctors around the world. Bob Atkins not only left a legacy of nutrition and health, but set an example for everyone to believe in themselves and to question establishment policies.

Bob, we thank you and we miss you.

---

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

---

##### THE 2003 UNITED NATIONS POPULATION AWARD

● Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that an American activist has been chosen as the recipient of the 2003 United Nations Population Award for only the second time in the history of the honor. This year's beneficiary, Werner Fornos, president of the Washington, DC-based Population Institute, is a well-known figure on Capitol Hill and a long-time advocate for international access to voluntary methods of family planning.

I ask that the following press release honoring Mr. Fornos' receipt of this prestigious award be printed in the RECORD.

The press release follows.

##### WERNER FORNOS WINS 2003 UNITED NATIONS POPULATION AWARD

Werner Fornos, a longtime Washington, D.C. resident and special advisor to former U.S. House of Representatives Speaker John W. McCormack, has been named the winner of the 2003 United Nations Population Award in the individual category.

"The selection is in recognition of your outstanding contribution to the awareness of population growth," Thoraya Ahmed Obaid, secretary of the award committee and executive director of the U.N. Population Fund, wrote to Fornos informing him of his selection.

The Family Planning Association of Kenya will receive the award in the institutional category. Founded in 1962 as a volunteer-based nongovernmental organization, it has pioneered the family planning movement in Kenya, promoting the provision of sexual and reproductive health services within the