percent of the military equipment available to the Indonesian Armed Forces when they invaded East Timor in 1975 had been supplied by the United States. Shipments of American weaponary were stepped up in the later 1970's, when as much as a third of East Timor's population of less than 700,000 perished as a result of Indonesian military action. The Clinton administration put restrictions in 1994 on the transfer to Indonesia of certain small arms that could be used in places like East Timor and in recent weeks, has also placed restrictions on the transfer of armored personnel carriers. These are welcome steps but they can never erase the earlier history, in which American diplomacy and arms played a significant role in making the East Timor tragedy possible.

''The United States therefore has a special responsibility to help protect the East Timorese people in the 1990's. The world must be particularly vigilant as the fifth anniversary of the Santa Cruz massacre approaches. The United States must also be alert to opportunities to support East Timor's international law and democratic principles. The continued denial of these rights led to the Santa Cruz tragedy in 1991 and is the root of the sorry situation that exists at present. In addition to taking diplomatic action to protect the people of East Timor from further violence, the United States must do whatever is possible to foster an authentic, peaceful solution to the conflict that is based on the wishes of the East Timorese people themselves.''

INDIA DENIES RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

HON. RANDY ''DUKE'' CUNNINGHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 1996

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, an editorial from the March 1996 issue of the Sikh Review was recently brought to my attention. This editorial details reports showing India's ongoing efforts to crush the Sikh religion. In India the Sikhs and other religious minorities are subjected to the same brutal policies.

The article, which I will introduce into the RECORD, discusses the Indian regime's effort to ''normalize'' the Sikh people. That is, as the article puts it, ''a term that has become a euphemism for destroying their culture and lifestyle, in cynical disregard of the democratic principles of plurality and coexistence.'' This kind of ethnic cleansing was our justification for our involvement in the Bosnian conflict. Why are we continuing to look the other way when India is involved?

I am introducing the March 1996 editorial from the Sikh Review into the RECORD.

A DANGEROUS SLANT

This is not a parable. Recently, a group of distinguished intellectuals, motivated by ordinary humanity, wrote to the President of India pleading for the release of several hundred Sikh youth detained without trial for as long as ten years. The silence in Rashtrapati Bhavan was deafening. In disgust, the memorandum was released to the Press coinciding with Human Rights Day, Dec. 11, 1995. The effect was even more silence.

Silence has its uses in statecraft. As the Indian poet, Vikram Seth has said: ''Ten hostages is terrorism; A million, and it's strategy'' (*The Golden Gate*).

Prolonged detention of the Sikhs is part of strategy. Nazi Germany had another name for it: The Final Solution.

How many of us have noticed that the government tourism department has, for over a decade, withdrawn all pictures and posters of the Golden Temple? Airport lounges, railway station waiting rooms, secretariat corridors, coaches of Rajdhani Express, even anterooms of Indian embassies abroad are singularly bereft of pictures of Sikh historical places. The model of the Golden Temple at Amritsar's rail terminal was smashed by Hindu zealots many years ago. This is apparently a part of the deep seated strategy to downplay the Sikh religion and culture. Those who attended the Vishwa Sikh Sammelan in Amritsar were struck by the weird black-*patka*-wearing commandos of the Punjab police crawling all over the holy city, not because India's textile mills have stopped manufacturing cloth for turbans—the ceremonial headgear!

In this grim strategy, the Press—vernacular as well as English—has become a willing tool of the government. Their method is simple: Do not project the Sikh in a positive light. Exaggerate every minor fracas. Underplay the Sikh identify. Depict the *patit* Sikh on the idiot box as the stereotype. Boost the un-Sikh practices. Highlight factional fights over gurdwaras. Deny *kirpan*-wearing passengers seats in airlines and railways. The list seems endless.

Thanks to economic liberalization, NRI is an honoured guest in India, a sort of prodigal son. Not so the Sikh NRI. He is earmarked by the Indian Embassies in the West for special treatment. No wonder so many of them dropped out of the Amritsar conference. The other day an Indian businessman was denied visa by Saudi Arabia to visit Riyadh on the ground that he professes Sikh religion. Government cannot be bothered with such petty aberations. Constitutional guarantees are, after all, so much paper.

The press in India, in most cases, owned by ultra-conservative Hindu businessmen often suffers from an overwearing sense of self-righteousness where the Sikh minority is concerned; How dare the Sikhs claim an independent religious identity? They must be taught a lesson. Simply brand them anti-national! No wonder these newspapers are natural allies of government and its gargantuan power machine. One good turn begets another. Unburdened by moral scruples, the newspapers lend all support to the government to undermine Sikh values.

We give, in this issue, a few instances of this insensitive attitude of the national Dailies, The Tribune, Chandigarh. The Hindustan Times, New Delhi and The Statesman, Calcutta. The malady has, however, become chronic and endemic. Readers will surely recall the disdainful manner in which the newly elected Parliament under Rajiv Gandhi on Jan 2, 1985 ignored the massacre of Sikhs in Delhi even as it mourned the dead of the Bhopal gas tragedy. Election posters of the party in power had then depicted the Sikh taxi driver as a potential terrorist—ignoring his reputation for honesty and bravery. Even the cartoonist Abu Abraham had, more in malice than satirical humour, made a caricature of a saintly Sikh holding a transistor bomb. The Doordarshan, which had blacked out the savagery of Oct. 1984 as a non-event, let its cameras linger balefully over the victims of transistor bombs which shadowy anti-socials had planted in Delhi bazars. When The Telegraph published, on May 5, 1986, a photo of a Sikh youth in police custody the caption proclaimed: ''A terrorist being taken away'', ignoring the elementary rule that no one can be so labelled except when convicted by due process. We had written to the Editor, Mr. M.J. Akbar, who did us the courtesy of a reply: ''I accept your point. In fact, I had pointed out the error to our (The Telegraph) people. I hope you understand that there was not deliberate malice. . . .''

More recently, The Times of India was less penitent. It published on April 12, 1995, a report that the house of union home minister, Mr. S.B. Chavan, in Nanded had been ''attacked by five men, four of them Sikhs.'' The ever-vigilant Rear Admiral (Retd.) Satyindra Singh lodged a protest with Press Council of India which drew the Times Editor's attention to the council ''Guidelines'' that the Press must avoid identifying the community of a person involved in crime. The newspaper took more than six months to publish a luke warm apology on Dec. 6, 1995. This is typical of a newspaper that had been known for its anti-Sikh slant dating back to Girilal Jain's vituperative writings that included his editorial ''De-turbaning of Sikhs'' in 1982.

As a minority religion, Sikhs have been under fierce pressure from the media and their mentor, the government. Far from showing an understanding and sympathy for their religious and cultural tradition, they have vowed to ''to mainstream'' the Sikhs—a term that has become a euphemism for destroying their culture and lifestyle, in cynical disregard of the democratic principles of plurality and co-existence.

Sikhs have no doubt survived challenges down the centuries. However, the ongoing challenge is far more insidious. It calls for what Guru Gobind Singh termed Gyaneh-ki-badhni, the scythe (sword) of wisdom. Our choice is clear. Let us stand up—not succumb—to the hostile machinations. Let us not abandon God and the Guru for the glittery tinsel of a modern state. Let us hold our head high in honour. Five hundred years ago Guru Nanak admonished the tyrannical rulers ''Koorh phire pardhan, ve Lalo''. The German philosopher, Emmanuel Kant later predicted that eventually a just world order would come about either through intellectual and moral insights or through the experience of chaos. Unless Indian polity makes the right choice, its slide into chaos is but a matter of time.

TRIBUTE TO JERRY WATERS

HON. PAT ROBERTS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 1996

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the Senate Foreign Relations room in our U.S. Capitol, I joined the many friends and colleagues of Dr. Jerry Waters in paying tribute to an outstanding public servant and to wish him well upon his retirement.

Jerry Waters, a native of St. Francis, KS, first came to Washington to work for Senator Jim Pearson. Prior to coming to our Nation's Capital, Jerry was a political science professor at Kansas State University. Jerry came to Washington with the intent of staying but 1 year but his devotion to and performance of duty was such that he stayed to his State's and Nation's benefit.

Serving as administrative assistant to Jim Pearson, Jerry was responsible for hiring quality staff and one such staffer was the daughter of our former Governor and Kansas political legend, Alf Landon. Yes, we can thank Jerry Waters, in part, for Senator NANCY KASSEBAUM's outstanding service. Another former Waters' staffer is the current Secretary of Agriculture, Dan Glickman.