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United States Senate

MEMORANDUM

SENATOR:

Attached is the press copy of your foreign policy speech to the ILWU which the Democratic Leader's office has expressed an interest in reading into the Record.

Dan
9-20-83

from the office of

Senator DANIEL K. INOUYE
of Hawaii

SENATOR:

Senator Byrd's office has expressed an interest in having the Leader read your ILWU foreign policy speech into the record.

Do you have any interest in Senator Byrd doing so? If you do, I will provide them with a copy of your approved press release.

Dan
HONOLULU, HAWAII-- I wish to take this opportunity to report on three matters of great concern to our nation: first, the destruction of Korean Air Lines Flight 007; second, Lebanon; and third, Central America.

With regard to Flight 007, much has been said about the Soviet Union shooting down a Korean Air Lines 747 on August 31, 1983. There is no question in anyone's mind now that the Soviet Union fired missiles at the aircraft, thus causing the death of 269 innocent men, women, and children. However, there are aspects of this tragic and barbaric episode that have not been appropriately discussed -- aspects which concern me as much as the shooting itself. For example, Soviet leaders have indicated that they had the plane under surveillance for more than two hours. If they are to be believed, they assumed throughout this period that the aircraft was a spy plane on an intelligence gathering mission. And in fact, the voice tapes suggest that this assumption was held up until the final minutes before the shooting. If the Soviets actually thought the plane was on a spy mission deep within Soviet airspace, why did they not pick up the hot line and call Washington? After all, this special phone system was established for emergencies of this nature. The Soviets should have known that if it were in fact a KC 135 on a deliberate spy mission, shooting it down may have precipitated a much more severe crisis than the one we already have. If it were a Korean aircraft on a proxy mission for the United States, we would have known about it and could have ordered it back in a hurry. My question is thus: why didn't Andropov ask us about the presence of this aircraft and its purpose before resorting to violence?
The downing of KAL Flight 7 raises a second issue: we should insist -- and I see no reason why the Soviets should continue to deny this request -- that ships from neutral countries be permitted into Soviet territorial waters to search for debris, the black box which contains crucial information about the last minutes of the doomed aircraft, and human remains. I cannot see any justification for the Soviets denying this simple request.

A third related issue is the unbelievable statement by the Soviet foreign minister, Mr. Gromyko, which should be roundly condemned by the family of nations. Rather than apologize for the incident, he denounced Korea's "criminal" violation of the Soviet Union's "sacred" borders and indicated that the USSR would do it again if it deemed such action necessary. This attitude, reinforced by Soviet Chief of Staff Nikolai Ogarkov in his recent press conference wherein he defended the Soviet Union's actions, places in jeopardy all aircraft which are presently required to follow routes near Soviet borders. Soviets, like all other nations, should be aware that even in this day of high technology, engine malfunctions and equipment failures are commonplace. We should demand that they reassess their policy and desist from such alarmist statements.

Until that time, we can only wonder at the statement made by Nikolai Podgorny when he said on the 50th anniversary of Soviet Civil Aviation in 1973: "we set human life and well-being above everything else."

The second foreign policy matter I want to address is Lebanon. The presence of the multinational peace-keeping forces in and around Beirut is a "fait accompli." These forces consist of 4,800 men from four different countries: the United States (1,200), Great Britain (100), France (2,000), and Italy (1,500). Although some in the United States questioned the wisdom of sending marines on a peace-keeping mission to war-torn Lebanon, the fact is that they are there today. These troops were ordered to the region by the President of the United States in his capacity as commander-in-chief of our armed forces. However, since August 25, 1982, when the marines first arrived in Lebanon, circumstances have changed dramatically. We are now the targets of the hostile fire, and 4 marines have been killed, while over a dozen have been wounded. U.S. positions have been shelled, our men fired upon, and our forces have had to respond in kind.

I would now like to bring to your attention a section of the war powers resolution, which became law (PL 93-148) on November 7, 1973. This Act requires that the President, in the absence of a declaration of war, seek Congressional approval for the use of U.S. forces abroad anytime they are introduced "into hostilities
or into situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances" Section 4(a)(1).

There is no doubt in my mind that the President will be flouting the laws of the land if he continues to insist that hostilities do not exist in Lebanon and that he need not invoke the provisions of the War Powers Act. This measure was debated extensively in the Congress following our disastrous involvement in Vietnam. It stemmed directly from the vivid memories of our undeclared war in Southeast Asia, where we lost the lives of over 55,000 Americans and hurt or crippled thousands more. Since the Constitution of the United States says clearly that the Congress has the right to declare war, the passage of the War Powers Act was an attempt by Congress to ensure that this provision of the Constitution was upheld by all Presidents and that we would never find ourselves in another Vietnam-like undeclared war.

I hope that my calling upon the President to invoke the provisions of the War Powers Resolution is not seen as a partisan gesture. If I were truly partisan, I would let him carry on without Congressional approval and let him take the blame when his Administration got into trouble. Rather, as a member of Congress and a representative of approximately one million Americans living in Hawaii, I believe that whenever the United States is involved in a hostile military situation that will or may result in the loss of lives, the President, as commander in chief and a sworn defender of our Constitution, must obey the law. I thus believe that the President must immediately invoke Section 4(a)(1) of the War Powers Act and submit a report to the Congress detailing his reasons for our troops' presence in Lebanon and the nature of the hostilities they are facing.

The third major foreign policy matter confronting our country is Central America. Countries such as Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Honduras have been on the front pages for many months now. And yet the latest polls suggest that most Americans are still not sure just whose side we are on. It is not clear to many whether we are supporting the good guys or the bad guys -- or even who they are supposed to be. This confusion is understandable because many Americans still recall, our involvement in Central America and the Caribbean earlier this century.
For example, in Nicaragua, where we have intervened militarily three times since 1850, the United States played the role of midwife in the birth of the Somoza dynasty. In terms of corruption, terror, and human misery, the Somoza regime was second only to that of the Cuban dictator Fulgencio Batista. As some of you may remember, the government of Mr. Batista was one of the worst we have seen this century. To this day, there is still no full accounting of the hundreds of people who disappeared during his rule or the millions of dollars in bullion that evaporated from Cuba's treasury. The pain, suffering, and inequity of Batista is still vivid in the minds of many Cubans, as it is for many Americans.

I think it would be wise for us to recall that we supported Batista diplomatically, militarily, and economically. It can also be argued that we assisted in the rise of Fidel Castro. If it were not Castro, someone else would have stood up eventually to oppose the dictator Batista. A similar situation occurred in Nicaragua, where the Sandinistas have taken their name from an assassinated general and peasant leader, Augusto Sandino. As you may recall, Sandino was murdered on orders from General Somoza after he accepted the government's invitation to come to Managua for peace talks. Yet we supported both Batista and Somoza, largely because they knew the secret password to our foreign policy: "I am against Communism". On the basis of their avowed opposition to communism, we aided their corrupt, dictatorial regimes which subverted human rights and belied the very principles of democracy upon which our own nation was founded.

In viewing today's problems in Central America, I believe that it would be wise for the United States to review its past and present involvement, however painful, in each country. Perhaps then, with an adequate appreciation for the history of the region, answers to the area's problems may be forthcoming. In particular, I would suggest that seeking military solutions to economic and social problems perpetuates the human misery which now appears endemic in that part of the world.

Regrettably, I believe the United States is sending conflicting messages to Central America. For example, we say on the one hand that the key to stability in the region is in alleviating the human suffering and poverty found in most parts of Central America. We thus have had foreign assistance programs that are programmed to raise the region's standard of living and infuse its people with democratic ideals. On the other hand, we have incidents such as the one reported earlier this week whereby Fred Ickle, the number three man in the Defense Department, calls for a military victory in Central America, maintaining that negotiations cannot resolve the problems there.
Officially, we have stated that we support the efforts of the Contadora nations, who have recommended that (1) all foreign powers withdraw their advisors from Central America, (2) the area be demilitarized, (3) all nations respect and work for self-determination, and (4) conflicts be resolved through negotiations. These Contadora proposals are essential to stop all hostilities and military activities in order to create an atmosphere conducive to sensible discussions and negotiations.

Our President has indicated that the United States supports the Contadora proposals. However, at the same time, he ordered 4,000 combat troops to Honduras and two naval task forces to the waters off Nicaragua as part of our involvement in "military exercises". I do not see how these actions on our part will serve to establish a climate that would be conducive to sensible -- and sensitive -- negotiations. It is only logical for the Nicaraguans to respond in kind to our "maneuvers" by strengthening their military forces. If you don't believe this to be logical, look at our own reaction to the downing of the Korean Airliner by a Soviet fighter. The American public and the Congress have become somewhat more hawkish, and a reluctant Congress has now approved funds for the MX missile and additional programs for the Department of Defense. If we, sensible and logical Americans, respond in this fashion to the shooting of Korean Air Lines Flight 007, we cannot expect Nicaraguans to act otherwise.

As you know, I was recently appointed to serve as a senior councillor on the National Bipartisan Commission on Central America to fill the vacancy created by the tragic death of my colleague, Senator Henry Jackson. As a member of this body, my first suggestions will be to (1) postpone our military maneuvers in Honduras, and (2) withdraw our naval flotillas from the shores of Central America.

I regret that my message today has not been a happy or lighthearted one, but I am certain that you expect me to be as candid as I can be on reporting the state of the nation as I see it.

Thank you for your time and attention.
I WISH TO TAKE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO REPORT ON THREE MATTERS OF GREAT CONCERN TO OUR NATION: FIRST, THE DESTRUCTION OF KOREAN AIR LINES FLIGHT 007; SECOND, LEBANON; AND THIRD, CENTRAL AMERICA.

WITH REGARD TO FLIGHT 007, MUCH HAS BEEN SAID ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION SHOOTING DOWN A KOREAN AIR LINES 747 ON AUGUST 31, 1983. THERE IS NO QUESTION IN ANYONE'S MIND NOW THAT THE SOVIET UNION FIRED MISSILES AT THE AIRCRAFT, THUS CAUSING THE DEATH OF 269 INNOCENT MEN, WOMEN, AND CHILDREN. HOWEVER, THERE ARE ASPECTS OF THIS TRAGIC AND BARBARIC EPISODE THAT HAVE NOT BEEN APPROPRIATELY DISCUSSED--ASPECTS WHICH CONCERN ME AS MUCH AS THE SHOOTING ITSELF.
FOR EXAMPLE, SOVIET LEADERS HAVE INDICATED THAT THEY HAD
THE PLANE UNDER SURVEILLANCE FOR MORE THAN TWO HOURS.
IF THEY ARE TO BE BELIEVED, THEY ASSUMED THROUGHOUT THIS
PERIOD THAT THE AIRCRAFT WAS A SPY PLANE ON AN
INTELLIGENCE GATHERING MISSION. AND IN FACT, THE VOICE
TAPES SUGGEST THAT THIS ASSUMPTION WAS HELD UP UNTIL THE
FINAL MINUTES BEFORE THE SHOOTING. IF THE SOVIETS
ACTUALLY THOUGHT THE PLANE WAS ON A SPY MISSION DEEP
WITHIN SOVIET AIRSPACE, WHY DID THEY NOT PICK UP THE
HOT LINE AND CALL WASHINGTON? AFTER ALL, THIS SPECIAL
PHONE SYSTEM WAS ESTABLISHED FOR EMERGENCIES OF THIS
NATURE.
THE SOVIETS SHOULD HAVE KNOWN THAT IF IT WERE IN FACT A
KC 135 ON A DELIBERATE SPY MISSION, SHOOTING IT DOWN MAY
HAVE PRECIPITATED A MUCH MORE SEVERE CRISIS THAN THE ONE
WE ALREADY HAVE. IF IT WERE A KOREAN AIRCRAFT ON A PROXY
MISSION FOR THE UNITED STATES, WE WOULD HAVE KNOWN ABOUT
IT AND COULD HAVE ORDERED IT BACK IN A HURRY. MY
QUESTION IS thus: WHY DIDN'T ANDROPOV ASK US ABOUT THE
PRESENCE OF THIS AIRCRAFT AND ITS PURPOSE BEFORE RESORTING
TO VIOLENCE?

THE DOWNING OF KAL FLIGHT 7 RAISES A SECOND ISSUE:
WE SHOULD INSIST--AND I SEE NO REASON WHY THE SOVIETS
SHOULD CONTINUE TO DENY THIS REQUEST--
THAT SHIPS FROM NEUTRAL COUNTRIES BE PERMITTED INTO
SOVIET TERRITORIAL WATERS TO SEARCH FOR DEBRIS, THE
BLACK BOX WHICH CONTAINS CRUCIAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE
LAST MINUTE OF THE DOOMED AIRCRAFT, AND HUMAN REMAINS.
I CANNOT SEE ANY JUSTIFICATION FOR THE SOVIETS DENYING
THIS SIMPLE REQUEST.

A THIRD RELATED ISSUE IS THE UNBELIEVABLE STATEMENT
BY THE SOVIET FOREIGN MINISTER, MR. GROMYKO, WHICH SHOULD
BE ROUNDLY CONDEMned BY THE FAMILY OF NATIONS. RATHER
THAN APOLOGIZE FOR THE INCIDENT, HE DENOUNCED KOREA’S
"CRIMINAL" VIOLATION OF THE SOVIET UNION’S "SACRED"
BORDERS AND INDICATED THAT THE USSR WOULD DO IT AGAIN IF
IT DEEMED SUCH ACTION NECESSARY.
THIS ATTITUDE, REINFORCED BY SOVIET CHIEF OF STAFF
NIKOLAI OGARKOV IN HIS RECENT PRESS CONFERENCE WHEREIN HE
DEFENDED THE SOVIET UNION'S ACTIONS, PLACES IN JEOPARDY
ALL AIRCRAFT WHICH ARE PRESENTLY REQUIRED TO FOLLOW ROUTES
NEAR SOVIET BORDERS. SOVIETS, LIKE ALL OTHER NATIONS,
SHOULD BE AWARE THAT EVEN IN THIS DAY OF HIGH TECHNOLOGY,
ENGINE MALFUNCTIONS AND EQUIPMENT FAILURES ARE COMMONPLACE.
WE SHOULD DEMAND THAT THEY REASSESS THEIR POLICY AND
DESIST FROM SUCH ALARMIST STATEMENTS.

UNTIL THAT TIME, WE CAN ONLY WONDER AT THE STATEMENT
MADE BY NIKOLAI PODORGNY WHEN HE SAID ON THE 50TH
ANNIVERSARY OF SOVIET CIVIL AVIATION IN 1973: "WE SET
HUMAN LIFE AND WELL-BEING ABOVE EVERYTHING ELSE."
THE SECOND FOREIGN POLICY MATTER I WANT TO ADDRESS IS LEBANON. THE PRESENCE OF THE MULTINATIONAL PEACE-KEEPING FORCES IN AND AROUND BEIRUT IS A "FAIT ACCEMPLI." THESE FORCES CONSIST OF 4,800 MEN FROM FOUR DIFFERENT COUNTRIES: THE UNITED STATES (1,200), GREAT BRITAIN (100), FRANCE (2,000), AND ITALY (1,500). ALTHOUGH SOME IN THE UNITED STATES QUESTIONED THE WISDOM OF SENDING MARINES ON A PEACE-KEEPING MISSION TO WARTORN LEBANON, THE FACT IS THAT THEY ARE THERE TODAY. THESE TROOPS WERE ORDERED TO THE REGION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES IN HIS CAPACITY AS COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF OF OUR ARMED FORCES. HOWEVER, SINCE AUGUST 25, 1982, WHEN THE MARINES FIRST ARRIVED IN LEBANON, CIRCUMSTANCES HAVE CHANGED DRAMATICALLY.
WE ARE NOW THE TARGETS OF HOSTILE FIRE, AND 4 MARINES HAVE BEEN KILLED, WHILE OVER A DOZEN HAVE BEEN WOUNDED. U.S. POSITIONS HAVE BEEN SHELLED, OUR MEN FIRED UPON, AND OUR FORCES HAVE HAD TO RESPOND IN KIND.

I WOULD NOW LIKE TO BRING TO YOUR ATTENTION A SECTION OF THE WAR POWERS RESOLUTION, WHICH BECAME LAW (PL 93-148) ON NOVEMBER 7, 1973. THIS ACT REQUIRES THAT THE PRESIDENT, IN THE ABSENCE OF A DECLARATION OF WAR, SEEK CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL FOR THE USE OF U.S. FORCES ABROAD ANYTIME THEY ARE INTRODUCED "INTO HOSTILITIES OR INTO SITUATIONS WHERE IMMINENT INVOLVEMENT IN HOSTILITIES IS CLEARLY INDICATED BY THE CIRCUMSTANCES" (SECTION 4(A)(1)).
THERE IS NO DOUBT IN MY MIND THAT THE PRESIDENT WILL BE FLOUTING THE LAWS OF THE LAND IF HE CONTINUES TO INSIST THAT HOSTILITIES DO NOT EXIST IN LEBANON AND THAT HE NEED NOT INVOKE THE PROVISIONS OF THE WAR POWERS ACT RESOLUTION. THIS RESOLUTION WAS DEBATED EXTENSIVELY--IN THE CONGRESS FOLLOWING OUR DISASTROUS INVOLVEMENT IN VIETNAM. IT STEMMED DIRECTLY FROM THE VIVID MEMORIES OF OUR UNDECLARED WAR IN SOUTHEAST ASIA, WHERE WE LOST THE LIVES OF OVER 55,000 AMERICANS AND HURT OR CRIPPLED THOUSANDS MORE. SINCE THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES SAYS CLEARLY THAT THE CONGRESS HAS THE RIGHT TO DECLARE WAR.
THE PASSAGE OF THE WAR POWERS RESOLUTION WAS AN ATTEMPT
BY CONGRESS TO ENSURE THAT THIS PROVISION OF THE
CONSTITUTION WAS UPHELD BY ALL PRESIDENTS AND THAT WE
WOULD NEVER FIND OURSELVES IN ANOTHER VIETNAM-LIKE
UNDECLARED WAR.

I HOPE THAT MY CALLING UPON THE PRESIDENT TO INVOKE
THE PROVISIONS OF THE WAR POWERS RESOLUTION IS NOT SEEN
AS A PARTISAN GESTURE. IF I WERE TRULY PARTISAN, I WOULD
LET HIM CARRY ON WITHOUT CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL AND LET
HIM TAKE THE BLAME WHEN HIS ADMINISTRATION GOT INTO
TROUBLE. RATHER, AS A MEMBER OF CONGRESS AND A
REPRESENTATIVE OF APPROXIMATELY ONE MILLION AMERICANS
LIVING IN HAWAII.
I believe that whenever the United States is involved in a hostile military situation that will or may result in the loss of lives, the President, as Commander and Chief and a sworn defender of our Constitution, must obey the law. I thus believe that the President must immediately invoke section 4(a)(1) of the War Powers Act and submit a report to the Congress detailing his reasons for our troops' presence in Lebanon and the nature of the hostilities they are facing.

The third major foreign policy matter confronting our country is Central America. Countries such as Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Honduras have been on the front pages for many months now.
AND YET THE LATEST POLLS SUGGEST THAT MOST AMERICANS ARE STILL NOT SURE JUST WHOSE SIDE WE ARE ON. IT IS NOT CLEAR TO MANY WHETHER WE ARE SUPPORTING THE GOOD GUYS OR THE BAD GUYS—OR EVEN WHO THEY ARE SUPPOSED TO BE. THIS CONFUSION IS UNDERSTANDABLE BECAUSE, AS SOME OF US WILL RECALL, OUR INVOLVEMENT IN CENTRAL AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN EARLIER THIS CENTURY.

FOR EXAMPLE, IN NICARAGUA, WHERE WE HAVE INTERVENED MILITARILY THREE TIMES SINCE 1850, THE UNITED STATES PLAYED THE ROLE OF MIDWIFE IN THE BIRTH OF THE SOMOZA DYNASTY.

IN TERMS OF CORRUPTION, TERROR, AND HUMAN MISERY, THE SOMOZA REGIME WAS SECOND ONLY TO THAT OF THE CUBAN DICTATOR FULGENCIO BATISTA. AS SOME OF YOU MAY REMEMBER,
The government of Mr. Batista was one of the worst we have seen this century. To this day, there is still no full accounting of the hundreds of people who disappeared during his rule or the millions of dollars in bullion that evaporated from Cuba's treasury. The pain, suffering, and inequity of Batista is still vivid in the minds of many Cubans, as it is for many Americans.

I think it would be wise for us to recall that we supported Batista diplomatically, militarily, and economically. It can also be argued that we assisted in the rise of Fidel Castro: if it were not Castro, someone else would have stood up eventually to oppose the dictator Batista.
A similar situation occurred in Nicaragua, where the Sandinistas have taken their name from an assassinated general and peasant leader, Augusto Sandino. As you may recall, Sandino was killed on orders from Anastasio Somoza after he accepted the government's invitation to come to Managua for peace talks. Yet we supported both Batista and Somoza, largely because they knew the secret password to "I am against communism." Our foreign policy: "anti-communism" on the basis of their avowed opposition to communism, we aided corrupt, dictatorial regimes which subverted human rights and belied the very principles of democracy upon which our own nation is founded.
IN VIEWING TODAY'S PROBLEMS IN CENTRAL AMERICA, I BELIEVE THAT IT WOULD BE WISE FOR THE UNITED STATES TO REVIEW ITS PAST AND PRESENT INVOLVEMENT, HOWEVER PAINFUL, IN EACH COUNTRY. PERHAPS THEN, WITH AN ADEQUATE APPRECIATION FOR THE HISTORY OF THE REGION, ANSWERS TO THE AREA'S PROBLEMS MAY BE FORTHCOMING. IN PARTICULAR, I WOULD SUGGEST THAT SEEKING MILITARY SOLUTIONS TO ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS PERPETUATES THE HUMAN MISERY WHICH NOW APPEARS ENDEMIC IN THAT PART OF THE WORLD.

REGRETADELY, I BELIEVE THE UNITED STATES IS SENDING CONFLICTING MESSAGES TO CENTRAL AMERICA. FOR EXAMPLE, WE SAY ON THE ONE HAND THAT THE KEY TO STABILITY IN THE REGION IN ALLEVIATING THE HUMAN SUFFERING AND POVERTY THERE, FOUND IN MOST PARTS OF CENTRAL AMERICA.
WE THUS HAVE PROGRAMS THAT ARE WORKING TO RAISE THE PEOPLE'S STANDARD OF LIVING AND INFUSE THEM WITH DEMOCRATIC IDEALS. ON THE OTHER HAND, WE HAVE INCIDENTS SUCH AS THE ONE REPORTED EARLIER THIS WEEK WHEREBY FRED ICKLE, THE NUMBER THREE MAN IN THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT, CALLED FOR A MILITARY VICTORY IN CENTRAL AMERICA, SAYING THAT NEGOTIATIONS CANNOT RESOLVE THE PROBLEMS THERE. IN MUCH THE SAME WAY, WE HAVE STATED THAT OFFICIALLY WE SUPPORT THE EFFORTS OF THE CONTADORA NATIONS, WHO HAVE RECOMMENDED THAT (1) ALL FOREIGN POWERS WITHDRAW THEIR ADVISERS FROM CENTRAL AMERICA, (2) THE AREA BE DEMILITARIZED, (3) ALL NATIONS RESPECT AND WORK FOR SELF-DETERMINATION, AND (4) CONFLICTS BE RESOLVED THROUGH NEGOTIATIONS.
AS AN ASIDE, I WOULD SAY THAT ALL OF THESE RECOMMENDATIONS ARE ESSENTIAL.

TO STOP ALL HOSTILITIES AND MILITARY ACTIVITIES IN ORDER TO CREATE AN ATMOSPHERE CONducIVE TO SENSIBLE DISCUSSIONS AND NEGOTIATIONS.

OUR ANSWER TO THESE PROPOSALS WAS A STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT THAT THE UNITED STATES SUPPORTS THE CONTADORA PROPOSALS.

HOWEVER, AT THE SAME TIME, HE ORDERED 4000 COMBAT TROOPS TO HONDURAS AND TWO NAVAL TASK FORCES TO THE WATERS OFF NICARAGUA AS PART OF OUR INVOLVEMENT IN "MILITARY EXERCISES." I DO NOT SEE HOW THESE ACTIONS ON OUR PART WILL SERVE TO ESTABLISH A CLIMATE THAT WOULD BE CONducIVE TO SENSIBLE--AND SENSITIVE--NEGOTIATIONS.
IT IS ONLY LOGICAL FOR THE NICARAGUANS TO RESPOND IN KIND
TO OUR "MANEUVERS" BY STRENGTHENING THEIR MILITARY FORCES.

IF YOU DON'T BELIEVE THIS TO BE LOGICAL, LOOK AT OUR OWN
REACTION TO THE DOWNING OF AN UNARMED CIVILIAN KOREAN
AIRLINER BY A SOVIET FIGHTER. THE AMERICAN PUBLIC AND THE
CONGRESS HAVE BECOME SOMEWHAT MORE HAWKISH, AND CONGRESS
SEEMS INCLINED AT PRESENT TO APPROVE FUNDS FOR THE MX
MISSILE AND ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

IF WE, SENSIBLE AND LOGICAL AMERICANS, RESPOND IN THIS
FASHION TO THE SHOOTING OF KOREAN AIR LINES FLIGHT 007, WE
CANNOT EXPECT NICARAGUANS TO ACT OTHERWISE.
AS YOU KNOW, I WAS RECENTLY APPOINTED TO SERVE AS A SENIOR COUNCILLOR ON THE NATIONAL BIPARTISAN COMMISSION ON CENTRAL AMERICA TO FILL THE VACANCY CREATED BY THE TRAGIC DEATH OF MY COLLEAGUE, SENATOR HENRY JACKSON. AS A MEMBER OF THIS BODY, MY FIRST SUGGESTIONS WILL BE TO (1) POSTPONE OUR MILITARY MANEUVERS IN HONDURAS, AND (2) WITHDRAW OUR NAVAL FLOTILLAS FROM THE SHORES OF CENTRAL AMERICA.

I REGRET THAT MY MESSAGE TODAY HAS NOT BEEN A HAPPY OR LIGHTHEARTED ONE, BUT I AM CERTAIN THAT YOU EXPECT ME TO BE AS CANDID AS I CAN BE ON REPORTING THE STATE OF THE NATION AS I SEE IT.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND ATTENTION.
I wish to take this opportunity to report on three matters of great concern to our nation: first, the destruction of Korean Airlines flight 007; second, Lebanon; and third, Central America.

With regard to flight 007, much has been said about the Soviet Union shooting down a Korean Airlines 747 on August 31, 1983. There is no question in anyone's mind now that the Soviet Union fired missiles at the aircraft, thus causing the death of 269 innocent men, women, and children. However, there are aspects of this tragic and barbaric episode that have not been appropriately discussed—aspects which concern me as much as the shooting itself. For example, Soviet leaders have indicated that they had the plane under surveillance for more than two hours. If they are to be believed, they assumed throughout this period that the aircraft was a spy plane on an intelligence gathering mission. And in fact, the voice tapes suggest that this assumption was held up until the final minutes before the shooting. If the Soviets actually thought the plane was on a spy mission deep within Soviet airspace, why did they not pick up the hot line and call Washington? After all, that is what the phone system is for.

The Soviets should have known that if it were in fact a KC 135 on a deliberate spy mission, shooting it down would have precipitated a much more severe crisis than the one we already have. If it were a Korean aircraft on a proxy mission for the United States, we would have known about it and could have ordered it back in a hurry. My question is thus: why didn't Andropov ask us about the presence of this aircraft and its purpose before resorting to violence?
The downing of KAL flight 7 raises a second issue: We should insist--and I see no reason why the Soviets should continue to deny this request--that ships from neutral countries be permitted into Soviet territorial waters to search for debris, the black box which contains crucial information about the last minutes of the doomed aircraft, and human remains. I cannot see any justification for the Soviets denying this simple request, and it shows in vivid detail their inhumanity and their insensitivity to the principles of freedom and fairplay.

A third issue is the unbelievable statement by the Soviet Foreign Minister, Mr. Gromyko, which should be roundly condemned by the family of nations. Rather than apologize for the incident, he denounced Korea's "criminal" violation of the Soviet Union's "sacred" borders and indicated that the USSR would do it again if it deemed such action necessary. This attitude, reinforced by Soviet Chief of Staff Nikolai Ogarkov in his recent press conference wherein he defended the Soviet Union's actions, places in jeopardy all aircraft which are presently required to follow routes near Soviet borders. Soviets, like all other nations, should be aware that even in this day of high technology, engine malfunctions and equipment failures are commonplace. We should demand that they reassess their policy and desist from such alarmist statements.

Until that time, we can only wonder at the statement made by Nikolai Podorgny when he said on the 50th anniversary of Soviet civil aviation in 1973: "We set human life and well-being above everything else."
The second foreign policy matter I want to address is Lebanon. The presence of the multinational peace-keeping forces in and around Beirut is a fait accompli. These forces consist of 4,800 men from four different countries: the United States (1,200), Great Britain (100), France (2,000), and Italy (1,500). Although some in the United States question the wisdom of sending Marines on a peace-keeping mission to wartorn Lebanon, the fact is that they are there today. These troops were ordered to the region by the President of the United States in his capacity as Commander-in-chief of our armed forces. However, since August 25, 1982, when the Marines first arrived in Lebanon, circumstances have changed dramatically. We are now the targets of hostile fire, and 4 marines have been killed, while over a dozen have been wounded. U.S. positions have been shelled, our men fired upon, and our forces have had to respond in kind.

I would now like to bring to your attention a section of the War Powers Resolution, which became law (PL 93-148) on November 7, 1973. This Act requires that the President, in the absence of a declaration of war, seek Congressional approval for the use of U.S. forces abroad anytime they are introduced "into hostilities or into situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances" (section 4(a)(1)).

There is no doubt in my own mind that the President will be flouting the laws of the land if he continues to insist that hostilities do not exist in Lebanon and that he need not invoke the provisions of the War Powers Resolution. This Resolution was debated extensively in
the Congress following our disastrous involvement in Vietnam. It stemmed directly from the vivid memories of our undeclared war in Southeast Asia, where we lost the lives of over 55,000 Americans and hurt or crippled thousands more. Since the Constitution of the United States says clearly that the Congress has the right to declare war, the passage of the War Powers Resolution was an attempt by Congress to ensure that this provision of the Constitution was upheld by all Presidents and that we would never find ourselves in another Vietnam-like undeclared war.

I hope that my calling upon the President to invoke the provisions of the War Powers Resolution is not seen as a partisan gesture. If I were truly partisan, I would let him carry on without Congressional approval and let him take the blame when his administration got into trouble. Rather, as a member of Congress and a representative of one million Americans living in Hawaii, I believe that whenever the United States is involved in a military situation that will cost lives, the President, as Commander and Chief and a sworn defender of our Constitution, must obey the law. I thus believe that the President must immediately invoke section 4(a)(1) of the War Powers Act and submit a report to the Congress detailing his reasons for our troops' presence in Lebanon and the nature of the hostilities they are facing.
The third major foreign policy matter confronting our country is Central America. Countries such as Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Honduras have been on the front pages for many months now, and yet the latest polls suggest that most Americans are still not sure just whose side we are on. It is not clear to many whether we are supporting the good guys or the bad guys--or even who they are supposed to be. This confusion is understandable because of, as some of us will recall, our involvement in Central America and the Caribbean earlier this century.

For example, in Nicaragua, where we have intervened militarily three times since 1850, the United States played the role of midwife in the birth of the Somoza dynasty. In terms of corruption, terror, and human misery, the Somoza regime was second only to that of the Cuban dictator Fulgencio Batista. As some of you may remember, the government of Mr. Batista was one of the worst we have seen this century. To this day, there is still no full accounting of the hundreds of people who disappeared during his rule or the millions of dollars in bullion that evaporated from Cuba's Treasury. The pain, suffering, and inequity of Batista is still vivid in the minds of many Cubans, as it is for many Americans.

I think it would be wise for us to recall that we supported Batista diplomatically, militarily, and economically. It can also be argued that we assisted in the rise of Fidel Castro: if it were not Castro, someone else would have stood up eventually to oppose the dictator Batista. A similar situation occurred in Nicaragua, where the
Sandinistas have taken their name from an assassinated general and peasant leader, Augusto Sandino. As you may recall, Sandino was killed on orders from Anastacio Somoza after he accepted the government's invitation to come to Managua for peace talks. Yet we supported both Batista and Somoza, largely because they knew the secret password to our foreign policy: "anti-communism." On the basis of their avowed opposition to communism, we aided corrupt, dictatorial regimes which subverted human rights and belied the very principles of democracy upon which our own nation is founded.

In viewing today's problems in Central America, I believe that it would be wise for the United States to review its involvement, however painful, in each country. Perhaps then, with an adequate appreciation for the history of the region, answers to the area's problems may be forthcoming. In particular, I would suggest that seeking military solutions to economic and social problems perpetuates the human misery which now appears endemic in that part of the world.

Regretably, I believe the United States is sending conflicting messages to Central America. For example, we say on the one hand that the key to stability in the region is alleviating the human suffering and poverty there. We thus have aid programs that are working to raise people's standard of living and infuse them with democratic ideals. On the other hand, we have incidents such as the one reported earlier this week whereby Fred Ickle, the number three man in the Defense Department, called for a military victory in Central America, saying that negotiations cannot resolve the problems there.
In much the same way, we say we support the efforts of the Contadora nations, who have recommended that (1) all foreign powers withdraw their advisers from Central America, (2) the area be demilitarized, (3) all nations respect and work for self-determination, and (4) conflicts be resolved through negotiation. As an aside, I would say that all of these recommendations are essential, but one in particular is imperative: to stop all hostilities and military activities in order to create an atmosphere conducive to sensible discussions and negotiations.

Our answer to these proposals was a statement by the President that the United States supports the Contadora group. However, at the same time, he ordered 4000 combat troops to Honduras and two naval task forces to the waters off Nicaragua as part of our involvement in "military exercises." I do not see how these actions on our part will serve to establish a climate that would be conducive to sensible--and sensitive--negotiations. It is only logical for the Nicaraguans to respond in kind to our "maneuvers" by strengthening their military forces. If you don't believe this to be logical, look at our own reaction to the downing of an unarmed civilian Korean airliner by a Soviet fighter. The American public and the Congress have become somewhat more hawkish, and the Congress has approved funds for the MX missile and additional programs for the Department of Defense. If we, sensible and logical Americans, respond in this fashion to the shooting of Korean Air Lines flight 007, we cannot expect Nicaragua to act otherwise.
As you know, I was recently appointed to serve as a councillor on the National Bipartisan Commission on Central America in order to fill the vacancy created by the tragic death of my colleague, Senator Jackson. As a member of this body, my first suggestions will be to (1) postpone our military maneuvers, and (2) withdraw our naval flotillas from the shores of Central America.

I regret that my message today has not been a happy or lighthearted one, but I am certain that you expect me to be as candid as I can be on reporting the state of the nation as I see it.

Thank you for your time and attention.