

mobilize the resources to bring positive results.

Let us avoid delay and lost opportunities because of traditional roles or defining a mission or merely seeking additional bodies to occupy our classrooms. By knowing and understanding your own community, you can discover endless opportunities for service to the community by your community college. The hallmark of that exploration needs to be excellence, flexibility, and opportunity.

When we examine community colleges, we understand certain common elements which can be identified in community colleges judged superior. These qualities include adaptability to new conditions and circumstances, operating with a continuing awareness of the community, extension of opportunities to the unserved, accommodation to diversity, an active role in the community's learning system, and a continuing relationship with the learner. It is important that the community college maintain a high visibility in the community so that each of its administrators, teachers, support staff and business council members become salesmen and saleswomen for the community college and the benefits it offers. It may also require a conscious marketing strategy but it is worth the effort.

All of you have done an outstanding job in building a community college system in West Virginia. However, new challenges are before you and I know you will respond to these in the same positive and creative way you have responded to other challenges in the past.

I wish you well in your endeavors as you provide excellence in education and new opportunities for the community college students in West Virginia.

KENNETH KAUNDA'S MESSAGE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1985

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, we in the West are far enough removed from the turmoil in South Africa so that it is easy for us to speak from a position of moral superiority. When President Reagan defends constructive engagement, he does so by saying what is best for the nonwhite majority. His advisers use untested theories explaining the detrimental effects of sanctions, while ignoring the rising tide of civil rebellion against Pretoria's racist economic and political system.

Those who have failed to view South Africa within the context of African history have committed a grave error. Pretoria may look to the West for its cultural roots, but it cannot avoid the fact that it is also located in Africa with African citizens, African neighbors, and uniquely African traits. For this reason, we must pay careful attention to the words of Kenneth Kaunda, the respected President of Zambia.

Mr. Kaunda gave an eloquent analysis of the situation in his region of the world during his visit to New York to honor the United Nations. His firsthand analysis is thought-provoking and worth our attention. I would like to submit the following article for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and urge my colleagues to read it carefully.

[From the New York Daily News, Oct. 23, 1985]

FROM KAUNDA, A CALL FOR SANCTIONS (By Earl Caldwell)

The night before, he stood in a crowded room at the River Club on E. 52d St. "I wish I could stand here before you and proclaim a message of hope," he said. "But I have no more reason to be optimistic. I bring very pessimistic news."

There was no other sound in the room, only the voice of Zambian President Kenneth Kaunda. "South Africa and southern Africa as a whole have reached a boiling point," he said. "Only God's miracles can save the situation. Time is not running out; time has run out."

For 21 years, Kenneth Kaunda has been president of Zambia. He has in that time become one of Africa's most respected leaders. Yesterday at the UN, it was his turn to address the historic 40th session of the General Assembly, and he used it to bring the issue of South Africa and apartheid back to the center of the agenda.

He said that inside South Africa the oppressed people are saying, "Enough is enough." And he added that bold steps "must be taken now." He called on South African President Botha to "declare unequivocally that apartheid is a dead issue" and to meet with genuine leaders of the oppressed people. He called for an end to the state of emergency, a lifting of the ban on the African National Congress.

When Kaunda rose to speak, it was 10:30 a.m. Many delegates were just arriving. But there was an urgency in his words, and when he finished, the applause was long and loud.

At the 40th session, it is not just the opportunity to address the world organization that leaders look forward to. A huge press corps has assembled at the UN this week. Leaders of the nations that are world powers can beckon the news media when they want. But for others, especially African leaders, it does not work that way. Those leaders do not often have the chance to express their views to the world press. But this week at the UN it is different. And yesterday, after he finished his address, Kaunda met with reporters.

He used that session, as he had with his speech earlier, to "warn the rest of the world of the impending disaster."

He told reporters he favored tough sanctions against South Africa. "It's quite clear in our minds that something has to be done," he said. He said that sanctions were "the better of two evils," that no sanctions means sending a signal to 29 million people that they are on their own. He said applying sanctions was a way for the rest of the world to say it was sick and tired of apartheid.

"We are at a very important juncture," he said. "Either we act or it will be like it was with Hitler; we will let millions of people die."

He said, "Sanctions at this juncture will hurt us, and hurt us badly, but without sanctions there will be a violent explosion." His is one of the frontline states (the black-ruled states that border South Africa). He spoke of the way they depend on South Africa's economy but added: "We can recover from the hurt caused by sanctions. Without sanctions, there can be no recovery."

The night before, at the River Club, before he finished speaking, he said he wanted to add a personal note: "I want to thank the American people." He spoke of the impact the anti-apartheid movement in the U.S. was having. At his press conference he said that pressure had moved the Reagan administration from its policy of constructive engagement toward South

Africa to one of limited sanctions. "Please continue," he said. "We are depending on the American people. Our position is that we should have more severe sanctions. That (pressure for sanctions) is very, very important."

In the fight against apartheid in southern Africa, nobody asks what Kenneth Kaunda has done. He put his whole country on the line. When the fight was against Rhodesia, he gave Joshua Nkomo's liberation army sanctuary in his country. The ANC, now banned in South Africa, operates from Kaunda's Zambia. His whole country pays a price for that. Sanctions will hurt even more, but Kaunda does not complain. It is a part of the reason he is one of Africa's most respected leaders.

HOPE FOR THE SUMMIT

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1985

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, our colleague in the other body, the senior Senator from Maryland, MCC MATHIAS, has written an excellent essay on the history of the summit process, which I am submitting for the RECORD.

As usual, his analysis is right on target. He accurately points out that what we should be expecting from the summit is not necessarily either a formal agreement or communique, but, instead, "to throw light upon possible paths to compromise." That certainly puts the entire process into perspective.

I would like to add that the Senator was recently elected president of the North Atlantic Assembly. It is my hope and belief that during his tenure as president of the assembly that its role in helping to preserve peace will be further enhanced.

The article follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 13, 1985]

SUMMITS PAST AND PRESENT

(By Charles McC. Mathias, Jr.)

Versailles, Munich, Yalta, Geneva, Glassboro, Vladivostok, Camp David. Famous and not-so-famous cities have become synonymous with summits of the world's leaders.

For better or worse, it is evident that summits are a fixture of modern diplomacy. Yet there has not been a meeting of the leaders of the two most powerful nations of the nuclear age since 1979.

If we are to guard against expecting too much from the rituals of summitry, especially in the television age, we cannot afford to go so long without candid discussion of our deep differences with a nation with the same capacity as we have to destroy the planet in a matter of minutes. For several years, however, a Soviet-American summit has been blocked by the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, by the attack on a civilian airliner, by too much of an ideological straitjacket here and there, by an ever-changing succession of leaders there.

Summitry seems to run in historical cycles. It was common for monarchs and chieftains to meet their principal rivals in earlier times. This practice fell into disuse in the 18th and 19th centuries—the age of Talleyrand, as we might call it. Yet personal meetings between heads of state have become a distinct feature of the diplomatic