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Last week was the week in which the United States fought a war with Serbia and lost. As of this dejected hour, there are almost half a million refugees around Kosovo's borders, and the magnitude of the slaughter inside Kosovo is unknown, though it is cert ainly what Senator Nickles would have to call "a very significant massacre"; but NATO is delighted to announce that it has destroyed a second bridge in Novi Sad, and that two significant buildings in Belgrade are in flames. No, wait, the clouds have clear ed. An appliance factory in Cacak is also a ruin.

The war aims of the Western alliance continue to be formulated in a language that remains bizarrely unaffected by the agony on the ground. These words that officially defy reality are designed to discourage any discussion of American ground troops, who might get hurt. And so at the Pentagon they speak only of "punishing" and "degrading" Serbia and its army. On March 31, President Clinton articulated "our stated objective" in this way: "To raise the price of aggression to an unacceptably high level so that we can get back to talking peace and security, or to substantially undermine the capacity of the Serbian government to wage war." But the Serbs are not waging a war, exactly. They are expelling people and exterminating people. The only way to punish and to degrade a savage in a ski mask who breaks down the doors of houses in the night and orders the women and the children to leave and shoots the men dead is to capture him or to kill him. Yet the president seeks not to stop aggression; he seeks to raise i ts price. Hasn't he heard that the Field of Blackbirds is priceless? Somebody should brief the president about unreason. For his own fondest aim for Operation Allied Force is to "get back" to "talking." What a distraction from dialogue evil is!

In Bosnia, a genocide took place in the face of American inaction. In Kosovo, a genocide is taking place in the face of American action. Truly, our capacity for horror is being taxed. NATO's war against Slobodan Milosevic and Slobodan Milosevic's war against Kosovo are being fought alongside each other, in a sickening disconnection. NATO is promising that its war against Milosevic will continue because its "credibility" is at stake; but credibility for NATO is not mercy for Kosovo. If Milosevic finally has his way with Kosovo and NATO finally has its way with Milosevic, then NATO will be credible, except morally. Operation Allied Force originated in a moral impulse, in an impatience with an injustice, and for this it deserves to be supported, or else the United States is just another great power; but it is no wonder that NATO's campaign is increasingly defined more in the terms of realism and less in the terms of idealism, because the struggle against ethnic cleansing has been thwarted.
in the Balkans for the second time in the annals of the Clinton administration. The work of idealism, once again, has been reduced to relief and rescue, to the aftermath of catastrophe. Where we should have rushed bullets we are now rushing blankets.

We have been witnessing a good fight badly fought. The means have not been commensurate with the ends. Operation Allied Force is Operation Insufficient Allied Force; and the crippling of Serbia from the skies will not alter this. How did this happen? A few early observations are possible.

The Velocity of Evil. In Washington it is said that the fault with Operation Allied Force was not its purpose but its "implementation." This is true, but it is too simple. For the implementation is a reflection of the extent to which the purpose was improperly comprehended. The failure in the planning of this operation was owed in part to a poor understanding of genocide as a military problem. The pre-empting of genocide, or the ending of it, has certain peculiarities as a military objective. The use of force against it cannot be satisfied with punishment, because punishment is always tardy. It is right to deny the aggressors the fruits of what they have done; but they have done what they have done. Punishment is just a way of restoring morality to tragedy. Also, it makes no sense to speak of escalation in a war against genocide. Such a war is not a war of attrition, if its aim is to prevent the death and the disappearance of a people. A war against genocide must be fought with a fury, because a fury is what it is fighting.

For the purpose of stopping genocide, the use of force is not a last resort; it is a first resort. The alacrity of the response matters as much as the intensity of the response. In Washington it is said that ground troops must not be "hastily deployed," but a hasty deployment is the only kind of deployment that is appropriate, because the crime, too, is hasty. The president is pleading that we "stay the course," and NATO is promising weeks and weeks of bombing. But Kosovo will soon be still. Less than half the Kosovar population is left in Kosovo. In Belgrade, the stillness of Kosovo will mean victory.

American culture and American politics are drenched in the memory of Auschwitz, but some of the fundamental features of ethnic cleansing, its swiftness and its single-mindedness, appear to have escaped American planners. They have not yet learned to think operationally about the resistance to genocide. Instead they consult and they calibrate. And they boast about the cohesion of the alliance. The good news is that Brussels is holding. The bad news is that Pristina is not.

In and Out. The infirmity of will that has characterized Operation Allied Force is best captured in the concept that has become the centerpiece of all discussion of the use of American force. I refer to the circumscription of American action known as "exit strategy." This dogmatic deadline is really a political concept, not a strategic concept; it allows politicians and planners to beautify their pandering to the polls with the high discourse of strategy. Essentially, "exit strategy" exchanges the maneuverability of soldiers for the maneuverability of politicians. It is a concept borrowed from the world of commerce, which is not a world of sacrifices for principle. A smart investor knows when to get out; so, too, a smart interventionist.

"Exit strategy" became canonical in 1993, in the wake of the clash in
Somalia in which 18 American soldiers were killed. President Clinton's response to the incident was not to suggest that the soldiers in Mogadishu had not died in vain, since hundreds of thousands of Somalis were saved from starvation by the American deployment. "Americans are basically isolationist," he explained to George Stephanopoulos. "They understand at a basic gut level Henry Kissinger's vital-interest argument. Right now the average American doesn't see our national interest threatened to the point where we should sacrifice one American life." Since it is an axiom of Clintonism that the president and the average American must at all times be the same, the president brusquely announced on October 7, 1993, that American troops would withdraw from Somalia on March 31, 1994. (Then he remarked that "I hope I didn't panic and announce the pullout too soon.") In 1996, Anthony Lake, his tortured and timid national security adviser, went so far as to codify an "exit strategy doctrine": "Before we send our troops into a foreign country, we should know how and when we're going to get them out." Lake was making omniscience into a condition of the use of American force.

The doctrine of "exit strategy" fundamentally misunderstands the nature of war and, more generally, the nature of historical action. In the name of caution, it denies the contingency of human affairs. For the knowledge of the end is not given to us at the beginning. We cannot completely predict or completely determine the outcome of our best endeavors, though our ignorance of their outcome does not make them less necessary or less just. No great deed, private or public, has ever been undertaken in a bliss of certainty. "Exit strategy" is for American strategy what "closure" is for American psychology: a spurious guarantee that Americans will not have to tolerate a condition of inconclusiveness for very long.

In war, certainly, an adherence to dogma is not strategic wisdom. "The only concept that more or less corresponds to the factors that distinguish real war from war on paper," Clausewitz famously wrote, is the concept of "friction." Among these "effects that cannot be measured, because they are largely due to chance," he added, is "the weather. Fog can prevent the enemy from being seen in time...." It follows that a good commander is a flexible commander: the sort of commander who would send Apache helicopters where F-117s cannot go, because the cause is too precious to surrender to the clouds; the sort of commander who would wisely order a mission to creep.

America's commitment to NATO would itself have failed the test of "exit strategy." It has been 50 splendid, exitless years. So, too, would other American deployments that have been essential to the protection of our values and our interests: the three American divisions in South Korea, for example. For "exit strategy" is more than a scruple about prudence in the use of force. (Who is for the imprudent use of force?) It is a scruple about the use of force itself. It is an inhibition, an intimidation. It rigs the discussion about military power in a way that makes any ambitious projection of it unlikely. The antithesis of "exit strategy" is courage.

Saving General Powell. As a consequence of the disappointment of Operation Allied Force, the Powell Doctrine is enjoying a revival. "This only affirms the Powell Doctrine," commented Senator McCain. "This is more reminiscent of the gradual escalation and bombing pauses that characterized the Vietnam War." No greater malediction can be hurled at a military operation. (But McCain was speaking critically of the Powell Doctrine; he called for ground troops.) And in an unexpected outburst of Powellism, Philip Gourevitch in The New Yorker fretted about "a new
military bog." He did not call for the introduction of ground troops; he called for the government to "declare its intent." Gourevitch writes as if he hates Clinton's hypocrisy more than Milosevic's cruelty. But we are fighting the West's own butcher; and it is owing precisely to such platitudes that the administration is restraining itself from doing all that needs to be done to stop him. (A new military bog in Rwanda would have been a godsend.)

Powell himself has been happy to express a feeling of vindication: "The challenge of just using air power is that you leave it in the hands of your adversary to decide when he's been punished enough.... So the initiative will remain with President Milosevic." The implication of Powell's remark is that he himself would have visited ground troops upon the Serbian rampage, so as to cut it off and kill it. The notion is grotesque. It was Powell who refused to consider the deployment of American soldiers in Bosnia during the long years of its excruciation. The Powell Doctrine (which also worships exit strategies) was significantly responsible for the military and political climate that has resulted in a half-measure such as Operation Allied Force. It was not formulated to encourage the use of American ground troops as an instrument of foreign policy. Quite the contrary. It promulgated a set of conditions for the use of American ground troops that will almost never be met. Powell is prepared to fight a war, but not a war that will ever be fought. In this way, the general can appear as a man of war and a man of peace. This trick accounts for his absurd popularity.

Powell's criticism of Operation Allied Force is that the war in the Balkans is not being waged like the war in the Gulf. For Powell, the Gulf war is the paradigm of war. It was, after all, a glorious victory. Of course, it was also a war fought with overwhelming force and complete dominance of the air in a featureless landscape where it almost never rains. Strategically speaking, Operation Desert Storm was freakishly easy. It was a victory, moreover, but it was not a glorious victory. America owed its success in the desert not least to the definition of success that Powell propounded. This definition excluded from the war the most difficult and the most urgent objective of all, the removal of Saddam Hussein from power.

It was said at the time that this objective would have fractured the international consensus in support of the war, which mandated only the liberation of Kuwait. But this was not the only American anxiety about the inclusion of the political objective among our war aims. There was another American anxiety, and it was that the political objective could not have been accomplished without a ground assault on Baghdad. This would have been dangerous. American soldiers would have been wounded and killed. And so American soldiers left the real trouble where they found it and came home.

If Saddam Hussein ever again makes use of his obscene arsenal, Colin Powell will have a lot to answer for. But there the general stood in his sanctity at the Academy Awards, wrapping himself in World War II and thrilling the young flesh. "Every generation has the potential for greatness," he preached. "Had those men and women failed in that test of their greatness, we would live far different lives today." Then they rolled the clip of Steven Spielberg's recreation of the least Powell-like military operation ever launched. You would not have known that it is Powell who has been instructing this generation of men and women to fail in their own test of greatness. Hitler is not the only test.
In the current crisis, the Clinton administration's euphemism for Powellism is "permissive environment." At the White House they are hoarse from protesting that they will introduce ground troops only into such an environment. They are not offering a definition of "permissiveness," but it is hard to imagine a circumstance of conflict in Kosovo that would fall within such a definition. There are trees in the Balkans, and mountains, and the devil's weather. Perhaps "permissiveness" means only peacekeeping, in which case the United States will dispatch its troops after they were desperately needed. Maybe American troops can police a partition, when it will be in the interests of Milosevic to keep them out of harm's way. They can give the remains of Kosovo, and the remains of NATO, and the remains of American interventionism, a decent burial.

Character Is (Other People's) Fate. Everything that Clinton does is so tiresomely Clintonian. This war is no exception. Its limitations and its inconsistencies are his limitations and his inconsistencies. He believes in the dissociation of actions from consequences. He does not like entailments. Impunity is his ideal. It is no wonder that such a man would kindle to the cruise missile, and more generally to the moral convenience of the technology of precision guidance. It allows the president to believe that America can fight a war and win a war without losing an American life. In all our sorties over Iraq there has been not a single American casualty. Never mind that the air war has left the regime in Baghdad and its instruments of mass destruction intact. The important thing is that there were American actions without American consequences. War without death: an apotheosis of Clintonism.

On March 23, the day before the bombing of Serbia (and the emptying of Kosovo) began, the president treated the members of afsce to a tutorial on America's actions in the Balkans. This was the speech in which he cheerfully confided, on the eve of a war, that "if the American people don't know anything about me--else--they know that I don't like to use military force." But this was not the most egregious of his reflections. He proceeded to pose as the savior of Bosnia. "I know what happened in Bosnia. The United States and our allies, along with courageous people in Bosnia and in Croatia who refused to be subdued and fought back, found the unity and the will to stand up against the aggression, and we helped to end the war."

Clinton's heroic account of his Bosnia policy is outrageous. It is true that he found the unity and the will, but only after years of averting his gaze from those same courageous people. The torments of Sarajevo, Prijedor, Banja Luka, Gorazde, and Srebrenica were an indirect consequence of this man's shallowness, of his politicized view of life. The polls told him to let the cleansing be. At afsce, however, Clinton had the temerity to compare himself to Churchill. "I want to talk to you about Kosovo today, but just remember this: It's about our values. What if someone had listened to Winston Churchill and stood up to Adolf Hitler earlier? How many peoples' lives might have been saved, and how many American lives might have been saved?" This, from the least Churchillian figure of our time. Surely the important point about the Americans who were killed in World War II is not that their lives might have been saved. (When Hitler came to power in Germany, war became inevitable. It was his reason for being. There are villains with whom there can be no getting back to talking peace and security.) Surely the important point is that their lives were not lost for nothing.
Unfortunately, this is not a point that this president can make. Operation Allied Force asks many things of the American people, and one of the most difficult things it asks of them is to be led into this war by this man. So let us be clear. At this miserable moment, it is a mark of moral and historical seriousness to support this morally and historically unserious man. Clinton's decision to attack Milosevic—or, in the shabby words of Newsweek, his "fail[ure] to offer Milosevic a face-saving compromise"—was the right decision. He is not admirable, but he is right. I am not sure if he understands why. His prosecution of the war will tell.

After Such Knowingness, What Forgiveness? It is springtime for realism. Idealism died with the cold war, didn't it? But apparently it didn't. The United States certainly has an interest in the stability of Europe and the authority of NATO, but the truth is that Operation Allied Force is an idealist's war. This maddens the realists, who thought that they were rid of such costly moistness. Republicans who swelled with pride during Reagan's war in Grenada and Bush's war in Panama are cool toward Clinton's war in Yugoslavia. This is what isolationism means, in Washington: my party's opposition to your party's intervention. Some conservatives are redescribing the cold war as nothing more than a great-power rivalry. Michael Mandelbaum's heartless old crack that foreign policy is not social work is being fanned back into life.

Thomas L. Friedman is one of the tough guys. He knows how the world really works. He first proved his toughness in 1995. "I don't give two cents about Bosnia," he wrote. "Not two cents." Four years later, he writes: "The question we are wrestling with in Kosovo today is this: How should Americans react when bad things happen in unimportant places?" Friedman still does not grasp that a place in which innocent men, women, and children are being expelled and exterminated is an important place. It is a place that asks about the philosophy by which we claim to live. For this reason, Pristina is a more important place than Davos.

I don't mean to be unfair. Friedman is not altogether unmoved: "I'm glad we're punishing the Serbs now for their ethnic cleansing. It's barbaric." Good. Also, "give war a chance." Also good. But now what? "I want NATO to stop what was bad and get out." So does NATO. But how? Not with ground troops, certainly. "While NATO steps up the air war, it also needs to step up its diplomacy." Friedman wants us to negotiate with Milosevic! He wants "a modified Rambouillet deal that would give the Kosovars internationally protected autonomy in a Kosovo still under Serb sovereignty, or a partition of Kosovo." But Kosovo will shortly cease to exist, except as a ghost. I also wonder whether Friedman would be willing, in the same spirit of realism about what a strong state will permit for a stateless minority in its dominion, to consider a modified Oslo deal that would give the Palestinians internationally protected autonomy in a Palestine still under Israeli sovereignty.

Fareed Zakaria is another one of the tough guys. He, too, is disabused of the sentimental illusion that the foreign policy of the United States must be animated by ideals. Not long ago he observed acerbically that "today it is the idealists who urge intervention—in Haiti, Somalia, Rwanda, Bosnia—while strategists, like Henry Kissinger, urge selectivity, caution, moderation." Idealists cannot be strategists. They are too simple for strategy. "In fact the new interventionists urge American involvement in precisely those areas where Washington has few national interests—this ensures that its motives are pure." Purity is what idealists want. But Zakaria knows that this is an impure world.
He knows, for example, that Slobodan Milosevic "is no Adolf Hitler. He is not even Saddam Hussein." I do not recall Zakaria getting too exercised about Saddam Hussein; but then Saddam Hussein is also no Adolf Hitler. Anyway, it is the responsibility of the realist never to get too exercised: surtout pas de zele and all that. And so Zakaria writes with condescension about Operation Allied Force: "[The administration's] goal--to stop the atrocities in Kosovo--is a noble effort but a naive one." But Zakaria is not naive. He recognizes that the crisis in Kosovo pales before the crisis in the global financial system. And he recognizes that NATO has "only two choices": to "wage war" or to "negotiate peace." If it wages war, however, "Kosovo will have to be armed and protected by NATO, probably in perpetuity." No exit there.

So Zakaria prefers that we negotiate peace. Since he is not worried about purity, he proposes that "someone could take a message to Milosevic that NATO would be willing to restart negotiations. (The pope's intermediary might be just the person to use.)" Zakaria's own plan for the appeasement of Milosevic is "a slice of Kosovo, to be made autonomous or quasi-independent." And then he, too, takes cover behind Winston Churchill. "As Winston Churchill--hardly shy about using military force--once said, there are certain circumstances in which 'jaw, jaw is better than war, war.'" Jaw, jaw: There speaks the gentleman from the Council on Foreign Relations. This is not realism. This is complacency. But it is not the historical task of the United States to make the world safe for brandy and cigars.

(Copyright 1999, The New Republic)
This is a picture of ethnic cleansing in progress (to see the Glodane village map on the web, go to this NATO site). The red-circled objects are Serbian armored vehicles, surrounding the Kosovo Albanian village of Glodane. The elongated gray smudge in the lower-right area of the shot is a crowd of people—population of the village, ousted from their homes and herded into a field by Serbian troops. You can also make out a flow of civilian vehicles, presumably full of deportees, proceeding from the field south on the road to Albania. It's breathtaking to contemplate these images, probably taken by an American U-2 spy plane over Kosovo at the height of the Serbian rampage through the province. It's even more chilling to realize that NATO is in possession of additional pictures, taken shortly after this one, which show the field completely empty and Glodane in flames. (Those photos have only been described to journalists, not released to the public, apparently to prevent the Serbs from making deductions about U-2 flight patterns.)

At last, "national technical means," the intelligence community's euphemistic name for its vast array of sophisticated spy planes, satellites, and remote listening devices, may be coming into its own as a tool for investigating and, eventually, punishing war crimes and other massive violations of human rights around the world. During the cold war, these supersecret eyes and ears in the sky were devoted mainly to monitoring military movements in the Soviet Union, especially possible violations of arms control agreements. But in the post-cold-war world the very same technology that enabled, say, a KH-11 spy satellite to spot a Soviet bomb as small as a soccer ball can be used to find and photograph a pile of massacred bodies. New Predator pilotless aircraft can actually produce videotape of ongoing military activity—including, presumably, assaults on civilians.

Four years ago, the United States released a few aerial photographs of mass graves near the massacre site in Srebrenica, where Bosnian Serb forces under General Ratko Mladic killed thousands of Muslim men in July 1995. But that was done on an ad hoc basis. Kosovo represents the first time President Clinton has formally "tasked" the intelligence community to use national technical means to document war crimes, according to a story by Vernon Loeb in the April 6 Washington Post.
Close call in Missouri battle over right to conceal weapons

By Steve Marshall
USA TODAY

A Missouri proposal that drew national partisan on both sides of the gun issue was fought down to the wire late Tuesday.

The referendum, the first time a state has allowed voters to decide the question of legalizing concealed weapons, brought out heavy sluggers on both sides, turning a state vote into a national battleground.

Proposition B would have allowed qualified residents to carry concealed weapons, a practice banned since the days of Jesse James.

With 46% of precincts reporting, the vote was a 50-50 split.

The National Rifle Association, which needed a victory to counteract recent adverse anti-gun publicity, provided more than $3.7 million, about 85% of the money backing the measure. Leading the charge was the NRA's Charlton Heston.

The opponents of the measure had one-fourth of the NRA's bankroll, but had help from big names, including Hillary Rodham Clinton, whose recorded voice was fed tele-marketing-style to women. Clinton said the measure is "just too dangerous for Missouri families."

Other backers included Sen. John Ashcroft, R-Mo., who did broadcast ads in favor of Proposition B, Anheuser-Busch and some police groups.

Republican John Danforth, who Ashcroft succeeded in the Senate, co-chairs an opposition group, the Safe Schools and Workplaces Committee. One officer in favor of the measure, Springfield police Capt. John Marcum, said, "It boils down to a basic right of self-defense. Why should you lose the right to defend yourself when you leave your home?"

The concealed weapons ban dates to the days of gunfighter Jesse James, a native of Kearney killed by a member of his own gang. In a crackdown on desperadoes, Missouri banned concealed weapons in 1875, seven years before his death.

The referendum resulted from failed annual attempts by lawmakers to pass a concealed-weapons law against Gov. Mel Carnahan's threatened veto.

Thirty-one states allow carrying concealed weapons, but legislators passed those laws.

The state auditor estimated that 80,000 Missouri citizens would apply for the concealed weapons carry permit if Prop B passed.

The requirements for applicants included at least 12 hours of state-approved firearms training.
Clinton pushes for anti-hate legislation
President: Prevent crimes against gays

By Mimi Hall
USA TODAY

WASHINGTON — President Clinton called on Congress Tuesday to pass an expanded version of hate-crimes legislation to include crimes based on sexual orientation.

Evoking the killings of two gay men on U.S. soil and the ethnic cleansing in Kosovo, Clinton said, "America will not be able to be a force for good abroad unless we are good at home."

Last year, Congress held hearings but did not vote on a bill that raised criminal penalties for crimes based on hatred of a person because of race, color, religion or national origin. The proposed Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 1999 also would include crimes based on a person's sex, sexual orientation or disability.

If it passes this year — and sponsors believe it has a better chance in the wake of recent killings of gay men in Wyoming and Alabama — the bill would make federal prosecution of hate crimes easier.

In the Senate, Judiciary Committee Chairman Orrin Hatch, R-Utah, plans a hearing this month on the new bill, which is being co-sponsored by 30 Democrats and four Republicans. Last year, he questioned whether a federal law was necessary since the crimes are covered by state law.

But last month, Hatch said, "I have become increasingly shocked and appalled by the level of viciousness associated with a type of criminal activity that is bigoted, ugly and downright un-American — hate crimes."

Advocates say a federal law would allow the Justice Department to go after people who commit hate crimes in more than one state and allow federal authorities to investigate crimes not solved by the states.

Current federal law covers hate crimes only when victims were engaged in certain federally protected activities, such as attending public school or serving on a jury. "We're not talking about everybody agreeing with everybody else on every political issue," Clinton said. "We're talking about whether people have a right, if they show up and work hard and obey the law and are good citizens, to pursue their lives and dignity without fear of being abused."

Clinton's comments came a day after one of the two men charged with last fall's murder of Wyoming college student Matthew Shepard pleaded guilty. Russell Henderson was sentenced to two consecutive life terms.

Shepard's death, and the beating death earlier this year of Billy Jack Gaither in Alabama, made national headlines. Two men have been charged with killing Gaither and burning his body on a tire pile.

The president also:
• Ordered the departments of Education and Justice to publish data on hate crimes at colleges and to in-
clude hate crimes in an annual report on public school safety.
• Announced a government-business project to teach middle-school students about tolerance.
• Sponsored bills that will include HRT Corp. and Court TV.
• Lobbying for and against the expanded legislation intensified after Clinton's announcement.

"The president has always understood the importance of sending the message that a hate crime committed against one American is a crime against all Americans," said Winnie Stachelberg of the Human Rights Campaign, a gay rights advocacy group.

But Robert Knight of the conservative Family Research Council criticized the law as unnecessary and said Americans should resist Clinton's "attempt to use the federal government as a giant scold, re-educating America's children away from traditional morality under the guise of tolerance."

Hate crime laws are on the books in 42 states, but only 21 cover crimes based on sexual orientation.
The Visit
A Child's Treat,
A Parent's Reward

Sareena Bain, all of 4 years old and dressed in a turquoise jumper, was waiting by the slam gate entrance to the Bexar County Detention Center, the San Antonio jail, for a new treat, a Saturday contact visit with her father, Bobby Bain, a convicted burglar.

A guard gently ordered Sareena to take off her shoes so they could be searched for drugs, then passed her through a metal detector. Nearby, civilian volunteers took the diapers of a group of babies to check for contraband, replacing them with fresh, jail-issued diapers.

Inspection finished, the children were ushered into a special visitors room, the walls painted jungle green and emblazoned with a mural from "The Lion King." Sareena scanned the large, unfamiliar men in orange jumpsuits in the room and then let out a whoop. "Daddy," she said, and jumped into Mr. Bain's arms.

Mr. Bain and the other men who opened special visitors rooms gained the right to a one-hour visit with their children by volunteering for an innovative program, PAPAS and their Children, in which 70 of the 3,200 inmates in the San Antonio jail live in the same pod and attend an hour of parenting classes five days a week.

Other inmates can talk to their visitors only by telephone through a glass wall.

The San Antonio program, and an equivalent one for mothers in the jail, are the best of their kind in the country, said Anna Laszlo, a criminologist in Washington who conducted a nationwide survey of programs for children of incarcerated parents for the Department of Health and Human Services.

In the visitors room, Derrick Hunt, a bear of a man convicted of drug possession, was bottle-feeding his month-old son, DiAnthony, in his arms. Unfortunately, the baby had picked this moment to take a nap. But Mr. Hunt was able to quiz his 5-year-old son, Derrick Jr., on his ABC's.

"I never really had a relationship with my children until I came to jail and took the classes," Mr. Hunt said, "but I've learned how to control my anger and how to put my kids in timeout rather than shout at them."

In the visitors room of the women's section of the jail, Mary Anne Garza was lying on the gray carpet with her three children tight around her: Edward, 7, Anna, 4, and Briana, 9 months. Tears rolled down her cheeks. Ms. Garza's brother is in prison for murder, her husband is in jail and she had now been convicted of auto theft.

Anna could not stop hugging her mother. "She wants to come to Jail with me," Ms. Garza said. "She is so worried about what is happening to me, and she is scared of the police and the guards."

Not long before, there was an automobile accident near her mother's house, where the children are staying. When the police came, Anna said: "Don't go outside. The police will take you away and there won't be any more moms."

Ms. Perez, the social worker who created the San Antonio, program for the sheriff's department said, "From a management point of view, it has been a success because it has been so popular it has changed jail culture."

The inmates who take part in it have never tried to smuggle in drugs, they openly express their emotions and there are no racial cliques or fights in the pods where they live.

"They are just parents, not brown, black or white," Ms. Perez said.

The inmates may actually be better parents in jail than before they were locked up, Ms. Perez said.

"Most of them are addicted," she said, "and when they are out there, the drug is the No.1 thing to them. But once in here, they have to be clean, they are able to think clearly and they learn now important parents are to their children."
Citing "Primitive" Hatreds, Clinton Asks Congress to Expand Hate-Crime Law

By KATHARINE Q. SEELYE

WASHINGTON, April 6 — Citing the dangers of "primitive" hatreds from Kosovo to the Old South, President Clinton today urged Congress to expand the definition of Federal hate crimes to include incidents based on a person's sexual orientation, sex or disability. The current law covers crimes based on race, color, religion or national origin.

"America will not be able to be a force for good abroad unless we are good at home," Mr. Clinton said at the White House, referring several times to growing up under segregation in Arkansas. He said that in 1997, more than 8,000 hate crimes were reported in the United States, almost one per hour.

The Clinton Administration backed a similar bill last year and expected that the murder of Matthew Shepard, a gay Wyoming college student, would increase support for it. But the bill languished in the Senate Judiciary Committee without a vote.

Today's announcement took place the day after Russell A. Henderson was sentenced to life in prison for Mr. Shepard's murder, but White House aides said the event had been scheduled a month ago and its timing was coincidental.

Still, Mr. Clinton did link hate crimes in America with the "ethnic cleansing" in Kosovo and said the United States should at least set an example by not tolerating such bias.

"When someone dies in a horrible incident in America," Mr. Clinton said, "or when we see slaughter or ethnic cleansing abroad, we should remember that we defeat these things by teaching and by practicing a different way of life and by reacting vigorously when they occur in our own midst."

He said several companies, including AT&T and Court TV, would join the Federal Departments of Justice and Education to help teach tolerance to middle-school students.

The current law not only limits the categories of crime that can be considered hate crimes but also requires that the victims be participating in one of six Federally protected activities when the crime occurs. These include attending public school, voting and traveling on an interstate highway. The proposed legislation would eliminate these circumstances as a precondition for a hate crime to occur.

Prospects for the legislation in Congress are uncertain. Senator Orrin G. Hatch, the Utah Republican who is chairman of the Judiciary Committee and who has scheduled a hearing on the subject for this month, said last year that he had mixed feelings about it. He noted that state and Federal laws already allowed for punishing hate crimes. But he also said the law might be needed to highlight the fact that "there's a punishment that comes from being vicious and vindictive against people who you might not agree with."

Robert Knight, senior director of cultural studies at the conservative Family Research Council, said he opposed the law because it would establish unequal protection for certain citizens and allow the President to advance a "homosexual agenda." Mr. Knight said the President's real purpose was "to go into middle schools and teach children diversity — as if all children are being misled at home by their parents and have to be re-educated by the Federal Government." This, he said, "is a hate crime against parents."

To be a force for good abroad, a look in the backyard.
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Prospects for the legislation in Congress are uncertain. Senator Orrin G. Hatch, the Utah Republican who is chairman of the Judiciary Committee and who has scheduled a hearing on the subject for this month, said last year that he had mixed feelings about it. He noted that state and Federal laws already allowed for punishing hate crimes. But he also said the law might be needed to highlight the fact that "there's a punishment that comes from being vicious and vindictive against people who you might not agree with."

Robert Knight, senior director of cultural studies at the conservative Family Research Council, said he opposed the law because it would establish unequal protection for certain citizens and allow the President to advance a "homosexual agenda." Mr. Knight said the President's real purpose was "to go into middle schools and teach children diversity — as if all children are being misled at home by their parents and have to be re-educated by the Federal Government." This, he said, "is a hate crime against parents."
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THE PRESIDENT: Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to make some fairly brief comments today about the situation in Kosovo and the humanitarian issue, and also about the good news today we received on the domestic economy. Let me make the economic remarks first, and then I will talk about Kosovo and refer to the folks from the administration who are here to my right.

As I think all of you know by now, it was reported today that last month the unemployment rate in the United States dropped to 4.2 percent, the lowest in this long expansion and the lowest monthly employment rate the United States has enjoyed since 1970. This is also an expansion that is widening the circle of opportunity.

We had, among other things in this last monthly report, the lowest Hispanic unemployment rate ever recorded. Now we know also that real wages went up last year at the highest rate in two decades.

Now, these economic indicators are more than just economic indicators; they mean wider opportunity and a better chance for millions of Americans to have stronger families and give their children a better chance. It is a reminder of the gains we have made because we have done the right things economically for the long run. And now we must act to extend that prosperity.

That means, among other things, we have to be very, very smart about how we deal with the question of the surplus. In the coming months, I will continue to insist that a substantial portion of the surplus -- the majority -- as I have outlined since the State of the Union, be set aside in a way that will save Social Security and Medicare and will enable us to pay down the debt, to keep interest rates low, to keep investment high, to keep the economy going.

I hope that today this good news on unemployment will remind us of how we got here and not make us forget how we got here.

Now, let me say a few words about Kosovo, and in particular the humanitarian situation. I am glad to be joined by the folks to my right -- Hattie Babbitt, the Deputy USAID
Administrator; Julia Taft, the Assistant Secretary of State for Population, Refugees, and Migration; General John McDuffie, the Chairman's Director for Logistics of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; and Eric Schwartz, who is our Director for Multilateral and Humanitarian Affairs at the NSC.

The humanitarian situation, as all of you know, remains grave in Kosovo. Since last year, nearly one in three people there have been pushed from their homes.

I met this morning with representatives of humanitarian organizations that are leading relief efforts in the area. They are doing courageous work under difficult circumstances. We want to support them in every way we can.

I can tell you that I was very impressed that they reported that the refugees coming out strongly support the action that NATO has taken and clearly understand that that action did not provoke the attempt to remove them from their homes, that that is part of an operation that has been going on since last year; that there were 40,000 troops and nearly 300 tanks -- Serbian troops and tanks -- massed in and around Kosovo at the time the peace talks in France broke up. And they are quite clear that what has happened to them was what was planned for quite a long while. And I appreciate the support and the great difficulty of maintaining it of these people who have suffered so much.

Now, what are we doing about this? This week I authorized an additional $50 million in emergency aid to augment our contributions to the UNHCR and to the other relief organizations, and to ensure that our military can do more to help them get aid to the people in need.

Today NATO agreed that its forces in Macedonia should support the relief effort there by providing transport, shelter, and logistical support.

While many people are arriving in neighboring countries, and Macedonia and Albania are especially burdened, with are able to provide help there -- although we need more countries to join us in providing help there. We must be increasingly concerned about the plight of displaced people who are actually trapped inside Kosovo and are under attack or certainly vulnerable to attack by Serbian forces.

That is why our air strikes are now increasingly focused on military targets there. There's no doubt that what Mr. Milosevic wants to do is to keep the land of Kosovo and rid it of its people. We cannot let that happen with impunity.

I said yesterday in Virginia to our troops and I want to say again, we must be determined, we must be persistent, we must be patient if we expect to see this mission through. And I am absolutely determined to do that.

We have to make sure that Mr. Milosevic pays a heavy price for this policy of repression. We have to seriously diminish his capacity to maintain that policy. Ultimately, we want to make it possible for the victims to return home, to live in security, and enjoy self-government.
Let me also reaffirm what I said yesterday about the three Army infantrymen who were seized on Wednesday, as they were carrying out a completely peaceful mission in Macedonia. There was no basis for them to be taken; there is no basis for them to be held; there is absolutely no justification for putting them on trial or displaying them in public, in violation of the Geneva Convention. As long as they are detained, they have the status of POWs and are entitled to all the protections that come with that status.

As I made clear yesterday, we will hold President Milosevic and his government responsible for their safety and well-being.

Q Mr. President, is Kosovo lost, sir? Q Mr. President, those same refugees you just cited a moment ago are, by and large, also saying that they believe that only NATO ground forces will be able to get them back into their country. Do you still feel the same way you do about ground forces?

THE PRESIDENT: I still believe that we have a good possibility of achieving our mission with the means that we have deployed. Remember, we have been at this for a week. I see all of you, and I don't blame you for doing this because everybody is trying to get their hands around a very complex problem, referring to Desert Storm or other historical analogies. This is like the Persian Gulf; this is like Vietnam; what is it like -- is it like what happened in World War II?

Let me remind you, for those people who talk about ground forces, the ground forces that were deployed in the Middle East were deployed after the objective had been achieved by Saddam Hussein, after he had captured Kuwait. It took, as I remember, maybe more than five months to do the preparatory deployment before any action could be taken.

So this air campaign has been much more rapid in getting up and getting underway than any sort of ground operation could be. And it seems to me we have a real obligation to try to keep the NATO allies together and to vigorously pursue this. We are making the air campaign more intense; we are adding targets; we are keeping the NATO allies together. And I believe we have quite a good chance of achieving our objectives of the return of the Kosovars to live in security with a measure of self-government that they enjoyed under the old Yugoslav Constitution before Mr. Milosevic took it away from them. And I believe that is what we should continue to do. That is what I intend to continue to do.

Q Mr. President, with villages burning, sir, and refugees coming out at a rate of nearly 100,000 a day, is it not unfair to say that Kosovo is already lost? And if it is lost, sir, is it your policy to get it back?

THE PRESIDENT: My policy is to stick with the NATO allies to provide for return of the Kosovars in conditions of security where they have the self -- the autonomy that they had before Mr. Milosevic took it away. That is my policy.

Keep in mind, this campaign of his started last year. There were hundreds of thousands
of refugees before the peace talks in France started. Before that happened, there were 40,000 troops and nearly 300 tanks in Kosovo or on the borders. So there has been a lot of speculation -- was this -- I don't think anybody in our military was under any illusion that he did not have the capacity to do what has been done. And what we have tried to do is to gear up this air campaign as quickly as we could, and given the limitations of the weather, proceed.

We have strong allied unity. We have real firm determination today in Europe that these objectives will be achieved. And we intend to stay after them until they are.

I do not believe -- I think that -- I do not believe that anyone should expect, or should have expected -- we recognized when we started that this campaign, this air campaign, would not be a week or two proposition.

Q But, sir, even many of those who advised and represented the Kosovars at Rambouillet say that process is now dead, given what has happened on the ground. Will there have to be some new security and political arrangement beyond what was envisioned at those peace talks? And what will the U.S. --

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think there will have to be some sort of security arrangement in order for them to live safely. And then there will have to be some sort of agreement that entails the autonomy to which they are entitled. That is clearly right.

So the elements that were discussed at the peace talks in France are still elements that have to be resolved before the Kosovars can either stay home or go home, for those who have left, and do so peacefully, and do so with some measure of autonomy. And it seems to me that will require, clearly, for some period of time, some sort of international force that will be able to protect their security.

So the elements, the framework that we dealt with in France is still the framework people are going to have to deal with; whatever label you put on it, the objectives that we seek to achieve will require certain means to realize.

Helen.

Q Mr. President, what about the deepening Russian involvement? Apparently, we understand they are now going to offer aid, they're sending ships into the Mediterranean. Are they ready for a fight?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't believe so. I believe that -- as I said before and I'll say again, one of the unfortunate side effects of this whole crisis -- and we saw it a little bit in Bosnia, but we were able to resolve it, thank goodness, in Bosnia in a way that brought us together with the Russians in the peacekeeping force there -- is that this whole issue has put great strains on the domestic politics of Russia in the Russian Duma because of the religious and cultural identity and the ethnic identity of the Russians with the Serbs.
But I think that, based on my experience in dealing with this in the last few days, and my experience in dealing with the Russians over the last six years, and what appear to be the facts now, they are looking for ways to continue to oppose what NATO is doing, but to leave open the prospect that they could play a very constructive role in making a peace. I don't think anyone wants to see this conflict escalate, and I certainly don't believe the Russian government does.

Thank you.

Q  Mr. President, what do you say to critics who say those troops weren't adequately armed on the border of Macedonia?
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Approximately 50,000 hate crime incidents and 60,000 hate crime offenses have been reported since 1991. In 1997 alone, there were over 8,000 hate crime incidents reported -- nearly one hate crime every hour.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Hate Crime Incidents Reported</td>
<td>4,558</td>
<td>6,623</td>
<td>7,587</td>
<td>5,932</td>
<td>7,947</td>
<td>8,759</td>
<td>8,049</td>
<td>49,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hate Crime Offenses Reported</td>
<td>4,755</td>
<td>8,106</td>
<td>8,987</td>
<td>7,262</td>
<td>9,895</td>
<td>10,706</td>
<td>9,861</td>
<td>59,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating Agencies</td>
<td>2,771</td>
<td>6,181</td>
<td>6,865</td>
<td>7,356</td>
<td>9,584</td>
<td>11,354</td>
<td>11,211</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of States, including D.C.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of U.S. Population Agencies Represent</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: A single criminal incident can involve more than one offense because multiple offenses may be committed in an incident.

Motivations Of Offenses (%), 1991-1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Racial Bias</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Bias</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity/National Origin</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Facts:

✓ Nearly 50,000 Hate Crime Incidents Have Been Reported Since 1991.
   According to the FBI, there have been nearly 50,000 hate crime incidents reported since 1991.

✓ Nearly 60,000 Hate Crime Offenses Have Been Reported Since 1991.
   According to the FBI, there have been nearly 60,000 hate crime offenses reported since 1991. Of the nearly 60,000 offenses, 62% were motivated by racial bias, 15% by religious bias, 12% by sexual-orientation bias, and 10% by ethnicity/national origin bias.

✓ Over 8,000 Hate Crime Incidents Were Reported In 1997.
   In 1997, the latest year for which FBI figures are available, over 8,000 hate crime incidents were reported -- THAT'S NEARLY ONE HATE CRIME EVERY HOUR.

✓ Nearly Two-Thirds Of Hate Crime Offenses Are Racially Motivated.
   According to the FBI, nearly two-thirds of hate crime offenses reported since 1991 are motivated by racial bias.
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HATE CRIMES ANNOUNCEMENT

DATE: April 6, 1999
LOCATION: Roosevelt Room
BRIEFING TIME: 10:00AM - 10:30AM
EVENT TIME: 10:30AM - 11:00AM
FROM: Bruce Reed, Mary Beth Cahill

I. PURPOSE

To urge Congress to pass quickly pending federal hate crimes legislation, and to demonstrate the broad base support for this legislation. Also, to announce other hate crimes initiatives targeted toward children, such as a public-private program that will develop a program for middle school children.

II. BACKGROUND

Today you will applaud public and private efforts to teach children about tolerance and urge Congress to quickly pass the pending federal hate crimes legislation. This legislation strengthens the existing federal hate crimes law by (1) extending the situations where prosecutions can be brought for violent crimes motivated by bias based on race, color, religion, or national origin; and (2) expanding the federal hate crimes statute to protect against hate crimes based on sexual orientation, gender, or disability. You will also announce a new public-private partnership which will focus attention on issues of hate, tolerance, and diversity in middle-grade schools. Finally, you will call on the Departments of Justice and Education to include hate crimes in its annual report card on school safety and to report on hate crimes and bias on college campuses.

Urging Passage of Expanded Federal Hate Crimes Law. You will urge Congress to pass the Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 1999, which expands a principal federal hate crimes statute. The current statute prohibits acts of violence that are based on a person’s race, color, religion, or national origin and that are intended to interfere with certain specified federally protected activities. The proposed legislation would make illegal acts of violence, even
if they did not interfere with federally protected activities. Further, the legislation would authorize the Department of Justice to prosecute individuals who commit violent crimes against others because of the victim’s sexual orientation, gender, or disability. Current federal law does not cover these cases at all.

Announcing Public-Private Partnership to Create a Middle-School Program about Tolerance. You will announce a public-private partnership that will develop a program for middle-school students to teach tolerance in the classroom and in their daily lives. The members of the partnership are AT&T, Court TV, the National Middle School Association, the Anti-Defamation League, and Cable in the Classroom, with assistance from the Departments of Justice and Education. This effort is supported by the NAACP, the Leadership Conference for Civil Rights, the National Council of La Raza, the National Asian Pacific American Legal Consortium, the National Association of Protection and Advocacy Systems, the National Education Association, and the National School Boards Association, and the Partnership expects support from other organizations that deal with these issues.

Recognizing that tolerance cannot be taught in a single day and that raising awareness of diversity should be integrated into students’ daily lives, this public-private partnership -- entitled “Dealing with Our Differences” -- will provide an opportunity for middle-school students to learn about the harmful impact of intolerance, and will highlight positive ways that young adolescents are dealing with diversity issues. The Partnership will develop in-school lessons and activities supported with cable TV programming; videos and websites; a nationally-televised forum on diversity and tolerance at the end of October; and post-show lessons and activities.

Creating New Studies About Hate Crimes in Schools and Colleges. In order to better understand the problem of hate crimes and intolerance among young people, you will call on the Departments of Justice and Education to include in their annual report card on school safety a section on hate crimes among young people, both at and away from school. In addition, you will direct the Department of Education, with appropriate assistance from the Department of Justice, to collect data on hate crimes and bias on college campuses for periodic publication.

III. PARTICIPANTS

Briefing Participants:
Bruce Reed
Elena Kagan
Mary Beth Cahill
Janet Murguia
Eddie Correia
Richard Socarides
Paul Glastris

Event Participants:
Attorney General Drew Ketterer (ME), Vice Chair, National Association of Attorneys General and Chair, Civil Rights Committee

On-Stage (No Speaking Role):
Secretary Richard Riley
Acting Assistant Attorney General Bill Lan Lee

IV. PRESS PLAN

Pool Press.

V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

- You will enter the Roosevelt Room, accompanied by Secretary Richard Riley, Acting Deputy Attorney General Bill Lann Lee, Attorney General Drew Ketterer, and Bishop Jane Holmes Dixon.
- Attorney General Ketterer will make brief remarks and introduce Bishop Jane Holmes Dixon.
- Bishop Jane Holmes Dixon will make brief remarks and introduce you.
- You will make remarks and depart.

VI. REMARKS

To be provided by speechwriting.