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BEIJING, July 23—China has fired four surface-to-surface guided missiles to kick off week-long military exercises just north of Taiwan, raising a question for Asian and American policymakers: Is China a military threat?

It’s an issue that has become more acute with Chinese purchases of new hardware, its development of three or four divisions of rapid reaction forces, new nuclear weapon tests, and a rhetorical assault on the United States.

Not a threat Friday that China would respond with force if Taiwan spurs the Chinese goal of reunification and declares independence.

Many countries in the South China Sea area were also upset by recent Chinese moves to strengthen its presence in the disputed Spratly Islands.

Although China’s military capability is modest compared to U.S. might, it can still and even smaller Asian nations. The specter of a “China threat” has already unified China’s anxious neighbors, spurred talk about a new “containment” policy in the United States and rallied U.S. congressional support for a tougher policy toward China and closer relations with Vietnam. Those concerns won’t be calmed by the maneuvers that started Friday and display of Chinese ships, subs and warplanes.

But specialists say the 3 million-man Chinese military is handicapped by outdated equipment that lags anywhere from 15 to 25 years behind American military technology. The Chinese military’s budget increases, while substantial, have failed to keep up with inflation over the past two decades.

Moreover, specialists on Chinese
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strategy doubt that the giant of Asia would take action that might disrupt the nation’s economic progress and social stability unless it were pushed hard. A major military initiative would undoubtedly disrupt trade relations, and more than 15 percent of China’s gross domestic product is intended for export. Indeed, the military itself has displayed a penchant for making money, not war.

“There has been no credible ‘China threat’,” said Charles W. Freeman Jr., former U.S. assistant defense secretary and a diplomat familiar with China. But, he warned, “by posing the existence of such a threat from China, we may now inadvertently be helping to create one.”

China’s size and its economic success have helped raise the possibility that it might pose a threat an issue.

“China is a big country. Its first goal is to raise the living standards of its people, develop the economy and defend the sovereignty of its territories,” said Cui Lira, director of the division of North American Studies at the Chinese Institute of Contemporary International Relations. “But be-
California Regents Aren’t the Last Word

Discretion Is Still the Better Part of College Admissions, Officials Say

By Rene Sanchez
Washington Post Staff Writer

The University of California Regents’ historic vote last week to end race-based admissions policies on all of its campuses has been praised as a bold strike that will wipe out inequities of affirmative action and denounced as a devastating setback for minority students. It may turn out to be neither.

There is no question that the decision, which California Gov. Pete Wilson (R) vigorously campaigned for as part of his presidential bid, will change the landscape for minority students seeking admission to the state’s universities and could ripple to campuses around the nation. The Clinton administration said yesterday that it will review whether the decision jeopardizes federal grants and contracts to the state.

Higher education officials say they are certain that once the new policy takes effect, there will be fewer minorities—notably blacks and Hispanics—on academically selective campuses such as UCLA and UC Berkeley.

But the intense rhetoric surrounding the vote has shifted attention away from a few key facts: First, even with the change the regents made, university officials still will have the discretion to choose between one-quarter to half of their students on criteria besides grades—so long as none is based strictly on race or ethnic origin.

What is more, virtually every university chancellor or president in the state agrees that the change, called it a “grave mistake” and said the Justice Department will review whether the change violates the terms of any federal grants or contracts that California receives. Funds for research, for example, could be affected.

“It is a major retreat, in terms of a university and a state that has always been on the leading edge of moving forward in terms of education and research and in equal justice,” Panetta said on CBS’s “Face the Nation.” “I think it’s divisive, and I think it’s really going to set that state back.”

Wilson, appearing on ABC’s “This Week With David Brinkley,” dismissed Panetta’s remarks and said a Justice Department review of the admissions changes would not sway him or the regents. “I think these threats are rather pathetic,” Wilson said.

Universities had been closely watching the debate unfold for months, and many higher education leaders said they were greatly dismayed by its outcome.

“The eyes of higher education have been upon California,” said Robert H. Atwell, president of the American Council on Education, which represents more than 1,600 colleges and universities. “Many other campuses are struggling with this issue and were looking to that debate for guidance. Now, we fear that the ill wind blowing out of California could touch down in other places as well.”

Several studies by university officials in California have detailed how the student population could change under the new rules. They conclude that the number of blacks and, in particular, Asians students will rise while the numbers of blacks and Hispanic students will plummet. One UC study predicted that the number of black students at the Berkeley campus—which is now 14 percent black—could decrease by more than 60 percent if race is eliminated altogether as a basis for admission.

For this reason, Regent Ward Connerly, a Wilson appointee who is black and who proposed the change, also asked the university system to develop new criteria to give consideration to students who meet minimum entrance requirements and have overcome such disadvantages as an abusive home or an impoverished neighborhood.

Magrath and others said that move and the fact that most university leaders oppose the change could limit its impact. “They don’t want to, and, in backside, and this gives them a margin not to,” Magrath said. “It may not be the end of the world.”

But hundreds of demonstrators who stormed the regents meeting in San Francisco over the week ends, the outcome of the vote that will not only affect the Berkeley campus around the nation still fear the worst—particularly because this change follows other recent and controversial decisions on race and college admissions, such as the court rulings that overturned the University of Maryland’s race-based Ban- neker Scholarship program.

UC President J.W. Peltason plead ed with the regents not to make the change, calling it a “grave mistake” that could destroy much of the progress the system has made in student diversity and send the wrong message to other campuses.

Today, for example, the UC Berkeley campus is 39 percent Asian, 32 percent white, about 14 percent Hispanic and 6 percent black, with the remainder unidenti fied by race. University officials said it would be impossible to convert to an admissions policy based on academic performance alone because by that measure they personally have far more equally qualified applicants, regardless of race, than they can admit.

“Universities have to be subjective,” Atwell said. “They have no other choice.”
Asia First: A Foreign Policy

By Michael Lind

The United States is approaching the year 2000 with a grand strategy designed for 1950. Although America spends almost as much as the rest of the world on defense, neither party is seriously questioning the continuing need for alliances designed for the cold war.

With the illusion of the “last superpower” long shattered, we have to think about American interests in terms of four other great powers: Japan, China, Russia and Germany. And for the next century, we must concentrate on Asia. It contains most of the world’s population and much of its land, and Japan and China are the only powers with the potential to be formidable rivals.

An “Asia first” foreign policy would entail maintaining an economic and military balance between Japan and China, ending America’s military agreement with Japan, increased cooperation with Russia on Asian affairs, forcing open Japan’s and China’s markets to U.S. goods, and dismantling NATO.

In the very long run, China may be the greatest threat to our interests. A China with only a quarter of America’s per capita income would surpass us as the world’s largest economy and, perhaps, as the preeminent military power. It has already replaced the Soviet Union as the major military supplier for anti-American regimes, and is insisting on great-power hegemony over the South China Sea.

Seeing Japan’s success in exploiting the open U.S. market while placing barriers on foreign investment at home, China is building up a huge bilateral trade surplus. Americans who hope that capitalist development will inspire a democratic and peaceful China will almost certainly be disappointed: after all, it took military defeat and occupation to bring democracy to capitalist Germany and Japan.

History warns us, however, against overestimating China’s potential — and underestimating that of Japan. Japan’s economy is superior to ours in many areas of finance and technology. If it chose to, Japan could become a high-tech military superpower overnight.

Ominously, many Japanese politicians and intellectuals are taking the line that the East Asian model of capitalism — stressing national community and strong government at the expense of individualism — is superior to “decadent” American liberal democracy. “This is a nation of Asian people with Asian blood,” Shintaro Isihara, one of many Japanese politicians arguing for a “re-Asianization” of Japan, has said. Reversing the 18th century slogan “Datsu-ah, nyu-o” (“Leave Asia, enter the West”), many Japanese leaders now recite the trendy slogan “Dasu-ah, nyu-ah” (“Leave the West, enter Asia”).

Those who argue that the U.S. can best restrain Japan by continuing to insure its military security must answer an obvious question: what do we get in return? As the Asian market becomes more important than ours for Japan, our leverage with Tokyo in trade talks will continue to diminish, no matter how many troops we have there. Why should U.S. troops serve indefinitely as the security guards of a latter-day Greater East Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere from which many American products are effectively excluded?

Besides, in the event of American-Chinese conflict, Japan is more likely to act as an opportunistic intermediary than a local ally, if its recent record of undercutting U.S. positions on human rights and arms proliferation in China and North Korea is any indication.

It is too early to tell whether China or Japan will be a greater challenge. The most prudent policy would be for the U.S. to keep its distance from both, weighing in on the side of the weaker whenever one grows overly strong.

In the interim we should remove most of our troops from Japan and replace the U.S.-Japan security relationship with more flexible agreements. Japan should assume responsibility for its own defense, with the two nations cooperating with others on regional security. (U.S. forces should remain in South Korea, however, until peaceful unification.)

Treat Japan as an equal, not a dependent, may also mean pushing for it to be given a permanent seat on the United Nations Security Council and allowing it to develop a nuclear weapons program if it seeks one.

A new realism in our Asian policy would mean rejecting the counsel of those who would continue to appease Japanese mercantilism on the theories that an overvalued yen or a domestic consumer revolt will soon eliminate its trade surplus. Our deficit with Japan is really caused by Japanese subsidiaries in other Asian countries exporting to the U.S. The problem has festered for so long only because many of America’s Asian experts and policymakers are supported by Japanese business interests and U.S. companies with stakes in Asia. (The second largest “soft money” contributor to the Republican party in the first two months of 1995 was the United States Asia Commercial Development Corporation.) The Clinton Administration should follow up its successful tough line in trade talks with China by giving Japan a stark choice between opening its market to the estimated $50 billion in American imports that is lost every year and our setting up equally restrictive barriers. The Administration should also begin negotiations with the European Union to form a trans-Atlantic common market limited to industrial countries that practice liberal capitalism and two-way trade.

Although our foreign policy should focus on Asia, we of course cannot ignore Europe’s great powers, Germany and Russia. Fortunately, neither are strong enough to be world-class threats. Economists predict that by the year 2020, there will be one German pensioner for every German worker. Countries with low birth rates do not engage in conquest, for lack of cannon fodder. The European Union’s inability to set a common policy toward the Balkans, though tragic, should reassure Americans worried about the emergence of a German-dominated supranational state.

The Russian Republic combines a population only slightly larger than Japan’s with a third world economy, an enfeebled Government, an insubordinate military and chaos on its borders. Eventually, no doubt, some regime, more likely authoritarian than democratic, will forge some degree of order and prosperity. A hostile Russia with nuclear weapons would be a threat — but more like a large Iraq than another Nazi Germany.

Yet it is in America’s interest for there to be a moderately strong Russia to act as a military counterweight in Asia to Japan and China. We should continue to support Russia’s territorial integrity and give it economic aid.

We cannot expect Russian cooperation in Asia, however, if we antagonize Russia by extending NATO into Eastern Europe. Thus we should replace NATO with a pan-European security organization that includes Russia and the U.S. The Western Europeans as a group, or the Germans independently, would assume separate responsibility for their own defense, permitting the U.S. to pull out most of its troops and end its implausible nuclear guarantee of Europe.

“The commonest error in politics is sticking to the carcasses of dead policies,” wrote the Marquess of Salisbury, one of Britain’s greatest statesmen, in 1877. “When a mast falls overboard, you do not try to save a rope here and a spar there, in memory of their former utility; you cut away the hamper altogether.” The United States-Japan alliance and NATO have been rendered irrelevant by cold war success. The new slogan in Tokyo ought to be adopted in Washington as well: “Leave the West, enter Asia.”

Michael Lind is a senior editor of Harper’s Magazine.
When to Lift the Iraq Embargo

The United States and Iraq are engaged in a cynical tug-of-war over a United Nations Security Council plan to let Baghdad sell $2 billion worth of oil over the next six months to pay for food, medicine and other necessities. Washington calls the plan humanitarian help for the Iraqi people. Baghdad says it is a violation of Iraq's sovereignty.

In truth, the plan is a political maneuver manipulated by both sides in the larger struggle over economic sanctions imposed on Iraq by the Security Council at the end of the Persian Gulf war. The sanctions include an embargo on oil sales until Baghdad eliminates all efforts to make weapons of mass destruction. The United States wants to maintain the oil embargo even if Iraq meets those conditions. To deflect mounting international criticism that it is being inflexible, Washington proposed sweetening an exception for oil sales for humanitarian purposes. Iraq is resisting the partial easing of the embargo because President Saddam Hussein hopes the Iraqi people will blame the United States, not him, for their hardships.

The embargo should not be lifted now because Iraq has yet to comply fully with the requirements on disarmament and international monitoring. When Baghdad is in compliance, the United States should allow Iraq to sell its oil. Maneuvering over a partial lifting is a disservice to the Iraqi people because it creates the illusion that the Iraqi dictator might use the oil revenue to help them, something he has shown no interest in doing.

The U.N. arms inspector Rolf Ekeus has just reported that Iraq is still concealing evidence of efforts to make biological weapons. There are signs it may also be hiding parts of its nuclear program. The U.N. inspectors cannot account for 17 metric tons of material that could be used to breed germ warfare agents like anthrax. They are not sure whether the material was consumed to grow bacteria or is being hidden. Iraq imported the material between 1988 and 1990, but contends it was distributed to agencies for diagnostic purposes, a contention the inspectors dispute.

Concern about the continuing Iraqi concealment of its nuclear program was recently aroused by the disappearance of one of Iraq's nuclear experts, who reportedly fled to Greece with documents showing that Iraq was still engaged in weapons design and nuclear research. American officials have vouched for the authenticity of some of the documents. The International Atomic Energy Agency is convinced that under its watchful eye Iraq cannot make a warhead, even if it could keep parts of its nuclear program going.

There is no simple way for Saddam Hussein to uphold his sovereignty, end the embargo and actually help his people. He can give the U.N. inspectors access and information they need.

The Rich Get Richer Faster

The gap between rich and poor is vast in the United States — and recent studies show it growing faster here than anywhere else in the West. The trend is likely to become an even more logical force as work spreads around the world. But the United States Government has done little to ameliorate the problem. Indeed, if the Republicans get their way on the budget, the Government will make a troubling trend measurably worse.

Some inequality is necessary if society wants to reward investors for taking risks and individuals for working hard and well. But excessive inequality can break the spirit of those trapped in society's cellar — and exacerbate social tensions.

After years of little change, inequality exploded in America starting in the 1970's. According to Prof. Edward Wolff of New York University, three-quarters of the income gains during the 1980's and 100 percent of the increased wealth went to the top 20 percent of families.

The richest 1 percent of households control about 40 percent of the nation's wealth — twice as much as the figure in Britain, which has the greatest inequality in Western Europe. In Germany, high-wage families earn about 2.5 times as much as low-wage workers; the number has been falling. In America the figure is above 4 times, and rising.

Interpreting these trends requires caution. Inequality rose here in the 1980's in part because the United States created far more jobs — many low-paid — than did Western Europe. Low-paying jobs are better than no jobs. Rising inequality in the United States has also been caused in substantial part by middle-class families that moved up the income ladder, opening a gap with those below them.

About half of Americans move a substantial distance up or down the income ladder over a typical five-year period. In a mobile society, where workers rotate among high- and low-earning jobs, earnings gaps get less frightening because any given job would be less entrapping.

But mobility has offset none of the increased inequality in income. Studies at the Maxwell School of Syracuse University show that mobility in America is not higher than in Germany. Nor does mobility here appear to be higher today than it was in the early 1970's. The best guess about the factor behind burgeoning inequality is technology; the wage gap between high- and low-skilled workers in America doubled during the 1980's. College graduates used to earn about 30 percent more than high school graduates, but now earn 60 percent more. Prof. Sheldon Danziger of the University of Michigan estimates that trends in private pay rates explain about 80 percent of recent increases in inequality; Reagan-Bush tax cuts for the rich and spending cuts for the poor explain much of the other 15 percent.

But even if government is not the main actor, it could be part of the solution. Changes in the Canadian economy during the 1980's also hit hard at low-wage workers. But the government stepped in to keep poverty rates on a downward path. In the United States, poverty rose.

House Republicans are now pushing the Federal budget in the wrong direction. At a time when employers are crying out for well-educated workers, the G.O.P. proposes to cut back money for training and educational assistance. America needs better Head Start, more money for secondary education. It needs to train high school dropouts and welfare mothers. The G.O.P. policy would leave the untrained stranded. That would harm the nation's long-term productivity — and further distort an increasingly tilted economy.
underlined that the pope is a lot healthier than he seemed late last year.

Vatican insiders who were combing the roster of cardinals for potential successors only a few months ago now focus less on papal health than on content: They foresee an intransigent, dogmatically demanding pope as Pope Paul maneuvers his church for the third millennium.

(Begin optional trim)

Revisiting a favorite theme Sunday for his "Urbi et Orbi" message, the pope quoted his recent encyclical on life issues in which he re-affirmed teachings against abortion, euthanasia and artificial birth control.

The spirit of the crucified Christ, whose Resurrection Christians mark at Easter, urges everyone, the pope said, "to work with perseverance and courage so that our time, marked by all too many signs of death, may at last witness the establishment of a new culture of life, the fruit of the culture of truth and of love."

Speaking from the balcony in an embroidered white robe topped by his tall bishop's miter, Pope Paul prayed for "victims of hatred and violence, as in Algeria, in Bosnia-Herzegovina, in Burundi and in southern Sudan."

(End optional trim)

Pope Paul's limp is pronounced, and he carries a short black cane.

The pope, who turns 75 on May 18, broke the femur in his right leg in a bathroom fall at the end of April last year. His recovery from bone-replacement surgery has proved much slower and far less complete than doctors had forecast.

(Optional add end)

In January, the pope carried off an exhausting 10-day trip to the Philippines, Papua New Guinea, Australia and Sri Lanka without a misstep. He came back exhausted, but except for the stubborn limp and the occasional grimace as he walks, he seems to have recovered his strength since.

For the rest of this year, Pope Paul has foreign trips scheduled to the Czech Republic in May, to Belgium in June, to Slovakia in July, to Africa in September and to the United Nations, New York, Newark, N.J., and Baltimore in October.

U.S. Officials View China as Possible Long-Term Threat By Jim Mann= (c) 1995, Los Angeles Times

WASHINGTON When U.S. strategic planners comb through history in search of precedents for the growing economic and military strength in China today, they are coming up with some ominous examples: Germany in the 1880s and Japan in the 1920s.

Their searches for historical comparisons demonstrate an important shift during the past two years in American policy and attitudes toward China.

For the first time in decades, U.S. military and intelligence officials are beginning to cast a wary eye at China as a possible long-term rival, a future threat to American interests in Asia and the Pacific.

Few believe that the two countries will be adversaries within the next 10 or 15 years. But China's fast-developing economy, its steady increases in military expenditures, its purchases of warplanes and submarines from Russia and some of its recent actions in the South China Sea are making U.S. military and intelligence officials begin to think about possibilities for future conflict.

American defense officials insist they do not now consider China a threat. But even the denials underscore the intensity of the debate about China.

"If you treat China as an enemy, China will become an enemy," Assistant Secretary of Defense Joseph Nye Jr. said in a recent interview. "It will become a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Merely talking about containment of China or the possibility of a future Chinese threat represents an extraordinary change in American strategic thinking.

During the 1970s and '80s, the United States saw China as its strategic partner in countering Soviet military power. At times during this period, American officials griped to their Chinese counterparts that they were not spending enough money or devoting enough attention to modernizing the People's Liberation Army, the Chinese military.

And at the beginning of the 1990s, after China had forcibly suppressed democracy demonstrations in Beijing's Tiananmen Square, the conventional wisdom among U.S. strategic planners was that China would be preoccupied for a long time with the job of maintaining internal stability.

Now, American thinking about China has shifted again. The dominant attitudes are of pessimism and wariness. Indeed, some American China specialists who have for years taken a relatively sympathetic view toward the Chinese leadership and military admit that they have become more gloomy.

"I'm worried, I really am," says Paul Godwin, a China specialist at the Defense Department's National War College. "I had assumed that when China's revolutionary elite passed away, the venom of Marxism-Leninism would be removed from China's defense policies.

"But that venom has been replaced by extreme Chinese nationalism. The young guys I meet (from the Chinese military) are extremely nationalistic. The objective is, 'Rich country, strong army.'""

The main thrust of American strategy is to bring China into international organizations now and to make sure that the Chinese leadership agrees to play by the same rules as everyone else so that it will not be necessary to contain a renegade Chinese superpower later on.

That strategy is what helps drive many of the seemingly contradictory components of U.S. policy toward China, which is occasionally tough and more frequently conciliatory.

Over the past two years, the Clinton administration has been seeking to bring China into groups such as the Missile Technology Control Regime and the World Trading Organization; to require China to obey rules on intellectual property rights; and to have China defend itself before the U.N. Commission on Human Rights.

The unease about China's future power and intentions has also prompted the continuing efforts by Defense Secretary William J. Perry to restore military contacts with Beijing and by the State Department to send a phalanx of U.S. officials to China.

"China is now just starting out as a growing power, just as Japan and Germany were growing powers at the beginning of this century," said Harvard University professor Ezra Vogel, who is the U.S. intelligence community's national intelligence officer for East Asia.

"It's the role of all of us to see we have a stable system that tries to encourage China and yet tries to prevent it from going too far."

(Optional add end)

The American unease about China is based on several factors.

The steady increase in China's spending for its armed forces. By official Pentagon estimates, China's official defense budget, adjusted for inflation, has increased by about 40 percent over the past five years during a period when American, Russian and Japanese defense spending have either stayed flat or declined.

The continuing growth of China's economy. Throughout the
allows multimillion-dollar corporations to pay as little as $400 a year. And he has stirred controversy with his proposal to revamp a pension system that allows some Brazilians, particularly federal and state employees, to retire as early as age 45 and collect more in pensions than they earned while working.

---

**Israeli Security Forces Ambush, Kill 3 Palestinians**

By Mary Curtiss

(c) 1995, Los Angeles Times

HEBRON, Israeli-Occupied West Bank: Israeli security forces Sunday ambushed and shot dead three Palestinians, one of whom the army called a key gunman for the militant group Hamas.

The three men later identified as Jihad Ghulmeh, Adel Falah and Tarek Natsheh were sitting in a white Subaru sedan, apparently preparing to mount a terrorist attack, when they were ambushed by a special border patrol unit, an Israeli army spokesman said.

According to the army, there was an exchange of gunfire. But Palestinian witnesses said that the Israelis sprayed the Subaru with machine-gun fire before the Palestinians saw them.

Maj. Gen. Dan Biran, commander of Israeli forces in the West Bank, said that two of the three had been "wanted for a long time."

Israel Television later said that Ghulmeh was believed to have been a leader of Izzidin al-Qassam, the military unit of the Islamic Resistance Movement, or Hamas. He was said to have led a cell that has carried out nine attacks on Israeli settlers and soldiers in the Hebron area in the past two years.

Falah was thought to have participated in some of those attacks. No information was available on Natsheh.

Two rifles, a pistol, ammunition and a leaflet claiming responsibility for the planned attack were found in the car, according to Israel Television.

The army slapped a curfew on Hebron shortly after the shooting, which erupted in a Hamas stronghold south of Hebron, the only town in the West Bank where Jews and Arabs live side by side. About 400 heavily guarded Jews live in the heart of Hebron among about 80,000 Palestinians.

By noon, the West Bank's second-largest city felt like a ghost town, with only a handful of Jewish settlers and soldiers walking the streets. The settlers, dressed in holiday finery, were celebrating the seven-day Jewish holiday of Passover. They welcomed the news that the Palestinians had been killed.

"We have feared this cell for many months, and now we really have feelings of a true holiday," said Zvi Katzover, the mayor of Kiryat Arba, a militant settlement that is home to about 6,000 Jews on the outskirts of Hebron.

But Biran warned that celebrations were premature.

"The work isn't over," Biran told Israel Radio. "There are still many squads at large. We need to restrain ourselves; there's no room for celebrations."

Ghulmeh is alleged to have led the March 19 ambush of a bus near Kiryat Arba in which two Israelis were killed. Israeli authorities also said he is believed to have been involved in a November ambush near Kirya Arba in which a rabbi, Amiram Oliani, was shot dead, and one last July in which a 17-year-old Israeli soldier was shot and killed.

Hamas and a smaller organization, Islamic Jihad, have vowed to try to avert the September 1993 peace accord between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization that granted the Palestinians limited autonomy in Gaza and the West Bank.

Appearing on the ABC News program "This Week With David Brinkley," Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin on Sunday criticized PLO Chairman Yasser Arafat for not taking stronger steps to control terrorism, but he firmly insisted that the violence will not derail the peace process.

"We have one alternative: to work with the partner which is ready for peace, headed by Chairman Arafat," Rabin said. "We have to comply to what we are committed to on the condition that he can cope with terrorism originated from areas under his control. This is simple."

Since Islamic terrorists launched two suicide attacks last Sunday, Arafat has ordered a crackdown on militants in areas controlled by his Palestinian Authority. Palestinian officials say that more than 300 Hamas and Islamic Jihad supporters have been arrested since last Sunday.

Rabin said Sunday that such measures are not enough. "I don't believe that (Arafat) has tried seriously" to control terrorism, he said. "Here and there, there were signs in the last two weeks of some efforts on his part, but fighting this kind of terrorism ... needs determination, readiness to use (his) own armed law enforcement forces, to take measures to bring people to the courts, to put them in jail."

Also appearing on the program, Palestinian negotiator Nabil Shaath conceded that the Palestinian leader did not use "all the police powers very early in the game to enforce his rule."

Shaath said that Arafat's concern was to avoid "the typical story of Third World violations of human rights" but insisted that the Palestinian Authority is now committed to preventing terrorism "in every way we can ... short of a civil war."

---

**Frail but Enduring Pope Offers Easter Greetings**

By William D. Montalbano

(c) 1995, Los Angeles Times

VATICAN CITY It was an old man who shuffled onto the main balcony at St. Peter's Basilica on Sunday to wish the world a happy Easter in 57 languages. It was also a comeback pope.

Climbing his 17th Easter season as leader of 950 million Roman Catholics, Pope John Paul II demonstrated the frailty that is a legacy of age and a broken leg and the stamina that is a hallmark of his life and his reign.

As apparent Sunday was the enduring public attraction of history's most-traveled pope: Tens of thousands of pilgrims braved Rome's coldest, wettest Easter in a quarter of a century to jam St. Peter's Square for Pope Paul's annual Easter speech and blessing, televised in 65 countries.

On the eve of a 75th birthday on which all bishops except he must tender their resignations, Pope Paul is a far cry physically from the outdoorsman elected to the papacy in 1978. But Easter Week ceremonies, including a 70-minute walk around the Colosseum in cold rain Friday night,
1980s, China's economy expanded at rates of more than 9 percent a year, and recently some annual growth rates have been about 12 percent.

China's continuing purchases of advanced military equipment from Russia and other countries. China has just obtained four new Kilo-class submarines from Russia. Over the past five years, the Russians have also said China advanced jet fighters, helicopters, tanks, transport planes, surface-to-air missiles, rocket engines, missile-guidance technology and uranium-enrichment technology.

From Israel, China has purchased tank-armor, missile and jet-fighter technology. And from Iran, Beijing has obtained air-refueling technology that will enable its jet fighters to operate at greater distances from Chinese territory.

China's territorial claims and recent behavior in the South China Sea. China long has claimed sovereignty over huge tracts of ocean and over the Spratly Islands, where five other governments also have claims. In February, Chinese personnel hoisted the Chinese flag and began building structures on a reef near the Philippines, arousing strong protests from President Fidel V. Ramos.

Still, Banning Garrett, an independent specialist on the Chinese military, and many other military analysts caution that it would be a mistake to exaggerate China's current capabilities or to think of it as a current threat to the United States.

For example, while China's overall economic growth has been rapid, its population is so huge that per capita income remains very low and it will face huge problems in feeding its people, who will number more than 1.5 billion by the year 2025.

The sharp increases in the defense budget over the past five years follow a decade in which China's military spending was held at relatively low levels. Likewise, experts say, the recent purchases of advanced weaponry come against a backdrop of years in which the Chinese armed forces operated with very low levels of technology.

"Right now, China can't even establish air superiority over China itself," says one U.S. government specialist on the Chinese military. "India has a better air force than China."

For now, China also remains weak in the sort of high technology the United States used in the Persian Gulf war.

"Beijing leaders are well aware that Chinese forces continue to have much more in common with those of (Iraqi President) Saddam Hussein than with the West," Robert Sutter, a Library of Congress China specialist, wrote last year.

Prison Compresses Horror of Existence in Rwanda By John Balzar (c) 1995, Los Angeles Times

GITARAMA, Rwanda. There is no space remaining in hell today. The doomed already fill it. They live, sleep, eat, rot and die squeezed together nearly four men per square yard in the roofless brick box that is Gitarama Prison.

Built to confine 400 on a ridge among the banana and potato communes of central Rwanda, the prison yard is now engorged with 6,793. There is no room to lie and sleep, no space to sit. So the prisoners stand as if one organism under the sun, under the rain, choking on the smoke of cooking fires, amid dysentery and despair.

Eight or 10 die each day of suffocation or from falling into the cooking fires or of disease; but they are replaced by others marched at gunpoint through the squeaky iron gate.

Not one of these prisoners has yet been convicted of a crime.

The horror of Gitarama Prison was begot by an even worse horror. Inside are ethnic Hutus, mostly young men, accused of last year's systematic slaughter of Tutsis—a genocide that left up to 1 million dead in this tiny country.

Like so much in Rwanda, the hell of Gitarama evokes conflicting emotions.

"You ask how I look at it as a humanitarian. It's very complicated. It comes at you at different levels," said Alison Davis, an Australian physician with Doctors Without Borders, who cares for the prison's sick.

"There is the inhuman way they are being treated like animals. No one should allow humans to live like this.

"The paradox is that these people I'm treating, many of them, are murderers. They have been inhumane themselves."

"I haven't been able to come to grips with that."

Neither has Rwanda, and neither has the world, which has been asked to help rebuild the Central African country.

One year ago this weekend, Rwanda was awash with blood and stricken with terror. The butcherery had reached full pitch as majority Hutus labored to purge Rwanda of minority Tutsis and of Hutus sympathetic to Tutsis.

"The number of people killed in the short period of time with hand-bala weapons has never been seen before," said Jose Ayala-Laso of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights.

At the time, the outside world mostly stood by, and the rampage continued until a small army of Tutsi rebels retook Rwanda inch by inch and established the struggling government now in place.

Today, about 35,000 Hutus accused of genocide are jailed in Gitarama and hundreds of smaller prisons. Government officials say 100,000 more are guilty.

At the same time, there is no hope that the prisoners will soon know their fate. While Rwanda's first genocide trial opened earlier this month, it was abruptly halted for lack of evidence and witnesses. Hutus, meanwhile, live in growing fear that the innocents are being swept up with the guilty and that freeze-lance revenge killings cannot be contained.

This is the awful Gordian knot that threatens to strangle hope in Rwanda. Perhaps surprisingly, the government of Rwanda is not hiding its miserable prisons. Rather, it opens them to world view.

It allows 115 U.N. human rights monitors to roam the cities and communes. It gives foreign journalists unexpected freedom. U.N. security forces have been permitted to return, even though they retreated during the Tutsi slaughter.

"No victorious army in history has allowed this kind of scrutiny," one U.N. worker said.

And why? Because Rwanda is in desperate need of help, particularly help bolstering its judicial system. If the world can comprehend Rwanda's plight, surely it will lend a hand, Rwandans reason.

(Original end add)

But the problem is that outside scrutiny results more swiftly in criticism than in assistance.

Photographs and reports on prison conditions have drawn worldwide rebuke. And an international aid package of $611 million remains largely a promise.

The U.N. World Food Council transports thousands of tons of supplies through Rwanda to feed and care for more than 1 million Hutu refugees living in neighboring Zaire among them thousands of accused murderers. When the Rwandan government halted the shipments earlier this month to draw attention to its own needs, the U.N. agency called the move "an outrage."

"We are in a situation where we feel like beggars," says Christine Umunorizi, Rwanda's deputy minister of rehabilitation.

"We think you should help us and then ask for results. But instead you ask for results for nothing. You think we should be angels. We're not angels. We're only trying."
Guatemalan Leader De Leon Sides With His Military Over U.S.

**Central America:** A president dependent on his army appears headed for conflict with Washington over slayings.

By EDWARD ORLEBAR

GUATEMALA CITY—Rallying to the defense of an army accused of political murder and ties to the CIA, the Guatemalan government appears to be on a collision course with the United States.

President Raituro de Leon Carpio, a former human rights ombudsman who until recently enjoyed enthusiastic U.S. support, is resisting calls from Washington to act against a former human rights ombudsman who enjoyed impressive popularity and a leftist guerrilla married to an American.

The revelations and allegations have forced an international re-examination of the well-known but little-discussed role of the CIA in Guatemala, where the longest guerrilla war in Central America and the tactics of a brutal military have claimed tens of thousands of lives.

And the increased scrutiny appears to have deepened divisions within the army over how to deal with its long history of corruption—and intensified a growing climate of instability in a country with scant democratic tradition.

Rising a costly showdown with Washington, De Leon has closed ranks with the Guatemalan army over accusations that Col. Julio Roberto Alpirez, a paid informant of the CIA, was involved in the 1990 killing of innkeeper Michael DeVine, a U.S. citizen, and the death of Efrain Bamaca Velazquez, a leftist guerrilla who was allegedly captured alive by the army in March, 1992.

De Leon has suggested that Alpirez sue Rep. Robert G. Torricelli (D-N.J.), who first publicly voiced accusations that the colonel ordered the killings while in the pay of the CIA.

De Leon's stance flies in the face of the U.S. government's position, which concurs with press revelations that Alpirez was involved in DeVine's killing while the colonel headed a jungle base close to the innkeeper's home.

"We need credible, thorough investigation on these cases," embassy spokesman John Roney said. "Now, more than ever, the Guatemalan government has to show concrete movement."

But prospects are slim that the reform-minded wing of the army—headed by the defense minister and the president's chief of military staff—will serve up the heads of innkeeper Michael DeVine, a U.S. citizen, and a leftist guerrilla married to an American.

The scandal of the last few weeks has obscured a little-discussed role of the CIA in Guatemala, where its long history of corruption—and intensified a growing climate of instability in a country with scant democratic tradition.

Although De Leon this month offered to examine information from U.S. officials in an effort to air charges of atrocities, few analysts here expect a real probe.

Only one Guatemalan officer has ever been convicted in a human rights-related killing. Capt. Hugo Contreras, who was given a 20-year term for his role in the DeVine murder, escaped from military custody in May, 1993, on the day his sentence was announced.

"The army's concern has been to avoid a chain reaction—to never clarify human rights cases, because one case will lead to another," said Gabriel Aguilar, a political scientist who has studied the military.

U.S. Embassy officials have expressed concern about the president's uncompromising tone, which underlies his apparent inability to persuade an army suspected of thousands of human rights violations to deliver one colonel.

"Everybody has doubts about the government's position, which concurs with press allegations that Alpirez was involved in the 1990 killing of innkeeper Michael DeVine, a U.S. citizen, and the death of Efrain Bamaca Velazquez, a leftist guerrilla who was allegedly captured alive by the army in March, 1992.

De Leon has suggested that Alpirez sue Rep. Robert G. Torricelli (D-N.J.), who first publicly voiced accusations that the colonel ordered the killings while in the pay of the CIA.

De Leon's stance flies in the face of the U.S. government's position, which concurs with press revelations that Alpirez was involved in DeVine's killing while the colonel headed a jungle base close to the innkeeper's home.

"The embassy identified Alpirez early on as having knowledge of the murder after the fact," said a U.S. Embassy spokesman here. "He was suspected of participating in a cover-up along with other senior military officers."