

of Operation Enduring Freedom/Noble Eagle and Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Today, these soldiers and their service become a part of South Dakota's military heritage. Like those who served in the two World Wars, in Korea, in Vietnam and numerous other places, this new generation has answered the call. They have offered to make every sacrifice, including life itself, to protect our freedom and security. We must never forget them or the honor with which they served.

This unit participated in a mobilization with few precedents in South Dakota history. Nearly 2,000 Guard and Reserve troops were called to active duty in our State, by far the largest mobilization since World War II. At the time the fighting began, units from more than 20 communities had been called up, from Elk Point in the South to Lemmon in the North, from Watertown in the East to Custer in the West. Indeed, our State's mobilization rate ranked among the highest of all the States on a per-capita basis.

These soldiers were proud to serve, and their communities are proud of them. Across the State, thousands of citizens pitched in to participate in send-off parades, to lend a hand for families who suddenly had to get by without a mom or dad, and even to assist with financial hardships caused by the mobilization. This mobilization was a statewide effort, in many ways.

In addition to the service of this particular unit, I want to acknowledge the sacrifices and dedication of the families who stayed home. They are the unsung heroes of any mobilization. They motivate and inspire those who are far from home, and they, too, deserve our gratitude.

Today, I join these families and the State of South Dakota in celebrating the courage, commitment, and success of the members of the 129th Mobile Public Affairs Detachment, and I honor their participation in this historic event in our Nation's history. Welcome home. Thanks to all of you for your courage, your sacrifice, and your noble commitment to this country and its ideals.

NATIONAL PEACE ESSAY CONTEST

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I am honored today to present to my colleagues in the Senate an essay by Collette N. Roberts of Rapid City, SD. Collette is a student at St. Thomas More High School, and she has been awarded first place in the 16th annual National Peace Essay Contest for South Dakota. "Justification of War: the Anglo-Zulu and Kosovo Wars" examines the Anglo-Zulu war of the late 19th century as a paradigm for understanding Kosovo's struggle against the military campaign of Slobodan Milosevic's Serbia. Collette has tackled a vitally important subject with insight and maturity. I can only hope that she continues to share her wisdom with the world, and I commend her

essay to my colleagues' attention. I ask unanimous consent that Collette Roberts's essay be printed in the RECORD.

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

JUSTIFICATION OF WAR: THE ANGLO-ZULU AND KOSOVO WARS

(By Collette N. Roberts)

"... this has never been and never can be one territory under two masters" (Judah, 2000, p. 4). The line in the poem by Anne Pennington and Peter Levi holds the ring of truth. Many wars have been waged over a piece of land such as the Anglo-Zulu and Kosovo Wars. The circumstances surrounding these wars are similar, but are justified only in part. In both wars, one side had reached the last resort: either defend their homeland or face subjugation. Both were waged by legitimate authorities; however, nothing justifies the genocide of a race and the slaughter of innocent civilians. Upon examination, the justness of the Anglo-Zulu and Kosovo Wars and NATO involvement in Kosovo is subjective, contingent upon the motives and actions of each party.

The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries mark the imperialistic age for Great Britain. By the 1870s, most of South Africa had succumbed to British rule. Zululand, however, one of the last independent African states in the region, presented challenge to an advancing white frontier (The Diagram Group, 1997, p. 105). Not only did the independent state disrupt Britain's confederation plans for the region, but also prevented sugar farmers from using the spacious tracts of land within the boundaries of Zululand. Furthermore, as long as the Zulu remained independent, they could not be sued for cheap labor. Zululand became a dollar sign in the eyes of the British. When the Zulu defied British subjugation, war inevitably ensued (Gump, 1994, p. 3).

British military forces, commanded by Frederick Thesiger (better known as Lord Chelmsford), began the invasion of Zululand in 1879. The Zulu, under the rule of King Cetshwayo, rose to defend their homeland. The first major battle occurred at Isandhlwana. Losses were heavy to both armies; but the Zulu, underestimated by the British, claimed victory. To justify his actions, Dabulamanzi, a Zulu general, said, "It is the whites who have come to fight with me in my own country and not I that do to fight with them" (Gump, 1994, p. 54).

Despite the intensity and valor with which the Zulu fought, the battle of Ndini marked the end of the Anglo-Zulu War. Poorly provisioned and outgunned, the Zulu military system was broken. Between six and ten thousand Zulu men died defending their homeland (Knight, 1995, p. 270). Following the war, the British began decentralizing the Zulu royal house. Zululand was carved into thirteen regions, each headed by British sympathizers. Finally subjugated, young Zulu men soon found themselves traveling outside Zululand in search of work. The system of migrant labor, as in other parts of South Africa, had at last taken hold of Zululand. The economic seeds of apartheid, the racist system of black oppression, had been sown (Knight, 1995, p. 272).

Those, like the Zulu, who are invaded by a conquering power are faced with only two choices: subjugation or war (Gump, 1994, p. 3). Though the chances for success were poor for the Zulu, war was the only chance to defend their homeland and preserve their way of life. When the British could not easily lay their hands on what they wanted, they believed they had reached the last resort, and

therefore initiated war. These attitudes are common throughout all imperialistic societies. Britain justified its actions through claims to "savage" Zulu; to expose them to a "new and better way of living" (Gump, 1994, p. 14). However, war, from the imperialistic standpoint not be the final option when a piece of land and the promise of a profit are found to be superior to human life.

The Anglo-Zulu War is not the only conflict history that has occurred over a piece of land. For centuries, opposition has brewed between the Serbs and Albanians of the Balkans. The source of conflict is Kosovo, a province of Serbia, sharing borders with Albania (Andrzejewski, 2000, p. 9). The claim of the area is bitterly disputed between the Serbs and the Albanians. Serbs hold that, despite the ethnic shift only a few generations ago, the people of Kosovo have been primarily Serbian. The Albanians, on the other hand, argue that their ancestors, the ancient Illyrians and the Dardanians, habituated the region prior to the Slavic invasions of the sixth and seventh centuries. Therefore, they believe, Albanians have the right to what they call "first possession." The truth concerning the claim of Kosovo is unclear. However, as in most cases, the truth is not what matters, but rather is what the people believe the truth to be (Judah, 2000, p. 2).

In April, 1987, a politician from Belgrade delivered a speech glorifying the Serbian nation. Because of high tensions between the Albanians and the Serbs, biased speech-making had been against certain unspoken "rules" in Yugoslavia. However, by the end of the year, he became the most powerful politician in Serbia (Andrzejewski, 2000, p. 18). In 1991, Milosevic began his war in Bosnia for a "Greater Serbia." By the time the Dayton Peace Agreement had been approved and signed, hundreds of thousands of Muslims and Croats had fallen victim to the program of "ethnic cleansing," driven from their homes, tortured, raped, and murdered (Andrzejewski, 2000, p. 20). Despite the declaration of peace, Milosevic's ambitions for a "Greater Serbia" had not been eliminated. His ambitions soon turned toward Kosovo.

Kosovo remained under the harsh rule of Serbia. In 1997, the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA), a small guerrilla force, began to wage a war against Serbian authorities. Alone, the KLA's chances for a sweeping victory were slim. However, the worthy cause of self-defense justifies their actions. The occasional skirmishes between the KLA and Serbian authorities culminated in the Serbian massacre in Drenica where dozens of ethnic Albanian civilians were slaughtered (Andrzejewski, 2000, p. 30). Despite NATO threats of airstrikes to end the fighting, the violence between the Albanians and Serbs continued to escalate. In January, 1999, Serbs massacred forty-five ethnic Albanians in the Kosovar village of Racak. NATO, acting as a peace-keeper gave the Serbs and Kosovar Albanians an ultimatum: make peace or face NATO military action. The Albanians were willing to make peace, but all agreements proved futile when Milosevic refused to sign (Andrzejewski, 2000, p. 33).

Far from any kind of last resort, Milosevic, wielding the power of a legitimate authority, instigated a massive Serb military attack on Kosovo. Kosovar Albanians, both military and civilian, were his paramount targets. A campaign of ethnic cleansing, echoing that of Bosnia, was launched on the Kosovar Albanians. Homes were burned, women were raped, and men were slaughtered; mass graves, freshly dug, could be seen from the air (Andrzejewski, 2000, p. 48). Milosevic justified his unjust actions through his call for a "Greater Serbia." Again, the desire for a piece of land was put before the sanctity of human life.

When peace became impossible and violence continued, NATO was left with the last resort. As promised, NATO took military action to halt the Serbian offensive and its mass genocide of the Albanians. A reasonable chance for success was existent. Furthermore, there was the belief that the consequences of these aggressive actions would be better than the situation that would exist had these actions not been implemented. In March 1999, NATO airplanes and cruise missiles began bombing Serbian military targets. Ultimately, through the joint efforts of the KLA and NATO, Serbia withdrew from Kosovo seventy-eight days later and signed NATO peace agreements. By the time peace had been achieved, 900,000 Albanians had been removed from their homes in Kosovo (Andryszewski, 2000, p. 54). Another ten thousand lay dead—murdered by Serbs during their ethnic cleansing of Kosovo (Andryszewski, 2000, p. 57).

Critics may argue that the decision to bomb Serbia may not have been the most effective course of action. Regrettably, serious mistakes were made and the bombings killed civilians, both Serb and Albanian. Furthermore, a bomb hit the Chinese embassy in Belgrade, killing three and wounding nearly two dozen (Andryszewski, 2000, p. 50). Despite these tragic events, had NATO not put pressure on Serbia to end its campaign of ethnic cleansing, the number of genocide victims would have only increased.

As demonstrated, one territory cannot serve two masters. The Anglo-Zulu and Kosovo Wars were waged because two parties tried to control one piece of land. Each party had reasons for taking part in the fight. Many factors come into play that do or do not justify these reasons. The Zulus and Albanians were justified by reaching the last resort and defense of their homeland. Though neither of these parties had any reasonable chance of victory, the justness of their cause is in no way lessened. NATO military action was justified in its attempts to check the violence. Britain and Milosevic, though legitimate authorities, valued land over human life. Their motives were unjust. Justice is blind, but will forever be weighed by our motives and actions.

REFERENCES

- Andryszewski, T. (2000). *Kosovo: the splintering of Yugoslavia*. Brookfield, CT: The Millbrook Press, Inc.
- Diagram Group, The. (1997). *People of South Africa*. New York: Author.
- Gump, J.O. (1994). *The dust rose like smoke: the subjugation of the Zulu and the Sioux*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Judah, T. (2000). *Kosovo: war and revenge*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Knight, I. (1995). *Anatomy of the Zulu Army: from Shaka to Cetshwayo*. London: Greenhill Books.

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, Senator 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 on September 22, 2000. A man looking to "waste some faggots" entered a gay bar in Roanoke, VA, and opened fire, killing Danny

Overstreet, and injuring six others. Overstreet, sitting at a table closest to the gunman, dropped when a shot hit him in the chest. The 43-year-old gay man died within minutes, despite efforts to help him. The other six victims eventually recovered. A witness told police that the gunman—a vocal antigay advocate—had asked directions earlier in the evening to gay bars in the Roanoke area.

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.

SUPREME COURT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION DECISION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on Monday, in a landmark decision, the Supreme Court made clear that colleges and universities can adopt admissions policies that take students' racial and ethnic background into account to achieve a diverse student body. The Court's decision is a resounding vindication for the fundamental principle that affirmative action can be used in education to promote opportunity for all, and encourage interaction among students of diverse backgrounds.

Our diversity is our greatest strength, and this decision recognizes the broad benefits of diversity in higher education. A diverse student body benefits all students at our colleges and universities and helps prepare students for our increasingly diverse workforce and our diverse society.

As the opinion of Justice O'Connor states, "Major American businesses have made clear that the skills needed in today's increasingly global marketplace can only be developed through exposure to widely diverse people, cultures, ideas and viewpoints." High-ranking military leaders, too, have stated that affirmative action is necessary for promoting a "qualified, racially diverse officer corps," to enable the Armed Forces to protect national security.

The Court's decision supports the paramount importance of education as a gateway to equal opportunity, reaffirming once again the Court's historic decision nearly 50 years ago in *Brown v. Board of Education*. Few areas are as vital to sustaining our democracy that education. Our institutions of higher education, like our public schools, are indispensable in broadening the minds of young adults, and training them for leadership.

As the Court stated in *Brown*, and emphasized again in Monday's opinion, "Education is the very foundation of good citizenship." The Nation is becoming increasingly diverse, and it is important for all our institutions to reflect that rich diversity.

The Court stated: "In order to cultivate a set of leaders with legitimacy

in the eyes of the citizenry, it is necessary that the path to leadership be visibly open to talented and qualified individuals of every race and ethnicity. Access to education must be inclusive of talented and qualified individuals of every race and ethnicity, so that all members of our heterogeneous society may participate in the education institutions that provide the training and education necessary to succeed in America."

The Supreme Court has made clear that a well-crafted affirmative action admissions program like that of the University of Michigan Law School is constitutional. It is flexible and allows for individualized review of each applicant, and it is not a quota. The Court also made clear that States do not have to promote diversity only by relying on percentage plan programs which guarantee college admission to all students above a certain class-rank in every high school graduating class in the State.

As the Court recognized, such programs do not work for graduate and professional schools. In fact, percentage plans can prevent colleges and universities from making the individualized assessment of applicants that is necessary to assemble a diverse student body.

Our country has made extraordinary progress over the past half century toward equality of opportunity in all aspects of our society, and affirmative action has been an indispensable part of that success. But we all know that we have to do more to make the promise of *Brown* a reality. Even with affirmative action, vast inequities remain in access to higher education especially for African-Americans and Latinos.

We know that civil rights is still the unfinished business in America. Half a century after *Brown*, our schools remain starkly divided along racial and ethnic lines, and minority children are too often relegated to inadequate schools. We have to do more to see that minority children are not forced to think of an institution like the University of Michigan as an impossible dream. This decision by the Supreme Court is another major step by the Court to make that dream possible, and it is difficult to believe that either this Congress or this President would approve a Supreme Court nominee who would reverse that decision.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, it has been nearly 50 years since the Supreme Court ruled segregation in schools unconstitutional in *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas*. Then-Chief Justice Earl Warren said: "We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal."

This week, the tenet of equality that lies at the foundation of the *Brown* decision was reaffirmed and strengthened. In fact, it is becoming more and