



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1995

No. 169

## House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. EVERETT].

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
October 30, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable TERRY EVERETT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of May 12, 1995, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member except the majority and minority leader limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] for 5 minutes.

### THE UNITED STATES SHOULD STAY OUT OF THE BAFFLING BOSNIAN CONFLICT

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, it is the time in a Presidential term when, whether Republican or Democrat, Presidents and their advisers begin to think about major feats that might be accomplished in foreign affairs. Sometimes, there are achievements. Often, it is mostly symbolism. It is much easier than staying in town and relating to Congress.

Some Presidents have seen themselves as Franklin Roosevelt, with cape

flying, standing on the bridge of a naval vessel in the North Atlantic. Others have seen themselves as Winston Churchill, the lone voice alerting the world to the rising power of Adolf Hitler and the danger to all Europe in the mid-1930's.

Sometimes our Presidents are right, but sometimes they are very, very wrong.

If I were to give advice to our current President, I would ask him to read the brilliant memoir of General Colin Powell. The General provides some very wise advice in "My American Journey." At page 291 he says:

What I saw from my perch in the Pentagon was America sticking its hand into a thousand-year-old hornet's nest with the expectation that our mere presence might pacify the hornets.

In 1991, when "well-meaning Americans thought we should do something in Bosnia," General Powell remembered "the shattered bodies of Marines at the Beirut airport," and he argued "for caution."

At pages 291 and 292, he comments:

Foreign policy cannot be paralyzed by the prospect of casualties. But lives must not be risked until we can face a parent or a spouse or a child with a clear answer to the question of why a member of that family had to die. To provide a "symbol" or a "presence",

The General added, "is not good enough."

Those are wise words.

Where is the defined mission of American forces in Bosnia? Many of us have argued for years—under two Presidents of the United States, one of each party—for lifting the arms embargo and letting the Bosnians fight for their own freedom. That has not been done.

Our executive and legislative energies should be on the major problems we have. The major problem where the American interest is directly affected is the world's remaining superpower, which is the Soviet Union, now the

former Soviet states, now Russia. That is the country that should occupy our interest in relation to NATO, in relation to ties to the West in the years ahead. If we fail in that, all else we do will be for naught.

At page 577, General Powell says:

No American President could defend to the American people the heavy sacrifice of lives it would cost to resolve this baffling conflict, the Bosnian baffling conflict. Nor could a President likely sustain long-term involvement necessary to keep the protagonists from going at each other's throats all over again at the first opportunity.

American GI's are not toy soldiers,

Powell observed,

to be moved around on some sort of global game board. [page 576]

We have to ask, where is the American interest? What are our objectives? What are our tactics? Are they worth endangering American lives?

Mr. Speaker, I say it is not worth endangering American lives, even though we can all grieve for the tragedies we see in the former Yugoslavia, in Bosnia. But when Bosnians are willing to pretend to be Serbs and Croats are willing to pretend to be Serbs and Bosnians and Serbs pretending to be Croats and Bosnians, it would be rather confusing to send American troops into that chaotic situation. And we must not do it.

Mr. Speaker, the article of Charles Krauthammer this last Friday in the Washington Post entitled "Clinton's Folly" also provides quite a bit of wisdom on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I include the article for the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 27, 1995]

CLINTON'S FOLLY

(By Charles Krauthammer)

The first law of peacekeeping is that when you have real peace, you don't need peacekeepers. When both parties are in military equilibrium and have no intention of fighting each other—Israel and Egypt, for example—peacekeepers are nice to have around but they are mere window dressing.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H11381