

expense of Russian civil society. He condones the abuse of government power to quash internal dissent and silence criticism of his regime. The raid and hostile government takeover of Russia's most important independent newspaper, magazine and television outlets, and last week's prevention of a human rights leader Sergei Grigoryants from boarding a flight bound for Washington where he was to attend a conference on Russia are sad examples of this trend.

The Congress has a responsibility to aid the President in cultivating Russian civil society. Historically, America's lawmakers have played a central role in this effort. The Jackson-Vanik amendment of the 1970's, for instance, linked economics and human rights, and effectively undermined Soviet Communism and hastened the arrival of Russian democracy. The Congress must again rise to the occasion.

In the final analysis, a democratic Russia, respecting human rights and observing international norms of peaceful behavior, is squarely in U.S. national security interests. Millions of Russians want to be part of the West culturally, politically, and in many other senses. These forces need to be strengthened. In my judgement the Russian Democracy Act is an incredibly prudent investment on the part of the United States to bolster whatever democratic forces there are in Russia. This is a critically important piece of legislation, and I urge my colleagues in Congress to support it.

GRADUATION ADDRESS AT US
ARMY WAR COLLEGE

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2001

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege to give the commencement address at the US Army War College on June 9, 2001. It was a terrific honor. My speech to that group is set forth as follows:

MILITARY HISTORY AND THE BATTLEFIELD OF
THE FUTURE

A couple of years ago, I prepared an article with the assistance of the Congressional Research Service entitled, "Learning on the Job: Applying the Lessons of Recent Conflicts to Current Issues in Defense Policy". It was the premise of my article that a careful look at significant U.S. military operations over about the past twenty years—roughly the period of time that I have served in Congress—can help shape answers to a surprisingly large number of contemporary issues in defense policy.

LESSONS LEARNED

My research revealed at least twelve military operations during my tenure in Congress, ranging from the small-scale 1985 interception of an aircraft carrying the Achille Lauro hijackers to the Persian Gulf War in 1991. We discovered that there were lessons learned in each of these military operations. I won't go into all of these lessons or all of these military operations, but let me summarize just a few of them:

In Lebanon, 1982–1984, we learned that we need force protection measures wherever we deploy our forces.

In Grenada, 1983, we discovered shortcomings in the ability of our forces to plan and execute joint operations.

Panama, 1989–1990, taught us that night operations could be conducted successfully and that stealth technology could work in an operational setting.

The Persian Gulf War, 1990–1991, showed that tactical, operational and strategic thought, derived from the study of yesterday's conflicts, pays off on the battlefield. It also demonstrated the devastating efficacy of high technology munitions like smart bombs, the success of stealth technology, the importance of establishing air supremacy, and the advantages of disabling the enemy's infrastructure and command, control, and communications ability. The war also made clear that the threat of the use of chemical and biological weapons is real.

It is also interesting to note how General Schwartzkopf used the lessons of history in at least three instances in his successful Desert Storm campaign: First, the thorough 40-day air campaign which preceded the ground war recalls the failure to conduct adequate bombardment at the island of Tarawa in November of 1943. The price paid for that failure at Tarawa was heavy Marine Corps casualties. In the Gulf War, the ability of Iraqi forces to offer opposition to our forces was severely reduced. Second, consider the successful feint carried out by the 1st Cavalry Division prior to the actual start of the ground war. This recalls Montgomery's strategy in 1942 at the Battle of the Marjith Line in North Africa against the German Afrika Corps. This action was a prelude to the decisive battle at El Alamein. Third, by utilizing a leftward flanking movement when he launched the ground war, General Schwartzkopf was taking a page from the book of Robert E. Lee and Stonewall Jackson at the Battle of Chancellorsville. As you will recall, Jackson's forces conducted a brilliant flanking maneuver and completely surprised Union forces under General Joseph Hooker, in the May 1863 battle.

Somalia, 1992–1993, taught us that we should strive to avoid mission creep, and that requests from on-scene commanders for additional equipment, personnel, or other resources must be given appropriate attention by the national command authority.

In summary, my research revealed that even apparently limited military operations have required a very broad range of well-trained and well-equipped forces. We don't have the luxury of picking and choosing what missions to prepare for. And all of this is expensive—we cannot expect to have global reach, or to be engaged in Europe, Asia, and other places around the world, on the cheap. We learned that while we still have much to work on—making the Army more deployable for one thing, how to move from peacekeeping by military forces to nation-building by largely civilian institutions for another—we have actually done a lot right. The U.S. military has shown the ability to absorb the lessons of each new operation. Improvements have been made in command arrangements, in operational planning, in tactics and doctrine, in training, and in key technologies. Precision strike capabilities have matured. Congress, yes Congress, has sometimes helped. Congress's establishment of an independent Special Operations Command in 1987 has been vindicated by the continued critical importance of special operations forces in a host of military actions since then, and by the marvelous performance of those forces when called upon. Con-

gressional passage of the Goldwater-Nichols Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 clearly helped to clarify and strengthen command arrangements.

KOREA, 1950

What caused me to think back on a now two-year-old article was the information that a group of Korean War Veterans would be in the audience today. No veterans from any war suffered more from the failure to heed the lessons of history than the veterans of the Korean War. Let me quote a passage from a book by former journalist Robert Donovan which describes the experience of elements of the 24th, Division upon their arrival in Korea in July, 1950:

"Out-gunned, lacking in heavy antitank weapons, unfamiliar with the terrain, ill prepared for combat after the soft life of occupation duty in Japan, the 24th Division soldiers were disorganized and confused, hampered by early-morning fog, exhausted by midday heat, and frustrated by faulty communications. Mis-directed mortar fire from one unit caused injuries and death in another. Chronically, supplies of ammunition ran low. Men were ambushed or were completely cut off in strange villages and never seen again. Mortars and machine guns were abandoned in the bedlam of battle . . ."

This was the experience of Task Force Smith and the other units which were among the first to deploy to Korea. Historians can argue over why we were so unprepared for conflict in Korea. Perhaps it was overconfidence after our great victory in World War II. Perhaps it was the tendency of the U.S. to "bring the boys home" immediately after a war—a tendency then-Major George C. Marshall noted in a 1923 speech—which led to cuts in the military that were too deep in a still-dangerous world.

Whatever the reason for our unpreparedness, there can be no disagreement on this: No group of Americans ever fought more bravely than those we called upon to serve in the Korean War. In the past decade, a lot of people have stepped forward to take credit for winning the Cold War. Let me tell you should get the credit. It is these Korean War veterans who are with us today. Their courage, their sacrifices, drew a line in sand against Communist expansion. There would be other battles—in Vietnam and in other places around the globe. But in Korea, a country most Americans had never heard of before 1950, the message was sent. America would fight to preserve freedom. We owe you a debt of gratitude we can never repay. Indeed, the whole world owes you a debt of gratitude. It is not enough, but I just want to say, "Thank you."

THE BATTLEFIELD OF THE FUTURE

Recently, I visited TRADOC headquarters at Ft. Monroe, and received an excellent briefing from General John Abrams and his staff, especially Colonel Maxie MacFarland, on the "Battlefield of the Future". Allow me to summarize that briefing from my perspective—a country lawyer who serves on the House Armed Services Committee, and who is an avid student of military history:

It should be obvious that we are not the only military that has learned lessons from these U.S. military operations which I discussed earlier, and from others around the world, such as Chechnya. The U.S. military is the most studied military in the world. All major U.S. field manuals and joint doctrinal publications are freely available on the internet, and indeed, U.S. military internet sites are frequently accessed by foreign organizations. Foreign military students from 125

countries around the world attend U.S. military education institutions, such as this one, or specialized U.S. military schools under the International Military Education and Training (IMET) programs. Our openness and reliance on information systems means that our adversaries in the future will have a greater depth of knowledge about the capabilities and operational designs of U.S. military forces.

We have advantages now in air, intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance, and other technology, and we will likely continue to have these advantages in the future. Our potential adversaries know we have these advantages and they will seek to offset them in some of the following ways:

They will seek to fight during periods of reduced visibility, in complex terrain, and in urban environments where they can gain sanctuary.

They may use terrorist organizations to take the fight to the U.S. homeland, and they could possibly use weapons of mass destruction, or attacks on infrastructure and information systems.

They will attempt to confuse U.S. forces so that the size, location, disposition, and intention of their forces will be impossible to discern. They will try to make U.S. forces vulnerable to unconventional actions and organizations.

To offset the U.S. technological overmatch, they will use selective or niche technology, perhaps even commercially-obtained technology, to degrade U.S. capabilities. As an example, during the first Chechen War, the Chechens bought commercial scanners and radios, and used them to intercept Russian communications.

They will endeavor to exploit the perception that the American will be vulnerable to the psychological shock of unexpected and unexplained losses. Their goal will be a battlefield which contains greater psychological and emotional impacts.

In this environment, U.S. forces may no longer be able to count on low casualties, a secure homeland, precision attacks, and a relatively short duration conflict. Conflict may occur in regions where the enemy has a greater knowledge and understanding of the physical environment, and has forces which know how to take advantage of it. They will seek to avoid environments where U.S. abilities are dominant. They will have more situational awareness than possible for U.S. forces.

My briefers at TRADOC referred to this kind of conflict as "asymmetric warfare". And as I listened to the briefing, I thought back on my military history and I realized the truth of the old cliché that there is "nothing new under the sun." Asymmetric warfare is not something new. In fact, it has been a part of American military history. Let me give you a couple of examples:

The first is from that series of conflicts that we collectively refer to as the Indian Wars, and it has a direct relation to the place we are standing right now. On July 18, 1763, during Pontiac's War, Colonel Henry Bouquet left Carlisle in command of a British army force of 400 men to relieve Fort Pitt, 200 miles to the west. On August 5 near a small stream known as Bushy Run, Bouquet's forces were attacked by Indians who were part of Pontiac's forces.

If you go to the Bushy Run Battlefield State Park today, as I have done, you will see open fields—perfect terrain for the mass formation warfare that Europeans knew how to fight. But on August 5 and 6, 1763, the area around Bushy Run was old growth forest of-

fering limited fields of fire. This was a physical environment that the Indians knew and understood, and they took advantage of it. They forced Colonel Bouquet's forces back into a defensive position on a hilltop. The Indians attacked this position repeatedly, but never waited for a counter attack. They simply faded into the forest, as was their style, suffering few casualties. By the end of the first day of battle, however, sixty of Bouquet's troops had been killed or wounded. As fighting continued on the second day, British losses were mounting and the situation was becoming desperate. At this point, Bouquet saved his forces with a brilliant maneuver, borrowed from Hannibal at the Battle of Cannae. First, he feigned a retreat. As the Indians, sensing victory, left their cover and charged in, they came under devastating fire on their flanks and rear from Bouquet's redeployed forces. Bouquet's strategy had caused the Indians to abandon their asymmetric tactics, and leave the cover of the forest. They were quickly routed and fled the battlefield.

One other interesting point regarding Bushy Run: The official history says that Bouquet's forces were engaged and surrounded by Indian forces at least equal in size to his own. However, when I toured the battlefield, Indian re-enactors, who have studied the battle extensively from the Indian point of view, maintained that the Indians numbered no more than ninety, and that the tactics they used in the forest made their numbers seem larger. Recall that my TRADOC briefing mentioned as an element of asymmetric warfare that adversaries would attempt to confuse U.S. forces so that the size of their forces would be impossible to discern.

Example number two. Just south of here is the site of the largest battle of the War Between the States. At Gettysburg, two large armies faced off in what was, by the standards of the time, conventional, or symmetrical, warfare.

But in Western Missouri, where I grew up and still live, the War Between the States was far different. In that border state, where loyalties were divided, large battles fought by conventional forces were the exception, not the rule. Most engagements were fought between small units, usually mounted. The fighting was brutal, vicious, and the civilian population was not spared from attack.

In this theater, Union forces suffered from some distinct disadvantages:

Many of the Union units were infantry, which were useless in a conflict where most engagements were lightning cavalry raids.

Union cavalry units were equipped with the standard issue single shot carbines and sabers. As I will later explain, this armament was ineffective against their adversaries.

Because Union leaders considered Missouri a backwater, Union troops got the leftovers—the Army's worst horses, officers deficient in leadership skills, and poor training.

Not surprisingly, these Union Army units suffered from poor morale and lacked unit cohesion.

In contrast, guerrilla units fighting on behalf of the Confederacy did not have leaders trained at West Point or field manuals to teach them tactics. But they did have strengths that they were able to take advantage of:

Their troops did not need training. They were tough, young farm boys, already skilled in riding and shooting.

Their basic weapon was the best revolver in the world—the six-shot Colt .44 Navy.

Most guerrillas carried four Colts, some as many as eight. Through trial and error, they discovered that they could shoot more accurately with a smaller charge, without sacrificing lethality. Moreover, this saved powder, a precious resource to the guerrillas. Thus armed, no guerrilla was ever killed by a Union cavalry saber.

Western Missouri was then noted for its fine horses, and the guerrillas got the pick of the lot in terms of speed and endurance.

They did not adhere to traditional ways of fighting. They preferred ambush and deception, often dressing in Union uniforms in order to get within point-blank range.

They had been raised in the area and knew the terrain, and how to travel on paths through the woods to conceal their movements. The Union troops traveled mostly on the main roads.

They received assistance from the local population—horses, clothing, food, intelligence, shelter, medical care. When the Union army tried to punish the locals for giving this assistance, these repressive measures only made the locals more supportive of the guerrillas.

Well, by now this should sound familiar. One does not usually find the term "asymmetric warfare" used in connection with Missouri in the 1860's, but you can see many elements in common with those mentioned in my TRADOC briefing on the Battlefield of the Future.

THE STUDY OF MILITARY HISTORY

No doubt during your time here at the Army War College you have had the opportunity to read and study a great deal of military history. Let me urge you to make that a lifetime commitment.

In 1935, the newly-elected U.S. Senator from Missouri visited a school then known as Northeast Missouri State Teachers College. While there he was introduced to a young man who was an outstanding student and the president of the student body. The Senator told the student, "Young man, if you want to be a good American, you should know your history." That young student, the late Fred Schwengel, went on to become a Member of Congress from Iowa, and later, President of the U.S. Capitol Historical Society. And, as you may have guessed by now, that newly-elected Senator went on to become President of the United States. The school is now named for him—Truman State University.

I can't say it any better than Harry S. Truman. The main praise for building an increasingly flexible and effective force must go mainly to the generation of military officers that rebuilt U.S. military capabilities after the Vietnam War. This generation has now almost entirely reached retirement age. The task of the next generation of military leaders is to learn as well as its predecessors. You are bridge between those generations. You have served under the Vietnam generation. You will lead, train, and mentor, the generation to follow. If you do your job well, some future leader in some future conflict will be able, like Colonel Bouquet at Bushy Run, like General Schwarzkopf in Desert Storm, to call on a lesson from military history to shape the answer to a contemporary problem.

GRATITUDE

The Roman orator Cicero once said that gratitude is the greatest of virtues. Those of you who serve in uniform, your families, and our veterans who have served in uniform and their families, deserve the gratitude of our nation. I know sometimes you feel unappreciated. Yes, there are days set aside

to officially honor our service members and our veterans:

Veterans Day is set aside to honor those who have served in our nation's wars. But is only one day.

On Memorial Day we pay our respects to those who have given that "last full measure of devotion". Again, one day.

Armed Forces Day is dedicated to those currently serving in uniform. One day. And, because it is not a national holiday, most people don't know the date of Armed Forces Day.

I want you to know that many Americans do appreciate you every day. They don't need a holiday to do it. So, let me express gratitude to you personally, and on behalf of the American people, for all that you do, and all that you have done. And, let me ask you as senior leaders to do your part to show gratitude. Let me tell you why: The difference between keeping someone in uniform and losing them might just be an encouraging word at the right time. So, when you go out to your next assignments, and that junior officer or that young NCO puts in those extra hours, or does something that makes you look good, take the time to express your gratitude. Let them know how much they are appreciated.

Thank you and God bless you.

A TRIBUTE TO TOP STUDENT HISTORIANS FROM BISHOP, CALIFORNIA

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2001

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention the outstanding accomplishments three student historians who are protégées of retired teacher Irene Sorensen of Bishop, California. Working with Mrs. Sorensen on independent study assignments, eighth graders Lauren Pollini and Kristen Kamei, and 10th grader Patrick Koske-McBride won a place on the California team at the National History Day competition at the University of Maryland this week. The competition involved students from across the United States who submitted projects on this year's theme: "Frontiers in History: People, Places, Ideas."

Lauren and Kristen qualified for the national competition by first winning California State History Day competitions at the county and state levels. Their exhibit, entitled "An Education Frontier: Assimilation Through Education: An Owens Valley Paiute Experience," won the state junior group exhibit category. This is Lauren's second trip to the National History Day competition—she was a finalist last year in the Junior Historical Paper competition.

This is also Patrick's second trip to National History Day. The Bishop Union High School student qualified for the national competition this year with a historical paper titled "Genetics Genesis: How the Double Helix Transformed the World." He also wrote his project independently of his regular classroom work.

The outstanding accomplishments of Lauren, Kristen and Patrick were undoubtedly guided by the leadership of her teacher, Mrs.

Irene Sorensen. Irene is a past winner of the Richard Farrell Award from the National History Day as the 1996 Teacher of Merit.

Irene retired last year month after 19 years of teaching at Home Street School and leading students to statewide and national recognition, but agreed this year to work with her former students on their projects. The town of Bishop, and Home Street School are 200 miles from the closest university library or other academic research facility. Yet under Irene's direction, Bishop students have won at the state level and qualified for National History Day nine times during the 13 years of History Day competition. Clearly, the dedication of teachers like Irene Sorensen make our public school system the finest in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me and our colleagues in recognizing Lauren Pollini, Kristen Kamei and Patrick Koske-McBride for their fine accomplishment. I'd also like to commend Irene Sorensen for her fine leadership and her devotion to such remarkable educational standards. Students like Lauren, Kristen and Patrick and instructors like Irene set a fine example for us all and it is only appropriate that the House pay tribute to them all today.

SIKHS REMEMBER ATTACK ON THE GOLDEN TEMPLE, THEIR MOST SACRED SHRINE

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 2001

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, in June 1984, the Indian government attacked the Golden Temple in Amritsar, the holiest shrine of the Sikh religion. Attacking the Golden Temple is the equivalent of attacking Mecca or the Vatican. It is a great affront to the Sikh Nation. As the Sikh martyr Jarnail Singh Bhindranwale, who was killed in the Golden Temple, said, "If the Indian government attacks the Golden Temple, it will lay the foundation of Khalistan," the name of the independent Sikh homeland which declared its independence on October 7, 1987.

This attack included the desecration of the Sikh holy scriptures, the Guru Granth Sahib, which they shot with bullets. Young Sikh boys were murdered. How can a democratic country commit this atrocity?

On June 2, Sikhs from around the East Coast demonstrated in protest of the Golden Temple massacre. Sikhs came from Philadelphia, Baltimore, Miami, and other places on the East Coast. They let it be known that the Sikhs still remember their martyrs and that the flame of freedom still burns in their hearts.

This launched a wave of violence which has killed over 250,000 Sikhs since 1984. In a new report, India is quoted as admitting that it held over 52,000 Sikh political prisoners without charge or trial. India has also killed more than 200,000 Christians in Nagaland and engaged in a wave of terror against them since Christmas 1998. Over 75,000 Kashmiri Muslims have died at the hands of the Indian government, as well as thousands of people from Assam, Manipur, and Tamil people, and Dalits (the dark-skinned "untouchables.")

America should not accept this kind of activity from a country that calls itself democratic. We should cut off aid to India until it allows full human rights for every citizen within its borders and we should support self-determination for all the peoples and nations of South Asia, such as the people of Khalistan, Kashmir, Nagalim, and others.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the Council of Khalistan's very informative press release on the June 2 demonstration into the RECORD.

SIKHS OBSERVE KHALISTAN MARTYRS DAY INDIAN ATTACK ON GOLDEN TEMPLE LAID FOUNDATION OF KHALISTAN

Washington, D.C., June 2, 2001.—Sikhs of the East Coast gathered in Washington, D.C. today to observe Khalistan Martyrs Day. This is the anniversary of the Indian government's brutal military attack on the Golden Temple, the Sikh Nation's holiest shrine, and 38 other Sikh temples throughout Punjab. More than 20,000 Sikhs were killed in those attacks, known as Operation Blue Star. These martyrs laid down their lives to lay the foundation for Khalistan. On October 7, 1987, the Sikh Nation declared its homeland, Khalistan, independent.

"We thank all the demonstrators who came to this important protest," said Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh, President of the Council Khalistan. "We must remind the Indian government that Sikhs will never forget or forgive the Golden Temple desecration and the sacrifice the Sikh martyrs made for our freedom. These martyrs gave their lives so that the Sikh Nation could live in freedom," Dr. Aulakh said. "We salute them on Khalistan Martyrs' Day," he said. "As Sant Bhindranwale said, the Golden Temple attack laid the foundation of Khalistan."

The Golden Temple attack launched a campaign of genocide against the Sikhs that continues to this day. This genocide belies India's claims that it is a democracy. The Golden Temple attack made it clear that there is no place for Sikhs in India.

"Without political power nations perish. We must always remember these martyrs for their sacrifice," Dr. Aulakh said. "The best tribute to these martyrs would be the liberation of the Sikh homeland Punjab, Khalistan, from the occupying Indian forces," he said.

Over 50,000 Sikh political prisoners are rotting in Indian jails without charge or trial. Many have been in illegal custody since 1984. Since 1984, India has engaged in a campaign of ethnic cleansing in which thousands of Sikhs are murdered by Indian police and security forces and secretly cremated. The Indian Supreme Court described this campaign as "worse than a genocide." General Narinder Singh has said, "Punjab is a police state." U.S. Congressman Dana Rohrabacher has said that for Sikhs, Kashmiri Muslims, and other minorities "India might as well be Nazi Germany."

A report issued last month by the Movement Against State Repression (MASR) shows that India admitted that it held 52,268 political prisoners under the repressive "Terrorist and Disruptive Activities Act" (TADA). These prisoners continue to be held under TADA even though it expired in 1995. Persons arrested under TADA are routinely re-arrested upon their release. Cases were routinely registered against Sikh activists under TADA in states other than Punjab to give the police an excuse to continue holding them. The MASR report quotes the Punjab Civil Magistracy as writing "if we add up the figures of the last few years the number of