RR

CA - Guatemala

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

SOVIET AND EASTERN EUROPEAN RESEARCH AND TRAINING ACT

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate agreed last week to restore full funding for a vital research and training program in Soviet area studies. I introduced the Soviet and Eastern European Research and Training Act (title VIII) in 1983 in the House, while Senator LUGAR introduced it in the Senate. We planned this to be a 10-year program, and so I am especially glad that the Senate adopted the Lugar-Simon amendment on the State Department appropriation bill.

What we are talking about here is $4.8 million to expand our Soviet bloc studies and research capability. The number of academic and policy experts in this area has always been small, and many expect that it will shrink still further if the necessary funds are not available. This is one of the most important educational assistance programs ever funded by Congress, because on it rests our Nation's ability to maintain and improve professional expertise on the Soviet system. Clearly, this is one area where we can't afford to "wing it" and make uninformed judgments about Soviet behavior.

This is an investment in the future. The National Council for Soviet and East European Research recently prepared a progress report for the Department of State Advisory Committee, which administers title VIII. In it the National Council notes that they received 148 applications from 102 institutions in 33 States, amounting to some $13.4 million in proposals. More than 100 of these proposals were deemed worthy of support, but many of these will not be funded because the initial outlay was far more modest. Now the good work already begun under this program can continue.

To cite the National Council:

> As a measure of the need for research support within the profession, (the proposals) provide eloquent testimony that the gap between current resources and the needs of the profession and the nation is manifest, compelling, and altogether too great. It speaks for the wisdom and importance of Title VIII, and for full appropriations.

I commend my colleagues for having joined with Senator LUGAR and myself in restoring the full appropriation.●

COSPONSORSHIP OF S. 1220, RENEWABLE ENERGY AND CONSERVATION TRANSITION ACT OF 1985

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to reiterate my support for Federal tax reform. I believe it is absolutely necessary that we pursue the administration's goal of a tax system that is both fair and simple. The proposed policies with respect to energy tax credits, however, seem to fall short of this goal.

For this reason, Mr. President, I rise in cosponsorship of S. 1220, the Renewable Energy and Conservation Transition Act of 1985, championed by my distinguished colleague from Oregon.

I support this bill because I believe tax reform, with respect to energy technology, must accomplish several goals: Reform must provide equitable treatment among competing energy technology; it must provide for a balanced and sustainable energy future; it must improve energy security with reduced payments for imported oil; and it must provide jobs while still protecting the environment.

Renewable energy sources have clearly demonstrated their value in a balanced U.S. energy policy. They now provide almost 10 percent of the Nation's prime energy, with tax incentives totalling close to $1 billion annually. This is compared to approximately $28 billion spent annually in Federal tax credits given to the more conventional energy technologies.●

CONFERENCE ON HUMAN RIGHTS IN GUATEMALA

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, on October 2, a group of us sponsored a conference on Human Rights in Guatemala. I would like to thank my cosponsors Senator TOM HARKIN, and the Washington Office on Latin America [WOLA] for a most successful meeting.

The keynote speaker was Lord Avebury, Chairman of the British Parliamentary Human Rights Group and author of the report on Guatemala entitled, "Bitter and Cruel." Among the distinguished speakers were representatives from the Council on Foreign Affairs, the International Human Rights Law Group, America's Watch, and the Mutual Support Group for Relatives of the Disappeared [Grupo do Apoyo Mutuo]. Afternoon workshops were held on the up-coming Guatemalan elections, the Indian situation, trade unions, the church and refugees.

Elections will be held in Guatemala on November 3 to select the first civilian government in that country since 1966. This conference was intended to provide a framework for evaluation of the election itself, the prospective government, and its effect on the human rights situation there.

U.S. foreign aid to Guatemala was suspended in 1977, due in large part to the deplorable human rights violations in that country. We welcome the prospect of democratic civilian rule in Guatemala. Congress has encouraged this effort by making renewed foreign aid available only upon establishment of a civilian government.

But the clear message from this conference was to proceed with great care in our evaluation of the changing situation in that country in the coming year. We will be watching its progress carefully, hoping that the historical pattern of human rights abuses will be broken, and that Guatemala will be firmly set on the road to true democracy.

I would like to thank the participants in the Conference for their help in understanding the problems of that country, and to congratulate them on most successfully bringing this important issue into sharp focus.

I would also like to include Senator HARKIN's luncheon address to the Conference and my own welcoming remarks. I ask that these two statements be printed in full in the RECORD.

The statements follow:

REMARKS BY SENATOR PAUL SIMON AT THE CONFERENCE ON HUMAN RIGHTS IN GUATEMALA

Thank you for your kind introduction, Sharon. I am here today for the same reason as you—because we share a common concern for the future of the people of Guatemala. We want to see the United States act as an effective advocate for social change and observance of human rights in that country.

We all know that the recent history of Guatemala is brutal and tragic. According to the Commission for Human Rights in Central America, since 1965 about 38,000 Guatemalans have been slain in political violence or have disappeared. There are living victims of torture as well.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Refugees, I am all to well aware of the extent of the Guatemalan refugee problem. Today, there are at least 45,000 officially recongized Guatemalan refugees who have fled the political violence and repression of their homeland; 24,000 are living in Mexico alone. And there are hundreds more who are not recognized as refugees, but have been forced to flee their homes.

This is a seminal moment in the modern history of Guatemala. Elections are scheduled to take place this November and a civilian government will be seated in January.

Those elections have been described as the single hope of the Guatemalan people. They have led many, both inside and outside of Congress, to take a new look at the situation in Guatemala. This year Congress has conditioned future aid to Guatemala on assumption of power by a freely elected civilian government, as well as demonstrated progress in human rights.

In order to judge future progress we must make a frank and realistic assessment of the current situation. That is why this conference is particularly necessary and appropriate. We are here, conscious of the past, to assess the present, so that we may act wisely in the future.

Contemporary Guatemala is a paradox. A return to forms of democracy has begun; elections for the Constituent Assembly took place last January; a new Constitution has been written; and eight parties have agreed to participate in the upcoming Presidential elections. I was also heartened by the statement of the six Vice Presidential candidates that visited Washington last week that they believed that the elections would be fair and free.

But if there is cause for hope there is also cause for caution and skepticism. There are reports that, after a brief decline, political violence in Guatemala is again on the rise. This Spring, two leaders of the Mutual Support Group, Guatemala's only human rights group, were brutally murdered. In the small Indian town of Patzun, more than 100 Indi-

ans have been killed or have disappeared since the beginning of the year. Faculty and students of the National University have been murdered. In short, Guatemala still has a consistent and continuing human rights problem.

Guatemala still has the most unequal distribution of land of any nation in Central America. In their most recent human rights report, "A Nation of Prisoners," America's Watch claims: "Guatemala still forcibly recruits its citizens into civil patrols and forcibly relocates others into so called 'model villages'." Under those circumstances I think that we should be circumspect and vigilant about changing our past policies too rapidly.

Some analysts fear that the elections will not change the human rights situation. They say that the army will remain the real power in the countryside and that counter-insurgency will override any other consideration. One thing is certain—without social reforms and true assumption of power by a civilian regime, elections will be a chimera, and repression will remain the only means of assuring social peace.

The great Venezualan Democratic leader Romulo Bettancourt once said that, "the nations of Lation America are the only countires in the world that are occupied by their own armies". Since then the winds of change have swept much of Latin America. Peru and Argentina are but two examples of countries that have made a successful transition from military to civilian government through wise and courageous political leadership.

Today Guatemala has a similar opportunity to make a transition. The elections provide an opening for change, but, to quote the Archbishop of Guatemala they are "a small hope, not a miracle or a big chance".

Guatemala is still a country that is literally occupied by its own army and it is still a country with a bitter history of institutionalized violence. But it is also a country in which a seed of democracy has been planted. By continuing to advocate human rights, and by continuing to push for economic, not military, aid perhaps we can help that seed to grow.

REMARKS BEFORE WOLA LUNCHEON ON GUATEMALA

(By Senator Tom Harkin)

Before beginning my remarks, I would like to extend my appreciation to this luncheon's featured guests, Lord Avebury, Chairman of the British Parliamentary Group on Human Rights, and Patt Derian, former Assistant Secretary of State on Human Rights under the Carter administration. Lord Avebury's report on Guatemala, "Bitter and Cruel,' has been an invaluable document for those in Congress concerned with the human rights situation.

I extend a special note of thanks to Reggie Norton and Joe Eldridge, my longtime friend and director of the Washington office on Latin America, for sponsoring today's conference and luncheon.

Since my last visit to Guatemala, I have been impressed and saddened by its extremes.

It is a country which has enjoyed one of the strongest and most productive economies of Latin America, yet four out of five of its children are undernourished, and its illiteracy rate is one of the highest in the hemisphere.

Its land is the richest in the region, yet it is the most unevenly distributed in all Latin America.

The beauty and richness of its Indian culture have attracted thousands of tourists, yet its military has pursued a policy of genocide against its indigenous population.

Guatemala, despite its natural richness and beauty, has imprisoned more than half its population.

Today, Guatemala poses a special contradiction. At a time when upcoming presidential elections may offer the promise of a democracy and the return of civilian rule, death squads stalk the streets of its capital and leaders of only human rights organizations have been brutally killed in recent months.

It is our task to weigh the promise of Guatemala's elections against the everyday terror of Guatemala's present before deciding upon the administration's request for higher levels of aid to that country.

I do not intend to predict the outcome of the presidential election or prospects for democracy. But I would caution that our hopes for Guatemala's future should be tempered by the tragedy of its past.

Twenty years ago, Guatemala elected its first civilian president since a coup a decade earlier. Moderate Guatemalans hoped that Mendez Montenegro would institute necessary social reforms. Our State Department saw in Montenegro a "willing partner" with whom we could "talk and accomplish things."

Our Government sent Guatemala $16 million in military aid, a planeload of green berets to train its armed forces, and nearly $3 million to instruct its national police force.

But Mendez Montenegro brought bloodshed, not social reform, to Guatemala. In the decade and a half since the election of Mendez, more than 30,000 people were abducted, tortured and assassinated. By 1980, Guatemala had become a country where—and I quote from a former government official—"death or exile is the fate of those who fight for justice."

When I think of Guatemala today, I am reminded of an interview conducted with an Indian living in a small village near Huehuetenango in northern Guatemala. The young man spoke of his townspeople's fear when the army entered his village in the early 1980's.

They buried their Bible, because the army had accused the local Catholic priest of being a Communist.

They buried their metal hoes, because the army accused peasants of using them to assist the guerrillas in destroying roads into their village.

And the young man even buried his Montgomery Ward catalogue, because it contained pictures of hunting rifles and men in green camoflage pants and hunting jackets.

I am also reminded of the remarks of a Guatemalan priest who said of the army, "they are mightier than God. They are everywhere, they see everything, they know everything."

I leave you with the wisdom of the Archbishop of Guatemala, a man who spent many years with the Indians in the highlands and who now courageously speaks for human rights in his country. To the archbishop, the elections offered "small hope," not "a miracle or big change."

Hope, at least temporarily, has been reborn for those who have not shared the vast natural resources that God gave to Guatemala.

Hope is there for the Indians who were once the owners of Guatemala, but are now its guests.

And there may be hope that its labor leaders and human rights groups like the mutual support group may express their concerns without fear of retribution from the military and its death squads.

We can help make those hopes a reality and foster democracy, but not by providing arms and police training to those who have massacred thousands of unarmed civilians.●

A FOND FAREWELL TO DOROTHEA R. KINGSBURY

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, when a good friend and colleague moves on, there are always mixed feelings. Today, my assistant Dot Kingsbury will retire. She has been with me since 1980. During these years, she has earned our respect through her hard work and keen mind, and our affection through her warmth and kind manner.

Dot helps manage the flow of correspondence in and out of my office. As every Member of this body knows, mail is the life blood of a Senate office. Through it, we communicate with our constituencies and colleagues. In my office, the receipt of 5,000 or even 10,000 pieces of mail in a single week is not unusual. Keeping track of all that paper is an enormous and taxing endeavor, but one that Dot seems to accomplish almost effortlessly. Her mnemonic prowess astounds us as often as it assists us. Dot is regularly able to recall the content and date of letters that crossed her desk in months and even years past.

Mr. President, we say a sad but very fond farewell to Dot Kingsbury today, and wish her a happy and healthy retirement. She will be greatly missed.●

1985 CONGRESSIONAL CALL TO CONSCIENCE

● Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, I rise today just a few weeks before the historic summit meeting in Geneva to once again join my colleagues in the 1985 Congressional Call to Conscience Vigil for Soviet Jewry. I would sincerely like to thank my fellow Senators who have already participated in this important effort. What is said here on the floor will be heard by both oppressor and oppressed, and we must continue to support these people whose rights and freedoms have not yet been recognized. I ask that the subject of human rights and freedoms is not overlooked when President Reagan and Secretary General Gorbachev meet next month. It cannot be; it is inextricably tied to all of the issues and disagreements between the superpowers, as well as among all of the nations of the world. Personal freedom is priceless, and we in this country all too often take that freedom for granted. We cannot condone the suppression of freedom, which is why vigils such as this are worthwhile and necessary. We must use our freedom to speak out, in the hope that those who hear us will heed our call for freedom.

When I addressed the Senate last, I mentioned the Lev Shapiro family, a family which I have adopted. The Shapiros are refuseniks; that is, they have continually been refused the right to leave the Soviet Union. They maintain a traditional Jewish home