

their work in commemorating the victims of the AMIA bombing and the individual lives lost to hatred and terror. The Latino and Latin American Institute of the American Jewish Committee deserves much credit and praise for initiating this important remembrance of an attack that affected the international community.

TRIBUTE TO PATRICIA LEWIS OF
WORCESTER, MASSACHUSETTS

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2006

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and pride that I rise today to pay tribute to a long-time friend, Patricia Lewis, or "Patsy," as she is affectionately known in my community. Patsy will be honored in the City of Worcester tonight for her outstanding work and unyielding service to the citizens of Massachusetts and our Nation. For 20 years Patsy has served as the Executive Director of the Worcester Community Action Council, Inc., an agency that was started in 1965 as the locally designated "community action" agency for the Economic Opportunity Act under the Johnson Administration. Today, WCAC serves as an umbrella agency for 25 education and social service programs.

Since her arrival, Patsy devoted most of her time fighting the good fight, serving as an advocate for the poor and the needy with dignity and respect. She and her staff along with the Board of Directors are a force to reckon with in the fight against poverty.

Mr. Speaker, Patsy's list of accomplishments is long. She doubled WCAC's annual budget; added and expanded services into Southern Worcester County; initiated new programs throughout WCAC's service area, including fuel assistance, Head Start, Americorps/Cityworks, Individual Development Accounts and Food Stamp outreach. Today, WCAC serves more than 11,000 households in Central and Southern Worcester County with an emphasis on developing self-sufficiency for low-income families.

Patsy has served on numerous human service organizations, including the Greater Worcester Community Foundation, United Way Women's Initiative, and the YWCA. She has been a joint faculty member of Worcester State College and Clark University. She is an alumna of Manchester College, Ohio State University, and Boston University.

Mr. Speaker, my friend Patsy is an individual who cares about people and I am truly appreciative of the work she has done for the residents of the 3rd Congressional district. As a result of her leadership and vision our community is a better place. For her outstanding service I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in honoring Patricia "Patsy" Lewis.

WORLD CUP VICTORY OR COLLEGE
GRADUATES

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, with the disappointing ending of the quest for the World

Cup through a loss to Ghana last week, I find it appropriate to bring to the attention of Congress an article written by David Brooks, a columnist with the New York Times, entitled "Our World Cup Edge." The article discusses our country's apparent disadvantage in skill and experience in this worldwide soccer competition, but touts the American university system, which produces most of the players on the U.S. team, as being the best.

While the U.S. team unfortunately was eliminated in the first round of the competition, our team can boast having the most college graduates. American athletes go to college to foster their athletic abilities, whereas Europeans are removed from school at a young age and placed in specialized training programs.

The article maintains that the higher level of education American athletes receive helps to boost our economy. American universities greatly contribute to a sense of community. Such a phenomenon dates back to the founding of these schools as autonomous, devoid of government intervention. Such a lack of government involvement allows American universities to remain competitors in the ideas market. By contrast, the European university system is controlled by the government and is therefore not very competitive. European governments encourage equality amongst their universities.

American universities are at the top. As Mr. Brooks cites, not only have our schools fostered strong sports programs, but they also build camaraderie through extracurricular activities. American universities also lead to business and cultural centers, while the European system does not have nearly as large an effect. With globalization, American universities have become increasingly more desirable, further benefiting our society.

I commend Mr. Brooks' analysis of the importance and success of our American universities. However, I would like to push Congress even further in identifying the challenge presented by the need to produce more engineers and scientists in today's increasingly competitive technological age. Our country has done an admirable job in ensuring our universities are the best, but we must continue working to keep up with technology by educating our students in the scientific fields.

I thank Mr. Brooks for his thorough comparison of university systems. I therefore submit for the RECORD Mr. Brooks' column in the June 22nd issue of the New York Times.

[From the New York Times, June 22, 2006]

OUR WORLD CUP EDGE

(By David Brooks)

Going into today's World Cup match against Ghana, no American player has managed to put a ball into the back of the net, but the U.S. team does lead the world in one vital category: college degrees.

Most of the American players attended college. Eddie Pope went to the University of North Carolina, Kasey Keller attended the University of Portland and Marcus Hahnemann went to Seattle Pacific.

Many of the elite players from the rest of the world, on the other hand, were pulled from regular schools at early ages and sent to professional training academies. Among those sharp-elbowed, hypercompetitive Europeans, for example, Zinedine Zidane was playing for A.S. Cannes by age 16, Luis Figo was playing for Sporting Lisbon at 17, and David Beckham attended Tottenham Hotspur's academy and signed with Manchester United as a trainee at 16.

The difference in preparation is probably bad for America's World Cup prospects, but it's good for America's economic and political prospects. That's because the difference in soccer training is part of a bigger phenomenon. American universities play a much broader social role than do universities elsewhere around the world. They not only serve as the training grounds for professional athletes, unthinkable in most other nations, they also contribute more to the cultures and economies around them.

The American university system was born with expansionist genes. As early Americans spread out across the frontier, they created not only new religious sects, but new colleges, too. The Dartmouth College case of 1819 restricted government's efforts to interfere in higher education. As the centuries rolled on, government did more to finance higher education, starting with the Morrill Land Grant College Act of 1862, but the basic autonomy of colleges and universities was preserved. They remained, and remain, spirited competitors in the marketplace of ideas, status, talent and donations.

The European system, by contrast, is state-dominated and uncompetitive. During the 19th century, governments in Spain, France and Germany abolished the universities' medieval privileges of independence. Governments took over funding and control, and imposed radical egalitarian agendas. Universities could not select students on merit, and faculty members became civil servants.

The upshot is that the competitive American universities not only became the best in the world—8 out of the top 10 universities are American—they also remained ambitious and dynamic. They are much more responsive to community needs.

Not only have they created ambitious sports programs to build character among students and a sense of solidarity across the community, they also offer a range of extracurricular activities and student counseling services unmatched anywhere else. While the arts and letters faculties are sometimes politically cloistered, the rest of the university programs are integrated into society, performing an array of social functions.

They serve as business incubation centers (go to Palo Alto). With their cultural and arts programs, they serve as retiree magnets (go to Charlottesville). With their football teams, they bind communities and break down social distinctions (people in Alabama are fiercely loyal to the Crimson Tide, even though most have not actually attended the university).

State-dominated European universities, by contrast, cast much smaller shadows. A Centre for European Reform report noted "a drab uniformity" across the systems. Talented professors leave. Funding lags. Antibusiness snobbery limits entrepreneurial activity. Research suffers. In the first half of the 20th century, 73 percent of Nobel laureates were based in Europe. Between 1995 and 2004, 19 percent were.

The two systems offer a textbook lesson in how to and how not to use government. In one system, the state supports local autonomy and private creativity. In the other, the state tries to equalize, but merely ends up centralizing and stultifying. This contrast might be worth dwelling upon as we contemplate health care reform, K-12 education reform and anything else government might touch.

The dynamic American university system is now undergoing yet another revolution—globalization. More foreign students are coming to the U.S., and more want to stay after they get their degrees.

This is bound to be great for American society. It will probably do almost nothing for our future World Cup prospects.