

trumpet the provincial reconstruction teams, United States military-civil affairs teams that are trying to win hearts and minds in the provinces by building schools, or latrines for schools. And they talk of the program to train the Afghan National Army, which should produce a 9,000-member force by next year.

But the national impact of all of this is virtually nil. As one director of a donor agency, which completed 160 construction projects last year, said, "The dimension of the destruction is such that people don't see it."

Compared with the enormous military-political Gordian knot that needs to be cut, the attention to human needs can only be described as paltry, even irrelevant.

Little has been done to disarm and dismantle the power bases of the factions, and as time goes on the armed men who rule the districts, regions and whole provinces are becoming more and more entrenched and increasingly powerful economically. They are likely to dominate politics during the next year, which could fatally erode all public trust in the process and the results. The country could end up being ruled by a mixture of drug lords and fundamentalist mujahedeen—in other words, people not much different from the Taliban.

Everyone has a different idea of what the United States should be doing, but most Afghans and Westerners working here agree that there are two basic requirements for nation-building that the United States cannot afford to ignore—providing security and establishing a functioning political system. They are interconnected, most here agree; in fact, it is impossible to have one without the other.

Only a legitimate, national political system will have the authority to establish a police and justice system with the necessary powers to establish real security. Without real security, there can be no widespread development; American soldiers cannot stand on every street corner, or monitor every business transaction and tax collection.

The problem here, as in Iraq, is that the American military is still running the show and views Afghanistan through the prism of the campaign against terrorism and not according to the country's political and economic demands. But if Afghanistan is to seize the chance this year to start becoming a stable and prosperous society, there is much, much more to be done.

Many are saying that Washington needs to exert more political pressure—on Mr. Karzai to act more decisively on this government to work more proactively, on the police nationwide to ensure law and order, on commanders to disarm, on ministers to reform their ministries and even out the balance of power, on warlords to give up their fiefs and join the government, on Pakistan to stop supporting the Taliban and other opponents of the Bonn process. The list goes on.

All those steps would be a help. But fundamentally, the Americans need to create an atmosphere in which democratic politics can take hold. That means doing more than attending to human needs and offering military training. It means, in the view of many Western officials here and prominent Afghans, putting pressure on the warlords, disarming them and cutting their power bases, leveling the political playing field so that the coming elections are free and fair.

#### LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2003

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. On May 1, 2003, Sen-

ator KENNEDY and I introduced the Local Law Enforcement Act, a bill that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred in Champaign, IL. On December 16, 2001, a Muslim Tunisian-American university student was beaten by a mob of several men. Participants in the attack restrained the victim's brother and his friends to prevent them from coming to his aid. The student was beaten by more than six of the men, one of whom broke his nose with a blunt object.

I believe that Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

#### THE INDICTMENT OF CHARLES TAYLOR

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I see that the senior Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. GREGG, is on the floor. Knowing of his longstanding interest in Sierra Leone, I wonder if he wants to speak briefly about the indictment last week of Charles Taylor by the Special Court for Sierra Leone.

Mr. GREGG. I thank the Senator from Vermont. He is correct about my longstanding interest in Sierra Leone. With respect to the Special Court, I am well aware of the events of the past week, where the Prosecutor of the Court, David Crane, unsealed an indictment for Charles Taylor, while Mr. Taylor was in Ghana.

Unfortunately, the international community did not act in time and Mr. Taylor was able to escape to Liberia. In doing so, the world missed a great opportunity to bring to justice one of the world's most notorious war criminals and advance the cause of international justice.

Mr. LEAHY. I agree with the Senator from New Hampshire. I spoke about this subject last week. Since then, it has come to my attention that some officials in the State Department and other governments are upset at Mr. Crane for the timing of this indictment, as they saw it as disruptive to the peace talks in West Africa.

While I can appreciate those concerns, I agree with one of Mr. Crane's statements on this issue, which I will read:

[T]he timing of this announcement was carefully considered in light of the important peace process begun this week. To ensure the legitimacy of these negotiations, it is imperative that the attendees know they are dealing with an indicted war criminal. These negotiations can still move forward, but they must do so without the involvement of this indictee. The evidence upon which this indictment was approved raises serious questions about Taylor's suitability to be a guar-

antor of any deal, let alone a peace agreement.

I was wondering if Senator GREGG had any thoughts on this issue.

Mr. GREGG. I agree with Mr. Crane's statement about the indictment of Charles Taylor. As much as anyone, I want to bring peace and prosperity to West Africa. But, Mr. Crane has a mandate to bring to justice those most responsible for the atrocities committed in Sierra Leone, and the trail led to Charles Taylor. Not indicting Mr. Taylor would have been outrageous. Justice would not have been served.

I also want to read from a Washington Post editorial, dated June 5, 2003, that summarizes the issue. It said, and I am quoting:

After years of afflicting his own country with the worst kind of brutality and aiding and abetting a cruel civil war in neighboring Sierra Leone, Mr. Taylor is now being pressed on his own soil by rebel movements bent on driving him from power. That he was out of the country this week was no accident. The purpose of his trip to Ghana, organized by the Economic Community of West Africa and a United Nations contact group that includes the United States, was to join peace talks with Liberian opposition groups. Military and political weaknesses, not strength, drove him from his haven in Liberia to the Ghana peace parley. Fear of international justice is what has sent him scurrying back home. . . . The idea of Mr. Taylor working out an eleventh-hour agreement that restores peace and stability to Liberia strikes many human rights observers as ludicrous given both his record of broken pledges and his overwhelming contribution to that country's misery. Faced with tightening international opposition, he now says he will consider stepping aside if that will bring peace. He's now even making noises about supporting a transitional government of national unity while remaining on the sidelines. Mr. Taylor, as usual, has it all wrong. He is in no position to guarantee any deal, let alone a peace agreement, as Mr. Crane said yesterday. Indicted as a war criminal, Charles Taylor today is nothing more than a wanted man.

In short, I agree with the Post's editorial and commend Mr. Crane for taking decisive action to indict Charles Taylor.

Mr. LEAHY. I share Senator GREGG's sentiments. I would also point out that Mr. Crane's office unsealed the indictment in a responsible way. According to information I received, the Special Court's chief of security was instructed to inform all organizations with personnel in Liberia, including the U.S. Embassy, Freetown, that "within 24 hours the Special Court was going to take an action that could possibly destabilize Monrovia." These actions were undertaken to ensure that all government and humanitarian personnel had notice to withdraw or stay home.

This effectively "unsealed" the indictment to governments and humanitarian organizations without tipping Mr. Taylor off. In addition, 3 hours before the press conference and public announcement, and minutes after the Court had confirmation that Ghanaian authorities were served with the arrest