

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NICARAGUA

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1986

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, as we approach debate yet again on the issue of aid to the Contras, I feel it would be helpful to establish some factual and analytical predicates which Members can use in determining how to cast their votes. Many Members have made up their minds, but for those who have not, I offer the following. It is an update of a similar statement I inserted in the RECORD 1 year ago.

This statement represents—as did its predecessor—an attempt to answer some of the questions most commonly asked about Nicaragua—either those which have been raised by administration statements on particular issues or others which follow from an examination of the conflict in Nicaragua. The conclusions I state are my own, but they are derived from a review of a wide, and I believe, representative, sampling of available information. They cover not only the conduct of the Sandinista Government of Nicaragua but the Contra forces seeking to overthrow that government.

NICARAGUA MILITARY BUILDUP

Military equipment deliveries to Nicaragua from the Soviet bloc are estimated at \$100 million during 1985. In 1980, this amount was \$10 million; in 1981, \$50 million; in 1982, \$100 million; in 1983, \$135 million; and \$250 million in 1984.

One way to look at these figures is to see a substantial sustained reliance on the Soviet Union and Cuba for military supplies and to posit that deliveries made in 1 year must have been contracted for months before actual receipt. Another way to look at the influx of equipment is to note that the large amount of this assistance (for example, helicopters) did not begin in earnest until 1982, the year when the Contras began to operate with U.S. assistance. In any event, it is clear that the great majority of military deliveries occurs after 1982 and that in significant part, consists of systems related to the Sandinistas' counterinsurgency efforts.

Traditionally, Soviet bloc donors have provided military assistance to many of their clients but have been not so generous with economic aid. Yet, in 1985 the Soviet bloc provided some \$450 million in economic assistance to Nicaragua. This was a significant jump from \$155 million in economic assistance in 1982.

NICARAGUA—SOVIET AND EE BLOC ASSISTANCE

	Military	Economic
1980	6	37
1981	39.5	78

NICARAGUA—SOVIET AND EE BLOC ASSISTANCE—
Continued

	Military	Economic
1982	88	155
1983	115.5	237
1984	248.1	281
1985	97	450

What type of military equipment has Nicaragua received from the Soviet Bloc? The chart that follows reflects approximate numbers of major weapons systems possessed by Nicaragua and compares them to those of Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala. (Costa Rica has no armed forces.)

	El Salvador	Guatemala	Honduras	Nicaragua
Tanks	0	15	0	140
APCs	50	50	100	200
Rocket launchers	140	0	0	25
Artillery pieces	60	70	25	90
Antiaircraft guns	50	10	30	170
Antitank weapons	40	250	40	125
Fighter aircraft	26	10	20	0
Trainer/attack aircraft	23	12	10	3
Transport/attack aircraft	2	0	0	0
Helicopter gunships	0	0	0	6
Transport/other helicopters	50	30	35	30
Patrol boats	15	20	20	20
Minesweepers	0	0	0	6

Are these weapons systems offensive or defensive in nature? Most of the equipment that the Nicaraguans have acquired have a counterinsurgency or defensive capability. In this category fall some major elements of Nicaragua's new (since 1979) military capabilities: air defense (radars and antiaircraft weapons), signals intelligence and communications, and antiarmor weapons. Some such as tanks, artillery, and attack helicopters, can be used both offensively and defensively but are generally considered offensive weapons. It should be noted that while the Nicaraguan tank inventory is both unusual and overwhelming vis-a-vis the inventories of its neighbors, tanks can be employed in the Central American context in only a limited fashion. Attacking north toward Honduras, for instance, there is only one rather narrow avenue which would accommodate tanks. This area, on the Pacific coast and called the Choluteca Gap, was the scene of the Big Pine III joint United States/Honduran military antiarmor exercise. Further, the Nicaraguan ability to use tanks in any invasion of its neighbors must be viewed in the context of its ability to supply these tanks with fuel. Nicaragua is chronically short of fuel to keep its economy running and totally dependent on tanker shipments for oil. It would need significant improvements in fuel supply, storage and transportation plus the ability to withstand a possible naval embargo to sustain and support an invasion force using its armor.

Much has been made of the Sandinistas' helicopter gunship—the MI-25 HIND—as a fearsome weapon against the Contras. The inventory of the MI-8/17 HIP transport helicop-

ters has increased and has provided new mobility to Sandinista forces. It is also evident, however, that these new weapons have not yet provided the Sandinistas with a knock-out punch. What they have done, however, is helped limit Contras tactics to classic guerrilla warfare on the small unit level.

What is the size of the Nicaraguan armed forces? The Nicaraguans have 65,000 men on active duty and another 55,000 reserve and militia—for a total of 120,000. By contrast, El Salvador has an army of 52,000 and is building a civil defense force. (Currently, it stands at 7,000.) Honduras has an army of 22,000. Guatemala has an army of only 35,000 but a large civil defense establishment.

	Active duty military	Reserve/militia or civil defense
Nicaragua	65,000	55,000
El Salvador	52,000	+7,000
Honduras	22,000	
Guatemala	35,000	300,000

ESTABLISHMENT OF A MILITARY BASE

The President, in his address to the Nation on March 16, 1986, said: "Today, Warsaw Pact engineers are building a deepwater port on Nicaragua's Caribbean coast similar to the naval base in Cuba for Soviet-built submarines. They are also constructing, outside Managua, the largest military airfield in Central America similar to those in Cuba from which Russian BEAR bombers patrol the U.S. East coast from Maine to Florida."

PORT AT EL BLUFF

Construction at the Nicaraguan port of El Bluff is not being done by military engineers of the Warsaw Pact but funding and technical assistance for the project has been provided by a Bulgarian consulting firm. While the expansion of the port will facilitate both commercial and military purposes, at this point, it doesn't appear that the principal purpose is to develop the facility for military. Currently, ships which unload on the Atlantic coast must offload their cargoes to lighter vessels for transport to El Bluff. The port is now half complete and, when finished, will save the Nicaraguans as average of \$27 per ton of cargo, as well as Panama Canal transit fees. The country's main port at Corinto, on the Pacific coast, is reportedly working at over 30 percent of its stated capacity. The Nicaraguans still require considerable funds to complete the project and they have been looking to East European nations for help. There is no evidence to suggest El Bluff is being built as a submarine base.

PUNTA HUETE AIRFIELD

The airfield the Sandinistas are still building at Punta Huete will have the capability to land any type of aircraft and eventually the airfield will be the headquarters for the Sandinista Air

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Force. Currently, the Nicaraguans only use the airfield for daylight operations. The transfer to make this an operational airfield does not appear likely in the near term due to the fact that there are no ground support facilities. It is estimated that this airfield could be fully operational by the end of the year.

While Russian BEAR bombers do land occasionally in Cuba on patrols that take them along the east coast of the United States, there is no evidence that the Sandinistas and/or the Soviets intend to undertake similar activities from Nicaragua.

NICARAGUAN INTENTIONS

What are the intentions of Nicaragua toward its neighbors? Are the military forces referred to above likely to be used to attack other Central American countries?

There is no evidence that Nicaragua has such an intention. It is clear that Nicaraguan forces have, from time to time, crossed its borders with Honduras and Costa Rica to attack Contras retreating to or concentrated in those countries. An attack of significant force took place in Honduras in March of this year. The intent in these attacks has been either retaliatory or hot pursuit—and not to take and hold territory or to invade a neighboring country. Some appear to have been intended to indicate Nicaraguan displeasure with the sanctuary afforded the Contras across Nicaraguan borders.

SUPPORT FOR INSURGENTS IN EL SALVADOR

On the other hand, the Nicaraguan Government appears to have committed itself to a policy of support for insurgencies in other Central American countries. The most important example of this policy is the assistance provided by Nicaragua to the Salvadoran guerrillas. It seems clear that the Nicaraguan commitment to the Salvadoran guerrillas stems from FMLM support to the Sandinistas during their efforts to overthrow Somoza and is a matter of revolutionary pride and solidarity.

The flow of arms from Nicaragua to the Salvadoran guerrillas continues, but at a greatly reduced rate. The network used for this purpose is run by Salvadorans with Nicaraguan support. The supplies provided by the network are thought to be mostly ammunition but also medicine and other supplies. It is also thought that until recently the Salvadoran guerrillas have enough arms but still rely, to some significant degree, on other types of assistance from Nicaragua. The flow of assistance from Nicaragua is sometimes erratic.

There have been no appreciable interdiction of arms shipments by the Salvadoran Armed Forces and none at the point of entry into El Salvador. The capture of supplies of arms in the past have been in Honduras while in transit or in safehouses.

The flow of assistance and supplies comes by water along the southeast coast of El Salvador, by land through Guatemala and Honduras, and possibly by air from Nicaragua. The inability of the Salvadoran or Honduran forces to interdict shipments by water routes alone is a factor of low priority for interdiction efforts, a lack of proficiency among the security forces, corruption, and of what is probably both an extremely effective guerrilla network handling a small volume of shipments.

Nicaragua also provides communications facilities, safe haven, training, and logistical support to the Salvadoran guerrillas. The system employed to provide all of these types of assistance is flexible and, apparently, very well run.

The judgments made above concerning assistance to the Salvadoran guerrillas are in part inferential but are based on a growing body of information.

SUPPORT FOR INSURGENTS IN HONDURAS

Nicaragua on two occasions—1981 and 1983—has trained and dispatched teams of Hondurans bent on initiating insurgent activity in Honduras. Nicaragua also provides Honduran leftists with training, funds, and equipment. The Nicaraguans did not provide this kind of assistance to Honduran groups prior to 1982 when U.S. assistance to the Contras began.

SUPPORT FOR INSURGENTS IN COSTA RICA

In Costa Rica, there is no insurgency. There have been clashes along the border between Nicaraguan forces and Costa Rican border officials. These have usually been in connection with the use by Contra forces of sanctuaries across the border. In addition, there is evidence that Nicaragua has provided funds and assistance to Costa Rican Communists and that some Costa Rican Communists have operated in units in Nicaragua against Contra forces along the Costa Rican/Nicaraguan border. Again, these events postdate the 1982 U.S. assistance to the Contras. There is no evidence that Costa Rican Communists have utilized Nicaragua as a base to conduct or export terrorism.

It is clear in both the case of Honduras and Costa Rica that each of these governments has not only tolerated but, particularly in the case of Honduras, provided safe harbor to Contra forces. It is also clear that the Nicaraguan Government has usually limited its cross border operations so as not to give either country good cause for requesting assistance from U.S. military forces.

SUPPORT FOR INSURGENTS IN GUATEMALA

Nicaraguan assistance to Guatemalan insurgents permits them to both propagandize and coordinate their operations in Guatemala. In addition, these groups have headquarters in Managua.

SUPPORT FOR INSURGENTS IN COLOMBIA

There is evidence that Nicaragua has provided weapons and training to the MI-19 insurgents in Colombia. This information surfaced as a result of the recapture of the Palace of Justice in Bogota by Colombian authorities after its seizure by the MI-19 in November 1985. There is also evidence that General Manuel Noriega, chief of the Panamanian Defense Forces, has aided the MI-19.

In addition to assistance to the insurgencies referred to above, some of these groups, in particular Salvadoran guerrilla groups, may assist Nicaraguan forces in combat against Contra forces. One way to view this phenomenon is to look at Nicaragua as a focal point for subversion in the Western Hemisphere. Another is to view the presence of these so-called internationalists as spontaneous support for the Sandinista revolution. The overthrow of Somoza, for instance, was achieved by the Sandinistas with the assistance of internationalists from other countries—as well

as from governments such as those of Costa Rica, Panama, Venezuela and Cuba.

PLO

In addition to the presence of Central American insurgents, a number of other groups are reported to be present in Nicaragua. The PLO, which has had a relationship to the Sandinistas since before 1979, has a very small military and security presence in Nicaragua—less than 20—and is thought to provide assistance in the maintenance and piloting of some Nicaraguan aircraft. The PLO has also provided some anti-aircraft guns and an airplane to Nicaragua. There is no evidence that the PLO has utilized Nicaragua as a base to conduct or export terrorism.

LIBYA

Libya also has had a relationship with Nicaragua since the overthrow of Somoza. The Libyans have a small military and security presence—approximately 25—in Nicaragua and their personnel appear to serve as pilots, mechanics, and air defense advisers. Libya has provided a few Polish MI-2 helicopters, light ground attack airplanes, anti-aircraft missiles, multiple rocket launchers and small arms to Nicaragua. It has attempted to transfer additional light ground attack aircraft but these attempts have been frustrated to date. In addition to military assistance, Libya has provided economic assistance, both through cash and credits and in oil barter arrangements. There is no evidence that Libya has utilized Nicaragua as a base to conduct or export terrorism.

IRAN

There is no Iranian military or security presence in Nicaragua. While there have been rumors of Iranian agreements to provide arms to Nicaragua, none have been delivered.

What information there is concerning PLO, Libyan, or Iranian relationships to Nicaragua does not indicate joint terrorist operations or Nicaraguan complicity in terrorism by the PLO, Libya, or Iran. There is no evidence that Iran has utilized Nicaragua as a base to conduct or export terrorism.

RED BRIGADES

While there have been reports that the Italian Red Brigades have a presence in Nicaragua, there is little firm evidence to confirm these reports.

CUBA

The single largest foreign presence in Nicaragua is that provided by Cuba. The intelligence community believes there are approximately 3,000 military and security personnel assisting the Nicaraguans. Cuban military advisers are thought to be placed in all elements of the military and security forces at every level. It is believed that some Soviet-supplied helicopters are likely piloted by Cubans since the Nicaraguans do not have the capability of piloting all these aircraft.

There have been as many as an additional 2,000 Cuban construction workers in Nicaragua. This work force appears to have changed in character in the aftermath of the Grenada operation. Older men and women have been replaced by younger workers with military experience; 1,500 teachers who returned to Cuba in a previous regular annual rotation are not expected to return.

SOVIET UNION

There is a Soviet military and security presence in Nicaragua estimated to range from 40 to 50 personnel. They are most likely assigned as advisers in the military and intelligence services or assist in the assembly and maintenance of the Soviet military equipment provided to Nicaragua. Recently, a Soviet reconnaissance aircraft has been overflying northern Nicaragua. Soviet military and security advisers maintain a low profile. Yet, they represent the willingness of the Soviet Government to invest in supporting a Nicaraguan Government friendly to the Soviet Union.

The Soviets have made no commitment to the defense of Nicaragua in terms of troops or military deployments. It appears that they need not exert pressure on the Nicaraguan Government, which has consistently asked for more assistance and become more dependent on the Soviet Union both militarily and economically. Common Soviet-Nicaraguan views on many issues result in parallel policies more conducive to Soviet interests than total Nicaraguan dependence and subservience to the Soviet Union.

NORTH KOREA

There is a small North Korean military presence in Nicaragua training the Nicaraguans in the use of four North Korean-provided patrol boats.

EAST EUROPEANS

There are several hundred East European advisers in Nicaragua. Most are Bulgarians associated with the construction of a deepwater port in El Bluff. There are also over 60 East German military and security advisers placed in the intelligence, security and telecommunications agencies of the Nicaraguan Government.

OTHER GROUPS

There have also been allegations that other terrorist groups such as the Irish Republican Army and the Bader Meinhof Red Army faction have personnel in Nicaragua. There is no evidence of such presences.

HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES OF MISKITO INDIANS

The Nicaraguan Government has been accused of genocide of the Miskito Indians on the Atlantic coast of Nicaragua. This appears not to be true.

The treatment of the Miskito Indians by previous Nicaraguan governments under the Somoza family could best be characterized as benign neglect. After the revolution of 1979, the Sandinistas attempted to force the Miskitos into participating in the full range of the Nicaraguan Government's political and economic programs. The nature of many of these programs clashed with the Miskitos' independent traditions. The tactics employed by the Government caused a great deal of discontent in Miskito communities. That discontent manifested itself in opposition to the regime or support for an armed group (known as Musura) under the leadership of Steadman Fagoth.

Fagoth's group operated in the extreme northeastern part of the country along the Rio Coco River separating Honduras and Nicaragua. These operations led the Nicaraguan Government in early 1982 to resettle large numbers of Miskito Indians away from the border so as to deprive Fagoth's group of

sanctuaries. In the course of this resettlement, the Nicaraguan Government razed Miskito villages in an area that had been the home of Miskito Indians for centuries. Those Miskitos who were resettled were removed to relatively secure surroundings and afforded the basic necessities but were uprooted from their traditional farming and fishing areas and required to shift to radically new ways of living.

In the course of the resettlement, a number of Miskito Indians were killed or have disappeared. The documentation concerning the resettlement is not good but the range of estimates for those killed or unaccounted for is from 50 to 100 individuals.

The Nicaraguan Government apparently realized the great unpopularity of its policy towards the Miskitos and has since taken a much ameliorated approach to Miskito concerns. In some cases, the government has permitted Miskitos to leave the resettlement camps and return to their ancestral villages. Fighting continues at low levels in Miskito and other Indian areas on the Atlantic coast of Nicaragua, but the abuses of which the Nicaraguan Government was originally, and justly, accused have largely disappeared.

HARASSMENT OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

The Nicaraguan Government has had very strained relations since 1979 with the hierarchy of the Catholic Church in Nicaragua. It has accused the bishops and, in particular, Cardinal Archbishop Obando y Bravo of engaging in partisan politics. The Government has prohibited the broadcast of masses on church holy days, has shut down the church's radio stations and publications, has sought to embarrass and deport clerics who have come into disfavor with the regime, and appears to have attempted to embarrass the Pope in his 1983 visit to Nicaragua. At various times, the Government has also attempted to exert more control over the church's schools and limit their enrollment.

One reason the church has become a target of the Government has been the outspoken nature of the bishops' pastoral messages to the faithful, particularly messages which have been critical of the sectarian nature of the Government or the economic failures of the Sandinista system, and those which have endorsed a dialog between the Government and the Contras.

While the Nicaraguan Government has harassed the archbishop and others its has considered opponents of the regime, it appears to have developed better relations with other religious figures, among them foreign priests, nuns, and various lay groups—both Catholic and otherwise—who live and work throughout Nicaragua. The experience of many who serve in parishes or religious communities outside Managua, as well as within the city, is that the regime has very actively engaged in supporting the kinds of social welfare activities, such as literacy, health, and education programs, in which these church groups assist.

Another factor in the Nicaraguan church-state relations equation is the division within the Catholic Church between the so-called popular church and traditional, orthodox Catholicism. Some of the religious figures who hold high Government positions in the Nicaraguan Government today are central figures in the popular church, whereas the bishops rep-

resent the orthodox and majority position in the church. The Government is thought to have tried to use the popular church as a way of distancing some Catholic congregations from the authority and teaching of the bishops.

PRESS CENSORSHIP

The Nicaraguan Government has consistently and pervasively censored all but clearly pro-government media in Nicaragua. This has included the radio stations and publications of the church but, particularly, the opposition newspaper, *La Prensa*. Censorship has ensured that information contrary to the regime's viewpoint is not published. The extent of censorship ranges from excising reports on Soviet actions in Afghanistan to stories that involve sports issues. The process by which *La Prensa* is censored is a cumbersome one and can be viewed, in part, as an attempt to limit the distribution of the newspaper. Without a variety of foreign financial contributions, including assistance provided by the National Endowment for Democracy and various friendly Western governments, *La Prensa* would have ceased publication years ago.

Censorship has been constant in Nicaraguan life since 1981 and has been justified by the Government of Nicaragua under a state of emergency declared in the spring of 1982 because of the attacks by Contra forces.

ELECTION PROCESS

The Nicaraguan elections in November 1984 have been referred to by some as Soviet style, sham elections. There are some similarities to Soviet bloc-style elections in that the military and security forces of the Government are identified completely with the ruling party, the media was controlled by the Government, and the conditions for the elections—including censorship and limits on opposition access to the media and political organizing—were regulated by a statute promulgated by the ruling party. All of these factors gave a great advantage to the Sandinistas in the 1984 election. At the same time, the conditions of the election were not so dissimilar from those taking place in many other countries throughout the Third World in which the U.S. Government fails to suggest that a sham has taken place.

With some notable exceptions of violence directed against opposition candidates, the actual conduct of the electioneering period was not marked by significant harassment of the opposition by the Nicaraguan Government. The election results probably reflect not only the advantages the ruling party had given itself but also its real popularity within the country. Even under more democratic conditions, the Sandinistas likely would have won a majority in the election.

The unknown factor in the election, besides the conditions under which they were held—conditions dictated by the Sandinista party—was the effect of the withdrawal of the major opposition (CDN) coalition from the election. There is speculation that the race could have been much closer had the CDN not withdrawn. There can be justifiable skepticism about the willingness of the Sandinista party to accept election results which gave it less than a clear majority but no evidence is avail-

able which suggests that the election tallies were altered by the Sandinistas.

1984 NICARAGUAN ELECTION

Party	Percent vote	Number deputies (seats)
Sandinista National Liberation Front, Daniel Ortega—Ruling party since July 1979 revolution	67.0	61
Democratic Conservative Party, Dr. Clements Guida—Pro-election splinter of traditional conservative party. Leadership took party into election against wishes of sizable pro-boycott faction	14.0	14
Independent Liberal Party, Virgilio Godoy—Liberal grouping kept on ballot against wishes of party convention and candidate Godoy. Some elected deputies have threatened not to take these seats in the assembly	9.6	9
Popular Social Christian Party, Mauricio Diaz—Progressive Christian democratic grouping	5.6	6
Communist Party of Nicaragua—Marxist-Leninist party	1.5	2
Nicaraguan Socialist Party—Marxist-Leninist party	1.3	2
Popular Action Movement—Marxist-Leninist party	1.0	2
Invalid votes—Mostly spoiled ballots	6.1	

Figures are percentage shares of valid Presidential votes, and numbers of deputies in new, 96-seat National Assembly. Abstention Rate: 25 percent, with 1.17 million ballots being cast out of total registered electorate of 1.55 million. Source: Supreme Electoral Council.

WHO ARE THE CONTRAS

Those armed groups opposing the Nicaraguan Government by force of arms are called the Contras. The single largest Contra force is the Nicaraguan Democratic Force, estimated to have between 15,000 to 20,000 active fighters. In addition, there are Indian groups collectively known as Kisan that are active on the Atlantic coast of Nicaragua. In the north, this group is referred to as UNO-Kisan. In the south, they are associated with the Southern Opposition Bloc [BOS].

Both the FDN and UNO-Kisan operate from sanctuaries in Honduras. The Kisan forces operate in northeast Nicaragua along the Rio Coco south of Puerto Cabezas; the FDN forces operate principally in mountainous areas in the north central and northwestern parts of the border region and as far south as Matagalpa.

In the south of Nicaragua, along the Costa Rican border and both inside Nicaragua and in Costa Rica, are groups of Contras who at one time all came under the titular command of Eden Pastora, the famous Comandante Zero of revolutionary fame, who left the Nicaraguan Government to head military operations of a number of Contras factions united under the banner of the Democratic Revolutionary Alliance, or ARDE.

Pastora is no longer waging a military campaign. He recently received asylum from Costa Rica and has said he will pursue a wholly political struggle. Pastora has always been strongly critical of the UNO/FDN organization as dominated by ex-Somoza National Guardsmen and of the United States for not providing him with sufficient military support. What remained of Pastora's forces recently joined with an organization—formerly the FARN and now known as UNO/South—headed by Fernando "El Negro" Chomorro.

ORIGINS

The armed struggle against the Sandinista regime began in earnest almost immediately after the overthrow of Somoza. A number of ex-Somoza national guardsmen escaped and settled in El Salvador and Guatemala. A small number settled in Honduras and many civilians settled in Miami.

The core group, known as the 15th of September Legion (named after Nicaragua's liberation day) set up headquarters in Guatemala.

There were also small pockets of resistance operating along the Honduran border, perhaps three or four groups of 50 to 75 ex-guardsmen involved in petty thievery and cattle rustling.

The organization of a resistance that could have some impact in Nicaragua began in early 1981 with the support of sympathizers in El Salvador and Guatemala assisted by Argentina. Argentina had provided training to some Salvadoran conservative groups and was also connected with senior officials in the Honduran military.

Was this a homegrown resistance movement that sought out the assistance of Honduras and the other country and later the United States, or did it begin with the United States seeking out assistance of the Hondurans and this other country to develop a unified opposition to the Sandinistas?

What is known is that the Latin American country forged a merger of the ARDEN [Nicaraguan Democratic Revolutionary Alliance], the military arm of which was the 15 September Legion, with the Nicaraguan Democratic Union [UDN] in September 1981 in an organizational meeting in Guatemala City. This group became known as the Nicaraguan Democratic Armed Force [FADN], later shortened to the Nicaraguan Democratic Force [FDN].

The close relationship that key Honduran officials had with the Latin American government and the close ties that developed between these officials and the U.S. Government in moving the Contra support effort forward were the key relationships in the creation of the FDN.

By the end of 1982, the general staff of the FDN had received so much criticism because its major task force commanders and officers were filled with ex-national guardsmen, the U.S. Government suggested and helped facilitate changes in the political directorate of the FDN. The object of the changes was to create a structure with genuine political credentials, untainted by association with Somoza. Edgar Chomorro, one of the individuals brought in to the directorate, has explained how the U.S. Government secured his participation and how the directorate was actually run. While the directorate had seven members, Chomorro states that actual power was wielded only by two individuals—Adolfo Calero, who was later named president of the Nicaraguan Democratic Force, and Enrique Bermudez, the commander for military operations.

When U.S. assistance first began, the plan set forth to the congressional intelligence committees was that there would be a military arm and a separate, political arm which would attempt to secure support from other nations. These two groups would not necessarily be part of the same movement. The greatest problem for the U.S. Government in managing assistance to the Contras was not the actual running of the war but developing a strong unified political movement that could attract support in Nicaragua.

In fact, there were few strong Contra political leaders and no effective political platform. In 1983, the new ARDE group, the Democratic

Revolutionary Alliance, led by Alfonso Robelo and Eden Pastora, had no basic political platform whatsoever. Pastora was and is charismatic, but his political goals were ill defined.

Contra unity efforts began shortly after Pastora's forces first began fighting in Nicaragua in April 1983. All such unity efforts eventually foundered on Pastora's reluctance to join with the FDN because of its ex-national guard leadership. On the other hand, although the U.S. Government provided Pastora with support, his claims about numbers of armed fighters and their military capabilities were thought by U.S. officials to be exaggerated.

The FDN, after some early reverses, became capable of conducting patrols in north and north central Nicaragua by early 1983. The FDN was never able to capture territory. Further, abuses against civilians and attacks against economic targets (which the congressional intelligence committees had been assured from the outset would not be undertaken) became commonplace. For some of the worst examples of such attacks, U.S. officials blamed the Latin American government advising the FDN. When this Latin American government pulled out of the operation in 1983 and only U.S. assistance and direction was provided, the FDN's record showed little change. As the FDN's numbers grew, so did attacks on economic targets or against civilians.

The FDN today still has as its political hierarchy the group that was selected by the U.S. Government in 1982 and still has an element of ex-national guard military leadership. FDN essential goals and objectives are no different today than they were at the outset—to overthrow the ruling Sandinista government of Nicaragua and install a new regime.

EXTENT OF NATIONAL GUARD INFLUENCE IN FDN

Many of the FDN's top military leadership consist of former national guard officers and noncommissioned officers. They permeate the general staff and field commander posts. As a percentage of the FDN membership the numbers of these individuals is small, but their influence in FDN military affairs is great.

U.S. ASSISTANCE

The United States has provided in excess of \$100 million in aid—lethal and nonlethal—to the Contras from fiscal year 1981 through fiscal year 1986. This assistance has been provided almost exclusively in kind. Major categories of assistance have included weapons and ammunition, uniforms and other equipment, food, medicine, and transportation. With the exception of the \$27 million in nonlethal assistance provided by the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1985, U.S. aid has been provided through intelligence channels.

During fiscal years 1982 and 1983, assistance to the Contras was constrained by the Boland amendment, which prohibited the expenditure of U.S. funds for the purpose of overthrowing the Government of Nicaragua. During fiscal year 1984, Congress limited the amount of aid for the Contras to \$24 million. Beginning in fiscal year 1985, Congress cut off all support to the Contras, but in August 1985, in the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1985, \$27 million in nonlethal assistance was appropriated for distribution by the Nicaraguan Humanitarian Assistance Office. In fiscal year

1986, Congress has appropriated funds for a limited amount of communications equipment and training for the Contras, as well as the provision of intelligence. The Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 1986 provides that no intelligence funds may be used to augment this limited assistance except by reprogramming or the enactment of separate legislation.

UNO

The United Nicaraguan Opposition [UNO] was established at U.S. urging in June 1985 as a political and, to a lesser extent, military control group over the FDN and other Contra forces. Since that time the Indian group known as Kisan with approximately 1,000 fighters, has become associated with UNO. Most recently, forces under Fernando "El Negro" Chomorro operating in southern Nicaragua have come under the UNO umbrella and have been designated UNO/South. It is difficult to determine how many personnel are associated with UNO/South but it is probably under 500.

The three-man directorate of UNO (Adolfo Calero of the FDN, Arturo Cruz, a 1984 Presidential candidate, and Alfonso Robelo of ARDE) has had considerable ups and downs since its formation. Disputes have largely focused on control of UNO's principal military force, the FDN, which now numbers some 17,000 personnel. Cruz and Robelo have allied themselves in an effort to obtain a greater say in military operations and, according to a Calero-Cruz-Robelo declaration in Miami on May 29, 1986, have reached such an accommodation.

UNO has stated that they support the Contadora process to find a political solution and that they are in agreement with the four democratic governments of Central America. UNO also indicates they have solved all of their internal difficulties and that all decisions will be by majority rule, with five exceptions. Those exceptions include: the expansion of the three-member directorate; decisions that concern the distribution of funds; a strategic change to the principles of the organization; the formation of new alliances with other groups; and the selection of a new military commander. Current military commanders, however, could be removed by majority, but the selection of a new commander would require consensus. If the directorate should become deadlocked, they can then turn to a five-man commission of distinguished Nicaraguans which has been established to resolve disputes. A civilian Secretary General and a civilian Military Coordinator have also been appointed to improve command and control.

With a change in direction at the top of the UNO leadership, the question remains whether they will, in fact, be able to change the FDN's military strategy. Currently, as they have for the last 5 years, the FDN attacks cooperative and state farms, vehicles on the roads and electrical towers and substations. Critics of the FDN believe these are economic targets while UNO spokesmen state that military and economic targets are inter-related and hard to distinguish. UNO indicates they are going to review the FDN's targeting strategy.

The thorny question is why the FDN can only attack economic targets when the El Sal-

vadoran guerrillas with less than half as many fighters can attack Salvador and military units as they did last week when they attacked the Army barracks at San Miguel.

How effective the UNO directorate will be in gaining control over FDN forces and developing a political military program that will appeal to the Nicaraguan people remains to be seen.

CONTRA ATROCITIES

There has been a range of accusations of Contra atrocities. These allegations fall into two categories: Contra attacks and human rights abuses in Nicaragua, and so-called Contra death squads acting in Honduras.

A number of human rights groups have conducted studies, including interviewing alleged victims, to document Contra atrocities in Nicaragua. Almost exclusively, these consisted of attacks alleged to have been made by the FDN. In addition, many North American religious people who have lived in Nicaragua and who have either witnessed such attacks or have seen or spoken with the victims of such attacks have provided reports concerning Contra abuses. Some of the reports or interviews conducted by particular groups have been attacked as lacking objectivity or fairness.

Several things are apparent concerning these allegations. First, the administration basically relies on the statements of the FDN concerning these attacks. While this information is relevant, it is clearly biased. Second, what the FDN itself admits—for example, on its September 15th radio—and what eyewitnesses make clear, is that the FDN will attack, and has attacked, collective farms in Nicaragua. The FDN views these collectives as organs of the Sandinista Government. Undeniably, such attacks have led to the death of innocent agricultural workers. Some collectives have been defended. It seems clear that many have been defended because of previous Contra attacks.

The FDN also attacks any other so-called organs of the Sandinista Government. These include health clinics and schools. The FDN considers any government officials, however lowly, legitimate targets whether or not they are armed. Transportation of any kind on rural highways and roads in northern Nicaragua is subject to FDN attack. Many such vehicles are government vehicles, including buses operated by the State to transfer passengers from one point to another.

Other firsthand accounts detail executions, sometimes preceded by torture, of individuals in towns or villages which the Contras have temporarily occupied. The FDN denies that it tortures prisoners. However, Edgar Chomorro, the ex-FDN political directorate member, has stated that the FDN often makes a practice of not taking prisoners, particularly those who have fought fiercely against them in battle. The FDN also admits that its forces in the past have sometimes not been under its full control and will admit to abuses of particular commanders whom the FDN has later punished.

It is clear that sometimes the Nicaraguan Government invents abuses attributed to the Contras where none occurred or exaggerates the effect of Contra attacks. But, these efforts at propaganda and disinformation cannot hide what appear to be clear factual evidence of

the widespread nature of Contra attacks, individual cases of executions and torture, as well as the continuing nature of such activities.

The provision of \$27 million in humanitarian assistance funds last year required improved reporting on and action by UNO to improve its human rights record. Most of the disciplinary proceedings undertaken so far by UNO/FDN against their personnel have largely been for infractions committed against other UNO/FDN personnel. Reports persist of UNO/FDN troops kidnapping campesinos and attacking civilian settlements.

Facts concerning allegations of Contra abuses in Honduras are scarce. There is little or no evidence about allegations made concerning death squad-type activities by the FDN or some FDN members. What little information that is available comes from the Contras themselves.

At the same time, what is otherwise available in the press suggests, but in no concrete way supports, so-called Contra death squad operations. It appears possible that before 1982, some activities in Honduras were engaged in by individuals who became FDN officials that resulted in disappearances or deaths. Such activities could have taken place after 1982 as well. Whether such alleged activities represented a policy of the FDN cannot be established.

POPULAR SUPPORT

The numbers of armed Contras have grown to perhaps 17,000 today. This growth was directly related to provision of U.S. assistance to clothe and feed these fighters. It appears that many of the recruits to the FDN were campesinos from the northern provinces of Nicaragua. Another source of recruits was Sandinista militia or regular troops who either deserted or, when captured, decided to join the FDN. The political base of the FDN appears to be rural and to stem from those areas where the FDN actually operates. The FDN apparently has not developed a base of support in Nicaragua's cities.

One view of this situation is that many campesinos cooperate with the FDN rather than suffer reprisals. Another is that the FDN has developed true support among such people. What remains constant is that FDN supplies, ammunition, and other support must come from Honduras. Most such aid appears to come from the previously appropriated \$27 million nonlethal U.S. aid and from contributions from some private U.S. sources. Previously, weapons and other funds were provided by the U.S. Government.

A somewhat different pattern of support has evolved among the Kisan and other Indian groups who have operated in the Atlantic coast region. There, fighters have all been indigenous to the region. These groups have at times claimed the allegiance of the great mass of the population. However, actual support appears to have waxed and waned and, in the period since U.S. military aid has effectively ceased, the number of Indian insurgent activities has greatly diminished.

POLITICAL MESSAGE

The Contras' political message is one of democracy, pluralism, a free economy, and fair, open elections. The link between this political platform and the activities of the armed Con-

tras is less clear. The political directorate of the FDN, for instance, appears to have been more of an afterthought than the generating forces behind creation of the FDN. UNO appears to have been created more for U.S. policy purposes than because of any Contra-generated unity impetus.

The political education and attitudes of the rank and file within the FDN and other UNO forces are difficult to ascertain. They are poorly educated. Reports of their political message suggest it is as religious as it is political. In any event, this message appears not to have taken root in terms of any armed resistance outside the areas where the Contras have been able to operate; that is, in the rural mountain areas of the north and north central Nicaragua. Particularly in the cities, there have been no developments that would indicate that the Contras' proselytizing has been in any way effective. Indeed, the Contras have gained what political respectability they have inside Nicaragua by allying themselves with the unarmed political opposition inside of Nicaragua and by UNO's endorsement of the peace proposal of January 17, 1986, made by the six Nicaraguan political parties.

PROSPECTS FOR THE CONTRAS

The President has requested \$100 million in assistance for the Contras during the remainder of fiscal year 1986 and for fiscal year 1987. With this assistance, the administration expects that the Contras can dramatically increase the numbers of armed Contra troops and exert significant military pressure on the Sandinistas. The administration does not predict victory by the Contras but says that without Contra military pressure, the Sandinistas are unlikely to agree to democratic changes within Nicaragua or to moderate Sandinista behavior toward its neighbors.

While UNO pays lip service to Contadora, the Basic Agreement signed in Miami on May 29, 1986, stresses reaching "the goals of liberating and pacifying the fatherland" and that "after the liberation of Nicaragua, the new National Army will be made of combatants from all fronts . . ." The Contras believe that \$100 million would set conditions for: First, the massive defection of Sandinista forces; second, the revolt of regional commands inside of Nicaragua; third, the addition of new recruits to the Contra cause; and fourth, widespread insurrection inside the country. They hold out the hope that with all this going on that conditions would be ripe in Nicaragua for a coup in the Sandinista leadership.

The problem with this thinking is that it does not tell us what Contra military pressure will produce. Since the beginning of U.S. assistance, the Contras' principle military tactic has been the ambush. Their troops have been forced to remain constantly on the move. The Contras brief experiments with conventional military tactics have resulted in little success and greatly strained their fragile logistics chain. Increased U.S. assistance, including logistics, seems unlikely to remove this basic restraint on Contra operations. The United States would have to equip the Contras with new equipment—including aircraft, surface-to-air missiles, heavy artillery and large numbers of transport vehicles—before they could seek to engage the Sandinistas on an equal footing inside Nicaragua. This kind of assistance

would be costly, would require sustained high levels of aid and significant American involvement in transportation, logistics, maintenance, training, and advice. Moreover, it would significantly raise the stakes for the United States in Nicaragua and make the use of U.S. military forces more likely if the Contras could not beat the Sandinistas unaided.

The view of many professional military officers and political leaders, both United States and Central American, is that the Contras cannot achieve a military victory against Sandinistas and that the eventual resolution of the conflict will require the intervention of the United States.

The conclusion that I draw is that the Contras cannot achieve either military victory or seriously threaten the Sandinistas with the \$100 million the President has requested. Either goal will remain unattainable unless the United States takes an increased direct role in aiding the Contras. Even then, the key factor will not be Contra military success but whether or not they can generate and sustain political support among the Nicaraguan populace. Despite the unpopular and repressive actions of the Nicaraguan Government, there is no evidence, after 5 years of guerrilla warfare, of measurable Contra political appeal within Nicaragua. This is most telling within the large population centers where the Sandinistas received their greatest support in the revolution of 1979.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. SPENCER FLO

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1986

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the outstanding efforts of Dr. Spencer Flo of Greenfield, MA, who this year marks his 55th anniversary as a practicing physician and surgeon. Dr. Flo's contribution to his community extends far beyond medicine and on July 13, 1986, Dr. Flo's years of commitment will be honored at a testimonial dinner.

After graduating from the University of Michigan Medical School in 1931, Dr. Flo completed his resident surgical service at Boston City Hospital in 1935 and finished his house physician residency at Boston Lying In Hospital in 1938. Dr. Flo joined the U.S. Army Air Force in January 1942 and served until November 1945. Also in 1942, he became a member of the American Board of Surgery and the American College of Surgeons, and in 1946 became a member of the New England Surgical Society.

Dr. Flo's service to his community, however, extended beyond medicine. He served as a member of the Greenfield School Committee from 1952-55 and as a Greenfield Selectman from 1955-58. He later served 6 years on the town library's board of trustees and served years in the Greenfield Taxpayers' Association.

It is rare to see such selfless devotion to others, and Dr. Flo's tireless efforts are truly an inspiration to us all. This man's compas-

sion, understanding, and healing skills have touched many lives and will continue to provide a valuable contribution in years to come.

I congratulate Dr. Flo on 55 years of distinguished and dedicated service. The residents of his community are truly fortunate to have benefited from such commitment.

I am proud to have such a capable and dedicated physician practicing in my First Congressional District of Massachusetts.

"NEW LEFT" FOUNDER SUPPORTS CONTRA AID

HON. GEORGE C. WORTLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1986

Mr. WORTLEY. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of debate over United States support to the Nicaraguan democratic resistance. While divisions remain on the means of bringing democracy to Nicaragua, there is, in Congress, a consensus that the Sandinista regime is oppressive and has failed to fulfill its leaders' 1979 promises to the Organization of American States to establish a pluralistic, democratic, nonaligned Nicaragua. Similar promises have been subverted before, in Cuba, Vietnam, Kampuchea, and Angola.

The issue of aid to the Nicaragua resistance was recently addressed by David Horowitz, a founder of the "New Left" and the movement against U.S. involvement in Vietnam. In "Nicaragua: A Speech to My Former Comrades on the Left" (Commentary, June 1986), Mr. Horowitz argues that "support for the Contras is a first line of defense." And, more importantly, "For Nicaraguans, a Contras victory would mean the restoration of democratic leadership from whom the Sandinistas stole the revolution in the first place * * *"

Mr. Horowitz, a man of the political left, offers us a warning if we fail to support the Nicaraguan resistance. I commend the following abridged version of Mr. Horowitz's article to my colleagues:

[From Commentary, June 1986]

NICARAGUA: A SPEECH TO MY FORMER

COMRADES ON THE LEFT

(By David Horowitz)

Twenty-five years ago I was one of the founders of the New Left. I was one of the organizers of the first political demonstrations on the Berkeley campus—and indeed on any campus—to protest our government's anti-Communist policies in Cuba and Vietnam. Tonight I come before you as the kind of man I used to tell myself I would never be: a supporter of President Reagan, a committed opponent of Communist rule in Nicaragua.

I offer no apologies for my present position. It was what I thought was the humanity of the Marxist idea that made me what I was then: It is the inhumanity of what I have seen to be the Marxist reality that has made me what I am now. If my former comrades who support the Sandinistas were to pause for a moment and then plunge their busy political minds into the human legacies of their activist pasts, they would instantly drown in an ocean of blood.

The issue before us is not whether it is morally right for the United States to arm

the contras, or whether there are unpleasant men among them. Nor is it whether the United States should defer to the wisdom of the Contadora powers—more than thirty years ago the United States tried to overthrow Somoza, and it was the Contadora powers of the time who bailed him out.

The issue before us and before all people who cherish freedom is how to oppose a Soviet imperialism so vicious and so vast as to dwarf any previously known. An "ocean of blood" is no metaphor. As we speak here tonight, this empire—whose axis runs through Havana and now Managua—is killing hundreds of thousands of Ethiopians to consolidate a dictatorship whose policies against its black citizens make the South African government look civilized and humane.

To expand its territorial core—which apologists still refer to as a "defensive perimeter"—Moscow has already slaughtered a million peasants in Afghanistan, an atrocity warmly endorsed by the Sandinista government.

Minister of Defense Humberto Ortega describes the army of the conquerors—whose scorched-earth policy has driven half the Afghan population from its homes—as the "pillar of peace" in the world today. To any self-respecting socialist, praise for such barbarism would be an inconceivable outrage—as it was to the former Sandinista, now Contra, Edén Pastora. But praise for the barbarians is sincere tribute coming from the Sandinista rulers, because they see themselves as an integral part of the Soviet empire itself.

To the Left I grew up in, along with the Sandinista founders, Stalin's Russia was a socialist paradise, the model of the liberated future. Literacy to the uneducated, power to the weak, justice to the forgotten—we praised the Soviet Union then, just as the Left praises the Sandinistas now.

And just as they ignore warnings like the one that has come from Violetta Chamorro, the publisher of *La Prensa*, the paper which led the fight against Somoza, and a member of the original Sandinista junta—"With all my heart, I tell you it is worse here now than it was in the times of the Somoza dictatorship"—so we dismissed the anti-Soviet "lies" about Stalinist repression.

In the society we hailed as a new human dawn, 100 million people were put in slave-labor camps, in conditions rivaling Auschwitz and Buchenwald. Between 30 and 40 million people were killed—in peacetime, in the daily routine of socialist rule. While leftists applauded their progressive policies and guarded their frontiers, Soviet Marxists killed more peasants, more workers, and even more Communists than all the capitalist governments together since the beginning of time.

In 1957, Carlos Fonseca, the founding father of the Sandinista Front, visited the Soviet Union with its newly efficient totalitarian state. To Fonseca, as to Borge and his other comrades, the Soviet monstrosity was their revolutionary dream come true. In his pamphlet, "A Nicaraguan in Moscow," Fonseca proclaimed Soviet Communism his model for Latin America's revolutionary future.

This vision of a Soviet America is now being realized in Nicaragua. The comandante directorate, the army, and the secret police are already mirrors of the Soviet state—not only structurally but in their personnel, trained and often manned by agents of the Soviet axis.

But the most important figure in this transformation is not a Nicaraguan at all.

For twenty years, from the time the Sandinistas first arrived in Havana, they were disciples of Fidel Castro. With his blessings they went on to Moscow, where Stalin's henchman completed their revolutionary course. Fidel is the image in which the Sandinista leadership has created itself and the author of its strategy. Its politburo, the comandante directorate, was personally created by Fidel in Havana on the eve of the final struggle, sealed with a pledge of millions in military aid. It was Fidel who supplied the arms with which the Sandinistas waged their battles, just as he supplied the Cuban general—Zenen Casals—who directed their victorious campaign (just as the Soviets supplied the general who directed Fidel's own victory at the Bay of Pigs). Without Castro's intervention, Arturo Cruz and the other anti-Somoza and pro-democratic contras would be the government of Nicaragua today.

And it was Fidel who showed the Sandinistas how to steal the revolution after the victory, and how to secure their theft by manipulating their most important allies: the American Left and its liberal sympathizers.

Twenty-five years ago Fidel was also a revolutionary hero to us on the New Left. Like today's campus radicals, we became "coffee-pickers" and passengers on the revolutionary tour, and we hailed the literacy campaigns, health clinics, and other wonders of the people's state.

When Fidel spoke, his words were revolutionary music to our ears: "Freedom with bread. Bread without terror." "A revolution neither red nor black, but Cuban olive-green." And so in Managua today: "Not [Soviet] Communist but Nicaraguan Sandinismo" is the formula Fidel's imitators proclaim.

Fidel's political poems put radicals all over the world under his spell. Jean-Paul Sartre wrote one of the first and most influential books of praise: "If this man asked me for the moon," he said, "I would give it to him. Because he would have a need for it."

When I listen to the enthusiasts for the Sandinista redeemers, the fate of a hero of the Cuban revolution comes to my mind. For in the year that Jean-Paul Sartre came to Havana and fell in love with the humanitarian Fidel, Huber Matos embarked on a long windowless night of the soul.

The fate of Huber Matos begins with the second revolution that Fidel launched.

All the fine gestures and words with which Fidel seduced us and won our support—the open Marxism, the socialist humanism, the independent path—turned out to be calculated lies. Even as he proclaimed his color to be olive-green, he was planning to make his revolution Moscow red.

So cynical was Fidel's strategy that at the time it was difficult for many to comprehend. One by one Fidel began removing his own comrades from the revolutionary regime and replacing them with Cuban Communists.

Cuban's Communists were then a party in disgrace. They had opposed the revolution; they had even served in the cabinet of the tyrant Batista while the revolution was taking place!

But this was all incidental to Fidel. Fidel knew how to use people. And Fidel was planning a new revolution he could trust the Communists to support: he had decided to turn Cuba into a Soviet state. And Fidel also knew that he could no longer trust his own comrades, because they had made a revolution they thought was going to be Cuban olive-green.

Although Fidel removed socialists and the Sandinistas removed democrats, the pattern of betrayal been the same.

To gain power the Sandinistas concealed their true intention (a Soviet state) behind a revolutionary lie (a pluralist democracy). To consolidate power they fashioned a second lie (democracy, but only within the revolution), and those who believed in the first lie were removed. At the end of the process there will be no democracy in Nicaragua at all, which is exactly what Fonseca and the Sandinistas intended when they began.

When Huber Matos saw Fidel's strategy unfolding in Cuba, he got on the telephone with other Fidelistas to discuss what they should do. This was a mistake. In the first year of Cuba's liberation, the phones of revolutionary legends like Huber Matos were already tapped by Fidel's secret police. Huber Matos was arrested.

In the bad old days of Batista oppression, Fidel had been arrested himself. His crime was not words on a telephone, but leading an attack on a military barracks to overthrow the Batista regime. Twelve people were killed. For this Fidel spent a total of eighteen months in the tyrant's jail before being released.

Huber Matos was not so lucky. Fidel was no Batista, and the revolution that had overthrown Batista was no two-bit dictatorship. For his phone call, Huber Matos was tried in such secrecy that not even members of the government were privy to the proceeding. When it was over, he was sentenced to solitary confinement, in a cell without sunlight, for twenty-two years. And even as Fidel buried his former friend and comrade alive, he went on singing his songs of revolutionary humanism and justice.

To believe in the revolutionary dream is the tragedy of its supporters; to exploit the dream is the talent of its dictators. Revolutionary cynicism, the source of this talent, is Fidel's most important teaching to his Sandinista disciples. This is the faculty that allows the comandantes to emulate Fidel himself: to be poets and hangmen at the same time. To promise democracy and organize repression, to attack imperialism and join an empire, to talk peace and plan war, to champion justice and deliver Nicaragua to a fraternity of inhumane, repressive, militarized, and economically crippled states.

The failure of Marxist economies to satisfy basic needs, let alone compete with the productive capitalisms of the West, has produced the military-industrial police states which call themselves socialist today. Nicaragua, with its Sandinista-created economic crisis and its massive military build-up, is but the latest example of this pattern.

Twenty-five years ago we on the Left applauded when Fidel denounced Cuba's one-crop economy and claimed that U.S. imperialism was the cause of the nation's economic plight. It seemed so self-evident. Cuba was a fertile island with a favorable climate, but U.S. sugar plantations had monopolized its arable land, and the sugar produced was a product for export, not a food for Cubans. The poor of Cuba had been sacrificed on the altar of imperialist profit. Whenever we were confronted by the political costs Castro's revolution might entail, we were confident that this gain alone—Cuba's freedom to grow food for Cubans—would make any sacrifice worthwhile. The same illusion—that the revolution will mean better lives for Nicaragua's poor—underlies every defense of the Sandinistas today.

It is nearly three decades since Cuba's liberation, and Cuba is still a one-crop economy. But the primary market for its sugar is now the Soviet Union instead of the United States. Along with this have come other economic differences as well. Cuba's external debt is now 200 times what it was when Fidel took power. And it would be far greater if the Communist caudillo had not mortgaged his country to his Soviet patron. So bankrupt is the economy Castro has created that it requires a Soviet subsidy of over \$4 billion a year, one-quarter of the entire national income, to keep it afloat. Before the revolution, Cubans enjoyed the highest per-capita income in Latin America. Now they are economic prisoners of permanent rationing and chronic shortages in even the most basic necessities. The allotted rations tell a story in themselves: two pounds of meat per citizen per month; 20 percent less clothing than the allotment a decade earlier; and in rice, a basic staple of Cuba's poor, half the yearly consumption under the old Batista regime.

The idea that Marxist revolution will mean economic benefit for the poor has proved to be the most deadly illusion of all. It is because Marxist economies cannot satisfy economic needs—not even at the levels of the miserably corrupt capitalisms of Batista and Somoza—that Marxist states require permanent repression to stifle unrest and permanent enemies to saddle with the blame.

This is also why Castro has found a new national product to supply to the Soviet market (a product his Sandinista disciples are in the process of developing in their turn). The product is the Cuban nation itself, as a military base for Soviet expansion.

And in the Sandinista revolution Fidel's colonial plantation has produced its most profitable return: an opportunity for Moscow to expand its investment to the American land mass itself.

Nicaragua is now in the grip of utterly cynical and utterly ruthless men, exceeding even their sponsors in aggressive hostility to the United States. The Soviets may be the covert patrons of the world's terrorist plague, but not even they have had the temerity to embrace publicly the assassin Qaddafi as a "brother" the way the Sandinistas have. The aim of the Sandinista revolution is to crush its society from top to bottom, to institute totalitarian rule, and to use the country as a base to spread Communist terror and Communist regimes throughout the hemisphere.

Support for the contras is a first line of defense. For Nicaraguans, a contra victory would mean the restoration of the democratic leadership from whom the Sandinistas stole the revolution in the first place, the government that Nicaragua would have had if Cuba had not intervened. For the countries of the Americas, it would mean a halt in the Communist march that threatens their freedoms and their peace.

In conclusion, I would like to say this on the Left: you are self-righteous and blind in your belief that you are part of a movement to advance human progress and liberate mankind. You are in fact in league with the darkest and most reactionary forces of the modern world, whose legacies—as the record attests—are atrocities and oppressions on a scale unknown in the human past. It is no accident that radicals in power have slaughtered so many of their own people. Hatred of self, and by extension one's country, is the root of the radical cause.

As American radicals, the most egregious sin you commit is to betray the privileges and freedoms ordinary people from all over the world have created in this country—privileges and freedoms that ordinary people all over the world would feel blessed to have themselves. But the worst of it is this: you betray all this tangible good that you can see around you for a socialist pie-in-the-sky that has meant horrible deaths and miserable lives for the hundreds of millions who have so far fallen under its sway.

UNCLE DAVE MACON DAYS

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1986

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to your attention the myriad of cultural jewels that the Sixth Congressional District of Tennessee has to offer.

The banjo is as dear to Tennessee tradition as the Stradivarius is to grand Vienna. Without exception buckdancing and clogging can be likened to the art of ballet in the hearts and minds of Tennesseans.

Each year in July, my hometown of Murfreesboro, in Rutherford County, plays host to a major event measuring the skill and execution of these early American art forms. Uncle Dave Macon Days, celebrated this year on July 11 to 13, is a unique event which promotes old-time music, crafts, art, and the folk-lore of the middle Tennessee region.

Uncle Dave Macon Days usually attracts more than 30,000 people and often exceeds the population of some of the surrounding towns. An interesting part of the festival is that it distinguishes between buckdancing and clogging as well as between bluegrass banjo and old-time banjo, as only the trained eye and ear of the middle Tennessee art enthusiast can do.

The event is named for Uncle Dave Macon, one of the first banjo superstars of the Grand Ole Opry in the 1920's. He is considered by Tennessee historians to be the individual who made the transition from rural folk music to modern country music. Born in 1870, he is said to have learned the early styles of "claw hammer" and "fraying" banjo picking from listening to former slaves and Civil War soldiers in the early days of the postwar era. He is credited as bringing old time music to the 20th century. Uncle Dave Macon Days was established in 1976 to promote old time music and to honor Macon and other individuals who perpetuate and encourage these early Tennessee art forms.

The dance competition requires that the original flat rhythm type buckdancing steps be performed for event qualification. It is this dance step which distinguishes buckdancing from clogging. No other festival is known to have such a requirement and further supports the event's desire to foster the original art form and attract the true experts.

During Uncle Dave Macon Days, competitions will be held to establish the grand champion at the skills performed. It is with this in mind that I, BART GORDON, as a Member of the U.S. Congress, proclaim these the National Old-Time Banjo, National Old-Time Buck-

dancing, and National Old-Time Clogging Championships to allow these established American art forms to receive the recognition they are due.

THE PRESIDENT'S COMPELLING ARGUMENTS FOR WHY WE MUST AID THE CONTRAS

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1986

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of another important debate on the question of aiding the Contras, I want to share with you what is undoubtedly the President's most convincing speech to date as to why our country must assist those freedom fighters.

Have we failed to learn from the past? I clearly remember the dismay of many Members of Congress when Fidel Castro publicly admitted that he was a Communist. I also remember how shocked many Congressmen were when the Soviet Union slowly, but surely, built Cuba into a base for Soviet expansionism in this hemisphere. Is history repeating itself?

Although the Contras are imperfect, they are the only hope for restoring democracy in Nicaragua. Unless we act soon, the Sandinistas will crush the democratic resistance in that country.

Do the Soviets question the importance of a Communist Nicaragua? Do they argue over the value of exporting Marxism-Leninism from that country to adjoining states? Do they debate at length about the advantage of helping the Sandinistas, a group which shares their philosophy of communism? Do they doubt for one moment the practicality of having a Nicaragua with seaports to service their submarines and ships and airfields where their spy aircraft can be based? We all know the answers to these questions.

Like it or not, our planet has become very small. Nicaragua is very close to our borders. Soviet influence there can be projected throughout this hemisphere to the Rio Grande River with little effort. The time to act is now.

With these concerns in mind, I commend the President's excellent speech to my colleagues.

TEXT OF REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT IN AN ADDRESS TO THE NATION

My fellow citizens. The matter that brings me before you today is a grave one and concerns my most solemn duty as President. It is the cause of freedom in Central America and the national security of the United States. Tomorrow the House of Representatives will debate and vote on this issue. I had hoped to speak directly and at this very hour to Members of the House of Representatives on this subject, but was unable to do so. Because I feel so strongly about what I have to say, I have asked for this time to share with you—and Members of the House—the message I would have otherwise given.

Nearly forty years ago a Democratic President, Harry Truman, went before the Congress to warn of another danger to democracy, a civil war in a faraway country in which many Americans could perceive no national

security interest. Some of you can remember the world then: Europe lay devastated.

One by one, the nations of Eastern Europe had fallen into Stalin's grip. The democratic government of Czechoslovakia would soon be overthrown. Turkey was threatened, and in Greece, the home of democracy, communist guerrillas, backed by the Soviet Union, battled democratic forces to decide the Nation's fate.

Most Americans did not perceive this distant danger. So the opinion polls reflected little of the concern that brought Harry Truman to the well of the House that day. But go he did. And it is worth a moment to reflect on what he said.

In a hushed chamber, Mr. Truman said that we had come to a time in history when every nation would have to choose between two opposing ways of life. One way was based on the will of the majority—on free institutions and human rights.

"The second way of life," he said, "is based upon the will of a minority forcibly imposed upon the majority. It relies upon terror and oppression, a controlled press and radio, fixed elections and the suppression of personal freedoms."

"I believe," President Truman said, "that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures."

When Harry Truman spoke, Congress was controlled by the Republican Party. But that Congress put America's interest first, and supported Truman's request for military aid to Greece and Turkey—just as 4 years ago Congress put America's interest first by supporting my request for military aid to defend democracy in El Salvador.

I speak today in that same spirit of bipartisanship. My fellow Americans—and Members of the House—I need your help.

I ask first for your help in remembering—remembering our history in Central America so we can learn from the mistakes of the past.

Too often in the past, the United States failed to identify with the aspirations of the people of Central America for freedom and a better life. Too often our government appeared indifferent when democratic values were at risk. So, we took the path of least resistance—and did nothing.

Today, however, with American support, the tide is turning in Central America. In El Salvador, Honduras, Costa Rica—and now in Guatemala—freely-elected governments offer their people the chance for a better future—a future the United States must support.

But there is one tragic, glaring exception to that democratic tide—the Communist Sandinista government in Nicaragua. It is tragic because the United States extended a generous hand of friendship to the new revolutionary government when it came to power in 1979.

Congress voted \$75 million in economic aid. The United States helped re-negotiate Nicaragua's foreign debt. America offered teachers, doctors, and Peace Corps volunteers to help rebuild the country. But the Sandinistas had a different agenda.

From the very first day, a small clique of Communists worked steadily to consolidate power and squeeze out their democratic allies.

The democratic trade unionists—who had fought Somoza's National Guard in the streets—were now told by the Sandinistas that the right to strike was illegal and that their "revolutionary" duty was to produce more for the state.

The newspaper—La Prensa—whose courage and determination had inspired so much of the Nicaraguan revolution—found its pages censored and suppressed. Violeta Chamorro—widow of the assassinated editor—soon quit the revolutionary government to take up the struggle for democracy again—in the pages of her newspaper.

The leader of the Catholic Church in Nicaragua, Archbishop—now Cardinal—Obando y Bravo, who had negotiated the release of the Sandinista leaders from prison during the revolution, was now vilified as a traitor by the very men he helped to free.

Soviet arms and Bloc personnel began arriving in Nicaragua. With Cuban, East German, and Bulgarian advisers at their side, the Sandinistas began to build the largest standing army in Central American history and to erect all the odious apparatus of the modern police state.

Under the Somoza dictatorship, a single facility held all political prisoners. Today there are eleven. Eleven prisons in place of one.

The Sandinistas claim to defend Nicaraguan independence. But you and I know the truth. The proud people of Nicaragua did not rise up against Somoza—and struggle, fight, and die—to have Cubans, Russians, Bulgarians, East Germans, and North Koreans running their prisons, organizing their army, censoring their newspapers, and suppressing their religious faith. One Nicaraguan nationalist, who fought in the revolution, says: "We are an occupied country today."

I could go on, but I know that even the Administration's harshest critics in Congress hold no brief for Sandinista repression. Indeed, the final verdict has already been written by Cardinal Obando himself in the Washington Post. Listen carefully to the Cardinal's words.

He says: The idea that the Sandinista regime "is a democratic government, legitimately constituted, which . . . seeks the welfare and peace of the people and enjoys the support of the overwhelming majority is not true."

To accept this as true, the Cardinal says, "is to ignore the mass exodus of the Miskito Indians . . . the departure of tens of thousands of Nicaraguan men and women of every age, profession, economic status and political persuasion . . . it is to ignore . . . the most terrible violation of freedom of the press and of speech in the history of our country . . . the expulsion of priests and the mass exodus of young people eligible for military service." As for the Catholic Church in Nicaragua, we have been "gagged and bound," the Cardinal says.

Many brave Nicaraguans have stayed in their country despite mounting repression—defying the security police, defying the Sandinista mobs that attack and deface their homes. Thousands—peasants, Indians, devout Christians, draftees from the Sandinista army—have concluded that they must take up arms again to fight for the freedom they thought they had won in 1979.

The young men and women of the democratic resistance fight inside Nicaragua today in grueling mountain and jungle warfare. They confront a Soviet-equipped army, trained and led by Cuban officers. They face murderous helicopter gunships without any means of defense. And still they volunteer. And still their numbers grow.

Who among us would tell these brave young men and women—your dream is dead; your democratic revolution is over; you will never live in the free Nicaragua you fought so hard to build?

The Sandinistas call these freedom fighters *contras*—for counter-revolutionaries. But the real counter-revolutionaries are the Sandinista commandantes, who betrayed the hopes of the Nicaraguan Revolution, and sold out their country to the Soviet Empire.

The commandantes even betrayed the memory of the Nicaraguan rebel leader Sandino, whose legacy they falsely claim. For the real Sandino—because he was a genuine nationalist—was opposed to communism. In fact, Sandino broke with the Salvadoran communist leader, Farbundo Marti, over this very issue.

The true Nicaraguan nationalists are the leaders of the United Nicaraguan Opposition: Arturo Cruz—jailed by Somoza, a former member of the Sandinista government; Adolfo Calero—who helped organize a strike of businessmen to bring Somoza down; and Alfonso Robelo—a social democrat, and once a leader of the revolutionary government.

These good men refused to make any accommodation with the Somoza dictatorship. Who among us can doubt their commitment to bring democracy to Nicaragua?

So, the Nicaraguan people have chosen to fight for their freedom. Now we Americans must also choose.

For you and I and every American has a stake in this struggle. Central America is vital to our own national security—and the Soviet Union knows it. The Soviets take the long view but their strategy is clear—to dominate the strategic sea lanes and vital chokepoints around the world.

Half of America's imports and exports, including oil, travels through the area today. In a crisis, over half of NATO's supplies would pass through this region. And Nicaragua, just 277 miles from the Panama Canal, offers the Soviet Union ports in both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

The Soviet Union already uses Cuba as an air and submarine base in the Caribbean. It hopes to turn Nicaragua into the first Soviet base on the mainland of North America.

If you doubt it, ask yourself: why have the last four Soviet leaders—with a mounting economic crisis at home—already invested over a billion dollars and dispatched thousands of Soviet bloc advisers into a tiny country in Central America?

I know that no one in Congress wants to see Nicaragua become a Soviet military base. My friends, I must tell you in all seriousness: Nicaragua is becoming a Soviet base every day that we debate and debate and debate—and do nothing.

In the 3 months since I last asked the House to aid the democratic resistance, four military cargo ships have arrived at Nicaraguan ports, this time directly from the Soviet Union. Recently we have learned that Russian pilots are flying a Soviet A.N.-thirty reconnaissance plane for the Sandinistas.

The Sandinistas claim this is just for making civilian maps. Our intelligence services believe this could be the first time Soviet personnel have taken a direct role in support of military operations on the mainland of North America.

Think again how Cuba became a Soviet air and naval base. You will see what Nicaragua will look like if we continue to do nothing. Cuba became a Soviet base gradually over many years. There was no single dramatic event—once the missile crisis passed—that captured the nation's attention. And so it will be with Nicaragua.

The Sandinistas will widen and deepen another port while we debate: is it for commercial vessels or Soviet submarines? The Sandinistas will complete another air strip while we argue: is it for 707's or Backfire Bombers? A Soviet training brigade will come to Nicaragua. Half will leave and half will stay. And we will debate: Are they soldiers or engineers?

Eventually, we Americans will have to stop arguing among ourselves. We will have to confront the reality of a Soviet military beachhead inside our defense perimeters—about 500 miles from Mexico. A future President and Congress will then face nothing but bad choices, followed by worse choices.

My friends in the House, for over 200 years the security of the United States has depended on the safety of unthreatened borders north and south. Do we want to be the first elected leaders in U.S. history to put our borders at risk?

Some of you may say: this is fear-mongering. Such a danger to our security will never come to pass. Perhaps it won't. But in making your decision on my request for aid tomorrow, consider this: what are the consequences for our country if you are wrong?

I know some Members of Congress who share my concern about Nicaragua have honest questions about my request for aid to the democratic resistance. Let me try to address them. Do the freedom fighters have the support of the Nicaraguan people? I urge Members of the House to ask their colleague, the Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, who recently visited a town in Nicaragua that was a Sandinista stronghold during the revolution. He heard peasants, trade unionists, farmers, workers, students, and shop keepers all call on the United States to aid the armed resistance.

Or listen to the report from Time Magazine of Central American scholar, Robert Leiken, who once had hopes for the Sandinista revolution. He says: "I have gone to a number of towns in Nicaragua where I have found that they the youth are simply not there. I ask their parents where they've gone, and they say, they've off to join the contras." In Managua, Leiken reports, 250 Nicaraguans stood on a breadline for 3 hours. "Who is responsible?" he asked. "The Sandinistas are responsible," the people said. "The Sandinistas," Leiken concluded, "have not only lost support. I think they are detested by the population."

Can the democratic forces win? Consider: There are 20 times as many Nicaraguans fighting the Sandinista dictatorship today as there were Sandinista fighters a year before Somoza fell. This is the largest peasant army raised in Latin America in more than 50 years. And thousands more are waiting to volunteer, if American support comes through.

Some members of Congress—and I know some of you—fear that military aid to the democratic resistance will be only the first step down the slippery slope toward another Vietnam. I know those fears are honest. But think where we heard them before.

Just a few years ago, some argued in Congress that U.S. military aid to El Salvador would lead inevitably to the involvement of U.S. combat troops. But the opposite turned out to be true.

Had the United States failed to provide aid then, we might well be facing the final Communist takeover of El Salvador, and mounting pressures to intervene—instead—with our aid—the government of El Salvador is winning the war—and there is no

prospect whatever of American military involvement.

El Salvador still faces serious problems that require our attention. But democracy there is stonger. And both the communist guerrillas and the right-wing death squads are weaker. And Congress shares credit for that accomplishment.

American aid and training is helping the Salvadoran army become a professional fighting force, more respectful of human rights. With our aid, we can help the Nicaraguan resistance accomplish the same goal.

I stress this point because I know many Members of Congress and many Americans are deeply troubled by allegations of abuses by elements of the armed resistance. I share your concerns. Even though some of those charges are Sandinista propaganda, I believe such abuses have occurred in the past. And they are intolerable.

As President, I repeat to you the commitments I made to Senator Sam Nunn. As a condition of our aid, I will insist on civilian control over all military forces; that no human rights abuses be tolerated; that any financial corruption be rooted out; that American aid go only to those committed to democratic principles. The United States will not permit this democratic revolution to be betrayed nor allow a return to the hated repression of the Somoza dictatorship.

The leadership of the United Nicaraguan opposition shares these commitments and I welcome the appointment of a bipartisan congressional commission to help us see that they are carried out.

Some ask: what are the goals of our policy toward Nicaragua? They are the goals the Nicaraguan people set for themselves in 1979: democracy, a free economy, and national self-determination.

Clearly the best way to achieve these goals is through a negotiated settlement. No humane person wants to see suffering and war.

The leaders of the internal opposition and the Catholic Church have asked for dialogue with the Sandinistas. The leaders of the armed resistance have called for a ceasefire and negotiations at any time, in any place. We urge the Sandinistas to heed the pleas of the Nicaraguan people—for a peaceful settlement.

The United States will support any negotiated settlement or Contadora Treaty that will bring real democracy to Nicaragua. What we will not support is a paper agreement that sells out the Nicaraguan people's right to be free.

That kind of agreement would be unworthy of us as a people. And it would be a false bargain. For internal freedom in Nicaragua and the security of Central America are indivisible. A free and democratic Nicaragua will pose no threat to its neighbors, or to the United States. A communist Nicaragua, allied with the Soviet Union, is a permanent threat to us all.

President Azcona of Honduras emphasized this point in a recent nationwide address. "As long as there is a totalitarian regime [in Central America] that has expansionist ambitions and is supported by an enormous military apparatus . . . the neighboring countries sharing common borders with the country that is the source of the problem, will be under constant threat." If you doubt his warning, consider this. The Sandinistas have already sent two groups of communist guerrillas into Honduras. Costa Rican revolutionaries are already fighting alongside Sandinista troops.

My friends in the Congress: With democracy still a fragile root in Central America—

with Mexico undergoing an economic crisis—can we responsibly ignore the long-term danger to American interests posed by a communist Nicaragua, backed by the Soviet Union, and dedicated—in the words of its own leaders—to a "revolution without borders"?

My friends, the only way to bring true peace and security to Central America is to bring democracy to Nicaragua. And the only way to get the Sandinistas to negotiate seriously about democracy is to give them no other alternative. Seven years of broken pledges, betrayals, and lies have taught us that.

That is why the measure the House will consider tomorrow—offered I know in good faith—which prohibits military aid for at least another 3 months—and perhaps forever—would be a tragic mistake. It would not bring the Sandinistas to the bargaining table. Just the opposite.

The bill, unless amended, would give the Sandinistas and the Soviet Union what they seek most—time. Time to crush the democratic resistance. Time to consolidate power. And it would send a demoralizing message to the democratic resistance: that the United States is too divided and paralyzed to come to their aid in time.

Recently, I read the words of a leader of the internal democratic opposition. What he said made me feel ashamed.

This man has been jailed, his property confiscated, and his life threatened by the security police. Still he continues to fight. He said: "You Americans have the strength, the opportunity, but not the will. We want to struggle, but it is dangerous to have friends like you . . . to be left stranded on the landing beaches of the Bay of Pigs. Either help us or leave us alone."

My friends in the House of Representatives: I urge you to send a message tomorrow to this brave Nicaraguan—and thousands like him. Tell them it is not dangerous to have friends like us. Tell them: America stands with those who stand in defense of freedom.

When the Senate voted earlier this year for military aid, Republicans were joined by many Democratic leaders: Bill Bradley of New Jersey, Sam Nunn of Georgia, David Boren of Oklahoma, Howell Heflin of Alabama, Lloyd Bentsen of Texas, Bennett Johnston and Russell Long of Louisiana, Fritz Hollings of South Carolina, John Stennis of Mississippi, and Alan Dixon of Illinois. Tonight I ask the House for that kind of bipartisan support for the amendment to be offered tomorrow by Democrats Ike Skelton of Missouri and Richard Ray of Georgia, and Republicans Mickey Edwards of Oklahoma and Rod Chandler of Washington. This bipartisan amendment will provide the freedom fighters with what they need—now.

With that amendment, you also send another message to Central America. For democracy there faces many enemies: poverty, illiteracy, hunger, and despair. And the United States must also stand with the people of Central America against these enemies of democracy.

That is why—just as Harry Truman followed his request for military aid to Greece and Turkey with the Marshall Plan—I urge Congress to support \$300 million in new economic aid to the Central American democracies.

The question before the House is not only about the freedom of Nicaragua and the security of the United States, but who we are as a people.

President Kennedy wrote on the day of his death that history had called this generation of Americans to be "watchmen on the walls of world freedom." A Republican President, Abraham Lincoln, said much the same thing on the way to his Inauguration in 1861.

Stopping in Philadelphia, Lincoln spoke in Independence Hall, where our Declaration of Independence was signed. He said far more had been achieved in that hall than just American independence from Britain. Something permanent . . . something unalterable . . . had happened. He called it: "hope to the world for all future time."

Hope to the world for all future time. In some way, every man, woman, and child in our world is tied to those events in Independence Hall, to the universal claim to dignity, to the belief that all human beings are created equal, that all people have a right to be free.

We Americans have not forgotten our revolutionary heritage. But sometimes it takes others to remind us of what we ourselves believe.

Recently, I read the words of a Nicaraguan Bishop, Pablo Vega, who visited Washington a few weeks ago. Somoza called Pablo Vega the "communist bishop." Now the Sandinistas revile him as the "contra bishop." But Pablo Vega is really a humble man of God.

"I am saddened," the good Bishop said, "that so many North Americans have a vision of democracy that . . . has only to do with materialism . . ." The Sandinistas "speak of human rights as if they were talking of the rights of a child—the right to receive from the bounty of the state . . . but even the humblest campesino knows what it means to have the right to act." "We are defending," Pablo Vega said, "the right of man to be."

Well Reverend Father, we hear you. For we Americans believe with you that even the humblest campesino has the right to be free. My fellow citizens, Members of the House: let us not take the path of least resistance in Central America again. Let us keep faith with these brave people struggling for their freedom. Give them, give me, your support; and together, let us send this message to the world: that America is still a beacon of hope, still a light unto the nations. A light that casts its glow across the land and our continent and even back across the centuries—keeping faith with a dream of long ago.

TRIBUTE TO DR. DAN COLLINS

HON. SALA BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1986

Mrs. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, on June 7, 1986, about 700 San Franciscans gathered at the Fairmont Hotel in San Francisco to pay special tribute to an old and dear friend of mine, Dr. Dan Collins.

I want to extend my warm congratulations to Dan and to share with my colleagues some thoughts about this very special man on the occasion of his 70th birthday.

Dan has distinguished himself as a spokesperson for social justice and civil rights on local as well as State and National levels. In addition to being vice president and trustee of the National Urban League, Dan is a founder

and board member of the San Francisco Bay Area Urban League.

Dr. Collins is a member of the board of trustees of four institutions of higher education, one of them, his undergraduate alma mater, Paine College. As an authority on education, Dan has held consulting positions on national educational boards and he was the first black on the State board of education in California. Dan served on corporate boards and is a member of many, many foundations.

Dr. Dan Collins: Husband, father, grandfather, dentist, educator, businessman, and author, we salute you; for a lifetime of unselfish dedication to the improvement of mankind and for all your achievements in your personal and professional life, we salute you.

Dan Collins is truly the renaissance man—he is indeed a man for all seasons. I join San Franciscans in saluting Dan Collins for his many years of dedication and commitment to his fellow human beings.

KIRK ON LAROCHE

HON. JOHN J. LAFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1986

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, soon we will be celebrating our National Day of Independence and the values of freedom and democracy that have made this country great for over 200 years. Political extremism is a direct threat to these values, and we must be constantly on the alert for the emergence of political fanatics. The recent events in Illinois, where candidates supporting Lyndon LaRouche defeated traditional candidates for the Democratic nominations for lieutenant governor and secretary of state, have raised our consciousness regarding the dangers of political extremism. A recent speech by Paul G. Kirk, Jr., chairman of the Democratic National Committee, describes these dangers in clear detail, and places them into the context of our own struggle to preserve our hard-won freedoms:

ADDRESS BY DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CHAIRMAN
PAUL G. KIRK, JR.

Within two weeks, all Americans will join the Empire State in the celebration of Liberty Weekend. The beauty of the Statue of Liberty—the symbol of America's basic principle—has been restored. We all look forward to a national celebration of our independence, our freedom, and our liberty. We will pledge our allegiance to these values. They are values we share despite our diversity. And we will pledge our fidelity to the responsibilities we share despite our individuality. We will pledge our allegiance and our fidelity to one another as Americans.

Whenever we have lost sight of that common bond as a people, we have foundered as a nation. When some of us refused to admit that human beings were not created to own other human beings, the nation divided in Civil War. When some were too greedy to believe that unbridled wealth could not be amassed at the expense of working America, the nation was crushed by economic Depression. When some were too proud to concede that no American, not even the President, is above the law, the

nation was strained by the scandal of Watergate.

Today, the American tradition and the American condition call out for a renewed commitment to common purpose and to individual opportunity. We do no honor to the birth of this nation if we stand idle while Americans divide under a new social Darwinism, a blind non-policy which permits poverty as a price of one's birthright and wealth as the reward for one's greed and elitism.

When the politics of common sense and common purpose are overtaken by a politics of selfishness, threats to American liberty are inevitable. When people feel abandoned or ignored, and are left without hope in the daily struggle of their own lives, they search in desperation for easier answers. They are living in a vacuum crying out to be filled. They are vulnerable to cynical sloganeering, to simplistic solutions, and to extreme appeals to their baser instincts.

And when average Americans are not informed and their education as voters taken for granted, they, too, may be deceived by fanatical candidates or extremist cults whose purpose is to distort the value of true meaning and to pervert the meaning of true values.

Lyndon LaRouche is an extremist fanatic who distorted the value of true meaning and perverted the meaning of true values by naming his cult the National Democratic Policy Committee. Three months ago, two of his disciples won nominations of the Democratic Party for statewide office in Illinois.

And they won with the votes of too many decent, common sense citizens who, when asked why they had supported these candidates, said: "I didn't know who they were or what they represented."

No one can undo history, but the Democratic Party must not permit that kind of history to repeat itself. For those of us in leadership positions in the Democratic Party—at the national, state, and local levels—the Illinois primary results were a rude—but valuable—reminder of two basic truths of political life in America:

(1) Responding to the needs, the aspirations, the education of the American people must never be ignored or taken for granted;

(2) Political extremism of any form must never be ignored or taken for granted.

In the days following the Illinois primary, a close examination of Lyndon LaRouche and his extremist cult—by the Democratic Party and the media—revealed the classic hallmarks of fraud and fascism.

In a pattern not unlike that of a Mussolini or a Hitler, the LaRouchites has exercised political expediency by moving from the extreme left to the extreme right, indulging in Anti-Semitism and religious and racial bigotry, never acknowledging or accepting the fundamental principles of democracy—respect for the rights of others, respect for majority rule, and respect for civil—and truthful—public debate.

They specialize in hatemongering and hysteria, bilking the innocent and the elderly, blaming the world's problems on LaRouche's conspiratorial villains which range from your former Governor Harriman to the family of your former Governor Rockefeller, from the Jews to the Jesuits, from former Vice President Mondale to the Queen of England.

Just as other totalitarians have sought to destroy other democratic systems from within, the LaRouchites are participating in American politics under clouds of fraud and

false pretenses. The allegations are legion:—Fraud in the raising of funds; fraud in the recruitment of candidates; fraud in qualifying for a place on the ballot; fraud in calling themselves a U.S. Labor Party; fraud in gaining political access at home and abroad; and fraud in calling themselves National Democrats.

As I think of what the centennial celebration will mean to me, I will think first of my grandfather—of how he must have felt, at age 14, just a little boy all alone, when he saw for the first time the "Mother of Exiles" welcoming him from the shores of Ireland.

Then I will think of his son, my own father, one of 14 children and the father of 5 himself, and how he must have felt, upon his return from World War II, when he saw Lady Liberty standing gracefully and proud in New York harbor, of what it meant to him to be home and to have had to leave behind—beneath endless rows of crosses and Stars of David—sons, husbands, and fathers of every creed and color who had given their lives for liberty and for a campaign to combat and conquer fascism.

Our battle is another kind of battle, but our defense must be no less vigilant.

In every campaign since Illinois, the Democratic Party has sought to ensure that, before each primary election, no voter would be able to say: "Nobody told me who the LaRouche candidates were or what they stood for."

We have monitored filings in every state in which LaRouche candidates have sought the Democratic nominations. Even in districts where Democrats have done poorly in the past, we have fielded candidates to oppose them—not to debate them and give them political legitimacy, but to defeat them by telling voters of their political lunacy.

To date, our strategy has succeeded. Since Illinois, I have devoted the Democratic National Committee's efforts to political action, and the LaRouche candidates have not won a single contested nomination for federal, state, or local office. They have been defeated by the true Democratic Party in 85 out of 85 election contests. The Liberty we love and will soon celebrate is one which permits extremists like LaRouche, however freakish, however fascist, however fanatic, —to exercise free speech in America's political process.

This decisive record of rejection of the LaRouchites by the Democrats at the polls may be the most effective statement that a political party can make to protect that process as a matter of political action. But, as Chairman of the Democratic Party and its National Committee—the keeper of the party's name, its integrity, its ideals and its traditions—I tell you, as a matter of political principle, that the LaRouche sect, masquerading as the National Democratic Policy Committee, represents all that is alien to the spirit and character of the true Democratic Party.

They practice the politics of intimidation and harassment; the politics of prejudice and the politics of paranoia; the politics of extremism and exclusion; the politics of fraud and the politics of fear. The Democratic Party of the United States rejects their tactics, their policies and their politics and calls on the voters of New York State to do the same.

It may have been only a fluke of history that so bizarre and extremist a movement has heightened the vigilance of the world's oldest political party. And, it is reassuring

that the Democratic Party has been successful in repelling these fanatical forces during the past three months. But, it is critical that we remember and remain vigilant—not only against the LaRouche movement but against other extremist movements as well.

Political extremism in America did not begin with LaRouche victories in Illinois in March of 1986, and it may not end with the election results in September or November of 1986. The LaRouche movement is only a recent example of extremist cults that have capitalized on discontent, exploited fear, promoted hatred, distorted politics, and defiled the true meaning of liberty and democracy.

A century-and-a-half ago, the Know Nothings exploited the tensions which resulted when the "Mother of Exiles" first welcomed her newly adopted children. The Know Nothings whipped up bigotry against Catholic immigrants. For more than a decade, they brought hate to American politics.

In the aftermath of the Civil War, the Ku Klux Klan continued to terrorize blacks and succeeded in denying them rights they felt had just been won. In the 1920's, the 1960's, and even in the '80's—the Klan re-emerged to attack blacks, Catholics, Jews, and other racial and religious Americans whose very presence has strengthened the diversity and, thus, the character of this nation.

The McCarthyites of the 1950's, the John Birchers of the 1960's and the LaRouchites of the 1980's may not have agreed on every issue. But they have shared a common view of the world—a belief in evil and all-powerful conspiracies; a disdain for the decent and nobler instincts of people; an impatience with compromise, majority rule, and with free and open debate. They have shared an intolerance for pluralism, diversity, and inclusion—the traditional practices and principles of American democracy, and the traditional values of the Democratic Party.

No Kahane and no Farrakhan, no extremists, no racists, no separatists, no demagogues who are not democrats with a small "d," will have any place in a party which is proud to be called Democratic with a capital "D." We reserve instead a place for those who sing "Sweet Land of Liberty" with the black preacher who dreamed of the day and died for the "day with all of God's children, black men and white men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics, will be able to join hands" as freedom rings.

During the next several days, the Democratic Party and most Americans will reflect upon and remember the true meaning of freedom and liberty and the true meaning of traditional American values—the abhorrence of prejudice, the tolerance of ideas and beliefs, the character and strength of America that is the very product of her diversity and pluralism, the freedom and fairness that is inherent in the politics of representation and inclusion.

Since its birth, this republic has been the safest haven for those in search of political and religious freedom. The Founding Fathers came together from different ethnic and religious backgrounds. Though they built colonies with different needs, resources and economies, they shaped a government committed to the belief that we are one nation. Though they recognized that a foundation of religious and moral values would be essential to the survival of the new government, they built respect for diversity into its Constitution. They proscribed in its Preamble that its purposes and theirs was to "... secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity ..."

One of the blessings of liberty bestowed by this country and to be secured by us is the right and opportunity of any individual or group to participate in the American political process. But the right to participate in politics in America brings with it a responsibility to practice politics in the tradition of America.

In that context, and in anticipation of the nation's birthday, let me mention one other matter relating to the politics of our time. A new wave of activists—many organized by or affiliated with spiritual or religious leaders—is becoming increasingly vocal and active in the American political process. These Americans are involved in a good faith attempt to make their views heard. But the religious and lay leaders of their organizations could be truer to the very concepts their names represent.

Those who profess to hold dear the traditional values of America and call themselves the American Coalition of Traditional values would be truer to their name if their leader refrained from corrupting the traditional value of religious tolerance by declaring that Catholicism is a "false religion" and that Jews have brought their own suffering upon themselves.

Those who profess to honor the fundamental tenet of freedom and call themselves the Freedom Council could be truer to their name by refraining from moral absolutism and deeming less worthy those whose religious values or beliefs may differ from their own.

The issue of tolerance is at the essence of freedom, of liberty and of those values which are uniquely American. Our differences, our contradictions, our separate beliefs as Americans cannot be resolved by absolutism nor by denying their existence.

Democrats believe in separation of church and state which will allow any religion to flourish, to contribute to the public dialogue, to participate in public life without dictating public policy. We believe in religious tolerance not merely as the token toleration of another's faith, but as a precious asset of the American character.

If we are to truly celebrate liberty and freedom in America, we will all celebrate the right to believe freely and strongly in one thing while protecting the right of others to believe just as freely and strongly in the opposite. No American liberty is safe unless that American liberty is protected. It is our American political system that protects those liberties, and it is our political duty to protect that system.

The party of Jefferson remains true to the American and Democratic values of liberty and freedom, of racial brotherhood and religious tolerance.

From Thomas Jefferson, who wrote religious freedom into the laws of his state and nation ... to Franklin D. Roosevelt, who saved working America and helped it enter the middle class and achieve economic security ... to John Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson, and Jimmy Carter, who fought for civil rights and equal rights ... the Democratic Party has stood for a vision of America as one nation, one people, with respect and caring for one another.

And today, that vision is no different. The Democratic Party is the party of common sense and the only party with a national sense of common purpose. It is the only political party that believes all Americans are in this adventure together, with equal and individual rights and opportunities, but with shared responsibilities.

The Democratic Party is, as it has always been, the political vessel for the hopes and aspirations of the average American. Democrats believe that individual opportunity and upward mobility, political, economic and otherwise, are reserved not just to the wealthy and the few, but are open to all, no matter one's roots, religion or region, no matter the color of one's collar or the color of one's skin.

It is no accident that the first Catholic nominee for the Presidency of the United States, a son of New York State, was a Democrat.

It is no accident that the first woman Vice Presidential nominee, a Catholic, a daughter of Italian heritage—and a daughter of New York State, was a Democrat.

It is no accident that the first Catholic to be elected President of the United States, a son of Massachusetts—and a son of Irish heritage, was a Democrat.

It is no accident that the first born-again Christian to be elected President of the United States, a son of Georgia, was a Democrat.

It is no accident that the two black presidential contenders, one a daughter of New York State, the other a son of South Carolina, have been Democrats.

At any time in our history, the surest political answer to extremism—the surest way to celebrate and renew the true meaning of liberty—is to fulfill the real mission of the Democratic Party.

To afford all Americans an equal opportunity to bring their voices and their values into the political process so long as they, in turn, respect that process by allowing others to do the same without fraud, or fear, or prejudice.

To build a future where every man, woman and child is given an equal opportunity to share in the promise of American life.

To do this, we only need to remember what I learned growing up in Boston: that the best politics is combining the toughness to govern with the compassion to care deeply enough to listen to the people, to respect their concerns, and to address their needs.

The politics of caring, of inclusion, and of values is the best strategy for victory; the proven model for principled, practical, common sense government; the proudest tradition of the Democratic Party; and the essence of the American political heritage of liberty and freedom.

As we celebrate Liberty Weekend together and as we take up the Democratic Party's battle today and in the days ahead, recall and take heart from the words of a noted journalist who said of other days and other struggles:

"The lesson of the days through which we are passing is that men and women cannot live upon the achievements of their forefathers, but must themselves renew them. . . . we cannot escape . . . the elementary facts of life—that for a people there is nothing for nothing, that what they have they must themselves make, that what they cherish they must themselves achieve, what they wish to keep they must themselves defend."

PANAMA DAILY INTERVIEWS CARDINAL OBANDO Y BRAVO

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1986

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, in a 1-minute speech today, I quoted Nicaraguan Cardinal Obando Y Bravo on life in Nicaragua and the ongoing war between the Contras and the Sandinistas. I urge my colleagues to read the entire text of the interview which follows:

According to the German internationalists, that is a "contra" strategy to move with greater ease through the northern mountains and "launch terrorist operations" against the civilian peasant population. "A good outcome in the case of the hostages is becoming increasingly difficult," the Europeans' communique noted.

In their document, the internationalists asked the government of Helmut Kohl and the Reagan administration to "end the kidnapping of their brother volunteer workers." The internationalists also maintain that the release of the hostages must be made "unconditionally." The Germans hold the governments of Bonn and Washington responsible for whatever may happen to the volunteer workers who have been held for 24 days by the FDN.

In view of the possibility that they may not be released through negotiation, the Europeans fear that only a "military solution" remains, which would mean a great risk to the lives of the workers. The Germans, in an attempt to draw world attention to the case, occupied the German Embassy in Managua on 10 May and have staged protests in front of the U.S. Embassy. Both the Germans and the Sandinista government blame the U.S. Government for the kidnapping of the volunteer workers.

PANAMA DAILY INTERVIEWS CARDINAL OBANDO Y BRAVO

(Interview with Archbishop Cardinal Oscar Obando Y Bravo by Mario Castro)

[Castro] Msgr., what is the Nicaraguan people's reality?

[Obando y Bravo] There is no doubt that our previous regime was unjust; now we have a leftist regime. If we are going to examine the situation from an economic viewpoint we must admit that the situation is very bad because we make our purchases with cards. In Nicaragua no one can buy what he wants, only what the state wants to sell.

In the war aspect there is a struggle against the groups that have turned against the government. The Sandinistas say that all the insurgents are former Somozist guards, which is not true. Among them are peasants and former members of the FSLN. We have the cases of Engineer Robelo and Arturo Cruz, former members of the government, and there is also the case of Zero, Eden Pastora, former deputy minister of the interior. The truth is that the situation is tense, and international policy has a lot to do with it.

[Castro] What is the human rights situation in Nicaragua?

[Obando y Bravo] We must take into account that in Nicaragua there is a law that has suspended the Nicaraguans' rights and guarantees since 15 October 1985. For example, if I want to officiate a mass on the battleground, I must request permission to do so.

The Nicaraguan church has suffered a great deal. On 15 October precisely, a bulletin called "Iglesia" ["Church"] was issued. By 0800 the police had seized the bulletins, before any decrees had been issued. Later on they occupied our press and social support office, and recently we received a note informing us that the press as well as the social support office will be taken over by the government.

Our radio station was closed on 1 January because it joined the network carrying the president's speech late, etc. Now we have no way of reaching the people with our Sunday programs. Before this, I used to write a homily for the press every week, and now its publication has been prohibited. That means that freedom of expression has been totally restricted.

[Castro] What about the workers' freedom of expression?

[Obando y Bravo] There are unions that are independent and others that are aligned with the government. The independent unions celebrated 1 May with a mass that I officiated, but it was very difficult to advertise because the government prohibited any ads carrying my name. The other unions simply obey the government.

[Castro] What is the Catholic Church's role in Nicaragua?

[Obando y Bravo] To evangelize, spreading the good news of the dead and resurrected Christ. We are preparing a Eucharistic Congress scheduled for October on Christ the King Day, which will do a lot for the Lord's people.

Meanwhile, the church evangelizes and at times sheds light on some problems through a pastoral letter. The last pastoral letter referred to the people's church. We offer guidance, but it must be understood that when speaking of the church we also refer to the laymen, to the believers, who are the ones called upon to resolve temporary issues, things related to the government.

[Castro] Do you consider yourself a political leader in your country?

[Obando y Bravo] I look at the word "politics" from two points of view. One viewpoint is broad, the other strict. In the broad sense I understand it to be the search for common well-being; in that sense all of us are politicians. However, if we speak of party politics, of trying to achieve power, I believe the Catholic hierarchy should not participate in politics, because while it is true that there is a relative incompatibility when clergymen are members of a political party, there is also the risk of increasingly dividing the church. For priests, the only party should be Christ's.

[Castro] We spoke about liberation theology in Nicaragua.

[Obando y Bravo] There is a group of priests who have identified with the government. I would say they are part of the structure itself, and they believe that Marxism is the solution for the Latin American countries. They do not have a large number of people at the base levels, but they do enjoy a great deal of governmental publicity, especially abroad.

[Castro] In your opinion, can they belong to the church?

[Obando y Bravo] I believe that the church is always generous and merciful. Even if it applies a sanction, an excommunication, or an a divinis suspension, it is always a preventive-type of sanction that calls for reflection and a return to the right path.

In Nicaragua there are many priests who hold Cabinet posts, and the Holy See has

handled this as a special problem. Foreign Minister Miguel D'Escoto and Culture Minister Ernesto Cardenal have been suspended a divinis by the Holy See; Education Minister Fernando Cardenal has left the Jesuit order through a decision of the order's highest authorities.

Personally, I believe that priests should not occupy public posts. That is laymen's work, and I have always felt that in Nicaragua there are laymen who are capable of holding those positions and perhaps of doing a better job than a priest.

[Castro] What can you tell us about Miguel D'Escoto's behavior, the accusations he has made, and his description of you as sacrilegious?

[Obando y Bravo] Along with the Nicaraguan people I have prayed that he will reflect and reconsider; we have prayed a great deal for his conversion. As a bishop and a Christian I do not feel any hostility toward him, and I know that I must pray for those who pursue and slander us.

[Castro] How are the Nicaraguan church's relations with those in the rest of Central America?

[Obando y Bravo] We keep in touch. We have received the constant support of all the bodies of the church, not only in Central America but in many other countries in the world who, aware of the situation of their Nicaraguan brothers, have expressed their spiritual support. This shows that when the church is united and one of its members suffers, the rest join to ask the Lord for help.

[Castro] What can you tell us about the contras?

[Obando y Bravo] The truth is that I have not kept in touch with them. I only know what the media reports. They are people who have risen up in arms, and although it is true that some of them were members of Somoza's government, the majority of them are students and young peasants who were 6 or 7 years old when the Sandinist revolution attained victory. Also among them are former members of the FSLN, who are struggling because they want another type of government.

[Castro] Are they supported by the majority of Nicaraguans?

[Obando y Bravo] That is very difficult to determine, because it is impossible to carry out a survey at this time. The FSLN does not favor surveys, and there are sectors of the population that support the government.

[Castro] And the church?

[Obando y Bravo] The church is the mother of all. We pray for the Sandinists and those who have risen up in arms, because as pastors we see them as two brothers struggling to destroy each other. This is why we have insisted so much on conversion and reconciliation. That is the role of the church hierarchy.

[Castro] Do you believe your country's government will fulfill its offer to withdraw foreign troops from Nicaraguan territory if the United States does the same in Honduras?

[Obando y Bravo] That is what the Sandinists have said. Nevertheless, I believe that would also depend on how that resolution is supported. We know that human beings can make promises and not fulfill them, just as the Roman saying goes: "It is common among the wise to have a change of mind." It depends on how that proposal is supported.

[Castro] Does Contadora have a future?

[Obando y Bravo] I believe that those of us who are involved should be grateful to

the Contadora countries for their goodwill. Success . . . that is something else.

[Castro] What is your opinion of the friction that exists between Presidents Reagan and Ortega?

[Obando y Bravo] I believe we should take into account that there is tension and when this happens there can be no peace or reconciliation because even the language used is laden with violence. That is why I always insist that it is necessary to seek the path of conversion, because there will be no prompt solution of those conflicts.

[Castro] To conclude, where is Nicaragua headed?

[Obando y Bravo] Nicaragua has a leftist regime, and it is on a socialist path.

[Castro] Do you see any possibility of change?

[Obando y Bravo] I will only repeat what many leaders have said: "The revolution has its objectives, and it will not change them." To mention what one of them said some months ago, I believe the revolution is making history on a one-eyed horse. Because of this it will be difficult for it to change its objective even if it must face many obstacles and difficulties. It will not change.

BOS, MISURASATA REJECT UNO AS MAIN CONTRA GROUP

[Excerpt] The Southern Democratic and Nationalist Forces [Fuerzas Democráticas y Nacionalistas del Sur] have announced that they reject the committee made up of Alfonso Robelo, Arturo Cruz, and Adolfo Calero as the main political organization of the opposition against the Managua regime, thus provoking a rift with the Nicaraguan Opposition Unity [UNO].

The Southern Opposition Bloc [BOS] celebrated yesterday an important assembly at the Coribici Hotel—inviting dissident militia members from Eden Pastora's military command and the national news media—to reveal various important points which define the military and political situation prevailing among the various sectors fighting the Nicaraguan regime.

The assembly was presided over by Bayardo Lopez, Alfredo Cesar, Brooklyn Rivera, Leon Nunez, and Dr. Leonel Blandon.

Dr. Blandon acted as master of ceremonies and presented Dr. Alvaro Taboada, who read a BOS communique concerning the events expected in the coming weeks and which will considerably affect Nicaragua's destiny.

IN HONOR OF RUBELL HELGESON

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1986

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Rubell Helgeson, a well known community activist, who will be honored on July 2 as the Pacific Palisades Citizen of the Year. Mrs. Helgeson was selected as the one community member who truly exemplifies civic service and community dedication for the year of 1985.

She has been described as "a virtual 'knight in shining armor' in her tireless devotion to the welfare of the Palisades. Her indefatigability is exceeded only by her incredible store of knowledge concerning the intricacies

and machinations of city and State government."

As a member of the Citizen's Advisory Committee for the Brentwood-Palisades Plan, Rubell worked with the city council office to create a suitable plan for this sensitive region. Her work culminated in 1985 with the adoption of the village specific plan, governing the commercial district, and the creations of a local design review board, of which she is a member. The board now meets regularly to approve or deny new construction.

Rubell's community involvement began about 15 years ago, when she left a journalism career for a short stint to work on local community issues. That short stint turned into several years, and she became a board member and then president of the Pacific Palisades Property Owners Association.

Mrs. Helgeson, who hails from Minnesota, is married to Wayne Helgeson, who is an engineer, and they have two children, David and Kirsten. Recently, she has gone back to school at UCLA to study urban planning.

It is a pleasure to share the accomplishments of Mrs. Helgeson with my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives. I ask that they join me in extending Ms. Helgeson congratulations and best wishes for continued success in all of her future endeavors.

IN TRIBUTE TO JANE DOE INC.

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1986

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a tribute to women business owners written by the woman I nominated as delegate to the upcoming White House Small Business Conference. Dr. Killian wrote an inspiring overview of why these women became business owners and what they face each day.

[From Network, June 1986]

CONGRATULATIONS JANE DOE INC.: A CELEBRATION FOR WOMEN BUSINESS OWNERS

(By Patricia Killian)

Put on your party hat, Jane Doe, Inc., you and your entrepreneur colleagues are part of the first economic celebration for women. In 1986 you are recognized as the fastest growing segment of the business world; 35 percent of all new businesses are started by women.

You are innovators, franchisers, retailers, high technology, service and product suppliers. Your businesses account for 20 percent of the U.S. gross national product. Why is that a reason for a party?

As recently as 10 years ago, it was believed that women-owned businesses accounted for essentially nothing (0.3 percent of the gross national product). "Believed" because no one kept track of women in business then. "Believed" that, although women might sew booties in their spare room or throw pots in their basement, they couldn't have been in real business.

Now it is known that you are business smart and becoming richer with average receipts of \$400,000 per year, and you number in the millions. Definitely time for a cele-

bration! So who are some of you who are celebrating in Colorado?

Barbara Griffin of Whale Scientific with 19,000 square feet of manufacturing space in Commerce City who says, "I hold several patents on products our firm makes, and I market internationally."

Gizella Penn, president of Flexoveyor Conveyor Company, who has been manufacturing large equipment for over 20 years and just moved into another business upturn. Kass Rosenberger who founded Creative Home Health Care, and Adele Emerson who caters fine cuisine through her staff at Nutcracker Sweet.

Sandy Feldman who provides specialty nurses nationwide through her Critical Care, Inc. Barbara Gorgan with Western Industrial Contractors who installs huge pieces of machinery throughout the Rocky Mountain region, and Margaret Hainey whose Gemm Demolition blows up and tears down buildings by contract.

Ann Padilla whose SunnySide, Inc., Employment has just expanded to include temporaries after 11 years. Rosemary LaPorta who owns and operates one of the mountain region's finest art galleries. Diana Carroll, DRC Construction, who takes TV cameras to underground pipelines. Nora Mulholland of Office Furniture Broker who says, "We have 2,000 square feet of showroom and 8,000 square feet of warehouse." It is indeed a lively party, but...

Not everyone believes a party is called for. Jane Doe, Inc. *The State of Small Business: A Report of the President May 1985* states that there are 54,800 of you in Colorado and your average receipts are only \$7,589! So, what's to celebrate about poverty?

"Oh, everyone knows that the report is not about women like me," says Jane Doe, Inc. "For example, the 11 celebrants just mentioned and I are not included because we own corporations, and the report talks only about women with sole proprietorships who filed Schedule C tax forms for either part-time or full-time self-employment in 1982."

"To compare the people described in the report with women who are full-time business owners is like comparing the dollars earned by part-time self-employed men with the dollar receipts of Martin Marietta, Adolph Coors, Gates and Hewlett-Packard. We aren't comparable."

"Would you like to hear how we got into business ownership?" asks Jane, sipping something cool. "Go ahead and ask."

Nora: "I was canned."

Ann: "I knew I could do as well as who I was working for and I could do it my way."

Barb: "My husband died and I had to provide for the children and myself, and the business was our only asset."

Pat: "I was laid off and it was the best thing that ever happened to me."

And are all the celebrants pleased to be in business? "Sure," says Jane Doe, Inc. "I'm pleased. Sometimes it's a hassle, but the rewards are worth all the effort. I'm doing something important and meaningful; I'm creating something that no one else can—my business done my way. And I'm not alone."

The Small Business Administration says women own 27.9 percent of all Colorado businesses. But that's probably a low esti-

mate, Jane says, since only sole proprietorships are considered. "They keep forgetting that women incorporate businesses and form partnerships."

The National Association of Women Business Owners surveyed its members in 1983 and found that 60 percent of women-owned businesses are corporations. Those 54,800 Colorado women proprietors noted in the report probably represent about one-third of the women in business in Colorado, which means there are some 173,968 women business owners in our state.

"And that means," Jane says, "that women generate billions of dollars each year in Colorado. Could this be? This party is certainly getting crowded."

Over at the punch bowl, some party goers are comparing notes. "When I have to pay the bills, I sometimes go nuts. My cash flow gets real hairy during my offseasons!" says Diana.

"I know what you mean," says Stephanie. "I have to use my lines of credit until the receivables come in. And sometimes the interest rates I pay for short-term notes are way more than four points above prime."

"But it's the payroll expenses that hurt me," moans Arlis. "Workmen's compensation, social security, Colorado and federal withholding all really mount up, and I dare not be late paying those. Even when people are late paying me."

"If you think that you have it bad, just try keeping track in a retail store. We're constantly making sales tax payments and they vary depending on what city and county we're in," complains Carolyn.

"Well, I hired a great accountant and she helped my bookkeeper set up some useful record-keeping systems," brags Lavona.

And the party goers are off comparing experiences with their lawyers, their accountants, their business management and public relations and employee hiring and benefits consultants. Jane Doe, Inc., and friends come to the conclusion that their successes are due in part to their astuteness in recognizing when they need expert assistance. And knowing that they must pay for it.

Over at the hors d'oeuvres table some of the retailers are conversing while munching. "Did you know that 45.6 percent of all wholesale and retail outlets are owned by women?"

"Are you sure about that?"

"It's in *The Report*." There is a moment of silence as everyone considers what it will be like when almost half of all types of business are women-owned, not just sales outlets.

Wilma Arnold of Faison Office Products, Judith Boyd of Les Chapeaux Ltd., Rose Edith Dwyer of Huymer Enterprises and Carolyn Fineran of Scandia Down Shops begin discussing market strategies. Lavona Marlow of Meggi's Dress Shop, Jane Martin of Potoflex Oven Sales and Judy Ruckstuhl of Color Profiles talk about marketing to upscale customers, while Carolyn Scholten of Best Book Buys and Marti Shotwell of World of Computers compare notes on the value of public relations, in addition to advertising.

From the center of the room comes a rumble of discontent. "I'm having the devil of a time getting financing," says Jane Doe, Inc. "I make and market all types of audio

and video tape, but I'm a young business and therefore, I'm told, not a good loan risk."

You at least have inventory and equipment, but I have it even harder because I'm told I need to have collateral. My assets are my time and experience, and maybe some office equipment," says Laura who has a psychology office.

More than one-third of all service businesses are owned by women like Laura who have few business assets to pledge for business loans. "The last business loan I got I had to put a second mortgage on my house," explains Rose. "Would you believe that an established woman business owner back east had to have her 17-year-old son co-sign before she could get a loan? It's the truth. It was so outlandish that it was put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD!"

The celebration ceases and all is silent until Barb reminds them that when they want a business loan, they increase their chances of getting one with reasonable and appropriate terms if they provide a business plan, balance sheet, and profit and loss statement, along with the loan application form. And that the assistance of a good accountant helps too.

As the revelry slowly resumes, success stories are shared. Karen Boringer of Colorado Communication Resources, Sylvia Bellomy who owns The Maids, Mary Calhoun-Howe of Raemar Associates and Connie Maslow of Consultants for Business Meetings explain how they plan their business growth.

Nancy Peterson of the Penrose Executive Club and Dorothy Schluter of Dot Leasing describe how they change their business plans to meet changes in the marketplace. Martha Illige-Saucier, M.D., and Kae Marley who makes designer fashion explain why and how they provide personal care and service, and all the trainers, consultants and seminar producers talk about why they think Colorado women eagerly seek out their educational services.

The party becomes a network session where everyone learns a little about each other's business, and lots of business cards are passed around that will end up on business rolodexes for future references.

Then just before the dancing begins, Mary McCurry, president of the National Association of Women Business Owners and a Colorado CPA with a growing company, is presented with a dozen long-stemmed roses. The roses are in appreciation for her efforts on behalf of women business owners and for her urging them to share the value and vision of who they are.

The formal part of the celebration closes with Sandra Phillips, real estate broker, and Marlene Ospina of Ospina Investment Group leading the celebrants in cheers for the 20 percent of the gross national product. The celebrants agree to continue to support each other and to continue to do as Congresswoman Patricia Schroeder asks, "to walk together with energetic commitment and connectedness" toward the year 2000 and 50 percent of the gross national product.

(Patricia Killian, Ph.D., is owner of Speech-Perfection and Rehabilitation and is past president of the Colorado chapter of the National Association of Women Business Owners.)