

S 5228

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 2, 1984

Senate, at the opening of the daily sessions of the Senate during the Ninety-seventh Congress, together with any other prayers offered by him during that period in his official capacity as Chaplain of the Senate; and that there be printed such additional copies not to exceed \$1,300 in cost of such document for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Sec. 2. The copy for the document authorized in section 1 shall be prepared under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF PRAYERS BY THE SENATE CHAPLAIN

The resolution (S. Res. 376) authorizing the printing of prayers by the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., as Chaplain of the Senate during the 98th Congress, was considered, and agreed to as follows:

S. Res. 376

Resolved, That there be printed with an appropriate illustration as a Senate document, the prayers by the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., the Chaplain of the Senate, at the opening of the daily sessions of the Senate during the Ninety-eighth Congress, together with any other prayers offered by him during that period in his official capacity as Chaplain of the Senate; and that there be printed such additional copies not to exceed \$1,300 in cost of such document for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Sec. 2. The copy for the document authorized in section 1 shall be prepared under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

GRATUITY TO CAROL JEFFERY TOLIVER, AND OTHERS

The resolution (S. Res. 377) to pay a gratuity to Carol Jeffery Toliver; Norman Lee Toliver; Marvin Lewis Toliver; Catherine Amelia Henderson; Ruth Louise Toliver; Mary Etta Samuel; Phyllis Jean Pelham; Alvin Windell Toliver; and Grace Ann Toliver was considered, and agreed to as follows:

S. Res. 377

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Carol Jeffery Toliver; Norman Lee Toliver; Marvin Lewis Toliver; Alvin Windell Toliver; brothers of James R. Toliver and Catherine Amelia Henderson; Ruth Louise Toliver; Mary Etta Samuel; Phyllis Jean Pelham; and Grace Ann Toliver, sisters of James R. Toliver, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum to each equal to one-ninth of five months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

GRATUITY TO RUTH M. FIRSHEIN

The resolution (S. Res. 378) to pay a gratuity to Ruth M. Firshein, was considered, and agreed to as follows:

S. Res. 378

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate

to Ruth M. Firshein, widow of Benjamin H. Firshein, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to nine months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

GRATUITY TO ERIC SWANSON AND KRISTAN BOOTH

The resolution (S. Res. 379) to pay a gratuity to Eric Swanson and Kristan Booth, was considered, and agreed to as follows:

S. Res. 379

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Eric Swanson, son of Ruth B. Swanson and Kristan Booth, daughter of Ruth B. Swanson, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum to each equal to one-half of seven and one-half months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

GRATUITY TO PATSY L. FUNK

The resolution (S. Res. 380) to pay a gratuity to Patsy L. Funk, was considered, and agreed to as follows:

S. Res. 380

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Patsy L. Funk, daughter of Thomas L. Maloney, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty on the Senate side of the Capitol grounds at the time of his death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

GRATUITY TO WALTER M. STICKELL

The resolution (S. Res. 381) to pay a gratuity to Walter M. Stickell, was considered, and agreed to as follows:

S. Res. 381

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Walter M. Stickell, widower of Rita L. Stickell, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

GRATUITY TO LAURA DUDLEY PAGE

The resolution (S. Res. 382) to pay a gratuity to Laura Dudley Page, was considered, and agreed to as follows:

S. Res. 382

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Laura Dudley Page, widow of Stanley H. Page, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to four months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

GRATUITY TO DANIEL T. FOLEY, MAUREEN C. CANNY, AND EILEEN P. TWIGG

The resolution (S. Res. 383) to pay a gratuity to Daniel T. Foley, Maureen C. Canny, and Eileen P. Twigg, was considered, and agreed to as follows:

S. Res. 383

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Daniel T. Foley, brother of Joan V. Foley and Maureen C. Canny and Eileen P. Twigg, sisters of Joan V. Foley, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum to each equal to one third of seven months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the several items were passed and/or agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, that concludes my list of routine items to be disposed of this evening.

THE EL SALVADOR ELECTIONS

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, El Salvador is scheduled to hold Presidential elections next Sunday, May 6. Based on some disquieting events of the last several weeks in that country, I believe strongly that the elections should be postponed until the conditions exist for a fair and workable electoral system. Furthermore, I have written to President Reagan and asked that the U.S. Ambassador to El Salvador, Mr. Thomas Pickering, be recalled immediately.

It is essential that Mr. Pickering be recalled before the elections on Sunday, if those elections are to have any credibility, either in El Salvador or in the United States. Ambassador Pickering has consistently taken actions in support of one candidate, and has thereby attempted to manipulate the electoral process in unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign nation. It is an open secret that Mr. Pickering demanded that Provisional President Magana veto the Constituent Assembly's plan to return to a more viable election system.

Mr. President, the first round of voting last month in El Salvador demonstrated courage and enthusiasm on the part of the voters; but, chaos and disorder reigned in the actual procedure. It is tragic but true that an estimated 300,000 people who voted in the March 1982 elections were not able to vote on March 25, 1984. About 10 percent of the people who lived in areas where the Marxist guerrillas were in a position to prevent voting, could not vote; and about 20 percent of those who showed up at the polls were unable to vote due to the complicated and deeply flawed system. For exam-

May 2, 1984

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 5229

ple, people were given incorrect information about where to vote; some places never received any ballots at all; and voter registration lists for whole cantons were lost. Toward the end of the day, some of the counterproductive procedures had to be relaxed in many areas.

Mr. President, after the first round it became apparent that the computer system—imposed and implemented by the U.S. Agency for International Development, and paid for by the U.S. taxpayers—needed to be either corrected or eliminated for the second round of voting. In the Legislative Assembly, the elected representatives voted to do just that. It was agreed upon that the incomplete and inaccurate voter registry lists would not be used again; rather, the voter would be able to cast his vote by showing his voter identification card, and by dipping his finger in indelible ink.

Last week, Provisional President Magana surprisingly vetoed the measure after he had declared that he would do so only if he found the new law to be unconstitutional. There is reason to believe that President Magana was forced into making such a decision. He did not find the measure to be unconstitutional; rather, he stated unconvincingly that all the irregularities, and inaccurate voter registry lists of the first round would be corrected. Now, just a few days before the final round, the incomplete and inaccurate registration lists remain unchanged. This means that most of the Salvadorans who were not able to exercise their constitutional right 1 month ago will once again be left out of the decisionmaking process. In El Salvador there are approximately 1.4 million eligible voters; it is not insignificant that about one-fifth of those voters will be precluded from voting, because of procedures that cannot be implemented in that war-torn country.

Mr. President, at the highest levels of this Government, the United States has declared that it is neutral in the Salvadoran elections. Yet hardly a day goes by where we do not find the Washington Post or the New York Times quoting an unnamed high level source saying that the United States would clearly prefer a victory by the moderate Jose Napoleon Duarte. These same sources are notorious for influencing public opinion by telling the liberal press that Duarte is the only candidate who would be able to bolster the U.S. Congress to supply the necessary funds to El Salvador.

Mr. President, I am convinced that precisely the opposite is true. If the U.S. Embassy is allowed to throw the Salvadoran elections to the socialist candidate, it is doubtful if either developmental or military assistance will be approved by the U.S. Congress.

OTHER INCIDENTS

I am deeply concerned, Mr. President, about other reports indicating that the State Department has not remained neutral during the political

campaign in El Salvador. For example, there is the very reliable report of the incident that occurred in the department (State) of Sonsonate, where Mr. Timothy Howard, Third Secretary of the U.S. Embassy, arrived by helicopter to meet with officials of one political party to tell them that the United States would not support their candidate. I have received numerous reports from Salvadoran citizens who say that they have been told, or led to believe, that only Mr. Duarte would be able to have the full support of the U.S. Government.

Mr. President, there are still other reports indicating that the U.S. State Department has bent over backwards to facilitate a Duarte victory in El Salvador. It is known that Mr. Pickering went so far to meet with the candidate of a major party to pressure him to withdraw from the race. After the first round of voting, Mr. Pickering also met with Jose Francisco Guerrero, who placed third, to tell him that the United States wanted him to remain neutral in the final round of balloting—an obvious move to favor Duarte.

THE IMPACT

Mr. President, the immediate impact of the interference of the U.S. State Department is obvious. By forcing President Magana to veto the election plan, the desire of the majority of the constituent assembly was thwarted; the elections will be carried out without a complete or accurate voter registration list; the whispering campaign by certain U.S. officials has intimidated the Salvadoran voters; and finally, there have already been reports in the Salvadoran press of fraud by the Christian Democrat Party in several zones—they were caught with polling boxes in their possession before election day. What will be the long-term result of all this? Will we find one more socialist country in the Western Hemisphere, and one more pawn of the Soviet Union at our doorstep?

A U.S. ENDORSEMENT

Mr. President, the scenario is all too clear. The United States has subtly, yet effectively, endorsed one candidate, Jose Napoleon Duarte, a leftist, even by Salvadoran standards. The U.S. media have managed to confuse the American people by failing to report the accurate facts about Mr. Duarte and the Salvadoran Christian Democrat Party. One need only look back to 1979 when Duarte and his other socialist allies ran El Salvador in a U.S.-sponsored junta. Duarte effectively destroyed El Salvador politically, socially, and economic in just 2 short years.

Mr. President, I remind my colleagues that it was Jose Napoleon Duarte who systematically imposed socialist reforms when he succeeded Guillermo Ungo as head of the Salvadoran junta in 1980. Duarte enthusiastically carried out the socialist land reform scheme created by the U.S. State Department. Duarte national-

ized all private banks in order to give the central government control of all credit. Duarte nationalized significant parts of the export sector, which caused enormous losses, unprecedented corruption, and a serious further decline in foreign exchange earnings. It will be worthwhile to examine the record. The facts, as I shall demonstrate, show that Duarte was and is the compliant agent of a network of international forces ranging from the Socialist International, to international banking groups, to left-wing foundations and media in the United States and Europe, all of them seeking to impose socialism in Central America.

DUARTE'S POLICY OF NEGOTIATION

Mr. President, President Reagan has stated a clear policy of not negotiating with the Marxist-Leninist groups in Central America, whether they be guerrillas or illegitimate regimes. Yet Mr. Duarte—and his party, the Christian Democrats—seem to have a special kinship with the leftists in the region. Last year in an interview, Duarte stated that if he lost the Presidential elections he might be forced to go to the hills and fight with the Marxist guerrillas. Then, on January 13, 1984, in an article in El Salvador's largest newspaper, *Diario de Hoy*, the second ranking member of the Christian Democrat Party, Julio Adolfo Rey Prendes, said, "We do not need to crush the enemy, we need to integrate him." The enemy of which he speaks is, of course, the Marxist-Leninist guerrilla organizations attempting to seize political power by violent revolution, and backed by the Soviet Union and its surrogates.

Mr. President, more recently Mr. Duarte made an even more significant announcement. On April 21 of this year, Drummond Ayres of the New York Times reported that Duarte asked two U.S. Senators to take a message with them to the Marxist-Leninist Sandinista dictatorship in Nicaragua. Duarte had his emissaries inform the Sandinistas that if he became President in El Salvador, he would seek negotiations with their regime. This, of course, should come as no surprise to those who remember that the political front man for the Salvadoran guerrillas, Guillermo Manuel Ungo, was Duarte's running mate in the 1972 elections. Statements such as these indicate that Duarte would once again share power with his socialist and Marxist allies, regardless of the fact that they are linked to the aggressive designs of the Soviet Union and its satellites in this hemisphere.

Consider a recent statement by Mr. Ruben Zamora, an active member of the Christian Democrat Party for more than 12 years, now a Salvadoran guerrilla leader. An April 24 Baltimore Sun article written by John Lantigua quotes Zamora: "In private he tells people he is willing to negotiate with us." It should be noted that guerrilla violence increased more under the

S 5230

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 2, 1984

Duarte junta than during any other period. And this Senator is one who cannot and will not support sending large sums of money to a country that insists on a plan to make a deal with the Communists.

DUARTE AND COMMUNITARIANISM

Mr. President, in his own book "Comunitarianismo Para Un Mundo Mas Humano (Communitarianism for a More Human World)," Duarte simplistically attacks the American system. He states:

Capitalism is not acceptable because it considers the individual to be in a struggle against collectivity . . . preaches the predominance of the individual . . . is based on the indifference of the State toward human truth . . . and has created a structure of antagonistic classes fomenting a conception that permits the preponderance of a dominant capitalist class, one that molds the conduct of the State anti-socially, and feeds on the misery and injustice of the exploited classes.

Many Salvadorans call Duarte's ideology undigested Marx.

Mr. President, we must not ignore what Mr. Duarte has said about private enterprise. On May 31, 1983, the Miami News carried a story written by Karen Stanley after a telephone interview with Duarte. The article reads:

Duarte criticized the *Diario de Hoy's* economic positions as "extremely right-wing, against the intervention of the State on any matter, and absolutely for private enterprise." Duarte said his Christian Democrats "believe that the State should be the director of society."

LINKS WITH SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL

Mr. President, it is a fact that the Christian Democrat Party in El Salvador has a history of clear-cut links with the Socialist International, with the Salvadoran Communist Party, and with the various subversive groups in El Salvador. In 1971, the Christian Democrats formed a legal alliance with the National Revolutionary Movement (MNR), which is affiliated with the Socialist International, and with the National Democratic Union (UDN) which has been the politically front of the Salvadoran Communist Party. Together, this coalition participated in the 1972 elections. In 1979, the Christian Democrats allied themselves with the Revolutionary Popular Bloc (BPR), which is the mass political front of the Marxist-Leninist guerrilla group, the Popular Forces of Liberation (FPL).

Mr. President, when the Christian Democrats were in power—from 1980 to 1982, with Duarte at the helm—there were people in key government posts who are recognized as militant Communists. For example, Jorge Alberto Villacorta was the Secretary of Agriculture; he is now the spokesman for the guerrillas and operates out of Costa Rica. Hector Trujillo was the Ambassador to Germany, in spite of the fact that he was and is a member of the Revolutionary Democratic Front (FDR). Sergio Lama was the

general consul in Santiago, Chile, and is the brother-in-law of the Salvadoran Communist Party head, Shafik Handal. In Mexico, Benjamin Guzman was named as cultural attaché, in spite of his direct participation in the Communist uprising of 1932.

During the Duarte junta, Roberto Castellanos Figueroa was sent by Duarte as Ambassador to Nicaragua, though he later resigned from his post as a protest, "because the Salvadoran oppressive regime is walking hand in hand with Yankee imperialism." Duarte's Ambassador to Italy was Avo Priamo Alvarenga, who was founder in the University of the Democratic Movement of the Left (MID), and was later a founder of the National Revolutionary Movement (MNR). This movement is now integrated with the revolutionary guerrilla forces.

Mr. President, we cannot ignore the fact that in the official U.N. speeches of El Salvador's current Foreign Minister, Fidel Chavez Mena, a high ranking member of the Christian Democrat Party, defended the positions of the nonaligned countries and defends the cause of the terrorist Palestinian Liberation Organization. These speeches can be found in the archives of the U.N., although I understand the Salvadoran newspapers refused to publish them because the speeches are considered embarrassing to the Salvadoran nation.

Mr. President, the links between the Christian Democrat Party in El Salvador, the Salvadoran Communist Party, and the Marxist-Leninist guerrilla organizations are real and definitive. Before the State Department meddles any further in the El Salvador election process, we should consider the consequences if the United States successfully forces a socialist victory in that country.

That is why I have urged President Reagan to recall immediately the U.S. Ambassador to El Salvador, Mr. Pickering. It is essential that this action be taken if next Sunday's elections are to have any credibility, either in El Salvador or in the United States.

All Americans agree that it should be a prime goal of our policy to support free and fair elections in El Salvador. But Ambassador Pickering has gone beyond that consensus, consistently taking actions which support only one candidate, and manipulating the electoral process in a way that can be considered only as unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign nation.

El Salvador has suffered for years from persistent interference by the United States in its democratic process. Despite this, the Salvadoran people have continued to keep faith in democracy, even when, as after the Constituent Assembly elections in 1982, the obvious intent of the electorate and the numerical result were thwarted by U.S. diplomatic pressures to impose the unelected provisional President, Alvaro Magana, on El Sal-

vador. Now, at a crucial moment in the electoral process, the U.S. Embassy has used this unelected provisional President as a tool to set aside the majority will of the elected Constituent Assembly.

There has been much talk about the "death squads" of the right and the left threatening the democratic process. I wrote to President Reagan on February 27 about that problem. As I stated in that letter:

Mr. President, you and I are gravely concerned about such violence—wherever it happens and regardless of who is responsible for it. . . . Once we learn, beyond a reasonable doubt, that any individual or group is engaged in extra-legal "death squad" activity—whether from the violent left or the violent right, with whatever motivation—we must take the position as a nation that we will not countenance it.

The point is this, Mr. President: Violence can be directed not only against persons and property; violence can be done to the democratic process as well—and we must not countenance it there either. In his actions designed to rig the electoral outcome, Ambassador Pickering is the leader of the death squad against democracy. It is an open secret that Ambassador Pickering has met with electoral candidates in an attempt to influence their decisions, and that he demanded that President Magana veto the Constituent Assembly's plan to return to a fair and workable electoral system. The effect of this will be to cast doubt over the validity of the electoral process, and make the hope of social reconciliation infinitely remote. Mr. Pickering has used the cloak of diplomacy to strangle freedom in the night. He should be removed from the scene of the deed immediately.

It is clear that the consensus on foreign aid to El Salvador has failed in the Senate. The Foreign Relations Committee was unable to report out either developmental or military aid. If Mr. Pickering is allowed to throw the Salvadoran elections to the candidate of his choice, it is doubtful if either developmental or military aid will be approved by the U.S. Congress. In order to restore U.S. credibility, remove the appearance of U.S. partisanship, and maintain hope of social reconciliation in a troubled country, it is essential, in my judgment as chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, to recall Mr. Pickering at once.

HISTORY OF U.S. INTERVENTION

El Salvador has become a case history of the destruction of a country through the means of U.S. assistance programs. Using foreign aid as a club, the U.S. State Department and the U.S. Embassy in San Salvador have constantly intervened in the internal affairs of El Salvador since 1962. This intervention has always been to push the country to the left, toward Marxist socialism.

In 1962, the United States insisted that El Salvador nationalize its central

May 2, 1984

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 5231

bank, nationalize the Salvadorean Coffee Co., adopt a system of price controls, exchange controls, high tariffs, strengthen left-wing trade unions, and install a burdensome "social security" system. The effect of the U.S. intervention was to slow down capital formation and economic growth, thereby making it more difficult to raise the standard of living for the poor of El Salvador. The U.S. Embassy also insisted upon a "progressive income tax" and the imposition of the highest property taxes in Latin America.

In 1965, the U.S. Embassy insisted that the Salvadorean Government tolerate the Communist takeover of the university there. The Embassy argued that by allowing the takeover, it would "contain" the subversive action. Of course, what it did was to give a base to subversion, strengthen the hand of the subversives by giving them a headquarters from which to operate. The U.S. Embassy even invited some of the Communist faculty members to go to the United States for Government-approved seminars.

Moreover, U.S. Ambassador Murat Williams was reported to be deeply involved in the organization of the Christian Democratic Party, the one that still remains the favorite of the State Department. His successor, Ambassador Raul Castro, was frequently heard to make disparaging remarks about the business and agricultural leaders of El Salvador; and Ambassador Ignacio Lozano was so obnoxious in his behavior, that then President Romero asked for him to be recalled even before Lozano took office. Ambassador Frank Devine was vocal in insisting that terrorists, who had been involved in violent crimes, were "political prisoners" and had to be released.

Ambassador Devine and Ambassador Bowdler openly worked with the opposition to overthrow the government of President Romero. They demanded that President Romero resign, and that new elections be called, even though the Salvadorean Constitution provided for election at regular intervals, similar to U.S. procedure. Assistant Secretary of State Viron Vaky and Ambassador Christopher van Hollen—who was only an inspector of embassies—made the same demands during visits to El Salvador.

Once the constitutional government of El Salvador was overthrown in 1979, a left-of-center military junta was installed with U.S. approval. On March 5, 1980, the unconstitutional junta suspended the constitutional rights of the people of El Salvador, and ordered the military to occupy the lands of the first properties targeted for "reform." Although it was widely publicized that "14 families" were responsible for controlling the country, the actual owners turned out to number in the thousands. The United States put \$22.5 million into the land reform program in 1980, and \$10.5 million in 1981. Legislative action by Congress put a stop

to further funding in 1981 through direct action, but U.S. policy has continued to support the program ever since.

At the time of the destabilization of El Salvador by the United States in 1979, El Salvador was a model of economic progress for a developing country—contrary to the myths which are widely published today. Of course a "developing country" is one which by definition is one which is still moving forward. One would not expect to find progress evenly distributed. It is not in the nature of a free society that the fruits of progress are evenly distributed all at once. Only in a coercive society can everyone be forced to live on the same level. Yet even by every measure of redistributive thinking, El Salvador in 1979 stood head and shoulders above other developing countries in the region. Despite the lack of resources, and despite the burdens of high taxes and economically repressive measures demanded by the U.S. State Department, the strong work ethic which characterizes Salvadorean society was already paying off.

ECONOMIC PROGRESS IN EL SALVADOR—THE RECORD IN 1979

I submit that there is no evidence that the situation in El Salvador is one of economic oppression. It is well known, for example, that income distribution statistics in the United States show that the top 20 percent of American families receive 41 percent of the national income, and the lowest 20 percent get only 5.4 percent of the national income. Yet no one calls this oppression in the United States.

In El Salvador, the top 5 percent of the population received 24 percent of the national income, and the lowest 20 percent received 5.7 percent, according to the 1977 statistics of the OAS Economic and Social Council.

Moreover, the OAS figures for El Salvador look especially good compared to those for all of Latin America: The top 5 percent got 32.7 percent for all Latin American countries, and the lowest 20 percent got 3.7 percent.

Indeed, the situation has been improving rapidly, despite the efforts of the terrorists to wreck the economy. The minimum wage in agriculture has increased 37 percent between 1976 and 1979, and for those workers in seasonal crops, 77 percent.

The United Nations has an economic indicator called the Gini which measures concentration of wealth. For El Salvador, the Gini is 0.50, which the U.N. classifies as "moderate," comparing it with Argentina, Chile, Costa Rica, and Venezuela.

A recent World Bank study shows that in El Salvador, 20 percent of the urban population and 30 percent of the rural population live below the poverty line. Of course, as we have discerned in our own country, poverty lines can be manipulated by political interpretation.

But for all Latin America the figures are 43 percent as calculated by the

ILO and 41 percent as calculated by ECLA—U.N. Latin American Economic Commission. So again El Salvador is doing far better than most, or, at least, it was until the Marxists began to move in and take over.

Indeed, the World Bank study shows a dramatic improvement in income distribution between 1965 and 1977, despite the rapid growth of population in El Salvador. Most of the increased distribution has affected the lower 40 percent of the people, incomewise.

As far as the tax burden is concerned in El Salvador, between 1971 and 1977, tax collections as a percentage of the GNP increased from 11 to 17 percent. This is one of the highest in Latin America. In 1962, direct taxes accounted for 38 percent of the revenues. In 1977 they accounted for 55 percent of the revenues. The indirect taxes, those which presumably affect the poor the most, decreased accordingly, from 71 percent in 1962 to 45 percent in 1977.

The myth has been perpetrated that the moderate-sized farms that were nationalized were exclusively in the hands of wealthy "absentee landlords" who did little or nothing to improve the productivity, or to better the lot of their workers. It was said that 78 percent of the land was in the hands of 10 percent of the landowners. But is such a "concentration" unjust? Those who cite it neglected to say that: "many of these landowners were corporations, such as we have in the United States, that have the capital to invest in long-range plans, and to provide greater benefits for their employees, precisely as it is in the United States. Moreover, the trend is slowly moving away from concentration, with the present level down from 83.8 percent in 1967."

But is such a system unjust? I doubt that many Americans would find it so, if they put it in an American context.

The Library of Congress states, for example, that in Illinois only 5 percent of the landowners own 57 percent of all the land; in North Carolina, the top 5 percent of the landowners own 69 percent of the land. Indeed, if we compare the total for the U.S. figures to those of El Salvador, we find that they actually exceed the concentration of land ownership in that country.

One should also compare the official statistics from the Natural Resources Economics Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. The pattern of land ownership varies, as we might expect. In almost every State, less than 5 percent of the landowners own more than 50 percent of the land. In fact, the national average for the United States is that 75.1 percent of the land is owned by only 5 percent of the landowners. In fact, 48 percent of the land is owned by less than 1 percent of the landowners. That means that nearly one-half of the United States is owned by 1 percent of the landowners.

It should be emphasized, that this is 5 percent and 1 percent of the landowners, not the population as a whole. If the statistics were worked up on ownership as a percentage of the population, the results would be even more dramatic.

But what if you consider only farm and ranch land? The statistics show that over half of all U.S. farm and ranch land is owned by only 5 percent of the landowners—in fact 52 percent. Finally, 30 percent of the farm and ranch land is owned by 1 percent of the landowners.

The bottom line, is that 75.1 percent of the land in the United States is owned by 5 percent of the landowners, while in El Salvador the figures cited are 78 percent of the land owned by 10 percent of the landowners. So it is fair to assume that the situation is worse in the United States—providing we agree that such statistical analyses tell us anything about social justice. Perhaps we should have land reform in the United States before we impose it on hapless smaller nations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two tables illustrating these facts be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TABLE 1.—CONCENTRATION OF LAND OWNERSHIP IN THE UNITED STATES OF ALL LAND BY REGION AND STATE

State and region	Proportion of acreage held by:	
	Largest 5 percent of landowners	Largest 1 percent of landowners
Proportion of acreage held by:		
	Largest 5 percent of landowners	Largest 1 percent of landowners
State and region		
Northeast:		
Connecticut	57	35
Maine	87	73
Massachusetts	63	37
New Hampshire	79	53
New Jersey	63	38
New York	80	45
Pennsylvania	64	29
Rhode Island	56	30
Vermont	37	14
Northeast States	76	46
North Central:		
Michigan	65	34
Minnesota	31	11
Wisconsin	53	19
Lake	55	23
Illinois	57	21
Indiana	49	18
Iowa	34	12
Missouri	39	15
Ohio	59	25
Corn Belt	51	20
Kansas	43	18
Nebraska	47	25
North Dakota	37	12
South Dakota	58	28
North Plains	41	22
North Central	58	26
Southern:		
Alabama	72	46
Arkansas	72	49
Delaware	80	52
Florida	89	77
Georgia	73	45
Kentucky	53	23
Louisiana	88	58
Maryland	59	27
Mississippi	62	36
North Carolina	68	42
Oklahoma	61	35
South Carolina	67	42
Tennessee	58	36
Texas	71	47
Virginia	69	39
West Virginia	67	41
South	74	48

Western:		
Arizona	84.7	74.4
California	87.8	88.3
Colorado	83.2	49.7
Hawaii	98.2	97.2
Idaho	86.1	80.9
Montana	64.8	32.5
Nevada	83.4	73.8
New Mexico	90.7	70.3
Oregon	90.3	73.5
Utah	84.2	84.2
Washington	87.1	89.4
Wyoming	88.6	85.9
West	81.2	59.9
U.S. total ¹	75.1	48.0

¹ Revised, excluding Alaska.
Source: Natural Resources Economics Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 2.—CONCENTRATION OF LANDOWNERSHIP IN THE UNITED STATES FOR FARM AND RANCH LAND BY REGION AND STATE

State and region	Proportion of acreage held by:	
	Largest 5 percent of landowners	Largest 1 percent of landowners
Proportion of acreage held by:		
	Largest 5 percent of landowners	Largest 1 percent of landowners
State and region		
Northeast:		
Connecticut	36	14
Maine	46	25
Massachusetts	42	19
New Hampshire	33	11
New Jersey	40	18
New York	30	12
Pennsylvania	32	12
Rhode Island	39	18
Vermont	18	6
Northeast States	35	14
North Central:		
Michigan	29	11
Minnesota	22	7
Wisconsin	20	7
Lake	24	8
Illinois	25	8
Indiana	27	9
Iowa	24	6
Missouri	28	10
Ohio	25	9
Corn Belt	25	8
Kansas	31	14
Nebraska	39	19
North Dakota	21	8
South Dakota	38	16
North Plains	33	15
North Central	34	14
Southern:		
Alabama	46	23
Arkansas	43	21
Delaware	67	31
Florida	61	27
Georgia	42	18
Kentucky	35	15
Louisiana	51	29
Maryland	27	9
Mississippi	45	20
North Carolina	43	18
Oklahoma	38	18
South Carolina	35	17
Tennessee	34	15
Texas	57	36
Virginia	46	18
West Virginia	37	16
South	52	31
Western:		
Arizona	67	46
California	72	45
Colorado	51	26
Hawaii	99	89
Idaho	62	33
Montana	47	22
Nevada	89	73
New Mexico	78	50
Oregon	67	47
Utah	66	41
Washington	62	31
Wyoming	67	31
West	72	43
U.S. total ¹	52	30

¹ Revised, excluding Alaska.
Source: Natural Resources Economics Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HELMS. Furthermore, 61 percent of the land in 1979 was under cultivation in farms of less than 100 hectares. There was already a land distribution program in operation, which in 1978 awarded 8,300 hectares, and in 1979 awarded 36,200 hectares to cooperatives representing 5,000 persons.

Unfortunately, the productivity of such distributions has declined.

Some persons have asserted that the concentration of land in the hands of a small group and the emphasis on exportation of agricultural products were responsible for the large part in the poverty in El Salvador.

Just the opposite is the case; in so far as national earnings were increased and have achieved better distribution, it was because of the earnings from agricultural exports. The notion that emphasizing exports somehow induces poverty is completely wrong. The fantasy that taking a nation back to stone-age socialism is progress is either the result of ignorance or of callous disregard for the sufferings of the poor.

Indeed, it is also wrong that exports were overemphasized. In 1978, basic food production increased 38 percent, making El Salvador self-sufficient in food.

It is often asserted that the most modern countries in the region are Costa Rica, Venezuela, Colombia, and Ecuador. Yet in the 1978 statistics published by the Inter-American Development Bank, that, to take just two significant indices of social welfare, El Salvador surpasses all of them in the percentage of governmental spending either for education, or public health, or both. Specifically, the figures are:

	Education		Public health
	(In percent)		
El Salvador	22.4	8.6	
Colombia	13.2	6.6	
Venezuela	13.6	5.2	
Costa Rica	34.3	4.0	
Ecuador	30.4	8.5	

Similarly, although El Salvador has a tragic rate of infant mortality, it is no worse than most Third World countries, and, in deaths per thousand, is about the same as such relatively rich Latin American countries as Colombia, Venezuela, and Mexico, according to the LADB figures. When the statistics for deaths under 5 years due to malnutrition are examined, El Salvador is comparable to Argentina, Colombia, Brazil, and Mexico.

Despite this record of progress, a case could be made that an even better record could have been accumulated if there had been considerably less intervention by the government in the economic sector. The socialist measures which have been forced upon El Salvador by U.S. pressure have impeded progress, rather than encouraged it. Moreover, they have contributed enormously to the atmosphere of increasing politicization that has devastated political life in El Salvador, and encouraged terrorism. The first steps that should be taken should be the depoliticization of the economy of El Salvador. The most effective and efficient method for increasing the distribution of wealth is to remove political values from the system of distribu-

May 2, 1984

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 5233

tion. Only a value-free economy can raise the standard of living of the poor.

But all of this was swept away—both by the economic terrorism imposed by the U.S. State Department, and the guerrilla terrorism of the left. The State Department aimed to sweep away the productive social structure through policies mislabeled "reform"; but the guerrillas went straight to the infrastructure which made an ordered society possible. Both contributed equally to the disaster.

NEGOTIATE WITH WHOM?

Mr. President, it is fashionable in some quarters to insist that the solution to the violence is to negotiate with terrorists. If this has ever been a solution, anywhere in the world, it has yet to come to my attention. Mr. Duarte's ties to the left are not ties to some indigenous fighters for social justice. On the contrary, they are tied to a very sophisticated Marxist-Leninist apparatus which is the result of a conscious program of exploitation of weaknesses and a carefully planned program of subversion.

When the U.S. press extolls the virtues of Mr. Duarte's erst-while political partner Guillermo Ungo, who now heads up the political arm of the Communist guerrilla movement, they conveniently ignore both the former close association between Duarte and Ungo, and Ungo's present role of putting a respectable front on the gang of leftist cutthroats and murderers who are trying to seize power.

When Reuben Zamora travels to the United States and is courted by press and universities alike, they fail to point out that he has a dual role as representative of a unit especially set up to disseminate foreign propaganda, and an actual guerrilla role in the terrorism.

There is, indeed, a very elaborate interlocking network, which was formalized and activated by Castro at a meeting in Havana in 1980. In order to see with whom negotiations might be carried out, I have pulled together the results of investigations carried out by my staff group assigned to this area. This information is based on field investigations and direct interviews in the region with appropriate experts.

EARLY SOVIET INFLUENCE IN EL SALVADOR

Mr. President, I am deeply concerned that in all the debates in Congress and in all the media coverage of the situation in El Salvador one central fact has been neglected. It is certainly no secret that the Soviet Union has been fomenting revolution in this hemisphere for almost seven decades. The strategic objective of the Soviet leadership to promote world revolution has been a central feature of international reality since the Bolshevik coup d'état in Russia in 1917. The question today, as it has been for most of this century, is what are we going to do to halt and to roll back Soviet global aggression?

Back in 1918, three Soviet agents—Guraski, Glabau, and Kavanov—entered El Salvador to work with Esteban Pavletich to establish the first Communist cells in El Salvador. Subsequently, Salvadorans such as Luis Felipe Recinos, Enrique Conde, and Augustin Faribundo Marti entered the Communist Party network. Enrique Conde fled to Costa Rica after President Maximiliano Hernandez Martinez launched his campaign against the Communist uprising in El Salvador in 1932. Conde continued his subversive activities against El Salvador from his base in Costa Rica and worked closely with key Costa Rican Communists such as Manuel Mora Valverde.

The penetration of the labor movement worldwide has always been a standard Communist tactic. In 1922, the Central American Labor Confederation (COCA—Confederacion Obrera Centroamericana) was founded and was based upon the Communist Party sections and organizational structures in Central America. The Salvadoran group that became a member of COCA was the Regional Federation of El Salvadoran Workers (FRTS—Federacion Regional de Trabajadores de El Salvador).

In 1929, the Soviet Communist Party sponsored a meeting in Havana, Cuba, of the heads of the Communist Parties of Central America and the Caribbean. In this October meeting, the Soviets brought Faribundo Marti under stricter discipline. The Soviets viewed his plans for a revolution in El Salvador in 1929 as premature and wanted the Communist Party and supporters in El Salvador to take more time to work out the plans for a more detailed strategy and to make better preparations.

The Komintern organization based in Moscow had a number of delegates at this meeting. At the time, the Komintern had a special department for Central America and the Caribbean whose central objective was fomenting revolution in the region. The Komintern directors at the Havana meeting wanted the Communist uprising in El Salvador to commence on October 17, 1932, and worked with the Communist Party of El Salvador (PCS) to assist in the coordination of the Communist elements in the labor movement, the peasant movement, and even within the military. The PCS had the support of Communist front operations controlled by Moscow such as Red Aid International based in New York, the International Labor Federation based in Amsterdam, the Komintern organization based in Moscow, the Communist Congress of Buenos Aires, and the Latin American Labor Confederation based in Montevideo.

The Communist rising in El Salvador did erupt in 1932 as planned but under the strong leadership of President Hernandez Martinez it was suppressed. Today, five decades later, we are again confronted by a Communist onslaught backed by Moscow in El Salvador.

STRUCTURE OF THE SOVIET BACKED COMMUNIST FORCES IN EL SALVADOR

The principal directing organ of the Communist revolution in El Salvador is the Unified Revolutionary Directorate (DRU—Direccion Revolucionaria Unificada) which controls the military, diplomatic, political, and economic aspects of the revolution. Five organizations are represented in the DRU: The Communist Party of El Salvador (PCS), the Popular Forces of Liberation (FPL), the Armed Forces of National Resistance (FARN), the Revolutionary Army of the Poor (ERP), and the Revolutionary Party of Central American Workers (PRCT).

The Communist Party of El Salvador started to be organized in 1918 as I mentioned earlier. In 1925, the party took on a formal and overt character. In 1930, Faribundo Marti returned from abroad to El Salvador and became the Secretary General of the party and picked as his chief lieutenants Alfonso Luna and Mario Zapata. Two factions within the PCS developed during the 1960's. One was headed by Shafik Handel who allowed for penetration of the electoral process as tactic to achieve power. The other faction was headed by the late Cayetano Carpio and it emphasized violent armed revolution as the road to power.

In April 1970, the FPL was formed when the Cayetano Carpio faction broke away from the official Communist Party which remained in the hands of Shafik Handel. In August 1975, the FPL established a mass front organization called the Popular Revolutionary Bloc (BPR). This front was formed through a coalition of FPL supporters and primarily those groups organized by Father Bernard Bourlang, a French Jesuit priest. Three of the four members of the central command within the FPL National Masses Committee—Juan Chacon, Facundo Guardado, and Julio Flores—became the leaders of the BPR. A fourth member of the committee, Oscar Bonilla, became secretary general of AGEUS (Association of University Students of El Salvador). Both the BPR and AGEUS were housed in the same office in the National University of El Salvador. The clear cut Marxist-Leninist ideology of the BPR and AGEUS are revealed in their publications such as "Red Star," "Popular Combat," "Guerrilla," and "The Rebel."

The Revolutionary Army of the Poor (ERP) was formed in March 1972 by a number of members of the El Salvadoran Communist Party. Under the leadership of Joaquin Villalobos, the ERP has had close working relationships with several guerrilla organizations in Latin America including the Tupamaro National Liberation Movement of Uruguay, the People's Revolutionary Army of Argentina, the leftist Revolutionary Movement of Chile (MIR).

S 5234

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 2, 1984

The mass front organization for the ERP is called the Popular Leagues of February 28 (LP-28) which has been concerned with propaganda, mobilization, and recruitment. The clear-cut Marxist-Leninist ideology of the ERP and its LP-28 is found in their publications such as "Proletariat Thought," "Communist Press," "Red Flag," "Wake Up Peasant," and "The Power is Born from the Gun." It is significant that an ERP member, Norma Guevara, was placed into a leadership position in the Communist supporting Salvadoran Commission of Human Rights.

The Armed Forces of National Resistance (FARN) was formed in 1975 after the assassination of an ERP member Enrique Dalton which precipitated a split in the ranks. FARN's former leader, Ernesto Jovel, was replaced by Ferman Cienfuegos after the former's death. Cienfuegos' real name is Eduardo Sancho.

FARN took over the Unified Popular Action Front (FAPU) which has been formed in 1974 by two Catholic priests, Higinio and Jose Inocencio Alas. FAPU has been especially close to the Union of Workers of the Salvadoran Institute of Social Security (STISS). The Marxist-Leninist ideology of FARN and FAPU are clearly identifiable in their publications such as "Pueblo" and "For the proletarian Cause."

The Revolutionary Party of Central American Workers (PRTC) was also spawned by the Communist Party of El Salvador. Its mass front organization is the Movement of Popular Liberation (MLP).

For its part, the Communist Party of El Salvador has operated through a mass front called the National Democratic Union (UDN) which was formed in 1970 and which participated in the 1972 and 1977 elections through a coalition of opposition parties known as the National Opposition Union (UNO). The UDN is composed of several Marxist-Leninist labor and peasant organizations including the Salvadoran Workers Confederation (CUTS).

The labor laws of El Salvador require that 10 unions are necessary to form 1 federation and that 3 federations are necessary to form a confederation. The Communist Party of El Salvador controls three federations: the United Trade Union Federation of El Salvador (FTCS); the federation Union of Food, Garment, and Textile Industry Workers (FESTIAVTSCEs); and the National Trade Union Federation of Salvadoran Workers (FENAS-TRAS). CUTS is the confederation in which these three federations are joined and it operates in close cooperation with the guerrilla front organizations such as the BPR, LP-27, and FAPU.

THE UNIFIED REVOLUTIONARY DIRECTORATE (URD)

In May 1980, at a meeting in Havana, Cuba, the Unified Revolutionary Directorate of the El Salvadoran

revolution was formed at the direction of Fidel Castro as a precondition for larger scale Cuban aid. The DRU is composed of three representatives of each of the five major Communist organizations in El Salvador.

According to information reaching my office, the membership of the DRU is as follows. The members from the FPL are: Leonel Gonzalez (a pseudonym); Dimas Hernandez (a pseudonym); and the third name is unknown. The members from the ERP are: Joaquin Villalobos; Jorge Melendez; and Sonia Medina. The members from the FARN are: Ferman Cienfuegos (a pseudonym for Eduardo Sancho); Oscar Armando Acevedo; and the third name is unknown. The members from the PRTC are: Roberto Roca (a pseudonym); Mario Lopez; and the third name is unknown. The members from the Communist Party of El Salvador are: Jorge Shafik Handal; Roberto Castellanos Calvo; and Mario Aguinada Carranza.

The DRU operates two key Commissions: The Commission for Finances (COFIN) and the Commission for International Relations (CORINTER). The Commission on Finances is composed of one member from each of the five organizations comprising the DRU. The head of the Commission is Farid Handal, the brother of Shafik Handal who is the head of the Communist Party of El Salvador. The mission of COFIN is to amass the financial support for the Salvadoran revolution from the international contacts. The Commission was located in Mexico City until late 1982 when the Mexican Government nationalized the private banks and the financial situation was unstable. COFIN was charged with handling the donations which came in the form of various currencies such as U.S. dollars, German marks, French francs, and so forth. The Commission then changed the foreign currencies into dollars for use inside of El Salvador by the DRU as well as for external purchases of arms. COFIN is now located in Panama taking advantage of the sophisticated network of international banking services in that country for the movement of moneys for the support of the Salvadoran revolution.

The Commission for International Relations, CORINTER, has had its base in Managua, Nicaragua, but now operates in a number of countries. Its offices in Mexico City are said to be the most important in terms of organizing international support and establishing logistical support for the Salvadoran revolution. The head of this Commission is Ferman Cienfuegos, whose real name is Eduardo Sancho. The delegate to CORINTER from the El Salvadoran Communist Party is reported to be Dr. Miguel Angel Saenz Varela.

In Costa Rica, the Salvadoran revolutionary complex maintains a similar operation to that in Mexico City. The

head of this operation is reported to be Dr. Renan Rodas Laso.

In Prague, Czechoslovakia, the Salvadoran revolutionary complex maintains an operation which interfaces with the Soviet Union and other satellite countries. The head of this office is reported to be Dr. Jorge Arias Gomez.

In Havana, Cuba, the DRU naturally maintains a key operational center whose head is reported to be Julio Cesar Salazar.

THE DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTIONARY FRONT (FDR)

Subordinate to the DRU is the Democratic Revolutionary Front (FDR) which was created in April 1980 to disseminate propaganda outside of El Salvador. The FDR is composed of the Revolutionary Coordinator of the Masses (CRM) which was formed in January of 1980 and the Democratic Front (FD) which was formed in April of 1980.

The CRM is composed of the overt mass organizations of the five Marxist-Leninist revolutionary organizations. The BPR is the mass organization for the FLP. The LP-28 is the mass organization for the ERP. The FAPU is the mass organization for the FARN. The MLP is the mass organization for the PRTC. The UDN is the mass organization for the Communist Party of El Salvador.

The Democratic Front is composed of organizations which do not take part in the armed military struggle on an overt basis. Three small political parties form the basis of the FD. They are the National Revolutionary Movement (MNR); the Popular Social Christian Movement (MPSC); and the Independent Movement of Professionals and Technicians of El Salvador (MIPTES).

Guillermo Ungo, the leader of the MNR which is a member of the Socialist International organization, is the head of the Democratic Revolutionary Front. It should not escape notice that Dr. Ungo went to Moscow during the 1960's to sign a cultural exchange agreement with Lomonosov University. He was representing the National University of El Salvador and traveled with its rector Dr. Fabio Castillo Figueroa. Dr. Castillo is the head of the Movement of Popular Liberation (MLP) which I mentioned earlier was the front organization for the PRTC which is one of the five Marxist-Leninist revolutionary organizations comprising the DRU.

According to information reaching my office, the Executive Council of the FDR is composed of one member from each of the eight organizations comprising the FDR. The BPR representative is Oscar Bonilla; the LP-28 representative is Galindo Mariel; the FAPU representative is Jose Napoleon Rodriguez Ruiz; the MLP representative is Fabio Castillo; the UDN representative is Dagoberto Gutierrez. The MNR representative is Guillermo Manuel Ungo; the MPSC representa-

May 2, 1984

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 5235

tive is Ruben Zamora; the MIPTES representative is Eduardo Francisco Calles who acts as the vice-president of the FDR.

THE PARIBUNDO MARTI NATIONAL LIBERATION FRONT (FMLN)

Also subordinate to the DRU is the Faribundo Marti National Liberation Front which was formed in November 1980 to coordinate and execute the armed revolutionary insurgency in El Salvador. The FMLN is composed of the five Marxist-Leninist revolutionary groups which form the DRU. They are: the Communist Party of El Salvador (PCS); the Popular Forces of Liberation (FPL); the Armed Forces of National Resistance (FARN); the Revolutionary Army of the Poor (ERP); and the Revolutionary Party of the Workers of Central America (PRTC). The FMLN has a general command which integrates and coordinates the armed insurgency of these groups.

COMMUNISM IS THE ENEMY IN EL SALVADOR

Mr. President, as I said at the outset I am deeply concerned that the Congress and the media are refusing to come to grips with the central fact in El Salvador. That fact is that the Soviet Union directly and through its satellites and surrogates is fomenting Communist revolution at our very doorstep.

The facts about the Soviet thrust into El Salvador and the Soviet-Cuban orchestration and manipulation of the revolutionary forces in El Salvador are clear for all to see. The facts about seven decades of Soviet subversion in our hemisphere are available to anyone who would care to study them. It is inconceivable to this Senator that at this late hour these facts are not being recognized for what they are and that truly effective steps are not being taken to exclude the Communist menace from our hemisphere.

We must be absolutely clear that communism is the enemy in Central America whether it hides behind a Socialist face or whether it stands plainly out in the open for all to see.

Mr. President, there is no substitute for military victory over the Communist forces in Central America and there is no substitute for free enterprise to bring prosperity and a better life for all in the region. It is at our peril that we forget these fundamental truths.

Mr. President, in today's Washington Post there appeared an article by Roland Evans and Robert Novak which describes the activities of our Ambassador to El Salvador, Thomas Pickering, and the attitude of the U.S. Embassy in favor of Jose Napoleon Duarte. I ask unanimous consent that this important article be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OUR MAN IN EL SALVADOR

SAN VICENTE, EL SALVADOR.—The quiet glee of American diplomats that Christian Democrat Jose Napoleon Duarte seems certain to win El Salvador's May 6 presidential runoff would be restrained if they carefully weighed the opinion of an army captain operating in this guerrilla-menaced area.

"Duarte ruined this country before," he told us, referring to Duarte's tenure as unelected president. "My brother officers and I think it would be a disaster for our country for this to happen again." Concerns that Duarte will not pursue the war vigorously are commonplace in San Vicente Province and other areas bloodied by communist insurrection. That explains why Duarte's conservative opponent, Roberto D'Aubuisson, will win handily here.

Helped by a huge majority in the capital of San Salvador, however, Duarte looks like a certain winner nationally—with some forecasts giving him two-thirds of the vote. That cheers U.S. policy makers, who fear a D'Aubuisson victory would cause Congress to cut off military aid.

But Duarte has yet to instill confidence in Salvadoran businessmen and hard-line anti-communists such as the army captain here. They fear the Reagan administration favorite pursues a non-Reagan agenda of appeasing the communists and further socializing the economy. The danger is not an army coup, but deepening economic decay, political instability and the calamity of right-wing insurgency amid left-wing revolt.

Duarte has never more clearly been Washington's man in El Salvador. "Without any doubt," D'Aubuisson told us in an interview broadcast over the Cable News Network, "the American Embassy under Mr. [Thomas] Pickering [U.S. ambassador] has tended to favor the election of Mr. Duarte." Contact between the embassy and D'Aubuisson is now at the level of assistant political officer.

Unsubstantiated accusations linking D'Aubuisson to right-wing "death squads" are less at issue than war-fighting strategy. There is unofficial opinion within the embassy the guerrillas never could be overcome militarily by D'Aubuisson and that the only hope is that Duarte can draw the insurrection's more moderate leaders into the political process. That requires a Christian Democratic government clearly to the left.

Although the U.S. news media routinely call Duarte "moderate" (while stigmatizing D'Aubuisson as "far right"), the Duarte regime expropriated land, nationalized banks and socialized the coffee import business. Salvadoran businessmen believe these "reforms," much more than ravages of war and worldwide recession, are responsible for economic stagnation that between 1979 and 1982 saw the gross national product revert to the level of 1962.

Even some of Duarte's admirers at the U.S. Embassy hope he will consider proposals by D'Aubuisson's National Republican Alliance (ARENA) to reinvigorate the economy with private credit. Far from hoping for such market-oriented policies under a second Duarte administration, businessmen fear new expropriations. Their cautious optimism about this country's future we observed last summer has turned to gloom, deepened by what they considered D'Aubuisson's failed campaign.

By sticking to patriotic, nationalistic themes, D'Aubuisson has welded support in San Vicente and other endangered areas. We want to a rally for him here attended by leaders of all parties other than the Chris-

tian Democrats. But nationwide, he has built no such coalition, and his business backers blame him for not preaching economic growth and jobs under democratic capitalism.

In contrast to his prior tenure when he treated businessmen with haughty contempt, Duarte recently sent an emissary to them offering a hand of friendship. It was made clear, however, that hand does not extend to Duarte's most prominent private-sector critics, adding to the air of foreboding.

The businessmen can head for Miami, further debilitating the economy. D'Aubuisson and friends can head for the hills, guns in hand. This would be no traditional military coup. The high command, liberally peppered with Christian Democrats, distrusts ex-Maj. D'Aubuisson and does not want to displease Washington.

But the bulk of the 28,000-man army likely would support D'Aubuisson, were it not for the fact that the high command does not let them vote. Their course may be determined by Roberto D'Aubuisson's conduct in defeat. "I believe in the sovereign will of the people," he told us, pledging adherence to the election. But he confides to friends he will become a Salvadoran "contra" if Duarte makes a deal with the guerrillas.

Campaign invective is now unrestrained, with mutual accusations of political murder and labels of "communist" and "fascist." That raises doubts whether a victorious Duarte can display true conciliation toward conservative views about prosecuting the war and encouraging the private sector. If he cannot, the election outcome long dreamed of at the State Department could yield bitter fruit for President Reagan's fight against communism in Latin America.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:10 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S.J. Res. 25. Joint resolution redesignating the Saint Croix Island National Monument in the State of Maine as the "Saint Croix Island International Historic Site".

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3739. An act to provide certain authority to reduce erosion within the Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4176. An act to confirm the boundaries of the Southern Ute Indian Reservation in the State of Colorado and to define jurisdiction within such reservation;

H.R. 4406. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate Wildcat Brook in the State of New Hampshire for potential addition to the national wild and scenic rivers system, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4616. An act to amend the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 to require States to use at least 8 per centum of their highway safety apportionments for developing and implementing comprehensive programs concerning the use of child restraint systems in motor vehicles, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4921. An act to provide for the selection of additional lands for inclusion within

S 5406

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 8, 1984

strong economy. We cannot do any of these unless they are all done together. If two appropriations caps are allowed, funds for educating our children will have to compete with funds for keeping them healthy. The two appropriations caps change the traditional economic analogy from a choice between guns and butter to a choice between guns and more guns, and a choice between better and education or health or crime control. Guns and butter are both important to our national security, but developing our human capital is the bedrock of our national security. I support an adequate military budget. But I am occasionally troubled by the thought that someday, unless we reorder our priorities, we could end up with a lot of complicated military hardware and no one literate enough to operate it.

In a time of scarce resources, in a time when the deficits drastically affect the rest of our domestic and international economy, we must make sure that every dollar spent yields a maximum benefit to the general welfare. This can only be done with one appropriations cap, where all programs are evaluated on their merits against one mother and against the economic consequences of uncontrolled deficits.

Mr. BAKER. I wish to announce there will be no more rollcall votes tonight.

THE ELECTION RESULTS IN EL SALVADOR

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, last week I called upon President Reagan to recall Ambassador Thomas Pickering for consultations on the role which he and his Embassy officials have played in rigging the election in El Salvador.

Now there is evidence that Mr. Pickering was but a key role player in a behind-the-scenes drama much wider than I could have imagined last week. When I asked the President to recall Mr. Pickering, I based the request on the overt actions which the Ambassador had been taking to enhance the candidacy of the socialist nominee, Jose Napoleon Duarte. Now the evidence is that Mr. Pickering was presiding over a covert plan to funnel U.S. Government funds and other assistance directly into Duarte's campaign.

This covert funding has been going on for 2 years. In other words, the State Department and the CIA bought the election for Duarte. Mr. Pickering was merely the purchasing agent. If Mr. Pickering did not approve of the scheme, he should have resigned.

It has been my understanding that President Reagan's policy is to build democracy in El Salvador. However, the covert funding of Duarte does just the opposite. It is, in fact, a misuse of the democratic process that ultimately will subvert the President's policy as defined by Mr. Reagan. The fact appears to be that President Reagan

never himself approved the funding of Duarte. It was the decision of the third-level interagency group on Central America that is supposed to coordinate policy in the executive branch. In 1981, President Reagan reportedly authorized the use of covert action to support parties being threatened by Marxist-Leninist insurgency, a step I consider quite proper. But at no time, according to my information, did the President authorize covert action on behalf of one democratic party to the detriment of other democratic parties. The bureaucrats evidently decided, in effect, to classify Roberto D'Aubuisson, Duarte's chief opponent, in the same category as the Communists.

Madam President, the bias of the bureaucrats in favor of the socialist candidate, Mr. Duarte, was plain for all to see, as was their actual malice toward Mr. D'Aubuisson, who openly espoused the principles of the Republican Party in the United States. Mr. D'Aubuisson was forever being linked—in the jargon of the media—to the so-called right-wing death squads. The cue was taken from slanderous accusations of President Carter's Ambassador to El Salvador, Mr. Robert White.

Yet Mr. White's accusations proved to be flimsy indeed; and when confronted by the attorney for one of his victims before the Western Hemisphere Affairs Subcommittee, he was forced to retract. Lawsuits against Mr. White are pending.

Mr. D'Aubuisson was never given the opportunity by the State Department or the media to confront his accusers. I personally made inquiries of every agency and every high official in the U.S. Government that I judged to be in a position to know the truth. In almost every case, I was told, in effect, that there was no credible evidence, but that it would be impolitic to say so. There were, however, one or two who said that yes, there was evidence linking Mr. D'Aubuisson to the death squads; but when pressed for specifics, they backed down, saying there was nothing that would hold up in court. I am still waiting for any specific evidence, whether it would hold up in court or not. I invite any official of the administration to put it forward.

Nevertheless, the State Department continued an underground campaign of malicious accusations against one of the chief candidates in the Salvadoran elections. Hardly a day failed to go by without unnamed Embassy spokesmen or their similarly anonymous colleagues here in Washington repeating their accusations, or indicating that things would go hard for El Salvador if the voters chose Mr. D'Aubuisson. The faceless spokesmen never failed to point out the symbolic act of refusing a visa to Mr. D'Aubuisson.

We see now that all of this was not just mere bias. The State Department and the CIA were protecting their investment. They had bought Mr. Duarte lock, stock, and barrel, and

they did not want the invested capital to be wasted by the Salvadoran voters rejecting the merchandise. They wanted the trappings of democracy to enhance the product, but they did not want to risk a real commitment to freedom.

This was not the policy of President Reagan. I have known the President too long to believe that he would ever support a phony democracy or a crooked election. This was the policy of a small coterie of bureaucrats with their own agenda and their own policies—the permanent government pursuing its own aims in defiance of the President's wishes.

Insofar as the President is responsible, he is responsible, by hindsight for not having been more exacting in insuring that the policymaking slots at the State Department are filled with persons loyal to his principles. Many good friends of the President have tried to warn him that the bureaucracy is out of control; but other advisers of the President have chosen to ignore those warnings. Yet we still see nominations coming forward for key State Department policy slots who represent the views of previous administrations and the bureaucratic establishment. Policy is created by persons; and the President will have to see to it that the persons he chooses are representatives of his aims.

The practical result is that we have the potential for a first-class debacle on our hands, with the prestige of the United States invested in a socialist who is pledged to an economic policy that will bring the country to a halt, and a diplomatic policy that will result in a coalition with the Marxist-Leninists. Mr. Duarte has already intimated that key Marxists will be in his government; and if these Marxists are invited, will the Marxist-Leninists be far behind? Mr. Duarte is without a mandate to rule or the arguments to produce national unity. In assuming power through a rigged election, Mr. Duarte runs the real risk of touching off another conflagration in a war-torn land.

It is a real question just who has been told about the covert funding of Duarte. I have today talked to high members of the administration who were just as shocked as I was to discover what had happened. I have talked to other Senators who were similarly in the dark. I hope that the President is fully briefed on the exact nature of U.S. support for Duarte before he makes his television speech tomorrow.

It is my understanding that not even the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence was informed of the funding of Duarte until last Thursday—the day after particulars I revealed in a speech on the Senate floor were made public. I do not know what went on at that meeting, but I have been given to understand that Senators who heard the news declined to go to El Salvador as election observers because they did

May 8, 1984

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 5407

not want to be in the position of appearing to approve what has transpired.

All the details of this operation should now be revealed. The whole truth should be told. The only way to make amends is to tell the truth. Those responsible for formulating, approving, and executing the policy should carefully consider whether they can continue to serve our Government with honor.

The whole purpose of our policy in El Salvador was to build democracy in that country, a country where the citizens were obviously yearning to participate in a free and open democratic process. This is a goal which I have strongly supported, and continue to support.

The essence of democracy is to allow the people to make their own choices within a constitutional system. The essence of democracy is to prevent undue pressures which block the free workings of the political system, and which give unfair advantages to one side or the other. This is what I believe in. This is what the American people believe in.

In our electoral system, we believe that democracy cannot flourish if any political candidate is funded from a single, overwhelming source. At the same time, we believe that a broad base of funding, coming in small donations from the people themselves, is an important sign of healthy democracy, and in itself a partial test of fitness to serve.

Instead, what we had in El Salvador was a calculated plan to defeat the working of democracy in El Salvador. It implies a fear that the people in El Salvador do not know what is good for them, and cannot be trusted to make a proper decision. When we see the narrowness of the apparent margin despite the unfair odds, we see that the fears of the opponents of democracy were justified.

The support reportedly given to Mr. Duarte was not just direct funding, but also comprehensive, across-the-board services. The United States provided funds for 400 precinct organizers for Mr. Duarte, set up a model press operation, provided radio and TV studios, gave technical advice and paid for the computer voter registration system that disenfranchise 20 percent of the voters the first time around. If the CIA programed the computers, how can anyone trust the numbers?

It is not my contention that Mr. D'Aubuisson should have won. My contention is that the Salvadoran people should have had the right to choose without undue pressure from the U.S. Government. It is alleged that I am defending Mr. D'Aubuisson; I have met him only once, on a brief occasion when we both happened to attend a dinner several months ago. On the other hand, I have met Mr. Duarte many times; my staff has spent hours with him discussing his political philosophy. We are under no illusions

as to his aims and ideas. Only a total perversion of the terms of political dialogue can establish Mr. Duarte as a moderate. If Duarte is a centrist, then our former colleague, George McGovern, is an extreme right winger.

However, my reactions to the El Salvadorans candidates are of no consequence. It is not our choice, but the choice of the people of El Salvador that matters. Unfortunately, the people of El Salvador were not allowed to make a free choice.

It is necessary, therefore, to clear the air. The whole truth should come out, so that the people of El Salvador can take whatever steps they deem necessary in the light of the facts.

I would not presume to dictate, or even suggest, what they should now do, if anything—but neither should anyone else connected with the U.S. Government.

SEA-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE

Mr. MATHIAS. Madam President, the nuclear-armed sea-launched cruise missile (SLCM) countdown has begun. Some time between now and June 30, the United States will begin deployment of the nuclear SLCM. Unless something is done soon, some time within the next 53 days the United States will begin the slide down the slippery slope of instability, landing on a heap of broken arms control promises.

Current American arms control efforts are limited to sporadic multilateral activity in the Geneva Committee on Disarmament. These efforts, such as they are, represent steps in the right direction, but they are not enough. We must return to the START and INF negotiations and tackle all the hard issues, including nuclear SLCMs, while there is still time.

Given the current state of world affairs, the United States should be doing everything in its power to bring the Soviet Union back to the negotiating table. But I am not persuaded that the United States is doing all that it could.

The most glaring evidence to suggest that we are not trying our hardest is found in our stated intention to deploy the nuclear SLCM. If we were really pursuing all avenues to achieve arms control, we would think twice before deploying a missile that will undercut all existing American arms control proposals. Once deployed, the nuclear SLCM could make START, or any other accord, obsolete before it is signed. The time to halt nuclear SLCM deployments and get arms control back on track is now, before major deployments occur, and not after the fact. And the best way to achieve these goals is to impose a bilateral moratorium on American and Soviet nuclear SLCM deployments. Senator DAVE DURKIN and I proposed just that on May 3, and we invite all interested colleagues to consider our pro-

posed moratorium as a way to bring the U.S.S.R. back to the Geneva talks. It is in our mutual interest to have those talks succeed.

As I mentioned before, time is running out. There are just 54 days before we reach the point of no return signaled by the first nuclear SLCM deployment.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MATHIAS. Madam President, pursuant to the provisions of rule VI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I ask leave of the Senate to be absent on May 9, 10, and 11 for the purpose of attending a conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR STAR PRINT—SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 111

Mr. MATHIAS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Concurrent Resolution 11 be star printed to correct a printing error on page 3, line 1, of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. BAKER. Madam President, there are a number of items, seven items, on today's Calendar of Business which appear to be cleared on this side for action by unanimous consent. I refer to Calendar Orders Nos. 794, 836, 837, 839, 840, and 841. May I inquire of the minority leader if he is in a position to clear all or any portion of those measures for action by unanimous consent at this time?

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, there is no objection on this side of the aisle.

Mr. BAKER. Madam President, I may also say to the minority leader that one other item is cleared on this side. That is Calendar Order No. 707, H.R. 3240. However, I am advised that the distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) wishes to be present when that measure is taken up.

What I propose to do now, and indeed I will make this request for the consideration of the minority leader and other Senators, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Orders 794, 836, 837, 839, 840, and 841 be considered en bloc.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I have no objection to that request. The distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) is present. Since he had indicated his desire to be present at the time Calendar Order 707 is taken up, the majority leader may want to proceed with that immediately or following the six calendar orders to which he alluded with reference to voting en bloc.

Mr. BAKER. Very well. Since it would be dealt with en bloc and the