

paid and at the same time threatened not to rebuke the wish of the men that paid them (ANTARA, November 24th, 1998).

At the end of the year, a riot broke in Poso, Central Sulawesi, which occurred between December 25th and 30th. There are not many data on this riot.

At the same time, riot broke in Belawan, North Sumatra, which was incited by a personal quarrel between two of the population over a pair of shoes.

Then came the real shock when a usually peaceful city, Karawang, West Java, broke its tradition and fell into riot.

The second most significant area is Ambon, capital of Maluku islands, where a riot broke on January 19th, 1999.

What interesting is that one of the alleged provocateur confessed that there is an involvement of "people from Jakarta", though the local Police Commander won't disclose further (ANTARA, January 25th, 1999).

The systematic use of violence by intelligent services can be summed up if we read the manual (Vademecum of Defense and Security) issued by SESKOAD (Academy for Army Staff of Command) which usually produces top agents for those services. One of the chapters deals with the rule when using tortures on captured prisoners.

It is also well known that these intelligent services also make a full use of local gangster to intimidate the oppositions. There are paramilitary groups supervised directly by local army commands: AMS (Siliwangi Youth) trained, armed, and supervised by the 3rd Military Region (code-named Siliwangi), AMD (Diponegoro Youth) same treatment by 4th Military Region (code-named Diponegoro). When counter demonstration (which shows support to the government) arose, the participants usually came from these Youths or other Youths such as Pemuda Pancasila (Pancasila Youth) or Pemuda PancaMarga, the foremost-two whose leaders have personal relation with Suharto himself. This so-called "counter-demonstrations" usually aims for a violence physical contact between group making rally. These Youths always carry weapons, at occasions they carry guns.

It feels a little uncomfortable when we read that some of the riots were instigated by quarrels between local gangster. Or in Banyuwangi case, indicates a direct involvement of those criminals. Or in Porsea case, paid thugs carried out the whole job. It is also very possible that the ones starting looting the shops are also those criminals. They have guts to rob people in broad daylight, surely they would be the first to see that chaos is the best time to loot.

There has been a proof that there were provocateurs in May 14th-15th Riot. The possibility is very high that all other riots are also results of provocations. And Intelligent Services are the best in this business.

Washington, DC, Feb. 8, 1999.

Solidaritas Nusa Bangsa.

ESTER JUSUF, SH,  
*Chairwoman.*

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, February 12, 1999*

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 19 (Kucinich amendment to H.R. 391), I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

#### TRIBUTE TO HOUSE IMPEACHMENT MANAGERS

### HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, February 12, 1999*

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, as the impeachment trial to President Clinton approaches its final act, I want to pay tribute to the managers on the part of the House, led by my distinguished friend from Illinois, HENRY HYDE. I thank them for enduring vitriolic attacks by the media, the President's minions, their constituents, and, sadly, some of their colleagues as they defended the law. Few of us have been put to a such a severe test as these manager-colleagues to prove allegiance to our sworn oath to "protect and defend the Constitution of the United States."

I worry about the moral health of our country when the modern-day justice system seems incapable of holding accountable celebrities who murder and presidents who lie. As has been asked so many times in recent weeks: "What do we tell our children?" Thankfully, we can hold up to the children men like our House managers as examples of Americans willing to sacrifice themselves for the benefit of our great nation.

I was unable to witness the closing arguments made by Mr. HYDE, but instead read his script. I consider him to be the House's finest orator and, as I read his statement, I imagined with my mind's eye his passionate call to duty. I only hope that his speech similarly stirred our Senate colleagues to "Let right be done."

I commend the entirety of Mr. Manager HYDE's closing argument to the attention of my colleagues.

CLOSING ARGUMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE  
HENRY J. HYDE, IMPEACHMENT TRIAL MANAGER

Mr. Chief Justice, learned counsel, and the Senate, we are blessedly coming to the end of this melancholy procedure, but before we gather up our papers and return to the obscurity from whence we came, please permit me a few final remarks.

First of all, I want to thank the chief justice not only for his patience and his perseverance but for the aura of dignity that he has lent to these proceedings, and it has been a great thrill really to be here in his company as well as in the company of you distinguished senators.

Secondly, I want to compliment the president's counsel. They have conducted themselves in the most professional way. They have made the most of a poor case, in my opinion.

Excuse me. There's an old Italian saying, that has nothing to do with the lawyers, but to your case, and it says: "You may dress the shepherd in silk, but he will still smell of the goat."

But all of you are great lawyers and it's been an adventure being with you.

You know, the legal profession, like politics, is ridiculed pretty much, and every lawyer feels that and understands the importance of the rule of law—to establish justice, to maintain the rights of mankind, to defend the helpless and the oppressed, to protect innocents, to punish guilt. These are duties which challenge the best powers of man's intellect and the noblest qualities of the human heart. We are here to defend that bulwark of our liberty, the rule of law. As for the House managers, I want to tell you and our extraordinary staff how proud I am of

your service. For myself, I cannot find the words to adequately express how I feel. I must use the inaudible language of the heart. I've gone through it all by your side, the media condemnations, the patronizing editorials, the hate mail, the insults hurled in public, the attempts at intimidation, the death threats, and even the disapproval of our colleagues, which cuts the worst.

You know, all a congressman ever gets to take with him when he leaves this building is the esteem of his colleagues and his constituents. We've risked that for a principle and for our duty as we've seen it.

In speaking to my managers of whom I am terminally proud, I can borrow the words of Shakespeare's "Henry V," as he addressed his little army of longbowmen at the battle of Agincourt, and he said: "We few—we happy few, we band of brothers. For he who sheds his blood with me shall be my brother. And gentlemen in England now abed will curse the fact that they are not here and hold their manhood cheap when any speaks who fought with us on St. Crispin's Day."

As for the juror judges, you distinguished senators, it's always a victory for democracy when its elected representatives do their duty no matter how difficult and unpleasant, and we thank you for it.

Please don't misconstrue our fervor for our cause to any lack of respect or appreciation for your high office. But our most formidable opponent has not been opposing counsel nor any political party. It's been cynicism—the widespread conviction that all politics and all politicians are by definition corrupt and venal. That cynicism is an acid eating away at the vital organs of American public life. It is a clear and present danger because it blinds us to the nobility and the fragility of being a self-governing people.

One of the several questions that needs answer is whether your vote on conviction lessens or enlarges that cynicism. Nothing begets cynicism like the double standard—one rule for the popular and the powerful and another for the rest of us.

One of the most interesting things in this trial was the testimony of the president's good friend, the former Senator from Arkansas. He did his persuasive best to maintain the confusion that this is all about sex.

Of course it's useful for the defense to misdirect our focus toward what everyone concedes are private acts and none of our business, but if you care to read the articles of impeachment, you won't find any complaints about private, sexual misconduct. You will find charges of perjury and obstruction of justice which are public acts and federal crimes, especially when committed by the one person duty bound to faithfully execute the laws.

Infidelity is private and non-criminal. Perjury and obstruction are public and criminal. The deliberate focus on what is not an issue here is the defense lawyer's tactic and nothing more. This entire saga has been a theater of distraction and misdirection. Time-honored defense tactics when the law and facts get in the way.

One phrase you have not heard the defense pronounce is the "sanctity of the oath," but this case deeply involves the efficacy, the meaning and the enforceability of the oath. The president's defenders stay away from the word "lie" preferring "mislead" or "deceived," but they shrink from the phrase "sanctity of the oath," fearing it as one might a rattlesnake.

There is a visibility factor in the president's public acts, and those which betray a trust or reveal contempt for the law are hard to sweep under the rug, or under the bed for that matter.

They reverberate, they ricochet all over the land and provide the worst possible example for our young people. As that third