

agents under contract to the UN document the arrival of every item, verify quantity and quality, and conduct lab tests to confirm that the goods conform to the contract. Once the goods have crossed the borders, UN observers then confirm the transit of all goods, their storage and equitable distribution, and they document the end use. Finally, UN staff review the documentation of the hundreds of UN observers. All this is paid for by 2.2 percent of the Iraqi oil sales—as of November 1998, \$207 million. Precisely because the system of verification is so thorough, the Security Council has been willing to grant permission for some dual-use goods to enter the country. The 661 committee has allowed purchases, for example, of chlorine gas for water purification and spare parts for crop-dusting helicopters because UN personnel were in Iraq to verify the location and use of each canister of chlorine and the installation of each helicopter part and the destruction of the old parts.

Relative to other UN programs around the world, those in Iraq are highly elaborate and expensive. Yet they do not come close to meeting the country's needs, according to the Secretary General's report of last fall. Although the quantity of chlorinated water is greater now, the water distribution system has deteriorated so much that by the time it arrives in people's homes, the water is not consistently potable. The emergency parts for electrical generators that do arrive merely slow down the deterioration of the electrical system, the power cuts are expected to be worse next year than this year. There are 210 million square meters of minefields, and the UN's three mine-detector dog teams (a total of six dogs) can barely make a dent.

It does not seem that the structure of the UN sanctions on Iraq could be duplicated in other situations. The expense of an elaborate bureaucracy, which closely monitors virtually all the goods Iraq has been permitted to purchase, is possible only because Iraq is paying for it. And that, in turn, is possible only because Iraq's wealth is so vast, and so easily converted to cash. Were it not for Iraq's wealth and the Security Council's success in tapping it, monitoring the sanctions regime and its humanitarian exemptions would cost far more than the UN could ever afford. Since most sanctioned countries—Yugoslavia, for example—don't have resources that can be tapped in the way Iraqi oil has been, it is hard to imagine that there could be many more sanctions-and-exemptions regimes of this scale.

While the sanctions against Iraq are in many ways anomalous, they nevertheless provide a graphic demonstration of how such extreme sanctions are implemented and justified. Just as the Gulf War offered a testing ground for new alliances and new weapons in the post-cold war world, the sanctions against Iraq have been an experiment in non-military devices of international governance. Both the United States and the UN are exhibiting a growing reliance on economic sanctions to achieve their aims around the world, even if in areas outside Iraq the sanctions regimes are somewhat less ambitious.

Although the UN had imposed sanctions only twice between 1945 and 1990, it has done so eleven times since then. But even this is very little in comparison with the frequency of US sanctions. Between 1945 and 1990 sanctions were imposed worldwide in 104 instances; in two-thirds of these, the United States was either a key player or the sanctions were unilateral actions by the United States with no participation from other countries. Since 1990 the United States' use of sanctions has increased by an order of magnitude. As of 1998, it imposed economic sanctions against more than twenty countries.

Even as it has been using sanctions on its own behalf, the United States has spearheaded many of the Security Council's recent sanctions efforts. While it would be incorrect to treat the Security Council as simply a naked tool of US hegemony (as much as Jesse Helms would like that to happen), the United States does have disproportionate influence both because of the veto power it holds as one of the five permanent members and because of its economic influence globally. And its leverage has only increased in recent years as Russia's willingness to exercise its veto power has been tempered by its dependence on the West for massive capital investment.

In 1990, sanctions appeared to be a nearly ideal device for international governance. They seemed to entail inconvenience and some political disruption but not casualties. Unlike the situation in Somalia, sanctions in Iraq did not involve troops. Because sanctions seemed to incur less human damage than bombing campaigns, peace and human rights movements found them attractive as well. Indeed, many of those opposing the Gulf War in 1990 urged the use of sanctions instead.

But what Iraq shows us is that it is now possible for sanctions to cause far more than inconvenience or international embarrassment. In the absence of a Soviet bloc as an alternative source of trade, it is now possible to construct a comprehensive sanctions regime that can absolutely break the back of any nation with a weak or import-dependent economy. Iraq has also demonstrated, quite graphically, that sanctions can cause fully as much human suffering as even a massive bombing campaign. Iraqi casualties from the Gulf War were in the range of 10,000 to 50,000. Casualties attributed to sanctions are anywhere from ten to thirty times that—and that's only counting the deaths of young children.

This ought to raise serious ethical concerns, since sanctions (like their low-tech predecessor, siege warfare) historically have caused the most extreme and direct suffering to those who are the weakest, the most vulnerable and the least political. At the same time, those who are affected last and least are the military and political leadership, who are generally insulated from anything except inconvenience and the discomfort of seeing "the fearful spectacle of the civilian dead," to use Michael Walzer's phrase. However devastating their effects on the economy and the civilian population may be, sanctions are rarely successful in achieving changes in governmental policy or conduct. Sanctions, like siege warfare, have generally been perceived by civilian populations as the hostile and damaging act of a foreign power. Sanctions, like siege warfare, have generally resulted in a renewed sense of national cohesion, not domestic pressure for political change. The most generous scholarship on this issue holds that in the twentieth century, sanctions achieved their stated political goals only about one-third of the time. But even that figure is disputed by those who point out that in most of these cases there were other factors as well; a more critical estimate places the success rate at less than 5 percent. In the other "success" cases—such as South Africa, which is often cited to show that "sanctions can work"—there were major factors other than sanctions. Many have suggested that the end of apartheid was due to internal political movements as much as to international sanctions. South Africa was also atypical in that those most affected by the sanctions also supported them. If not sanctions, then what? Is bombing preferable to sanctions as a device to "punish rogues" and enforce international law? Without the sanctions option, it is sometimes argued, the

militarists will just say there is no longer an alternative to bombing. But the Iraq situation demonstrates that sanctions are not merely a "problematic" or "less than ideal" form of political pressure. Rather, they are an indirect form of warfare. Not only are they politically counterproductive, but sanctions directed toward the economy generally (as opposed to, say, seizing personal assets of leaders) are inherently antihumanitarian.

Denis Halliday, the former Assistant Secretary General of the UN, resigned in protest last fall, saying that he no longer wished "to be identified with a United Nations that is . . . maintaining a sanctions programme . . . which kills and maims people through chronic malnutrition . . . and continues this programme knowingly." His conclusion seems very like US Supreme Court Justice Harry Blackmun's position on the death penalty in his 1994 dissent in *Callins v. Collins*: For the death penalty to be constitutional, it must be applied equally in like cases; but at the same time, the sentencing judge must have the option of granting mercy based upon the circumstances. These two requirements, Blackmun reasoned, are irreconcilable, and no amount of "tinkering" will somehow make the contradiction dissolve. Likewise, no amount of tinkering will make sanctions anything other than a violent and inhumane form of international governance. It is hard to articulate any greater good that can justify the deliberate, systematic imposition of measures that are known to increase chronic malnutrition, infant mortality and the many varieties of human damage that impoverishment inflicts.

## SENSE OF HOUSE REGARDING HUMAN RIGHTS IN CUBA

SPEECH OF

**HON. DAN BURTON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 23, 1999*

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my support for H. Res. 99. If you follow Cuban policy at all, I know you will agree with me that it is disappointing to see this Administration yield to this hemisphere's last remaining dictator, Fidel Castro. Not long ago, President Clinton announced a new proposal to loosen the trade embargo on the Government of Cuba. The embargo was codified because of the murder of unarmed American citizens. I believe that Castro has done nothing to warrant any reevaluation of the sanctions imposed on his regime. Now, almost three years later, the President has taken steps that not only breathe new life into the brutal Castro dictatorship, but he is trying to circumvent U.S. law.

Now, we learn that the Clinton Administration has decided to hold our American pastime hostage. If the President gets his way, the Baltimore Orioles will face a Cuban National team in Havana on March 28th of this year. It is appalling to me that the President is using baseball to push friendly relations with the Cuban dictatorship. This will be the first Major League Baseball visit to Havana since 1959, and it couldn't come at a worse time. A Cuban court has just convicted the island's four top opposition leaders for sedition.

Vladimiro Roca Antunez, Martha Beatriz Roque Cabello, Felix Bonne Carcases, and Rene Gomez Manzano were arrested in 1997 after petitioning the regime for immediate reforms and publishing a pamphlet entitled "The

Homeland Belongs to Us All." In this pamphlet, they describe their hopes for a free and democratic Cuba. They were convicted for nothing more than expressing their opinions and speaking the truth. They are the Lech Walensas & Vaclav Havels of Cuba. Their trial and conviction came two weeks after Castro handed down his new Sedition Law to severely punish those who dare speak to foreign journalists or publicly criticize his revolution.

Under the new Sedition Law, they were arrested for holding news conferences with foreign journalists and diplomats, urging voters to boycott Cuba's one-party elections, warning foreigners that their investments would contribute to Cuban suffering, condemning Castro's grip on power, and criticizing Communist Party propaganda. Mr. Speaker, this sounds to me like a return to the gulags of Soviet communism and the horror of European fascism.

They were apprehended and jailed 1½ years ago for their "crimes". On top of the imprisonment and physical and mental mistreatment they endured for more than 600 days, the four freedom fighters were also forced to endure a Stalinist show trial. As a recent wire report observed, in keeping with the closed, totalitarian nature of the Castro regime, "Few Cubans and even fewer foreigners are allowed inside a Cuban courtroom. Trials tend to be closed and proceedings are rarely reported by the government-controlled media." But Castro eagerly allowed the cameras to roll during the trial of these four dissidents to send a message to the rest of the island: Anyone who threatens his regime will be punished severely. Cuban reporters are terrified of the new Sedition Law; it has empowered Castro's secret police to intensify their harassment of Cuba's already-stifled press.

The dissidents received prison sentences ranging from 3½ to 5 years. The independent Cuban Commission on Human Rights and National Reconciliation said that since Feb. 26, 1999, authorities had rounded up nearly 40 other dissidents and warned an additional 35 to remain at home during the March 1st trial. Officials from the U.S. Interest Section in Havana were denied access to the trial.

The State Department recently released this statement regarding the trial: "We strongly denounce these actions by the Cuban government, which reveal its utter disregard of the concerns of the international community." Yet, neither the president nor the secretary of state has taken any action to put muscle behind those words. In fact, underscoring its perverse misunderstanding of the situation, the State Department believes the trial and conviction of these four voices of freedom is the very reason we need more people-to-people contacts with Havana. The only thing more people-to-people contacts will do is further prop-up Castro's regime.

Finally, it should be noted that the Sedition Law was approved by Castro just weeks after the president's January announcement that he was easing the embargo.

Mr. Speaker, I must also report even more disturbing news to my colleagues. I believe we have an administration that is so hellbent on normalizing relations with Cuba that it is willing to overlook allegations of drug-trafficking.

On December 3, 1998, the Colombian National Police seized 7.5 tons of cocaine headed for Cuba, and eventually likely the United States and elsewhere. I have sent investigators down there who were able to put together

the pieces of the puzzle in three days which our government, the ONDCP, DEA, CIA, and White House have either not been willing to do, or worse do not want to put together.

I have a letter from Barry McCaffrey which says there is no evidence that the Castro government is involved in drug-trafficking, ignoring the fact that Castro's brother, Raul, has been under indictment in Miami since the early 1990's for drug-trafficking and racketeering. Also, Ileana de la Guardia, the daughter of executed Cuban Colonel Tony de la Guardia, is currently involved in a court case in France where she alleges that drug trafficking reaches the "highest echelons" of the Cuban government.

What is the problem with this administration when it comes to Fidel Castro? Why does the White House continue to ignore the grim and brutal realities of Castro's dictatorship? I don't know the answer, but I believe it goes beyond a simple disagreement on policy. How we can turn a blind eye to Castro's behavior and even reward him is truly beyond me.

What is obvious is the fact that this White House will do anything to normalize relations with the last dictator in the Western Hemisphere. The White House wants to dilute and then eliminate the Burton-Helms Embargo; the White House is flouting the law, ignoring the will of the American people, and tossing aside four decades of bipartisan agreement on Castro. It is left to us in Congress to do what is right.

Mr. Speaker, I join my fellow cosponsors in support of H. Res. 99. Let's do everything we can to keep the heat on Castro and his gulags. As a Houston Chronicle editorial recently observed, "This is no time to play ball with Fidel Castro."

---

#### TRIBUTE TO KATHY ADAMSON

### HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 24, 1999*

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Kathy Adamson, an extraordinary citizen of San Mateo County, California, who will be inducted into the San Mateo County Women's Hall of Fame on Friday, March 26, 1999.

A native of Redwood City, Kathy Adamson has been a foster parent to more than four hundred children ranging in age from newborn to sixteen. Children in her temporary care have included drug exposed infants, shaken babies, toddlers, children with Attention Deficit Disorders, and adolescent girls. Kathy's home became a hospice for terminally ill infants, many of whom died in her loving arms. Since 1995 she has worked with San Mateo County Mental Health as an independent contractor, providing a variety of programs designed to help support parents and children in need. In recognition of her professionalism, her exceptional work and her compassion, Kathy was elected President of the San Mateo County Foster Care Association.

Mr. Speaker, Kathy Adamson is an outstanding woman and I salute her for her remarkable contributions and commitment to our community. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring her on being inducted into the San Mateo County Woman's Hall of Fame.

#### TRIBUTE TO ROBERT "PETERBO" BANKHEAD

### HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 24, 1999*

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to pay tribute in memory of Mr. Robert "Peterbo" Bankhead, who recently passed. He was not only a County Supervisor in my district, the 2nd Congressional District, but also a personal and dear friend to me. It is very hard to effectively portray in a short amount of time to you the true heart, spirit, and countless deeds of Mr. Robert "Peterbo" Bankhead.

Mr. Robert "Peterbo" Bankhead was born on August 30, 1999. He attended Humphreys County High School in Belzoni, Mississippi where he was a member of the first class to graduate from Humphreys County High School. He graduated from Mississippi Valley State University with a Bachelor of Science degree in Criminal Justice in 1977. Additionally, he graduated from MATC (Milwaukee Area Technical College) with a degree in the Culinary Arts. He opened Peterbo's Restaurant in 1974 in Isola, Mississippi where it remains today. During the life of Robert Bankhead, he received several social and community awards for his countless hours, and dedication. He was life-time member of Mississippi Valley State Alumni, the Mississippi Restaurant's Association, and served as Beat 1 Supervisor for Humphrey County for two consecutive terms.

Robert will always be remembered as a person willing to go the extra mile. In closing, Mr. Speaker I would like to say that Robert has made a tremendous contribution to the future of America. His work was pivotal and instrumental in the overall success of my 1996 and 1998 campaign. My prayers go out to his family and his contributions will be remembered in Mississippi, specifically the 2nd Congressional District for years to come.

---

#### A BLOOMIN' GOOD FAMILY AND THEIR BLOOMIN' GOOD BUSINESS

### HON. JAMES A. BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 24, 1999*

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, all around Washington the crocuses and forsythia are starting to bloom, and for some it is a daily ritual to see whether or not the famed cherry blossoms have started to hail the true start of spring. The people of Saginaw, Michigan, may not have the same early blooms or the Tidal Basin ritual, but they have something better—McDonald's Nursery which is celebrating its 70th anniversary this week.

Seventy years ago, Dr. Francis J. McDonald, a dentist with a vision for the beauty of nature, started McDonald's Nursery as a hobby. He bought five acres of land off Seidel Road with a 400-year old beech tree on it. He dug a well that to this day supplies water to the nursery, and with his children, Joe, Jim, Mary, Catherine and Tom, he planted trees. Today those trees provide a forty foot tall memorial to his legacy. With his wife Mary, he