will be at least as appropriate when other nations of Asian ethnicity in that part of the world can supplement Australia's effort. So far, at least, this is a regional problem in need of regional solutions.

For these reasons, it also is right for the United States basically to stay out—at least for the short term, and possibly for the long. U.S. armed forces taking part are likely to number in the hundreds. Their role would be in support functions—what National Security Adviser Sandy Berger characterized as ''airlift to bring forces to the region, logistical and transportation capabilities, communications capabilities.''

The boiling over of East Timor can't be justified, but in hindsight the degree to which it caught the international community napping is a little surprising. Indonesia, which sprawls over 17,000 islands and encompasses hundreds of ethnicities and languages, is a nation that for half a century has been held together by smoke, mirrors and the threat of just what is happening now; violent repression.

East Timor's U.N.-sponsored vote for independence was perceived by the militias and the military as a foretaste of similar efforts in other independence-minded regions, of which there are several. And since by the military's and militia's perception, they have only one tool with which to ''repair'' the situation, that's the tool they're using.

The whole world is watching the rivers of blood that are the result. It cries out to be stopped. This is too early to talk about resolving the sides' differences. For now it is enough simply to separate them and try to calm the situation.

Down the road, better solutions are needed—in part for humanitarian reasons, but also for practical ones. Indonesia is flung across a vast reach of water linking the Pacific and Indian oceans, and through this maze of islands threads a major oil-shipping lane. The effects of disrupting that could ripple through economies worldwide.

For now, though, the most urgent need has just one focus: Stop the killing. It's heartening to see events there aimed toward that end.

THE INFLUENCE OF CUBAN AMERICANS

HON. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1999

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend to you the attached article written by Mr. Frank Calzon, entitled ''Blame Castro, not the Cubans.'' Mr. Calzon is the executive director of the Center for a Free Cuba in Washington, DC, and is a tireless fighter for democratic causes. I believe Mr. Calzon makes an excellent case in his article and I encourage my colleagues to learn from it.

BLAME CASTRO, NOT THE CUBANS

Although prejudice can be found anywhere, Americans might be shocked that bigotry has raised its ugly head in the upper reaches of the Clinton administration.

The pugnacious debate about Cuba has grown uglier since The New York Times quoted unnamed administration officials asserting that Cuban Americans hold U.S.-Cuba policy hostage. If this were said about the NAACP's interest in South Africa, or the Jewish-American community's concerns about Israel, cries of outrage against such bigotry would resound across America.

While critics might object to the influence of Cuban Americans, interest groups (ethnic, regional, professional, corporate, etc.) are simply a fact of life. When Cuban Americans write to their members of Congress, they are exercising their right to petition the government for redress of grievances. When my sisters attend a political rally, they are enjoying the right of assembly guaranteed by the Constitution. Until now, I believed that when my parents register and vote, they are fulfilling a civic responsibility. But now I know that ''a senior government official'' thinks that what they are really doing is ''holding U.S. policy hostage.''

To note the virulent attacks on the Cuban-American community is not to assert that its members are exempt from responsibility for the shrillness of the debate. We are not. But it might be instructive to remember that whether it was workers attempting to unionize 100 years ago, African Americans demanding an end to discrimination in the 1960s, or women struggling to achieve equality today, the victims of great injustices are sometimes a nuisance to those not interested in their plight.

What could Cuban Americans say that would be so objectionable?

That the administration's accords with Fidel Castro have been negotiated in such secrecy that sometimes not even the Cuba desk at the Department of State is informed.

That the ''adjustments'' in Cuba policy are often presented as *fait accompli*, ignoring the Congress and U.S. laws.

That the government's spinning and lawyerly hair-splitting over-shadow Cuba policy, promoting a mind-set that believes in giving Castro the benefit of the doubt. The most recent example: the suggestion that a legal opinion is needed to determine whether the embargo statutes prohibit not only American sales to the Cuban government but also sales through the Cuban regime

The debate provides a sobering commentary on the values held by some American elites on the eve of the 21st Century.

For some, Castro is the one remaining beacon in a pantheon that once included Josef Stalin, Mao Zedong and Ho Chi Minh. As long as Castro or North Korea's Kim Iong Il, the son of the deceased Kim Il Sung, remain in power, it can be said that the socialist experiment has not been a complete fiasco.

Yet the American people have an instinctive aversion to tyranny and object to providing assistance that could lengthen Castro's rule. Most Americans agree that the problem is Castro, not the Cuban Americans. Because Castro refuses to base U.S.-Cuban relations on any—sort of reciprocity-and certainly because of his abhorrent human-rights record—those seeking to soften the sanctions rely on ''spinning'' policy, redefining the meaning of the law and slandering the Cuban-American community.

How did it come to be, that without further congressional action, the Cuban Adjustment Act—which protected Cuban refugees since the mid-1960s—now has a different meaning?

Furthermore, what prevents other laws from being subjected to similar whims of the executive branch?

What prevents other communities—blacks interested in South Africa, Irish-Americans concerned about Ireland and Jewish-Americans following events in Israel, for instance—from being accused by unnamed government officials of holding American policy hostage because they disagree with the government?

The implications of this issue obviously extend beyond Cuban Americans.

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT GENERAL JAMES E. MOORE

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1999

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to note the passing of Lieutenant General James E. Moore on January 30, 1999. General Moore served bravely in battle, and served the community equally well in overseeing the closure of Fort Ord Army base.

General Moore was born into the military, at Fort Thomas Kentucky on June 28, 1931. He grew up both in the United States, much of those years near Salinas California, and in China. After graduation from West Point, he earned his master's degree in education from Columbia University. He also graduated from the Air Command and Staff College and the Army War College. He commanded a combat battalion in the 25th Infantry Division in the Central Highlands of Vietnam in 1966 and 1967. His leadership skills were recognized when, in 1985, General Moore was assigned the command of the combined field army in Korea, the largest field army in the free world. His honors include the Distinguished Service Medal, Silver Star, Air Medal, Combat Infantryman's Badages, Legion of Merit with an Oak Leaf Cluster, Meritorious Service Medal, Army Commendation Medal, Senior Parachutist's Badge and Ranger tab. General Moore was a man of modesty and compassion, putting the troops ahead of himself, even letting the soldiers eat first when he joined them in the mess hall. He has been described by colleagues as a gifted, natural leader.

When General Moore retired in 1989, he and Joan, his wife, returned to the Fort Ord area. Within a few months, the Army announced base closure plans, with Fort Ord one of the first designated for conversion. Then-Congressman Leon Panetta, aware of General Moore's accomplishments and his willingness to be of service to the community, urged him to establish a task force that would undertake the monumental job of coordinating federal, state and county agencies with the 12 cities in the area and with the military. There were no precedents for the undertaking. Working on a volunteer basis, General Moore spent over two years overseeing comprehensive studies, discussions and negotiations, finally producing a 600-page document that has become the blueprint for military conversion and reuse planning.

Although he continued to participate peripherally in the continuing reuse planning, General Moore again went into retirement, looking forward to reading, traveling, photography and his hobby of building model sailing ships. The appreciative community honored his contributions with a dinner at the Monterey Conference center.

Lieutenant General James E. Moore is survived by his loving wife, Joan; his three daughters, Elizabeth, Susan and Mary; and his four sons, James Moore IV, Robert, Michael, and Matthew; a step-mother Annie; and his sister Patricia, and eleven grandchildren. He was a born leader, a mentor, a man who generously gave and received great respect. he undertook the most challenging tasks with a positive attitude, so it is no wonder that his achievements were many. Everyone who had