

Senator David Durenberger
U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

5/17/84

Dear Senator,

Your letter of the 10th again indicates that we are in substantial agreement, certainly in our hopes for Central America. I've thought most of the day about responding because I do not want to waste your time and, respectfully in some areas of disagreement, I've decided to ask you to think from another side on your given sets of facts.

Perhaps basic, because I am without question about your intentions, is the fact that you think as a Norte Americano, not as a Nicaraguan. You also disregard the most serious current underlying cause, our intervention, and reaction to it. And in spite of the considerable amount of time you've taken to learn what is going on there, you forget the history and experiences on which these people draw and in terms of which they react.

Most sincere and concerned Americans will interpret the "Pastoral Letter on Reconciliation" exactly as you do. In reading it I've marked seven passages that, in Nicaraguan terms, justify their complaints. The present government, I am certain, interprets that letter as a demand for its abdication. For one example, how would you as in that government react to the charge that it is "dishonest" to blame "foreign aggression" for any of their troubles? Is there any question at all? Have not our efforts to ruin them economically and our military efforts against them limited their choices and caused much if not most of the present troubles?

You say that "Honduras does face a significant threat from Nicaragua." Isn't it the fact that Honduras is the major sanctuary and staging ground for all the attacks on Nicaragua? If you were the Nicaraguan government would you ignore that and grant your enemies total immunity? How else would or could you fight back, defend yourself? And would you not with any other country doing the same thing? Is there any other way you could hope to survive?

We'll never know what would have developed in Nicaragua simply because we drove them the way they've gone by giving them no real alternatives.

And do you really think that Nicaragua has been as much involved in destabilization ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Honduras as Honduras has been in destabilizing Nicaragua?

It accomplishes nothing constructive in that area for us to make them look good and as our victims, which is what our policies and acts have done. Witness the speech of the President of Mexico, anything but a radical.

There is no possibility of any lasting solution until all intervention ends and these people are given time to work out their own destiny. No country will invade any other, so help ought not include any more military equipment of any kind. They need economic help and a shining example. Meanwhile, there also is no possibility that Nicaragua can overthrow the governments of any of its neighbors. If they leave Nicaragua alone, it has what is more important to it than bothering them.

My fear is that the longer we persist in our present policies the more they will be driven to extremes. And the longer it will require for them to even want to turn to a genuinely representative society.

You refer to the Pope's visit and the heckling, but have you forgotten his condemnation of the priests who were democratic and sought to help undo the effects of the long dictatorship and turn the people toward democracy? They also are condemned in the pastoral letter. I do not think either denunciation is at all helpful and I believe that in the end both will be counterproductive. ... We must live by and practice our traditional beliefs and abandon our dominating paranoia or we fail.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd.

ROBERT J. DOLE, KANS., CHAIRMAN

BOB PACKWOOD, OREG.
WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR., DEL.
JOHN C. DANFORTH, MO.
JOHN H. CHAFFEE, R.I.
JOHN HEINZ, PA.
MALCOLM WALLOP, WYO.
DAVID DURENBERGER, MINN.
WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG, COLO.
STEVEN D. BYMMS, IDAHO
CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, IOWA

RUSSELL B. LONG, LA.
LLOYD BENTSEN, TEX.
SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, HAWAII
DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN, N.Y.
MAX BAUCUS, MONT.
DAVID L. BOREN, OKLA.
BILL BRADLEY, N.J.
GEORGE J. MITCHELL, MAINE
DAVID PRYOR, ARK.

United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

RODERICK A. DEARMENT, CHIEF COUNSEL AND STAFF DIRECTOR
MICHAEL STERN, MINORITY STAFF DIRECTOR

May 10, 1984

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, Maryland 21701

Dear Harry:

Thank you for your continuing correspondence on Central America.

I would agree with you that we cannot force the governments of Central America into becoming democracies. Clearly, it is up to the people of these countries to develop their own democratic institutions. However, we in the United States can assist the democratization process through developmental assistance of various kinds. Over the long term, the social and economic stagnation of the region will be the greatest challenge that these nations face. In the short run, nearly all of these countries have serious security problems which must be addressed if our economic assistance is to be effective. That's why I believe that some military aid for several of these countries is necessary at this point.

I remain optimistic that the newly elected government of Napoleon Duarte can be effective if we in the United States do not vacillate in supporting his efforts to reform Salvadoran society. Such reforms will take time and they will be costly, but they are necessary. The U.S. Government, American business, private voluntary organizations, and individual citizens can and should play a role in this process of reform.

In Honduras, President Suazo Cordova has recently reasserted his authority over the Honduran military. This is a positive development as it strengthens the prospects of various democratic institutions in that country. We must continue to encourage the electoral process and to assist the Honduran economy. Unfortunately, Honduras does face a significant threat from Nicaragua as demonstrated by numerous attempts by Honduran dissidents to destabilize their government. Moreover, Nicaragua has been involved in the destabilization of not only Honduras, but Costa Rica, El Salvador, and Panama as well. I've examined the current situation in Nicaragua in some detail in a speech that I gave on May 1. I hope that you'll take the time to read it.

Sincerely,


David Durenberger
United States Senator

DD:soc

what is expected if they are brought into a full partnership with management and perceive themselves as having a real interest in the success of the enterprise. I am most pleased that these Maryland firms are helping to pave the way for a more productive and committed work force.●

KEEPING OUR PROMISE TO TAIWAN

● Mr. QUAYLE. Mr. President, I think most Americans look forward to better trade relations with the People's Republic of China and the promise such trade relations might hold for American export industries.

At the same time, I think that most Americans do not want to go back on any of our stated commitments to our ally and already strong trading partner, Taiwan. Certainly, this is President Reagan's position. He made this clear last Wednesday when he assured Taiwanese officials that the Taiwan Relations Act is still good law. As he noted in a recent interview with journalists from China, "we are not going to turn our backs on old friends in order to strengthen or make new friends."

In the case of Taiwan, this reflects good sense. Taiwan, after all, conducts much more trade with the United States than does the People's Republic of China. Also, the United States has had constant, good relations with the Republic of China far longer than we have had relations with the People's Republic of China.

In Taiwan we have a good friend. Certainly, we should do nothing in our pursuit of better trade relations with the People's Republic of China to prejudice the freedom and independence of the people under the Republic of China. This is the promise we must keep. To do otherwise would be a disturbing precedent for all of our loyal friends throughout the world.●

WHO REALLY WANTS NEGOTIATIONS IN NICARAGUA?

● Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, we learned on Easter Sunday that all nine of Nicaragua's Catholic bishops signed a pastoral letter to the leaders of the Nicaraguan Government concerning the need for political dialog among all Nicaraguans. In brief, the letter said, and I quote, "Dialog is necessary if we are to have social peace."

This statement would not seem objectionable or inflammatory, yet that is exactly how the Sandinista leadership of Nicaragua responded to it. In past months, Junta Coordinator Daniel Ortega and Interior Minister Tomas Borge had loudly and repeatedly stated that they favor dialog with Nicaragua's opposition and that they support free elections. Their response to the pastoral letter seems to put the lie to their earlier claims of willingness to engage in serious and comprehen-

sive negotiations with opposition elements. For example, Minister Borge states: "This is a criminal suggestion * * *. The Pastoral letter seeks confrontation and violates the law of the land." For his part, Mr. Ortega says that this letter "supports the plans of aggression of the North American administration against the Nicaraguan people" and that it is part of a "plan of internal destabilization."

My question would simply be this: What type of dialog do the Sandinistas really want? My answer would be: None, unless the opposition subordinates itself to the control of the Nicaraguan state. In Nicaragua, opposition is tolerated only to the extent that it provides window dressing. Any person or group with a claim on the affections of large numbers of Nicaraguans, or with the potential to make the Junta give up its privileged status while ordinary Nicaraguans do without, is considered intolerable by the Sandinistas. In short, anybody loyal to the original goals of the revolution is now viewed as a threat by Nicaragua's new autocrats.

There is more than enough blame to go around for this situation, and we in the United States certainly must recognize our share of responsibility for it. Nevertheless, the greatest blame for the tragedy of Nicaragua must rest with the Sandinista leadership. The Sandinistas made many pledges when they seized power in 1979: Establishment of a pluralistic democracy; creation of a mixed economy; protection of each citizen's rights from arbitrary infringement by the Government; and development of an independent and truly nonaligned Nicaragua. These are all admirable goals and ones which merit our support. Unfortunately, the Sandinista has repudiated these pledges and has sought to impose a dictatorship upon the Nicaraguan people.

It appears that the Sandinista leadership has decided to renew its policy of confrontation with the Catholic Church. Some of us are aware of their policy of harassment of church leaders practiced through 1981-82. As many may remember, Pope John Paul II visited Nicaragua about a year ago and was heckled and threatened by numerous Sandinista militants. For a time, the Sandinistas relaxed some of the constraints imposed upon the Catholic Church and seemed to act in a more conciliatory manner toward the church. However, the Sandinistas seem to have given up on negotiations with Catholic leaders. This is particularly unfortunate because the church is uniquely suited to serve as a mediator among the various factions that have embroiled Nicaragua in civil war. And let there be no mistake about this, Nicaragua is in the midst of a civil war.

Sandinista policies since 1979 have polarized and alienated numerous segments of Nicaraguan society, including the Catholic Church, the middle class,

and the various Indian minority groups of the Mosquitia region. To give you a brief illustration of the level of disenchantment within Nicaragua today, we need look at the number of Nicaraguan refugees in neighboring countries: In Panama, 20,000 Nicaraguans; in Costa Rica, at least 30,000 Nicaraguans; and in Honduras, 25,000 Nicaraguans. As you can imagine, these 75,000 Nicaraguans place a tremendous burden on these neighboring countries. Nevertheless, Nicaragua's Government denies that a refugee problem even exists or that its policies may have caused this exodus of its citizens.

We must also remember as well that much of the Nicaraguan opposition movement is not composed of former adherents of Anastasio Somoza's dictatorship. Yet, this is how the opposition to the Sandinistas is often portrayed in our press. Leaders of the opposition such as Violeta Chamorro, Alfonso Robelo, Arturo Cruz, and Eden Pastora fought Somoza's dictatorship of the right and now oppose the directorate's dictatorship of the left. These people all worked for the implementation of the original goals of the Nicaraguan revolution, yet the regime in which many of them served has now branded them as traitors.

I do not believe that men and women like Robelo and Chamorro are anything but loyal Nicaraguan patriots who also fervently believe in democracy and human rights. Various opposition leaders, both inside and outside Nicaragua, have repeatedly called for a comprehensive effort to peaceably resolve the civil war in Nicaragua. Sadly, the Sandinista directorate has given little more than lip service to these requests for conciliation. I have spoken with a number of individuals in the opposition and they all voice a willingness to open a political dialog with the Sandinista regime. To date, the Sandinistas have indicated that they will not negotiate with any individual who has taken up arms against the Nicaraguan Government and that they may not even permit the participation of many domestic opposition leaders in that country's upcoming elections.

In closing, I would echo the Washington Post's editorial of April 27 in saying that Messrs. Ortega and Borge and the rest of the Sandinista directorate should realize that peace will not return to Nicaragua unless there is a genuine peace dialog among all Nicaraguans. The Nicaraguans demand such a broad-based dialog in El Salvador—they should reciprocate in their country and set a good example for the rest of the Central American region by observing the call for peace of Nicaragua's Catholic Church.

Mr. President, I ask that the text of the pastoral letter and articles on the controversy from the Washington Post and the New York Times be printed in the Record.

The material follows:

PASTORAL LETTER ON RECONCILIATION FROM
THE NICARAGUAN BISHOPS

To the priests and deacons in our dioceses:

To members of religious orders:

To catechists and bearers of the Word:

To our brothers and sisters in the apostolic
lay movements:

To principals, teachers, and students in
Catholic schools:

To all our beloved faithful:

Grace and peace from God our Father and
Jesus Christ our Lord.

DEAR BROTHERS AND SISTERS: At this solemn Easter celebration, the ultimate expression of God's love for mankind through the redemption, we invite you to share more fully in the spiritual wealth of the Holy Year, which will be extended in Nicaragua by a special concession from Pope John Paul II until June 17, 1984, the feast of the Holy Trinity.

This extension and the urgent need in our society for sincere and brotherly reconciliation through individual conversion have moved us to send you this exhortation.

1. DOCTRINAL SETTING

1. *Sin, the root of all evil*

When sin came into the world, all things were changed profoundly; the soil yielded brambles; civilizations and institutions passed away; man himself rebelled against his fellow men, and the empire of tyranny and death began (cf. Gen. 3:16-19; 4:7-8).

Man, created in the image of God (Gen. 1:26) did not wish to acknowledge or glorify Him; man became vain in his imagination, and his foolish heart was darkened (Rom. 1:21). There were also those who, like Satan, disguised themselves as angels of light to deceive others and lead them to perdition. (cf. II Corinthians 11:14-15). A poorly understood anthropocentrism plunged mankind into the heavy bondage of sin.

2. *Redemption by Christ*

Christ, by His death and resurrection, has reconciled us to God, to ourselves, and to our brothers and sisters, has freed us from the bondage of sin (cf. Col. 1:20-22, Cor. 5:18), and has given His church the mission of transmitting His message, pardon, and grace (cf. Mt. 29:18-20, Mk. 15-20).

All this should be for us a call to conversion; it should be the beginning of a radical change in spirit, mind, and life (cf. John Paul II, Bull. "Open the Doors to the Redeemer," No. 5).

There are three aspects to this conversion which redeems our individual and collective lives:

(A) We must avoid personal sin, any act that disrupts our baptismal alliance with God.

(B) We must banish any sinful attitudes from our hearts, that is, any habitual rejection, whether conscious or unconscious, of Christian standards and moral values.

(C) We must put an end to such sins of society as participation in injustice and violence.

3. *Sin after the redemption*

Nonetheless, sin has persisted in the world since our redemption by Christ, because:

(A) Man abuses his freedom and does not accept God's grace.

(B) Society has become secularized and is no longer oriented toward God; it does not heed the church, the universal sacrament of salvation, but considers it an alienating institution.

(C) At times it claims to accept Christ and His teachings, but it repudiates the church

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, quotations throughout the letter have been translated without reference to any official English text.

and thereby falls into the temptation of establishing other "churches" than the one founded by the apostles and their successors, the legitimate bishops.

(D) We forget that coexistence can only be based on an accurate perception of the individual as an intelligent, free, and religious human being, with rights and duties devolving from his very nature (cf. John XXIII, Enc. *Pacem in Terris* No. 9-10).

(E) Materialistic concepts of mankind distort the person and teachings of Christ, reduce man to merely physical terms without taking account of his spiritual nature, so he remains subject to physical forces called the "dialectics of history." And man, alienated from God and from himself, becomes disoriented, without moral and religious reference points, without a higher nature, insecure and violent.

II. OUR SITUATION

1. *The problem of sin in the world*

Pope John Paul II, in his message for the 17th World Day of Prayer for Peace on January 1, 1984, expressed his concern about the current world situation, a concern which we, too, share: "Peace is truly precarious, and injustice abounds. Relentless warfare is occurring in many countries, continuing on and on despite the proliferation of deaths, mourning, and destruction, without any apparent progress toward a solution. It is often the innocent who suffer, while passions become inflamed and there is the risk that fear will lead to an extreme situation."

2. *In Nicaragua*

A. *Belligerent Situation*

Our country, too, is plagued by a belligerent situation pitting Nicaraguan against Nicaraguan, and the consequences of this situation could not be sadder:

Many Nicaraguan youths and men are dying on the battlefields.

Many others look toward the future with the fear of seeing their own lives prematurely ended.

A materialistic and atheistic educational system is undermining the consciences of our children.

Many families are divided by political differences.

The suffering of mothers who have lost their children, which should merit our great respect, is instead exploited to incite hatred and feed the desire for vengeance.

Farmworkers and Indians, for whom the Church reserves a special love, are suffering, living in constant anxiety, and many of them are forced to abandon their homes in search of a peace and tranquility that they do not find.

Some of the mass media, using the language of hate, encourage a spirit of violence.

B. *The Church*

One, albeit small, sector of our Church has abandoned ecclesiastical unity and surrendered to the tenets of a materialistic ideology. This sector sows confusion inside and outside Nicaragua through a campaign extolling its own ideas and defaming the legitimate pastors and the faithful who follow them. Censorship of the media makes it impossible to clarify the positions and offer other points of view.

3. *Foreign interference*

Foreign powers take advantage of our situation to encourage economic and ideological exploitation. They see us as support for their power, without respect for our persons, our history, our culture, and our right to decide our own destiny.

Consequently, the majority of the Nicaraguan people live in fear of their present and uncertainty of their future. They feel deep frustration, clamor for peace and freedom.

Yet their voices are not heard, muted by belligerent propaganda on all sides.

4. *The root of these evils*

This situation is rooted in the sin of each and every one, in injustice and oppression, in exploitative greed, in political ambition and abuse of power, in disregard for moral and religious values, in lack of respect for human dignity, in forgetting, abandoning, and denying God.

III. RESPONSE OF THE CHURCH

1. *Conversion and reconciliation*

The Church ardently desires and encourages peace and tranquility and believes that there is only one path to that end, conversion. This means that we must all turn our eyes and heart to God, our Father, who through Christ offers us the true path to reconciliation, forgiveness, and peace.

"It is not behavior alone that needs to be changed, but the heart that guides our lives. At the community level it is important to examine ourselves as persons, as groups and social units, not only as victims but also as authors of certain collective deviations from God's plan, in order to implement together God's plan for constructive human endeavor." (cf. Peace and Conversion, a Pontifical document issued by the Commission on Justice and Peace at Rome on September 30, 1983.)

The entire universe is the object of redemption since it also reveals the glory of God and must be sanctified and consecrated to God (cf. Vatican II, Const. *Lumen Gentium*, No. 34). Christ resurrected is at the center of history and of the world, leading us toward its full maturity and its final liberation from all the forces of evil (cf. Vatican II, Const. *Lumen Gentium*, No. 48).

2. *Confession: The path of conversion*

John Paul II in his address on reform and holiness given at Rome on November 26, 1983, said: "To assist such conversion, the Lord instituted the sacrament of reconciliation. In it Christ Himself goes to meet the man oppressed by the awareness of his own weakness. He raises him and gives him the necessary strength to continue his path. With the sacrament the life of the Resurrected Christ enters the spirit of the believer, bringing forth renewed generosity of purpose and an enhanced capacity to live by the Gospel."

Jesus reconciled all things, bringing peace through the Cross (Col:20) and transmitted this power to His disciples (cf. Jn4:21, 13:34-35, 12-17).

Preparing to receive the benefits of the sacrament of confession is an important step in conversion. A sincere examination of our sins, self-criticism of our attitudes and our life, these reveal to us our faults and make us abhor sin which is an offense against God, an affront to the Church, and damage or injury to our neighbor. It encourages us to turn totally to God and to reform our lives, it brings us back to the Church and closer to our brothers.

3. *Dialogue*

The road to social peace is possible through dialogue, sincere dialogue that seeks truth and goodness. "That [dialogue] must be a meaningful and generous offer of a meeting of good intentions and not a possible justification for continuing to foment dissension and violence." (John Paul II, Greeting to Nicaragua, March 4, 1983)

It is dishonest to constantly blame internal aggression and violence on foreign aggression.

It is useless to blame the evil past for everything without recognizing the problems of the present.

All Nicaraguans inside and outside the country must participate in this dialogue, regardless of ideology, class, or partisan belief. Furthermore, we think that Nicaraguans who have taken up arms against the Government must also participate in this dialogue. If not, there will be no possibility of a settlement, and our people, especially the poorest among them, will continue to suffer and die.

The dialogue of which we speak is not a tactical truce to strengthen positions for further struggle but a sincere effort to seek appropriate solutions to the anguish, pain, exhaustion, and fatigue of the many, many people who long for peace, the many, many people who want to live, to rise from the ashes, to see the warmth of a smile on a child's face, far from terror, in a climate of democratic harmony.

The terrible chain of reactions inherent in friend-enemy dialectics is halted by the word of God, who demands that we love even our enemies and that we forgive them. He urges us to move from distrust and aggressiveness to respect and harmony, in a climate conducive to true and objective deliberation on our problems and a prudent search for solutions. The solution is reconciliation. (cf. John Paul II, Peace and Reconciliation. Address by the Pope in El Salvador, March 6, 1983).

If we are not open to objective acknowledgment of our situation and the events that distress our people ideologically, politically, and militarily, then we are not prepared, in a true and Christian way, for reconciliation for the sake of the real, living wholeness of our nation.

Considering that freedom of speech is a vital part of the dignity of a human being, and as such is indispensable to the well-being of the nation inasmuch as a country progresses only when there is freedom to generate new ideas, the right to free expression of one's ideas must be recognized.

The great powers, which are involved in this problem for ideological or economic reasons, must leave the Nicaraguans free from coercion.

CONCLUSION

If we want our conversion to find true expression in the life of our national community, we must strive to lead lives worthy of the Gospel (cf. Ph 1:27, Ep 4:1), reject all lies, all harmful or offensive words, all anger and evil utterance, and be benevolent and forgive generously as God forgave us through Christ (cf. Ep 4:25-32, Co 13:12-14).

It behooves us to value each life as a gift of God, help the young to find meaning and value in their lives and prepare themselves for their future roles in society, forgive enemies and adversaries, facilitate the return of those who have left their country and welcome them with an open heart, free those imprisoned for ideological differences, create a climate of friendship and peace conducive to social harmony.

"In the great task of bringing peace and reconciliation to the nation, the family as the basic unit of society cannot be ignored. Nor can respect for its rights." (Cf. Gaudium et Spes N.52, quoted by John Paul II in his address to the bishops of El Salvador, February 24, 1984).

May the Holy Virgin, who played her part in our redemption with such exemplary fortitude, provide us with the necessary strength to perform our Christian duty of love and peace.

And may the Lord of Peace grant us all, always and in all our endeavors, the peace and tranquility which we seek (cf. 2 Th 3:16).

Done at Managua, April 22, Easter Sunday, 1984 (to be read and published in

the usual manner), Episcopal Conference of Nicaragua.

Pablo A. Vega, Bishop of Juigalpa, President; Bosco Vivas Robelo, Assistant Bishop of Managua, Secretary; Miguel Obando Bravo, Archbishop of Managua; Julian Barni, Bishop of Leon; Leovigildo Lopez Fitoria, Bishop of Grenada; Ruben Lopez Ardon, Bishop of Estelí; Salvador Schlaefter B., Bishop of Bluefields, Carlos Santí, Bishop of Matagalpa; Pedro L. Vilchez V., Prelate of Jinotega.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 26, 1984]

NICARAGUAN ASSAILS BISHOPS IN RENEWED CONFLICT

(By Richard J. Meislin)

MANAGUA, NICARAGUA, April 25.—A top Nicaraguan leader today condemned a call by the country's Roman Catholic bishops for talks with the opposition, saying that it was part of a "plan of internal destabilization."

The leader, Daniel Ortega Saavedra, coordinator of the Nicaraguan junta, charged that the nine bishops were "repeating the policy" of the Reagan Administration. He said their position, expressed in a pastoral letter, "supports the plans of aggression of the North American Administration against the Nicaraguan people."

Mr. Ortega's remarks, published in the official newspaper Barricada, reflected renewed frictions between the Sandinista Government and the Roman Catholic Church. The way in which the issue has developed, meanwhile, demonstrated the manner in which information and opinion reaches the Nicaraguan public.

The pastoral letter, signed by Nicaragua's nine Catholic bishops, was issued Easter Sunday. It said that "dialogue is necessary if we are to have social peace" and added:

"All Nicaraguans, within the country or abroad, without regard to their ideology, class or political affiliation, should participate in this dialogue. Moreover, we believe that those Nicaraguans who have taken up arms against the Government should participate."

PUBLICATION BARRED AT FIRST

The position of the bishops ran counter to that of the Government, which has repeatedly vowed not to negotiate with the anti-Sandinista rebels. Mr. Ortega said that it was "totally absurd" that the bishops, who he said "have rejected a dialogue with the people and the revolution, on the other hand want us to have a dialogue with the assassins."

The Government initially responded to the pastoral letter by barring its publication. On Monday, the official Sandinista newspaper—the only paper to mention the letter—published a sarcastic article about the bishops' call under the headline, "Bishops ask 'pardon' for the Somocistas."

Much of the criticism in the article stemmed from the bishops' lack of emphasis on outside causes for Nicaragua's problems. The Government regularly asserts that the guerrilla opposition lacks any internal support and functions only because of United States backing.

The pastoral letter said that it was "not always honest to justify internal aggressions and violence on aggressions from outside." But it criticized the superpowers as well, saying that "they see us as an object to support their power, without respecting our people, our history, our culture and our right to decide our own destiny."

ON THE SIDE OF IMPERIALISM

Although the text of the letter had not yet been made public, Tuesday morning's issue of Barricada quoted the mother of a

young man who died in the 1979 uprising here as having asked "How is it possible that the bishops propose that the people talk to the assassins?" She said the bishops were "on the side of imperialism, of the traitors."

Other mothers of fallen soldiers, whom the newspaper described as representing "moral authority," were quoted in a similar vein.

The same day's issue of El Nuevo Diario, another pro-Government newspaper, published an editorial roundly denouncing the pastoral letter and asking, among other things: "Can the authors of this document present one single mother of a martyr who would confirm that she has been manipulated to hate and seek revenge?"

El Nuevo Diario's editorial appeared directly under a photograph of President Reagan and his wife, Nancy, frolicking in the waters off Hawaii, over the caption, "Happy while the world burns." Beside the editorial was another article reporting the statement of Bishop Paul Moore Jr. of the Episcopal Diocese of New York on Sunday that the Reagan Administration's Central American policy was "illegal, inconsistent, ill-advised and immoral."

FULL TEXT IS PUBLISHED

The full text of the pastoral letter appeared in Tuesday evening's issue of La Prensa, an independent newspaper that frequently spars with the Government.

It was preceded by an explanation from the Interior Ministry, which said that it was authorizing the publication "because of superior orders," even though the letter "contains violations of the laws of our country and positions in open confrontation with the revolution."

It added that it was for the people to "judge the positions of the top ecclesiastical hierarchy."

La Prensa, which has refused to publish several times rather than submit to Government censorship, has published no reaction or commentary about the pastoral letter.

[From The Washington Post, April 26, 1984]

SANDINISTA OFFICIAL ASSAILS BISHOPS' BID FOR TALKS

(By Bernd Debusmann)

MANAGUA, NICARAGUA, April 25.—Interior Minister Tomas Borge has branded as "criminal" a call by the country's Roman Catholic bishops for peace talks, rejecting any negotiations with U.S.-backed insurgents.

"We will never negotiate with the Contras," Borge said in an interview, using the term for right-wing rebels armed and financed by the CIA.

In a pastoral letter read in most of Nicaragua's churches over Easter, the nine Roman Catholic bishops suggested a dialogue for peace involving all Nicaraguans, including those "who have risen in arms against the government."

"This is a criminal suggestion," Borge said. "The pastoral letter seeks confrontation and violates the law of the land."

The rebel forces includes senior former members of ousted dictator Anastasio Somoza's National Guard, the only Nicaraguan organization which was formally declared illegal after Somoza's removal in a broad-based popular revolution spear-headed by the Sandinista National Liberation Front.

Borge, the only surviving founder-member of the front, said the bishops' pastoral letter was "more radical in its anti-Nicaraguan tone . . . than even statements by Kirkpatrick."

Jeane Kirkpatrick, U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, is seen here as a leading

proponent of military force to oust the nine Sandinista commanders who effectively run Nicaragua.

Diplomats said the pastoral letter and the Sandinistas' angry reaction to it could herald a new round of confrontation between the church hierarchy and the state.

Church-state tensions were thrown into sharp focus a year ago when Pope John Paul II visited here and harshly criticized the Sandinista-promoted "popular church," whose priests see no conflict between Christianity and left-wing revolution.

The bishops' pastoral letter at Easter said, "The road through which social peace can be achieved necessarily leads through dialogue. All Nicaraguans inside and outside the country should participate in this dialogue, regardless of ideology, class or party position. What is more, we feel that Nicaraguans who have risen in arms against the government must participate."

The Associated Press reported another development from The Hague:

Former State Department legal adviser Abram Chayes told the World Court today "there can be no doubt" that the United States is violating the charter of the United Nations by supporting rebels fighting the Nicaraguan government.

Chayes spoke on behalf of Nicaragua during the first day of preliminary hearings on a complaint Nicaragua filed against the United States. Both Nicaragua and the United States are arguing their cases in the preliminary hearings, although the United States has rejected the court's jurisdiction.

The court granted a one-day recess requested by the U.S. delegation to allow it to "prepare its case," a court source said.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 27, 1984]

ADVICE FOR MANAGUA

President Reagan has been receiving much good advice, from Congress and, especially generously, from the press, on the subject of Nicaragua. But Nicaragua needs some good advice, too. If Central America is eventually to settle down. It could most usefully come from the Willy Brandt-type social democrats in Europe and those liberals elsewhere who tend to coddle the Sandinistas, and from the larger group that has faulted the interventionist aspects of President Reagan's policy. We have in mind two points.

The ruling Sandinistas stand strongly behind the demand of the Salvadoran guerrillas to be admitted to a "power-sharing" process in El Salvador. In Nicaragua, however, the nine comandantes reject any thought of admitting Nicaraguan guerrillas to power-sharing or even to the elections the regime now plans on Nov. 4. After the country's Catholic bishops called for a peace dialogue involving all Nicaraguans, including those "who have risen in arms against the government"—such dialogue is the left's constant appeal in El Salvador—the Sandinista police chief denounced the call as "criminal." The Sandinistas insist they will not open their elections—elections they seem intent on running in the Soviet style anyway—to the Nicaraguan contras even if the guerrillas lay down their arms.

The Sandinistas, by way of seeking international support, are now broadcasting news of the considerable damage done by the contras. People are being killed in military engagements, but many of the targets are economic and civilian in character, and the results are commonly measured in dollar terms or in terms of hardships inflicted upon the population. The Sandinistas, of course, show no similar dismay over the substantially greater damage done to economic and civilian targets by the guerrillas whose

operations they encourage in El Salvador. Some on the left suggest it is all right to destroy, say, a coffee plantation belonging to an "oligarch." This is rubbish. Peasants work on plantations; Nicaragua's friends in El Salvador have also shot up the bus fleet, which transports the poor.

There is great need for a single standard in judging political events in Central America. There is a need for it in Washington and a need for it in Managua, too. ■

MARGARET HAZARD, A BORN DEMOCRAT

● Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I should like to share with my colleagues the sad news of the death of Margaret M. Hazard, the matriarch of Rhode Island's Democratic Party, who died on Sunday at the age of 101.

She cast her first vote for President in the 1924 election, when she voted a straight Democratic ticket—a practice she continued throughout her life.

Her formal involvement with the Democratic Party started in 1948 when she was a delegate to the National Democratic Convention in Philadelphia and she has been a delegate to each one ever since.

The Democratic Party, both in Rhode Island and nationally, will miss her pioneering spirit, her wisdom, and her charm. I had looked forward to working with her once again at the 1984 Democratic Convention.

Regardless of political party affiliation, I know Rhode Islanders and citizens throughout the Nation join me in mourning her passing and in treasuring her legacy.

I should like to share with my colleagues a brief tribute to her legacy that appeared in the Providence (R.I.) Journal on May 1, 1984, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

MARGARET HAZARD, SPIRITED PUBLIC SERVANT

The Democrats will have to get along without Margaret M. Hazard at their national convention this summer in San Francisco. It will be no small loss: the tiny North Kingstown woman probably would have given the party the distinction of being first with a centenarian in its delegate ranks. Mrs. Hazard was a regular since 1948 (except in 1972) at such presidential-nomination sessions. Despite advancing age, she was always a spirited participant, just as she was in Rhode Island political affairs.

"Aunt Margaret," as she was known within the party, was wooed biennially by candidates for the Democratic state ticket. In earlier days, during her half-century on the party's state committee, her support carried special weight. As a deputy clerk for decades of the old district court in Wickford and Wakefield, her endorsement just about put South County's imprimatur on an aspirant. As she became an elder stateswoman, a recommendation from Aunt Margaret still was sought, for its sentimental as well as practical value.

One convention at which she showed her mettle was the 1968 embroglio in Chicago, the scene of violent Vietnam War protests. Tightly guarded buses transported delegates from their hotels to the Stockyards convention center, which was ringed with fencing, and national guardsmen. Mrs. Hazard, then 85, took all the turmoil in stride. Though the security measures didn't deliver dele-

gates back to bed until well after midnight, she was invariably first on line each morning for the return trip to the arena, meantime soothing colleagues concerned about their safety.

Probably the only thing that could have kept her from San Francisco this July was her death, which occurred Sunday at age 101. To the very end, Aunt Margaret remained the darling of state politicians—Republicans, too. Her charm as well as her longevity had put her above partisanship. All will miss her. ■

HOME HEALTH CARE

● Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, my colleagues and I have had many discussions about community-based services and their importance in the care of frail elderly and disabled. I know that many other Senators share my interest and support for these services. I was therefore pleased to learn that a home health agency from my home State of Ohio, the Visiting Nurse Service (VNS) of Toledo, was recently chosen the agency of the month by the National Association for Home Care.

The Toledo VNS was founded in 1902 and incorporated in 1908 as the Toledo District Nurse Association (TDNA). For more than 80 years the agency has provided nursing, home health, and therapeutic services. It currently makes 50,000 home visits a year, and in 1982, the VNS/TDNA provided care to 3,763 individuals.

Home health services are particularly vital for the elderly, who often suffer from multiple chronic conditions which severely limit their ability to care for themselves. Once stabilized through the services of agencies like the VNS/TDNA, these individuals are often able to remain at home. The VNS/TDNA also assists families caring for young children or adults who would otherwise require hospitalization or prolonged institutionalization.

In the past I have sponsored legislation to extend the services of home health agencies and have supported resolutions recognizing the importance of these valuable programs. This includes measures such as National Nurse Recognition Day on May 6 which acknowledges one of the health professionals so responsible for the success of home care.

I ask that the article, "Visiting Nurse Service of Toledo—Eighty-three Years of Caring" from the April issue of Caring be printed in the RECORD so my colleagues can share in my appreciation for this fine organization.

The article follows:

VISITING NURSE SERVICE OF TOLEDO—EIGHTY-THREE YEARS OF CARING

The Visiting Nurse Service of the Toledo District Nurse Association (VNS/TDNA) has been caring for elderly and disabled persons for over eighty-three years. During that time they've given 4.3 million home visits to needy persons.