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STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT AND SECRETARY OF DEFENSE LES ASPIN

The Oval Office

5:21 P.M. EST

SECRETARY ASPIN: I have been proud of the work that President Clinton and I have done over the past year to reshape our American military to deal with the new dangers of a vastly changed world. We now have a new working consensus about how much we should spend on defense. And we can work together building the right kind of military strengths that we need.

As a result, this year we have been able to focus our agenda at home, because we have been agreed on our military effort and what we need to remain strong. We have also worked together with our uniform military to find common ground on some very, very difficult social issues that could have distracted us from maintaining a ready-to-fight force.

Dealing with all of these changes have made for a very challenging and interesting year. I am extremely proud of the work that we have done together.

I have been working continually for over 20 years to help build a strong American military. It's time for me to take a break and to undertake a new kind of work. So I have asked the President to relieve me of this duty as Secretary of Defense as of January 20th.

I know that while Bill Clinton is our Commander in Chief our country will continue to grow in all of its strengths, our men and women in uniform will always be honored, and we will be true to our best values as a people.

THE PRESIDENT: Ladies and gentlemen, it is with real sadness that today I accept Secretary Aspin's request to be relieved of his duties as Secretary of Defense for personal reasons. I am very grateful that he's agreed to remain at his post until January 20th, and beyond if necessary, so that we can plan together for the coming year and effect a smooth transition at the Pentagon.

Les has been a close advisor and a friend of mine for a long time. I have valued his wise counsel as a key member of our national security team. And I have told him that after he takes the break he's requested I very much hope he will consider other assignments for this administration.

During a lifetime of public service in Congress, with our transition, and at the Pentagon, Les Aspin has made invaluable contributions to this nation's defense and security. None of them have been more significant than his service as Secretary of Defense. Along with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, he has provided solid leadership for our uniformed and civilian defense personnel during a period of transition that is historic and has at times been unsettling.
He helped launched creative policy responses to the fundamental changes of this era -- from the dissolution of the Soviet empire, to the growing challenges of ethnic conflict and weapons proliferation. And through it all, he has led with character, with intelligence, with wisdom and the unflappable good humor that is both his trademark and his secret weapon.

One of his most important contributions in this past year has been his efforts to help our administration relate our defense strategy in this new era and our defense spending. Under his leadership, the Pentagon conducted the first comprehensive review of our forces since the end of the Cold War. This now well-known, bottom-up review has provided our nation with a profile of this era's threats and a vision of our force structure that will guide our nation's military for many years to come.

He's provided steady leadership for the entire defense community as it has confronted the inevitable downsizing that accompanied the end of the Cold War. He acted on the recommendations of the Base Closure Commission in a way that demonstrated equity, responsibility and a great concern for the communities and the families that were hit hard by the closure of our military facilities. And as we've reduced our force levels, he's been the first to voice concerns for the men and women in uniform who shoulder the burden of our national security.

His leadership has also been invaluable in helping our country to adapt to our military social changes. He led the way in our efforts to open the doors for women to serve our nation in combat roles and helped to ensure more equitable rules toward homosexuals in our military. He's provided creative leadership as he's mobilized the Pentagon to develop new and stronger responses to the many security challenges of this new era, such as his new counterproliferation initiative. And on a range of tough decisions and tough challenges abroad, from Bosnia to Korea, he has called them as he saw them, bringing to bear a lifetime of experience and dedication and a razor-sharp mind to our nation's security interest.

Above all, Secretary Aspin has provided deep strategic thinking and leadership at a time of profound change in this world. As a result, when our citizens go to bed tonight, we can do so secure in the knowledge that our nation is building the right forces and acquiring the right capabilities for this new era.

I will always appreciate the thoughtful and dedicated and, ultimately, selfless service that Les Aspin provided to me and to this nation over this last year. I asked a lot of him -- tough times and tough problems. He gave even more to me, to our military and to our country than was asked, and I will always be very, very grateful.

Thank you.
The Rose Garden

1:33 P.M. EST

The President: Ladies and gentlemen, yesterday I announced that Secretary Aspin would be stepping down as Secretary of Defense next month after a year of devoted service. I want to stress again how deeply grateful I am on behalf of all Americans for his hard work and his many unique contributions to the Pentagon and to our national defense.

To ensure the greatest possible continuity, I wanted to announced a successor as soon as possible. So today, I am very pleased to announce my intent to nominate Admiral Bob Inman as the next Secretary of Defense.

Admiral Inman was one of our nation's highest-ranking and most respected military officers. He was a four-star admiral whose career in the Navy and in our intelligence community and in private business has won him praise from both Democrats and Republicans who admire his intellect, his integrity and his leadership ability.

The Admiral's experience in serving our nation is truly impressive. He personally briefed Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy. He held senior positions under Presidents Ford, Carter, Reagan and Bush. Former Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger called Admiral Inman "a national asset." And I know he will be a national asset as Secretary of Defense.

He brings to this job the kind of character all Americans respect. The son of a gas station owner in a small east Texas town, he rose to distinction and success on the basis of his brains, his talent, and his hard work. He finished high school at 15, graduated from college at 19, joined the Naval Reserve at 20, and then launched an impressive 31-year career in the Navy. He served on an aircraft carrier, two cruisers and a destroyer, as well as on onshore assignments as an analyst for naval intelligence.

In 1976, at the age of 45, he became the youngest Vice Admiral in peacetime history. Bob Inman's stellar intelligence work caught the attention of many military and civilian leaders and prompted his elevation to several high posts in the intelligence community. He served as Vice Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, Director of the National Security Agency, and Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Because of his outstanding service, he was awarded the National Security Medal by President Carter.

Over the past decade since Admiral Inman left government, he served in a wide range of private sector positions, including CEO of two private sector electronics firms, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, and a teacher at his alma mater, the University of Texas. He's also served on 11 non-for-profit organizations.

MORE
corporate boards. And in all these roles, Admiral Inman has established a reputation for penetrating analysis, strong leadership, and a rock-solid commitment to this nation's security. Those qualities will serve our nation well as the Admiral becomes our next Secretary of Defense.

This is a time of great change in our world. We must build on the work Les Aspin began with a bottom-up review to ensure that we have the right forces and strategy for this new era. We must ensure that, even as we reduce force levels, our military remains ready to fight and win on a moment's notice. We must ensure that our men and women in uniform remain the best trained, the best equipped, the best prepared fighting force on Earth. And we must maintain and build strong bipartisan support in the Congress and in the country for the foreign policy and national defense interests of our nation.

I am confident that Admiral Inman is the right leader to meet these demanding challenges. I am grateful that he's agreed to make the personal sacrifices necessary to return to full-time government service and to accept this important assignment at this pivotal time in world events. I'm delighted that he will be joining our national security team, and I thank him for his service to the nation.

ADMIRAL INMAN: Thank you, Mr. President. You do me great honor with this appointment. Notwithstanding all the wonderful things you said, I am an imperfect human being who has been provided many wonderful opportunities, none quite yet of the status of this. I've not done all of them as well as I would like, but I've always worked hard at them, and I will work hard at this one.

As you know, I did not seek the job. In honesty, I did not want the job. Ultimately, you would ask, then, why am I here? Duty and country. I was persuaded from our lengthy conversations of the President's absolute commitment to build a strong bipartisan support for where this country needs to go in the years out ahead. I would tell you up front, honestly, I did not vote for President Clinton, I voted for President Bush, even though I was mad at him about his handling of the economy, but because I considered him a personal friend. The President did know that when he asked me to take this job.

I look forward to the challenges that are in front of us. I particularly look forward to working with the senior members of the national security team. Warren Christopher I consider an old friend and someone I enjoy working with, but I greatly admire. Tony Lake is a new acquaintance to me, but in these very few short days, it's been a great start.

But ultimately, the key to my being willing to do this, to give up a very happy and prosperous life, was the President's commitment and our interaction. I had to be comfortable that he was persuaded I was the right choice for this time frame.

And, Mr. President, as you know, I had to reach a level of comfort that we could work together, that I would be very comfortable in your role as the Commander in Chief -- President -- while I was Secretary of Defense. And I have found that level of comfort.

As I look at the challenges in front of us the road ahead is already pretty well mapped. I've had the privilege of knowing Les Aspin for more than 15 years. He is truly one of the great intellects in this country. From the first meeting, he's always been challenging what was the best approach to national security for this country. I'm persuaded that the work he's done over these last 11 months will make it vastly easier for his successor, but it won't be an easy job.
As I try to describe myself, I'm an operator, hopefully with a strategic view. I would hope in the years ahead to focus on an area that may surprise you -- I've noted the media coverage this morning has focused almost entirely on my intelligence background. In these last 10 years I've learned a lot about how business works, and I would hope to spend a lot of my time on bringing best business practices to the Department of Defense.

My sense in traveling the country is that the public is less concerned about what we're doing overseas or our commitments than whether we are getting a dollar value for a dollar spent in defense. And I would hope at the end of our years working together, we will have persuaded them, Mr. President, that they are. And I would hope to ensure that we practice standards of ethics and integrity in the Department of Defense that will be a beacon for the rest of government.

Finally, to my many friends in the media, both here and around the country, there have been at my last count some 82 calls last night and this morning for interviews. If we are going to build a bipartisan support for national security, it has to begin with establishing the best relationship with the Congress. I will be deeply respectful of the Senate's approach to the confirmation process. I believe, therefore, it will be wisest if I limit my public remarks on issues until the confirmation process is through, and then I will try to be as available to all of you in the future as I have been in the past.

Thank you very much. And thank you, Mr. President, for your confidence.
EXECUTIVE ORDER

ORDER OF SUCCESSION OF OFFICERS TO ACT
AS SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including section 3347 of title 5, United States Code, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Succession to Act as the Secretary of the Air Force. (a) In the event of the death, permanent disability, or resignation of the Secretary of the Air Force, the incumbents holding the positions designated below, in the order indicated, shall act for and exercise the powers of the Secretary of the Air Force:

(1) The Under Secretary of the Air Force.

(2) The Assistant Secretaries and General Counsel of the Air Force, in the order fixed by their length of service as permanent appointees in such positions.

(3) The Chief of Staff of the Air Force.

(b) In the event of the absence or temporary disability of the Secretary of the Air Force, the incumbents holding the Department of the Air Force positions designated in paragraph (a) of this section, in the order indicated, shall act for and exercise the powers of the Secretary of the Air Force.

(1) The designation of an Acting Secretary of the Air Force applies only for the duration of the Secretary's absence or disability, and does not affect the authority of the Secretary to resume the powers of the Secretary's office.

(2) In the event that the Secretary of the Air Force is temporarily absent from the position, the Secretary of the Air Force may continue to exercise the powers and fulfill the duties of his office during the absence, notwithstanding the provisions of this order.

(c) Precedence among those officers designated in paragraph (a) of this section who have the same date of appointment shall be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force at the time that such appointments are made.

(d) Notwithstanding paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section, an officer shall not act for or exercise the powers of the Secretary of the Air Force under this order if that officer serves only in an acting capacity in the position that would otherwise entitle him to do so.

Sec. 2. Temporary Nature of Succession. Succession to act for and exercise the powers of the Secretary of the Air Force pursuant to this order shall be on a temporary or interim basis and shall not have the effect of vacating the statutory appointment held by the successor.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

THE WHITE HOUSE,
April 22, 1994.
EXECUTIVE ORDER

ORDER OF SUCCESSION OF OFFICERS TO ACT AS SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including section 3347 of title 5, United States Code, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Succession to Act as the Secretary of the Army.
(a) In the event of the death, permanent disability, or resignation of the Secretary of the Army, the incumbents holding the positions designated below, in the order indicated, shall act for and exercise the powers of the Secretary of the Army:

(1) The Under Secretary of the Army.
(2) The Assistant Secretaries and General Counsel of the Army, in the order fixed by their length of service as permanent appointees in such positions.
(3) The Chief of Staff of the Army.

(b) In the event of the absence or temporary disability of the Secretary of the Army, the incumbents holding the Department of the Army positions designated in paragraph (a) of this section, in the order indicated, shall act for and exercise the powers of the Secretary of the Army.

(1) The designation of an Acting Secretary of the Army under this subsection applies only for the duration of the Secretary’s absence or disability, and does not affect the authority of the Secretary to resume the powers of the Secretary’s office.

(2) When the Secretary of the Army is temporarily absent from the position, the Secretary of the Army may continue to exercise the powers and fulfill the duties of his office during his absence, notwithstanding the provisions of this order.

(c) Precedence among those officers designated in paragraph (a) of this section who have the same date of appointment shall be determined by the Secretary of the Army at the time that such appointments are made.

(d) Notwithstanding paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section, an officer shall not act for or exercise the powers of the Secretary of the Army under this order if that officer serves only in an acting capacity in the position that would otherwise entitle him to do so.

Sec. 2. Temporary Nature of Succession. Succession to act for and exercise the powers of the Secretary of the Army pursuant to this order shall be on a temporary or interim basis and shall not have the effect of vacating the statutory appointment held by the successor.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

THE WHITE HOUSE,
April 22, 1994.
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PRESIDENT CLINTON APPOINTS 9 MEMBERS TO THE AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

The President today announced his intent to appoint Hugh Carey, Evelyn Pat Foote, Gabriel Guerra-Mondragon, Rolland Kidder, Douglas Kinnard, Alfred Los Banos, Tom Lyons, Brenda Moore and Gail Reals as members of the American Battle Monuments Commission.

The American Battle Monuments Commission is responsible for commemorating the U.S. Armed Forces in places where they have served since April 6, 1917, by designing, constructing, operating and maintaining permanent American military burial grounds on foreign soil. The Commission also controls the erection of military monuments and markers in foreign countries by other American citizens, both in the public and private sectors. The Commission operates and maintains 24 military burial grounds for War Dead and 73 memorial structures worldwide. Over 11 million people visited these cemeteries, monuments, and memorials last year.

Additionally, the Commission is responsible for the commemoration of the 50th anniversary of D-Day. Events commemorating this occurrence will take place throughout the United States and France, from May 11 - June 13, 1994.

EVELYN PAT FOOTE of Maryland
Ms. Foote is a retired Brigadier General in the United States Army. She has held a number of command and staff positions in Europe and Vietnam, culminating in her current assignment as Commanding General of Fort Belvoir, Virginia. She worked in many positions dealing with the advancement of women in the armed forces and is highly decorated.

GABRIEL GUERRA-MONDRAGON of Maryland
Mr. Guerra-Mondragon is President of TKC International, Incorporated, an international consultant and a former foreign service officer and served as a UNESCO delegate during the Carter Administration. Mr. Mondragon was also a staff attorney at the Commission on Civil Rights.

ROLLAND KIDDER of New York
Mr. Kidder is currently President of Kidder Exploration, Inc., Independent Oil and Gas Company. He was formerly a Trustee of the New York Power Authority and a member of the New York Assembly. Mr. Kidder is a graduate of the US Navy Officer Candidate School in Rhode Island and served in the Navy during the Vietnam War.

-more-
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ALFRED LOS BANOS of Hawaii
Mr. Los Banos is currently retired from the Hawaii Veterans Administration. He served in Korea where he was paralyzed from the waist down and was the first soldier from Hawaii to be disabled during the war. Mr. Los Banos is active in the Korean Veterans' Association, participates in the "Korea Revisit Program," and was a member of the Pacific War Memorial Commission.

TOM LYONS of Illinois
Mr. Lyons is a partner in the law firm of O'Keefe, Ashenden, Lyons & Ward. He was formerly a Member of the Illinois State Senate and is Chairman of the Democratic Party of Cook County. He served as a platoon leader, Third Infantry Division of the Army Rangers.

HUGH CAREY of New York
Mr. Carey is the former Governor of the State of New York. He is currently Executive Vice President of W.R. Grace & Co, where his responsibilities include oversight of the company's government relations. He enlisted in the New York National Guard and served in Northern France and Holland during WWII. His troop was responsible for the liberation of the Nordhausen concentration camp. Governor Carey received the Bronze Star and the Croix de Guerre during his tour of duty. He also served seven terms in the U.S. House of Representatives.

DOUGLAS KINNARD of Virginia
Mr. Kinnard is a Retired Brigadier General who served in World War II, the Korean War, and the Vietnam War. He has also served as Chief of Staff for the Second Field Force in Vietnam, Chief of Military History for the U.S. Army, and Director of the Center for Military History. Mr. Kinnard is a graduate of the West Point Academy. He is currently a Writer, Lecturer, and Visiting Professor at the University of Richmond. He has previously taught at the National Defense University, the Naval War College, the University of Vermont, the University of Oklahoma, and the Center for International Studies at Princeton University. His military awards include the Distinguished Service Medal, the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star for Heroic Achievement, and the Air Medal for Valor.

GAIL REALS of Virginia
Ms. Reals is a retired Brigadier General, United States Marine Corps. Ms. Reals was the first woman Brigadier General in the Marine Corps and served as Commanding General of the Marine Corps Base at Quantico. She is currently a student in public policy at George Mason University.

BRENDA MOORE of New York
Dr. Moore is an Assistant Professor at the State University of New York at Buffalo. She is a disabled veteran who served in the Vietnam War. She also serves on the Board of Directors of the Inter-University Seminar on Armed Forces and Society.
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REMKS BY THE PRESIDENT TO SOLDIERS AND THEIR FAMILIES

Soldier's Gym
Fort Drum, New York

6:02 P.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. Those of you who can be seated. (Laughter.) Hello.

AUDIENCE: Hellooo!

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you for the wonderful welcome. Thank you for this beautiful, beautifully decorated place of welcome. Thank you for letting the band play "Yakity Sax." That was an interesting little twist. (Laughter.) And thank you for letting me sit next to a distinguished soldier who was from my hometown -- our grandparents knew each other -- Command Sergeant Major Johnson, stand up. (Applause.)

You know, we were sitting back there talking, he was looking at me thinking, I don't know about you, Mr. President, but I've come a long way. (Laughter.)

I thank all of you for being here. I also want to acknowledge the presence in the audience today of the Lt. Governor of New York, Lt. Governor Stan Lundine, and Congressman John McCue from this district. Thank you, gentlemen, for being here. (Applause.)

I also want to thank the eight couples that are here behind me and Major Tony Smart, who was sitting up there with me. The nine of them gathered over at General and Mrs. Meade's house a few moments ago to talk to me about what it was like to be in Somalia and what it was like to be the family members left behind. They represented you wonderfully well. I loved my time with them. And it must not have been all that easy for them to do, but they were terrific. I'd like for you to acknowledge them all. (Applause.)

I thank General Meade for his welcome and General Shal for his fine remarks.

You know, this is a great day, but it is March 15th and there's still a couple of feet of snow on the ground up here. (Applause.) When I heard -- I know that there are fair number of men and women in our Armed Forces who come from the southern part of the United States. (Applause.) When I realized you'd had 160 inches of snow, 26 days in January below zero, one day at 43 degrees below zero -- that's real temperature, not wind chill -- I'm surprised we have anybody who didn't go to Somalia. (Laughter.) I'm surprised anybody stayed behind. Some of the ladies who were meeting with me said that shoveling the snow was maybe a harder duty than their husbands had to endure.

But I'm glad to be here. I thank you for the hat. Look at my nice tie, here. It's your tie. (Applause.) I will wear it with pride.
It's also a privilege for me to welcome back "Lil' Deuce" today. (Applause.) I say on behalf of all the American people, thank you, job well done and welcome home.

Fifteen months ago, our troops went to Somalia to help stop one of the great human tragedies of our time. Already 300,000 people -- many of them little children like those here in this audience -- had died of starvation and disease -- twice as many were in danger of dying very quickly. Relief supplies were rotting on the docks of Mogadishu, hostage to a small number of armed Somalis.

To help relieve this suffering, our nation acted. President Bush deployed 28,000 American troops in support of a United Nations humanitarian mission. It was after the election, I was coming in and I gave him my full support. Joining with other soldiers and relief workers from around the world, our troops helped restore hope and save hundreds of thousands from certain death.

This proud division, the same division that helped the citizens of Florida rebuild after Hurricane Andrew knows something about restoring hope. (Applause.) I saw some of you there, too.

Today in Somalia, the crops are growing, food and medicine are flowing. Roads, schools and clinics have reopened. No longer are thousands of children dying every day. Leaders are sitting down today at peace talks in Nairobi. You helped make all that possible. And by March 25th, a week ahead of schedule, the last American military units in Somalia will be heading back to their loved ones and home. (Applause.)

There are those who will say we have not done everything that could have been done because Somalia has not yet found an enduring peace; because factions continue to fight for advantage, indifferent to the deadly chaos they threatened to recreate. But never forget, because of your efforts and the efforts of so many others, the starvation has ended and the Somali people have been given a serious chance to build their own future.

That is all we or anyone else can provide. We cannot rebuild other people's societies. You have given them a chance to seize their own future. That is what we do in the United States, and that is what others must do as well. You have given them that chance, and for that, the world should be grateful to you. (Applause.)

Let me say that we must honor not only those who returned hail and healthy, but also those who came home wounded and those who did not return. I met in Walter Reed Hospital one of your numbers, Sergeant Chris Reid, a very brave and terribly impressive soldier who is still in the hospital nursing his wounds. And I know that our prayers, all of our prayers are with him.

Just yesterday an American AC-130 crashed off the coast of Kenya on its way to Somalia and several of the crew members perished. On behalf of all the American people, let me express our sympathy to the loved ones of those who were lost in that accident.

On Veterans Day I had the honor of meeting three other members of your great division -- Specialist Michael Carroll and Duane Bevitt and Lt. Colonel Egon Hawrylack. They came to the White House -- I thought I deserve a cheer for pronouncing his name right. (Applause.)

Let me tell you, they came to the White House, those three people, with some others who served there with a simple message. They said, we are proud of what we did. When most of
our troops came home last May, General Robert Johnson came to the White House and he said this about you and your colleagues who served in Somalia: "A lot of 18 and 19-year-old men and women in uniform," he said, "demonstrated discipline, good judgment, and a good deal of patience in performing a rather unique mission."

That is putting it mildly. People who were not there do not know how much patience was required on how many circumstances under difficult, difficult conditions. (Applause.) And General Johnson said, "I don't think any other country in the world could have done what we did." I say that is true and we are all proud of what you did.

In this new era, you all know that we may ask our military to undertake a range of missions -- fighting aggression in the Gulf, helping to contain the conflict in the Balkans, working to build a democratic peace in Europe through NATO's Partnership for Peace. But whatever the setting, our people in uniform carry the same message of strength and hope and freedom.

That's why our forces must always be the best trained, the best equipped, the best prepared in the world; and the people with the best spirit, the best morale and the deepest conviction. People like you. That is my commitment -- to keep you there and keep you strong. (Applause.)

I want to say one other word about the mission in Somalia. General Shalikashvili just described that work as a great victory as measured in the thousands and hundreds of thousands of children and men and women who are alive today. In that sense, the mission you undertook was without precedent. American soldiers did not go to Somalia to conquer, but on a mission of mercy; a mission accomplished; a mission to be proud of. Let history also record that here at Fort Drum and at other bases across our nation that it was not just the troops who earned their stripes, but the spouses, the families, the children, the civilian colleagues and the communities.

I want to say again, I am profoundly grateful to all the families and all the family support groups and all the civilians who made this possible. And these fine people behind me, who spent about an hour talking to me today taught me things and made me see things and understand things from your point of view that I could never have learned otherwise. I owe you all a debt, and I believe I will be a better President and a better Commander in Chief because of the time they spent to share your lives, your experiences and your hopes with me. I thank them for that, and I thank you for that. (Applause.)

Finally, let me say, if there are any debates still to be had about our mission in Somalia, let people have those debates with me. But let there be no debate about how you carried out the mission. You answered the call, you did your job, you served your country wonderfully well. More than that no one can ask. So to all the American men and women who have served with honor in this difficult and dangerous mission, I say you have shown the world what Americans are made of. Your nation is grateful, and your President is terribly, terribly proud of you.

Thank you. God bless you, and God bless America.

(Applause.)

END 6:14 P.M. FORT
Vice Admiral Boorda, born in South Bend, Indiana in November 1938, enlisted in the U.S. Navy in February 1956. He attained the rate of petty officer first class, serving in a number of commands, primarily in aviation. His last two enlisted assignments were in Attack Squadron 144 and Carrier Airborne Early Warning Squadron 11. He was selected for commissioning under the Integration Program in 1962 and attended Officer Candidate School.

Following commissioning in August 1962, Vice Admiral Boorda served in USS PORTERFIELD (DD 682) as Combat Information Center Officer. He attended Destroyer School in Newport and, in 1964, was assigned as Weapons Officer, USS JOHN R. CRAIG (DD 883). His next tour was as Commanding Officer, USS PARROT (MSC 197). Vice Admiral Boorda's first shore tour was as a weapons instructor at Naval Destroyer School in Newport, RI. In 1971, after attending U.S. Naval War College and obtaining a B.A. from the University of Rhode Island, he assumed duties as Executive Officer, USS BROOKE (DEG 1). That tour was followed by a short period at the University of Oklahoma and an assignment as Read, Surface Lieutenant Commander Assignments/Assistant for Captain Detailing in the Bureau of Naval Personnel. In 1975, Vice Admiral Boorda took command of USS PARRAGUT (DDG 37) remaining until 1977. He was next assigned as Executive Assistant to the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower & Reserve Affairs). In 1979, he relieved the civilian Presidential appointee in the position, remaining until he assumed command of Destroyer Squadron TWENTY-TWO in 1981. In 1983 and 1984 he served as Executive Assistant to the Chief of Naval Personnel/Deputy CNO for Manpower, Personnel and Training. In December 1984, Vice Admiral Boorda assumed his first flag assignment as Executive Assistant to the Chief of Naval Operations remaining until July 1986. Vice Admiral Boorda's next assignment was as Commander, Cruiser-Destroyer Group EIGHT in Norfolk, Virginia. As a Carrier Battle Group Commander embarked in USS SARATOGA (CV 60), he also served as Commander, Battle Force SIXTH Fleet in 1987. In July 1988, Vice Admiral Boorda was nominated to be the Chief of Naval Personnel/Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Manpower, Personnel and Training) and assumed that office on 9 August 1988.

Vice Admiral Boorda's awards include the Distinguished Service Medal (2nd award), Legion of Merit (3rd award), Meritorious Service Medal (2nd award) and several other personal and campaign awards.

Vice Admiral and Mrs. Boorda, the former Battle Moran of Comanche, Oklahoma, have four children. Two sons, Robert and Edward, are Surface Warfare Officers and their daughter, Anna, is also married to a Surface Warfare Officer. Their son David resides in Arlington, Virginia.

In August 1988, Admiral Boorda became Chief of Naval Personnel/Deputy Chief of Naval Operations.

The Admiral’s military awards include the Distinguished Service Medal, second award; the Legion of Merit, third award; the Meritorious Service Medal, second award; and a number of other personal and campaign awards.

Admiral and Mrs. Bertie (Moran) Boorda have four children and nine grandchildren; two sons are naval officers.
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Womack Army Medical Center
Fort Bragg, North Carolina

2:36 P.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: First of all, I'd like to thank General Shelton and General Steele and General Davis for welcoming me here and for giving me an opportunity, not only to review the site of the crash, but also to go into this hospital and to see, not only a good number of the soldiers who were injured, but also the people who have been up virtually non-stop for the last two days caring for them.

I found it deeply moving. In the first place, the morale of the people who have been burned and injured is high. Their pride in their work and in their country is very strong. And what everybody said about the quality of care they've gotten and the outpouring of effort that has been made to help them deal with their problems has been very moving. Person after person after person said, you know, I just can't wait to get back to my work. I'm ready to serve again.

It was a deeply moving thing. I'm very grateful to them for their service, and to all of those who have cared so well for them.

Q Mr. President, can you tell us what you talked about, or what you said to some of those who you saw today?

MR. PRESIDENT: A lot of times we just made small talk. I asked them where they were from, how long they had been in the army, what happened. They talked about it a little bit.

I was especially moved -- I met a man and his wife who were both in the incident, both in the service, both injured. The man was injured because he was putting the fire out on his wife. And a lot of these young people were injured because they,
Instead of taking themselves to safety, were trying to help others who were being burned.

It was a very -- I wish everyone in America could have seen the faces, the eyes, the spirit of these people, they would realize how fortunate we are to be served by men and women like this who are both brave and selfless, and with no concern other than just to get back to their lives and to their duty. I mean, it is very, very moving. I'm very glad I came; I'm glad I had the opportunity to see this, and again, profoundly grateful to the people in this fine hospital who are taking such good care of them.

Q. Is this one of the worst incidents you've seen?

MR. PRESIDENT: It was a serious problem, but they've handled it magnificently, I think.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END
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The President: Hello. I just wanted to make a brief statement. This morning, I called General Shelton at Fort Bragg and General Floyd at Pope Air Force Base to personally express my sorrow and condolences because of the tragedy yesterday, and to thank them, and through them, the members of our armed services who do the work that they do.

As I said in my statement yesterday, it's sometimes easy for those of us who enjoy the protection of the United States military to forget that it is a dangerous business, even in peace time, because of the training which must be carried out. And I think the hearts and thoughts and prayers of all Americans go out to the families of those who were killed yesterday, those who were injured, and all of those who were involved in this tragedy. We wish them only the best, and we are all thinking of them.

I'd also like to say a brief word about the tragic murder of Mr. Colosio in Mexico yesterday. As you know, I called President Salinas last night, and we had a conversation about it which was entirely personal. And, again, the United States, all of us, particularly the Vice President and I and Secretary Cisneros and others who had met Mr. Colosio, feel a great sense of loss and feel the pain of the Mexican people and the pain of his family.

The United States has done what we could do today to try to support the people of Mexico and the government by making it clear that we think that the country's institutions are fundamentally strong. There was a brief delay in the trading of Mexican securities today to give the investors the opportunity to find out the facts in the hope that we would avoid any undue movement there. That delay lasted somewhere around 30 minutes or an hour. And I think it did have a good salutary effect to make, just to make sure that the investors has all the facts and were not under any misapprehension about what had occurred. And it appears that things are proceeding normally there. So our best wishes go out to the Mexican people, and our grief and our condolence and our prayers to them in this terrible time of loss.

Q Mr. President, are there steps the United States government can or should take to try to make sure that there's stability in Mexico?

The President: Well, what we can do, and what I think we should have done, first of all, is to take the steps we took on the trading. Secondly, I did talk to Secretary Bentsen last night to make sure that if there was serious trading in Mexican currencies, that we could try to help to stabilize that.

But, as you know, their financial institutions were all close down today. So they took that step, and we'll just have to see whether anything else happens on that regard tomorrow. But I think things will settle down here. And I think fundamentally they are in
sound shape. And I hope that will be the case. We'll have to wait and see what happens tomorrow.

Q Mr. President, what did you tell the American Jewish leaders today about a status of a united Jerusalem?

THE PRESIDENT: I told them that the position -- I told them what I've always told you in public. I'll tell you the exact words I used: I said, my position has not changed on that issue. But my position is also that the United States and other countries should refrain from intervening in these peace talks between the parties themselves. And part of the Declaration of Principles between Israel and the PLO was that the disposition of that issue would be a so-called final status issue to be resolved at the end of the talks. And I have respected that process. So I have made it clear that the United States has not changed its position. The way we handled the resolution on the Hebron massacre in the U.N. gave us the opportunity to make that clear again. But we are trying to get these peace talks going, and we are going to let the parties make their decisions for the future of the Middle East on their own, and we are going to do everything we can to facilitate it.

Q What do you hope to accomplish in your press conference tonight?

THE PRESIDENT: Basically, I'm going to make a report to the American people about what we're trying to do up here; about the work we're doing on the crime bill, on health care, on a number of other important issues. And if I don't get to the Hill now, I'll be behind the curve on health care. So I've got to go.

THE PRESS: Thank you.
I am pleased to announce that I have nominated Admiral Jeremy M. Boorda to succeed Admiral Frank A. Kelso II as Chief of Naval Operations.

Admiral Boorda is currently serving as Commander in Chief, U.S. Naval Forces, Europe/Commander in Chief, Allied Forces, Southern Europe where he is responsible for coordinating and planning NATO military actions over Bosnia-Herzegovina and in the Mediterranean and Adriatic seas.

Admiral Boorda brings to the job of Chief of Naval Operations a keen appreciation of operational requirements in the post-Cold War world and an outstanding ability to work with our allies in complex and challenging circumstances. He has distinguished himself as one of the foremost military leaders serving in the armed services today and his counsel and guidance on the many national security issues facing our nation will be of great value.

Admiral Boorda assumes the post of Chief of Naval Operations at an important time in the history of the United States Navy. I will depend on him to continue the progress that Admiral Kelso has made in restructuring the Navy to meet the new domestic and international security environments.

I have also nominated Vice Admiral Leighton W. Smith, Jr., U.S. Navy, to relieve Admiral Boorda and be promoted to the rank of admiral. As the former Director for Operations, U.S. European Command, and the current Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Plans, Policy and Operations, Vice Admiral Smith possesses a thorough understanding of NATO structure and the requirements of the European theater of operations.
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Thank you for joining me this morning. Our team of Unified and Specified CINCs has undergone some changes since we last met in August. I would like to welcome some new members to the team. Admiral Chiles, we are pleased to have you at Strategic Command and appreciate the significance of the Navy taking its turn in this rotation. General Joulwan we want to thank you again for your strong support during our very successful NATO Summit last month and in our recent success in stopping the shelling of Sarajevo. Finally, General McCaffrey we just wished you well last week in sending you off to Southern Command.

We also bid farewell to a key member of our team this week. Admiral Jeremiah, you have been such a key player in so many of our policy deliberations that it is hard to imagine you not being here. We wish you every success and happiness in your retirement.

This is our first time to meet since I asked Dr. Perry to be Secretary of Defense. I know you worked closely with him when he was Deputy Secretary and I am confident those ties will continue. I might add, what with the developments in Bosnia and Korea, he has had to hit the ground running and I am very pleased with the way things have gone since he took over. I even like his suits.

Turning to the business at hand, I have asked General Shalikashvili to brief us on the situation in Bosnia and
Korea. Time permitting, I'd also like to hear from you on matters of particular concern in your respective areas. Since our time is short, let us proceed.
SUGGESTED QUESTIONS
Regional and Functional Commands

U.S. European Command (General Joulwan)
- How is the morale of the personnel in the tactical fighter units that have been involved in the Bosnia air strike ultimatum? Do they appreciate the enormous contribution they have made to peace by standing ready to carry out this critical mission?
- With regard to NATO Summit follow-up, what has been the performance to date by the French in implementing their part of the Partnership for Peace and Combined Joint Task Force initiatives?

U.S. Forces Korea (General Luck)
- Other than the Patriot missile and Apache helicopter issues, are there any other upgrades in our military capabilities that we ought to be paying attention to in the near-term?
- Looking beyond the immediate situation and toward our longer-term goals, how are we progressing in our efforts to shift a greater emphasis to Republic of Korea (ROK) forces for defense of South Korea? For example, have ROK military leaders assumed greater command responsibilities?
- How are ROK military relations with other countries in the region?

U.S. Southern Command (General McCaffrey)
- Recognizing that you have only been at your new post for a week, how are our preparations proceeding for the transfer of control over the Panama Canal? Is there strong sentiment for the U.S. maintaining some residual presence in Panama?
- How would you describe the reaction of our allies in the Hemisphere to our recent decision to place less emphasis on the drug interdiction effort and more emphasis on stemming production and demand?

U.S. Central Command (General Hoar)
- What is your current assessment of the situation we can likely expect in Mogadishu on March 31? Do you now expect it to be quiet or violent?
- How are we progressing in our planning to protect our withdrawal in the event things should turn ugly?
- Iraq has been making some progress toward complying with U.N. terms, which has in turn increased the pressure from some quarters on the U.N. to lift sanctions. What is your assessment?
U.S. Pacific Command (Admiral Larson)

- In the weeks since our decision to lift the trade embargo on Vietnam, have you seen any additional willingness on the part of the Vietnamese to help us attain the fullest possible accounting of our POW/MIAs?

- With regard to China, are there aspects of its military modernization program that you find worrisome?

U.S. Atlantic Command (Admiral Miller)

- As the CINC responsible for training U.S. forces that deploy abroad, what are you doing differently to prepare our troops for peacekeeping operations?

- How do you assess the readiness of the forces under your command?

- The last time we met we discussed your efforts to deploy "adaptive force packages" (which use components from all the military services to provide tailored capabilities to the receiving CINCs). How is this program working out?

U.S. Strategic Command (Admiral Chiles)

- The FY 95 defense budget request would deactivate 20 B-52H's and DoD and the NSC will decide in the context of the NPR whether an additional 27 B-52H's should be retired. In your opinion, how would the loss of these additional 27 B-52's affect our ability to meet conventional bomber requirements under the Bottom-Up Review? How would it affect our ability to maintain nuclear requirements at START II levels?

U.S. Special Operations Command (General Downing)

- How are our Special Operations Forces being utilized in peacekeeping operations? Current operations are obviously placing additional stress on your forces. What steps are you taking to keep this within tolerable bounds?

- What additional capabilities do you think our Special Operations Forces should have in a world increasingly characterized by regional instability?

Space Command (General Horner)

- The MILSTAR program is being criticized by some as being a remnant of the Cold War. Are you satisfied that this program has been modified to reflect the new security environment in which U.S. forces will be operating?

- What impact will the decision to work with Russia on the Space Station have on related U.S. military programs?
Transportation Command (General Fogleman)

- What degree of confidence do you have that McDonnell-Douglas will be able to act on the recent C-17 settlement and get this troubled program back on track in a manner that would justify our procuring more than 40 aircraft?

- Until we obtain the C-17 or a commercial wide-body equivalent, how large is the shortfall in our capability to meet the lift requirements of two nearly simultaneous regional crises?

- What progress are we making toward acquisition and construction of the sealift ships that we need to meet our strategy?
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Less than six weeks ago, I was sworn in as Secretary of Defense. It seems more like six months, with the swirl of events and the significance of the actions taken in that short time. During this period, I have been enormously impressed with the diversity of actions which the Secretary is called on to take. The Secretary of Defense has two key responsibilities: to ensure the appropriate use of military force, and to ensure the readiness of our armed forces should military force be required.

This latter responsibility can be described as a management task -- the task of managing DoD resources so that our armed forces are maintained in such a state of readiness that they can successfully respond to any plausible military challenge. This management task is made exceedingly difficult by the substantial drawdown in defense resources now underway -- a 40 percent reduction in budget over a 10-year period. Indeed, maintaining core capabilities and morale during a major reduction in force is one of the most difficult tasks faced by any manager, in government or in business.

During the past year, when I was serving as Deputy Secretary, I've talked with many of you about the approaches the Department is using to deal with this management challenge. In brief, we are trading off force structure for readiness; we are reducing infrastructure, including military personnel, DoD civilian personnel, and bases; and we are reforming our acquisition system so that we can integrate the defense industrial base into the national industrial base. These are all important challenges, and any one of them would be an appropriate subject for a talk to this audience.

Tonight, however, I don't plan to talk about these management responsibilities, as important as they are. Rather, I plan to talk about my responsibility for the use of military force. This responsibility involves determining when the use of military force is appropriate; authorizing the deployment of military units; and providing the support for our deployed forces. While the Secretary of Defense is not the only advisor to the President on when the use of military force is appropriate, and when it is not appropriate, he does bring a uniquely informed perspective to that crucial question.

When and how to use American military force is one of the most difficult questions facing a President today because of the
complex security problems facing the world. During World War II, we were fighting for our survival as a nation. Consequently, we were committed to use the full military force required for total victory. In our military engagements since World War II, we have never used the full military force available to us. During the Korean War, we did not use nuclear bombs, even when our ground forces were encircled in the Pusan enclave. Similarly, no nuclear weapons were used during the Vietnam War. During Desert Storm, we not only refrained from the use of nuclear weapons, we also showed substantial restraint in our use of conventional weapons, limiting our attacks on Baghdad to cruise missiles and precision-guided munitions directed against military targets, and stopping the war before we had destroyed the Iraqi army. President Bush determined that this limited use of military force was consistent with the limited political objective of liberating Kuwait.

In Bosnia today we have still more limited interests, and therefore our use of military force is correspondingly more limited. We have, for example, agreed to certain very specific uses of air power. But we have decided not to deploy ground forces except in the context of implementing a settlement accepted by all the parties. I'm going to talk tonight about how we determined what use of military power was appropriate in Bosnia, and where that decision is likely to take us in the near future.

This talk does not presume to be a general analysis of how the United States should apply military force in the post-Cold War era. But the problems we see in Bosnia are in some ways representative of a class of national security problems familiar in the world today. It involves a bloody conflict, where the warring factions are motivated by deep-seated hatreds fueled by the aggressive ambitions of leaders bent on establishing a "Greater Serbia." Senator Moynihan has written that "Ethnicity is the great hidden force of our age." Ethnicity is a great force, as he writes, but it is no longer hidden.

As a people, we have become absorbed in the ongoing war in Bosnia. CNN has brought its horrors into our living room, including the appalling slaughter that took place in the marketplace in Sarajevo last month. The human costs of the war -- especially the systematic killing and the ethnic cleansing -- are evident, and deplorable.

But what are the national interests of the United States in this war? It does not involve our supreme national interest; unlike our stake in World War II and the Cold War, our national survival does not hinge on its outcome. So we could just sit it out. Therefore, some have argued that we should sit it out.

We have rejected that option for two reasons. First, we have a compelling national security interest in preventing the
war and its consequences from spreading -- beyond Bosnia or even beyond the Balkans. Second, we have a humanitarian interest in trying to limit the violence and relieve suffering while we work for a peace settlement.

These are real interests, and we take them seriously, but they are limited interests, and they have different priorities in terms of what is at stake for America. Our actions need to be proportional to these interests. How then do we advance these limited interests in an effective way, and with appropriate levels of risk to our people and at an acceptable cost in resources?

Our first emphasis is on actions that can prevent the war from spreading, since this is where our most profound national security interests lie. We have taken one modest but significant action in that regard, which is to deploy a small infantry unit to Macedonia to participate in a U.N. peacekeeping force based there. This peacekeeping force is intended to observe the situation there, and by its presence help deter the war from spreading, which is of particular importance because of the potential of a Macedonian war drawing Greece and Turkey into the conflict. It is that concern of a widened conflict which presents the greatest risk to American interests.

The peacekeeping force in Macedonia is a limited deterrent, but the best way to keep the war from spreading is to stop it as soon as possible. Therefore our primary goal is to promote a negotiated peace settlement among the warring factions. For almost two years, peace talks have been sponsored by the European Community and the U.N., with modest American participation. Since European interests would benefit most from a settlement, it was appropriate for Europe to take the lead. And let me say, we appreciate the hard work our allies have put into resolving this complex and frustrating dispute. Several times a peace agreement seemed close, but each time some obstacle prevented closure.

A month ago, with the peace talks at an impasse, Warren Christopher, under encouragement by several European leaders, introduced a U.S. initiative to meet individually with the warring parties to try and find some new approach to peace. The U.S. envoy, Ambassador Redman, brought the Muslims and the Croats together in a "Framework Agreement" which is the first step in what could be a comprehensive peace agreement. Much hard work lies ahead, but real progress has already been made.

The essential foundation for that initiative was NATO's renewed demonstration of resolve to back up diplomacy with a credible threat of force and to reduce the level of violence while the talks are underway. On February 9, NATO, with leadership from the United States, and in response to a U.N. Security Council request and resolution, agreed to use its air power to stop the artillery bombardment of Sarajevo.
This initiative built on the longstanding NATO-enforced effort to stop the aerial bombardment of cities and stop other uses of tactical air in the war. This was accomplished by establishing a "no fly zone" over Bosnia, and enforcing that policy by basing a formidable NATO air fleet in Italy and the Adriatic to maintain a 24-hour patrol over Bosnia. This NATO fleet has been successful in effectively deterring the aerial bombardment of cities in Bosnia for the past ten months, compared to the frequent bombardment which preceded the establishment of the no-fly zone. The first militarily significant violation occurred last week. NATO warplanes responded by shooting down four of the six violators.

The artillery bombardment of Sarajevo was stopped by establishing a "no bombardment" policy in Sarajevo. NATO said it would make subject to attack any artillery piece that fired into Sarajevo, or was not under U.N. control within the zone extending 20 kilometers from Sarajevo. This policy was motivated by the staggering rate of civilian casualties resulting from the day-to-day bombardment of Sarajevo. There have been 10,000 deaths and 40,000 wounded in Sarajevo, many from artillery bombadments. Since the NATO ultimatum was announced, Sarajevo has gone more than twenty days without any artillery attacks, compared to the months of December and January, when it often received more than a thousand shells a day.

But the fighting still goes on in ways that are difficult to influence with the use of airpower alone -- in particular, the small-arms, close-combat fighting around many cities and villages in Bosnia. So we also have programs to mitigate the effects of the violence resulting from that warfare. The United Nations has 14,000 troops on the ground in Bosnia to that end, and one of their major tasks is to guard the relief convoys that bring food, medicine, and clothing to the beleaguered cities in Bosnia. Here the role of NATO airpower is to provide close air support for the U.N. ground forces if they call for it. Additionally, the United States and other nations have mounted a massive program to deliver relief supplies by airlift and airdrop. This has involved tens of thousands of troops, millions of pounds of food, medicine and supplies, and billions of dollars.

After almost two years of violence and frustrated peace efforts, we seem to be making some progress toward peace in Bosnia. But what are the next steps? And where do they lead? Anyone who tries to forecast events in the Balkans is either brave or foolish. With that caveat, I will proceed bravely, but I hope not foolishly.

Many have proposed that the United States and NATO build on their successful use of airpower to lower the level of violence even further by extending NATO's protection to the other "safe-
area" cities in Bosnia. I believe that any proposed extension of NATO military use should pass the following three tests:
(1) it should enhance the ongoing peace negotiations;
(2) it should lead to a significant reduction in civilian casualties; and,
(3) it should be enforceable by the use of NATO airpower and U.N. ground forces. We do not want to make empty threats!

The NATO ultimatums to stop aerial bombardment and artillery bombardment of Sarajevo passed all of these tests, and all were successful. Extending these ultimatums to safe-area cities where the principal military activity is infantry or guerrilla action in and around urban areas would not be enforceable with NATO airpower. Indeed, trying to use airpower in such situations actually could increase rather than decrease the civilian casualties. I recall the observation from the Vietnam war that "we had to destroy the village in order to save it." On the other hand, as the U.N. commander, Lieutenant General Rose, increases the size and aggressiveness of his ground forces, NATO could very well be called on to provide close air support for U.N. forces, and the NATO air fleet is prepared to do just that.

These military actions by NATO have not only reduced the level of violence in Bosnia, they arguably have been a stimulus to the peace talks by demonstrating the resolve of NATO and, in particular, the United States. And that is what really counts, for the future in Bosnia depends primarily on the outcome of these peace talks.

Last week, as a result of a new American peace initiative, the Bosnian government, the Bosnian Croats and the Republic of Croatia signed a "Framework Agreement." This agreement called for a Federated Republic in the Bosnian government- and Bosnian Croat-controlled portions of Bosnia-Herzegovina. They also agreed on the outlines of a confederation between this new Federated Republic and the Republic of Croatia. This week Ambassador Redman is in Vienna with representatives of these three parties to work out the political details of these accords, including the preparation of a constitution for the new Federation. At the same time, retired General John Galvin is in Croatia with military leaders of the three parties to work out the necessary military arrangements.

All three signers of the Washington accords praised the United States for its leadership in making the accord possible. Indeed, the Prime Minister of the Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina said the agreement "would not have been possible without the American leadership." But as he noted, much hard work lies ahead to go from a framework agreement to a federation. Even harder work lies ahead to bring the Bosnian Serbs into these peace talks in a constructive way.
This is where Russia can play a role. There has been some concern about Russia's engagement in Bosnia, given that U.S. and Russian interests in the Balkans do not fully coincide. But so far Russia has played a constructive role by urging the Serbs to comply with NATO's air strike ultimatum. Russia's offer to send civilian observers under U.N. leadership to Tuzla was instrumental in the Serbs' agreeing to let that airport reopen for the delivery of relief supplies. As President Clinton and I have made clear to President Yeltsin and Defense Minister Grachev, we welcome Russia's constructive participation in the peace process.

There are many ways that the progress in Bosnia could be derailed. But with the Serb acceptance of the NATO ultimatum to stop bombarding Sarajevo, and then the Framework Agreement, twice in the past few weeks the worst possible outcome has not happened in Bosnia. This confirms that diplomacy can succeed when backed up by the credible threat of force.

It is difficult to be optimistic about Bosnia after so many months of bloodshed and missed opportunities. But seeing that the worst possible outcome does not always happen gives some cause for hope that the warring parties may sign an agreement that will end the violence. If that happens -- and we should be more hopeful now than we were a few weeks ago -- the United States is prepared to play a major role in implementing a peace agreement. We are prepared, with congressional approval, to send a substantial force to Bosnia under NATO command and control to implement peacekeeping operations.

However, as we contemplate the future, I'm reminded of the story of the scorpion and the frog, which I will transplant from another part of the world where it was first coined. The scorpion and the frog were at the side of the Drina River, and the scorpion wanted to cross, but he couldn’t swim. So he asked the frog if he could ride across the river on his back. The frog said, "How do I know you won't sting me?" To which the scorpion replied, "Because if I did that, we'd both drown." So the frog said, "OK, hop on," and they started across the river.

But when they were halfway across, the scorpion stung the frog, who became paralyzed. Just before they sank below the surface of the water, the frog asked the scorpion, "Why did you do that? Now we're both going to drown." To which the scorpion responded, "Well, this is the Balkans."

The conflict in Bosnia today is similar to conflicts underway or threatening to start in many countries of the world, especially in the newly independent states of the former Soviet bloc. All of them have the potential for the appalling violence we're seeing in Bosnia, only on a larger scale. And all of them have the potential for spreading into wider wars. The grimness
of this prospect of widespread war was captured by W.H. Auden when he wrote, on the eve of World War II:

"In the nightmare of the dark,
All the dogs of Europe bark;
And the living nations wait,
Each sequestered in its hate."

The ethnic hatreds and ultranationalist forces loose in the world today will present us with challenges for the foreseeable future. We must learn to deal with these challenges in a way that carefully analyses the national security interests at stake for the United States, and in a way that calibrates our response to the level of our interests. Our response must make full use of the unique leadership role of the United States, and take into account the important but limited role of military power in such challenges. In my talk tonight, I have looked at one case study in such challenges, believing that there are important lessons to be learned both from our failures and from our successes in Bosnia.

Bosnia is a stark example of the seemingly intractable problems facing us in the post-Cold War era, and it is a cautionary tale of the quagmire that awaits us if we become active participants in every civil war erupting in this era. But it also offers some hope that American leadership combined with a selective application of military power can play a constructive role in bringing these wars to an end.

# # #
STATEMENT BY THE PRESS SECRETARY

The President today announced that the Administration will allow for the expansion of the sale of images taken from space and the export of the systems themselves. This decision is expected to expand American jobs and business opportunities by enabling U.S. firms to compete aggressively in the growing international market for remote sensing, which already accounts for nearly $400 million worldwide and is expected to grow to more than $2 billion by the turn of the century.

Under the policy, U.S. companies will be licensed by the Secretary of Commerce to operate private remote sensing systems and sell those images to domestic and foreign entities. The export of turn-key remote sensing systems will also be considered under this policy on a case-by-case basis under an export license issued by the State Department. National security and international obligations will be protected through specific licensing conditions. Export of sensitive technologies will be considered on a restricted basis.

Vice President Gore also highlighted the decision's importance to maintaining the competitiveness of America's aerospace industry. "Removing some of our barriers to the sale of space-based remote sensing systems and data products is a major contribution to the ability of U.S. industry, which sets the world standard for these systems, to compete successfully in this rapidly emerging global commercial market," he said.

Equally important, the Vice President said, is the contribution which data from such satellites will make to our knowledge of the planet: "Timely, high quality data which we expect to become available from these systems will include global change and environmental information which will form a vital part of this country's National Information Infrastructure."

Space-based images and imaging systems are increasingly being recognized by commercial entities as a means of dramatically improving their productivity and business operations. Farmers, city planners, environmentalists, news organizations, map makers, surveyors, geologists, mining
companies, oil companies, timber harvesters, taxing authorities, as well as foreign governments have all recognized the utility of high quality space-based images for purely commercial purposes.

This new policy should also aid the U.S. defense industry in its efforts to find new commercial applications for defense technologies and enhance U.S. global competitiveness in the international remote sensing market. Including the market for images incorporating demographic or technical data with digital maps, or geographic information systems, the market for space-based imagery could be up to $15 billion by the year 2000.
FACT SHEET

FOREIGN ACCESS TO REMOTE SENSING SPACE CAPABILITIES

Background

Remote sensing from space provides scientific, industrial, civil governmental, military and individual users with the capacity to gather data for a variety of useful purposes. The US Government operates very high resolution space-based reconnaissance systems for intelligence and military purposes. These systems are among the most valuable US national security assets because of their high quality data collection, timeliness, and coverage and the capability they provide to monitor events around the world on a near real-time basis. More nations have discovered the value of these satellites and are developing their own indigenous capabilities, or are seeking the purchase of data or systems.

Policy Goal

The fundamental goal of our policy is to support and to enhance US industrial competitiveness in the field of remote sensing space capabilities while at the same time protecting US national security and foreign policy interests. Success in this endeavor will contribute to maintaining our critical industrial base, advancing US technology, creating economic opportunities, strengthening the US balance of payments, enhancing national influence, and promoting regional stability.

Scope of Policy

The policy covers foreign access to remote sensing space systems, technology, products, and data. With respect to commercial licenses, this would include operating licenses granted under the Land Remote Sensing Policy Act of 1992 and export licenses for certain items controlled on the US Munitions List (USML). While the policy will define certain restrictions for export of items on the USML, export of items on either the USML or the Commerce Control List (CCL) would continue to be licensed in accord with existing law and regulations.
Licensing and Operation of Private Remote Sensing Systems

License requests by US firms to operate private remote sensing space systems will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis in accordance with the Land Remote Sensing Policy Act of 1992 (the Act). There is a presumption that remote sensing space systems whose performance capabilities and imagery quality characteristics are available or are planned for availability in the world marketplace (e.g., SPOT, Landsat, etc.) will be favorably considered, and that the following conditions will apply to any US entity that receives an operating license under the Act.

1. The licensee will be required to maintain a record of all satellite tasking for the previous year and to allow the USG access to this record.

2. The licensee will not change the operational characteristics of the satellite system from the application as submitted without formal notification and approval of the Department of Commerce, which would coordinate with other interested agencies.

3. The license being granted does not relieve the licensee of the obligation to obtain export license(s) pursuant to applicable statutes.

4. The license is valid only for a finite period, and is neither transferable nor subject to foreign ownership, above a specified threshold, without the explicit permission of the Secretary of Commerce.

5. All encryption devices must be approved by the US Government for the purpose of denying unauthorized access to others during periods when national security, international obligations and/or foreign policies may be compromised as provided for in the Act.

6. A licensee must use a data downlink format that allows the US Government access and use of the data during periods when national security, international obligations and/or foreign policies may be compromised as provided for in the Act.

7. During periods when national security or international obligations and/or foreign policies may be compromised, as defined by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of State, respectively, the Secretary of Commerce may, after consultation with the appropriate agency(ies), require the licensee to limit data collection and/or distribution by the system to the extent necessitated by the given situation. Decisions to impose such limits only will be made by the Secretary of Commerce.

- more -
in consultation with the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of State, as appropriate. Disagreements between Cabinet Secretaries may be appealed to the President. The Secretaries of State, Defense and Commerce shall develop their own internal mechanisms to enable them to carry out their statutory responsibilities.

8. Pursuant to the Act, the US Government requires US companies that have been issued operating licenses under the Act to notify the US Government of its intent to enter into significant or substantial agreements with new foreign customers. Interested agencies shall be given advance notice of such agreements to allow them the opportunity to review the proposed agreement in light of the national security, international obligations and foreign policy concerns of the US Government. The definition of a significant or substantial agreement, as well as the time frames and other details of this process, will be defined in later Commerce regulations in consultation with appropriate agencies.

Transfer of Advanced Remote Sensing Capabilities

1. **Advanced Remote Sensing System Exports:** The United States will consider requests to export advanced remote sensing systems whose performance capabilities and imagery quality characteristics are available or are planned for availability in the world marketplace on a case-by-case basis.

   The details of these potential sales should take into account the following:

   - the proposed foreign recipient’s willingness and ability to accept commitments to the US Government concerning sharing, protection, and denial of products and data; and
   
   - constraints on resolution, geographic coverage, timeliness, spectral coverage, data processing and exploitation techniques, tasking capabilities, and ground architectures.

   Approval of requests for exports of systems would also require certain diplomatic steps be taken, such as informing other close friends in the region of the request, and the
conditions we would likely attach to any sale; and informing the recipient of our decision and the conditions we would require as part of the sale.

Any system made available to a foreign government or other foreign entity may be subject to a formal government-to-government agreement.

**Transfer of Sensitive Technology**

The United States will consider applications to export sensitive components, subsystems, and information concerning remote sensing space capabilities on a restricted basis. Sensitive technology in this situation consists of items of technology on the US Munitions List necessary to develop or to support advanced remote sensing space capabilities and which are uniquely available in the United States. Such sensitive technology shall be made available to foreign entities only on the basis of a government-to-government agreement. This agreement may be in the form of end-use and retransfer assurances which can be tailored to ensure the protection of US technology.

**Government-to-Government Intelligence and Defense Partnerships**

Proposals for intelligence or defense partnerships with foreign countries regarding remote sensing that would raise questions about US Government competition with the private sector or would change the US Government’s use of funds generated pursuant to a US-foreign government partnership arrangement shall be submitted for interagency review.

# # #
STATEMENT BY THE PRESS SECRETARY

The President, on the recommendation of the Secretary of State has asked General John R. Galvin (U.S. Army, retired) currently Olin Distinguished Professor of National Security at West Point and former SACEUR, to assist in the military aspects of ongoing negotiations on Bosnia. General Galvin will head the U.S. team to the talks on the transitional military arrangements called for in the Framework Agreement concluded in Washington on March 1 between representatives of the Bosnian government, the Croatian government and the Bosnia Croat community. General Galvin, who will have the personal rank of Ambassador, will join the U.S. Special Envoy for the Former Yugoslavia, Ambassador Charles Redman, next week in Zagreb and Sarajevo for initial contacts with the involved political and military authorities.
For Immediate Release

February 24, 1994

PRESIDENT CLINTON NAMES JOHN M. DEUTCH
TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

President Clinton today announced his intention to nominate John M. Deutch, a highly respected expert on military technology and current Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology, to serve as Deputy Secretary of Defense under Secretary William Perry.

"John Deutch is a sound and sophisticated adviser whose expertise on military technology and policy has served the Department of Defense well in his tenure as Undersecretary of Defense," the President said. "Secretary Perry and I will rely heavily on his knowledge, imagination and judgement as we work to maintain the strongest military in the world at a time of budgetary constraints."

Deutch has more than 30 years of experience in national security policy and defense acquisition and technology. His government assignments include service in the Department of Energy as director of Energy Research, acting assistant secretary for Energy Technology, and undersecretary of the Department. He has been a member of the White House Science Council, the Defense Science Board, the Army Scientific Advisory panel, the Chief of Naval Operations Executive Panel, the President's Commission on Strategic Forces, the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, and the President's Nuclear Safety Oversight Committee. He also serves as a consultant to the Bureau of the Budget.

Deutch became a member of the faculty at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1970 and since then has been an associate professor and professor of chemistry, chairman of the Department of Chemistry, and dean of science. From 1985 - 90, he was provost of M.I.T. Since 1990, he has been Institute Professor.

Among his other significant achievements, Deutch has been trustee of the Urban Institute, member and chair of the National Science Foundation Advisory Panel for Chemistry, an overseer of the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, a trustee of Wellesley College, a director of Resources for the Future, a member of the Trilateral Commission, and a member of the Governor of Massachusetts Technology and Economic Development Council.

-more-
A graduate of Amherst College with a B.A. in history and economics, he earned both a B.S. degree in chemical engineering and a Ph.D. in physical chemistry from M.I.T. He holds honorary doctoral degrees from Amherst College and the University of Lowell. Deutch has been a Sloan Research Fellow and a Guggenheim Fellow; he is also a member of Sigma Xi and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Deutch was born in Brussels, Belgium and became a U.S. citizen in 1946. He has three sons and his permanent residence is in Belmont, Massachusetts.
President Clinton today announced his intention to nominate Rudy de Leon Undersecretary of the Air Force, the number two civilian position in that branch, and Jeffrey K. Harris Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Space.

"These two individuals have each given almost two decades of substantial service to their country," the President said. "I am confident their experience and commitment will serve them well in their important new roles."

de Leon, a native of California, has eighteen years of experience in government service. Most recently, he served as chief of staff to the Secretary and Deputy Secretary of Defense. Prior to his assignment in the Pentagon, de Leon was Staff Director of the House Armed Services Committee and directed the committee's 1992 review "Defense for a New Era, Lessons of the Persian Gulf War."

As Undersecretary of the Air Force, de Leon will be chief deputy to Secretary of the Air Force Sheila Widnall.

Harris has more than 18 years of experience with the Central Intelligence Agency, where he held a variety of key policy-making positions. Harris received a B.S. from Rochester Institute of Technology.

As the Air Force Assistant Secretary for Space, Harris will be responsible for all space matters and will serve as the director of the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO) - the organization which buys and operates our national space-based reconnaissance and intelligence systems.
Aspin. ... Last April 28, I announced a policy to open up more specialties and assignments to women in the armed forces. The new policy directive had three elements. First part, it opened up combat aircraft to women. Second, it instructed the Navy to open additional noncombatant ships to women and to draft a proposal for Congress that would remove the legislative ban on women serving on combat ships. The third part of the directive of April 28 was it instructed the Army and the Marine Corps to identify additional assignments that could be opened to women.

Under the April 28 directive, we've achieved some historic gains. Women are now competing for combat aircraft assignments in all of the services. The numbers are pretty impressive.

First, in the Air Force, women are now flying combat aircraft, and more than 99 percent of Air Force jobs are open to women. Second, the Navy has expanded the number of flying squadrons where women can serve from 42 to 200, and women are taking off in tactical aircraft from Navy aircraft carriers. Third, in the Army, women are piloting helicopters in combat aviation units. More than 9,000 aviation positions are now available to women.

And finally, the Navy has opened 18 additional ships to women so that ... there are now almost 9,000 sea billets available. And in November, Congress adopted and President [Bill] Clinton signed the legislation repealing the law barring women from serving on combat ships. This eventually will open up thousands of more sea billets to women as ships are modified to meet berthing and privacy requirements. In all, 90 percent of the Navy's jobs are being opened to women.

Today, ... we'd now like to talk a little bit about what we're doing on the third issue, which is asking the Army and the Marine Corps to look at additional places that might be opened to women.

Risk Rule

Our action today has two parts, one dealing with the risk rule, which is familiar, I think, to most of you and the other with a definition of direct ground combat. Under the former system, ... women were explicitly barred from combat units, and in addition, they were barred from a larger number of support units under the application of the so-called risk rule.

The risk rule barred women from noncombat units where the risk was as great as that in combat units. So the risk rule, in effect, said that while women were barred from combat units, they were also barred from any noncombat units where the calculation showed that the risk to the people in that unit was as large or greater than in a combat unit.

For example, suppose it was shown that the risk of serving in a particular kind of truck company was as great as the risk of serving in an infantry company that that truck company serviced. Then women could not serve in the infantry company, but they could not serve in the truck unit that was supporting it. So it was heavily tied to the combat units, and the risk rule said you've got to calculate the risk to determine ... whether women can serve.

What we've decided is that now since we've changed the calculation about women serving in combat, and, in fact, women now are serving in combat aircraft and they are serving in Navy combatant ships, ... the risk rule, has really been overtaken by events, and we are rescinding the risk rule as of Oct. 1, 1994. That's part No. 1.

The second part concerns ... direct ground combat and what the definition is. Our policy says that women will not serve in units that engage in direct ground combat. And today, we are uniformly defining "direct ground combat" for the first time. The definition has three parts, all of which must be present to prevent service by women.

Women may not serve in units that one, first of all, engage an enemy on the ground with individual or crew-served weapons; that two, are exposed to hostile fire; and that three, have a high probability of direct physical contact with the personnel of a hostile force. ... That is the definition of a ground combat unit. And that is the definition of a unit in which the women will not be allowed to serve.

So that's the direct ground combat rule. It is now up to the services to use it as a guide to determine which positions can be opened up to everyone. ... At the time they [the military services] come back with their report, we're asking them to...
Expanding the roles for women in the military is the right thing to do, and it's also the smart thing to do.—Aspin

justifies in detail why billets are being opened and why they're being closed. They will be looking at a whole number of units. ...

The Army ... [has] already been doing a lot of work on this, and I think they are very forward-leaning on a whole bunch of these and they should be commended for their work on opening up a whole lot of these areas to women. In fact, I think it looks pretty extensive.

My guess is it will be pretty extensive opening up of most of ... the maneuver brigade headquarters, the divisional forward-support battalions, ceremonial units, chemical recon and smoke platoons, mechanized smoke companies, engineer companies, collection and jamming companies, divisional MP companies. The last three there are a little more problematic. We're looking at them. They're going to look at them and report back.

Probably they will open up some air defense artillery; the aviation positions depend a little bit on how it works out between the services; the MLRS [Multiple Launch Rocket System] field artillery, I would say, looks unlikely that that would be opened up. But on the whole, it's going to be an extensive expansion of positions open to women. Not 100 percent, but a very, very high percentage of these. ...

Some Positions Still Closed

In addition to all of this, the services are going to be permitted to keep some positions closed under certain special conditions. For example, they will not assign women to positions where it would be prohibitively expensive to ensure their privacy, and ... we also will not assign women to positions in some special operations or units that operate behind enemy lines.

But let me stress a very important point that we are saying with the issuance of these guidelines here today, and that is that these guidelines will not close any positions to women that are now open. ...

I think we've made historic progress in opening up opportunities for women in all of the services. Expanding the roles for women in the military is the right thing to do, and it's also the smart thing to do. It allows us to assign the most qualified individual to each military job, which is very, very important when what we really rely on is the high quality of our personnel as the keystone to the effectiveness of the United States' military in the new era. In all of these actions, our overall aim remains the same — a high-quality, ready-to-fight force.

Any questions? ...

Q. Mr. Secretary, have you gotten any strong opposition from the Army and the Marine Corps on this, and do you expect foot-dragging in the future on this?

Aspin. I do not. We've had extensive conversations before and, of course, a number of them lately, and the answer is no. We are all on the same wavelength on this one. ...

Q. A follow-up to that, if I may — actually, a three-part question, if you will allow me.

Aspin. Sure.

Q. First of all, do you have reason to believe that your successor will go along with this policy?

Aspin. Yes.

Q. Second, why wait till October of this year — almost a year away — to rescind the risk rule? ...

Aspin. The ... date is Oct. 1, 1994, because that's what Congress is now requiring reporting requirements for changes in this area.

What they say is that there has to be a time limit, there has to be certain time frames before any changes can go into effect so that they have a chance to review it. And you work it out, it turns out that the earliest that this could go in effect with the time limits written in by Congress is Oct. 1, 1994. ....

Q. If the three requirements all have to be present, it's not clear to me what exposure to hostile fire adds. I mean, if they have to be in direct — at risk of direct physical contact with the enemy, why do you need to add that second thing — what does that mean?

Aspin. Well, it's a high probability of direct physical contact with the personnel of a hostile force — directly it would be hand-to-hand combat, all right? Hostile fire might come even though you don't have hand-to-hand person-to-person contact — in other words, physical hand-to-hand combat, but under hostile fire.

Q. Yeah, but it wouldn't work the other way. You wouldn't have exposure to direct physical contact and not be exposed to hostile fire. I don't see why you need to add the hostile fire component.

Aspin. You could be in direct physical contact and not hostile fire. Hostile fire covers a situation where you might be under artillery fire, which is different from physical contact.

Q. If you're under artillery fire and you're not at risk of direct physical contact, then it doesn't apply, right? You're not ruled out; women aren't ruled out. ... Aspin. No, they're not ruled out of those units.

Q. Well, you said ... [the opening of] some positions in air defense artillery and ... multiple launch rocket systems [was] unlikely. Would you have liked to [have] seen more in that area?

Aspin. ... When you get a chance to talk to the Army about what they're doing, I think you'll find that they have been extraordinarily forthcoming in this, and I think they've done a very, very good job of trying to do the best they can.

Q. Well, that may be the case if you're talking to the Army leadership, but not necessarily to the women who are in some of these positions, such as those women who had been in Lance [tactical missile] areas and now are not.

Aspin. That needs to be worked. We're working, those.

Q. Since that weapon [the Lance] is gone, they have no career left. ... It's only several dozen women, but the Army is basically shutting them out of a future.

Aspin. Not true.

Q. And what is the machismo that retains the fact that these
women should not be allowed in those positions when other women can be in combat helicopters? I mean, it just doesn't seem to make sense.

Aspin. These things are being done in a, I think, a very rational and a very step-by-step manner. I think that — remember, the phrase here is that nobody will be kept out of a position that they have been serving in previously. So we’re working the issue of the Lance as a separate issue. But the basic judgment is, is that the MLRS is of such a range that it ... does fall under the direct ground combat definition.

Q. So you're saying you’re trying to find something else for those women?

Aspin. We’re working that problem. Go ahead.

Q. ... Mr. Secretary, why not expose women to artillery? ...I mean how is a man ...

Aspin. They are exposed to artillery.

Q. But I mean — I mean, why not put women in field artillery? Why not? I mean, what's wrong with a woman being killed if she's in the service, especially if it affords her rights that men have to be promoted?

Aspin. ... The rule that is in effect here is that it is a definition of whether you are in a direct ground combat unit. And ... if you are in direct ground combat — that unit is in direct combat — then women are not part of it. ... Now then, the definition is what falls into that, and the definition, as we are working this, includes MLRS — not all artillery — in the direct combat units.

Q. What’s the rationale? ...

Aspin. It’s the range of the MLRS.

Q. OK, I just wanted to talk about that, because that strikes me as a good example. ... It’s my understanding that MLRS does have a range of 20 or so kilometers. It’s hardly a direct-fire weapon.

Aspin. It is not a direct-fire weapon.

Q. So ... how is that covered by your definition?

Aspin. Because it is a relatively short range.

Q. OK, but ... all field artillery batteries have a shorter range, and you seem to be leaving in air defense artillerymen. ... One of the positions that aren’t open now are basically the Stinger people, and they’re right up front. I mean, they’re traveling with the mobile artillery units. They’re traveling with the tanks. They’re traveling with the infantry units. How could you conceive of opening ... Stinger missile positions to women [but not]... MLRS [units, which are] really in the rear?

Aspin. The issue is whether you are in direct combat, direct ground combat. And under the definition, as we are applying it, you do not include the MLRS units. ...

Q. Mr. Secretary, you’ve been high in your praise of the Army on this. How are the Marines doing?

Aspin. Also very well. Very well on it, ...

Q. Could you, however, address your comments to those women who may look at this policy and the MLRS as a loophole that the services might take to follow through with wider — address your comments to the women who might be disappointed or fear this is ...

Greater Opportunities

Aspin. The women will not be disappointed in this proposal. The women will have a great opportunity to expand their opportunities ... to serve in the United States military under these proposals, as they did under combat aircraft when that was opened up, as it did when we opened up more ships. We are now opening up greater opportunities in the ground units, the Marine Corps and the Army, for women's participation. The doing away of the risk rule and the substituting for this direct-combat ground combat unit makes a tremendous difference.

A whole host of units that were support — the combat support, combat service support which were eliminated from the ability for women to serve in the past because of the risk rule — it was judged that, yes, they were support units, but they were supporting the units that were in combat so they had the same risk as the unit, and therefore, women couldn’t serve. All of that is being taken away. All of that is now opened up. All of the combat service support units are now being opened to women. This is an enormous step forward for the ability of women to serve their country in the military of the United States. ...

Q. ... I'm just curious about if you can provide, first of all, what the percentage of positions open to women in the Army is now, what the percentage might go to, and for any raw numbers about how many jobs this might open up. ...

Dorn. The Army tells me that on the basis of the list, assuming you have a list of things the Army has been looking at quite recently. The secretary told you how he thought the types of units on that list would come out. And the Army’s projecting that if, in fact, we proceed to implement that list, as the secretary suggested, we might be talking about a total number of jobs in the sort of 10,000 or 15,000 range active and reserve. But let me remind you that that list is only a partial list of the huge range or diversity of units that exist in the services.

Q. The secretary said that only 1 percent of jobs in the Air Force ... excluded women; he said 10 percent in the Navy. Do you have a rough equivalent of the Army right now, how many ... women don’t have access to?

Dorn. I can give that to you in a couple of ways. If I remember correctly, ... around two-thirds — it’s 60 percent — of Army jobs will be open to women as a result of this.

Remember that there is a substantial difference between the two. In the Army and the Marine Corps we’re talking about forces that have
large numbers of ground combat units. And under this rule women are not serving in ground combat units. So there will be some difference across the services with respect to the percentage of women — or the percentage of positions open to women.

Q. You say roughly it’d be 60 percent. What is it now? What’s it going from to?

Dorn. Probably better to talk with the Army after they’ve worked the numbers — after they’ve worked the doctrine.

Q. How about the Marine Corps, a rough estimate on the Marine Corps?

Dorn. Let me ... just put it generically, because as the secretary emphasized, we’ve laid out a rule. We have to see what the results are. I would hate to ... give you a number and find out that ... we were one or two percentage points off or even 20 percentage points off because of the precise way this fell out after the services have worked the definition through their doctrine and after we’ve tried at OSD [Office of the Secretary of Defense] level to ensure consistency.

Suffice it to say that more than 99 percent of Air Force positions are currently open to women. The number is going to be somewhat less in the ... Army and Marine Corps.

Q. Mr. Dorn, can we follow up on the secretary, who has said that he asked the services to get back to him “shortly”? Can you define shortly? Will it be before he leaves you know, months, weeks, days?

Dorn. The memorandum that Secretary Aspin issued today calls for the services to come back in the spring with a list of units. Remember ... , there are literally hundreds of units to be looked at and positions to be looked at.

The services have asked for two or three months to look at those units and to send back to us a list of units currently closed that will be opened as a result of this rule. A list of units currently closed that need to remain closed under this rule and a justification for each action. That’s going to take about three months.

Policy Approval

We’ll discuss it with the services, and then we send this up to the Congress as is required by law. That’s why ... this order or this change does not take effect until next fall.

Q. I’m confused. I thought that the secretary had the right to change the policy without congressional approval.

Dorn. The secretary has the right to change the policy without congressional approval. The ... Congress has asked that we consult before making any concrete changes in the assignment of women. That’s in the latest authorization.

Q. Some additional numbers. What’s the percentage of units subject to direct combat to the total force?

Dorn. I can’t give you that number. I’m going to have to get back.

Q. Mr. Dorn, Secretary Aspin used a truck company as an example of the risk rule. Under the new rules, these guys [women] are not going to have individual or ... crew-served weapons. They’d be able to go up and be the support for that infantry company, then, right?

Dorn. That’s the theory, to open up more opportunities for women in combat support, combat service support units. Our whole goal is to enhance the pool of talent available to the military.

Q. So you’d have trucks serving literally alongside infantry and armor — supplying them?

Dorn. Supplying them. Now ... you may want to take a look at what the rule says, because ... it is possible for ... the services to request a collocation exception. That is, if a particular type of unit is physically collocated, that is assigned to operate long term beside an infantry or armored battalion, then the services can come back to us and say, look, this is not going to work out. This is why it’s rather difficult at this point to be precise about what’s going to happen.

Q. Doesn’t that basically reinstate the risk order, then?

Dorn. No, it does not. ...

Q. Well, how do you determine the collocation? Is it not risk, or is it logistics of collocation?

Dorn. It’s issues of privacy, it’s issues of the probability of direct engaging in hand-to-hand combat.

Q. In this area of examination, these various specialties, particularly in the Army, aren’t there women in some of these specialties? I think of divisional MP companies, intelligence — I mean, these areas are not entirely closed to women now, are they?

Dorn. Some of these — some of these areas are not closed. Women, for example, are in certain types of air defense units — Patriot, for example. The question is to look across the board at these units and figure out ... which others of them can be opened up.

Q. Are any of these areas that you list, particularly for the Army, without women now? Maneuver brigade headquarters?

Dorn. ... Yes. ... If I recall correctly, women are not in military intelligence battalions as a matter of policy, although exceptions may be made on a case-by-case basis. Women are not, as I recall, in maneuver brigades, but I stand to be corrected. This is something you can discuss with the Army.

These are intended to be real changes. Again, keep in mind ... within each of these categories, one may be talking about a variety of specific units, and the question is to look across that wide range and figure out what kinds of additional openings are possible.

Q. Mr. Dorn, it was reported that when you first sent over the redefinition of the risk rule to Mr. Aspin, he sent it back, thinking it did not go far enough, ... and Mr. Aspin was sort of pushing you to go a little
farther. Give us your reading of the services' thinking on this. Are they sort of being tugged along on this or are they really proactive on wanting to go farther with this? What is your read on that?

Dorn. I've talked with the service chiefs and with the service secretaries as well as with other members of the service leadership. My sense is that they are fully on board with this memorandum as it's worded. ...

Q. The secretary mentioned that the reason the MLRS was still off limits was because of the range of the weapon. Under this new definition, what is the definition of direct physical contact? The numerical range that, I guess? Is it 32 kilometers for MLRS?

Dorn. I believe that's right. ...

Q. Is it greater than 32?

Dorn. I can't give you this. This is one of the matters of consistency that we have to work on, but this is intended to be sort of a "whites of the eyes" definition.

What we have to look at is exactly where these units are located on the battlefield, how they actually operate in battle, and I cannot tell you whether — that's often not going to be a number because, of course, what you're looking at is the likelihood that a particular unit can be overrun. The reason we settled at battalion level is the battalions are the primary maneuver units. They're units that are engaged in — are very likely to engage in very, very close direct contact with an adversary. ...

Q. Mr. Dorn, in the case of aircraft, you already have limited combat aircraft, and that's dangerous support, and I wondered what the rationale was for requirements on the ground. Is it mainly the problem of physical strength, relative physical strength or is it a residual of fear of casualty, or what's the major — what are the major factors and how do they rate?

Public Support

Dorn. I guess I'd look at it in a couple of ways. First of all, this is what the American public tells us through public opinion polls, through members of Congress. We've learned is that the American public is willing to tolerate — indeed, support — putting women into combat aircraft; the American public is willing to support putting women on combat vessels; that the American public is very, very reluctant about the idea of women engaging in hand-to-hand combat.

Second, of course, we get a lot of information and a lot of good advice from the military services. They are the people who tell us what's going to work. It is their job to maintain combat effectiveness and the readiness of the forces. And so we also are trying to reflect the best judgments of the military.

Q. By that token, in combat aircraft you've got units that collocate with infantry. I think the Air Force is opening up A-10s; the Marine Corps opening all their helicopters. Yet the Army is not going to open up helicopters that collocate with ...

Dorn. I think Secretary Aspin said that that's a matter that needs to be worked on. There are some things on this short list where we feel reasonably confident about the outcome and there are some things that are going to have to be looked at rather closely, and that's one of them.

Q. It seems that the Army is the most resistant.

Dorn. I'm not sure that's fair at all. ...

Q. How many women [in the service] did you have ... involved in the last few months working on the final details of this?

Dorn. You remember that the secretary in April, on the April 28 memo, established an implementation committee. That actually turned out to be several working groups looking at the continued need for the risk rule, looking at the definition of direct ground combat and other matters — a total of, oh, 50 to 60 people, and women made up about a quarter of that 50 to 60.

Q. Has that implementation board or whatever, the advisory board, been going on since then, since April, or did it disband in August?

The reason we settled at battalion level is the battalions are the primary maneuver units.—Dorn

Dorn. It hasn't disbanded. Some part of it disbanded, for example, when we made a decision about the risk rule or thought we were close to a decision about that — the panel's recommendation on the risk rule, we suspended that and then began talking directly with the senior leadership of the services. And the same would be true of other specific issues. So ...

Q. Well, since September, maybe, how many women were involved directly in finalizing this?

Dorn. I can't give you that. I can't give you that number. ... I'm telling you that when we began this process ... immediately after the secretary issued the April 28 memorandum, 50 to 60 people were involved in the process, mostly O-5s and O-6s, military officers, some civilians. Of that 50 to 60, roughly a quarter were women. ...

Q. I want to ask you, do you anticipate that there'll be increased costs with this policy? And is that something that you've looked at?

Cost Consideration

Dorn. It is. And, as a matter of fact, it is one of the possibilities for exception, particularly, for example, where one has to make a provision for privacy and berthing. If the secretary of the Navy, for example, looks at ships that need to be reoutfitted, he may decide not to reoutfit a ship that is likely to be decommissioned fairly soon. So that is a consideration.

You don't have any overall estimate of how much more it would cost ... ?

Dorn. No. No, because we don't know exactly what's going to happen with this wide range of units.

Q. You mentioned ships. Does this include submarines as well? Is that being looked at ... ?

Dorn. Of course, but I can't give you what the results are going to be with respect to submarines. ...

Q. Can I ask if the rationale for
If we are talking about exactly how much additional progress or additional change is likely, I'm optimistic.—Dorn

keeping women out of MLRS units and field artillery — is it that the exchange of fire between those units is a sort of a hand-to-hand combat? Or is it the possibility that those units might be overrun and thus become a target for hand-to-hand combat?

Dorn. Again, I think it would be better before I give you the Army's explanation to actually see the Army's explanation in writing. Conversationally, the explanation is that MLRS, unlike Lance, is a unit that operates fairly far forward on the battlefield. Lance was a system with a range in excess of 100 miles and was located rather far to the rear on a battlefield. MLRS, I'm told, is located farther forward. But let me stress the need to give the Army time to look specifically at the issue and give you a definition that very carefully matches the definition against their military doctrine.

This really does have to be a systematic process. ... There are lots of questions we can't answer off the tops of our heads.

Q. Mr. Dorn, what would you say to those who would look at the MLRS and the exception you just said about costs that it might take for privacy and start to criticize the policy as containing so many loopholes that it allows the Army and Marine Corps to basically just continue excluding ... ?

Dorn. I think this is a pretty unambiguous policy. What it says is that the intent of the policy is to enhance opportunities for women. That is said quite unambiguously. It says further that no positions currently open to women will be closed. If we are talking about exactly how much additional progress or additional change is likely, I'm optimistic. ... The services seem eager to proceed. But let's wait until we've run this through the process before we make definitive judgments. ...
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Q Good afternoon to you there, sir. (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: Hello, Michael, how are you?

(Applause.)

Q I must tell you, Mr. President, when people heard
that you were coming on this morning, their already-broad beams grew
broader. People are very, very delighted that you've taken the
interest, sir, and the direct concern that you have with the
suffering out here. But it's an inspiring morning.

Good morning, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: Good morning. It must be inspiring.
The courage, the determination demonstrated by the school's
administration, faculty, and students to get the campus back in
operation so quickly -- just a month later -- is very impressive. I
want to compliment President Blenda Wilson and everyone else who
worked on it. And I know that -- I think she's there along with Cal
State University Chancellor Barry Munitz. And I just have heard so
much about it.

FEMA spent a lot of time out there. I think Dick
Krimm's with you there. And we've had so many reports from Henry
Cisneros and Federico Pena and all the people I've had out there and
all the people from California who work at the White House who have
been out there.

I couldn't believe that you sustained $300 million worth
of damage. And all of your 53 buildings were damaged, and you're
back open a month later. It's a real tribute to you. So I'm glad to
hear the California spirit alive and well. I can hear it in the
background from all the clapping and everything.

Q It's here. (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: The Vice President is coming out to
Northridge on Wednesday to inspect the damage. And I hope you'll all
go see him. (Applause.) He's younger and has less gray hair than I
do, so more college students should like seeing him. (Laughter.)

Q Did he write that comment, Mr. President?

THE PRESIDENT: No -- no, but he might have. I mean,
he's got a pretty good sense of humor about it. We kid each other a
lot. And his sense of humor is great, especially if the jokes are at
my expense. (Laughter.)

Q Mr. President, why does it take an earthquake, a
disaster of this magnitude to get such a generous response from
Washington? I mean, shouldn't some of the federal aid and assistance
be available to people who are dislocated by, for example, the
closure of so many Cold War-related industries in California.

MORE
THE PRESIDENT: Absolutely. Absolutely, it does. It should happen. And we are working -- since I have been in office, we've worked very hard to dramatically increase the amount of assistance in terms of job training and in terms of alternative development of jobs for use of defense technologies for commercial purposes, and in helping communities put themselves back together.

I came in here with a real philosophy that we ought to be spending a lot of money every year on defense conversion and on other things that dislocated people who wanted to work. So last year we spent $500 million on defense conversion. This year we're going to spend much more. And we need to do more.

Now, keep in mind, one of the things that constrains us now is the enormous government deficit, which the Congress is normally willing to suspend in the case of an emergency. So that's one of the reasons these things happen more quickly.

But we are moving toward investing more in communities and in workers and in new technologies. And it shouldn't take a natural disaster to get us to plan for and take care of the fundamental needs of our people.

Q Mr. President, Mother Nature really has socked it to us, given most of the nation a devastating few months. As you read and study the reports and you watch the news, do you have an overall comment that you'd care to make about the way that citizens impacted by hurricanes, blizzards, floods, fires, and now earthquakes have responded to these disasters?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I'd say the American people get an A-plus for the way they've dealt with this. You know, there was a 500-year flood in the Middle West. I visited there several times -- just stunned by it. Then in the last several months you've had the fires in California, plus the mud slides and the terrible problem of the earthquake. And of course, another earthquake and the problems in Los Angeles just a couple of years before that.

So this is really an enormously difficult time for people, especially in California but in many other parts of the country. And then in the East Coast, you know, we had the bitteress winter in over 100 years and many, many people died there.

But it seems that when these things happen, when nature reminds us that we're not in full control of our destiny, somehow people almost relax more and they come together, they think about what's really important, they trust each other. I think it's fascinating in how many communities the crime rate dropped dramatically after this earthquake occurred, when presumably it might have been easier to go out and steal from people. People didn't want to do it as much.

I think that sometimes we need to remember what it was like in the midst of one of these natural disasters and see if we can't behave more like that all the time, and realize we need each other and we are a community; and when we pull together and work together, we can do unbelievable things in a very short time.

When we fight with one another, when we're divided, when we're shortsighted, none of us can become what we ought to be.

(Applause.)

Q Mr. President, I know you've toured the area. It's so easy to assess the damage and compare the scene with a war zone, but I think that's where the comparison ends. But this is a campus of 25,000 students who are hell-bent and determined to get on with MORE
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life, to get on with their education, and they don't look like refugees from a battlefield. Sir, should --

THE PRESIDENT: Good.

Q Good. (Laughter.) Mr. President, should there be such a thing as automatic sort of mandated natural disaster insurance so that no one is left out when the hurricanes and the earthquakes etcetera strike?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we're looking at that. Let me say, we're trying to do more to reduce the cost of people and property of natural disasters by doing a better job of thinking ahead; by choosing where we will build with an awareness of potential disasters; by constructing what we do build very well; by retrofitting where it's cost-effective. A lot of the retrofitting that was done on the highway structures in California really worked. And if we had had another six, seven months before this last earthquake, we would have retrofitted more and had even less damage. So these are things that we have to really invest a lot more time and effort in.

With regard to having a federal disaster insurance fund, I think that you have to remember that insurance works when the risk is spread broadly, and that requires a lot of people to participate, including many who don't think they're particularly at risk and others who may not be particularly at risk.

So when the taxpayers do it like this, we spread the risk very broadly across all of us who live in America because some of us are in trouble. If there were a way to use insurance mechanisms to do a better job so we wouldn't have to increase the deficit, that would be better still. But we have to ask ourselves whether that would be putting even more burden on people who are really not at risk.

We're thinking about it, and we're soliciting ideas. And there are a lot of bright people in universities all over California and in businesses who may have some good ideas about this. And I assure you that -- three or four have already been presented to us, and we're going to research them all very carefully and eagerly look for other options, because we have been very fortunate that we would get the money through the Congress to deal with the floods and to deal with the earthquakes. But it is a difficult thing.

Q So when we have -- I didn't say if we have -- when we have health care reform, will the new system, whatever its final shape, better serve the masses in time of a major disaster?

THE PRESIDENT: Oh, absolutely. I kept wondering, when I was out in California and I realized how many people were hurt or needed medical care or thrown out of their homes and maybe subject to overexposure, how many of those people didn't have health insurance; whether they didn't go to the doctor or didn't visit the hospital just because they didn't have any coverage; or whether they did, took medical care and now wonder whether they can afford to pay for it or whether they're at risk of bankruptcy.

If we would simply join the ranks of all the other advanced countries in the world and provide comprehensive health care that can never be taken away through a system of guaranteed private insurance, it would stabilize life for working families enormously. I also will say that according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office study issued about a week ago, small businesses would benefit perhaps more than big businesses because their premiums would go down and everybody would be covered.
We have simply got to stop making excuses and saying, well, America's the only country in the world that can't figure out how to cover its folks. You've got almost one in four people living in California without any health insurance -- citizens, never mind the immigrant population, citizens who don't have health care. We have got to do a better job.

Q  Mr. President, Blenda Wilson, who's the president of CSUN would love to ask you a question if she may. And, by the way, I've just realized why it was difficult for you to get through to Boris Yeltsin, sir. He was worried that you might have been calling for disaster relief. (Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: I thought I might have to get on the phone and phone around the world to get enough money to deal with it, but we made it. (Laughter.)

Q  Mr. President, we're delighted that you would join us on this opening of our spring term. While we've been talking about disaster relief and health care, I recall your work several years ago with the Education Commission of the States and found you to be a strong advocate of education -- partly because, I think, you realize as we do that the young people and middle-age people, for that matter, who attend California State University will be those citizens and employees and employers and entrepreneurs that are essential to economic development.

When you think about the relationship of disaster relief and higher education and work study programs, which are very important to you, how do you -- what would you say to the students that are gathered here at this public university?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, first of all, I'm proud of the fact that Congress was able to come up with the money to fully reimburse Cal State-Northridge for the losses it occurred, along with a 10 percent match coming from the state. I'm very proud of that.

Secondly, I hope that during this clean-up effort, there will be even more jobs available in the short run, which will help a lot, and which some of your students will be able to get.

But, thirdly, and perhaps most important of all, the average age of a college student today is a little over 26 years of age. More and more people recognize that if they want to get a good job with a growing income, if they don't want to have the kind of stagnant wages that most American workers have been saddled with for 20 years, they've got to have at least two years of post-high school education and training. And we are busily engaged here in Washington in passing some education legislation and some training legislation which will make it easier for every person in America to get those two years of post-high school education and training.

That's the most important thing of all. If you stay there, if you see it through, it you go on and get a four-year education -- the more you have, the better your prospects are. But we know, based on the 1990 Census, we actually now have hard evidence that the global economy is punishing high school dropouts, punishing high school graduates, and rewarding people who have two years or more of post-high school education.

So if we want to restructure the California economy and we want new jobs in high-tech areas without the guarantee of defense, we've got to make sure that every young person and every not so young person in California who will go to a place like Cal State-Northridge, does so. (Applause.)

Q  Mr. President, I can't think of an occasion when a Chief Executive of the United States has aligned himself so
We have simply got to stop making excuses and saying, well, America's the only country in the world that can't figure out how to cover its folks. You've got almost one in four people living in California without any health insurance -- citizens, never mind the immigrant population, citizens who don't have health care. We have got to do a better job.

Q Mr. President, Blenda Wilson, who's the president of CSUN would love to ask you a question if she may. And, by the way, I've just realized why it was difficult for you to get through to Boris Yeltsin, sir. He was worried that you might have been calling for disaster relief. (Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: I thought I might have to get on the phone and phone around the world to get enough money to deal with it, but we made it. (Laughter.)

Q Mr. President, we're delighted that you would join us on this opening of our spring term. While we've been talking about disaster relief and health care, I recall your work several years ago with the Education Commission of the States and found you to be a strong advocate of education -- partly because, I think, you realize as we do that the young people and middle-age people, for that matter, who attend California State University will be those citizens and employees and employers and entrepreneurs that are essential to economic development.

When you think about the relationship of disaster relief and higher education and work study programs, which are very important to you, how do you -- what would you say to the students that are gathered here at this public university?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, first of all, I'm proud of the fact that Congress was able to come up with the money to fully reimburse Cal State-Northridge for the losses it occurred, along with a 10 percent match coming from the state. I'm very proud of that.

Secondly, I hope that during this clean-up effort, there will be even more jobs available in the short run, which will help a lot, and which some of your students will be able to get.

But, thirdly, and perhaps most important of all, the average age of a college student today is a little over 26 years of age. More and more people recognize that if they want to get a good job with a growing income, if they don't want to have the kind of stagnant wages that most American workers have been saddled with for 20 years, they've got to have at least two years of post-high school education and training. And we are busily engaged here in Washington in passing some education legislation and some training legislation which will make it easier for every person in America to get those two years of post-high school education and training.

That's the most important thing of all. If you stay there, if you see it through, if you go on and get a four-year education -- the more you have, the better your prospects are. But we know, based on the 1990 Census, we actually now have hard evidence that the global economy is punishing high school dropouts, punishing high school graduates, and rewarding people who have two years or more of post-high school education.

So if we want to restructure the California economy and we want new jobs in high-tech areas without the guarantee of defense, we've got to make sure that every young person and every not so young person in California who will go to a place like Cal State-Northridge, does so. (Applause.)

Q Mr. President, I can't think of an occasion when a Chief Executive of the United States has aligned himself so
life, to get on with their education, and they don't look like refugees from a battlefield. Sir, should --

THE PRESIDENT: Good.

Q Good. (Laughter.) Mr. President, should there be such a thing as automatic sort of mandated natural disaster insurance so that no one is left out when the hurricanes and the earthquakes etcetera strike?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we're looking at that. Let me say, we're trying to do more to reduce the cost of people and property of natural disasters by doing a better job of thinking ahead; by choosing where we will build with an awareness of potential disasters; by constructing what we do build very well; by retrofitting where it's cost-effective. A lot of the retrofitting that was done on the highway structures in California really worked. And if we had had another six, seven months before this last earthquake, we would have retrofitted more and had even less damage. So these are things that we have to really invest a lot more time and effort in.

With regard to having a federal disaster insurance fund, I think that you have to remember that insurance works when the risk is spread broadly, and that requires a lot of people to participate, including many who don't think they're particularly at risk and others who may not be particularly at risk.

So when the taxpayers do it like this, we spread the risk very broadly across all of us who live in America because some of us are in trouble. If there were a way to use insurance mechanisms to do a better job so we wouldn't have to increase the deficit, that would be better still. But we have to ask ourselves whether that would be putting even more burden on people who are really not at risk.

We're thinking about it, and we're soliciting ideas. And there are a lot of bright people in universities all over California and in businesses who may have some good ideas about this. And I assure you that -- three or four have already been presented to us, and we're going to research them all very carefully and eagerly look for other options, because we have been very fortunate that we would get the money through the Congress to deal with the floods and to deal with the earthquakes. But it is a difficult thing.

Q So when we have -- I didn't say if we have -- when we have health care reform, will the new system, whatever its final shape, better serve the masses in time of a major disaster?

THE PRESIDENT: Oh, absolutely. I kept wondering, when I was out in California and I realized how many people were hurt or needed medical care or thrown out of their homes and maybe subject to overexposure, how many of those people didn't have health insurance; whether they didn't go to the doctor or didn't visit the hospital just because they didn't have any coverage; or whether they did, took medical care and now wonder whether they can afford to pay for it or whether they're at risk of bankruptcy.

If we would simply join the ranks of all the other advanced countries in the world and provide comprehensive health care that can never be taken away through a system of guaranteed private insurance, it would stabilize life for working families enormously. I also will say that according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office study issued about a week ago, small businesses would benefit perhaps more than big businesses because their premiums would go down and everybody would be covered.
immediately and completely with a Californian concern or issue, in
this case a natural disaster. Our leader locally is Mayor Richard
Riordan.

THE PRESIDENT: Is he there?

Q Yes.

MAYOR RIORDAN: Mr. President?

THE PRESIDENT: I had to do it, otherwise he would have
camped out on my doorstep here and never gone home. (Laughter.)

MAYOR RIORDAN: Well, I feel like you've been camping
out on our doorstep. I'd like to thank you on behalf of not only the
students, faculty and staff of Northridge, but all the citizens of
L.A. for your A+ effort and your A+ team. We've had, I think, more
Cabinet members in Los Angeles in the last month than you've had in
Washington. (Laughter.)

Q Mr. President, thank you so very much, indeed, for
taking our call on the spur of the moment like that, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Michael. Let me just say one
thing. I want to compliment the Mayor and everybody that we've
worked with in California. I know you could say that they're so good
at this because you're becoming experts at dealing with disasters.
But let me say, I was a Governor for 12 years. I went through floods
and hurricanes, I saw whole little towns blown away. I have lived
through a lot of these things. And I cannot say enough about the
leadership of the Mayor and the people out there, the work that
they've done -- it's just been terrific.

And, in terms of doing this radio program, one of the
things I said I'd do if I ever were fortunate enough to be elected
President is to try to give this job back to the people of this
country and their real concerns. And you know, I just left a very
important meeting with the President of Kazakhstan. That's long way
away, but it affects American interests. But our interests can only
be affected there if people in California can succeed -- if the
people who are listening to this radio program can succeed.

So, I think I did my job today by talking to you, and I
just loved it. I thank you for giving me a chance to do it.
(Applause.)

Q Thank you, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Bye bye.
President Clinton today signed into law H.R. 2401, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994, which authorizes FY'94 appropriations of $260.9 billion for national defense programs at the Department of Defense and elsewhere and sets personnel strengths for the active and reserve components of the armed forces.

The President also signed H.R. 3341, which increases the rate of special pension payable to persons who have received the Congressional Medal of Honor from $200 to $400 per month.
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President Names Walker, Pirie to Installations Posts at Pentagon

President Clinton announced today that he intends to nominate Robert M. (Mike) Walker to be Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations, Logistics, and Environment, and Robert B. Pirie, Jr. to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Installations and Environment.

"With their long years of experience in military policy, Mike Walker and Robert Pirie are well qualified for these positions," said the President. "I am looking forward to their service at the Pentagon."

Robert M. (Mike) Walker is the staff director of the Senate Subcommittee on Military Construction since 1987, and was previously the subcommittee's minority clerk for six years. He has also served as a professional staff member of the Senate Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, and as a legislative assistant to Senator Jim Sasser of Tennessee. Before joining Sasser's staff, he was an assistant to U.S. Rep. Joe L. Evins. Walker attended the University of Tennessee, and is an Army National Guard veteran. He is a resident of Charles Town, West Virginia.

Robert B. Pirie, Jr. has over thirty years experience in defense-related work in the armed forces, the civil service and in industry. He served twenty years as a naval officer, culminating his service with three years in command of the nuclear attack submarine USS Skipjack. In recent years, he has served as President of the Essex Corporation, Director of the Chief of Naval Operations' Study Group at the U.S. Naval War College, and Vice President of the Center for Naval Analyses, his current position. Pirie holds a B.S. from the U.S. Naval Academy, and a B.A. and M.A. from the Final Honour School of Philosophy, Politics and Economics at Oxford University, where he studied as a Rhodes Scholar. He lives in Bethesda, Maryland with his wife, the former Joan Adams. They have three children.

# # #
President Clinton will place calls to members of the United States Armed Forces who are serving abroad during this Christmas holiday. Below are the names, branch of service, where they are serving, and if available, their hometowns. Included is information about their roles in the service.

PFC Shaw Lawson
United States Army
Pan Mun Jon, Korea
Syracuse, New York
Lawson is a Military Police Officer in the Joint Security Area.

Staff Sergeant Andrew Freeman
United State Army
Mogadishu, Somalia
Donalsville, Georgia
Freeman is the Chief of the 2nd Platoon, 7th Section for E Battery, 7th FA at Ft. Drum, New York. He displayed bravery above and beyond the call of duty on October 3-4, 1993.

Sergeant Amanda C. Snow
United States Marines
Okinawa, Japan
No home town listed
Sgt. Snow is assigned to the 3d Supply Battalion.

Sergeant Marvin E. Eubanks
United States Marines
Moscow, Russia
No home town listed
Sgt. Eubanks is assigned to the Marine Security Guard Duty detail in Moscow.

Petty Officer Second Class Christoper J. Gilliam
United States Navy
USS Scott, Guided Missile Destroyer deployed off the coast of the former republic of Yugoslavia
Newport News, Virginia
He was recognized as the USS Scott's sailor of the quarter for October - December, 1993.
Petty Officer Third Class Travis Ray Hatten  
United States Navy  
USS Denver, Amphibious Assault Transport ship deployed off the coast of Somalia  
Baton Rouge, Louisiana  
Hatten is assigned to the medical department on board ship.

Staff Sergeant Peggy Ann Spindler  
United States Air Force  
Zagreb, Croatia  
Chamberlin, South Dakota  
Sgt. Spindler is assigned to the 48th Air Transportable Hospital as a medical service specialist. She is part of the U.S. contingent providing medical care to the multination U.N. protection force in the former Yugoslavia.

Airman First Class Emilio Gil  
United States Air Force  
Ineirlik, Turkey  
Hialeah, Florida  
Gil is assigned to the Combined Task Force Operation Provide Comfort. He operates and maintains diesel generator sets.

Petty Officer Second Class Leanna L. Ashley  
United States Coast Guard  
Honolulu, Hawaii  
Portland, Oregon  
Ashley is assigned to the Office of the 14th Coast Guard District.

Petty Officer First Class Darryl D. Crawford  
United States Coast Guard  
Aguadilla, Puerto Rico  
Warner Robbins Air Force Base, Georgia  
Crawford is assigned to the Coast Guard Air Station Barinuen as a Telephone Technician.
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EXECUTIVE ORDER

AMENDMENTS TO THE MANUAL FOR COURTS-MARTIAL, UNITED STATES, 1984

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. 801-946), in order to prescribe amendments to the Manual for Courts-Martial, United States, 1984, prescribed by Executive Order No. 12473, as amended by Executive Order No. 12484, Executive Order No. 12550, Executive Order No. 12586, Executive Order No. 12708, and Executive Order No. 12767, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Part II of the Manual for Courts-Martial, United States, 1984, is amended as follows:

a. R.C.M. 109 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) In general. Each Judge Advocate General is responsible for the professional supervision and discipline of military trial and appellate military judges, judge advocates, and other lawyers who practice in proceedings governed by the code and this Manual. To discharge this responsibility each Judge Advocate General may prescribe rules of professional conduct not inconsistent with this rule or this Manual. Rules of professional conduct promulgated pursuant to this rule may include sanctions for violations of such rules. Sanctions may include but are not limited to indefinite suspension from practice in courts-martial and in the Courts of Military Review. Such suspensions may only be imposed by the Judge Advocate General of the armed service of such courts. Prior to imposing any discipline under this rule, the subject of the proposed action must be provided notice and an opportunity to be heard. The Judge Advocate General concerned may upon good cause shown modify or revoke suspension. Procedures to investigate complaints against military trial judges and appellate military judges are contained in subsection (c) of this rule.

(b) Action after suspension or disbarment. When a Judge Advocate General suspends a person from practice or the Court of Military Appeals disbars a person, any Judge Advocate General may suspend that person from practice upon written notice and opportunity to be heard in writing.

(c) Investigation of judges.

(1) In general. These rules and procedures promulgated pursuant to Article 6a are established to investigate and dispose of charges, allegations, or information pertaining to the fitness of a military trial judge or appellate military judge to perform the duties of the judge’s office.
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(2) Policy. Allegations of judicial misconduct or unfitness shall be investigated pursuant to the procedures of this rule and appropriate action shall be taken. Judicial misconduct includes any act or omission that may serve to demonstrate unfitness for further duty as a judge, including but not limited to violations of applicable ethical standards.

(3) Complaints. Complaints concerning a military trial judge or appellate military judge will be forwarded to the Judge Advocate General of the service concerned or to a person designated by the Judge Advocate General concerned to receive such complaints.

(4) Initial action upon receipt of a complaint. Upon receipt, a complaint will be screened by the Judge Advocate General concerned or by the individual designated in subsection (c)(3) of this rule to receive complaints. An initial inquiry is necessary if the complaint, taken as true, would constitute judicial misconduct or unfitness for further service as a judge. Prior to the commencement of an initial inquiry, the Judge Advocate General concerned shall be notified that a complaint has been filed and that an initial inquiry will be conducted. The Judge Advocate General concerned may temporarily suspend the subject of a complaint from performing judicial duties pending the outcome of any inquiry or investigation conducted pursuant to this rule. Such inquiries or investigations shall be conducted with reasonable promptness.

(5) Initial inquiry.

(A) In general. An initial inquiry is necessary to determine if the complaint is substantiated. A complaint is substantiated upon finding that it is more likely than not that the subject judge has engaged in judicial misconduct or is otherwise unfit for further service as a judge.

(B) Responsibility to conduct initial inquiry. The Judge Advocate General concerned, or the person designated to receive complaints under subsection (c)(3) of this rule, will conduct or order an initial inquiry. The individual designated to conduct the inquiry should, if practicable, be senior to the subject of the complaint. If the subject of the complaint is a military trial judge, the individual designated to conduct the initial inquiry should, if practicable, be a military trial judge or an individual with experience as a military trial judge. If the subject of the complaint is an appellate military judge, the individual designated to conduct the inquiry should, if practicable, have experience as an appellate military judge.

(C) Due process. During the initial inquiry, the subject of the complaint will, at a minimum, be given notice and an opportunity to be heard.

(D) Action following the initial inquiry. If the complaint is not substantiated pursuant to subsection (c)(5)(A) of this rule, the complaint shall be dismissed as unfounded. If the complaint is substantiated, minor professional disciplinary action may be taken or the complaint may be forwarded, with findings and recommendations, to the Judge Advocate General concerned. Minor professional disciplinary action is defined as counselling or the issuance of an oral or written admonition or reprimand. The Judge Advocate General concerned will be notified prior to taking minor professional disciplinary action or dismissing a complaint as unfounded.

(6) Action by The Judge Advocate General.
In general. The Judge Advocates General are responsible for the professional supervision and discipline of military trial and appellate military judges under their jurisdiction. Upon receipt of findings and recommendations required by subsection (c)(5)(D) of this rule the Judge Advocate General concerned will take appropriate action.

Appropriate Actions. The Judge Advocate General concerned may dismiss the complaint, order an additional inquiry, appoint an ethics commission to consider the complaint, refer the matter to another appropriate investigative agency or take appropriate professional disciplinary action pursuant to the rules of professional conduct prescribed by the Judge Advocate General under subsection (a) of this rule. Any decision of a Judge Advocate General, under this rule, is final and is not subject to appeal.

Standard of Proof. Prior to taking professional disciplinary action, other than minor disciplinary action as defined in subsection (c)(5)(D) of this rule, the Judge Advocate General concerned shall find, in writing, that the subject of the complaint engaged in judicial misconduct or is otherwise unfit for continued service as a military judge, and that such misconduct or unfitness is established by clear and convincing evidence.

Due process. Prior to taking final action on the complaint, the Judge Advocate General concerned will ensure that the subject of the complaint is, at a minimum, given notice and an opportunity to be heard.

The Ethics Commission.

Membership. If appointed pursuant to subsection (c)(6)(B) of this rule, an ethics commission shall consist of at least three members. If the subject of the complaint is a military trial judge, the commission should include one or more military trial judges or individuals with experience as a military trial judge. If the subject of the complaint is an appellate military judge, the commission should include one or more individuals with experience as an appellate military judge. Members of the commission should, if practicable, be senior to the subject of the complaint.

Duties. The commission will perform those duties assigned by the Judge Advocate General concerned. Normally, the commission will provide an opinion as to whether the subject’s acts or omissions constitute judicial misconduct or unfitness. If the commission determines that the affected judge engaged in judicial misconduct or is unfit for continued judicial service, the commission may be required to recommend an appropriate disposition to the Judge Advocate General concerned.

Rules of procedure. The Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the service concerned may establish additional procedures consistent with this rule and Article 6a.

Military Counsel. If requested by the prisoner and such request is made known to military authorities, military counsel shall be provided to the prisoner before the initial review under subsection (i) of this rule or within 72 hours of such a request being first communicated to military authorities, whichever occurs first. Counsel may be assigned for the limited purpose of representing the accused only during the pretrial confinement proceedings before charges are referred. If more
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assignment is made for this limited purpose, the prisoner shall be so informed. Unless otherwise provided by regulations of the Secretary concerned, a prisoner does not have a right under this rule to have military counsel of the prisoner's own selection.

c. R.C.M. 305(h)(2)(A) is amended to read as follows:

"(A) Decision. Not later than 72 hours after the commander's ordering of a prisoner into pretrial confinement, or after receipt of a report that a member of the commander's unit or organization has been confined, whichever situation is applicable, the commander shall decide whether pretrial confinement will continue.".

d. R.C.M. 305(i)(1) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) In general. A review of the adequacy of probable cause to believe the prisoner has committed an offense and of the necessity for continued pretrial confinement shall be made within 7 days of the imposition of confinement under military control. If the prisoner was apprehended by civilian authorities and remains in civilian custody at the request of military authorities, reasonable efforts will be made to bring the prisoner under military control in a timely fashion. In calculating the number of days of confinement for purposes of this rule, the initial date of confinement shall count as one day and the date of the review shall also count as one day.".

e. R.C.M. 405(i) is amended to read as follows:

"(i) Military Rules of Evidence. The Military Rules of Evidence - other than Mil. R. Evid. 301, 302, 303, 305, 412, and Section V - shall not apply in pretrial investigations under this rule.".

f. R.C.M. 701(g)(3)(C) is amended to read as follows:

"(C) Prohibit the party from introducing evidence, calling a witness, or raising a defense not disclosed; and"

g. R.C.M. 704(e) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Decision to grant immunity. Unless limited by superior competent authority, the decision to grant immunity is a matter within the sole discretion of the appropriate general court-martial convening authority. However, if a defense request to immunize a witness has been denied, the military judge may, upon motion of the defense, grant appropriate relief directing that either an appropriate general court-martial convening authority grant testimonial immunity to a defense witness or, as to the affected charges and specifications, the proceedings against the accused be abated, upon findings that:

(1) The witness intends to invoke the right against self-incrimination to the extent permitted by law if called to testify; and

(2) The Government has engaged in discriminatory use of immunity to obtain a tactical advantage, or the Government, through its own overreaching, has forced the witness to invoke the privilege against self-incrimination; and

(3) The witness' testimony is material, clearly exculpatory, not cumulative, not obtainable from any other source and does more than merely affect the credibility of other witnesses.".
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h. R.C.M. 910(a)(1) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) In general. An accused may plead as follows: guilty; not guilty to an offense as charged, but guilty of a named lesser included offense; guilty with exceptions, with or without substitutions, not guilty of the exceptions, but guilty of the substitutions, if any; or, not guilty. A plea of guilty may not be received as to an offense for which the death penalty may be adjudged by the court-martial.".

i. R.C.M. 918(a)(1) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) As to a specification. General findings as to a specification may be: guilty; not guilty of an offense as charged, but guilty of a named lesser included offense; guilty with exceptions, with or without substitutions, not guilty of the exceptions, but guilty of the substitutions, if any; not guilty only by reason of lack of mental responsibility; or, not guilty. Exceptions and substitutions may not be used to substantially change the nature of the offense or to increase the seriousness of the offense or the maximum punishment for it.".

j. R.C.M. 920(b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) When given. Instructions on findings shall be given before or after arguments by counsel, or at both times, and before the members close to deliberate on findings, but the military judge may, upon request of the members, any party, or sua sponte, give additional instructions at a later time.".

k. R.C.M. 1103(g)(1)(A) is amended to read as follows:

"In general. In general and special courts-martial which require a verbatim transcript under subsections (b) or (c) of this rule and are subject to review by a Court of Military Review under Article 66, the trial counsel shall cause to be prepared an original and four copies of the record of trial. In all other general and special courts-martial the trial counsel shall cause to be prepared an original and one copy of the record of trial.".

Sec. 2. Part III of the Manual for Courts-Martial, United States, 1984, is amended as follows:

a. Mil. R. Evid. 311(e)(2) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Derivative Evidence. Evidence that is challenged under this rule as derivative evidence may be admitted against the accused if the military judge finds by a preponderance of the evidence that the evidence was not obtained as a result of an unlawful search or seizure, that the evidence ultimately would have been obtained by lawful means even if the unlawful search or seizure had not been made, or that the evidence was obtained by officials who reasonably and with good faith relied on the issuance of an authorization to search, seize, or apprehend or a search warrant or an arrest warrant. Notwithstanding other provisions of this Rule, an apprehension made in a dwelling in a manner that violates R.C.M. 302(d)(2)&(e) does not preclude the admission into evidence of a statement of an individual apprehended provided (1) that the apprehension was based on probable cause, (2) that the statement was made subsequent to the apprehension at a location outside the dwelling, and (3) that the statement was otherwise in compliance with these rules.".
b. Mil. R. Evid. 505(a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) General rule of privilege. Classified information is privileged from disclosure if disclosure would be detrimental to the national security. As with other rules of privilege this rule applies to all stages of the proceedings."

c. Mil. R. Evid. 505(g)(1)(D) is amended by adding the following at the end:

"All persons requiring security clearances shall cooperate with investigatory personnel in any investigations which are necessary to obtain a security clearance."

d. Mil. R. Evid. 505(h)(3) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) Content of notice. The notice required by this subdivision shall include a brief description of the classified information. The description, to be sufficient, must be more than a mere general statement of the areas about which evidence may be introduced. The accused must state, with particularity, which items of classified information he reasonably expects will be revealed by his defense."

e. Mil. R. Evid. 505(i)(3) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) Demonstration of national security nature of the information. In order to obtain an in camera proceeding under this rule, the Government shall submit the classified information and an affidavit ex parte for examination by the military judge only. The affidavit shall demonstrate that disclosure of the information reasonably could be expected to cause damage to the national security in the degree required to warrant classification under the applicable executive order, statute, or regulation."

f. Mil. R. Evid. 505(j)(4)(B) is amended to read as follows:

"Standard. Classified information is not subject to disclosure under this subdivision unless the information is relevant and necessary to an element of the offense or a legally cognizable defense and is otherwise admissible in evidence. In presentencing proceedings, relevant and material classified information pertaining to the appropriateness of, or the appropriate degree of, punishment shall be admitted only if no unclassified version of such information is available."

g. Mil. R. Evid. 505(j)(5) is amended to read as follows:

"(5) Closed session. The military judge may exclude the public during that portion of the presentation of evidence that discloses classified information."

h. Mil. R. Evid. 609(a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) General rule. For the purpose of attacking the credibility of a witness, (1) evidence that a witness other than the accused has been convicted of a crime shall be admitted, subject to Mil. R. Evid. 403, if the crime was punishable by death, dishonorable discharge, or imprisonment in excess of one year under the law under which the witness was convicted, and evidence that an accused has been convicted of such a crime shall be admitted if the military judge determines
that the probative value of admitting this evidence outweighs its prejudicial effect to the accused; and (2) evidence that any witness has been convicted of a crime shall be admitted if it involved dishonesty or false statement, regardless of the punishment. In determining whether a crime tried by court-martial was punishable by death, dishonorable discharge, or imprisonment in excess of one year, the maximum punishment prescribed by the President under Article 56 at the time of the conviction applies without regard to whether the case was tried by general, special, or summary court-martial.

i. Mil. R. Evid. 1101(d) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Rules inapplicable. These rules (other than with respect to privileges and Mil. R. Evid. 412) do not apply in investigative hearings pursuant to Article 32; proceedings for vacation of suspension of sentence pursuant to Article 72; proceedings for search authorizations; proceedings involving pretrial restraint; and in other proceedings authorized under the code or this Manual and not listed in subdivision (a)."

Sec. 3. Part IV of the Manual for Courts-Martial, United States, 1984, is amended as follows:

a. Paragraph 37c is amended by inserting the following new subparagraphs (10) and (11) at the end thereof:

"(10) Use. 'Use' means to inject, ingest, inhale, or otherwise introduce into the human body, any controlled substance. Knowledge of the presence of the controlled substance is a required component of use. Knowledge of the presence of the controlled substance may be inferred from the presence of the controlled substance in the accused's body or from other circumstantial evidence. This permissive inference may be legally sufficient to satisfy the government's burden of proof as to knowledge.

(11) Deliberate ignorance. An accused who consciously avoids knowledge of the presence of a controlled substance or the contraband nature of the substance is subject to the same criminal liability as one who has actual knowledge."

b. The last paragraph of paragraph 37e is amended to read as follows:

"When any offense under paragraph 37 is committed: while the accused is on duty as a sentinel or lookout; on board a vessel or aircraft used by or under the control of the armed forces; in or at a missile launch facility used by or under the control of the armed forces; while receiving special pay under 37 U.S.C. Section 310; in time of war; or in a confinement facility used by or under the control of the armed forces, the maximum period of confinement authorized for such an offense shall be increased by 5 years."

c. Paragraph 43d is amended to read as follows:

"d. Lesser included offenses.

(1) Premeditated murder and murder during certain offenses. Article 118(2) and (3) - murder

(2) All murders under Article 118.

(a) Article 119 - involuntary manslaughter

more

(OVER)
(b) Article 128 - assault; assault consummated by a battery; aggravated assault

(c) Article 134 - negligent homicide

(3) Murder as defined in Article 118(1), (2), and (4).

(a) Article 80 - attempts

(b) Article 119 - voluntary manslaughter

(c) Article 134 - assault with intent to commit murder

(d) Article 134 - assault with intent to commit voluntary manslaughter".

d. Para 45d(1) is amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"(e) Article 120(b) - carnal knowledge".

e. Para 45f(1) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Rape.

In that _______ (personal jurisdiction data), did, (at/on board—location) (subject-matter jurisdiction data, if required), on or about _______ 19__, rape _______ (a person who had not attained the age of 16 years)."

f. The following new paragraph is inserted after paragraph 96:

"96a. Article 134 (Wrongful interference with an adverse administrative proceeding)

a. Text. See paragraph 60.

b. Elements.

(1) That the accused wrongfully did a certain act;

(2) That the accused did so in the case of a certain person against whom the accused had reason to believe there were or would be adverse administrative proceedings pending;

(3) That the act was done with the intent to influence, impede, or obstruct the conduct of such adverse administrative proceeding, or otherwise obstruct the due administration of justice;

(4) That under the circumstances, the conduct of the accused was to the prejudice of good order and discipline in the armed forces or was of a nature to bring discredit upon the armed forces.

c. Explanation. For purposes of this paragraph "adverse administrative proceeding" includes any administrative proceeding or action, initiated against a servicemember, that could lead to discharge, loss of special or incentive pay, administrative reduction in grade, loss of a security clearance, bar to reenlistment, or reclassification. Examples of wrongful interference include wrongfully influencing, intimidating, impeding, or injuring a witness, an investigator, or other person acting on an adverse administrative action; by means more
of bribery, intimidation, misrepresentation, or force or threat of force delaying or preventing communication of information relating to such administrative proceeding; and, the wrongful destruction or concealment of information relevant to such adverse administrative proceeding.

d. Lesser included offenses. None.

e. Maximum punishment. Dishonorable discharge, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and confinement for 5 years.

f. Sample specification. In that [personal jurisdiction data], did, (at/on board--location) (subject-matter jurisdiction data, if required), on or about [date], wrongfully (endeavor to) [impede (an adverse administrative proceeding) (an investigation) (_______)] [influence the actions of ______, (an officer responsible for making a recommendation concerning the adverse administrative proceeding) (an individual responsible for making a decision concerning an adverse administrative proceeding) (an individual responsible for processing an adverse administrative proceeding) (_______)] [(influence) (alter) the testimony of __________ a witness before (a board established to consider an adverse administrative proceeding or elimination) (an investigating officer) (___)] in the case of ______, by [(promising) (offering) (giving) to the said ______, (the sum of $ ___) (_______, of a value of about $ ____)] [communicating to the said ______ a threat to ___] [(_______), (if) (unless) the said ______, would [recommend dismissal of the action against said ______] [(wrongfully refuse to testify) (testify falsely concerning ___)] [(_______)] [(at such administrative proceeding) (before such investigating officer) (before such administrative board)] [_______]."

Sec. 4. These amendments shall take effect on [insert date of last day of the 30-day period beginning on the date of signature by the President], subject to the following:

a. The amendments made to paragraphs 37c, 37e, 43d(2), 45d(1), and 96a of Part IV shall apply to any offense committed on or after [insert date of last day of the 30-day period beginning on the date of signature by the President].

b. The amendments made to Section III shall apply only in cases in which arraignment has been completed on or after [insert date of last day of the 30-day period beginning on the date of signature by the President].

c. The amendment made to Rules for Courts-Martial 405(i), 701(g)(3)(C), and 704(e) shall apply only in cases in which charges are preferred on or after [insert date of last day of the 30-day period beginning on the date of signature by the President].

d. The amendments made to Rules for Courts-Martial 910, 918, and 920 shall apply only to cases in which arraignment occurs on or after [insert date of last day of the 30-day period beginning on the date of signature by the President].

e. The amendments made to Rule for Courts-Martial 305 shall apply only to cases in which pretrial confinement is imposed on or after [insert date of last day of the 30-day period beginning on the date of signature by the President].
f. The amendment to Rule for Courts-Martial 1103(g)(1)(A) shall apply only in cases in which the sentence is adjudged on or after [insert date of last day of the 30-day period beginning on the date of signature by the President].

g. Nothing contained in these amendments shall be construed to make punishable any act done or omitted prior to [insert date of last day of the 30-day period beginning on the date of signature by the President], which was not punishable when done or omitted.

h. The maximum punishment for an offense committed prior to [insert date of last day of the 30-day period beginning on the date of signature by the President] shall not exceed the applicable maximum in effect at the time of the commission of such offense.

i. Nothing in these amendments shall be construed to invalidate any nonjudicial punishment proceeding, restraint, investigation, referral of charges, trial in which arraignment occurred, or other action begun prior to [insert date of last day of the 30-day period beginning on the date of signature by the President], and any such restraint, investigation, referral of charges, trial, or other action may proceed in the same manner and with the same effect as if these amendments had not been prescribed.

Sec. 5. The Secretary of Defense, on behalf of the President, shall transmit a copy of this order to the Congress of the United States in accord with section 836 of title 10 of the United States Code.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

THE WHITE HOUSE,

# # #
Thank you. ... I must tell you that I'm delighted to be here, but I also feel very bad because I looked at my calendar, and ... I realize I have been here almost two months now. I have been very delinquent in not coming to you much sooner and introducing myself, but I guess time flies when you're having fun or some kind of a cliche like that.

I have to tell you that I was under no illusion when I came here about what would be in my in-basket. After all, I had served in the chairman's office before going to Europe. But I guess I didn't realize just how full the in-basket could really get.

Whether those are the issues that are so well familiar to you — Somalia and Haiti and Bosnia and North Korea — or whether it's worrying about the process that's now ongoing in Russia as they build, their democratic institutions and market economies and how all that will turn out or just downsizing and restructuring the force and making sure that we do all that right and that in the process we don't just get smaller, but that we also get better.

It would be a hit on us if we, in this process, didn't turn over every rock and try to figure out if there isn't a better way of doing things. But while we do that, ensuring that we protect the quality of life for our service men and women and their families and our civilian work force, and that's no mean trick, as you well understand.

Let me tell you that I have really enjoyed the challenges so far. I have been busier than I thought I would be. But having assured you of that, that I'm not underemployed, but that I'm enjoying it, and that I'm really enjoying the people that I work with here.

With that, I know you don't want me to talk too long. You'd rather ask questions. So what are your questions?

North Korea Challenge
Q. Gen. Shalikashvili, certainly one of the highest profiled challenges that face you now is North Korea, the problem of North Korea. You have a study under way, I know, with the South Korean military, on changes that might be needed to beef up the military there. Have you any preliminary results from that study? Do you think that forces need to be beefed up — U.S. and South Korean forces? And are you confident that the force that's there now could stop any North Korean thrust before it reached Seoul?
A. First, as far as the ongoing effort to determine whether their structure is right or whether their capabilities are in place and what it is that we, in a reinforcing role, ought to be doing, I think it's much too early to be talking about specifics, other than you need to view that it's an ongoing process and not something that has all of a sudden been brought about by what we've been reading in the headlines, and that is the nuclear issue. I am satisfied, having gone to Korea about a month ago and meeting there with my counterpart, that that's going well.

As far as our confidence to stop a North Korean attack into the South, I am very, very confident. I think even the more pessimistic studies that you sometimes write about have no question that we will stop, that the South Koreans, together with our reinforcements, will stop North Korean attack far short of their reaching their war objectives. I would not want to stand here before you and speculate where in relationship to Seoul is. Suffice it to say that I am very comfortable that no one has yet suggested that we would not be able to stop the North Koreans.

Q. How would you be able to stop them? In 1950 the Chinese came in on behalf of North Korea, and it became a very bloody, long war, and we know the outcome. What is your assessment of Red China today? Will they remain neutral? Do you think they'd come in if North Korea attacks?
A. I think the conditions are totally different. I certainly would not envision right now that we would be facing the Chinese government and the Chinese troops if, in fact, North Korea were foolish enough to attack the South.

Q. Given the North Koreans' vast numerical superiority, how is it that the South Korean forces reinforced by the U.S. would be able to repel an invasion?
A. First of all, there is more to a warfighting capability than the number of soldiers or airmen or Marines that one side or the other has. It has to do with the quality of the force. It has to do with the quality of the armaments. It has to do with terrain, and also it has to do with whether you're the attacker or the defender. I am not alone in this military judgment, that the Republic of Korea forces, reinforced by the
United States, as it's now envisioned, would be able to stop any attack.

But let me say, I don't want to leave it with the impression that something has changed in the last month or two or three that somehow makes it more likely that North Korea is engaged in some kind of preparation for an attack. I don't want to leave that impression at all. What I am saying is something that has been true for some time, and I think it's going to remain true for some time to come, without giving you all the impression that we... sense that the North Koreans are in some kind of a preparatory phase prior to attack.

Russian Reform

Q. You mentioned Russia. The parliament there, they're electing a parliament, the Nationalist Group, that has opposed many of [President Boris] Yeltsin's policies on denuclearization, on switching to defense conversion. What are your thoughts about that, and how it would change any U.S. military policy?

A. The first thing I would tell you is that it's useful to remember, as a start point, that there's an awful lot to be satisfied about in the sense that we've had the first free democratic elections since, I guess, 1917 and probably and that we do have a new constitution that guarantees an awful lot of the rights to the citizens of Russia. So I think there's an awful lot to be very thankful about.

As far as the outcome between the reformers and those who would slow down the reforms or reorient reforms, I think I would like to reserve judgment until we see better, really, how that came out. Certainly, you could speculate that we hope that after all the votes are counted that the reformists will come to the realization and will go on with the process. And despite some of the reporting as to the statements that one side or another might have made during this election process, I think it's too early to tell whether there is any kind of a significant reversal in Russia and its commitment, the government's commitment, to democratic reform.

After all, they have just voted on a constitution where the presidency has been strengthened many-fold. Right now, as far as I know, Yeltsin will continue with the democratic processes, in his views, towards Ukraine and the relations that he wishes to build with Ukraine that have nothing to do with threatening each other with nuclear weapons.

North Korea's Objectives

Q. Another question having to do with Korea. Your own assessment of the likelihood of a North Korean attack? And secondly, you mentioned in one of your answers, to a question on Korea, that you were confident that the combined United States/South Korea could stop a North Korean attack short of North Korea's war objectives. What are North Korea's war objectives?

A. I will tell you that none of us read their war plans, and I wouldn't want to pretend otherwise. I think logic would lead you to the conclusion that they probably would wish to reunify the country through force, and I think our friends in the Republic of Korea, together with us, have the capability of stopping him short of that.

Q. And the likelihood?

A. I think we have all heard enough about the unpredictability of Kim Il Sung and Kim Jong Il's regime, so I think it is very dangerous to speculate one with the other. All I would say is that I don't see anything different today than I did a few months ago when I came to this job, and people who have been here in this building and watching this part of the world longer than I have don't see anything that has particularly happened that would increase or decrease the likelihood between now and, let's say, six months ago.

Q. Just getting back to your idea of what their war objectives are, American analysts have assessed that one of their objectives would be to surround and possibly overrun Seoul. Do you believe that ROK forces reinforced by American forces could stop a North Korean invasion short of Seoul?

A. It's certainly a possibility, and our hope that we can do so.

Q. But you're not certain about that? Obviously, their artillery guns are well within range. It's an easy mark there. But in terms of ground forces actually coming in?

A. I think you're talking of a
hugc. city that's only some, at its narrowest point, some 20-plus miles from the border. So let me simply say that we have every intention to try to do so. I certainly think there is a very good likelihood. However, there are also many imponderables that you simply cannot predict.

Q. A two-part question about Somalia. Did you see the video of the Oct. 3 battle in Mogadishu? And two, would you give us your evaluation of the performance of [Army Maj.] Gen. [William] Garrison, [commander, joint] special operations?

A. Are you talking about the video that was made by the forces that participated in that operation?

**Somalia Operation**

**Q.** Oct. 3.

**A.** Yes, I saw it several times. In my judgment the military personnel involved in that operation performed with extraordinary courage in an extremely difficult situation and I think, from a military point of view, did an absolutely sterling job. I think Gen. Garrison had gone through all the proper planning and precautionary steps that one would expect of a leader in that kind of an operation and led those troops with great distinction.

**Q.** When are we going to get that video?

**A.** I don't know. We'll look into it.

**Q.** Is there any security material in there?

**A.** There might be. There might be methods they used on the video that I just simply am not prepared to answer for you now. But those of you who have known me for more than a day or so know that if there is a way to make this available to you, I certainly won't stand in the way.

**Q.** On the issue of peace operations, considering the problems in Somalia, do you have reservations, and should there be solid conditions before U.S. forces are placed under United Nations command?

**A.** I have always maintained, even long before the 3-4 October fight in Mogadishu, that there must be very solid conditions before United States forces participate in any kind of operation, whether that's under United Nations or not.

Certainly for operations under the United Nations, there ought to be some very strict conditions.

In addition to those that we would consider for an operation were it, for instance, under the command and control of NATO or unilaterally under the United States, is the issue of the robustness of the chain of command under the U.N., the specific rules of engagement and whether they not only allow for the self-protection of the force, but also are robust enough to allow you to get the job done.

I think we ought to make sure that we judge those doings on a case-by-case basis, but I can well imagine that there will be United Nations operations in the future where we can all, with a great deal of confidence, say that the command/control arrangement is robust enough, the rules of engagement are proper, and then for me to recommend to my boss that it would make sense to participate. There are other cases where I would obviously have to say no.

Let us agree, I think, to judge each one of them on a case-by-case basis.

**Military Options**

**Q.** Let me get your judgment on two military matters. First of all, on Korea. Does this country have military options in the event diplomacy fails that, in your judgment, are preferable to permitting the North Koreans to develop nuclear weapons capability? No. 2, do you support extending the borders of NATO eastward over the next several years with no particular military infrastructure in place to defend this new territory, and at a time of shrinking defense budgets and real deep questions about the national will, to take on additional commitments?

**A.** On the first question, I know that you do not seriously want me to discuss any planning that we do on this or any other operation. I would hope that this building does not get caught short if we are ever asked to do something, and I feel confident that we won't be. But that's all I would really want to say on that matter.

As far as the issue of extending security guarantees to the East, I think for the longest time we were talking about whether security guarantees are to be extended or whether NATO membership ought to be extended.

It is, I think, becoming clearer and clearer that there is a consensus forming in the alliance that people would like to think, on that issue, that the question is no longer whether, but when and how. And while this process might be lengthy and this process might not satisfy some of our Eastern friends in terms of how quickly it can move ahead, that the alliance is beginning to come to that conclusion that we are now standing at the threshold of saying when and how, as opposed to whether.

**Partnership for Peace**

The issue of extending security guarantees in this time frame, I think, is premature as I view the debates in the various capitals, and I think one of the reasons why the United States has proposed its Partnership for Peace is to have a proposal on the table that is appropriate to the times we are in, in relationship to this issue of extending membership, this whole question of whether it is not premature, right now, to extend guarantees, and how are the capitals of the member countries of the alliance now willing to do so?

My sensing is that the vast majority are not yet ready to do so, and yet there has to be a qualitative step forward from the NACC [North Atlantic Cooperation Council] process that was our first reach to the East. I think, viewed in that light, I think the Partnership for Peace has been embraced by all NATO countries that I'm aware of, and I think it's also going to get acceptance in the East.

**Q.** In your role as the principal military adviser to the president, what do you intend to say to him this week when he sits to consider the defense budget?

**A.** I'm not sure what you mean "when he sits down this week to consider the defense budget."

**Q.** He and Secretary [of Defense Les] Aspin have to meet on the defense budget to decide whether, actually, to break the budget caps or to keep the budget within those limits.

**A.** I don't mean to evade your
question, I really don’t know. I
know that they have a meeting. I’ve
been told that they have a meeting
coming up. Whether that’s just
simply to outline, for the president,
where Secretary Aspin sees the
issue or not, I can’t comment on it.

Pentagon Budget

Q. The Pentagon is facing these
shortfalls, $50 billion by some
estimates. What’s been your
military advice as to what would
happen if the Pentagon has to
absorb those kind of cuts, $50
billion or any limit below that?
A. I think we probably can all
agree that there is an issue, as
Secretary Aspin said this weekend.
We’re not sure whether that’s $50
billion or slightly smaller, a slightly
larger number. So I wouldn’t want
to get hung up on the number.

The second thing I think that
Secretary Aspin said, and I’d like to
reinforce, it isn’t a we-they issue. It
is that, together, we have this
dilemma of how to solve that
problem. It’s much too early to
reach any conclusions that it
cannot be solved.

We need to ... scope the prob­
lem and then look at realistic
solutions to it, and we can only get
there if we all work together. ... If
we see that there isn’t a solution
that will get us to that, then I think
we can talk about what the fallout
would be. So I think it’s a little
premature for me to say what the
dire consequences might be if we
can’t together solve the problem.
I’m confident that there’s a way that
can be solved.

Q. But having said that and
given that the Army especially has
been complaining pretty loudly that
they’re not ready now, you’re going
to have to absorb the $50 billion
adjustment, be it somewhat higher
or somewhat lower. Aren’t you
really running the risk that the
entire military won’t be ready?
A. I was not aware that the Army
said that they are not ready. I think
all of the services are concerned. I
think for every budget cycle that I
am aware of, we’ve always tried to
be very realistic as we look at the
resources vs. the structure that’s
needed to execute a strategy. But in
my discussions with the leadership
of the Army, I was not aware that
they were claiming that they are
now somehow over the edge. I
don’t think they are.

All of the services, and certainly I
as chairman, have a concern that
we have sufficient resources to get
the force structure and properly
support that force structure in order
to be able to execute the strategy
that was developed and articulated
during the Bottom-up Review,
which I think is the right strategy.

Q. What do you foresee happen­
ing in Bosnia? Have you been able
to give some time to a re-evaluation
of a potential U.S. commitment of
forces to any kind of NATO peace
keeping? And what would you
imagine the size of that might be?
A. First and foremost, like last
winter, the main effort right now
needs to be to get folks through the
winter. That means we need to
redouble our efforts in a humanitar­
ian area. And as you know, Secre­
tary [of State Warren] Christopher
announced when he was in Europe
a couple of weeks ago, that we’re
doing just that. And I think we will,
very soon, have the airplanes in
place and the humanitarian goods
to be able not only to significantly
increase our air landings into
Sarajevo and Tuzla, if the warring
factions ever allow the airport to be
opened, and certainly also to
increase our airdrop operations.

But your question goes beyond
that, and beyond that is the issue of
supporting a peace agreement if, in
fact, the three factions ever reach
an agreement. There was a degree of
euphoria here last week. As is
often the case, in Bosnia it was not
well-founded, because once again,
at least so far, they have not
managed to come to an agreement.
My understanding is that they’re
going to be meeting again on the
21st of this month to try to see if
they can come to an agreement.

The United States has stated that
if there is an agreement and it is a
just agreement and all three parties
sign up to it — not just the leader­
ship, but there is indication that
throughout, down to the warlords,
that there is the willingness to
implement that agreement and if it’s
implementable with military
forces — that the United States
would be willing to, in coordina­
tion, in consultation with Congress,
to participate in such an operation.
I don’t know of anything that has
changed.

So where I now stand and all of
us, we’re very carefully watching
the peace process to see whether,
in fact, we can finally have an
agreement that emerges from
Geneva or any other talks.

Q. But there’s a lot of ifs to that.
A. Not on our part. It’s on their
part, really. But I think we went into
it — Europeans and Americans —
from the very beginning, that we
cannot impose a peace on them.
We need to do all we can to help
them reach an agreement, but
ultimately, the agreement must be
one that they all sign up to. So far,
they have been unable to do so.

Troop Pullout

Q. When the U.S. pulls its troops
out of Somalia in the end of March,
how many support troops will be
left, and how safe will they be?
A. How many Americans?
Q. Yes.
A. We have indicated that ..., I
think when the president an­
nounced it, it was 300 or less. I am
going to Somalia on Saturday. One
of the things I want to look into is,
not only what we will then, eventu­
ally, on the 31st of March have to
leave. Where I come from I’d rather
the number be smaller than larger.

Secondly, I want to make sure
that while I have carefully viewed
the withdrawal plans, I want to
make sure that I have the opportu­
nity to sit down with ... leaders
there and review, in person, their
withdrawal plans to make sure that
we can do that as efficiently and as
safely to ourselves and the other
forces that are there ....
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To understand the opportunity we have today in Europe, we should start with a look back at Europe 45 years ago, between World War II and the Cold War.

It was a time of great hope. World War II was over. Freedom-loving nations were victorious. And like today, the post-war era was an historic turning point. There were dangers ahead. But there also was an opportunity to build a secure, unified Europe.

That, of course, was the vision presented by George C. Marshall when he stepped up to the microphone to give his famous commencement speech at Harvard.

His vision was inclusive. Marshall's plan was offered to all of Europe, from the Atlantic to the Urals, including the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe. His vision—a continent of prosperous democracies cooperating in international relations to their mutual security. No country was excluded.

Events intervened. Stalin declined the offer. The Iron Curtain descended. And only half of Marshall's vision was realized.

Now, 45 years and a Cold War later, we have another opportunity, not to come up with a new Marshall Plan, but to pick up where the Cold War left off, to rededicate ourselves to Marshall's vision of a Europe whole, secure and free. That vision is now within our grasp. But to seize it, we must do three things.

First, we must reaffirm that the Euro-Atlantic region is one, indivisible geopolitical region, and that as a consequence the United States is in Europe to stay.

Second, we must support the success of democratic and economic reforms in Central and Eastern Europe, including Russia, Ukraine, the other former Soviet republics. We should pay special attention to the courageous efforts of reformers in these nations. Freedom and prosperity are the best guarantees of security and stability in all of Europe.
Third, we must promote development of a new security system that is based on the realities of today's Europe, not on the artificial lines drawn to divide Europe during the Cold War. This, of course, is the difficult task.

I believe we have begun a process that could produce such a system and I would like to talk about it today. It's a proposal we've offered to our NATO allies for consideration at the January summit. It's called Partnership for Peace. I offered the broad outlines of the partnership during my NATO meetings in Travemuende, Germany on October 20. And Warren Christopher has talked about them extensively. Today I'd like to fill in some of the details.

We start our approach to this with certain assumptions and it's important that we state them up front. They are that NATO is a singularly effective international security organization which should be adapted to the post-Cold War era, that NATO remains our chief avenue of involvement in Europe; and, finally, that NATO should be at the heart of any new Euro-Atlantic security system.

These considerations comprised our starting point when we began looking for ways to foster a new, better security system, in Europe. The result is the Partnership for Peace.

As we envision it, the partnership will provide a framework for detailed, operational military cooperation for multinational security efforts that has NATO at its core.

The nations of the partnership would eventually participate with NATO in a range of military activities. These activities could include joint military planning, training, exercises. They could even include operations such as search and rescue missions, disaster relief, peacekeeping and crisis management.

Partnership for Peace sets out a process to take us from where we are today to this new stage of security cooperation. Here's how it would work:

Leaders at the NATO summit early next month would approve a framework declaration for the partnership and issue invitations to the 22 members of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council and other European states on which the NATO allies agree. Any could sign up.

Interested individual nations would sign the declaration indicating agreement to commit to join the partnership.

Each new partner would then identify the facilities, resources and forces it is willing to make available to the Partnership, and the extent of its intention to participate in joint training, planning and operations.
A partner will also identify what it intends to do to achieve civilian control of the military and make defense budgets and policies transparent, that is making them visible to the citizenry.

Finally, NATO officers, working with planners from partner nations in a planning cell at Mons, home of the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe, would draw up a program for training, planning, combined exercises and other participation in NATO activities.

By this time, it would be clear which nations intended to become active, contributing Partners for Peace. The program put forward by the planners would go to NATO and partner political authority for approval and the process of implementation would begin.

One of the key products of this process for the active partner is security consultation. Allies and partners would agree to consult whenever the territorial integrity, political independence or security of a partner state was threatened. These consultations should do much to increase the sense of security and stability of the Eastern Europeans.

It’s important to note here that there are two things partnership would not provide, the NATO security guarantee and automatic membership at some future time.

First, the security guarantee. Article Five of the North Atlantic Treaty requires each member to regard an attack on one as an attack on all. The Article Five guarantee would not be extended to partners.

The next big question, of course, is whether joining the partnership is a ticket into NATO. It is not. Partners for Peace would not automatically become eligible for membership in NATO. They don’t even have to want to join NATO. And partners would not get a veto over who will join NATO.

On the other hand, partners for peace would have an opportunity to work with NATO to develop the principles, purposes and capabilities of NATO members. While partnership is no guarantee of membership, active participation would likely be an essential condition of future NATO membership.

There are big advantages to this approach to the current NATO members as well as the partners.
First, it does not re-divide Europe. We spent two generations trying to lift the Iron Curtain. We don't want to replace it by drawing another line. Partnership for Peace gives all nations the same chance to take part, but makes the results dependent on the effort of each partner.

Second, Partnership for Peace sets up the right incentives. In the old, Cold War world, NATO was an alliance created in response to an external threat. In the new, post-Cold War world, NATO can be an alliance based on shared values of democracy and the free market. Partnership for Peace rewards those who move in that direction.

Third, Partnership for Peace requires that partners make a real contribution. It doesn't just ask what NATO can do for its new partners, it asks what the new partners can do for NATO. Security consultations, for instance, will be available to active partners, those who make a contribution and involve themselves in the multinational activities that are the heart of NATO.

Fourth, it keeps NATO at the center of European security concerns and thereby keeps American involvement at the center of Europe.

Finally, it puts the question of NATO membership for the partners where it belongs, at the end of the process rather than at the beginning. After we have some experience with the partnership process, it will be much clearer who among the eligible nations genuinely wants to buy into the NATO ideas of shared democratic values and cooperative security.

Some have criticized the partnership, saying that it will dilute NATO. I believe it will strengthen NATO. It will keep NATO relevant to and concentrated on promoting a security system for the Euro-Atlantic region. It will help NATO adapt to changing times and requirements after two generations of concentration on the Warsaw Pact.

There have been complaints that the partnership treats all former communist states alike regardless of their intentions. On the contrary, it gives every state an equal chance to make its intentions clear before it is taken into the new security system. The partnership process offers equality of opportunity, but judges results entirely on the behavior of individual states.

The partnership imposes no timetables, or hard and fast rules governing how much the partners must do, or how soon. They can work at their own pace. At first, some states may be content with merely signing the declaration. Others may limit themselves to token participation.
However, active and committed partners, those that jump right into the planning, exercises and training with allied forces and participate in regular political consultations, will have an edge. They'll pick up NATO's standard operating procedures, habits of cooperation, and routines of consultation more quickly.

The Partnership for Peace was an initiative of President Clinton. We're pleased that it's gotten such a remarkable response. NATO General Secretary Manfred Woerner has endorsed it strongly. It's received the active support of every ally. It's widely applauded in Europe as an example of American leadership in the post-Cold War world.

President Clinton understands this new world. Partnership for Peace is another example of how he is acting to deal with it in a way that continues America's leadership, while equitably sharing the burden of realizing our mutual goals.

We believe the partnership will help to bring about what we all want -- Marshall's vision of a peaceful, stable, secure and unified Europe.

Thank you very much.
MEMORANDUM FOR ANTHONY LAKE

FROM: DON STEINBERG

SUBJECT: Request from CNN for Pre-Taped Interview

Jill Dougherty of CNN would like to pre-tape an interview with you next week to fit into a larger package they are preparing on the President's trip to NATO and Russia. Specifically, Jill is interested in discussing with you the goals for the NATO Summit and the East-West relationship.

APPROVE DISAPPROVE
From 1986 to the present, Admiral Bob Inman and his wife employed a part-time housekeeper (on a 1-3 times a week basis) for whom they did not withhold social security and related taxes. At the outset of his discussions with the White House, Admiral Inman fully disclosed this situation and made clear his intent to come into compliance with Administration policy on this issue.

Today Admiral Inman has filed the requisite forms with the Internal Revenue Service and has made payment on approximately $6,000 in taxes owed. Any interest and penalties will be calculated and assessed directly by the Internal Revenue Service at a later date.
Pool Report #2  
Dec. 17, 1993

Clinton reads Christmas story to kids and hosts East Room performance of "Annie Warbucks" (or Annie II) put on by New York cast for the kids.

First this item: Asked by Mik after reading ""The Night Before Christmas'" to some school kids in the State Dining Room if there was anything left in his stocking this year for the Pentagon, Clinton said he believes the $50 billion shortfall being talked about is really much less. He said he had a good meeting with Aspin this morning. ""Everyone agreed the shortfall is considerably less than predicted,'"' he told the pool in response to Mik's question. He said instead of the $50 billion over five years in further cuts it would likely be closer to $30 billion over six years.

Now for the day's Kodak moment. After hosting philanthropist Walter Annenberg this morning, Clinton played host to Daddy Warbucks and the New York cast of ""Annie Warbucks,'" which was invited to perform a shortened version of the sequel to the original Annie play for some 140 kids from seven local public schools.

Clinton read to the kids first before the performance, seating himself in a rocking chair in front of a roaring fire in the state dining room. The kids, fidgeting with noses, fingers in mouth and drawn as much to the clicking of the pool cameras' as the president's reading, sat on the floor in front of him. Clinton, wearing a bright Christmas tie adorned with a painting of jolly old St. Nick, began by saying that the story ""The Night before Christmas' was Chelsea's fav. ""The first lady and I really love this story,'"' he told his young audience. ""We use to read it to our little girl when she was very young. She still likes it.'"

Mrs. Clinton sat off to the side of the room just in front of a wonderful looking and very real gingerbread White House, complete with Socks the cat camped out at the North portico. Mrs. Clinton, to the delight of the kids, said she would try to find Socks, and sure enough, Clinton walked into the East Room a few minutes later with Socks cradled in his arms.

After Clinton finished reading in the State Dining Room, the kids were treated to a visit from Santa played by Secret Service Officer Jim Shea. Jim walked in in his Santa suit, jingling some bells in a sack. Some of the kids made a dash for him. He turned on his heels, and led them toward the East room, where they were seated for the performance of Annie. But most of the kids lingered in the dining room, grabbing at the prez and Mrs. Clinton and competing with your pool for the prez's attention. He kept trying to get them to follow Santa Jim, but they wouldn't budge. Finally, one little girl took the hint, and asked: ""How did you say to get there?'" Apparently the prez's direction's to the East Room were unclear.

Once everyone was finally in the East Room — which was decorated with no less than six Christmas trees trimmed in gold lights,
scarlet and gold ribbon _ the fun really got started. The Clinton's sat on the front row, almost stage center, and the the kids all around the room in folding chairs. But before the performance could get underway the kids were treated to an account of the musical's history by someone who obviously had never spoken to kids before. They didn't know what the heck he was talking about, they just figured they were about to be entertained in some fashion. Anyway, this guy (The White House could not immediately provide us with the names of cast members, but may have them later) presented the Clinton's with a a new CD recording of the show and a baseball cap with what appeared to be the musical's logo on it. Clinton thanked him and put the cap on for a few seconds. The intro taken care of, the 16 cast members who came down from New York _ complete with Annie's dog - took the stage and delivered a delightfully entertaining show that could have been scored by the prez himself. For example, when Daddy Warbucks tells Annie that he'll have to marry to keep her from being sent back to the orphanage, Annie says, ""I'd like for things to stay the way they are."" Daddy erupts in song: ""Me, too, honey. But nothing ever stays the same. Changes, changes, that's what life is all about."" Finally, Annie, too young too vote but apparently having been influenced somehow by Clinton's campaign anyway, concludes: ""Nothing seems certain but change."

A while later, Clinton couldn't help but laugh when Annie declares: ""Seems like in Washington all you here is 'Wait.'"" These words delivered after she asks the show's narrator, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, to help the nation's farmers. ""I'll make Congress see it our way,"" he assures here. ""Democrats and Republicans alike...Somebody going to do something before it's too late."" Our Annie FDR, of course, creates the Tennessee Valley Authority, which in today's Clinton world be like the putting NAFTA, the economic and health care plans all together in the same package. Clinton loved it. ""Weren't they wonderful?"" he asked the kids afterward, as he and Mrs. Clinton took the stage to thank the cast. ""Merry Christmas everybody,"" the first lady said. It was a wonderful show. Sorry we don't have names but the entire cast was great, especially Annie, who looked to be about nine or 10 and had one mean set of lungs. Her face got red as a beet when she sang, but geez, she could belt it out. The dog was even good. He sat by his trainer, choking down dog biscuits most of the show. But he barked and bounded to Annie's side on command, making quite an impression on the kids.

One cast member who played the the part of the Tennessee farmer's wife, told the Clinton's that her husband was from Hickham, Ark. They laughed at that, but I couldn't hear what they said. That's about it. The kids, I'm told, were bused in from Turner, C.D. Cooke, Malcolm X, and Wilkinson schools. A group of grandmothers, who have adopted some of the kids from troubled homes, were also in attendance. I was told the grans call themselves Sarah's Circle.

McDonald _ Houston Chron
THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release December 16, 1993

BIOGRAPHY OF BOBBY RAY INMAN

During a 31-year military career that included some of the most sensitive national security posts in government, Bobby Ray Inman earned a bipartisan reputation as one of the nation's finest intelligence officers. News accounts have referred to him as "simply one of the smartest people ever to come out of Washington or anywhere," (Omni. 11-84) and "a superstar in the intelligence community [and] a tough-minded administrator" (Newsweek. 2-16-81).

Inman was born in 1931 in the small town of Rhonesboro, Texas. After graduating from high school at age 15 and the University of Texas at age 19, he joined the Naval Reserve in 1951 and was commissioned an ensign in 1952. He then spent 19 years as an analyst for Naval Intelligence, serving on an aircraft carrier, two cruisers and a destroyer, as well as in a variety of onshore assignments.

In 1972, Inman graduated from the Naval War College and became the executive assistant to the vice chief of naval operations. He then rose to Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence of the Pacific Fleet in 1973, Director of Naval Intelligence in 1974, and Vice Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency in 1976. He was named director of the National Security Agency in 1977, and served four years at the head of this major agency. As he rose through these posts, Inman won the Distinguished Service Medal, the Navy's highest non-combatant award, and the DIA's Defense Superior Service Medal for "achievements unparalleled in the history of intelligence."

In 1981, Inman was nominated by President Reagan to be the Deputy Director of Central Intelligence. He was easily confirmed, and served in that position until resigning in March 1982. At that time, he became the first naval intelligence specialist ever to earn the rank of four-star Admiral. Senator David Boren said of Inman's time at the CIA that, "it was principally Admiral Inman who first showed that the congressional oversight process could work."

Since leaving the Navy, Inman has been involved in several business ventures, served on a variety of corporate boards, and acted as an outside advisor to three Presidents, the State Department, and Congress. Currently a resident of Austin, Texas, Inman is married to the former Carolyn Russo. They have two sons, Thomas and William.
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December 15, 1993

Dear Les:

It is with deep sadness that I accept your request that, for personal reasons, you be relieved of your duties after your years of intense, unselfish and extraordinarily effective service to our nation and its security. I am grateful that you are prepared to remain at your post through January 20, or beyond if necessary, as we work through the immediate issues before us and as we manage a smooth transition to your successor.

I hope that after you have taken the break you have requested, you will consider other important assignments that you would find challenging and personally rewarding.

I am proud of your accomplishments over the past year, and you should be, as well. In the Congress, in the campaign and as Secretary of Defense, you have been an effective leader in efforts to harness together our defense strategy and defense resources, culminating in this year’s Bottom Up Review. Together with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, you skillfully managed difficult issues — such as the military service of homosexuals and women in combat — that could have proved both deeply divisive and damaging to our military effectiveness and readiness. You helped conduct the first review of our nuclear posture since the end of the Cold War and advanced a new counter proliferation strategy. And you helped in the distinguished appointment of a new Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General John Shalikashvili.
All of this took skill and hard work, and all Americans are in your debt for it.

I look forward to urging you once again to bring your great skills and deep devotion to your country's service.

With admiration,

[Signature]
Dear Les:

It is with deep sadness that I accept your request that, for personal reasons, you be relieved of your duties after your years of intense, unselfish and extraordinarily effective service to our nation and its security. I am grateful that you are prepared to remain at your post through January 20, or beyond if necessary, as we work through the immediate issues before us and as we manage a smooth transition to your successor.

I hope that after you have taken the break you have requested, you will consider other important assignments that you would find challenging and personally rewarding.

I am proud of your accomplishments over the past year, and you should be, as well. In the Congress, in the campaign and as Secretary of Defense, you have been an effective leader in efforts to harness together our defense strategy and defense resources, culminating in this year's Bottom Up Review. Together with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, you skillfully managed difficult issues -- such as the military service of homosexuals and women in combat -- that could have proved both deeply divisive and damaging to our military effectiveness and readiness. You helped conduct the first review of our nuclear posture since the end of the Cold War and advanced a new counter proliferation strategy. And you helped in the distinguished appointment of a new Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General John Shalikashvili.
All of this took skill and hard work, and all Americans are in your debt for it.

I look forward to urging you once again to bring your great skills and deep devotion to your country's service.

With admiration,

[Signature]

Bill Clinton
December 15, 1993

The President
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President,

It has been one year since you asked me to serve as your Secretary of Defense. It has been an honor for me to work with you as we have reshaped our country’s military to protect Americans in a vastly changed world.

I am proud of the progress we have made in dealing with these changes. We now have a clear strategic sense of the new dangers we now face. After a year’s work we will be able to secure our country against these new dangers with a Bottom Up Force. By strategically defining the strengths we need and honestly projecting how much this force will cost, we have also built a new consensus to invest what is necessary to underwrite this Bottom Up Force. As a result we have moved for the first time in fifteen years away from the polarizing debates about how much we should spend on defense and worked together to build the military strengths we know we need. This has helped end the gridlock that for years kept us from governing and from concentrating on our agenda at home.

We have also worked together with our uniformed military leadership to find common ground on some difficult social issues that were avoided in the past and which could have divided our military. So we can now ensure that we will have a ready to fight force without the continuing distractions of these controversies.

As you know, dealing with these changes have made it a tough year for us all --- tough issues, tough calls.

I share your pride in the progress we have made. But now, as we have discussed on previous occasions, I ask you to relieve me of the duty as your Secretary of Defense on January 20. I ask this for quite personal reasons. I have been working continually for over two decades to help build a strong American military. It’s time now for me to take a break and undertake a new kind of work.
Of course, I pledge my every effort to support you and my successor in a smooth and orderly transition. You can continue to draw on one of the strongest and most talented senior management teams the Department of Defense has ever seen. Bill Perry and General Shali will give you a continuity of leadership as my successor works with the Senate to assume office.

Finally, I want to thank you for the honor of serving you and our country. You are a great Commander-In-Chief. I know that while you are our President our country will grow in all of its strengths, Americans will continue to be secure, our men and women in uniform will always be honored, and we will be true to our best values as a people.

Sincerely,
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