

1956 and 1957 seasons. He returned to the Indians for 1958 and went on to play for Chicago and Detroit until 1959 when he retired.

While the late Jackie Robinson broke the color barrier in the National League in a much-chronicled story, only 11 weeks later Doby followed suit in the American League to a more quiet narrative. Through much of his career, Doby was an overlooked pioneer who endured the same racial taunts Robinson had from teammates, fans and managers.

Pitcher Lou Brissie, another native South Carolinian, played both with and against Doby in the years following World War II. He remarked that Doby was "really an extraordinary man, in many ways. I have a great deal of respect for him. He always carried himself with dignity." While I congratulate the athlete who topped the American League in 1954 with 32 homers and 126 RBIs, it is the man Brissie describes that I pay tribute to today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in honoring Larry Doby, the newest member of the baseball Hall of Fame, a fine South Carolinian, and a model American.

EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGES

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1998

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention the December 12, 1997 speech by former Congressman John Brademas, entitled "Educational and Cultural Exchanges Across the Atlantic."

I ask that the full text of Dr. Brademas' remarks be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Those remarks follow:

EDUCATIONAL & CULTURAL EXCHANGES ACROSS THE ATLANTIC

(By Dr. John Brademas)

I am delighted to have been asked by Wouter Wilton to speak to you today about educational and cultural exchanges across the Atlantic.

My own links with Europe, let me say at the outset, are several, and they are deep. My late father was born in Kalamata, Greece. In fact, I am the first native-born American of Greek origin to have been elected to the Congress of the United States.

After graduating from Harvard, where I well remembered Secretary of State George Marshall's famous Marshall Plan speech, I spent three years of graduate study at Oxford University where I wrote my Ph.D. dissertation on the anarcho-syndicalist movement in Spain from the mid-1920s through the first year of the Spanish Civil War.

I did most of my research through visits to a library in Amsterdam and interviews with Spanish anarchists in exile living in Paris, Bordeaux and Toulouse.

As a Member of Congress, I traveled to Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Spain, the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia and the United Kingdom.

You will not be surprised then that I enthusiastically applaud the efforts of the Delegation of "Team Europe USA" of the European Commission. For although for many of us participating in this meeting, the connections between the United States and Western Europe have been natural, indeed essential, to our lives, I do not think that even well-

educated Americans know much about the European Union per se.

Indeed, given the importance of Japan, Korea and especially China, and in light of the continuing need for oil from the Middle East and lack of stability there, is the US-European relationship still fundamental?

Now my Harvard classmate, Sam Huntington, in a powerful essay in *Foreign Affairs* last year, notes that the United States is pulled in three directions—Latin America, Asia and Europe.

"The third pull," says Huntington, "toward Europe is the most important. Shared values, institutions, history, and culture dictate the continuing close association of the United States and Europe. Both necessary and desirable is the further development of institutional ties across the Atlantic, including negotiation of a European Free Trade Agreement and creation of a North Atlantic Economic Organization as a counterpart to NATO," which Huntington describes as "the security organization of Western civilization."

Although I do not accept Huntington's contention that peoples reared in Eastern Orthodox or Muslim civilizations are incapable of learning the habits and practices of democracy, I do agree with his assertion of the primacy for the United States of our ties with Europe.

EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGES

You must understand that the subject of the study of other countries and cultures is one that has preoccupied me for a long time. Thirty-one years ago, as a Member of Congress, I wrote—and President Lyndon Johnson signed into law—the International Education Act, to provide Federal funds to colleges and universities in the United States for teaching and research about other countries. Unfortunately, Congress failed to appropriate the money to implement the statute, and I believe the United States—of course, not for that reason alone—has suffered a great deal in the ensuing years from our ignorance of such places as Vietnam, Iran and Central America.

When, in 1981, I became President of New York University, I determined to strengthen the University's offerings in the international field.

Already powerful in the study of French civilization, we established the Alexander S. Onassis Center for Hellenic Studies—I have told you of my Greek ancestry—and the Casa Italiana Zerilli-Marimó.

With a gift from the late Milton Petrie of New York and his wife, Carroll Petrie, we instituted the King Juan Carlos I of Spain professorship of Spanish culture and civilization under which we have brought eminent scholars annually to lecture at NYU.

We founded the Skirball Department of Hebrew and Judaic Studies and, in our Stern School of Business, a Center on U.S.-Japanese Business and Economic Studies.

My Gaelic-speaking successor as NYU President, L. Jay Oliva, inaugurated Ireland House.

And only last April, I had the honor of welcoming His Majesty, King Juan Carlos I, to our campus to dedicate the King Juan Carlos I of Spain Center of New York University. In the presence of His Majesty, Queen Sofia and the First Lady of the United States, Hillary Rodham Clinton, we officially opened the Center.

As you know, several American universities have programs or centers on Latin America but there are almost none on Spain. We at NYU intend that the King Juan Carlos I of Spain Center become the premier institution in the United States for the study of modern Spain, its economy, history, and politics.

We have already in recent months enjoyed visits from former Prime Minister Felipe González and his successor, José Maria Aznar.

Here I draw your particular attention to a bequest from the late actress, Paulette Goddard, with which we have endowed a chair in European Studies and created, in memory of her late husband, the novelist Erich Maria Remarque, the Remarque Institute, directed by Professor Tony R. Judt and aimed specifically at promoting the study of Europe and facilitation of communications between Americans and Europeans.

I think it appropriate here if I simply quote some lines from the statement of the objectives of Remarque Institute: "[T]he study of Europe—European history, languages, and culture—is no longer a mainstay of educational programs in the United States. In high schools and in colleges it is not uncommon for students to graduate with only the flimsiest acquaintance with Europe. . . . The overall result is not only that the study of Europe . . . has declined in U.S. colleges, but that the sort of scholarly expertise on which journalists, politicians, business people, and the arts world might draw and with which they used to interact is much reduced."

At New York University, I trust I have made clear, we are in large measure Eurocentric in our offerings, especially in our Department of History.

And I must also comment on our students, for of the more than 3,000 colleges and universities in the United States, NYU ranks fourth in the number of non-immigrant international students on campus.

Today over 3,600 students from 120 countries—12.5 percent of our total enrollment—are pursuing academic degrees at NYU.

Also this year, 175 students are participating in NYU Study Abroad Programs in Florence, Paris, London and Prague, while more students from our professional and graduate schools are studying in other countries.

Yet if it is true, as the Institute of International Education reports, that the United States hosts more foreign students by far than any other country—457,984—that number has remained relatively flat for seven years.

In the 1995-96 academic year, the total number of Americans studying abroad was only 89,000, or about one-half of one percent of the student population in the United States. I nonetheless note that this figure marked an increase of 5.7 percent in the number of U.S. students going abroad, following an 11 percent rise the previous year. I add that about two-thirds of American students who did academic work in other countries in 1995-96 went to Western Europe.

I offer these facts at a time when, as all of you know, there has been a general retreat in the United States from investment in international diplomacy. That retreat is reflected in cuts in U.S. Information Agency student exchange programs, near elimination in some countries of the Fulbright exchanges, shutdowns of American consulates, harsh attacks on the United Nations, failure to pay our UN dues and, most recently, denunciation of the Kyoto Protocol on global warming by Republican members of the United States Senate.

CULTURAL EXCHANGES

Now if I bring to the discussion of international education the experience of a former legislator and university president, I wear yet another hat that touches directly on the subject of educational and cultural exchanges.

In 1994 President Clinton did me the honor of appointing me chairman of the President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities.

Composed of 45 persons—32 private citizens and 13 heads of Federal departments and agencies with cultural programs—our Committee is charged by the President with encouraging greater private sector support and more public-private partnerships for the arts and the humanities in the United States.

Earlier this year the President's Committee—of which the First Lady, Hillary Rodham Clinton, is Honorary Chair—released *Creative America*, a Report to the President—and the country—containing over 50 specific recommendations for action.

One of the major recommendations in our report to President Clinton was to expand international cultural and educational relations.

In *Creative America*, the President's Committee asserted that "international artistic and scholarly exchanges are more important than ever in a world in which ideas, information and technologies travel freely across national borders."

Certainly, the American economy is linked to international markets, as the current troubles in Asia vividly demonstrate, and as a global power, the United States has a vital interest in supporting programs in our schools, colleges and universities that increase our knowledge and understanding of other countries, cultures and languages.

In this connection, the Fulbright and U.S. Information Agency Exchange Programs have played a crucial role in promoting democratic values around the world.

Everyone here knows that not only have the Fulbright exchanges brought to the United States at critical stages in their careers future presidents and prime ministers, university presidents and scholars, influential journalists and business leaders but have also opened doors of opportunity for Americans to study and teach in other countries.

It is, therefore, a matter of great distress to members of the President's Committee that in recent years, government funding of the Fulbright program and other international educational and cultural exchanges has been sharply reduced even as private sector support for such efforts has been leveling off.

In light of the nature of the present US Congress, I'm glad to report that a few months ago the Senate and House of Representatives voted funds for educational and cultural exchanges at approximately current levels. One program, the Higher Education Collaboration between the United States and the European Union, will provide grants to be made jointly by the US Department of Education and the European Commission to help American and European colleges and universities with student exchanges.

In like fashion, I hope that more business firms and private foundations in the United States and elsewhere will support programs of international studies at colleges and universities in their respective countries as well as international scholarly exchanges. For example, my colleagues at NYU are now discussing prospects for a campaign to raise funds to endow fellowships for students from Spain and the Spanish-speaking world to pursue graduate study in the humanities and social sciences at our university and fellowships for NYU students to go to Spain or Latin American for post-graduate work.

Even as we in the United States must do far better than we have been doing in supporting international studies at our own colleges and universities and scholarly and cultural exchanges with other countries, I hope you will permit me to suggest that there should be more attention in Europe to learning about America.

When I was at Oxford 45 years ago, study of the United States ended with the League of Nations. And while there's been some

progress, it's only in recent years that Oxford has established an Institute for American Studies.

And with the increasing integration of the European Community and the prospect of adding new members from East and Central Europe in the near future, European students need to learn more about each other. It is, therefore, most encouraging that the European Union is supporting several programs to encourage intra-European study and has allocated funds to include students from East and Central Europe, including Russia.

Allow me here to mention a project on which I have been working for the past two years with colleagues in the United States and Europe. I speak a Chairman of the National Endowment for Democracy, a Federally-funded, nongovernmental, nonpartisan foundation that makes grants to private organizations that champion the institutions and practices of a democratic society. My colleagues I plan to establish a Center for Democracy and Reconciliation in Southeastern Europe, to be located administratively in Salonika, Greece. The programs and activities of the Center will be carried out in the several countries of Southeastern Europe—the Balkans. These programs are intended to be multinational in scope bringing together participants from the various countries of the region.

The purpose of the Center's multinational approach is to foster greater interchange and understanding among the peoples of the area and to develop networks among individuals and groups committed to the democratic and peaceful development of Southeastern Europe.

For example, one Center project would support the writing of school textbooks and improvement of pedagogy at all levels in the countries of the region. Textbook treatments of historical relationships are of real consequence in Southeastern Europe. There are few direct cultural and educational links among peoples in the Balkans and the views they take, of their neighbors are extremely important in shaping political attitudes. We hope to forge better ties through a series of workshops for university professors of Balkan history from throughout the region.

The governing body of the Center will be composed chiefly of persons from the region itself. To finance whatever projects the Center will undertake, approaches will be made to corporations, private foundations and the European Commission.

Certainly my colleagues and I who hope to see a Center to support the development of democratic institutions in this troubled part of Europe believe that education, at every level, must play a crucial role.

Now the activities of the President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities and the National Endowment for Democracy are not the only ones that continue to bring me to existential connection with Europe.

For example, I'm also chairman of the American Ditchley Foundation. Ditchley Park, as many of you know, a few miles outside of Oxford, England, is a lovely 18th-century house that for some 40 years has been a place for conferences on all manner of subjects. I myself chaired a symposium there two years ago on "Corruption in Democratic Societies" and will next February lead another on "Corruption: What to do About it?". Law enforcement authorities, business and political leaders and scholars from several countries, chiefly Europe and the United States will participate. As the battle against corruption has won new visibility on the part of OECD member states, I hope this issue will command increased attention in the European Commission Parliament.

Also, a few weeks ago in both Washington, DC and New York, I was one of 25 Americans

who joined a like number of Spaniards from the worlds of business, government and the universities to discuss matters of mutual interest. We shall meet next year in Barcelona.

Here I recall that early in my Congressional career, I regularly took part in what was known as the Anglo-American Parliamentary Group on Africa. Members of our House and Senate, the House of Commons and House of Lords, would meet periodically to discuss Africa but this arrangement was also one of the few venues that enabled British and American politicians to know each other personally and talk about the politics of our two countries.

Ought there not be established a systematic program of exchanges between and among Members of the US Congress, Members of the European Parliament and of the parliaments of EU member states?

I add that next week in Athens, under the auspices of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, to take part in the third meeting of a Forum on Greece, Turkey and the United States. Seven persons from each country—nearly all of us having earlier served our respective governments in some capacity—will meet to discuss problems of common concern—the Aegean, Cyprus, relations with the European Union—and hope to build some useful bridges.

And that bridge building across the Atlantic is, after all, what, or so it seems to me and, I take it, to all of you, what we should be about.

Now I realize that there are many more aspects to the transatlantic relationship than I have here addressed: trade, the expansion of NATO, what to do about Bosnia, how to deal with Iran and Iraq, to name a few.

And I could add to this list of challenges to revive—to strengthen and not diminish—US-European exchanges. Certainly I hope that President Clinton will make this commitment a top priority on his foreign policy agenda.

I think it appropriate, therefore, that I conclude these remarks by recalling to you the words of the signatories of the North Atlantic Treaty over four decades ago:

"They are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law."

That's still a pretty good foundation!

UNITED STATES-PUERTO RICO POLITICAL STATUS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1998

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 856) to provide a process leading to full self-government for Puerto Rico:

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 856, the United States-Puerto Rico Political Status Act which presents to Puerto Rican voters three political status alternatives: statehood, commonwealth, independence.

If the Commonwealth option obtains a majority of the votes, or if none of the three options obtain a majority, a referendum will be held in Puerto Rico every ten years until an option providing for full self-government achieves a majority of the votes.