

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FINAL OFFENSIVE BY SUDANESE
GOVERNMENT DEMANDS UNITED
STATES ATTENTION**HON. FRANK R. WOLF**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 1994

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, the urgency of the humanitarian crisis in Sudan cannot be overestimated. As the Washington Post reported February 6, the Sudanese Government has launched a final offensive against the south, causing 100,000 new refugees to flee to Uganda and leaving 2 million people at risk of starvation because of the imminent shut down of Operation Lifeline Sudan [OLS]. OLS represents a number of nongovernmental relief organizations working under the authority of the United Nations to provide the bulk of relief to southern Sudan.

This weekend's report confirms the December prediction of a long-term relief worker assessing the outcome of such a large-scale offensive:

It is most probable that virtually all Operation Lifeline Sudan (OLS) will be forced to shut down, and the government will insist that all relief work be carried out through their own channels * * * Needless to say, this would be catastrophic for the people of the south, who at this time are extremely vulnerable and almost totally dependent upon the OLS pipeline aid. Deaths from starvation and sickness would dwarf anything we've seen in the past.

I applaud Representative HARRY JOHNSTON's efforts to draw attention to the crisis and to bring the southern rebel leaders to Washington for peace negotiations during the "Sudan: The Forgotten Tragedy" conference last fall. Representative JOHNSTON was also tireless in pressing for the passage of his bill, House Concurrent Resolution 131, condemning the genocide of Sudan and calling for U.N. Security Council action. Sadly, the situation has rapidly deteriorated since the important congressional attention of last fall.

It is now estimated by the United States Committee for Refugees that 1.3 million civilians in southern Sudan have died over the past 10 years as a direct result of civil war and the Sudan Government's genocidal policies against its citizens in the south. That is nearly 2,500 deaths every week for the past 10 years.

As many of my colleagues know, I have witnessed first hand the massive suffering occurring in southern Sudan, located in the Horn of Africa. My most recent trip there was last February, when I traveled to southern Sudan with the assistance of the United States Committee for Refugees, Norwegian People's Aid, a humanitarian relief organization, and Catholic Relief Services.

I have stood on the floor of the House many times in the past, trying to describe to you the malnutrition, the disease, the massive population displacement, the gruesome effects of war, and human rights abuse that I have witnessed in Sudan. The reality in Sudan is difficult to describe, because it begs description.

The new report by the U.S. Committee for Refugees, estimating that 1.3 million southern Sudanese have perished since 1983, is yet another indication that southern Sudan is hell on Earth due to the unconscionable policies of the Sudanese Government and in-fighting between rebel groups. I hasten to point out that the U.S. Committee for Refugees is a highly respected organization whose reports on refugee emergencies worldwide are reliable, credible, and authoritative. I have long had the highest regard for the U.S. Committee for Refugees, particularly for its tireless reporting, analysis, and advocacy on the tragic situation in Sudan.

This exhaustive report, "Quantifying Genocide in the Southern Sudan: 1983-1993" by Millard Burr of the U.S. Committee on Refugees, is based on systematic compilation of year-by-year field reports and internal Sudanese documents. It concludes that the death toll in Sudan is, sadly, not diminishing. The report estimates that some 300,000 persons died in southern Sudan during 1992 and the first 5 months of 1993—nearly 4,000 deaths per week for 17 months—making it one of the deadliest periods ever in Sudan.

One of every five southern Sudanese has died from the war or from war-related causes, according to the report, and 4 of every 5 southern Sudanese have been uprooted from their homes at some time since 1983. More than 300,000 southern Sudanese are refugees, and some 5 million Sudanese from the south and north are internally displaced.

Mr. Speaker, I must repeat what I said on the House floor last November: We have a responsibility to continue to demand justice in Sudan, because we can no longer say that we don't know what's happening there. This thorough report by the U.S. Committee for Refugees tells us all too clearly.

This House acted responsibly last November when we passed House concurrent resolution 131, which condemned the Government of Sudan for its severe human rights abuses and deplored the bloody internecine fighting among factions of the rebel Sudanese People's Liberation Army. A great deal of work went into that resolution, including work and analysis by the U.S. Committee for Refugees. This newest report, "Quantifying Genocide in the Southern Sudan," reminds all of us that we cannot cease our efforts. Men, women, and children continue to perish in southern Sudan as we speak.

I will distribute this report to members of the Human Rights Caucus of the House of Rep-

resentatives. Others who are interested need only contact my office or the U.S. Committee for Refugees. I respectfully urge my colleagues and their appropriate staff persons to pay attention to this authoritative report, and I commend the U.S. Committee for Refugees for its diligence on behalf of the people of southern Sudan.

In closing, I want to say that time is of the essence. Many are dying daily in Sudan as the government continues its new offensive, and it is crucial that this crisis receive Security Council attention very soon. Congressman JOHNSTON, other Members and I will be asking to meet with President Clinton soon to press for U.N. action as well as the appointment of a special envoy for peacebrokering in the region. It must happen soon, because every day so many are dying.

CONGRATULATIONS AND THANKS
TO MR. ANDRES L. SOTO**HON. KEN CALVERT**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 1994

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that makes America the truly great country that it is, is its spirit of voluntarism—the willingness of citizens from all backgrounds and occupations to give of their time and talents to make their communities better places in which to live and work.

The community of Riverside, CA, has been fortunate to have an exceptionally dedicated group of citizens who give freely of their energies and talents to make our city and county such desirable places to live. One of these exceptional citizens is Mr. Andres L. Soto.

A graduate of Norte Vista High School, Riverside Community College, and the University of California at Riverside, Andy is a true Riverside product.

After high school, he served in the United States Army and received the Bronze Star for his service in Vietnam. And, he has never stopped serving his country and his community.

Mr. Soto has been involved in a wide range of civic activities. He has served on the city of Riverside Planning Commission since 1990, and as its chairman since 1992. He has served as a member of the State Department of Parks and Recreation Hispanic Advisory Council since 1980, and as its chairman for more than 7 years. He has also served as a member of the board of directors of the California Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, and on the California Social Services Advisory Board.

From 1972 through 1980, Andy was a member of the city of Riverside Parks and Recre-

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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

ation Commission, and was its chairman in 1978. He has also served as a member of the city of Riverside Economic Development Committee, the University of California Riverside Citizens Committee, the Riverside Jaycees, the Mexican-American Political Association, the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 9223, the American Legion Post 289, the American G.I. Forum Riverside Chapter, the County of Riverside Veterans' Advisory Committee, the American Red Cross of Riverside board of directors, the Easter Seal Society board of directors, and the County of Riverside Affirmative Action Commission.

For more than a decade, Mr. Soto has also been a mainstay of the Greater Riverside Hispanic Chamber of Commerce. He was the founder of the organization in 1979, and served as its president in 1981, 1983, 1986, 1987, and 1993. On Saturday, February 26, 1994, Andy will step down as president, but will remain active in the organization.

Andy Soto is one of those citizens that any community would love to have and we feel extremely fortunate that he is in Riverside. On behalf of the citizens of the 43d congressional district, I wish to extend my thanks and appreciation to Mr. Andres L. Soto for his service to the Greater Riverside Chamber of Commerce and for all he has done for our community.

FAILING NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 1994

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to my colleagues an article in the commentary section of yesterday's Washington Times that points up a major failing of the Clinton administration's new national drug control strategy.

Entitled "Indispensable interdiction," it is written by my two colleagues from New York, Congressman CHARLES B. RANGEL and Congressman BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, the former chairman and vice chairman of the House Select Committee on Narcotics.

The article underscores the fact that the direction this administration is taking on what may be the single most destructive force that is devastating our cities—narcotics—is truly a bipartisan concern.

I ask that the full article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

INDISPENSABLE INTERDICTION

(By Charles Rangel and Benjamin Gilman)

After an extensive policy review, the Clinton administration has apparently concluded that broad-scale international interdiction of narcotics, as pursued under prior administrations, has failed to reduce the supply of illegal drugs in the United States.

Instead, the administration plans to focus heavily on the treatment and rehabilitation of hardcore abusers. This approach, however, ignores the relationship between drug availability and use, and will be a prescription for defeat.

Between 1987 and 1991, 552 metric tons of cocaine were seized in Latin America alone. At the same time, the percentage of cocaine users in the United States dropped by more than half.

Just this month, University of Michigan researchers, in their annual survey for the National Institute of Drug Abuse, found that drug use is up among American teenagers after a decade of decline.

Besides reducing supply, interdiction also has a deterrent effect which cannot be measured solely by quantifiable means such as seizures and arrests.

The amount of drugs not manufactured or shipped to the United States for fear of seizure is immeasurable but nonetheless important.

Nor can the added costs to traffickers for the shipments they do make be quantified, but those costs make drugs more expensive on the street and less easily obtainable.

The question, however, is not how much gets in even with interdiction, but how much more would get in without a major interdiction program, and the impact of those additional drugs on our cities and youth, and on our treatment and rehabilitation efforts.

Interdiction assumes increasing importance as dealers seek to expand their markets by distributing free drug samples on the streets and in the schools.

If interdiction is allowed to lag, the result inevitably will be more and cheaper drugs on the streets. This will swamp the very treatment programs on which the administration wants to focus because today's casual user is tomorrow's hardcore abuser.

The administration's own emphasis on community policing is itself a form of street-level interdiction.

Community policing is an effective tool against illicit drugs, but it must be part of a broad strategy that attacks the entire chain of trafficking, beginning in the producing countries and continuing through the transit zones to the dealers.

A successful counter-narcotics strategy must include reduction of demand through education, treatment and rehabilitation, as well as reduction of supply through eradication, interdiction and enforcement.

Diminishing any of these components would be a major mistake with severe consequences.

The administration should not abandon interdiction, especially without clear evidence that this would not exacerbate the nation's already serious crime problem, health care costs, violence, and the other negative aspects of the illicit narcotics trade.

Overseas interdiction carries the battle to the traffickers in their own backyards. If given full support, interdiction of the larger quantities that can be seized while in transit can be as effective in reducing available drugs as interdiction on the street.

Federal drug agencies in recent years have forced the traffickers to conduct their business further and further away from the United States. The administration should build on this progress rather than allow our streets to become the first line of defense against drugs.

The American people also need to hear from the Secretary of State that illicit narcotics are among the administration's major foreign policy concerns and will receive the attention and resources it requires.

A TRIBUTE TO WIZF

HON. DAVID MANN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 1994

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues an outstanding community activist organization from the First District of Ohio, WIZF-FM in Cincinnati.

WIZF is well known as a dedicated and prominent influence in the betterment of the African-American community.

WIZF observes its seventh year of innovative leadership in the radio entertainment industry. The stations 32 highly motivated employees are the stations driving force behind its ability to serve the most vulnerable members of the community.

Throughout the years WIZF has sponsored several projects to help underprivileged children, the homeless, and to provide holiday meals for anyone in need.

WIZF never limits its support to people in need. When a local high school student, Derrick Turnbow, became paralyzed after a gun shooting incident, WIZF's determination to help his recovery prevailed by raising a substantial amount of money for his medical treatment. The station has also provided drives for food, clothes, and money for displaced victims because their homes were damaged or destroyed from the hurricane in Florida and from the floods in the Midwest.

WIZF has annually given benefits for charitable organizations such as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the National Council on Negro Women, and the Black Male Coalition.

In recognition of Black History Month, this year WIZF began the Unsung Hero awards to recognize community members for their leadership and encouragement to improve and better the lives of citizens in Cincinnati, especially the youth. The first year honorees are: Abdur Rasheed Ali, Selfu Begashaw, Wendell "Butch" Burbridge, Debbie Bustion, Lillian Carr, Maude Ellington, Thomas H. Graves, Jr., Robert L. Humphries, Franklin D. James, Sandra Jones, Ron Sanders, and Patricia Talison. I am pleased to represent such a giving group of individuals.

Mr. Speaker, WIZF-FM exemplifies a tremendous amount of community spirit. I would like to offer my thanks and appreciation for the outstanding contributions its staff has made to the people of Cincinnati.

MINORITY HEALTH IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1994

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 1994

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Mr. SYNAR, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. FRANKS of Con-

necticut, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. MENDENDEZ, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mr. UNDERWOOD, I am pleased to introduce the Minority Health Improvement Act of 1994.

The principal purpose of this bill is to strengthen Federal programs designed to improve the health status of minorities through the delivery of health care services, training of health professionals, and expanded research and data collection. The legislation was reported by the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment on February 9, 1994.

Last summer our subcommittee received testimony from many witnesses who testified about the barriers that many people in minority communities experience when trying to receive basic health care services. The overwhelming lack of health insurance for many minority communities is compounded by the fact there is no doctor in the neighborhood, or the nearest clinic is three bus rides away, or the doctor doesn't speak the patient's language.

A major provision of this bill goes right to the heart of improving the health status of minorities. It guarantees the training of young minority health professionals who will provide basic health services in the communities where today—minorities have the least access to health care.

By replacing a confusing and ineffective patchwork quilt of scholarship programs, the bill offers disadvantaged students the opportunity to attend school without the fear of un-surmountable debt. It will provide disadvantaged students full scholarship plus a living stipend in exchange for a commitment to join the National Health Service Corp and work, after graduation, in a medically underserved community.

The effect of the legislation is to expand by over 200 percent the number of disadvantaged students able to receive a corp scholarship. Last year 1,363 minority students applied for Corp scholarships but funds were only available to meet the needs of 118. Hundreds of students already committed to improving the health status of disadvantaged communities were denied the opportunity for lack of funding.

The budget caps require tough choices, but by acting to consolidate existing Federal health scholarship programs, new opportunities can be opened for hundreds of minority students and hundreds of medically underserved communities. This is a worthy objective for which this Congress can take great pride.

This bill also reauthorizes a number of expiring programs which comprise the core of our Federal strategy to promote minority health and reduce the disparity in health status and health access. These programs include:

The Office of Minority Health, which is charged with establishing national minority health goals;

The Health Careers Opportunity Program, which is critical to identifying and nurturing the health professions careers of promising minority students;

The Centers of Excellence, which support a network of academic centers focused on minority health training;

Special financial assistance, which support disadvantaged students attending programs in veterinary medicine, pharmacy, public health, optometry, and allied health;

Federally subsidized loans, which support student attending health professions schools; and

Loan repayment programs, which encourage minority health professionals to teach in health professions schools.

TRIBUTE TO SGT. CHARLES M. HOUSE, ONE OF LOS ANGELES FINEST

HON. DANA ROHRBACHER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 1994

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to acknowledge one of Los Angeles finest law enforcement officers, Sgt. Charles M. House, who has retired and we will honor him April 5, 1994.

Charles is a man of integrity, honesty, and practices what he preaches. After 27 years of enjoyable and eventful years with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, he is riding into the sunset on a standard retirement. It has been said that some individuals in government as well as private industry toward the twilight of their career file for questionable medical retirements, not Charles.

A few years ago while en route to this facility driving his personal car, Charles was rear-ended by a individual who did not have insurance, a job, nor driver's license. Charles' insurance company repaired his car and offered him \$1,000 for his injuries which were very minor. Charles told the insurance representatives \$1,000 was excessive and he settled for substantially less.

I met Charles when he became a candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives in 1988, the year I was elected to Congress. Charles did not have a primary opponent, so he and his wife, Martha, went to my campaign office and helped me win my election. That's what I call a team player.

On March 17-19, 1989, Charles was in El Salvador, President Bush appointed him to the Commission that was sent to El Salvador to monitor that country's first free democratic Presidential elections in the history of that nation. That was quite an honor aside from the importance of their mission. President Bush personally approved each of the 51 members of that delegation which consisted of Senators, Congressmen, business executives, and Charles.

President Bush in 1990 then again in 1991, nominated Charles to be Director of the Office of Victims of Crime. However, his nomination died a slow and agonizing death in the U.S. Senate.

Additionally Charles was in:
1991—Selected Volunteer of the Year by the American Heart Association; 1991—se-

lected Lion of the Year by the Hacienda Heights Lions Club, 1990—selected Citizen of the Year by the Hacienda la Puente Chamber of Commerce; and 1986—received an honorary doctorate of law degree from Pacific States University.

Best wishes, Charles, Martha, and Melanie and God Bless.

INTRODUCTION OF NATIONAL EARTHQUAKE AWARENESS WEEK RESOLUTION

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 1994

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a resolution designating the week of April 3, 1994, as "National Earthquake Awareness Week." The purpose of this resolution is to provide awareness of earthquake threats and to increase public knowledge of how to prepare and respond to an earthquake. Thirteen of my colleagues join me in cosponsoring this resolution.

Last month's tragic earthquake in Northridge, CA, has provided us with yet another reminder of the power and unpredictability of nature. This quake caused over 57 deaths, more than 6,000 injuries, and a significant disruption of the surrounding transportation system. It may in fact turn out to be one of the costliest disasters in this Nation's history. Furthermore, there is a high probability of more major earthquakes within the next few decades, and not only for California. From Hawaii to Pennsylvania, States across the Nation are experiencing earthquakes with varying intensity. It is therefore important that people are aware of the hazards posed by earthquakes and know the steps necessary to protect themselves.

This measure is a means to rapidly and expeditiously increase awareness of the threat caused by these natural disasters. I have great confidence that this resolution will facilitate the education of communities across the Nation on ways in which to adequately respond to earthquakes. National Earthquake Awareness Week is essential to mitigating the paralyzing effects of a natural disaster such as the one that struck Los Angeles.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to sign onto this resolution, so that we can better educate our children, communities, and businesses on preparing for earthquakes.

TRIBUTE TO SAUL WEPRIN

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 1994

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a great New Yorker and a great civic leader, former speaker of the New York State Assembly Saul Weprin. Mr. Weprin left us

early this morning in Long Island Jewish Hospital, at the age of 66.

Mr. Speaker, Saul Weprin served admirably in the Nation's greatest State legislature since 1971, when he gained office in a special election. During his tenure, Mr. Weprin held a series of chairmanships that left his indelible mark on New York State government.

As chairman of the assembly judiciary committee, Mr. Weprin helped write New York's equitable distribution divorce law. As chairman of the ways and means committee and then as speaker, Mr. Weprin had a tremendous influence on tax and spending policy, working closely with Governor Cuomo. During this time, Mr. Weprin was known to lead with grace, wit, and humility—a precious commodity for many who hold public office.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my condolences to Mr. Weprin's surviving wife, Sylvia, and his three sons, Barry, David, and Mark. May his memory be for a blessing.

HISTORIC THEATER REOPENED

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 1994

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss a terrific historic renovation that recently took place in my district. This week, we in the Seventh Congressional District will celebrate the reopening of the Media Theater.

Small town movie theaters are an important part of American history. The Media Theater has occupied a prime location on State Street, the main street in Media Borough, since 1927. For more than 60 years, this vintage movie palace has entertained hundreds of thousands of theatergoers with films and live performances.

The theater had fallen on hard times in recent years and was at risk of going under, as many moviegoers flocked to malls and other large-scale movie houses. But many civil leaders, led by businessman Walter M. Strine, undertook a local campaign to save the Media Theater. Thanks to this heroic effort, the theater has been restored to its former grandeur and will reopen on Friday, February 18, 1994 with a Media Theater for the Performing Arts production of "My Fair Lady."

I would be remiss if I did not make special mention of the work of Mr. Strine in this effort. Due to his efforts, the theater has been completely restored to reflect its original English Renaissance style. Walter Strine undertook this project because of his love for the community and his dedication to his hometown. The result is a cultural arts center that will be important to the entire Delaware Valley.

I am pleased to congratulate Walter Strine, and I wish the Media Theater for the Performing Arts much success.

FOSTER CARE LIVING ARRANGEMENTS

HON. DICK SWETT

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 1994

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Foster Care Living Arrangements Act of 1994. This legislation is intended to enhance the supportive services options available for elderly and disabled adults in their homes. My proposal would amend section 131 of the Internal Revenue Code, which excludes certain foster care payments from a taxpayer's gross income. This bill would extend the benefits of that provision to shared living arrangements.

In essence, a shared living arrangement is an adult in need of foster care who has a roommate. Typically, roommates in these situations are independent contractors, who work under the auspices of nonprofit community service organizations. Roommates agree to provide certain services to the foster care adult, such as being available overnight in the event the adult needs personal assistance. They provide companionship and guidance within and outside the home for cooking, cleaning, shopping, and recreation. These individuals also assist with personal hygiene and medical needs. They work cooperatively with family, friends, and neighbors and allow the foster care adult to live in dignity in his or her home and community.

Mr. Speaker, in New Hampshire we are very proud of our record in meeting the needs of persons with disabilities. We were the first State to close our public institution for the developmentally disabled. Since the early 1980's, we have led the Nation in developing a system of community-based services for persons with disabilities. Shared living arrangements and adult foster care have been an important part of our strategy to maximize the independence of our developmentally disabled citizens while also saving taxpayer dollars.

This legislation would expand on New Hampshire's record of success. It will expand access to needed support services and encourage more citizens to participate in efforts to undertake foster care responsibilities in their communities. This is exactly the kind of approach that Members from both sides have advocated in the debate over long-term health care. Persons with disabilities and the elderly have diverse needs and abilities. By expanding the range of choices available to meet their needs, we can enable them to remain safely and comfortably in their homes and communities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important initiative for adults with disabilities and join me in cosponsoring this proposal.

COMMEMORATION OF THE 76TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 1994

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 76th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. On Sunday, February 13th, the Detroit-area Lithuanian community will mark the event by holding a commemorative ceremony at the Lithuanian Cultural Center in Southfield, MI.

This year's observance of Lithuanian independence is a particularly happy occasion. After nearly 54 years of occupation, it is the first anniversary celebrated without Russian military forces deployed inside the Republic.

Although Lithuania continues to face many challenges, there are many things to celebrate. Lithuania is in the process of creating new democratic institutions and establishing diplomatic relations with the rest of the world. The transition to a market economy will be difficult; however, it is occurring. Although state domination of much of the economy continues, over 80 percent of small enterprises are now in private hands.

I am watching events in Lithuania and remain guardedly optimistic. I am particularly concerned about the 100,000 Russian troops in the neighboring region of Kaliningrad. The United States never recognized the illegal annexation of Lithuania and has always supported independence. The remaining troops in Latvia and Estonia must also be removed and guarantees must be secured that these forces will never again threaten the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Baltic Nations.

I commend the Lithuanian-American community for their vigilance through the many difficult years and I urge my colleagues to join me in commemorating the 76th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

IN HONOR OF TALMADGE DAVIS

HON. GEORGE (BUDDY) DARDEN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 1994

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a man who has served his community honorably for more than three decades: Talmadge Davis of Heard County, GA.

In 1957, Talmadge was elected clerk of Superior Court of Heard County, where he served for 20 years. From January 1978 until his recent retirement, Talmadge served as president of the Bank of Heard County.

Mr. Speaker, a sign of the deep respect and admiration the people of Heard County have for Talmadge Davis is the fact that more than 200 citizens stopped by the bank to congratulate Talmadge on his retirement and to wish him well.

Although he will no longer be bank president, Talmadge will still serve his community

as a member of the Heard County Water Authority Board, the Heard County Development Authority, the Chattahoochee-Flint Regional Development Center Board, and the Heard County Chamber of Commerce. Talmadge will also serve on the Bank of Heard County's board as well.

Talmadge has given 36 years of outstanding service to the people of Heard County. His legacy of service is something all of us should strive to emulate. I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Talmadge and his wife Jackie a happy retirement.

COMMEMORATING THE LAKE COUNTY DRUG TASK FORCE

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 1994

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commemorate the brave men and women of the Lake County drug task force for executing the largest cocaine seizure in the history of the State of Indiana. It is the hard work of these individuals and others like them across the Nation who put their lives on the line every day to help us win the war on drugs and crime.

On the afternoon of Tuesday, August 17, 1993, the Lake County drug task force raided a home in Dyer, IN, and seized 176 pounds of cocaine with an estimated street value of \$15 million. The raid culminated an 11-month investigation that previously resulted in the seizure of thousands of dollars, a truck, and two motorcycles.

The success of the drug task force is personally gratifying to me since I know its members. The success of the drug task force should be gratifying to Congress as a whole because it is the congressional appropriation of Federal dollars through the Bureau of Justice Assistance Program that provides the money to fund its vital activities.

The men and women who make up the Lake County drug task force are: Sheriff Stephen Stiglich, chairman of the board; Assistant Chief Judith Petro, project director; Gus Flores, intelligence analyst; Sgt. Richard Borchert, unit supervisor; DEA Agent Raymundo Vasquez; Officer Shaw Spurlock; Officer Zon Haralovich; Officer Luis Lopez; Officer Cynthia Shelton; Officer Reginald Harris; Officer Anthony Stanley; Officer Thomas Hyde; office manager Linda James; secretary Carmen Drew; and others. We are indebted to these individuals and other law enforcement agencies throughout Lake County, whose heroic efforts to fight drugs and crime make northwest Indiana a safer place to work and live.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the rising tide of drugs and crime makes the mission of the Lake County drug task force even more important. The record seizure last August was of great historical significance to the Hoosier State and the Nation. Its continued success is a victory for the people of northwest Indiana

and the rule of law and order. I call on you and my other House colleagues to join me in commending the outstanding work of the Lake County drug task force and of all those who made this possible.

THE PATRIOT: AN AMERICAN SUCCESS STORY

HON. PETER G. TORKILDSEN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 1994

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Patriot Air Defense System represents a remarkable technological achievement for our country. Its performance against tactical ballistic missiles during Desert Storm—against a threat for which the system was not originally designed—is a major success story for American technology, the American worker, and the American Armed Forces. From a military perspective, it protected airfields, key debarkation points, and critical assets while allowing the United States and its allies free access to all required airspace. From a strategic perspective, it denied Saddam Hussein any significant success with his most touted terror weapon, the Scud. The effective use of Patriot during the war saved countless military and civilian lives, reduced major damage to civilian dwellings, protected allied war fighting assets necessary for the successful prosecution of the campaign and allowed Israel to remain out of the conflict.

In Saudi Arabia, the Patriot was an outstanding success. The United States Army has officially scored Patriot's success at over 70 percent. Patriot units were deployed with the first United States troops to enter Saudi Arabia and were under the command and control of the United States Army and were operating under procedures developed and optimized over time by the United States Army who had ample time to optimize the defense design and conduct training exercises from locations that would later engage actual incoming Scuds attacks. When Desert Storm was initiated, all Patriot fire units were strategically in place, ready to protect key national, and military assets with trained troops prepared to engage the enemy.

In Israel, the opposite occurred. Patriot fire units were hastily deployed after a number of Scuds had already inflicted heavy damage to the cities of Tel Aviv and Haifa. There was little time for site optimization or onsite crew training and the Israeli crews manning Israeli Patriot units had not finished their training on Patriot in the United States. When the Israeli soldiers were sent to war with their Patriot equipment, they had only completed 6 weeks of a scheduled 16-week operational training course in the United States and, although hard to believe, they had never fired a Patriot missile. Furthermore, all Patriot units in Israel were under the control of the Israeli Defense Force, which was itself unfamiliar with Patriot operations.

The sites chosen for deployment in Israel resulted in gaps in overall coverage, poor in

defense of urban areas and high radar interference from surrounding structures. In addition, radar beams were improperly directed into buildings which caused Patriot missiles to fly into the ground after launch. To further complicate the situation, an ad hoc group of academicians involved in the defense process initiated experimentation with Patriot which included: continually modifying the firing doctrine; changing intercept altitudes; cross firing from multiple fire units; and authorizing operators to fire at will. Given all this, it is a miracle that Patriot worked at all against tactical ballistic missiles in Israel since the system was deployed and operated in conflict with established United States Army doctrine. Even under the conditions described above, Patriot successfully intercepted over 40 percent of the Scuds it engaged in Israel.

The United States should be proud of Patriot and the role it played in helping win the gulf war and hold the coalition together. All of us should be proud that the system stands guard today here at home and in many foreign countries, and helps to preserve peace in many parts of the world.

SCHOOL COUNSELORS PRAISED

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 1994

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with you and my colleagues my appreciation for the work conducted by our school counselors. Students who attend school in the 1990's face an incredible set of challenges, obstacles, and choices which can impact them immediately and well into their adulthood.

The school counselors of the 1990's are trained professionals who must meet State certification standards, and if they are members of the American Counseling Association, are bound to a code of ethics. Children as young as 5 years old come to school and face the problems of drugs, violence, and social problems that many of us never thought existed when we went to school. And, while some of us did experience the pain of prejudice, I am glad to see that today's school counselors are trained in facilitating classroom and small group exercises which help kids appreciate each other's differences—rather than use such diversity to divide and segregate.

School counselors consult with teachers to improve classroom behavior and they work with the parents of students who may be experiencing academic or adjustment problems.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the rich ethnic and cultural diversity which encourages what I feel are some of the best educational institutions in this country. To ensure that the elementary, middle, secondary, and postsecondary schools of my district provide the best possible education for all of our students, regardless of income, ethnicity, disability or social situation requires a team of highly skilled educational professionals. We are fortunate in the 15th Congressional District to have dedicated

educators who each day provide important services to our students. Among this group of professionals are school counselors.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join with me during National School Counseling Week in acknowledging the dedication of our Nation's professional school counselors.

WHY YOUR WAGES KEEP FALLING

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 1994

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, recently John B. Judis published an excellent analysis of the fall in American wages, in the *New Republic*. I'm pleased to insert this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the *New Republic*, Feb. 14, 1994]

WHY YOUR WAGES KEEP FALLING

(By John B. Judis)

"For twenty years the wages of working people have been stagnant or declining. * * * For too many families, even when both parents were working, the American dream has been slipping away. In 1992 the American people demanded that we change," Bill Clinton declared in his State of the Union address. But in the year he has been in office, Clinton has not succeeded any better than his predecessors in meeting that demand. Last year, Americans' hourly wages didn't grow at all. And the wages of workers in mining, construction, transportation, public utilities, retail, business and health services fell as much as 2 percent. Even college-educated workers—thought to be immune from economic distress—saw their wages drop almost 1 percent. And these are the lucky ones. The rest have had to make do with temporary jobs or have simply been laid off.

As Clinton acknowledged, these figures are about more than just dollars and cents. They are about the sustaining myth of American life. In the twentieth century, the promise of America—once religious salvation—became an ever rising standard of living. Until the 1970s that promise was fulfilled. But since then, Americans' real wages have been falling at an increasing rate—1.6 percent from 1973 to 1978 and 9.6 percent from 1979 to 1993. So far the reaction has been a low rumble, muted by two-earner families and overtime hours. But if wages continue to decline, that rumble could turn into a deafening roar.

There are plenty of causes: government policies, new technologies and automation, more women in the work force. But the most important, and an often overlooked one, is the change that occurred in the relationship between business and labor after the loss of American industrial supremacy. The unfashionable truth is that the decline of American wages has been largely a result of the decline of American labor unions.

From World War II through the early '70s, American business and labor leaders enjoyed an amicable relationship. They worked together against Soviet communism and for free trade, civil rights and increases in Social Security and the minimum wage. While they sometimes exchanged harsh words at the bargaining table, they reached agree-

ments that, between 1948 and 1973, doubled the real wages and benefits of American workers. The relationship was sustained by U.S. firms' domination of the world market. American steel and auto companies could always offset wage increases with price increases without undermining their profits or market share.

During these years, American workers in the private sector occupied three tiers. On the first tier were workers from largely unionized industries in manufacturing, transportation, mining and construction. These workers enjoyed a 10 percent to 30 percent wage and benefit premium over their nonunion counterparts, who comprised the second tier. The third tier was made up of primarily nonunion service and small-business workers. Wages in this tier, subject to supply and demand and the minimum wage, ran as little as one-third of those in the first tier. Despite the hierarchy, however, workers in the second and third tiers benefited from the wage gains and clout of first-tier unionized workers. Employers of nonunionized workers in industries dominated by unions often paid comparable salaries in order to discourage unionization. And third-tier workers benefited not only from increases in the minimum wage won by unions, but also from the looming threat of unionization.

By the early '70s, American business lost the industrial superiority that had supported this edifice. In 1971 the United States, competing with revived European and Japanese manufacturers, ran its first trade deficit since 1893. And as more countries modernized, American firms in key industries such as steel, automobiles, shipbuilding and textiles faced a global glut of production. Business became a tougher game in which even minor price increases could lead to huge losses in market share and profits. It was under this pressure that American firms began to re-examine their relationship with labor and their commitment to the prevailing wage structure.

During the 1970s corporations started to resist wage increases and fight labor unions in the political arena. In 1972 corporate CEOs formed their own lobbying organization, the Business Roundtable. During the Carter years, the Roundtable's lobbyists succeeded in watering down the Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment Bill and in blocking labor law reform that would have amended the National Labor Relations Act to increase the penalties on employers that used intimidation to discourage workers from joining a union. In the 1980s, under Ronald Reagan, business went even further, defeating attempts to adjust the minimum wage to inflation and securing the nomination of anti-labor candidates to the National Labor Relations Board and other government panels.

During the Reagan years, businesses also began to demand and get "givebacks" from unions. Corporations won unprecedented concessions in meat-packing, tires, steel, motor vehicles, trucking and air transportation. Companies that didn't have unions used long neglected loopholes in labor law to thwart unionization; other unionized companies such as Phelps Dodge and Eastern Airlines, inspired by Reagan's ouster of the PATCO strikers, sought to remove their unions.

Under relentless attack from business and facing a hostile administration in Washing-

ton, unions lost ground, declining from 31 percent of the nonagricultural work force in 1970 to 26 percent in 1979 to 13 percent today. The effect of this on wages can be calculated by multiplying the loss in the wage premium by the number of workers who might otherwise have been represented by unions. On this basis, Lawrence Mishel and Jared Bernstein of the Economic Policy Institute, the authors of "The State of Working America," estimate that the collapse of unionism cost blue-collar workers 3.6 percent in real wages from 1978 to 1988.

At a deeper level, business' successful offensive against unions changed the wage structure of the American economy. Instead of unionized workers setting the pace in wages, they became a lagging indicator of the real state of the wage economy. The first tier began to shrink and collapse into the second tier. Workers in the heavily unionized steel industry, for example, saw their wages fall from \$20.37 per hour in 1981 to \$17.91 per hour in 1987 to \$16.87 per hour in 1992 (all these figures are in 1992 dollars). Workers in the second tier began to see their wages driven down to the level of nonunionized laborers and service workers. The wages of partially unionized meat-packing workers went from \$13.98 per hour in 1981 to \$10.39 per hour in 1987 to \$9.15 per hour in 1992. Meanwhile, workers in the third tier, deprived of even the modest protections of the minimum wage, found themselves edging toward subsistence levels. Workers in restaurants and bars—one of the fastest-growing groups in the 1980s—saw their wages fall from \$6.14 per hour in 1981 to \$5.46 per hour in 1987 to \$5.29 per hour in 1992.

This collapse of the partnership between business and labor and the resulting decline of unionism helps explain why real wages fell so sharply in the United States but were resilient in Western Europe and Japan. European and Japanese firms also faced stiff competition and global overcapacity in the 1970s and 1980s. But in Western Europe, because of the strength of their unions and their countries' social democratic parties, and in Japan, because of the commitment to a harmonious relationship between labor and business, firms sought other means to protect their profits, from trade protection to limits on immigrant workers to on-the-job productivity. When these measures failed, they even accepted lower profit rates. In the United States, however, business sought to defend its profits primarily by holding down wages: often by eliminating unions or preventing them from organizing.

In this climate, other shifts took place to weaken wages still further. To cut costs, businesses began to move manufacturing facilities overseas. In 1987 automakers spent \$28 billion on parts manufactured overseas, up from \$8 billion ten years before. The Big Three went from importing 500,000 engines in 1983 to 1.92 million in 1987. Companies also replaced workers with technology. From 1979 to 1992, thanks to automation, manufacturing output rose 13.1 percent, while the work force declined by 15 percent. Both trends eliminated many of the higher-wage first-tier jobs and plunged these workers into competition for lower-wage second-tier and third-tier jobs. In 1979, 38 percent of 25- to 34-year-old male high school graduates were employed in better-paying manufacturing jobs; by 1987 only 29 percent were, while those employed in the low-paying wholesale

and retail trade sector rose from 18 percent to 23 percent. And union attempts to organize these service workers proved largely unsuccessful.

The trade deficit and immigration didn't help. In 1982 the United States began running massive trade deficits in industrial goods, particularly cars, auto parts and consumer electronics, creating a net loss of American manufacturing jobs. And the influx of unskilled immigrants during the '80s drove down the wages of third-tier workers, particularly in the West. In a 1991 study for the National Bureau of Economic Research, economists George J. Borjas, Richard Freeman and Lawrence Katz (who is now the Labor Department's chief economist) estimated that from 1980 to 1988, up to half of the 10 percent decline in the wages of high school dropouts was attributable to the trade deficit and the immigration of unskilled labor.

The entry of women into the work force may also have depressed real wages. From 1970 to 1988 the percentage of working women rose from 43.3 to 56.6. These new workers probably helped hold down wages in third-tier service work, but more important, they allowed the impact of the sharp contraction of male income to be softened. By contributing to family income, women made it possible for families to increase their income even though individual wages were declining. According to Mishel and Bernstein, family income grew 0.6 percent per year from 1973 to 1979 and 0.4 percent from 1979 to 1989. If family income had declined at the same precipitous rate as male income, then workers would have fiercely resisted wage cuts, and the 1980s might have been a period of labor militancy similar to the 1870s or 1930s.

Of course, not all workers have suffered declining wages in the past two decades. During the 1970s college-educated workers and upper-level white-collar workers found their wages stagnating, but in the early '80s, they gained ground, creating a widening gulf between lower- and upper-income workers and between high school and college-educated workers. But this gap may prove transitory. From 1989 to 1993 the wages of white-collar executives and managers dropped 0.8 percent, the wages of technical workers fell 2.9 percent and the wages of college-educated workers declined by 2.5 percent.

The rise and then fall in white-collar wages was caused partly by a shift in supply and demand. According to economists Frank Levy and Richard Murnane, the number of college-educated workers rose 85 percent between 1971 and 1980; then, between 1979 and 1987, a time when new technology was creating demand for specially trained workers, the number rose by only 32 percent, bidding up wages. Now supply is once more outrunning demand. In *The Monthly Labor Review*, Kristina Shelley, an economist at the Bureau of Labor Statistics, predicts that from 1990 to 2005 job openings for college graduates will slump compared with the previous five years, while the number of bachelor's degrees will increase. The temporary reprieve for college-educated earnings may already be over.

White-collar and college-educated workers are also going through a process called "proletarianization." Initially seen as professionals or as part of management, these workers are now finding their work regulated in the same manner as wage workers in

factories and offices. Doctors and nurses have become employees of HMOs; computer programmers have become piece workers for giant software firms. As they have lost the prerogatives of management or the protections of a craft guild, their wages have begun to fall like everyone else's.

So what's to be done? Plenty of solutions have been proposed to counter the decline of wages, but most of them address secondary rather than primary causes. Economists typically blame lower wages on lagging productivity and hope higher productivity is the answer. They're half-right. Higher productivity is necessary for higher real wages, but it hasn't turned out to be sufficient. During the 1980s manufacturing productivity grew a robust 3.6 percent annually, but manufacturing wages fell by 0.6 percent per year. What might have been labor's share went into dividends and profits.

Clinton's solution, derived from Secretary of Labor Robert Reich, is to finance worker retraining. Reich argues that the cause of wage decline is a mismatch between workers' skills and the demands of a high-tech economy, resulting in too many unskilled or semi-skilled workers chasing too few jobs and too few college graduates chasing the new high-wage, high-skill jobs. Reich has proposed spending \$3.5 billion on worker retraining over the next four years. "All of the studies show that if you get long-term training [for] a year or more," Reich explains, "you're going to affect your future incomes by increasing that future income by an average of 5 to 6 percent."

Reich is also half-right. There's a surplus of unskilled and semi-skilled labor. Unfortunately, giving them skills won't necessarily help things. According to a study last fall by James Franklin of the Bureau of Labor Statistics most new jobs in the next decade will be as unskilled hospital orderlies or food preparation workers, not as software engineers or marketing supervisors. And while training, especially on the job, can boost productivity, studies don't bear out Reich's or Clinton's hopes that it will raise the future wages of those involved. The most recent Labor Department survey, conducted by the highly respected Mathematica Policy Group, found that laid-off workers who underwent training under the Trade Adjustment Assistance Act failed to raise their wages. More than three-quarters of the workers, the study found, "earned less in their new job three years after their initial unemployment insurance claim than they did in their pre-layoff job."

The solution favored by many labor leaders and liberal Democrats is to restore the pre-1973 status quo. They want to raise the minimum wage (which Clinton has postponed asking Congress to do), reform labor laws, restrict the immigration of unskilled workers and remove incentives for firms to have foreign countries do their manufacturing. While these measures address the cause of wage decline much more directly than do the economists' or Clinton's proposals, they slight the genuine dilemma that American businesses face. If wages were to increase at the rate that they did from 1948 to 1973, many American firms quickly would suffer the fate of Frigidaire or Philco. The world economy is simply a different and less friendly place than it once was.

What is really needed is a grand compromise between business and labor, where

business would secure labor's commitment to raising productivity and keeping wage costs competitive in exchange for its support of legislation strengthening labor's organizing rights. Although it wouldn't restore the status quo ante, this kind of compromise would do more to brake the fall in wages than the most innovative training program.

Some labor economists and maverick labor leaders have already suggested this kind of compromise. MIT economist Thomas Kochan, a member of the administration's newly appointed Commission on the Future of Worker-Management Relations, has proposed one possible deal. Business would support labor law reform to put teeth into that laws that deter companies from strong-arming against union organization. In return, labor would swallow what is now a potentially illegal way to raise worker productivity—Japanese-style, management-sponsored employee committees in nonunion workplaces. But while some labor unions would support this kind of compromise, business is almost universally opposed. Absent a wave of 1930s-style worker militance, business leaders believe they would be giving up more than they receive by agreeing to any new labor organizing rights. Kochan has tried to interest Clinton and Reich in this idea, but they remain enthralled with the panacea of retraining.

It would be nice if the affliction of falling real wages could be cured through the market's invisible hand. But it has already persisted through three recessions and recoveries. It's a problem that ultimately requires visionary thinking and radical political action. But like other such problems (welfare reform leaps to mind), the decline of wages will probably have to get worse before everyone can agree on a viable strategy for reversing it. What our standard of living will be when that happens is anybody's guess.

FOURTH DISTRICT HEALTH CARE REFORM

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 1994

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on January 20 I conducted a health care reform and community meeting in Raleigh. The purpose of this marathon session, which went from 9 a.m. until 10:30 p.m. with brief breaks to take nourishment, was to bring the national health care debate home to North Carolina—to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the health care system in our part of the State, to examine the stake we have in reform, and to discover what positive contributions we might make to the national debate. After hearing from five panels on special health care topics throughout the day, the community meeting provided a useful opportunity for individual constituents to voice their concerns. Over 50 constituents took the microphone, often recounting experiences that put a human face on this daunting policy challenge. The enthusiastic, sometimes heated participation of my constituents suggests that this is indeed a front-burner issue in North Carolina. Over 200 people attended our morning and afternoon sessions, and over 250 peo-

ple took part in the evening's community meeting.

Throughout the day, several moderators joined me and an overflow audience at North Carolina State University's McKimmon Center in receiving testimony from panels of expert witnesses on children's and adolescents' health needs, health care innovations, the needs of the uninsured and underserved, small business concerns, and alternative reform and cost containment strategies.

Joining me in moderating the five panels were Lt. Gov. Dennis Wicker, North Carolina House of Representatives Speaker Dan Blue, Health Care Financing Agency (HCFA) Deputy Administrator Dr. Helen Smits, and North Carolina Division of Medical Assistance Director Barbara Matula.

The day's testimony left little doubt that American health care, at its best, is the most proficient and innovative in the world. But we also found ample evidence that this care is not being delivered equitably or at acceptable cost to all of our citizens. Part of the solution, almost all witnesses stressed, is insurance reform, so that basic coverage is not jeopardized or priced out of reach when one moves or changes jobs or gets sick. But many also stressed that insurance reform is not the total solution. Insurance coverage may be of little benefit to families who have no medical providers or facilities nearby or have no knowledge of the basics of health care or of what services are available to them. Efforts at education and outreach must be stepped up, and both patients and providers must pay more attention to healthy lifestyles and preventive care.

We also heard a great deal of testimony about the progress we have made in discovering new drugs and therapies, reorganizing the delivery of care and controlling costs, and reaching underserved populations—and of how reform must nurture such innovations and preserve the good coverage and freedom of choice that many people already enjoy. It also became clear that while no perfect solution is available—if it existed, we no doubt would have discovered it by now—the status quo cries out for change. The President and Mrs. Clinton have successfully brought this issue to the fore, but a great deal of debate and hard work still lie ahead.

Our first panel focused on the health needs of children and adolescents. John Niblock, president of the North Carolina Child Advocacy Institute, and Dr. Stephen Edwards, a prominent Raleigh pediatrician, gave an alarming health profile of North Carolina's children—some 300,000 of whom are without health insurance—and outlined what changes in health policy are required to address their needs. Dr. Michael Durfee and State school nurse consultant Marilyn Asay portrayed adolescents as the most underserved population and the most difficult to reach, and described their respective outreach efforts through Wake Teen Medical Services and school-based clinics. Paul Hildebrand, executive director of the Alice Aycock Poe Center for Health Education in Raleigh, told of the enthusiastic reception that the modern, multimedia presentations of the

Poe Center have had from North Carolina school children. Kathy H. Richardson, maternity care coordinator for the Baby Love Program at Twin County Rural Health Center in Hollister, NC, told of the innovative ways this program had reached out to poor women in a rural county to ensure that they received proper maternity care.

The second panel, health care and innovation, brought together a number of different ideas that have worked well in North Carolina and deserve wider dissemination. Gale Johnston Adcock, coordinator of primary care services and wellness education at SAS Institute, told how 95 percent of SAS's employees and families took advantage of the company-based wellness program and of the positive effect the program had on company health care costs. Dr. Robert C. Bast, Jr., director of the Duke Comprehensive Cancer Center, highlighted recent advances in cancer prevention and treatment and stressed the importance of sustaining vital research. Dr. Leah Devlin, director of the Wake County Health Department, told of several innovative ways that the county had put together partnerships and combined various sources of local, State, and Federal moneys to deliver public health services. Dr. E. Harvey Estes, Jr., director of the Kate B. Reynolds Community Practitioner Program of the North Carolina Medical Society Foundation, told of the foundation's program to recruit and retain primary care physicians for underserved areas in North Carolina. Dr. David Goff, a pediatrician, discussed the positive ways that managed care systems and primary care physicians can expand access to care and help contain costs. Meg Molloy, nutrition program director of the Sarah W. Stedman Center for Nutritional Studies at the Duke Center for Living, emphasized the importance of nutrition education in encouraging healthy lifestyles and of nutrition therapies as a cost-effective treatment of heart disease and other disorders. Dr. James E. Nidel, director of Glaxo Research Institute, stressed the promise of pharmaceutical research in developing cost-effective treatments. Bill Remmes, administrator of Rural Health Group, Inc., related how a network of five medical offices, a nursing home and rest home, apartments for the elderly, and a senior center had been built and organized over a decade in two rural counties.

Our third panel dealt with health care and small business. Two North Carolina businessmen—Robert B. Allbert, owner and operator of 30 Precision Tune shops, and Joe Stanley, owner of Joe and Moe's Auto Repair in Shallotte, NC—told about the special problems of small businesses in obtaining affordable health care coverage for their employees but also sounded a warning about the possible costs of reform. Jim Long, insurance commissioner for North Carolina, discussed the initiatives his department had used to expand coverage throughout the State. Parham McNair, representing the Independent Insurance Agents, told of the special services independent agents provide as the link between insurance providers and small businesses. Elizabeth F. Kuniholm, speaking both as a small businesswoman and representative of the

North Carolina Academy of Trial Lawyers, discussed the issue of malpractice reform. Harrison J. Kaplan, counsel and government relations manager for Kaiser Permanente, discussed business participation in health maintenance organizations and their success in rendering cost-effective health care services.

On panel four we turned to competing reform proposals and their implications for North Carolina and the Nation. Brad Adcock of North Carolina Blue Cross/Blue Shield, Moses Carey, Jr., executive director of Orange-Chatham Comprehensive Health Services, Inc., Robert J. Greczyn, Jr., chief executive officer of the Carolina Physicians' Health Plan, Dr. Donald T. Lucey from the North Carolina Medical Society, and Eric Munson, executive director of the University of North Carolina Hospitals, each diagnosed the strengths and weaknesses of the present system and presented their priorities for reform. Christopher J. Conover of Duke University's Center for Health Policy Research and Education gave a careful analysis of how and why "managed competition" could work. Joe Graedon of the syndicated column and radio show "The People's Pharmacy" stressed the importance of outcomes research and other means of informing and empowering consumers to successful reform. Pam Silberman, project director with the North Carolina Health Access Coalition, set down the elements of successful health care reform as identified by the coalition she represents.

Our fifth and final panel, "Underserved Health Care Needs," focused on three key areas of need: Older Americans and long-term health care, mental health, and low-income rural and urban populations. Martha Brown, with the Home Health Care Association of Chapel Hill, told of the value and cost-effectiveness of home-based care. Travis H. Tomlinson, Jr., president of Whitaker Glen, a 96-unit comprehensive retirement community in Raleigh, discussed several aspects of President Clinton's proposed health care reform plan and emphasized that home-health care and nursing home care served two distinct populations. Bennett Cotten, a clinical social worker representing the North Carolina Association of Social Workers, and Dr. David Smoot, representing the North Carolina Psychological Association, discussed the extent of mental illness and the benefits of including adequate coverage in any health care reform plan. Maureen Darcy, certified nurse-midwife, and Torlen L. (Tork) Wade, associate director of the North Carolina Office of Rural Health and Resource Development, discussed the difficulties in attracting and retaining primary care providers in rural areas and the efforts underway in North Carolina to do so. Barbara Zelter Earls, representing North Carolina Fair Share, stressed the importance of securing comprehensive coverage for all income groups.

Helen Smits of the Health Care Financing Administration, representing the Clinton administration, joined me for the evening community meeting at which over 50 citizens told their stories and expressed their views. In policy preference, they ranged from some who thought the Clinton plan not comprehensive

enough to others who would repeal even Medicare if given the chance. Several farmers protested the singling out of tobacco for a hefty excise tax increase, wondering why other products with associated health care costs were not included. Some spoke for and others against the inclusion of abortion in the basic health plan. Small business owners expressed apprehension about the expense of coverage, although some argued for leveling the playing field between businesses that did and did not cover their employees. Some people reported having good coverage and positive experiences with local hospitals and doctors, and warned against disrupting those relationships. But others recounted losing their coverage after serious illnesses and having to fight for payments for procedures they thought were covered. Many were willing to tell intensely personal stories, which underscored the high stakes we have in reforming the system but also in getting it right.

A full transcript of the health care forum is being prepared and will be distributed to the congressional committees of jurisdiction and to others who are interested. I am grateful to the many panelists and other constituents who participated. I believe that all of us there came away with a better understanding of the importance of health care reform to North Carolina and the Nation and the implications of the policy choices we face.

THE PIN-STRIPE APPROACH TO GENOCIDE

HON. FRANK McCLOSKEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 11, 1994

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit a very important statement on Bosnian policy development by Richard Johnson, a very dedicated and able State Department officer.

The statement follows:

THE PIN-STRIPE APPROACH TO GENOCIDE (By Richard Johnson)

My thesis here is a simple one: senior U.S. Government officials know that Serb leaders are waging genocide in Bosnia, but will not say so in plain English because this would raise the pressures for U.S. action.

Since late summer 1992 the Executive Branch of the U.S. Government, under both the Bush and Clinton Administrations, has come under significant pressure to make an unequivocal determination that the Serb campaign in Bosnia constitutes genocide under the 1948 UN Genocide Convention.¹

External pressures have come from the U.S. media, human rights organizations, American Jewish and Moslem advocacy groups, prominent foreign policy experts, members of Congress, the Bosnian government, and from states friendly to Bosnia at UN fora including the UN General Assembly, the UN Commission for Human Rights, and the June 1993 UN World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna.²

Internal pressures have come from lower and middle-level Foreign Service Officers (FSO's) with line responsibilities for U.S. policy on Bosnia, other FSO's who have used the State Department's dissent channel mechanism to press their views, and the four FSO's who subsequently resigned to protest U.S. policies.³

These pressures have triggered a number of statements by senior State Department officials and by the President, particularly since December 1992, that implicitly or explicitly address the issue of whether genocide is underway in Bosnia.⁴

Some of these come very close to saying yes. However, none make a clear and unequivocal determination that Serb leaders are waging genocide in Bosnia, and that the moral and legal obligations of the Genocide Convention apply. Instead, Administration statements have typically asserted that the Serb campaign "borders on genocide," or that "certain actions" by "Bosnian Serbs" have been "tantamount to genocide" or constitute "acts of genocide."⁵ There are two hypothetical explanations for such equivocation.

One is that further collection and assessment of evidence is needed before a clear determination can be made, particularly with regard to intent (e.g., do Serb leaders and their forces seek to destroy a substantial part of the Bosnian Moslem population, or rather to displace it, or does the mass murder by Serb forces stem from a systematic plan or from a coincidence of local decisions by local commanders?) and responsibility (can responsibility be traced up to Bosnian Serb political and military leaders, and to Serb leaders in Serbia, and with what degree of conclusiveness?).

Several State and NSC officials put forward this explanation to the author, in more or less explicit terms. These officials would often also assert that the genocide issue may be of moral and historical interest, but is not of operational importance in terms of pursuing justice (war crimes are easier to prove than genocide) or ending the killing in Bosnia (through a "negotiated settlement").⁶

However, some of these as well as other State officials also acknowledge that policymakers at the White House and in State have shown little interest in clearing up the questions that supposedly stand in the way of an unequivocal finding of Serb genocide in Bosnia. There has never been a Presidential or NSC directive to State and other intelligence agencies to conduct research and analysis aimed at establishing whether there is a good case against Milosevic et al. for genocide in Bosnia. Nor has there been any mobilization of resources to this end. The human resources applied to the Bosnia war crimes issue at State and CIA have been minimal, and have declined at State in 1993. The personnel involved have been tasked more with recording specific war crimes than with tracking the responsibility for such war crimes to the Serb leadership.⁷

The other explanation is that policymakers have opted for equivocation because an explicit, unequivocal determination that genocide is underway in Bosnia, and that Milosevic, Karadzic and their military commanders are responsible, would produce more political pressure to take effective action, including the use of force, to end and punish the genocide. At a minimum, such a determination would undermine the credibility of

Western policies that rely on UN/EC-mediated "peace talks" to reach a "voluntary settlement" between "warring factions"—who would now be defined as the perpetrators and victims of genocide. This explanation is supported by the following elements of the Executive Branch treatment of this issue since fall 1992.⁸

The most explicit, forward-leaning Administration positions have never been followed up with consequent actions. In August 1992 State confirmed that Serb-run "detention centers" in Bosnia featuring systematic killing and torture were a significant problem.⁹ State then initiated a process of submitting data on war crimes in Bosnia to the UN War Crimes Commission. However, lead action on compiling these submissions was assigned to an FSO in the Human Rights Bureau with no prior knowledge of Balkan affairs, and a short-term State intern just out of college; hardly a commitment of personnel and expertise commensurate to the recognized gravity of the issue.¹⁰

In mid-December 1992, Acting Secretary Eagleburger broke new ground in drawing parallels between Serb behavior in Bosnia and Nazi behavior, naming senior Serb leaders as bearing responsibility for war crimes and crimes against humanity in Bosnia, and citing some of the questions they should face. However, his public statements were not followed up by any internal taskings within State or to CIA to build up cases against these leaders.¹¹

In mid-December 1992 the United States also voted for a UN General Assembly resolution on Bosnia which, among other things, stated that Serb "ethnic cleansing" in Bosnia is a form of genocide.¹² However, the Executive Branch never followed up by citing or using this determination as a basis for Western policies. Similarly, in June 1993 the United States supported an appeal of the UN World Conference on Human Rights to the UN Security Council to take "necessary measures to end the genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina . . ." However, the U.S. took no subsequent action on the basis of this appeal and its finding of genocide. Indeed, as of December 1993, an official at State Department Bureau of Human Rights was unable to locate a copy of the Conference appeal in office files, and described it as something the Department viewed as "not really an official act of the Conference."¹³

More equivocal statements tend to be made by more senior officials in high-profile fashion. Less equivocal statements are made by lesser officials in lower-profile fashion. The President has, largely in response to questioning, repeatedly drawn some degree of analogy between the Holocaust and the present mass extermination of Bosnians. But he has chosen never explicitly to address whether Serb leaders are engaged in genocide.¹⁴ Warren Christopher volunteered during his confirmation hearings that the Serb campaign of "ethnic cleansing" was resulting in "near genocidal or perhaps really genocidal conditions."¹⁵ But he has never raised the issue since becoming Secretary, and his most extensive comments on the matter since then, under questioning on May 18, 1993, before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, are also the most equivocal presentation by any Administration official since the beginning of the war in Bosnia.¹⁶ These comments triggered an extraordinary memo to the Secretary from the Acting Assistant

Footnotes at end of article.

Secretary for Human Rights reminding the Secretary that Serb and Bosnian Serb forces were responsible for the vast majority of war crimes in Bosnia.¹⁷

The most straight-forward statement by a senior official of the Clinton Administration has also been the most obscure: a mid-November written submission to a House subcommittee in response to a question taken by State Counselor Wirth five months earlier, stating that "The Department of State does believe that certain acts committed as part of the systematic Bosnian Serb campaign of 'ethnic cleansing' in Bosnia constitute acts of genocide."¹⁸

Secretary Christopher has opted out of the Bosnia genocide issue since May. Persistent questioning by Congressman McCloskey has been the primary trigger of Administration review of this issue since April 1, when McCloskey got Christopher to promise him a clear determination as to whether the Serb campaign in Bosnia is genocide under the Convention.¹⁹ How to respond to McCloskey's question (and his repeated follow-ups) was a recurrent issue among the Bureaus of European Affairs, Human Rights, Intelligence and Research, International Organizations, Congressional Relations, and the Office of the Legal Advisor, and between these offices and the "seventh floor" (i.e., the Secretary and his senior advisors) from April to October. On October 13 the Secretary finally approved an action memo which had been redrafted numerous times, and which would authorize the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations to sign a letter to McCloskey using the language subsequently used in State's mid-November submission to the House cited above. However, the Secretary annulled his approval of the proposed letter to McCloskey after the latter called for his resignation in mid-October.

In a subsequent exchange with McCloskey during a House Foreign Affairs Committee hearing, Christopher chose not to respond to McCloskey's question on the genocide issue. Instead, the Secretary charged that McCloskey's views on Bosnia would require several hundred thousand U.S. ground troops, asserted that McCloskey's emotions were clouding his judgment, and rejected any further "debate" with McCloskey on Bosnia.²⁰

Seventh-floor policy makers at State have repeatedly rejected efforts by the Bureaus to have them make less equivocal statements of genocide in Bosnia.²¹ On April 1, perhaps in response to McCloskey's questions to Christopher, outgoing State Department spokesman Boucher instructed then-Bosnia desk officer Harris to draft a strong statement by the Secretary on genocide in Bosnia. Harris's draft, dated April 2, was cleared by all the relevant Bureaus and submitted to the Office of the Spokesman. It included the assertion that "The United States Government believes that the practice of 'ethnic cleansing' in Bosnia includes actions that meet the international definition of genocide as well as constitute other war crimes." The statement was never issued; Harris believes it was killed by incoming Department spokesman Donilon, in consultation with the Secretary.

Similar language was again cleared by the relevant Bureaus in September in one iteration of the proposed response to McCloskey's April question to the Secretary; this draft was also rejected by the seventh floor.²¹

Senior policy-makers do not have better information about realities in the Balkans

than do the lesser officials who have sought to bring them to make clearer statements on genocide. Some light on their thinking in rejecting Bureaus' recommendations is shed by comments made by Under Secretary Tarnoff and Counselor Wirth at an April 28, 1993 State Department luncheon for Elie Weisel.

Weisel argued that whether or not genocide was underway in Bosnia, the Serb concentration camps and mass murders there constituted a moral imperative for decisive outside intervention. Tarnoff took Weisel's point but noted that failure in Bosnia would destroy the Clinton Presidency. Wirth agreed with Weisel that the moral stakes in Bosnia were high, but asserted that there were even higher moral stakes at play: "the survival of the fragile liberal coalition represented by this Presidency."²²

CONCLUSION

The story told above is one of many failures. Senior policy-makers have failed to level with the American people on the nature of the moral and security challenge the United States faces in the Balkans. Lesser officials have failed to resist the obfuscation of their seniors. Outside the Executive Branch, the broad range of interested observers who see Milosevic's campaign for a Greater Serbia as an instance of genocidal aggression that the United States must confront have failed to apply coherent and sustained pressure to force at least a straightforward Executive Branch statement on the genocide issue.

I draw no constructive lessons from these failures except that avoiding them requires a series of moral choices by individuals. Those made by senior policy-makers with the most influence in defining the challenges America faces are most momentous. But all, cumulatively, make a difference.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Under the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, to which the United States, the successor states to former Yugoslavia, and some 100 other countries are parties, "genocide" is defined to include any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group: (a) killing members of the group; (b) causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; (d) imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; (e) forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

The Convention is a specific response to Nazi extermination practices during World War II.

² The author is compiling a list of prominent persons, groups, governments, and international fora that have defined Serb behavior in Bosnia as genocide, and will make it available on request.

³ The author is personally aware that in December 1992 three FSO's who had shared responsibility for Yugoslav affairs between 1990 and 1992 used the dissent channel to press for a State determination that Milosevic was engaged in genocide in Bosnia; that in April 1993 twelve FSO's actively engaged in Bosnia policy submitted a letter to the Secretary which among other things described the conflict in Bosnia as Serb genocide; and that the four FSO's who have resigned in protest—George Kenney in August 1992 and Marshall Harris, Steve Walker, and Jon Western in August 1993, have all defined the war as genocide.

⁴ See compendium at Tab A, drawn from White House, State Department and Congressional public documents and the U.S. media.

⁵ Several officers currently and formerly in State's Office of the Legal Advisor have told the author that there is no legal difference between saying starkly that "what has happened is genocide," and saying less starkly that "what has happened is tantamount to genocide" or "what has happened are acts of genocide." The "tantamount to" formulation appears to have originated on the Seventh floor.

⁶ Author's December 1993 interviews with sixteen current and former State employees ranging from desk officers to Deputy Assistant Secretaries, and with NSC European Affairs Director Jenonne Walker in May 1993. In December 1993, Walker declined to discuss U.S. policy process on the issue of genocide in Bosnia with the author, on the grounds that it was "too sensitive."

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ This explanation is also advanced by many of the sixteen current and former FSO's interviewed by the author for this essay.

⁹ See President Bush's August 6, 1992 remarks on "Containing the Crisis in Bosnia and in Former Yugoslavia" and Acting Secretary Eagleburger's August 5, 1992 statement "Detention Centers in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Serbia" in Dispatch, U.S. Department of State Bureau of Public Affairs, August 10, 1992; and George Kenney, "See No Evil," in *The Washington Monthly*, November 1992. Kenney underlines senior State officials' resistance to investigating, confirming, or publicizing Serb atrocities in Bosnia, and their efforts to minimize U.S. media attention to them.

¹⁰ Author's interview with the State Human Rights Bureau action officer and the former intern in question.

¹¹ See Secretary Eagleburger's December 16, 1992 statements in Dispatch, U.S. Department of State Bureau of Public Affairs, December 28, 1992. The absence of follow-up taskers was confirmed to the author in interviews with the current and former FSO's cited above.

¹² See United Nations General Assembly Resolution A/47/92 of December 17, 1992, passed 102 for (including the U.S.), 57 abstentions, and none against, which holds Serbian and Montenegrin forces responsible for aggression and for "the abhorrent policy of 'ethnic cleansing,' which is a form of genocide . . ."

¹³ Author's interviews with State Human Rights Bureau officers, December 1993. Notwithstanding State's unofficial views as to the unofficial status of the Conference's appeal, it was in fact forwarded by Alois Mock, President of the World Conference on Human Rights, to the President of the UN Security Council on June 16, 1993, as a decision of the Conference.

¹⁴ For texts of the President's and Secretary's statements, see compendium at Tab A.

¹⁵ See New York Times, January 14, 1993, cited in compendium at Tab A.

¹⁶ See Christopher's May 18 comments in compendium at Tab A, including the insinuation that Bosnian Muslims are suspected of genocide themselves. Several State officials have told the author that they were flabbergasted by Christopher's remarks on atrocities and genocide in Bosnia in his May 18 House Foreign Affairs Committee Hearing, and that these remarks bore no relationship to expert and consensus views within State on those issues. One State official has told the author that late on May 17, the Secretary's office sought urgent information from the Human Rights Bureau on Bosnian Muslim atrocities only.

¹⁷ Author's interviews with current and former FSO's.

¹⁸ See text of Wirth statement in compendium at Tab A. This statement responded to a question put to Wirth by Congressman McCloskey on June 10 at a House Appropriations Subcommittee meeting.

¹⁹ See McCloskey's April 1 question and Christopher's initial response in compendium at Tab A. The author's account of the reaction to McCloskey's pressures within the Department is based on interviews with current and former FSO's in December 1993.

²⁰ See transcripts of November 4, 1993 House Foreign Affairs Committee Hearing.

²¹ This and the following paragraph are based primarily on the author's December 1993 interview with Marshall Harris, currently foreign policy advisor to Congressman McCloskey.

²² The author witnessed this Weisel/Tarnoff/Wirth luncheon discussion.

TAB A

December 1993—Draft State Department Human Rights for Bosnia: no mention of genocide.

November 18: State Department Counselor Wirth's response to Congressman McCloskey's June 10 questions in public hearings:

"... The Department of State does believe that certain acts committed as part of the systematic Bosnian Serbs campaign of 'ethnic cleansing' in Bosnia constitute acts of genocide."

November 22: Secretary Christopher, Four On-the-Record Interviews with European media: no mention of genocide or even aggression; Bosnia treated as an issue of "warring parties" unwilling to conclude a peace settlement.

November 13: State Department spokesman McCurry declines to comment on whether continuing siege of Sarajevo meets the criteria for NATO air strikes laid down by Christopher in August (i.e., "continued strangulation") and adds: "Is Bosnia horrifying, troubling? ... it is no more horrifying or troubling than the instances around this globe where populations, because of civil strife ... face these kinds of humanitarian disasters." President Clinton asserts "All we can do is to try to make sure that we minimize the human loss coming on for this coming winter." A State Department official's comments: "Who do you champion any more? It's not clear." (Washington Post, November 13)

November 30: Secretary Christopher addresses CSCE Ministerial: no mention of genocide or aggression; Bosnia and Herzegovina treated as humanitarian crisis and scene of "atrocities" to be dealt with by UN War Crimes Tribunal.

November 15: Assistant Secretary Oxman speech on "Why Europe Matters": no mention of the word Bosnia, much less genocide or aggression; Bosnia and Herzegovina treated as "ethnic conflict" within borders of former Yugoslavia.

November 9: Secretary Christopher before Senate Foreign Relations Committee lists 6 US foreign policy (not including Bosnia, Somalia or Haiti) (Newsday, November 5)

November 4: Secretary Christopher before House Foreign Affairs Committee dismisses Congressman McCloskey's charges that USG and Christopher are ignoring genocide in Bosnia, asserts "I don't see any point in debating this subject further," (AP, November 5, Barry Schweid); Christopher does not address McCloskey's assertion that genocide is underway in Bosnia; rather, Christopher asserts that McCloskey's objectives require sending hundreds of thousands of US ground troops to Bosnia whereas "I don't think our vital interests are sufficiently involved to do so ..." (Reuters, November 5, Carol Giacomo)

November 5: Secretary Christopher on CNN "the World Today", responding to Congressman McCloskey's charge that the U.S. is allowing genocide in Bosnia: "... We have a fundamental disagreement. At the end of the day, his proposal would require putting 200,000 or 300,000 American troops into Bosnia to try to take the country back ... to put it back in its pre-war status. I simply disagree with that. And I want the country to know, I don't think that's a good idea."

October 10: Secretary Christopher declines to predict whether US troops will ever be sent to Bosnia to enforce a peace settlement, emphasizing that "very hard questions" will have to be answered positively by the Administration in consultation with Congress (NBC "Meet the Press" October 10)

October 21: Secretary Christopher, Questions and Answers comments on Bosnia, in Hungary:

"... President Clinton has said early on and we continue to say we will not try to impose a solution on the parties. The U.S. is not prepared to send hundreds of thousands of its troops to impose a solution on the parties that are not quite ready for a solution or don't seem to be ready for a solution. We're hoping the parties will come to a peaceful agreement, that they will finally recognize that there is only futility in the war they are pursuing ..."

October 5: Assistant Secretary Oxman before Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

"Lots of innocent people are being killed. But it is a complex problem that we didn't create. And our approach to it has been to support a negotiated settlement. That isn't jazzy, but that's our approach."

September 5: Assistant Secretary Oxman appears before House Foreign Affairs Committee:

"McCloskey, who has been trying since April to get the State Department to say Serb actions fit the legal definitions of genocide, tried again. 'Are they guilty of genocide ... a systematic policy of extermination of, you know, members of a particular ethnic group?' Oxman, using language previously used by Secretary of State Warren Christopher, said actions 'tantamount to genocide have been committed.' But he did not say Serb actions fit 'the technical definition of genocide' under a 1948 UN convention. McCloskey said afterwards that U.S. policy amounts to 'putting a gun to Izetbegovic's head to accept this settlement that will be the death of his country.' He said the State Department was trying to evade its 'moral and legal obligations' to brand Serb actions as genocide and try to prevent them." (Washington Post, September 16)

September 9: Washington Post article on Clinton-Izetbegovic meeting/press conference:

"Clinton reaffirmed his willingness to send troops if there is a 'fair peace that is willingly entered into by the parties ...' But Clinton, asked about the proposal [of Izetbegovic, for NATO air strikes to lift the siege of Sarajevo], rejected it. 'I believe all that has to be part of the negotiating process. I don't think that the U.S. can simply impose an element like that,' he told reporters."

September 9: The New York Times article on Clinton-Izetbegovic meeting describes Clinton Administration as backing away both from threat of NATO air strikes to relieve siege of Sarajevo, and from idea of NATO peacekeepers to enforce settlement.

September 3: The Washington Post:

"The U.S. yesterday backed efforts by Bosnia's Muslims to gain more territory in the proposed partition of the country, as President Clinton warned Serb and Croat forces that the option of using NATO air power against them 'is very much alive' ... 'If while talks are in abeyance,' the President added, 'there is abuse of those who would seek to interfere with humanitarian aid—attacking protected areas, resuming sustained shelling of Sarajevo, for example—then first, I would remind you that the NATO military option is very much alive ...' Clinton, asked if he intended to revive his proposal for exempting Bosnia's Muslim-led government from a UN arms embargo, said ... 'I have always favored lifting the arms embargo. I think the policy of

the UN as it applies to that government is wrong,' he said. 'But I am in the minority. I don't know that I can prevail.'"

September 15: Assistant Secretary Oxman appears before House Foreign Affairs Committee:

"Rep. MCCLOSKEY. ... As you know, since April I've been trying to get an answer from State as to whether these activities of the Bosnian Serbs and Serbs constitute genocide. Will I get a reply on that today ...?"

Mr. OXMAN. I learned, just today, that you hadn't had your response. And the first thing I'm going to do when I get back to the Department is find out where that is. We'll get you that response as soon as we possibly can. But to give you my personal view, I think that acts tantamount to genocide have been committed. Whether the technical definition of genocide ... I think this is what the letter that you're asking for needs to address."

August 9: Statement by Secretary Christopher, released by the Office of the Spokesman, August 9, 1993, "Air strikes in Bosnia-Herzegovina":

"The United States is pleased by the important actions taken today by the North Atlantic Council. These steps significantly further the United States initiative to make air power available to lift the strangulation of Sarajevo and other areas, stop interference with humanitarian relief operations, and promote a viable political settlement in the negotiations in Geneva. At the North Atlantic Council meeting last Monday, NATO unanimously made the policy decision to prepare for air strikes and laid down a clear warning to those responsible for the strangulation of Sarajevo and other civilian areas. Today, the alliance unanimously approved a thorough and detailed operational plan for air strikes prepared by the NATO military committee over the last week in conjunction with UNPROFOR. The plan is sound and comprehensive. It sets forth the targeting identification process and the command and control arrangements for air strikes. With today's decision, the alliance now has in place all the means necessary to take forceful action against the Serbs should they not cease their intolerable behavior. The unanimous decision today signals that the international community will not accept the laying siege of cities and the continued bombardment of civilians, the denial of humanitarian assistance to people in need, or empty promises as a cover for aggression. The Serbs are on notice, and whether air power is used depends on their deeds."

June 2: AFP "U.S. Has No Vital Interests in Bosnia; Christopher":

"Secretary of State Warren Christopher has said the United States has no vital interests in Bosnia and that the military options it backed there would not be effective. 'Bosnia is a human tragedy—just a grotesque humanitarian situation,' Christopher said on television Tuesday as the United Nations Security Council finalized plans for six protected Moslem safe havens. 'It does not affect our vital national interests except as we're concerned about humanitarian matters and except as we're trying to contain it.' He said Washington still preferred lifting the arms embargo on the Bosnian Moslems and carrying out air strikes against Bosnian Serb military forces attacking the Moslems, though he conceded the air attacks alone would have limited effect ... 'If you rule out ground troops, you find air power inef-

fective, and if you define it as a humanitarian situation, then your options are really much different than they would be in places like Somalia where militarily it was rather simple to solve problems," Christopher said.

June 29: Explanation of U.S. Vote on Lifting Arms Embargo Against Bosnia, Madeleine K. Albright, U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations, Statement before the UN Security Council, New York City, June 29, 1993:

"... Nor should today's vote be seen as an indication that the international community is willing to turn a blind eye to the gross violations of human rights that have been committed in Bosnia, primarily by the Bosnian Serbs. We will continue to insist that, if the authorities in Belgrade want to rejoin the family of nations, they will have to stop the violence, stop the killing, stop their aggressive war against the Bosnian state and comply with all relevant Security Council resolutions. . . . Our goal remains a negotiated settlement freely agreed to by all the parties."

June 10: House Foreign Affairs Committee Subcommittee on International Security:

"Mr. McCloskey. . . . But specifically, what does the State Department say about genocide, are they ready to state that this is genocide rather than tantamount to genocide or akin to—

Mr. WIRTH. We have done so. We have done so.

Mr. McCloskey. In what document, or record, or communication?

Mr. WIRTH. In supporting the Tribunal on genocide. We have done so.

Mr. McCloskey. Could I get a copy of a definitive statement that genocide has occurred? Because quite frankly, I have been asking Mr. Christopher for that since April 1st. Again, not to be pejorative on that, but I just have not gotten a reply. That would be very helpful if I could get that in the next day.

Mr. WIRTH. We have, as you know, supported the war crimes tribunal. And we have made statements and made clear that genocidal acts have taken place.

Mr. McCloskey. I do not want to go on about it. But to two such distinguished State Department representatives here, if I say by tomorrow afternoon if I could have a statement as to whether the State Department believes it is genocide or not, it would be helpful.

Mr. WIRTH. We will get that right back to you. Those statements have been made, and we'll get it right back to you."

May 25: ABC News Nightline Interview with the Secretary of State Warren Christopher:

"Secretary CHRISTOPHER. We're prepared to keep the sanctions on until they move back from the aggression they followed. . . . I can blame the Bosnian Serbs for being guilty of aggression. I can blame the Bosnian Serbs for being guilty of a series of atrocities. They are the main perpetrator of evil in atrocities by all parties. But the Bosnian Serbs are subject to a lot of blame, and I will not absolve them from that.

KOPPEL. If they continue in their atrocities, if they continue killing and raping, some of the other things that they have been accused of doing—again, if I understand U.S. policy correctly, you would be willing to use air power only to protect the U.N. forces

that are on the ground right now, in effect, to get out, not to do anything about stopping the atrocities. Do I misunderstand the policy?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. No, I think that's correct. Our commitment to use United States military force at the present time is only to protect the U.N. forces that are there. And I think that's the limit of our commitment for military power at present time. We have concluded that our national interests are not sufficiently engaged to use U.S. troops in this situation. It's a quagmire. It's a morass. I think if U.S. troops are put in there, they'll be there for an indefinite period of time. It does not meet the test that I've laid down for being a situation where you can define your goals with care, where you have a chance of success, where you have an exit strategy and it's a situation that the American people would support over a long period of time."

May 12: Interview With Don Imus of WFAN Radio in New York City, May 12, 1993:

"Mr. IMUS. You know, I agreed with you when you said during the campaign that history has shown that you can't allow the mass extermination of people and just sit by and watch it happen, and that really is driving this, isn't it?

The PRESIDENT. Yes. It is a difficult issue. Let me say that when we have people here who've been involved in many previous administrations that are involved in national security including, obviously, a lot of people who were involved in the two previous ones, I mean, and everybody I talk to believes that this is the toughest foreign policy problem our country has faced in a long time. And I'm trying to proceed in a very deliberate way to try to make sure there isn't a Vietnam problem here. But also to try to make sure that the United States keeps pushing to save lives and to confine the conflict. I don't think we can just turn away from this. Just because we don't want to make the mistake we did in Vietnam doesn't mean we shouldn't be doing anything. There are things that we can do, and we're trying to do more to push this thing toward a settlement. . . .

I think there are some things that we're going to be able to do with our allies that will continue to turn the pressure up. But this is a European issue, as well as a world issue, and I think we have to move forward with Europe. . . .

It is a very, very difficult issue, but I think that we're pushing in the right direction, going in the right directions, and I think the American people will support the combination of clear, disciplined restraint on our part and not creating a unilateral American involvement, but continuing to push to end the slaughter, end the ethnic cleansing and confine the conflict so that it doesn't cause us a lot more problems."

April 21: The President's News Conference:

"The PRESIDENT. I will say what I said from the very beginning. Our fundamental interests here, the United States' interests, are two. We want the conflict to be contained, and we want the slaughter and the ethnic cleansing to stop. We believe in order to get that done ultimately there will have to be some reasonable borders—some political solution to this which has a reasonable territorial component. And we'll just have to see what happens over the next few weeks."

May 14: The President's News Conference:

"Q. Mr. President, you've said that the United States will not go it alone with mili-

tary action in Bosnia. And yet, the European allies have refused to sign-on to your proposals. If the allies refuse to follow suit, where does that leave the United States?

The PRESIDENT. . . . I do not believe the United States has any business sending troops there to get involved in a conflict in behalf of one of the sides. I believe that we should continue to turn up the pressure. And as you know, I have taken the position that the best way to do that would be to lift the arms embargo with a standby authority of air power in the event that the present situation was interrupted by the unfair use of artillery by the Bosnian Serbs. That position is still on the table.

Q. Mr. President, you said last week that if you went to air power in Bosnia you would have a clear strategy and it would have a beginning, middle, and end. What happens, though, sir, if a plane is shot down, if you lose a pilot or a couple of pilots, or if the Bosnian Serbs decide to escalate the conflict, or the Serbians by going into, say, Kosovo?

The PRESIDENT. Well, the Bush administration before I became President issued a clear warning to the Serbs that if they try to occupy Kosovo and repress the Albanians there, that the United States would be prepared to take some strong action. And I have reaffirmed that position. . . .

Q. There seems to be a Catch 22 emerging on Bosnia. One would be, you have consistently said that you want to have a consensus with the U.S. allies. But until that consensus is formed, you found it seems very difficult to explain to the American people precisely how that war should be defined: Is it a civil war? Is it a war of aggression? And also not necessarily what the next step should be, but what are the principles, the overriding principles that should guide you as a policy? What can you tell the American people right now about that?

The PRESIDENT. First, that is both a civil war and a war of aggression, because Bosnia was created as a separate legal entity. It is both a civil war where elements of people who live within that territory are fighting against each other. And there has been aggression from without, somewhat from the Croatians and from the Serbs, principally from the Serbs—that the inevitable but unintended impact of the arms embargo has been to put the United Nations in the position of ratifying an enormous superiority of arms for the Bosnian Serbs that they got from Serbia, and that our interest is in seeing, in my view at least, that the United Nations does not foreordain the outcome of a civil war. That's why I've always been in favor of some kind of lifting of the arms embargo, that we contain the conflict, and that we do everything we can to move to an end of it and to move to an end of ethnic cleansing. Those are our interests there, and those are the ones I'm trying to pursue. But we should not introduce American ground forces into the conflict in behalf of one of the belligerents, and we must move with our allies. It is a very difficult issue. I realize in a world where we all crave for certainty about everything, it's tough to deal with, but it's a difficult issue. . . . I have a clear policy. I have gotten more done on this than my predecessor did. And maybe one reason he didn't try to do it is because if you can't force everybody to fall in line overnight for people who have been fighting each other for cen-

turies, you may be accused of vacillating. We are not vacillating. We have a clear, strong policy."

May 18: House Foreign Affairs Committee Hearing:

"Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Ackerman, you've given me a lot to answer in the few moments I have here. First, with respect to the moral case that you make, one of the just absolutely bewildering parts of this problem is that the moral case is devastating and clear that there are atrocities, but there are atrocities on all sides . . . We've been filling reports with the United Nations for some time—we're in the seventh or eighth report of that kind. If you look at those and read those, you'll find indication of atrocities by all three of the major parties against each other, the level of hatred is just incredible. So, you know, it's somewhat different than the Holocaust; it's been easy to analogize this to the Holocaust, but I never heard of any genocide by the Jews against the German people. But here you have atrocities by all sides which makes this problem exceedingly difficult to deal with. Now, with respect to the use of air power—and I will try to capsule my responses—the respect in which the president has recommended a possible standby use of air power is in connection with the lifting of the arms embargo. We think there's a strong moral case for the lifting of the arms embargo because it works to the disadvantage of one party, that is, the Bosnian government. The air power would be used to compensate during the transition period when the Bosnians are getting some arms so as to level the playing field.

Rep. FRANK MCCLOSKEY (D-Indiana). . . . I am fearful of remarks that you made today positing moral equivalency, if you will, as to the Serbs, the Croats, and particularly the Muslims in all this, as I would rather refer to them, the Bosnians. I would just advise being very careful about this. You, yourself, and even more eloquently, Mr. Clinton, have in the past made very good statements about what is at stake here. I know, you know that my request is still pending right now as to whether the Serb aggression—and they are the overwhelming perpetrators of evil in all this, much more so than anyone else on the scene—whether Serb aggression does constitute genocide under the outlines of the U.N. convention.

That being said, I don't see how this thing moves off the diplomatic dime without a clear and forceful statement from President Clinton. Will he try to use, or would you advise him to use the bully pulpit soon to rally the American people, to rally the Congress and to rally the West as to what is really at stake here, as hundreds of people continue to die every day, and so far nothing stops, nothing deters ongoing Bosnian Serb and Serb aggression.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Mr. McCloskey, thank you for the question, and for giving me an opportunity to say that I share your feeling that the principal fault lies with the Bosnian Serbs. And I've said that several times before. They are the most at fault of all three sides, and atrocities abound in this area, as we have seen in the last several days and weeks.

But I agree that the aggression coming from Serbia is the principal perpetrator of the problem in the area. With respect to genocide, the definition of genocide is a fairly technical definition. Let me get it for you here.

Under the 1948 convention, the crime of genocide is to commit—an individual, in order to commit the crime of genocide, must commit one or more specific acts with intent to destroy in whole or in part a national, ethnical, racial or religious group as such.

I would say that some of the acts that have been committed by various parties in Bosnia, principally by the Serbians, could constitute genocide under the 1948 convention if their purpose was to destroy the religious or ethnic group in whole or in part. And that seems to me to be a standard that may well have been reached in some of the aspects of Bosnia. Certainly some of the conduct there is tantamount to genocide.

Rep. MCCLOSKEY. And the hoped for more comprehensive public assertion of leadership, sir?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Well, you know, the president is very much seized with this problem, and when the time comes for him to want to enlist the American people, especially in the commitment of military forces, if that ever becomes necessary, I'm certain that he will undertake to explain it fully to the American people. He must do so. He must also consult with Congress extensively."

May 6: Remarks by the President to the Export-Import Bank Conference, Washington, DC.

"THE PRESIDENT. . . . The international community, I believe, must not allow the Serbs to stall progress toward peace and continue brutal assaults on innocent civilians. We've seen too many things happen, and we do have fundamental interests there, not only the United States, but particularly the United States as a member of the world community.

The Serbs' actions over the past year violate the principle that internationally-recognized borders must not be violated or altered by aggression from without. Their actions threaten to widen the conflict and foster instability in other parts of Europe in ways that could be exceedingly damaging. And their savage and cynical ethnic cleansing offends the world's conscience and our standard of behavior.

Your presence here—your understanding of the importance of exports to America's future, to the blending of our nation and our culture and our values with those of like-minded persons throughout the world—should only reinforce our determination to confine, inasmuch as the international community can possibly confine, savage acts of inhumanity to people solely because of their ethnicity or their religion; to confine insofar as we possibly can as an international community the ability of one country to invade another and upset its borders; and certainly to try to confine this centuries-old series of ethnic and religious enmities to the narrowest possible geographic boundaries."

May 1: US Consultations With Allies on Bosnia-Herzegovina, Secretary Christopher, Opening Statement at a news conference, Washington, DC:

"Upon taking office, President Clinton inherited a complex and tragic situation in the former Yugoslavia. The situation has bedeviled the international community now for almost 2 years. It's a problem with deep historic roots. In the post-Cold War period, the former Yugoslavia has been the scene of violence, tragedy, and outrageous conduct.

The President has acted to deal with this conflict. . . . Yet the outrages have con-

tinued in the former Yugoslavia area. In the face of Serbian aggression, the President has been rigorously reviewing further options for action during the course of the last week.

. . . He has been exploring additional actions the international community can take to respond to the violence, stop the aggression, and contain the conflict.

The President has just completed a meeting with his principal national security advisers. At this meeting the President decided on the direction that he believes the United States and the international community should now take in this situation. This direction involves a number of specific recommendations, including military steps. The President is sending me to Europe to consult with our allies and friends on a course of actions. The problem is at the heart of Europe's future. Our efforts will be undertaken with our partners. We're ready to play our part, but others must be as well. . . .

There are, of course, issues of conscience and humanitarian concerns at stake in this situation. But fundamentally our actions are also based upon the strategic interest of the United States. All of us seek to limit the risk of a widening instability that could lead to a . . . war."

May 25: Madeleine K. Albright, Excerpts from statement by the U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations, UN Security Council Adopts Resolution 827 on War Crimes Tribunal, New York City, May 25, 1993.

". . . The crimes being committed, even as we meet today, are not just isolated acts of drunken militia men, but often are the systematic and orchestrated crimes of government officials, military commanders, and disciplined artillery men and foot soldiers."

April 23: Clinton Defends First 100 Days, Stresses Options in Bosnia, Presidential News Conference:

"Q. Mr. President, there's a growing feeling that the Western response to the bloodshed in Bosnia has been woefully inadequate. Holocaust survivor Elie Wiesel asked you yesterday to do something, anything to stop the fighting. Is the United States considering taking unilateral action such as airstrikes against Serb artillery sites?"

President CLINTON. Well, first let me say, as you know, for more than a week now we have been seriously reviewing our options for further action . . . I think we should act. We should lead, the United States should lead. We have led for the last three months.

We have moved the coalition, and to be fair, our, our allies in Europe have been willing to, to do their part, and they have troops on the ground there. But I do not think we should act alone, unilaterally, nor do I think we will have to.

And in the next several days I think we will finalize the extensive review which has been going on, and which has taken a lot of my time, as well as the time of the administration, as it should have, over the last 10 days or so. I think we'll finish that in the near future and then we'll have a policy, and we'll announce it and everybody can evaluate it.

Q. Do you see any parallel between the ethnic cleansing in Bosnia and the Holocaust?

P. I think the—I think the Holocaust is on a whole different level. I think it is without precedent, or peer in human history. On the other hand, ethnic cleansing is the kind of inhumanity that the Holocaust took to the

nth degree. The idea of moving people around, abusing them and often killing them solely because of their ethnicity is an abhorrent thing. And especially troublesome in that area where people of different ethnic groups lived side by side for so long together.

And I think you have to stand up against it. I think it's wrong . . .

Q. Mr. President getting back to the situation in Bosnia, and we understand you haven't made any final decision on new options previously considered unacceptable, but the two most commonly heard options would be lifting the arms embargo to enable the Bosnian Muslims to defend themselves, and to initiate some limited airstrikes, perhaps to cut off supply lines.

Without telling us your decision—presumably you haven't made any final decisions on those two options—what are the pros and cons—that are going through your mind right now and will weigh heavily on your final decision?

P. I'm reluctant to get into this. Those are two of the options. There are some other options that have been considered. All have pluses and minuses. All have supporters and opponents in the Congress, where I would remind you, heavy consultations will be required to embark on any new policy.

I do believe that on the airstrike issue, the pronouncement that [Chairman of the Joint Chief of Staff Gen. Colin L.] Powell [Jr.] has made generally about military action apply there. If you take action, if the United States takes action, we must have a clearly defined objective that can be met, we must be able to understand it, and its limitations must be clear.

The United States is not, should not become involved as a participant in a war. With regard to the, to the lifting of the arms embargo, the question obviously there is the—if you widen the capacity of people to fight, will that help to get a settlement and bring about peace, or will it lead to more bloodshed, and what kind of reaction can others have that would, that would undermine the effectiveness of the policy.

But I think both of them deserve some serious consideration along with some other options we have. . . .

Q. Since you said that one side in the Bosnian conflict represents inhumanity, the Holocaust carried to the 'nth degree,' why do you then tell us that the United States cannot take a partisan view in this war?

P. Well, I said that the principle of ethnic cleansing is something we ought to stand up against. That does not mean that the United States or the United Nations can enter a war, in effect, to redraw the lines, geographical lines of republics within what was Yugoslavia, or that that would ultimately be successful.

I think what the United States has to do is to try to figure out whether there is some way, consistent with forcing the people to resolve their own difficulties, we can stand up to and stop ethnic cleansing, and that is obviously the difficulty we are wrestling with.

This is clearly the most difficult foreign policy problem we face and that all of our allies face. And if it were easy, I suppose it would have been solved before. We have tried to do more in the last 90 days than was previously done. It has clearly not been enough to stop the Serbian aggression, and we are now looking at what else we can do.

Q. Yesterday you specifically criticized the Roosevelt administration for not having bombed the railroads to the concentration camps and things that were near military targets. Aren't there steps like that that would not involve conflict, direct conflict or partisan belligerence that you might consider?

P. There may be. I would remind you that the circumstances were somewhat different. We were then at war with Germany . . . and that's what made that whole incident, series of incidents, so perplexing. But we have, as I say, we've got all of our options under review. . . .

April 21: The Washington Times: "Airstrikes in Bosnia lose appeal; Congress urges stronger steps" by Warren Strobel.

" . . . With Mr. Christopher describing U.S. policy toward Bosnia as 'at a turning point,' President Clinton called together his top policy advisers to discuss possible new steps.

Alluding to the Nazi attempt to exterminate Jews, Mr. Clinton said the carnage there merits U.S. intervention.

"I think the Holocaust is the most extreme example the world has ever known of ethnic cleansing and I think that even in its more limited manifestations it's an idea that should be opposed," he said yesterday at the beginning of a meeting with Czech president Vaclav Havel. . . .

The administration is under intense pressure from lawmakers, many of whom are pointing to tomorrow's dedication of the Holocaust Memorial Museum and asking whether the West really meant it when it said, 'Never again.'"

April 1: President Clinton, Question-and-Answer Session With the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Annapolis, Maryland.

"Q. Mr. President. . . . Do we have a national interest in checking the spread of greater Serbian ethnic cleansing in the Balkans? And are we losing our credibility as a nation as this horrifying aggression in a sovereign state continues without your unrestrained, forceful, and public condemnation of it?"

The PRESIDENT. Yes, we have a national interest in limiting ethnic cleansing. . . . The thing that I have not been willing to do is to immediately take action the end of which I could not see. Whatever I want to do, I want to do it with vigor and wholeheartedly. I want it to have a reasonable prospect of success. And I have done the best I could with the cards that I found on the table when I became President. If you have other ideas about what you think I ought to do that would minimize the loss of life, I would be glad to have them.

Q. Sir, do you condemn it here today?

The PRESIDENT. Absolutely. I condemn it, and I have condemned it repeatedly and thoroughly. And I have done everything I could to increase the pressure of the international community on the outrages perpetrated in Bosnia by the aggressors and to get people to stand up against ethnic cleansing. The question is what are we capable of doing about it from the United States. If you look at the responses that have been mustered so far from the European states that are even closer and that have a memory of what happened when Hitler, who was not shy about using his power, had hundreds of thousands of people in the former Yugoslavia and even then was unable to subdue it entirely.

I think you have to look at what our realistic options are for action. The question is not whether we condemn what's going on. Ethnic cleansing is an outrage, and it is an idea which should die, which should not be able to be expanded. The question is, what can we do?

Now, I have said that the United States would be prepared to join with a United Nations effort in supporting a peacekeeping process that was entered into in good faith. If the Serbs refuse to do that, then we will all have to reassess our position. But we must be careful not to use words that will outstrip our capacity to back them up. That is a grave error for any great nation, and one I will try not to commit."

April 15: NBC Today Show Interview, Guest: Secretary of State Warren Christopher.

"Q. Mr. Secretary, let me ask you about Bosnia for a moment. Margaret Thatcher said on this program that the European Community was guilty of being an accomplice to massacre by not intervening militarily in Bosnia and she called for two things: loosening the arms embargo so the Bosnians could get arms, and a bombing campaign to make it painful for the Serbs. What's your reaction to that?"

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Well, I've said before it's a horrifying situation in Bosnia and it seems to get worse every day. It seems to me that Prime Minister Thatcher's prescription is one for only increasing the carnage. The United States does not have any intention in intervening in that war with ground troops. We're taking a number of important steps to try to persuade the Serbs not to continue their aggression, but I do not think that her prescription is the right approach to it. It's a rather emotional response to an emotional problem."

April 22: President Clinton, US Holocaust Museum Dedicated, Address at the dedication ceremony, Washington, DC:

" . . . The Holocaust reminds us forever that knowledge divorced from values can only serve to deepen the human nightmare, that a head without a heart is not humanity.

For those of us here today representing the nations of the West, we must live forever with this knowledge: Even as our fragmentary awareness of crimes grew into indisputable facts, far too little was done. Before the war even started, doors to liberty were shut. And even after the United States and the Allies attacked Germany, rail lines to the camps within miles of military significant targets were left undisturbed . . .

Ethnic cleansing in the former Yugoslavia is but the most brutal and blatant and ever-present manifestation of what we see also with the oppression of the Kurds in Iraq, the abusive treatment of the Baha'i in Iran, the endless race-based violence in South Africa. And in many other places we are reminded again and again how fragile are the safeguards of civilizations. . . ."

April 1: House Foreign Affairs Committee International Operations Subcommittee

"Rep. FRANK McCLOSKEY (D-Indiana). . . Previously in response to a question to whether or not genocide has taken place, the reply from State was that acts tantamount to genocide have taken place. I think that's not a clear answer to a very important and policy driving question.

Would you order a clear, explicit determination, yes or no, if the outrageous Serb

systematic barbarism amounts to genocide? That's one question . . .

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. With respect to the definition of circumstances in Bosnia, we certainly will reply to that. That is a legal question that you have posed.

I have said several times that the conduct there is an atrocity: the killing, the raping, the ethnic cleansing is definitively an atrocious set of acts, whether it meets the technical legal definition of genocide, it's a matter we will look and get back to you."

March 23: Questions for the record submitted to Mr. Stephen Oxman by Senator Dole, Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

"Question. *Bosnia-Herzegovina*. In November, 1992, the U.N. Human Rights Commission approved a resolution, which was supported by the United States, which asks member states to provide their views as to whether the actions of the Serb forces in Bosnia-Herzegovina constitute genocide under the Genocide Convention. What is the U.S. legal judgment on this matter? Has the United States submitted its views to the U.N. Human Rights Commission? If not, why has it not done so?

Answer. The resolution in question 'called upon all States to consider the extent to which the acts committed in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia constitute genocide.' It did not request views to be submitted, but rather for States to look at this question.

The Administration has done so, and concluded that acts tantamount to genocide have taken place in Bosnia. Because of this, and because of the need to ensure accountability for such acts, the Administration believes that the War Crimes Tribunal being established by the Security Council should have jurisdiction over such acts."

March 10: House Appropriations Subcommittee Hearing, Topic: State Department programs, Witness: Secretary of State Warren Christopher.

"Rep. SKAGGS. Let me also invite you to lay out your sense of the U.S. national interest in our efforts to calm things down in the former Yugoslavia, an identification of U.S. interests that goes beyond certainly the laudable humanitarian objectives that we're now pursuing.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Well, thank you for that opportunity. The case, Mr. Skaggs, is no less than the prevention of a conflagration that could envelop all of southeastern Europe and perhaps rage beyond, as it sometimes has from that area, to consume a substantial portion of the world. That's what's at stake here, preventing a widespread area conflict . . . At a very minimum, it's important to stop them before they enter other areas, and that's why we've attached so much importance to giving them a strong warning about creating conflict in Kosovo as well as the stationing of international observers on the border of Macedonia . . .

So the stakes for the United States, and for the citizens of the United States, are to prevent the broadening of that conflict to bring in our NATO allies, and to bring in vast sections of Europe, and perhaps as happened before, broadening into a world war.

You know, there's kind of an eery analogy here. When you think of Sarajevo as being the triggering point for World War I, here we are again. How many years later, seven decades later we're back with Sarajevo perhaps being once again the trigger. If that isn't

warning enough for us, then we certainly are failing to follow the lessons of history.

That's why the United States is interested. That's why we are wanting to take an active role there."

February 22: UN Security Council Adopts Resolution 808 on War Crimes Tribunal. Statement by Madeleine K. Albright, US Permanent Representative to the United Nations, UN Security Council, New York City, February 22, 1993.

"There is an echo in this chamber today. The Nuremberg principles have been reaffirmed. We have preserved the long-neglected compact made by the community of civilized nations 48 years ago in San Francisco: to create the United Nations and enforce the Nuremberg principles. The lesson that we are all accountable to international law may have finally taken hold in our collective memory. . . ."

February 10: New Steps Toward Conflict Resolution in the Former Yugoslavia, Secretary Christopher, Opening statement at a news conference, Washington, DC, February 10, 1993.

" . . . This conflict may be far from our shores, but it is not distant to our concerns. We cannot afford to ignore it. Let me explain why.

We cannot ignore the human toll . . . Our conscience revolts at the idea of passively accepting such brutality.

Beyond these humanitarian interests, we have direct strategic concerns as well. The continuing destruction of a new UN member state challenges the principal that internationally recognized borders should not be altered by force. In addition, this conflict itself has no natural borders. It threatens to spill over into new regions, such as Kosovo and Macedonia. It could then become a greater Balkan war, like those that preceded World War I. Broader hostilities could touch additional nations, such as Greece, Albania, and Turkey. The river of fleeing refugees, which has already reached the hundreds of thousands, would swell. The political and economic vigor of Europe, already tested by the integration of former communist states, would be further strained.

There is a broader imperative here. The world's response to the violence in the former Yugoslavia is an early and crucial test of how it will address the concerns of ethnic and religious minorities in the post-Cold War world. That question reaches throughout Eastern Europe. It reaches to the states of the former Soviet Union, where the fall of communism has left some 25 million ethnic Russians living as minorities in other republics, and it reaches to other continents as well.

The events in the former Yugoslavia raise the question of whether a state may address the rights of its minorities by eradicating those minorities to achieve 'ethnic purity.' Bold tyrants and fearful minorities are watching to see whether 'ethnic cleansing' is a policy [that] the world will tolerate. If we hope to promote the spread of freedom or if we hope to encourage the emergence of peaceful multi-ethnic democracies, our answer must be a resounding no."

January 20: President Clinton's inaugural address:

" . . . When our vital interests are challenged, or the will and conscience of the international community is defied, we will act—with peaceful diplomacy whenever possible, with force when necessary. . . ."

January 22: Los Angeles Times: Clinton to Press Active U.S. Role in Bosnia

" . . . This is clearly the highest priority of the President in the National Security Council's agenda. . . . 'Madeleine Albright, Clinton's nominee for ambassador to the United Nations, told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. 'We will, in fact, be meeting on this subject very soon.'"

January 20: Washington Post: U.S. Human Rights Report Charges Serb Drive 'Borders on Genocide':

"The 'ethnic cleansing' campaign pursued by Bosnian Serbs to drive Muslims and other ethnic groups from their homes in Bosnia-Herzegovina has resulted in murder, torture, rape and starvation on a scale that 'dwarfs anything seen in Europe since Nazi times,' the State Department said yesterday in its annual human rights report.

'It borders on genocide,' Patricia Diaz Dennis, assistant secretary of state for human rights, said in describing the efforts of Serb irregular forces, aided by Serbia and the Serbian-controlled Yugoslav army, to bring most of Bosnia under their control."

January 14: The New York Times: Clinton's State Dept. Choice Backs, 'Discreet' Force (report on Christopher's confirmation hearing):

" . . . Later, his remarks were more pointed. The Serbian campaign of 'ethnic cleansing,' he said, was resulting in 'near genocidal conditions or perhaps really genocidal conditions.' At another point he said, 'It is a situation where Europe has performed in an abysmal way.'"

January 14: The New York Times: Excerpt From an Interview With Clinton After the Air Strikes:

"Q: Are you ready to support a Nuremberg-like war criminal trial? Eagleburger has named several leaders there as war criminals?

A: Absolutely . . . Somehow the West has got to say something and do something about the idea of ethnic cleansing, which is such an embracing idea that if you believe in it, it justifies the brutalization of women who aren't your women and the torture of children that aren't your children.

I think it is important to point out that this Bosnian thing has potential ramifications further away from the reach of the United States and Europe on the republics of the former Soviet Union, in central Europe. This is the idea under which this whole thing has proceeded, is what the West has to stand up against, what the United Nations has to stand up against.

" . . . I think that as horrible as the loss of life, and the torture and the butchery and the starvation has been the potential for a bigger impact is greater than that even. Because it's all been done under the notion of ethnic cleansing. I mean, here we are on the verge of the 21st century, and people who are literate, who can read and write, who are part of a very old, civilized tradition, think it's O.K. to slaughter the living daylight out of one another under the guise of ethnic cleansing. It is a barbaric idea . . . We've got to take a stand against it. It's an awful idea, and the potential ramifications are very very great, because they justify doing anything."

December 16, 1992: The Need To Respond to War Crimes in the Former Yugoslavia, Secretary Eagleburger, Statement at the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia, Geneva, Switzerland.

... We have, on the one hand, a moral and historical obligation not to stand back a second time in this century while a people faces obliteration . . . The fact of the matter is that we know that crimes against humanity have occurred, and we know when and where they occurred. We know, moreover, which forces committed those crimes, and under whose command they operated. And we know, finally, who the political leaders are to whom those military commanders were—and still are—responsible . . .

Finally, there is another category of fact which is beyond dispute—namely, the fact of political and command responsibility for the crimes against humanity which I have described. Leaders such as Slobodan Milosevic, the President of Serbia, Radovan Karadzic, the self-declared President of the Serbian Bosnian republic, and General Ratko Mladic,

commander of Bosnian Serb military forces, must eventually explain whether and how they sought to ensure, as they must under international law, that their forces complied with international law. They ought, if charged, to have the opportunity of defending themselves by demonstrating whether and how they took responsible action to prevent and punish the atrocities I have described which were undertaken by their subordinates . . .

It is clear that the reckless leaders of Serbia, and of the Serbs inside Bosnia, have somehow convinced themselves that the international community will not stand up to them now, and will be forced eventually to recognize the fruits of their aggression and the results of ethnic cleansing . . .

Thus, we must make it unmistakably clear that we will settle for nothing less than the

restoration of the independent state of Bosnia-Herzegovina with its territory undivided and intact, the return of all refugees to their homes and villages, and, indeed, a day of reckoning for those found guilty of crimes against humanity . . .

But in waiting for the people of Serbia, if not their leaders, to come to their senses, we must make them understand that their country will remain alone, friendless, and condemned to economic ruin and exclusion from the family of civilized nations for as long as they pursue the suicidal dream of a Greater Serbia. They need, especially, to understand that a second Nuremberg awaits the practitioners of ethnic cleansing, and that the judgment, and opprobrium, of history awaits the people in whose name their crimes were committed."

... the fact that we know that crimes against humanity have occurred, and we know when and where they occurred. We know, moreover, which forces committed those crimes, and under whose command they operated. And we know, finally, who the political leaders are to whom those military commanders were—and still are—responsible . . .

... the fact that we know that crimes against humanity have occurred, and we know when and where they occurred. We know, moreover, which forces committed those crimes, and under whose command they operated. And we know, finally, who the political leaders are to whom those military commanders were—and still are—responsible . . .

... the fact that we know that crimes against humanity have occurred, and we know when and where they occurred. We know, moreover, which forces committed those crimes, and under whose command they operated. And we know, finally, who the political leaders are to whom those military commanders were—and still are—responsible . . .

... the fact that we know that crimes against humanity have occurred, and we know when and where they occurred. We know, moreover, which forces committed those crimes, and under whose command they operated. And we know, finally, who the political leaders are to whom those military commanders were—and still are—responsible . . .

... the fact that we know that crimes against humanity have occurred, and we know when and where they occurred. We know, moreover, which forces committed those crimes, and under whose command they operated. And we know, finally, who the political leaders are to whom those military commanders were—and still are—responsible . . .

... the fact that we know that crimes against humanity have occurred, and we know when and where they occurred. We know, moreover, which forces committed those crimes, and under whose command they operated. And we know, finally, who the political leaders are to whom those military commanders were—and still are—responsible . . .

... the fact that we know that crimes against humanity have occurred, and we know when and where they occurred. We know, moreover, which forces committed those crimes, and under whose command they operated. And we know, finally, who the political leaders are to whom those military commanders were—and still are—responsible . . .

... the fact that we know that crimes against humanity have occurred, and we know when and where they occurred. We know, moreover, which forces committed those crimes, and under whose command they operated. And we know, finally, who the political leaders are to whom those military commanders were—and still are—responsible . . .

... the fact that we know that crimes against humanity have occurred, and we know when and where they occurred. We know, moreover, which forces committed those crimes, and under whose command they operated. And we know, finally, who the political leaders are to whom those military commanders were—and still are—responsible . . .

... the fact that we know that crimes against humanity have occurred, and we know when and where they occurred. We know, moreover, which forces committed those crimes, and under whose command they operated. And we know, finally, who the political leaders are to whom those military commanders were—and still are—responsible . . .

... the fact that we know that crimes against humanity have occurred, and we know when and where they occurred. We know, moreover, which forces committed those crimes, and under whose command they operated. And we know, finally, who the political leaders are to whom those military commanders were—and still are—responsible . . .

... the fact that we know that crimes against humanity have occurred, and we know when and where they occurred. We know, moreover, which forces committed those crimes, and under whose command they operated. And we know, finally, who the political leaders are to whom those military commanders were—and still are—responsible . . .