

pulled himself together and went on to Sarajevo to conduct what proved to be a critical negotiation with President Izetbegovic. It was the warrior skills that Wes brought to the diplomatic field that contributed to the cease fire between the warring parties, and finally to a peace agreement which was militarily enforceable. Because of the skills of this warrior-statesman, the killing in Bosnia has stopped and the threat of a wider war in Europe has been dramatically reduced. This past week, Wes Clark was nominated by President Clinton to take over the command of SOUTHCOM just relinquished by Barry McCaffrey.

During the Cold War, the U.S. had technological superiority, which allowed us to maintain deterrence with smaller forces than the Soviet Union. But during Desert Storm, we had technological dominance, which allowed us to achieve a stunning victory, quickly and with minimal casualties. Now that we have experienced dominance we like it. And we plan to keep it. Some of you will be warrior-technologists responsible for sustaining that dominance. You may even end up reporting to Paul Kern, West Point '67, who is currently my senior military assistant. Paul is what I mean when I talk about a warrior-technologist. He was an engineering instructor at West Point. And he was decorated for combat both in Vietnam and Desert Storm. US News and World Report called him the only "ace" of Desert Storm. His tanks destroyed more than a dozen Iraqi aircraft that were trying to take off from Jalibah Airfield to escape the lightning thrust of the 24th Division's advance. This month, General Kern will assume the role of warrior-technologist when he takes command of the 4th Infantry Division at Fort Hood. Under his leadership, the 4th ID will become the test-bed for the Army's Force XXI—the battlefield of the future. The technologies he will test promise to revolutionize how we fight on the ground and ensure that we remain the world's dominant land force well into the next century.

Today's Army, while smaller than in the recent past, is still a corporate giant, so some of you will have to be warrior-managers during your career. The regular Army, National Guard and Army Reserves represent a giant personnel and resource management challenge far greater than that faced by any of our major industrial corporations. Investing wisely in people, equipment and training, and balancing scarce resources requires decisions that will affect the capabilities of the Army for decades to come. When you leave here today, you will be officers in an Army guided by a warrior, Denny Reimer, West Point class of 1962, who is also a superb manager. In 1990 Denny was the Deputy Chief of Staff busily planning the post-Cold War drawdown of the Army, when suddenly Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait. In the face of this drawdown, Denny managed to provide the necessary forces for Operation Desert Storm, while still maintaining the quality and readiness of the U.S. Army.

Because of the success of these efforts, the U.S. Army is rightly recognized as the world's best Army. In fact, armies all over the globe use the U.S. Army as a model. So today, when you become an officer in the U.S. Army, whether you want to be or not, you will become a role model. A classic example of this is Dan Christman, Class of '65, another warrior, who returns to West Point this summer as the new Superintendent. Just as General Graves has been a role model for every cadet that passed through these gates the past five years, so too will General Christman. Dan Christman is used to being a role model because for four years he has served as a role model for soldiers of the new

democracies of the old Soviet bloc. As Military Representative to NATO and on the Joint Staff, General Christman has been a key architect of our efforts to help show the militaries of these nations how to operate in a democracy. He helped to create NATO's Partnership for Peace program, in which old enemies that used to train to fight against each other in war, now train together in peace. On Monday, I will be at the L'viv training range in Ukraine, along with the Russian, Ukrainian and Polish defense ministers, participating in a Partnership peace-keeping exercise. A primary benefit of these exercises is that officers trained under the old Soviet system are exposed to American officers and NCOs, and see first hand how a first class military operates in a democracy.

These multinational training exercises are excellent training, because anytime you go into combat, you are likely to be part of a coalition operation, and you will have to build strong bonds with your foreign counterparts. George Joulwan, Class of '61, has become an expert at building strong bonds. It was General Joulwan as SACEUR, the Supreme Allied Commander of Europe, who put together IFOR—the multinational coalition that is helping bring peace in Bosnia. He had to forge an alliance of 16 NATO nations plus 18 others, including nations from the former Warsaw Pact, and even Russia. I can only imagine what General Eisenhower, the first SACEUR, would think if he saw a Russian general sitting with General Joulwan at NATO headquarters reviewing their operational plan for deployment in Bosnia. I traveled all over the world—Moscow, Geneva, Brussels, even Kansas—to negotiate the Russian participation in IFOR with my Russian counterpart, Pavel Grachev. But it would never have happened if George Joulwan and General Shevtsov had not been able to sit down and hammer out a practical military agreement, warrior to warrior. General Joulwan's ability to put together this historic coalition will not only give peace a chance to endure in Bosnia, it will cast a long shadow over the security in Europe for years to come.

I have talked today about the diverse tasks being performed every day by officers in the U.S. Army. But whatever you are called on to do, you will be expected to be a leader—a leader of the world's best soldiers. Leading the American force in Bosnia is General Bill Nash, West Point Class of 1968. As commander of the 1st Armored Division, General Nash will tell you that peacekeeping is a mission that every Army officer must be prepared for. For decades, the 1st Armored Division was trained and ready to fend off a Soviet assault through the Fulda Gap. But in the summer of '95, when a peacekeeping mission in Bosnia seemed imminent, General Nash started up the first large-scale peacekeeping training program in our Army's history. He set up a training range in Germany which simulated all of the hazards our troops would face in Bosnia: contending armies, paramilitary forces, bad roads, mines, black marketers, and even CNN reporters. Every unit slated to go to Bosnia was sent to train at that range. The results were stunning. When D-Day arrived, 20,000 troops, their weapons and supplies were moved into Bosnia. They were confronted with terrible winter weather, they faced the possibility of armed resistance and the reality of three million uncharted land mines. They made this move in record time and with no casualties, and they inspired respect everywhere they went.

Ten days after General Nash started moving into Bosnia, I went to Bosnia to visit our troops. General Shalikhshvili, General Joulwan, General Nash and I all went from Croatia into Bosnia by walking across the

pontoon bridge the Army's combat engineers had just built over the Sava River. Responsible for its construction was General Pat O'Neal, who's here today to see his son, Scott, graduate. Building that bridge turned out to be a problem of epic proportions. General O'Neal's team ended up having to build the longest pontoon bridge in history, because Bosnia was experiencing the worst winter and the worst flooding of the century. As we neared the middle of the bridge, we met some of the combat engineers who had built it. They were dirty, cold, and exhausted—but very proud. One of them, a sergeant first class, came forward and told us that his enlistment was up, and that he wanted to reenlist. So, we swore him in for another 4 years in the U.S. Army, right there in the middle of the Sava River bridge. After all he had been through—bitter cold, soaking rains, snow, flooding of biblical proportions, the danger of land mines—this NCO still wanted to reenlist. That is an example of "true grit." That is the sort of soldier you will soon lead.

Well, I have told you today about some of the Army's leaders who were cadets here just one generation ago. They are leaving you one hell of a legacy. I have also told you something about the talent and dedication of our NCO corps. You can be proud to lead them, and you should follow General Reimer's guidance about these great NCOs—that is, you should "give a damn." I think you can sense how proud I am of the leaders and the NCO's in our Army today. I hope you share my pride because you are about to become officers in the best damned Army in the world. And your country is counting on you to sustain its quality and morale.

All of you have challenging careers to look forward to. But, as you face the challenges of being a warrior, a statesman, a technological innovator, a manager, a coalition builder and a leader, you must never forget that you are more than an Army officer, more than the sum of your service. You are also private citizens, members of a community, a family, an extension of your friends and loved ones. Maintain perspective, strike a balance in your life, be considerate of others, reserve a share of your heart for those you care about and who care about you. They say a soldier fights on his stomach—but a soldier also fights with his heart. The hopes and prayers of your families, of all Americans, and of freedom-loving people everywhere march with you.

In the stairway outside my office at the Pentagon hangs a favorite painting of mine. In the painting a young serviceman is praying with his family just prior to his departure on a foreign deployment. Under the painting is the passage from Isaiah in which the Lord asks, "Whom shall I send? And who will go for us?" And Isaiah responds, "Here am I. Send me."

At this critical point in our history, your Nation has asked, "Whom shall I send? Who will go for us?" And today, you have answered, "Here am I. Send me."

Your Nation is grateful. Your families are thankful. And I could not be prouder.

THE BURTON AMENDMENT TO H.R.  
3540

HON. MICHAEL F. DOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1996

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, last night here on the House floor we witnessed an extraordinary

sight. The pending business was the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], which would have singled out India for special criticism.

What was extraordinary was that there was literally a line of Members—on both sides of the aisle—waiting to speak against the amendment. Not only was the overwhelming majority opposed to the Burton amendment, but the depth of their feeling was so strong that they felt the need to speak out publicly.

I was one of those who came to the floor last night expecting to speak. However, in the interests of maintaining the schedule, I deferred until now.

Let's look at what is happening in India. We recently had free and fair elections, which has led to the peaceful transfer of power. We have seen steady progress by India in improving its human rights record. We have seen steady progress in the opening up of Indian markets to American products. Now that there is a new government in India, we should ask ourselves what sort of message should we send to them about recent events there.

How did the Burton amendment propose to respond to this progress? By singling out aid to India for special treatment and doing so in a way that would reverse the trend that has got us to where we are today. This is a nation with a population of over a billion people—a nation forced to deal with a multitude of ethnic groups and miles of disputed borders. Despite all these hurdles, India has maintained its democratic tradition, and has continued the difficult challenge of implementing broad economic reforms.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House has acted so decisively in expressing support for the continued evolution of Indian society.

A SERIOUS CASE OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST ETHNIC ALBANIANS

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1996

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the attention of my colleagues to the serious case of ethnic discrimination and violation of human rights involving the effort to establish the University of Tetova in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

Almost 2 years ago Professor Dr. Fadil Sulejmani filed formal documents with government officials in order to establish the University of Tetova in the city of Tetova in western Macedonia. Albanian intellectuals sought permission to establish the University because

ethnic Albanians in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia face severe limitations in their efforts to receive a higher education. Ethnic Albanians comprise as much as 40 percent of the population of the country. The 1991 Yugoslav census reported that ethnic Albanians made up 20 percent of the population of the Republic of Macedonia, but Albanians and other specialists, including the United States Helsinki Commission, suggest that the proportion is considerably higher.

Only two universities exist currently in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia—the Universities of Skopje and Bitola—and only 2 percent of Albanian young people are admitted to study at these two institutions. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, in the past Albanian young people had the opportunity to study at universities elsewhere in the former Yugoslavia—Pristina, Zagreb, Ljubljana, and other universities. With the collapse of the former Yugoslavia, these opportunities are no longer available to ethnic Albanians from Macedonia. Clearly, finding additional opportunities for higher education for ethnic Albanian students is vitally important, and the establishment of the University of Tetova was intended to fill this important gap.

What was the response when Professor Sulejmani attempted to establish a university for ethnic Albanians? The government of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia failed to respond to the filing of formal documents for the establishment of the university. Government officials refused to discuss the issue with Professor Sulejmani—despite repeated requests for dialogue. Because the government refused to consider the establishment of a university or even to discuss the matter with Albanian academic leaders, the university opened on December 14, 1994. The government responded by sending several hundred police officers, bulldozing one university building, jailing the faculty for 24 hours, and conducting a campaign of harassment and intimidation against the students.

Mr. Speaker, just a few months later in February 1995, a delegation of Americans, including former Congressman Joseph DioGuardi of New York and Ms. Shirley Cloyes, visited the University of Tetova. They were joined by Mihajlo Mihajlov, a prominent anti-Communist dissident in the former Yugoslavia and now living in the United States. Just hours after the American delegation departed from Tetova, Albanian police authorities arrived at the buildings where the university was seeking to function. In the violence which they provoked, one individual was killed and twenty-eight others were wounded. Some twenty-five leading professors and students were arrested and imprisoned. Those who were imprisoned in this unnecessary show of force were subsequently

released, but their travel documents were seized by police, and authorities refused permission to the Albanian academic leaders to travel and the professors and students remain subject to intimidation.

Mr. Speaker, the action of the government in these cases is a cause of serious concern to me. The ethnic Albanian population of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia needs to have access to higher education, and Albanian academicians have sought to follow proper procedures in creating educational opportunities through establishing the University of Tetova. The government is using force and intimidation in an effort to repress the ethnic Albanian population of that country.

Mr. Speaker, I can speak with some authority about the intransigence of the government officials on this issue. Three months ago, I invited Dr. Sulejmani, the Rector, and Professor Melaim Fejziu, the Vice Rector, of the University of Tetova to meet the Members of Congress to discuss this issue in Washington. Since the passports of both of these individuals were confiscated by government authorities, I also wrote to Macedonian President Kiro Gligorov requesting that the travel documents of these two Albanian academicians be returned to them so they could travel to the United States for meetings with me and other Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks after my invitation was received, I had a response from Dr. Sulejmani and Professor Fejziu expressing their interest in meeting with me and my colleagues in the Congress here in Washington. They expressed regret, however, that their passports had not been returned and said that they have been given no information about when they might be returned.

I have not even had the courtesy of a response from the President of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. I know he has been recovering from an accident, but his staff presumably still functions, the Foreign Ministry presumably is still in operation. I am appalled and outraged that the government has failed to respond to my request and has even failed to give me the courtesy of a reply.

Mr. Speaker, the United States is firmly and unequivocally committed to human rights, to the full exercise of civil rights by all peoples, and we are equally committed to opposing discrimination on the basis of ethnic, religious, racial or other grounds. I sincerely urge the government of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to moderate its policies and permit the University of Tetova to go forward. I commend the outstanding effort by Dr. Sulejmani and his colleagues, and I invite my colleagues to join in applauding this endeavor.