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CONFLICT IN THE BALKANS: Are the Americans 'Coming In'?

Bosnia's U.N. Envoy Will Succeed Its Slain Foreign Minister

Bosnia named Muhamed Sacirbey, center, its United Nations envoy, as Foreign Minister yesterday. Mr. Sacirbey, 38, who is also an American citizen, may be the best-known voice of the Bosnian Government. He succeeds Irfan Ljubijankic, who was killed on Sunday when Serbs shot down his helicopter.
Clinton’s Offer of TroopsPLEASES EUROPE

Seen as Sign of American Willingness to Enter Bosnia Conflict

By JOHN DARNTON

LONDON, June 1 — President Clinton’s offer to consider using United States troops to help reposition United Nations peacekeepers in Bosnia was welcomed today in Britain and France. It was seen as a sign that Washington might finally be willing to engage in the three-year conflict that turned suddenly into crisis.

Britain’s Defense Secretary, Malcolm Rifkind, said the President’s statement, made on Wednesday, was “definitely a significant development.”

Mr. Rifkind insisted that he “would not want to push” his interpretation too hard, but said that it appeared that the President had made “a significant change” from his previous position. That was that American ground troops would enter Bosnia only in case of ultimate success or failure — either to help monitor a peace agreement among all the combatants or to assist in the evacuation of the United Nation’s 22,000 troops.

Mr. Clinton made headlines in the British press as if a decision to send United States troops were virtually guaranteed. That is far from the case. His remarks appeared to have gone some way in erasing, at least for a while, an undercurrent of bitterness from the feeling that it was in part United States demands for a tougher stand against the Bosnian Serbs that helped land the European and other troops in the latest Balkan crisis.

It erupted last week when NATO launched air strikes against a Serbian ammunition depot and then Bosnian Serbs seized more than 300 United Nations troops as hostages to thwart further attacks.

Policy makers in Britain, France and other countries were still struggling today to coordinate their response. Along with a call for more troops and equipment, they agreed upon the need for a mobile rapid intervention force to avoid similar crises in the future. But London and Paris appeared to have different visions of what that force should be.

Britain, which has seized the initiative in the crisis by being the first to rush reinforcements — more than 1,000 troops with another 5,500 likely to go soon — regards the force as an adjunct to the existing deployment. It would be at the disposal of the commanding officer, Lieut. Gen. Rupert Smith, and would widen his military capability by rushing assistance to trouble spots where United Nations forces are threatened.

France seemed to have something grander in mind: a large force, between 4,000 and 5,000 men, stationed in a central location, highly mobile and heavily armed. It could enforce new military objectives, like opening a land corridor to Sarajevo or keeping the airport at the capital functioning. Such a move could represent a shift in strategy and place the peacekeeping operation on a more warlike footing.

The composition and role of the rapid reaction force are among the topics to be discussed at a special meeting of NATO and European Union defense ministers who were called upon by France to meet Saturday in Paris.

Meanwhile, European leaders strove to discourage speculation that the new reinforcements to Bosnia are nothing more than a cover under which the troops already there could pull out, a view that undercut the pressure they are trying to bring upon the Bosnian Serbs to release the hostages.

Erasing the bitterness between the White House and the Europeans.

Both the British Prime Minister, John Major, and the new French President, Jacques Chirac, today painted their countries’ involvement in Bosnia in sweeping terms as a mission in the broad interest of European stability and world peace.

Speaking at a funeral in Vannes for two French soldiers killed Saturday in Sarajevo, Mr. Chirac, in his first comments on the crisis, vowed that France “will not accept the turn of ethnic hatred and barbarism to the continent.” Nor would it accept its soldiers “being humiliated, wounded or killed with impunity,” he declared.

In a debate at the House of Commons yesterday, Mr. Major emphasized that the reasons Britain initially sent troops still existed. If they were withdrawn, there would undoubtedly be “a wider conflagration across the Balkans,” he said. In a none-too-subtle reference to World War I, he added: “War memorials throughout the United Kingdom testify to the price paid in British blood for past Balkan turbulence.”

But Mr. Major conceded that the presence of the reinforcements would be invaluable should a decision to withdraw become necessary.

Lord Owen, who announced his resignation yesterday as the European Union’s mediator in Bosnia, made the same point in an interview today with the BBC. He said Britain might eventually "bless the day" it sent in the extra personnel. "I hope we don’t have to go. But let’s be realistic about it; if we have to go, we need extra forces to help extract us,” he observed.

Washington, London, Paris and other capitals have been in frequent contact over recent days, and diplomats suggested that longstanding differences over Bosnian policy were being overcome or at least shelved. As Foreign Minister Hervé de Charette of France put it, "the French position and the American position are in the same line or near the same line."

Echoing the position of the United States, Germany, which does not have troops in Bosnia, said that it too was prepared to provide assistance in a redeployment of United Nations peacekeepers. Bonn had already pledged troops to help in an evacuation.
Balkan Update

In GORAZDE, fighting between Bosnian Government forces and Serbs left more than 400 United Nations peacekeeping troops marooned yesterday.

Throughout BOSNIA, there was no hint of progress toward the release of peacekeepers detained by the Serbs. In BANJA LUKA, one of their strongholds, Serbs detained a civilian official of the United Nations, The Associated Press said.

In WASHINGTON, Congressional sentiment seemed decidedly against sending American ground troops to fight in Bosnia. But members of both parties said they might support allowing United States forces to help withdraw United Nations peacekeepers.

Governments in LONDON and PARIS applauded talk of wider American participation. They also discussed plans for a mobile rapid force that could move quickly to protect peacekeepers when they are threatened in the future.

In PALE, the Serbs' political leader, Radovan Karadzic, warned that any attempt to rescue the peacekeepers would be a "catastrophic mistake."

In BELGRADE, an American envoy asked Serbia's leader to isolate Bosnian Serbs by recognizing Bosnia's Government.

SARAJEVO's situation grew more critical, with water and electricity cut, streets deserted and supplies ebbing because of a blockade and sniping by Serbs. Shelling by Serbs also wounded more civilians in besieged Tuzla.

"We in the Government believe we should not be closed to requests concerning a redeployment, in line with what we have envisaged for the withdrawal option," said Foreign Minister Klaus Kinkel.

In the context of setting up a new deployment, should that involve moving troops from the six vulnerable "safe areas" they now occupy, Mr. Clinton's offer to lend troop assistance was seen as significant.

At the same time, policy makers here said privately that they recognized that the President's room to maneuver on Bosnia was limited by the Republican leadership in Congress. In general, the Republican views -- ranging from demands to lift the arms embargo for Bosnian Government forces to calls for strategic air strikes against the Bosnian Serbs -- evoke horror here.

The concern is that they would invite retaliation against the forces already there, including 3,800 French and newly bolstered British troops totaling about 4,700. When the hostages were seized, President Clinton came in for attack in a number of British newspapers.

Almost from the time that Britain, France and other countries committed soldiers to peacekeeping forces in the Balkans, diplomats here and in Paris have said that the effort cannot be effective without the full backing of Washington and American military might.

"The hope has been all along that the Americans would come in, would see that it's in their interest to have a peaceful Europe and avoid a Balkan conflagration," said one British diplomat. "I'm not sure the President's speech gets us there, but perhaps it's a step along the path."
Many in Congress Reluctant
To Widen U.S. Role in Bosnia

BY KATHARINE Q. SEELYE

WASHINGTON, June 1 — Sentiment in Congress today was decided-
ly against sending American ground
troops to fight in Bosnia, although
members of both parties said they
might support allowing United
States forces to help withdraw Unit-
ed Nations peacekeepers.

Even Senator Jesse Helms, the
North Carolina Republican who is
chairman of the Foreign Relations
Committee and a pointed critic of
President Clinton, said he would not
object if the United States helped
evacuate United Nations troops. But
of the involvement of American
forces for any other purpose, such as
helping to move the peacekeepers to
more defensible positions, Mr.
Helms declared, "Not on my watch."

President Clinton said Wednesday
that he might send troops to Bosnia
not only to help with withdrawal but
for "a reconfiguration and a
strengthening" of United Nations
forces. But he said that so far, he had
not had any requests for such de-
ployment and had made no deci-
sions.

Among the voices of caution was
that of Representative Newt Ging-
rich, Republican of Georgia, the
Speaker of the House.

"We should wait to see what's
happening," he told reporters in
Georgia. He said it was unlikely that
"we would say to our allies of a half-
century the U.S. won't do anything,
but at the same time we don't want
to go and get involved." He added,
"It's very important for us to be
very cautious."

He said he had been reassured by
Gen. John Shalikashvili, chairman of
the Joint Chiefs of Staff, that "there
were no circumstances where we
would come under U.N. command."

With the Administration's inten-
tions undefined, Republican leaders
in the Senate planned hearings on
Bosnia next week, while Democrats
were muted in offering their whole-
hearted support. Republicans and
Democrats alike renewed their calls
for lifting the arms embargo to allow
the Bosnian Government to defend
itself and urged the President to
make the case to Congress — and the
nation — for how involvement in
Bosnia would serve American inter-
ests.

Despite the predictable criticisms
of President Clinton's handling of
Continued on Page A10, Column 3
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Many in Congress Reluctant to Back Wider U.S. Bosnia Role

Continued From Page A1

Bosnia — Senator Bob Dole, the Republican leader, branded it an abrupt failure — there were some surprising voices of sympathy for the President in what many view as an intractable situation.

"Nobody's gotten it right yet, not Bush, not Clinton," said Senator Mitch McConnell, Republican of Kentucky, chairman of the foreign operations subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee and a leader on foreign affairs in the Senate.

"It's easy to jump on the President," he added. "I've done that on a variety of issues. But frankly, I don't have any clearer idea on how to proceed from here than I believe he does."

But by and large, Republicans and Democrats alike expressed little enthusiasm for American involvement in the Balkans.

"I hear from people about tax policy and pesticides and affirmative action, not about Bosnia," said Representative Henry Hyde, the Illinois Republican who, like most other members of the vacationing Congress, is back in his district talking with voters. "But I don't see that the U.S. has to be at the eye of every storm over the globe. This is a European matter, and there ought to be enough resources in Europe 50 years after World War II to deal with it."

Representative J.D. Hayworth, a freshman Republican from Arizona, said, "My constituents, who are among the most conservative, are not neo-isolationists but practical, and their question is, 'Where is our national interest?'

The lack of a specific policy proposal from the President has made for some confusion on Capitol Hill. Senator Paul Coverdell, Republican of Georgia, said: "I think they were on reasonable, groundwork, when they talked about evacuation assistance. But who in the hell can understand where reordering deployment goes?"

Mr. Coverdell faulted the President for not consulting in advance with Senator Dole, who has said the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees would hold hearings next week. "I think that when we're back on deck Monday, there will be a very, very intense scrutiny that will mount very quickly," Mr. Coverdell said.

Many Democrats appear as reluctant as Republicans to send troops, at least to fight as combatants. "I am not in favor of using U.S. ground troops in Bosnia," Representative Richard A. Gephardt, Democrat of Missouri, the minority leader, said in a statement. Like others, he said he would "reserve judgment" on providing limited troops for other purposes until he saw a specific proposal from NATO.

"The President is treading on very dangerous ground," said Representative Billy Tauzin, a conservative Democrat from Louisiana. "We should not get dragged into this war.

Representative Steny Hoyer, a Maryland Democrat, said he would go "further than the President in terms of unilateral lifting of the arms embargo."

But Representative Howard L. Berman, a liberal Democrat of California, a member of the International Relations Committee, and one who is somewhat sympathetic to the President, cautioned against such a move. "The existence of NATO is at stake here," he said.

As for using U.S. forces to fight, Mr. Berman said: "You don't want to fight without a massive deployment of personnel. You can't do it with 5,000; 10,000 or 20,000 troops, and not enough has been done yet to lay the foundation for a massive American invasion."

One of the few Democrats to issue a ringing endorsement of President Clinton was Representative John P. Murtha of Pennsylvania, ranking member of the Appropriations subcommittee on National Security. "I absolutely agree with President Clinton's position on Bosnia as laid out in his speech at the Air Force Academy," Mr. Murtha, a conservative, said. "The national security interest of the United States is to protect against a wider war in the region."

Administration officials gave a classified briefing on the Bosnia situation to some members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last week before the NATO air strikes. Senator Richard G. Lugar, Republican of Indiana and a member of the committee, said the officials outlined a scenario involving "a very large NATO force with about a one-third complement of Americans that would in fact be of sufficiently large size and military impressiveness and robust enough to extricate whoever is there."

Mr. Lugar said that such a force should remain in Bosnia, on the major ports, airports and other strategic positions, and make it clear that they are going to stay until a diplomatic accord is achieved. He also sees this force as the solution to the hostage crisis. By his reckoning, it would be big enough to convince the Serbs that a failure to release the hostages would have dire consequences.
Allies Seem Near Accord
To Bolster Bosnia Force

Details Are in Doubt but Pullout Is Unlikely

By R. W. APPLE Jr.

WASHINGTON, June 1 — The United States and its allies appeared today to be headed toward an agreement to reinforce and partly reposition the United Nations force in Bosnia, rather than withdrawing it in the face of increased pressure from the Bosnian Serbs. But major details remained in doubt.

"The option that is strongly preferred," Secretary of State Warren Christopher told reporters in Madrid, using the acronym for United Nations Protection Force, "is that Unprofor should be strengthened, Unprofor should not be withdrawn, and there should be consideration of redeployment if military officials think that it is desirable."

Laid aside for the moment, said American officials, is the whole question of possible United States participation in any attempt to rescue the more than 300 hostages seized by the Bosnian Serbs after NATO air strikes last week. The United States, the officials said, would not contribute troops to a French-planned quick-reaction force of several thousand to be based in Croatia, but might send equipment.

Elaborating slightly on the speech he made Wednesday, President Clinton, who is traveling in Montana, said in an interview published today in The Billings Gazette: "If the U.N. forces want to stay in Bosnia but have to relocate so they can concentrate themselves in more secure areas, if they needed help from us, we would be willing to give it."

"As long as the mission was strictly limited for a very narrow purpose and it was something that we could do for them that they couldn't do for themselves, upon proper consultation with Congress, I would be inclined to do that," Mr. Clinton said.
opinion opposes use of American troops in the Balkans.

"But they would not be going there to get involved in the war or to be part of the United Nations mission."

But Congressional opinion remained solidly arrayed against any use of American troops in the Balkans for any purpose except the extraction of the United Nations peacekeepers. Republicans tended to voice their criticisms of Mr. Clinton's new policy in the sharpest terms, and few prominent Democrats stuck their necks out to defend the President.

Like Senator Bob Dole of Kansas on Wednesday, other Republicans, including Senators John McCain of Arizona and Phil Gramm of Texas, a Presidential hopeful, said Mr. Clinton was merely reinforcing failure.

Senator Jesse Helms of North Carolina, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, said, "Not on my watch," but it was not clear what he could or would do to stop the President from acting as he chose. The Republicans in Congress have vowed to repeal the War Powers Act, which gives Congress at least theoretical power to restrain Presidents in foreign policy.

Other Republicans also entered the fray, all but insuring that next week, when Congress returns from a brief vacation, will be filled with argumentation and recrimination on Capitol Hill.

James A. Baker 3d, who served as Secretary of State under President Bush, said of Mr. Clinton's position: "This is a slippery slope, in capital letters. This is exactly the kind of mission creep that led to disaster in
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Question of a U.S. role in a rescue of U.N. peacekeepers is laid aside.

Somalia. This is incrementalism at its worst — and a sure recipe for disaster.

Returning from the West, Mr. Clinton will meet at the White House Friday with Defense Secretary William J. Perry and Gen. John Shalikashvili, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to ponder the next steps. Then on Saturday, Mr. Perry and General Shalikashvili will attend a meeting in Paris with officials of European nations that have contributed peacekeeping troops to Bosnia.

Final decisions, White House officials warned, will not be made until a meeting of NATO defense ministers in Brussels on Thursday. But that could be part of an effort to conceal the timetable for action.

Much remains to be decided.

One major point concerns the enclaves where isolated groups of peacekeepers, cut off from their headquarters, appear highly vulnerable. In the so-called eastern enclaves, the British are at Gorazde, Ukrainians are in Zepa and Dutch forces are based in Srebrenica.

One American involved in planning said there was no question that United Nations observers dotted about the country — known to officials as "the onesies and the twosies" — will have to be pulled back to safer positions. But removing the larger groups from the Muslim enclaves might well expose them to capture by the Bosnian Serbs, which the United Nations has vowed to prevent. If the enclaves were overrun, United Nations credibility in the Balkans, already low, would plunge to the bottom.

Mr. Christopher's aides said he opposed leaving the enclaves.

But the commander of the French contingent in Bosnia, Gen. Bernard Janvier, said during a visit to the Security Council in New York last month that if the troops in the enclave had to be withdrawn to the central region, the Bosnians left behind might be able to defend themselves.
we need to ask the Bosnian Government about that,” an allied official at the United Nations said. “This is very much on our minds.”

A second imponderable is timing. No progress has been made yet in gaining the release of the hostages, and even the most optimistic officials in allied capitals think that freeing them by diplomatic means will take a considerable time. So the question arises: Can a redeployment be undertaken with the hostages still in the hands of the Bosnian Serbs?

“An argument can be made,” a ranking American official said, “that beginning a repositioning effort would put pressure on the Bosnian Serbs to release the hostages. An argument can also be made that it might infuriate them and cause them to harm the hostages. We will simply have to make the best judgment we can when the moment comes.”

A third imponderable is how American force should be used. There appear to be no important splits in the Administration, though some might appear as final decisions are hammered out. At the meeting on Sunday called to discuss American support for repositioning, Mr. Christopher and the State Department expressed reluctance and, unusually, Mr. Perry and defense officials expressed support for backing the allies with United States forces.

But everyone quickly got back on board, officials asserted. “There has been a complex interplay of policies and personalities on all this,” one American said, “but much less backbiting than usual.”

Some American officials said today that American troops might be held in reserve on shipboard, to be committed only if the peacemaking forces ran into trouble as they began their moves. Others said American forces would be directly involved, perhaps including American helicopters and planes to be used to make the actual pickups of peacekeeping units.

Any loss of aircraft and capture of crews would increase the already substantial political peril the operation holds for the President. “It is a very tough call, very, very tough,” a White House aide said. “One thing you can be sure of: If we go in, we will go in with the firepower to cover any contingency.”

Whether, in the end, the Europeans will wish to make a formal request for help if it involves the prospect of operations on such a large scale remains to be seen. In the past they have sought to limit the fighting.
My fellow Americans:

I want to speak to you this evening about a challenge facing our country and our allies. It is a painful challenge, one that none of us would seek. But there comes a time for nations, as for individuals, when it is more dangerous to avoid trouble than it is to make a stand for what is right.

That time has come in Bosnia. Many of you will be asking: Why should we care about such a faraway country? Why should we get involved? It is a President’s duty to answer those questions — to explain our interests and our goals when we take action abroad.

Three years ago some of the Serbs in Bosnia launched an aggressive war against that state. Armed with weapons from the army of the former Yugoslavia, they captured much of Bosnia’s territory. They used murder, rape and torture to remove or frighten non-Serbs out of that territory. They shelled civilians in the capital, Sarajevo, and other cities. They blew up churches and mosques.

The outside world did not intervene militarily to stop the aggression and genocide. Instead the United Nations sent a force with a very limited mission: to feed the people in Sarajevo, and elsewhere who were being shelled and starved by the Serbs.

The United Nations force, with its narrow mission, was impartial between aggressor and victim. It stood by while Serbian snipers killed children on the streets of Sarajevo. It asked permission of the Serbs to get humanitarian convoys through, and the Serbs often said no.

Our allies, France and Britain, sent troops to the U.N. force. We did not. But when the U.N. asked for NATO air strikes to help the mission, our men and planes took part. We were there last week when the U.N. called for a NATO strike after heavy Serbian shelling of Sarajevo.

You all know how the Serbs responded. They shelled the city of Tuzla, killing 71 civilians, most of them children. And they seized more than 300 U.N. soldiers as hostages.

In my judgment the North Atlantic Alliance, the great protector of peace and security in Europe, cannot let that kind of outrage continue in Europe. Even after three years of an ill-defined U.N. mission, it is not too late for meaningful action. Indeed, action is more essential now than ever.

We need a new mission with clearly defined goals. It must be committed to do all that can be done to protect the victims of aggression from siege and assault. It must be able to respond vigorously and protect its own soldiers. And it must be ready to persist until Bosnian Serb outrages cease, opening the way to a realistic settlement.

If NATO is prepared for that kind of effort — serious, with clear rules, not muddled and half-hearted — I would be willing to contribute a small number of American soldiers to help set up the new mission. That is a risk. But unless we share the risk, our allies will not so easily respond to American leadership. And without American leadership strong action is unlikely, and aggression and genocide will prevail for the first time in Europe since the Nazis.

If our allies are not prepared for that kind of tough mission, one with real military aims, the U.N. force should be pulled out. Then we should help arm and train the Bosnian Government’s forces, and help with strategic bombing of Serbian military facilities and headquarters.

It is often said that air strikes will not tip the balance in war. But if that is so, why did the Bosnian Serb leaders react so outrageously when NATO carried out the first meaningful strikes of this war? They were worried — that is why.

When Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait, President Bush said: “This will not stand.” And it didn’t. Here again we have unconcealed evil, the evil of leaders who kill children because they are of another faith. And this time the evil is in Europe, where we have invested so much to keep the peace for the last 50 years.

That is why it is vital for us to take a stand in Bosnia. The aggression there does not immediately threaten our lives, but it threatens our civilization in an insidious way. If we and our European allies cannot work together to stop this menace, the alliance may come apart — and all of us be adrift in a dangerous world.

Ladies and gentlemen, some of the commentators have said that taking a stand against the evil in Bosnia will be politically damaging. If so, I am prepared to pay the penalty. But I do not believe that Americans are afraid to stand up for what is right.

Good night, and God bless you.
Bill Clinton's War

President Clinton is not leading the United States to war in Bosnia. He has already done that. The question now is whether Congress and the public will stop him before he sends American troops into the land of their approaching death.

Until now, Americans did not much care or little note that they were at war. Only foreign lives were involved, not the real stuff. Congress and the press cheered, crying bombs away to Mr. Clinton and his sorrowful little team.

Americans are not cheering now that he is telling us that soon he is likely to send actual American troops to shed actual American blood in Bosnia, despite years of his promises of never ever.

Psychiatrists who examine the President's weird record in Bosnia would understand what he is saying as he wanders the road from President Peace to Bomber Bill to Commando Clinton: Somebody—please stop me. I warn you I may order in the troops any day now. Don't you hear me? All the U.N. or our allies have to do is ask me and I will do it! Somebody—Russians, Serbs, allies, Congress, public, press, somebody—help me not do it.

Republicans and Democrats, even journalists, are rubbing their sweet sleepy eyes. Troops, they ask? That would mean war!

Where do they think we have been? When American planes bomb another nation, that is war. Bombers do not like it, you see. They fight harder. So we bomb them harder.

When harder falls, bombbomb must lead to a decision on whether to commit ground forces. There's no free bombing.

But even when Mr. Clinton changed months ago from no, never, to saying that he would send 25,000 Americans to extricate U.N. forces if it came to that, Congress and the press did not understand that American soldiers were being prepared to meet live ammunition in Bosnia. Congress did not even ask for a vote. But Bosnians understood, all sides.

Now Bomber Bill is getting ready to wade ashore; he says he may also send in troops while the U.N. "redeploys." That is jargon for digging in against "the Serbs." And that is politicalized journalese implying rebel Serbs are not genuine "Bosnians" like the Muslims, whom the press just calls Bosnians. But these Serbs are native Bosnians fighting a Western-backed Government of other native Bosnians they see as enemies and from which they want out, out.

The bomb bomb brigade is beginning to understand, almost. No U.S. troops, they say! Just keep bombing, flatten them.

Bosnia's Serbian Christians will kill more Bosnian Serbian Muslims and U.N. soldiers. American troops will go in eventually. Soon we may be on some embassy roof, praying for helicopters.

Mr. Clinton did something worse than just go to war without public or Congressional consent. He did it under pressure.

In the first years of the war he and his advisers believed the U.S. should not get in, with bombing or troops. It was not simply because of the sickening atrocities of the Serbian Christians against the Muslims that Mr. Clinton changed his mind and brought America into war. The U.S. barely noticed when President Assad slaughtered thousands of Syrians in Hama. Now Mr. Clinton sends the White House lawn for him.

Rwanda, Chechnya, Sudan, Tibet—terrorism by slaughter, and the U.S. sends no bombers or troops.

But Mr. Clinton bowed to the line of American desk-warrior bureaucrats, politicians, academics and journalists that if the now-inevitable partition of Bosnia gave Serbian Christians any territory they had won in battle, NATO would die of sheer humiliation.

For a half-century, Americans thought correctly that the reason for creating NATO was to contain the Soviet Union. But, well, the NATO hierarchy is seriously in need of a little work.

Poignant. But when and by whom in American officialdom was NATO made responsible for putting down every rebellion or secession in Europe? When did Washington decide that NATO's face was so vital that Americans had to rouge it up even at the cost of dying in the Balkans? At that price, who needs it?

While we think that over, Congress should at last bar U.S. bombing and U.S. troops, subject to swift release of U.N. prisoners. It will not end the war. Americans cannot do that—just Bosnians. But it will answer Mr. Clinton's urgent need for help.
FIGHTING IN BOSNIA
FLARES OVER POSTS
ABANDONED BY U.N.

PEACEKEEPERS MAROONED

Battle Rages Near 'Safe Area'
in East as Serbs Tighten
Grip Around Sarajevo

By ROGER COHEN

SARAJEVO, Bosnia and Herzegovina, June 1 — Heavy fighting erupted in the eastern enclave of Gorazde today as Bosnian Government forces and separatist Serbs battled over posts that had been abandoned by besieged United Nations troops.

The fighting left 400 peacekeepers marooned in the town, which the United Nations had declared a "safe area" but has been unable to protect.

At the same time, the situation became more critical for the almost 300,000 people in Sarajevo, with water and electricity cut, bakeries running out of flour, and the main streets deserted because of intermittent sniping. The Bosnian Serbs' noose around the city tightened to the point where no international aid is getting in.

Amid a flurry of diplomatic and military activity, the weary Sarajevans pushed wheelbarrows and baby carriages full of containers of water, cultivated improvised vegetable gardens, sprinted across crossroads exposed to fire, and fed goats, rabbits and chickens on the grassy borders of once busy thoroughfares.

The arrival in Bosnia of British reinforcements for the United Nations mission here was overshadowed by the fighting in Gorazde, about 40 miles east of Sarajevo. The battles centered on positions on the outskirts of town vacated by United Nations troops who were forced out or taken hostage by the Serbs after NATO bombed a Serbian ammunition depot last week.

United Nations military analysts reported 350 detonations today as Government forces and Serbs battled for five strategic observation posts abandoned by the United Nations on the east bank of the Drina river. One emplacement appeared to have fallen to the Bosnian Army.

Some shells fired at Bosnian troops on the east bank of the river by the Serbs from positions on the west bank above Gorazde fell short and hit the town center, which has about 60,000 inhabitants, said a United Nations spokesman, Lieut. Col. Gary Coward.

After a long period of confusion, Western governments appear to have decided that they have had

Continued on Page A10, Column 3
Fighting Flares at 'Safe Area' Over Posts Vacated by U.N.
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enough of "safe areas" like Gorazde and Sarajevo that are unsafe, peacekeepers who are potential hostages, are risking that offer no solution, and diplomacy that is not backed by any credible threat of force.

It is precisely this kind of impasse that the United Nations intends to prevent through the proposed redeployment of the 22,000 United Nations troops in Bosnia to safer positions and the suggested dispatch of a rapid reaction force of between 4,000 and 5,000 Western troops.

But several questions about future policy remained unresolved, most critically whether new troops in Bosnia - even perhaps including some Americans - would wear the white of United Nations peacekeepers or the green of a fighting army. Moreover, if the reinforcements come as an army, who would be its enemy?

"I'm really not sure whether we are moving from white to green," Colonel Coward said. "But since the end of the ceasefire here in April, our command has been looking closely at the need for a rapid reaction force."

Over the last week, the Bosnian Serbs, who want their own ethnically pure state, have designated the peacekeepers as their enemy and have taken more than 300 of them hostage. Formally, there has been no request for the dispatch of United Nations troops. The 1,200 British troops now moving into central Bosnia and providing peacekeepers with artillery for the first time will wear United Nations uniforms.

"We don't want this to be a battlefield ground where international soldiers are at all kinds of uniforms take care of their own problems," Mr. Mlucic said. The fact, however, is that Bosnia is much more a European battlefield than it is a European state. After three years of war, the Government only controls about a quarter of the country. Moreover, local Bosnian commanders in various parts of Bosnia have virtually set up their own fiefdoms.

As the new plans slowly evolved today in Western capitals, there appeared to be little immediate chance of helping the peacekeepers in Gorazde or easing the threatening Serbian encirclement of Sarajevo.

With more than 120 United Nations soldiers held hostage by the Serbs as insurance against further NATO air strikes, it appeared certain that NATO air power would not be used to deter the fighting in Gorazde or oblige the Serbs to surrender the several hundred heavy guns that the Serbs hold from the United Nations and placed once again at the Bosnian capital.

The NATO air strikes last week were intended to force the Serbs to respect a ban on heavy weapons within 125 miles of Sarajevo. Instead, the Serbs took back the guns they handed over last year to the United Nations, outlining the last vestiges of the Sarajevos "safe area."

There was no sign of any progress toward release of the hostages. "It is the opinion of this command that currently we should not negotiate on the issue of the hostages and that we should demand their unconditional release," Alexander Ivanovic, a United Nations spokesman, said today.

"Don't want this to be a battlefield ground where international soldiers are at all kinds of uniforms take care of their own problems," Mr. Mlucic said. The fact, however, is that Bosnia is...
Monday, May 29

NYT

"The policy of using NATO force was strongly backed by President Clinton when the air strikes began on Thursday with an attack . . . . But the Administration has fallen largely silent on how to respond to the crisis that has ensued."

"We have no problem with going either way -- escalating or backing down -- but we need some clear word," an official close to [General Rupert Smith] said.

"In Washington, Clinton administration officials said the U.S. is prepared to support a French plan to redeploy U. N. troops into more secure positions, and emphasized the need to bolster peacekeeping mission in Bosnia."

Post

"An administration official said that plans under discussion included the possible use of Marines and amphibious forces in air and sea rescue operations."

TUESDAY, May 30

NYT


"For the first time, a senior Clinton Administration official said . . . that the United States was not ruling out contributing American troops in a combat role."

Lake: Deployment of Marines is "a precautionary measure. No decision has been made yet to send them into combat."

Sr Admin: [But] commando role could not be "excluded."

Post

Lake: Rerouting amphibious group was "purely . . . a precautionary measure . . . There have been no decisions to send our troops into Bosnia. No decision has been made to send them into combat."

Official traveling with Christopher: U.S. has "not excluded" the possibility of using commandos to rescue hostages . . . ." 

Editorial: "The Bosnia Humiliation." "The new factor is the Bosnia equation is the utter public humiliation of the United States."

1
WEDNESDAY, May 31

NYT

Headline (A1): "... Hints Larger Role, Door Left Open to Send American Soldiers to Help U.N. Regroup"

"United States officials said today that the Clinton Administration was prepared to offer military equipment and logistical support to reinforce United Nations forces in Bosnia. They left open the possibility that Washington would contribute troops for a limited mission to help regroup and move the United Nations force into safer, more fortified positions."

"The comments -- carrying the strongest suggestion of a broader United States role in Bosnia to date -- came as ... ."

McCurry: The U.S. is prepared "to provide a variety of resources and materiel." ... Asked repeatedly whether the President might consider a limited use of American troops to rescue ... , he declined to speculate on what form any assistance might take. ... . "We've said that we will be there, we will be there to respond," Mr. McCurry said, referring to NATO contingency plans to help the United Nations forces.

Bacon, Defense: Declined to rule out "the use of United States troops if they are asked to help with a redeployment of U.N. forces." "If we are asked to help NATO, we will consider those requests," he said.

Perry, MacNeil-Lehrer: "They could be part of an extraction operation ... . [Asked if this could lead to American ground forces in Bosnia, he said: "No, except for one contingency: were we send our forces in as part of NATO to extract U.N. forces in danger. It would be a NATO operation under NATO command. We'd go to Congress for support before we did it."

Post


"The Clinton administration said yesterday it would permit using U.S. ground troops in Bosnia to protect U.N. peacekeepers as they move to more defensible positions."

"The U.S. position marked a shift from the administration's previous stance, more than a year old, that it would send American ground troops to Bosnia only to protect an evacuation of U.N. peacekeepers or to monitor a peace agreement."
"But White House press secretary Michael McCurry yesterday broadened that U.S. commitment to include helping the British, French and other peacekeepers if the West moves to redefine its role and strengthen them."

McCurry: "... the United States stands ready to provide appropriate support to that end." Would not define "appropriate support."

"We've said that we will be there, we will be there to respond. ... We understand what our obligations are as the leader of the alliance, and the president would be prepared to act on that type of request."

Thursday, June 1

NYT

Headline (A1): "Clinton Talks of Ground Role in Bosnia"

"President Clinton said today that the United States should be prepared to help the United Nations not only in withdrawing its forces from Bosnia if that became necessary, but in moving and strengthening those forces if needed."

Clinton: "... I must carefully review any request involving a temporary use of our ground forces."

"Other leading foreign-policy spokesmen in both parties also expressed strong doubts about Mr. Clinton's apparent willingness to broaden the circumstances under which American troops might be committed. Previously, he had said they would be used only to help cover a United Nations withdrawal from Bosnia."

Top State aide: A third possible circumstance for the use of American troops would involve the extremely difficult task of mounting commando raids. . . ."

Editorial: Head: "The Slippery Slope in Bosnia." "The Clinton Administration has recklessly blurred the clear and prudent line it once drew against using American ground forces in combat in Bosnia. Yesterday the President declared that he would respond favorably to any NATO request for American troops to help reposition the U.N. peacekeeping forces there. ... Until now, the Administration had insisted that American ground troops would only be used to evacuate the U.N. peacekeepers from Bosnia or to police a negotiated peace that all sides committed themselves to observe."

Post
"Clinton’s statement . . . immediately set off protests by Republican lawmakers who promised hearings on what they called a significant change in U.S. policy."

McCurry: "It’s important to send a signal that we would be there" to help the U.N. force."

News analysis: "The Clinton administration’s declaration on Tuesday that U.S. ground troops might be sent to Bosnia to help U.N. forces take up more defensible positions is perhaps the most vivid sign of the West’s deepening involvement in the Bosnian quagmire."

**Friday, June 2**

_NYT_

President Clinton said Wednesday that he might send troops to Bosnia not only to help with withdrawal but for a "reconfiguration and a strengthening" of U.N. forces.

Clinton [in Billings Gazette ivu]: "As long as the mission was strictly limited for a very narrow purpose and it was something that we could do for them that they couldn't do for themselves, upon proper consultation with Congress, I would be inclined to do that. But they would not be going there to get involved in the war or to be part of the U.N. mission."

Headline (A1): "Clinton’s Offer of Troops Pleases Europe; Seen as Sign of American Willingness to Enter Bosnia Conflict."

"Mr. Clinton made headlines in the British press as if a decision to send U.S. troops were virtually guaranteed."

_Post_

"It appeared that Clinton and his aides miscalculated the effect of words Wednesday, when he said in a commencement speech at the Air Force Academy that he would allow U.S. troops to help British, French and other troops under the U.N. flag regroup inside Bosnia."

"Throughout the day, the administration tried to draw a sharp distinction between offering U.S. ground troops to aid in U.N. repositioning and the involvement of U.S. troops in the conflict involving U.N. and Bosnian combatants. Vice President Gore . . . said, "We are not in any way attempting to create a situation where U.S. ground forces would be involved in Bosnia. That is not our policy. We are not in favor of that. We are not going to let that occur."
"In the past, Clinton and his aides had said U.S. troops would go to Bosnia only to help the U.N. force, UNPROFOR, withdraw from the country completely, or to help implement a peace settlement agreed to by all parties. Sending troops to help UNPROFOR unites reposition or consolidate themselves inside Bosnia could interject them into tense and potentially lethal standoffs between UNPROFOR units and Bosnian Serb forces."
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Copter Downed

33 Britons Are Seized

By ROGER COHEN

SARAJEVO, Bosnia and Herzeg-ovina, May 28 — Bosnia's Foreign Minister was killed today, and the Bosnian Serbs stepped up their humiliation of the United Nations by adding 33 British soldiers and 8 Canadians to a long list of hostages.

Irfan Ljubijankic, the Bosnian Foreign Minister, died when his helicopter was shot down by Serbian forces near the town of Cetinjgrad in Serbian-occupied Croatia, Government officials said. The United Nations said the helicopter had been downed by a missile apparently fired from Serbian-held territory, Croatian Serb forces said they had shot down the helicopter, a Croatian Serb news agency reported.

Mr. Ljubijankic, 43, was one of three co-presidents of the governing Most Serb Nationalist Party of Democratic Action. He was traveling early today from his native Bihać to Zagreb, the Croatian capital, when the helicopter was shot down in a mountainous area from the Bosnian border.

His death came as separatist Serbian forces, apparently emboldened rather than cowed by two NATO air strikes near their stronghold of Pale last week, took British soldiers captive at several United Nations observation points in the town of Gorazde in eastern Bosnia.

Serbian troops approached the British emplacements and threatened to blow up British peacekeepers with force, United Nations officials said. Some British soldiers escaped, but 33 of them were captured and led away to an unknown destination. The Bosnian Serbs now hold a total of 325 hostages, United Nations officials said.

"The Bosnian Serb Army is behaving like a terrorist organization," said Alexander Ivanko, a United Nations spokesman. It was the first time that the United Nations had referred to the Bosnian Serbs as terrorists, but this did not alter the fact that the Serbs have apparently seized the political and military initiative.

The capture of the British troops amounted to a particularly sharp challenge to Western governments by the Serbs, who have responded with aggression rather than compliance to NATO's attempt to stop Serbian shelling of Sarajevo through the use of limited force.

The Serbs are now defying the two largest contributors of troops to the peacekeeping force — Britain and France. More than 150 French troops are already being held as hostages or human shields in an attempt — successful so far — to deter further NATO military action. Eight Canadian soldiers were also detained today near the town of Ilijaš, northeast of Sarajevo.

The policy of using NATO force was strongly backed by President Clinton when the air strikes began on Thursday with an attack on an ammunition dump near the Bosnian Serb stronghold. But the Administration has largely feared to be publicly guilty of any call to NATO's air-strike targets and would remain there as long as the threat of further NATO attacks remained.

The Serbs have not complied with any of the conditions set in a United Nations ultimatum before the air strikes began. Rather than hand over heavy weapons and often used to resupply the Serbs as anything other than an appeasement after a brief show of largely futile force.

The Serbs have cut off electricity, gas and water to Sarajevo since the NATO bombing on Thursday, and have tightened their noose around the city. The one Government-held route into town — a small mountain track — is being fired at regularly with heavy machine guns and mortars.

The worst single shelling incident of the war, in which 71 people were killed in the northeastern town of Tuza on Thursday night, was followed today by further Serb shelling of the town. One person was killed and two wounded on a day when many mourners were in the streets attending funerals of those killed last week.

Mr. Ljubijankic, the Bosnian Foreign Minister, became the second highest-ranking member of the Government killed since the Bosnian war began in 1992. In January 1993, Hajduja Turadic, the Deputy Prime Minister, was killed while supposedly under the protection of French peacekeepers near Sarajevo's airport.

The downing of the helicopter today also killed Izet Mubuechagic, 57, the Deputy Minister of Justice, and four other people, the Bosnian Government said.

Clandestine nocturnal helicopter flights between the Muslim enclave of Bihać and Zagreb have been going on for many months. They are widely used to supply the isolated enclave with weapons. Television cameras are in the breach of the NATO-enforced no-flight zone over Bosnia but NATO has tended to turn a blind eye to them.

Continued From Page 1

"General Mladic demanded an apology for the death of the Serbian soldiers, which of course General Smith was not prepared to give," the official said. "General Mladic seemed unable to grasp that the Serbs initiated the battle." Lieut. Col. Milovan Milutinovic, a Bosnian Serb officer, said today that 188 of the hostages were being held at what is called "a potential air-strike targets" and would remain there as long as the threat of further NATO attacks remained.
Hourly News Summary

Around the World, Around the Clock...with United Press International.
-0-
Secretary of State Christopher is heading to Europe for a meeting with America's allies on the situation in Bosnia. With United Nations peacekeepers being held as hostages by Serbian forces, diplomats are trying to decide how to respond.
-0-
Talks between negotiators for AT&T and representatives for two trade unions haved ended for the night and will resume this morning. Company spokesman Herb Linneri says some progress has been made, but key issues, such as wages and health care benefits for retirees, still need to be resolved.
-0-
Police in Cambridge, Massachusetts, say a brutal stabbing spree at a Harvard University dormitory resulted in the deaths of two students and left another injured.
-0-
The Pakistani suspected of engineering the 1993 bombing of the World Trade Center of New York reportedly had been plotting an even more spectacular attack that would have blown up 11 U.S. airliners in a single day as they traveled over the Pacific Ocean.

The Los Angeles Times said computer records showed Ramzi Ahmed Yousef had been arranging for five Muslim terrorists to plant virtually undetectable bombs aboard the 11 jumbo jets.
-0-
Flood relief efforts along the rain-swollen Illinois River were hampered this weekend by tornadoes that struck near the town of Meredosia. Three inches of rain pelted the area as a workforce composed of volunteers, prisoners and state employees raced to shore up a levee before the river crests on Thursday.
-0-
-160 people are dead and 1,700 remain buried beneath the rubble of a small Russian town destroyed by a strong earthquake. The quake hit on Russia's Pacific coast.
-0-
Actor Christopher Reeves, best known for his role as Superman, is hospitalized at the University of Virginia Medical Center after he fell off a horse. His publicist says he is in a stable condition. It is not known how long he will remain in the hospital.
-0-
The vast majority of Americans favor the establishment of a federal bioethics commission. Pollsters project that most Americans believe such a governmental body is needed to protect the individual's right to privacy, as genetic testing becomes more prevalent.
-0-
The opening of kid-comedy "Casper" scared up an impressive $16 million to secure the top spot at the nation's box offices during the first three days of the Memorial Day weekend. Other top films were "Die Hard With a Vengeance" and "Crimson Tide."
-0-
By Diane Kepley (UPI)
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FRANCE ON BOSNIA: BEEF UP OR LEAVE

Seeks Deal to Augment U.N. Force and Alter Mandate

By CRAIG R. WHITNEY

PARIS, May 28 — Prime Minister Alain Juppé said tonight that France would press for withdrawal of the United Nations peacekeeping forces from Bosnia unless NATO and the United Nations agreed in the next few days to send them reinforcements.

He also repeated a call by President Jacques Chirac on Saturday for the United Nations to revise its mandate and intensify its peacemaking efforts if France is to keep its 3,800 soldiers in Bosnia, which both men say is what they really want.

As Bosnian Serb forces took more peacekeepers hostage today, including 33 British troops, Mr. Juppé said both the mission of the United Nations force and its deployment at scattered and poorly defensible sites around the country urgently needed to be changed.

The British Government issued a statement saying that it "utterly condemned" the seizure of its soldiers and said it was increasing its deployment of troops to Bosnia as soon as possible.

In Washington, Clinton Administration officials said the United States is prepared to support a French plan to redeploy United Nations troops into more secure positions, and emphasized the need to bolster peacekeeping mission in Bosnia. [Page 5].

In an interview on national television, Mr. Juppé said, "We have to end the taking of hostages, restart the diplomatic process, and if all that fails, then agree to withdraw."

"I can't tell you whether that will be today or the day after," he said, addressing a public he knew was ly elected conservative President, "but we cannot live with the situation as it is," he said.

He spoke after a weekend of intensive telephone contacts on the Bosnian crisis between Mr. Chirac and President Clinton, President Boris N. Yeltsin of Russia, Prime Minister John Major of Britain, President Slo-

Continued From Page AI

bodan Milosevic of Serbia and other leaders. Most of the European allies that United troops in Bosnia appear to support France's calls for them back from exposed positions. Diplomats said Canada is also deeply concerned about the possible additional dangers that its troops could face as a result of NATO threats to repel attacks with air strikes.

Mr. Juppé said that at meetings set to be held in the Netherlands on Monday night and Tuesday, France would seek its allies to agree to send a NATO air-mobile reaction force to Bosnia equipped with helicopters and gunships that peacekeepers could call on for protection.

"These decisions should be taken within the next few days," he said.

Secretary of State Warren Christopher and Foreign Ministers of the United Nations contact group of countries seeking a diplomatic settlement in Bosnia — the United States, Britain, France, Germany and Russia — are to meet in the Hague on Monday night to consider ways of restarting diplomatic efforts, French officials said.

They are to go to the coastal resort of Nordwijk on Tuesday and Wednesday for a regular NATO ministerial meeting and for consultations between the allies and former Warsaw Pact countries.

The French proposal for a NATO reaction force would require agreement by both the United Nations and NATO — an arrangement that United States officials say has proved highly unsatisfactory in launching air strikes so far.

The French Prime Minister was also critical of the United Nations decision to call in NATO bombers against the Serbs last week, though France supported the decision at the time to force the Serbs to stop bombarding Sarajevo and to return heavy weapons they had illegally seized from United Nations weapons-collection depots.

"That ultimatum and those air strikes were not carefully planned," Mr. Juppé said tonight. "They submitted our troops to ill-considered risks. We have no right to expose our soldiers to ill-considered risks."

Mr. Juppé, who was Foreign Minister until Mr. Chirac, France's newly elected conservative President, put him at the head of a new Government 11 days ago, said that France would ask the contact group to name a single negotiator to try more effectively for a settlement. So far, its officials have usually traveled together in groups, but the Bosnian Serbs have sometimes refused to let all of them pass its checkpoints.

The Prime Minister did not say how he expected diplomacy suddenly to work after years of futility, but he did say that President Slobodan Milosevic of Serbia could use his influence on the Bosnian Serbs more effectively to pressure them into accepting a settlement.

"Milosevic could do something tomorrow," Mr. Juppé said. "He could recognize Bosnia and Herzegovina within its present frontiers."

The contact group, tried unsuccessfully this spring to get Mr. Milosevic to agree to that as a condition for lifting United Nations economic sanctions against Serbia, but Mr. Milosevic insisted that the the sanctions be lifted unconditionally first.

"The moment that is accomplished, I believe the international community should recognize the situation and lift the sanctions," Mr. Juppé said. "It's a clause permitting reimbursement if necessary," Mr. Juppé said.

Mr. Chirac on Saturday gave French troops in Bosnia full authority to resist attack with force and despatched a French air and naval force, including the aircraft carrier Foch and a helicopter carrier, to the Adriatic.

The force is to arrive there on Tuesday and join NATO naval operations that already include an American aircraft carrier, the Theodore Roosevelt.

The NATO forces could be used to aid peacekeepers and, if necessary, to take them to safety if France, Britain, Spain and the other countries involved decide that their mission cannot be carried out and that their position is untenable.

"We have other courses of action under consideration, but any action has to be collective," Mr. Juppé said.

France's Foreign Minister, Hervé de Charette, said in an interview published today in the weekly Journal de Dimanche that the United Nations effort to keep heavy weapons out of a 12½-mile zone around Sarajevo has failed.

"With violations of the initial arrangements by one side or the other," he said, the United Nations force "has progressively been driven into a situation where it can no longer carry out its mission."
U.S. FINDS ITSELF VIRTUALLY ALONE ON JAPAN TRADE

WORRIES IN REST OF ASIA

Little Support in Europe, Too
— Washington Is Said to Doubt Own Legal Case

A

BY DAVID E. SANGER

SINGAPORE, May 27 — Japanese trade officials have spread through Asia in recent days, warning government officials that their booming economies will be the next targets if Japan is forced by the United States to set aside a certain portion of its market for American goods.

The message is sinking in. Nearly two weeks after declaring that it would impose harsh trade sanctions on Japan, the Clinton Administration is finding itself isolated and outmaneuvered around the world, with Asian governments joining their counterparts in Europe in condemning Washington’s move to impose $6 billion in punitive tariffs against Japanese-made luxury cars.

In a stream of newspaper columns, public speeches and private meetings with American officials, Asian leaders have told the Clinton Administration that they share its frustration in opening Japanese markets, but cannot abide its tactics.

“We are quite sympathetic with America’s goals,” Sarasin Viraphol, director general for American affairs in the Foreign Ministry of Thailand, said here today during a break in a meeting of senior American and Asian business leaders, government officials and academics that was dominated by the trade confrontation.

“We understand why America feels it must go eyeball to eyeball. But if it is successful using this weapon on Japan, soon it will use it on all of us.”

The sharp rejection of President Clinton’s initiative in both Asia and Europe has come as a pleasant surprise to Japanese officials, and it seems to be emboldening them to face down the United States. In private, several senior Japanese officials say they believe that Mr. Clinton’s top trade advisers are already having second thoughts and will seek a face-saving compromise rather than let the newly formed World Trade Organization issue a ruling on the legality of the American sanctions. The Clinton Administration, however, appears dug in.

“Both countries have walked themselves into positions that are hard to get out of,” said Gerald Curtis, a professor of political science at Columbia University and a longtime expert on Japanese politics. “That is why everyone is so nervous that this time there could be a real collision.”

On Sunday, the United States trade representative, Mickey Kantor, continued weeklong sparring with the Japanese over when to resume trade talks. Washington proposed a meeting on June 20, which Tokyo said was too close to the sanctions deadline. It asked instead for a meeting early in June. But Mr. Kantor, appearing on the ABC television program “This Week,” said June 20 was the “correct date.”

Most trade experts say they expect that Japan would win a legal challenge to the 100 percent tariffs that are to be imposed on 13 Japanese-made luxury car models if an agreement is not reached by June 26. Commerce Secretary Ronald H. Brown seemed to acknowledge that possibility earlier this week in Paris, when he said that American Government lawyers had mixed emotions about whether the punitive tariffs violated the world trade agreement approved last year.

“He was putting the best possible face on things,” a senior American official said of Mr. Brown’s comments. “I think there is a clear apprehension that we are going to court with a losing case.”

Indeed, American officials are making little effort to defend the legality of the sanctions. Instead, they have begun to send direct and indirect messages to Tokyo that something much more important than auto parts is at stake.

Japanese leaders, they now argue, have an essential decision to make: whether it is worth winning a case in front of the World Trade Organization if the long-term cost is harm to their overall relationship with the United States. Winning the case in front of the trade organization, they have warned, would be an empty victory if it jeopardized American public support for the security alliance that Japan depends upon.

The warning seems at odds with the Administration’s public position — stated several times in the last two weeks by White House officials — that they would never use American security guarantees for Japan as a weapon in trade disputes. But in subtle ways, the two are already linked.

This morning, for example, The Straits Times, Singapore’s Government-influenced newspaper, carried an interview with Winston Lord, the American Assistant Secretary of State for East Asia and the Pacific, that used unusually blunt language in warning Japan of the risks of its stance.

Mr. Lord said the United States was not linking its security presence with trade agreements. But he added that the public might make that linkage.

Continued From Page A1
Abroad at Home

ANTHONY LEWIS

... Or Karadzic Dead

By taking United Nations peacekeepers hostage and using them as human shields, Dr. Radovan Karadzic and the other Bosnian Serb leaders have defined themselves as outside law and civilization. But then that should not have been a surprise to anyone who knew their works.

Dr. Karadzic and his colleagues, after all, presided over the first attempted genocide in Europe since Hitler: the systematic murder, torture and rape that constituted ethnic cleansing. Their idea of reprisal showed up recently when Bosnian Serbs responded to Serbian defeat in neighboring Croatia by blowing up Catholic churches in the town of Banja Luka, killing a priest and a nun.

The U.N. commander in Bosnia, Lieut. Gen. Rupert Smith of Britain, well knew that the Serbs might retaliate against his men when he asked for NATO airstrikes. So did British, French and U.S. officials who supported the strikes. They decided to go ahead anyway because inaction against ever bolder Serbian violations — shelling Sarajevo, seizing sequestered heavy weapons — was making the U.N. position untenable.

The Serbian retaliation was characteristic in its cowardice. The Bosnian Serb forces not only took hostages at the airport, but also set fires at Sarajevo and Tuzla, killing scores of civilians. That was one more war crime: Deliberate targeting of civilians has been that for generations.

What can General Smith, and the politicians behind him, do in the face of the hostage-taking? The first step has been taken: making clear to Dr. Karadzic the price that he will pay if the threat to kill the hostages is carried out.

In 1994 an American, Ion Perdicaris, was kidnapped near Tangier by a local chieftain named Rassouli. Teddy Roosevelt's Secretary of State, John Hay, sent Rassouli a cable saying the United States wanted "Perdicaris alive or Rassouli dead." Perdicaris was released.

Life is more complicated now, and Bosnia much more so. But the essence of the message is the same: If a single hostage is murdered, Dr. Karadzic and everyone else in the chain of command to that killing will be held responsible for murder — and relentlessly pursued.

But we know by now that little things like the law against murder are not likely to bother Dr. Karadzic. So do General Smith and NATO and the U.N. cave in to the Serbs in order to get the hostages back?

No. The price of that weakness would be the final shattering of the U.N. Protection Force, with grizzly consequences for it and for the Bosnian people. Unprofor would almost certainly have to be withdrawn, probably under attack, with large numbers of American and other new ground troops sent in to leverage the withdrawal. Many more Bosnian Muslims and Croats would be subjected to Serbian ethnic cleansing.

The signs are that the countries involved are not at this point in a mood to yield. Both the British and the French have sent additional forces and weapons to take more aggressive action if necessary to secure their men's position.

If Unprofor toughs it out, its commanders will try to avoid getting their men in situations where the Bosnian Serbs can again pick them off. That may mean abandoning isolated Bosnian Government enclaves in eastern Bosnia, where small numbers of Unprofor soldiers are now essentially defenseless. Would the civilian populations then be moved? How? The human problems would be ghastly.

At the same time, a more robust and defensible Unprofor would have to secure its position in and around Sarajevo. For one thing, it would have to seize full control of the airport, so it would not be subject to constant Serbian harassment.

Whatever is done will require a large amount of resolve and collaboration among Western leaders. Those are qualities that can hardly be taken for granted.

President Clinton has been, and is, in a curious position: determined not to have U.S. forces on the ground because of the political risks, yet pushing those who have troops there to be tougher toward the Serbian aggressors. It does not give him much moral or political leverage.

For the West, the cost of staying the course in Bosnia may be severe. But we can see ever more clearly what the cost of yielding to evil would be: a terrifying precedent for the peace and security of Europe.
Not Just Memories

HONOLULU

A respectful ceremony is being held here today at the National Memorial that was the battleship Arizona.

Memorial Day is set aside to remember those killed in all our wars. But on the golden anniversary of V-J Day, coming up on Sept. 2, we should go beyond remembrance.

V-J + 50 years is a time to re-experience, to understand and to profit from the greatest event of this century: the victory of the free world over the forces of Germany's Nazism, Italy's Fascism and Japan's militaristic imperialism.

V-E Day, a nearly comparable commemoration, was botched by an Administration eager to bolster the current Russian regime and snub the British. The historic moment was frittered away in a vain reach for transient summit success.

Unfortunately, the moment is being lost again by a failure of vision.

The three-day event in Hawaii is being planned by the Defense Department. Ceremonies will be held at the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific; 20,000 veterans and armed service members will parade; salutes will be offered to uniformed representatives of countries involved in or touched by the war.

The centerpiece will be the speech of the President of the U.S aboard the aircraft carrier Carl Vinson, with the Arizona in the background. Bill Clinton will stand in the spotlight during three days of military pageantry, with no other world leader present.

The event has been downgraded to the level of defense ministers. Military bureaucrats of 47 nations have been invited (including Russia, which helped little in defeating Imperial Japan; and Vietnam, opening the backdoor to diplomatic relations.)

The decision not to invite the President of the Philippines (Bataan, Corregidor) is dismaying; the absence of a prime minister and the leaders of Commonwealth and other nations that helped win the war is an affront to history; the failure to invite the Prime Minister of Japan wastes an opportunity for reconciliation.

With no world leaders invited, no political or great moral lesson will be drawn from the victory. Little use will be made of the occasion to celebrate and advance the cause of freedom in Asia.

Much of the thinking that led to this planned military extravaganza has been: How can we get past this day without offending the Japanese? At first, our embassy in Tokyo tried to rename it "Victory in the Pacific Day." With that roundly derided, the White House now calls the day everything: V-J, Victory in the Pacific, End of World War II Commemoration, whatever.

Let's start afresh. A celebration needs a theme. Those chosen by the Pentagon — "Remembering the War" and "Peace at Last" — are banal and backward-looking. World War II was not fought to fight a war; it was fought to achieve a great moral purpose. The theme of V-J Day should be: the victory of democracy over tyranny, begun 50 years ago, is not yet finished.

It's fine to recall Admiral Spruance's naval genius at the Battle of Midway and to rerun TV's "Victory at Sea," but unlike D-Day, V-J Day transcends any battle. Commemoration of the event that defines this century is too important to be left to the brass.

Americans should take unabashed pride now in the democracy in the Philippines, our former colony; at the new freedom in Taiwan; closest to home, at the statehood of Hawaii, enriching our culture.

And the U.S. should seize this opportunity to tell the world how proud we are at the opportunity our educators gave Japan, and how the Japanese made the most of the V-J gift of democracy. Sure, they took advantage of our defense umbrella to leapfrog our economy; sure, they closed their markets and invited a trade war.

But thanks to their good sense and our exemplary occupation, Japan is a great democracy and no threat to its neighbors. V-J + 50 is the day to suspend the sniping and join in wonderment at how — a half-century later — victor and vanquished are both winners. And to point to the day when a billion more Asians will be free.

Remember the dead; honor the veterans; but celebrate victory by reminding the new generation why the war was fought and how it snatched freedom from the jaws of tyrants.

Three months remain to invite the leaders of the world to a civilian V-J commemoration worthy of that victory.
Bosnian Serbs Seize More U.N. Troops

BOSNIA, From AP

By Joel Brand
Special to The Washington Post

SARAJEVO, Bosnia, May 28—Bosnian Serbs tightened their stranglehold on the United Nations peacekeeping force today, taking at least 41 more soldiers hostage as the U.N. command awaited guidance from Western leaders on how to respond to the deepening crisis.

In the midst of the hostage standoff, Bosnia's foreign minister was killed, along with three other officials, when his helicopter was shot down over Croatian Serb territory apparently by a Serb missile. Irish Ljubljanac was the most senior Bosnian government official to be killed in the three-year-old communal war. He had been visiting the besieged town of Bihac.

Since NATO airstrikes on Thursday, and Friday aimed at ending Serb shelling of Sarajevo, the Bosnian capital, the Serbs have taken 211 U.N. soldiers prisoner—holding many of them as human shields—and they have another 156 surrounded in small groups at observation posts and heavy weapons collection points.

Serb units also took control today of the last remaining U.N. weapons collection points in their territory and the guns stored there. The move effectively ended the mechanism of a heavy-weapons exclusion zone, established by NATO, that had brought 15 months of relative peace to Sarajevo.

The Serbs took control today of the last remaining U.N. weapons collection points in their territory and the guns stored there. The move effectively ended the mechanism of a heavy-weapon's exclusion zone, established by NATO, that had brought 15 months of relative peace to Sarajevo.

The Serbs have established a zone extending from Sarajevo to the Adriatic Sea.

About as many U.N. troops managed to elude capture, many under fire. In one instance, several U.N. soldiers drove an armored personnel carrier through a Serb barricade. The British U.N. commander in Gorazde began withdrawing troops from the most vulnerable observation posts after the incident.
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The Serbs went after the British peacekeeping troops for political reasons, a U.N. official said. "In their eyes, they added more aces up their sleeve to have some Brits," he said. "It puts more pressure on the main two capitals—Paris and London.

Britain has the second-largest contingent in Bosnia, after France, and generals from the two countries hold the three most important posts in the U.N. force in the region.

The Serb military commander, Gen. Radko Mladic, threatened British peacekeepers if four Serb military men captured by French troops in Sarajevo's fierce combat were not released by 6 p.m. local time tonight, a deadline that expired without action.

"We are worried about the use of the considerable military equipment the Serbs have captured in the past three days. In addition to the weapons, field kitchen and hundreds of peacekeepers holding hostage, they have six French helicopters, one U.N. helicopter and 10 French armored personnel carriers.

"Our worry is the use of our equipment by Serbs to attack our troops or Bosnian Serbs," said French Maj. Guy Vinet, a U.N. spokesman.

All the Serb warplanes made brief appearances in the skies over Sarajevo, but have carried out no further missions. Serb fighters apparently fired outdated antiaircraft guns at the planes today, but NATO did not report coming under fire.

The Serbs have capitalized on the international community's indecision and have forced a shift, in the West, in strengthened Western capitals from how best to preserve the mission in Bosnia to how best to protect the lives of their troops.

"What they are doing now will be in their favor for a long time," said a senior U.N. official in Zagreb. Unless the United Nations responds with force, the Serbs will be able to dictate the future terms of the peacekeeping mission to their liking, he said.

"But they will pay a very high price politically in the long run," the official said. "They will never be accepted as a credible entity in the international community, with their ultimate goal.

For the moment, however, U.N. officials in Sarajevo face an immediate crisis that has sharpened daily in the past five days.

"We know the decision will be made sooner rather than later," a U.N. official said. "We don't like being left in the darkness without any clear guidance on how to proceed.

The risk is that the situation will get out of hand. We can't keep a lid on this for too long.

In Washington, President Clinton's senior foreign policy advisers, including Secretary of State Warren Christopher and Defense Secretary William J. Perry, held a two-hour discussion at the White House on a French proposal for reorganizing the U.N. peacekeeping mission.

A U.S. official said participants agreed that "the air strike option" should be left open but that lessons should be drawn from the reaction of the Bosnian Serbs, including the need for "more careful strategic planning" to avoid the taking of hostages en masse.

The advisers reviewed contingency plans that could involve the use of U.S. Marines and other commando units to rescue U.N. peacekeepers who are surrounded by Bosnian Serbs. The United States has promised to help in any emergency withdrawal of peacekeepers from allied nations, and could send up to 25,000 troops to assist in any general withdrawal.

Christopher will fly to The Hague for a meeting Monday of the contact group of major powers—the United States, Russia, France, Germany and Britain.

Across Europe, Western leaders held crisis meetings, but no decisions were expected at least until NATO foreign ministers meet Tuesday, also in the Netherlands.

The British government, after an emergency cabinet meeting, said it will send two artillery battalions and an armored engineer squadron to Bosnia as soon as possible.

In a statement, it threatened severe consequences if the peacekeepers are not released unharmed.

This morning, Serb troops shelled the northeastern town of Tuja, killing one man. One of the shells fell in the square where 71 residents were killed Thursday.

The hostages and the Serb threats against peacekeepers remain the United Nations' top concerns. Serb authorities appear to be dispersing the hostages over a wide area.

Ukrainian peacekeepers captured Saturday were seen being put on buses that headed north from Sarajevo. At least 17 U.N. soldiers were shot about another day chained to potential NATO targets.

A U.N. officer said today that a plan for two groups of French troops to arrive next Monday with the aid of NATO close air support was scrapped Saturday when the Serbs moved in reinforcements.

Those troops remain locked in a tense standoff with more than 100 Serb militia and at least four tanks.

The United Nations complained strongly about the treatment of its personnel in Serb hands.

"The Bosnian Serb army, commanded by General Mladic, continues to behave like a terrorist organization, chaining unarmed peacekeepers to potential military targets as human shields, threatening U.N. positions with force, holding guns to U.N. officers' heads, threatening to kill them and wearing U.N. insignia and uniforms," Alexander Vankin, a U.N. spokesman said.

The United Nations would continue to insist on immediate withdrawal of all Serb forces, he said.

"Ultimatums and air strikes must be used after reflection and preparation," he added.

"Last Friday's ultimatum and air strikes were not well prepared and expressed the peacekeepers to thought. The Serbs have taken advantage of this failure," he said.

Two Serb soldiers were taken by French forces in Zagreb, said French Maj. Gen. Herve Gobilliard, the U.N. commander for Sarajevo. "We are doing everything we can to stabilize the situation," the Frenchman added.

Alain Juppé, the French Prime Minister, said today that a 10-hour truce was imposed in order to give diplomats time to prepare peace talks.

"The time for words is over," the Premier said. "It is now time to engage in action."
U.S. Push for Airstrikes Shown as Miscalculation

By Michael Dobbs
Washington Post Staff Writer

The Clinton administration's decision to push for airstrikes against the Bosnian Serbs is turning into a military, diplomatic and public relations fiasco.

By taking hundreds of peacekeepers hostage, relentlessly shelling "safe areas" that the United Nations has pledged to protect and ignoring a series of international ultimatums, the Bosnian Serbs have shown that they will not be bombed into submission by a few air-tcraft. They have called the bluff of the international community, and Western governments are searching for a coherent response.

The initial assumption by the Clinton administration that it would be possible to shore up the credibility of the U.N. peacekeeping force through the use of limited air power has been shown to be a miscalculation. Both supporters and opponents of greater U.S. involvement in what had been Yugoslavia agree that the failure to develop a strategy that takes into account the likely reaction of the Bosnian Serbs has had disastrous results.

"The Bosnian Serbs have now
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Washington Won't Rule Out Commando Move to Free Hostages

By STEVEN GREENHOUSE

THE HAGUE, Tuesday, May 30 — The United States, Britain, France, Germany and Russia resolved this morning to expand the size of the United Nations force in Bosnia and give it heavier equipment to deter any repetition of raids that have left more than 300 peacekeepers as hostages.

And for the first time, a senior Clinton Administration official said on Monday that the United States was not ruling out contributing American troops in a combat role, specifically a commando action to free the hostages.

Asserting that they would not let the hostage-taking blackmail the United Nations into withdrawing its 22,000 peacekeepers, the United States, Russia, and the European powers endorsed a plan drafted by France that would regroup the United Nations force into larger, easier-to-defend contingents and give it more aggressive rules of engagement to ward off attacks.

To that end, Britain announced that it would send 5,000 more troops to Bosnia. France said it was sending the six-ship carrier Forme Foch and helicopter gunships to support its contingent. The United States, which has sent the aircraft carrier Theodore Roosevelt to the Adriatic, is also sending 2,000 marines there.

Anthony Lake, President Clinton's national security adviser, said in Washington that the deployment of the marines, who are trained in commando operations, was "a precautionary measure," adding, "No decision has been made yet to send them into combat."

But another senior Administration official insisted that a commando role could not be "excluded."

The foreign ministers of United States, Britain, France and Germany made their call for strengthening the United Nations Protection Force at an emergency four-hour meeting held here late tonight with Russia's Foreign Minister, Andrei V. Kozyrev. The five countries form the so-called contact group, which has been delegated to lead international efforts to end the fighting in the Balkans.

The United States and the European nations went into the meeting hoping to win Russia's endorsement of the plan to strengthen and reconstitute the United Nations force. The officials called on the Bosnian Serbs to free the peacekeepers immediately. But they gave few clues about how they would persuade the Bosnian Serbs to release the hostages.

Referring to the United Nations Protection Force in Bosnia, a senior United States official said, "The taking of hostages underscores the need for Unprofor to be beefed up and for measures to be taken to reduce the vulnerability of the troops so the risk of hostage-taking and retaliatory actions is reduced, if not eliminated."

The official, who is traveling with Secretary of State Warren Christopher, said the Administration might also bend unspecified logistical support to reconfigure the United Nations force. Such a move is expected to involve reducing the functions of the peacekeepers, while concentrating them into larger, more defensible groupings that can better carry out their remaining functions.

"We believe the U.N. needs to be regrouped so it's less vulnerable," said Britain's Foreign Secretary, Douglas Hurd.

France's new Prime Minister, Alain Juppé, threatened to draw France's peacekeepers unless the United Nations force is strengthened and its mission redefined so it can be more effective in carrying out its assignment.

While focusing on military options, the foreign ministers also said they hoped to pursue diplomatic avenues to end the conflict, by redoubling efforts to persuade President Slobodan Milosevic of Serbia to recognize Bosnia's territorial integrity. Such an action would further isolate the Bosnian Serbs, who control about 70 percent of Bosnia's territory.

The foreign ministers of the contact group convened their emergency meeting here to discuss the hostage crisis and the future of the United Nations mission in Bosnia. Discussions will continue Tuesday and Wednesday in a different forum: a NATO foreign ministers meeting to be held in Noordwijk, a Dutch seaside resort just north of The Hague.

In Brussels Monday, the 15 nations of the European Union urged France's and Britain's call to strengthen the United Nations force in Bosnia.

An American official said there seemed to be little alternative but to negotiate with the Bosnian Serbs, since Britain, France and other countries with troops being held hostage fear that new air strikes or other tough action could lead to the death of those hostages. Some American officials say they want to make sure that further air strikes are not ruled out as an option, adding that the Bosnian Serbs must not be allowed to get away with what the Administration has called "terrorist" behavior.

American diplomats said the contact group was leaning against having United Nations peacekeepers take over the remaining safe-areas in eastern Bosnia, including Srebrenica and Gorazde. These officials said France was against such a withdrawal because those safe areas were already so vulnerable to a Serbian takeover.

But the United Nations Secretary General, Boutros-Boutros Ghali, has suggested withdrawing from those enclaves because the United Nations forces there could be overwhelmed by Serbian troops and because he wants to the peacekeepers to do fewer, better jobs, but better jobs.

One American official traveling with Mr. Christopher said they were dismayed that United Nations leaders did not do a better job insuring that the peacekeepers when last week's air strikes were carried out.

"The events of the last few days of last week have been one of those interesting moments when the reality comes crashing down through the ceiling," one American official said over breakfast meeting to be held in Noordwijk, a Dutch seaside resort just north of The Hague.

But another senior Administration official said, "Although events of recent days may give ground for skepticism about the degree to which Milosevic has the ability to deliver the Bosnian Serbs," an American official said, "we continue to believe that the moving toward mutual recognition and steps to further tighten up Milosevic's cutoff of support to the Bosnian Serbs could contribute to a process towards a political settlement."

Continued on Page A4, Column 4
ALLIES RESOLVE TO BOLSTER U.N. PEACEKEEPING IN BOSNIA;
U.S. WEIGHTS A COMBAT ROLE
How NATO Air Strikes Put U.N. Troops in Harm's Way

By ROGER COHEN

SARAJEVO, Bosnia and Herzego-
vina, May 29 — It was a few hours
after the NATO air strike last Fri-
day that the French United Nations
peacekeepers commanded by Lieut.
Col. Jean-Paul Michel came under
fire from the Bosnian Serbs.

The 21 soldiers, members of the
Fifth Infantry Battalion, were sta-
tioned just south of Sarajevo, the
Bosnian capital, at the Serb-held
Lukavica barracks, where their mis-
sion was to guard Serbian heavy
weapons that are banned in an area
around the city.

Abruptly, a group of Serbs ap-
peared and fired a volley of bullets in
the vicinity of the French troops
before demanding their surrender.

"One of my lieutenants called me
and said they were under fire and
requested my instructions," Colonel
Michel said. "As a peacekeeper, it
was not easy to know how to respond.
I told them to refrain from firing
back but not to surrender."

The Serbs quickly increased the
pressure on the French, firing rock-
et-propelled grenades in their direc-
tion and destroying three United Na-
tions vehicles parked in front of an
area around the city.

Again the lieutenant in Lukavica
called his commander seeking in-
structions.

"I had never faced this kind of
decision," Colonel Michel said. "We
are deployed here as peacekeepers,
not as fighting soldiers. I knew we
had no way of getting them out and
no way of protecting them. I said to
myself, 'My men are going to die if
they start shooting back. And for
what? For peace?' So I ordered them
to surrender."

The quandary of this French offi-
cer illustrates why the American-
backed policy of using NATO air
strikes while United Nations peace-
keepers are on the ground has proba-
bly run its course in Bosnia.

The televised images of peace-
keepers taken hostage appear to pre-
clude the kind of sustained attack
strikes that last week by William J.
Perry, the American Defense Secre-
tary. Intended to cow the Serbs, the
limited NATO strikes have had the
reverse effect.

The 21 French soldiers duly joined
the more than 325 hostages current-
lly being held by the Serbs as insur-
ance against further air strikes by
the North Atlantic Treaty Organiza-
tion. For the French soldiers was
later shown on Bosnian Serb televi-
sion, chained to a potential NATO
target.

Colonel Michel is deeply indignant
and clearly troubled. He is worried
about the fate of his captured sol-
diers, with whom he has lost contact.
But he still believes he made the
right decision. "I could not justify
shredding my men's blood in circum-
stances where I could not defend
them," he said.

It now seems that until the United
Nations peacekeepers are either bet-
ter able to protect themselves or
have been withdrawn, the use of air
strikes appears to have overwhelm-
ing drawbacks.

Britain signaled the beginnings of
a new policy today, dispatching two
gun batteries to the Croatian port of
Split. A United Nations spokesman,
Lieut. Col. Gary Coward, said the
units, consisting of about 300 men
and a dozen 105-millimeter guns
with a range of about 12 miles, would
arrive in Split on Tuesday and move
into Bosnia by Friday.

"Where we need them and would
like to deploy them is somewhere
near Sarajevo," he said.

These British troops will be under
United Nations command, thus pro-
viding the peacekeeping force here
with artillery for the first time. Oth-
er British troops, including a 5,000-
strong British brigade equipped with
anti-tank helicopters, may follow in
the next few weeks, if the current
crisis is not resolved.

It is already clear that the addi-
tional British troops, dispatched fol-
loving the capture by the Serbs of 33
British peacekeepers on Sunday, have
a double purpose.

They could be used either to re-
force the fire power of a reconfi-
gured United Nations presence here,
or to help the United Nations troops
to withdraw from Bosnia if a deci-
sion is made for them to leave. The
United Nations has 22,500 peace-
keepers in Bosnia, of which the larg-
est contingents are British and
French.

Their arrival thus represents a
decisive step away from the weary
pattern of NATO threats and help-
less United Nations peacekeepers
that led to a stalemate over the past
year. In fact, a new phase ap-
pars to be opening.

That is what the French peace-
keepers did the day after the Luka-
vica episode, forming a blue-helmet-
ed commando unit to take back a
critical emplacement between the
Serbs and Bosnian Government
forces on Sarajevo's Vrbanja bridge.

The price for the French was
high: the death of two peacekeepers,
including a 19-year-old soldier,
Jacques Humblot, who had arrived
in Bosnia just two weeks earlier.

"It was a difficult decision but it
was the right one," said General
Hervé Gobillard, the commander of
French troops in Sarajevo.

The difference between Lukavica
and the Vrbanja bridge was that the
bridge was accessible to the main
force of French troops here and so
could be defended. Moreover, the
position, in a no-man's land between
the Serbs and Muslims, is critically
important.

Nonetheless, the episode again un-
derlined the difficulties of peace-
keepers in the midst of war. "We
have four Serbian prisoners from
the battle, but we don't know what
to do with them," said Col. Gerard
Dubois, a spokesman. "Are they prisoners
of war? Can peacekeepers hold pris-
ioners of war? We are studying the
Geneva Convention."

The Bosnian Serbs suggested to-
day that they had no such ethical
problems with their hostages and
intended to hold them for some time.

Their leadership in Pale, near Sa-
rajev, issued a statement, saying
that the prisoners would only be re-
leased when "the Governments that
sent them and the United Nations
give full peace to the Serbs."
THE HAGUE, May 30 (Tuesday)—The foreign ministers of the United States and leading European powers have in principle agreed on a plan to reorganize and reinforce United Nations peacekeepers in Bosnia to give the embattled and demoralized force the power to defend itself.

The plan, originally proposed by France, envisages regrouping the 1,000 peacekeepers in Bosnia in major towns and fortifying them with 120 tanks as the deployment of additional ground troops. The immediate purpose of the plan is to prevent any repetition of the hostage crisis of the last few days following NATO airstrikes on separatist Bosnian Serbs.

The International Contact Group formulating an international peace plan for Bosnia consists of the United States, France, Britain, Germany and Russia. The meeting was convened in an attempt to develop a coherent international response to the dilemma of the Bosnian Serbs, who have captured 370 peacekeepers and 31 armored combat vehicles, stepped up shellings of U.N. "safe areas" and seized artillery weapons and other military equipment from U.N. warehouses.

After the meeting, which concluded at 2 a.m., French Foreign Minister Herve de Charette announced that the ministers had decided to "give a new impetus to the diplomatic process" by seeking to bridge the remaining gaps with Serbia-led Yugoslavia on a peace plan that would involve early recognition by Western governments of Bosnia and a strengthening of border controls.

U.S. Special Envoy Robert Frasure will return to Belgrade to try to conclude an agreement with Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic. The U.S. Security Council will then consider a resolution, to be drafted, on suspending sanctions against Yugoslavia.

Russian Foreign Minister Andrei Kozyrev said it was important that the Contact Group had decided to give priority to "political rather than military demands" and was once again united. Russia strongly opposed last week's decision to conduct airstrikes against Bosnian Serb positions—made without consulting Moscow.

After the meeting, an exhausted U.S. official said that Kozyrev had "single-handedly prolonged the meeting by two hours" by arguing about individual points of the communiqué. The Russian minister rejected language proposed by the United States holding out the possibility of future airstrikes to enforce U.N. resolutions.

Secretary of State Warren Christopher said the international community should retain the possibility of using air power to promote a political settlement in Bosnia. He and other foreign ministers denounced the Bosnian Serbs for what they described as "outrageous acts" against U.N. peacekeepers, adding that they would hold Serb leaders personally responsible for the security of U.N. hostages.

The fierce diplomatic maneuvering came against a backdrop of intensified military preparation, including contingency planning for NATO assistance in redeploying U.N. peacekeepers to more defensible positions in Bosnia. Joining the already substantial NATO air armada based in Italy and naval forces in the Adriatic Sea is the aircraft carrier USS Theodore Roosevelt, with the two other ships in its battle group and the 24th Marine Expeditionary Unit—which includes about 2,200 Marines trained in special operations.

President Clinton's national security adviser, Anthony Lake, said in Washington that the rerouting of the amphibious group from an ex-Sea sardelkina in the Mediterranean to waters near Bosnia was "purely...a precautionary measure. There have been no decisions taken to send our troops into Bosnia. No decision has been made to send them into combat."

Over the weekend, Britain announced it was sending up to 6,200 troops to Bosnia—with the first contingent arriving Tuesday—to protect the 3,300 peacekeepers already there. France also is considering sending reinforce- ments to beef up its peacekeeping contingent. Before the meeting, a senior U.S. official said the hostage crisis had caused the United States and its allies "to make a very fundamental decision about whether they are going to let themselves be intimidated and run out of Bosnia."

He accused the Bosnian Serbs of having like a "terrorist organization" in resorting to tactics of mass kidnapping. "This is not an equivalency war," the official said. "There is a fundamental difference between the Bosnian Serbs and what the government is doing."

Although Western officials denied any intention of using air power, the possibility of a second or even third phase of air strikes—some 220 in all—would almost certainly involve a shift in the strategy of using air power to promote a political settlement in Bosnia.

As the ministers met in The Hague, there was a swirl of mutual recrimination in the air over the way in which the Bosnian Serbs were permitted to call the bluff of the international community. U.S. officials accused the United Nations of failing to take adequate measures to protect the peacekeepers from hostage-taking, while British and French commentators said Washington had pushed the airstrike option without thinking through the consequences.

The confrontation between U.N. troops and the Bosnian Serbs has dealt a blow to the U.S. strategy of negotiating a peace deal with Milosevic. Full implementation of a sanctions-easing package on Yugoslavia depends on Milosevic's ability to persuade his one-time Bosnian protégés to accept a peace agreement that would almost certainly involve a significant loss of territory for the Serbs.

During hours of face-to-face talks in Belgrade, Milosevic told Washington special U.S. envoy Francis Sayre that he was confident of his ability to persuade the military leader of the Bosnian Serbs, Radovan Karadzic, to go along with an eventual peace agreement.

The immediate effect of the hostage-taking crisis, however, has been a rallying of Bosnian Serb ranks around Karadzic, with Milosevic masterminding the strategy of seizing hundreds of U.N. peacekeepers as hostages to prevent further airstrikes. There is considerable skepticism over how much influence Milosevic wields over the Bosnian Serbs.

"It's like dealing with a used-car dealer who doesn't have any cars," a NATO officer said.

The Contact Group considered possible modifications of the peace agreement to bridge the remaining differences with Milosevic, who is insisting on a firm timetable toward the complete lifting of sanctions.

The complex package worked out by Milosevic and Frasure envisages a stage-by-stage easing of sanctions against Yugoslavia, whose economy has been crippled over three years by a shortage of oil and imported raw materials, with the return, Yugoslavia consisting of Serbia and Montenegro—would recognize Bosnia within its present internationally recognized boundaries, a step that U.S. officials maintain would tantamount to giving up the dream of a "Greater Serbia" that inspired the rebellion by the Bosnian Serbs.

An official traveling with Christopher said the United States has "not excluded" the possibility of using commandos to rescue hostages seized by the Bosnian Serbs.
Allies Opt to Beef Up U.N. Bosnia Operation

U.S., Europeans Accept Plan to Regroup Force

By Michael Dobbs
Washington Post Foreign Service

THE HAGUE, May 30 (Tues-
day)—The foreign ministers of the United States and leading European powers today agreed on a plan to re-
organize and reinforce United Na-
tions peacekeepers in Bosnia to give the scattered and demoralized force
the power to defend itself.

The plan, originally proposed by
France, envisages regrouping the
22,000 peacekeepers in Bosnia in ma-
jor towns and fortified camps, as well
as the deployment of additional
ground troops. The immediate pur-
pose of the plan is to prevent any rep-
eating of the loose plan of the past
days following NATO airstrikes on
separatist Bosnian Serbs.

The international Contact Group,
formulating an international peace
plan for Bosnia consists of the Unit-
ated States, France, Britain, Germany,
and Russia. The meeting was con-
vened in Brussels to achieve a co-
herent international response to the
defiance of the Bosnian Serbs, who
have captured 370 peacekeepers—
and 31 armored combat vehicles; stepped up shelling of U.N. "safe ar-
 eas"; and seized artillery weapons
and other military equipment from
U.N. warehouses.

After the meeting, which concluded
at 2 a.m., French Foreign Minis-
ter Herve de Charette announced
that the ministers had decided to
"give a new impetus to the diplomat-
inc process" by seeking to bridge the
remaining gaps with the three Serb
entities. They envisaged a peace plan that would
involve early recognition by Bel-
grade of Bosnia and a strengthening
of border controls.

U.S. Special Envoy Robert Fra-
sure will return to Belgrade to try to
conclude an agreement with Serbian
President Slobodan Milosevic. The
U.N. Security Council will then con-
sider a resolution on suspending
sanctions against Yugoslavia.

Russian Foreign Minister Andrei
Kosyrev said it was important that
the Contact Group had decided to
give priority to "political rather than
military demands" and was once
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again united. Russia strongly opposed last
week's decision to conduct airstrikes against
Bosnian Serb positions—made with out-
consulting Moscow.

Secretary of State Warren Christopher said
the international community should retain
possibility of using airpower to promote a po-
litical settlement in Bosnia. He and other for-
eign ministers denounced the Bosnian Serbs for their "repeated provocation against U.N. peacekeepers, adding that they
would hold Serb leaders personally responsible for the security of U.N. hostages.

The furious diplomatic maneuvering came
against a backdrop of intensified military prep-
arrations, including contingency planning for
NATO assistance in redeploying U.N. peace-
keepers to more defensible positions in Bosnia.

Joining the already substantial NATO air ar-
mada based in Italy and naval forces in the
Adriatic Sea is the aircraft carrier U.S.S. The-
odore Roosevelt with the two other ships in its
battle group and the 24th Marine Expedition-
ary Unit, which includes about 2,200 Marines
trained in special operations.

President Clinton's national security advis-
er, Anthony Lake, said in Washington today
that the rerouting of the amphibious group
from an exercise off Sardinia in the Mediterr-
eanean to waters near Bosnia was "purely... a
precautionary measure. ... There have been
two decisions taken to send our troops into Bos-
nia. No decision has been made to send them
into combat."

Over the weekend, Britain announced it
was sending up to 6,200 troops to Bosnia—with
the first contingent arriving Tuesday—to pro-
tect the 3,300 peacekeepers already there.
France also is considering sending reinforce-
ment to beef up its peacekeeping contingent.

Before the meeting, a senior U.S. official
said the hostage crisis has caused the United
States and its allies "to make a very fundamen-
tal decision about whether they are going
to let themselves be intimidated and run out of
Bosnia. "He accused the Bosnian Serbs of be-
having like a "terrorist organization" in resort-
ting to tactics of mass kidnapping.

"This is not an equivocal war," the official
said. "There is a fundamental difference be-
tween the Bosnian Serbs and what the govern-
ment is doing."

Although Western officials denied any inten-
tion to pull their troops out of Bosnia, the plan
decided today could serve as a first step for an
eventual withdrawal. Once the peacekeepers
are concentrated in more defensible locations, it
would be easier to move them out of the coun-
try without incurring major casualties.

As the ministers met in The Hague, there
was a whiff of mutual recrimination in the air
over the way in which the Bosnian Serbs were
permitted to call the bluff of the international
community. U.S. officials blamed the United Na-
tional community could exploit differences be-

"It's like dealing with a used car dealer who
doesn't have any cars," a NATO official said.

The Contact Group considered possible
modifications of the peace agreement to
bridge the remaining differences with mileso-

vici, who is insisting on a firm timetable toward
the complete lifting of sanctions.

The complex package worked out by Milo-
sevic and Frazier envisages a step-by-step

easing of sanctions against Yugoslavia, whose
economy has been crippled over the past three
years by a shortage of oil and imported raw
materials. In return, Yugoslavia—now consist-
ing of Serbia and Montenegro—would recog-
nize Bosnia within its present internationally
recognized boundaries, a step that U.S. offi-
cials maintain would be tantamount to giving
up the dream of a "Greater Serbia" that in-
spired the rebellion by the Bosnian Serbs.

The intensity of Bosnian Serb attacks on
U.N. troops also led the Contact Group to
rethink their assumption that all sides in the conflict want the peace-
keepers to stay as a "shield" against a lifting of
the international arms embargo against the

A senior U.S. official said it was an "open
question" now whether the Serbs wanted to
drive U.N. troops out of Bosnia altogether to
consider their gains.

An official traveling with Christopher said
the United States has "not excluded" the possi-

ble of using commandos to rescue hostages
seized by the Bosnian Serbs.
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The Bosnia Humiliation

The NEW factor in the Bosnia equation is the utter public humiliation of the United States. Prodded to display "leadership," it pressed for NATO air strikes against the Bosnian Serbs, who had conducted new bombardments of Muslim civilian centers and further provocations of U.N. authority. The Clinton administration acted, however, without taking into due account the previously used, entirely predictable Bosnian Serb tactic of making United Nations peacekeepers hostages and evidently—incredibly enough—without an idea of what Step 2 would be after the likely Bosnian Serb retaliation. There are no American peacekeepers in Bosnia, and hence no American hostages. But the photos of U.N. soldiers shackled to possible NATO targets mark a particularly costly debacle for the Clinton administration, and given its quarrel with Republicans in Congress over its foreign policy prerogatives as well as over its inclination to work in concert with U.N. forces, could hardly have happened at a worse time.

It was always clear that if the United Nations was to stand up to the Bosnian Serbs, it had to choose between a spasmodic and brief response for show and one that carefully accepted the risks of a deeper and costlier but more productive engagement. Obviously, the Serbs were counting on the U.N. to fade. They met NATO's strikes on military targets with further outrages and provocations. They are now responsible for a lengthening list of grave violations. The United Nations must continue searching for effective ways to hold them responsible. If its forces, in concert with the United States, back off now, the rout will have serious ramifications for American diplomacy and American security interests around the world.

Bosnia is not of direct strategic significance to the United States. But the final abandonment of Bosnia would rip at the threads of international order and harden a cruel post-Cold War calculus based on the general perception of what aggressors can get away with. It may be that the U.N. peacekeepers (what an ironic title that is) need to be regrouped and strengthened because their protection under the current rules has become an intolerable impediment to and distraction from the protection of the Bosnian people. The United States has in the past pledged to contribute forces for the purpose of escorting the exposed peacekeepers out. By following through on this, Washington could become better able to draw allies into doing more. For if the United Nations decides now simply to regroup the U.N. peacekeepers and let the Bosnian Serbs have their way, it might as well close up shop except as an international chitchat society for the foreseeable future. The urgent obligation on the organization is to honor its commitment to protect the Bosni-an people and to find the military means to do so.

All through the Bosnian ordeal, a political track has been open to the Serbs. But they have chosen conquest and "ethnic cleansing" rather than conciliation to ensure themselves a decent place in a post-Yugoslav order. This is how they have come to be isolated even from their kin in Serbia proper and even from their political patrons in Russia. Their residual chance of having their own real-enough ethnic grievances addressed lies in their capacity to recognize the rights of others. This is the political message the United Nations must convey along with NATO's bombs. Meanwhile, the Bosnian Serbs must be made to know that they have just made their own prospects dimmer, not brighter.
IN RECENT years, Cabinet departments have been created for reasons having as much to do with politics and public relations as with administrative logic or managerial efficiency. Nearly two decades ago, The Post argued against the creation of a separate Department of Education because the impulse to create one seemed motivated less by a desire for better schools than by a desire on the part of politicians to get or stay on the right side of the National Education Association. The Department of Veterans Affairs was set up mostly because veterans are an important political constituency and not because having a Cabinet agency would necessarily improve policy or programs concerning veterans. At other times, Cabinet departments have been created as a relatively cheap way for officials to make a public show of caring about a problem. Thus we now have a separate Department of Energy as well as a Department of Housing and Urban Development.

It's a sign of how the political mood has changed that the current fashion is not for the creation of departments but for their demolition. The budget proposals being considered by the House include suggestions that the Commerce, Education and Energy departments be abolished. The Senate budget is, for now, more modest on this score; it has only Commerce in its sights. Hero again, the advocates are obviously engaging in a pretty high proportion of show to substance.

But even so, it's not quite fair to dismiss these suggestions as mere showboating. Precisely because the Cabinet has grown so much in recent years for some of the wrong reasons, there is something to be said for stepping back and asking basic questions. Is this array of departments really the right one for what is wanted from government now? Would rearranging some government functions and juggling others lead to a more effective government? The point should be to answer such basic questions and not simply to have a few trophies to show off for constituents of departments summarily extinguished. It's also important to remember that many of the arguments over the merits of existing agencies are really arguments about other things.

A new report from the Brookings Institution called "Cutting Government" points out that abolishing departments is not necessarily the same thing as slimming down government. The report's authors, Donald F. Kettl and John J. Dilulio Jr., note that getting rid of federal agencies or reducing their size "does not automatically do away with the people they serve, the public demands they embody, the programs they administer or the tasks they perform." People should keep this in mind as the attacking and defending heats up in the days ahead.

Juggling departments is the secondary goal, as meaninglessly symbolic in itself as the creation of some of them may have been in the first place. The questions to be answered in every case—Commerce, Education, Energy et al.—are how can you best reduce the cost and simplify the operation while maintaining essential programs and functions. There will be quarrels about the meaning of all of these terms, but those are the right quarrels, as distinct from the ones about symbolism.

THE FIGHT over whether to abolish the Education Department, which has been going on since about the day the place was created, is billed as a debate about the federal role in education. It is only tangentially that. By far the most hot air is being expended on the part of that role that have the least effect on education.

The federal role in education falls mostly into two big categories—aid to higher education and aid to elementary and secondary schools—and arguments about them have little directly to do with whether there is a department of education; both had their greatest growth in years when no such department existed. In federal support for higher education, the government is a major player: The states spend more, but federal money is spread throughout the system, from student financial aid to support for academic research. In the second category, aid to elementary and secondary schools, the federal proportion of spending is far smaller, about 7 percent. The rest comes from states and localities. This money is distributed through a variety of programs whose purpose, generally speaking, is to narrow the inequities between rich and poor schools by targeting money to poor schools and poor children.

Over the years the shape of this aid—the largest component of which is known as Chapter 1—has been a matter of tussling, mostly over attempts to focus the small amount of money more effectively on schools that really need it against continual and inexorable pressure from appropriators to spread the funds around to all districts, rich and poor. The administration pushed hard in 1994 to get appropriators to target the money better—some 90 percent of all districts currently get it—but succeeded only in shifting around a few formulas that allowed "concentration grants" to the poorest schools. The aid could be used a lot more effectively than it is, but its basic mission is straightforward, and the beneficiaries—especially of the concentration grants—are among the nation's poorest. It is this money, some $6 billion, that some House members are proposing to convert to block grants and send to the states stringless, in essence undoing whatever progress has been made on that front and spreading an already minor amount of money even more thinly.

The arguments offered in defense of having a department of education bear on this question only indirectly. Defenders speak of the symbolic prominence implied in having a department and a department secretary, about the organizational efficiencies afforded by having all the programs in the same place and about the fate of Goals 2000. Goals 2000 is an outgrowth of the education reform movement that attempts to tie even tinier sums of money to states' willingness to adopt voluntary educational standards and to work toward meeting its six goals for school quality by the millennium.

But the real goals of federal aid to education are much simpler than that. We don't see that the organizational structure under which these programs are administered matters half so much as whether Congress abandons efforts to direct the money to where it can do some good. That is what the fight should be about.
Serbs Now See Peacekeepers As the Enemy

By ROGER COHEN

SARAJEVO, Bosnia and Herzegovina, May 30 — The Bosnian Serbs edged closer today to a formal state of war with United Nations peacekeepers, declaring them an enemy, annul all agreements with them, and threatening the life of a spokesman.

The defiant statement from the Serbs, who released 6 French soldiers but continued to hold more than 320 peacekeepers hostage, came as British forces arrived in the Croatian port of Split with a mission to reinforce the United Nations mission in Bosnia by providing troops for the first time.

About 2,000 United States marines and a French aircraft carrier moved close to the Adriatic coast, 120 miles southwest of Sarajevo, in a show of force that seems unlikely to lead to any immediate action but underscored the gravity of the hostage crisis.

A state of extreme tension prevailed in Sarajevo's streets largely deserted, water and electricity supplies cut, NATO fighter planes circling overhead, and jumping French soldiers at United Nations bases pointing machine guns at any approaching vehicle.

In taking peacekeepers hostage an insurance against further attack since NATO twice bombed a Serbian ammunition dump last week, the Serbs have also seized at least 6 United Nations tanks, 12 armored personnel carriers and more than 25 armored jeeps. They are thus able to distinguish themselves as peacekeepers with ease.

"They've got what they need to look like a company of peacekeepers," said the commander of the 1st Battalion, Lord Smith, "with 1,300 people under arms.

Meeting in their stronghold of Pale, nine miles from Sarajevo, the political and military leaders of the separatist Serbs issued a statement accusing the United Nations and NATO of "flagrant interference in the conduct of the Bosnian Serbs' defense mission" as well as the Muslim-led Bosnian Government — "peacekeeping cannot continue to function.

After three years of war, the Bosnian Serbs, who want their own state, control 70 percent of Bosnian territory.

Alekso Buha, the self-styled foreign minister of the breakaway Serbs, said that the hostages would be released if NATO and the United Nations formally renounced all military and peacekeeping activities. But NATO foreign ministers meeting in the Netherlands said they would not be intimidated into complying and would refuse to authorize the unconditional release of the hostages.

"Right now, the United Nations appears to be beyond any reconciliation with the Serbs," said Alexander Ivanko, a spokesman for Gen. Rupert Smith, the commander of the 22,000 United Nations soldiers in Bosnia.

Mr. Ivanko, who recently said the Serbs were behaving like terrorists, was quoted today by the self-styled Bosnian Serb government of "insulting and slandering the Serbs.

The United Nations spokesmen, a Russian who was initially perceived by the Serbs as a potential friend, was quoted as saying "to go home before I was too late" and that he might "run into an accident" if he did not heed this advice.

The Serbs' determination in relations between the Serbs and the United Nations appears to be linked to meet the NATO air strikes last week. The arrival of General Smith to replace Lieut. Gen. Sir Michael Rose has brought a sharp change in view to which the Serbs have had great difficulty adapting.

In the place of the bluster and bombast of General Rose, who was not above bending the rules in the interest of compromise with the Serbs, General Smith has brought a cool rigor and an apparently implacable interpretation of the United Nations mandate.

The mandate is not neutral. It tends, for example, to back the authority of the legal Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina, calling on the United Nations to protect the "safe area" of Sarajevo — that is the capital city and the mainly Serbian-held territory within 12.5 miles of it.

It was the Serbs' resumption of shelling Sarajevo with banned heavy artillery that led General Smith to order the NATO bombing of ammunition depots near Pale — the kind of military decision that General Rose always avoided.

Since then, officials said, General Smith has spoken to the Bosnian Serb commander, Gen. Ratko Mladic, three times. The upshot was not General Mladic at one point scoffed that General Smith should "go take some tranquilizers." General Smith said the Bosnian Serb commander was behaving "like a terrorist.

"General Smith is very cool and, for that reason, the Serbs see him as dangerous," said one official close to him. "When the first NATO air strike came in, he was doing a crossword. He's very clear on the fact that he's going to apply the mandate or, if not, secure another mandate he can enforce.

In an Indicative of this resolve, a first group of British soldiers who will reinforce the United Nations mission will arrive today, according to a Hercules C-130 aircraft in Split to-day. The soldiers are gunners who, will bring two 105-millimeter gun batteries into Bosnia over the next few days.

The gunners will be joined by logistics and contingent units in a total initial force of about 1,200 soldiers. An air mobile brigade, equipped with tanks and helicopters, has been placed on standby.

[Reuters reported that the first British troops of the reinforcements reached the British United Nations base in the western Bosnian town of Split on May 30. Some were expected to be deployed to the main British base in Zvets not far to the north.] In all, the British Government has indicated that 6,000 more soldiers may be sent. There are already 6,600 British troops here, the second larg­est contingent after the French.

The new forces could be used to reinforce a more coherent United Nations mission with a more limited mandate or to assist in an eventual withdrawal. The United Nations military command is now determined to ensure that peacekeepers are no longer left in vulnerable or isolated positions where they can be taken hostage.

It appears that the further United Nations protection of the Muslim enclaves of Zepal and the mainly Serbian-held territories is not yet seen in eastern Bosnia might be incompatible with such a revamped mission. The Bosnian Government indicated concerns over such a possi­bility of withdrawal today by confi­ning 76 Ukrainian peacekeepers in Gorazde to their base.

---

Major Supports U.N. Role

By RICHARD W. STEVENSON

LONDON, May 30 — Prime Minis­ter John Major said today that he strongly favored a continued United Nations presence in Bosnia, but that British troops could only stay safely if they were reinforced.

Mr. Major, speaking at a news conference today his decision Sun­day to send up to 6,000 additional troops, nearly tripling the British forces in Bosnia. He said that a United Nations withdrawal would leave the Balkans vulnerable to "war on a scale not seen there and would risk a wider war. Mr. Major's decision to reinforce the British troops in Bosnia was supported by the opposition Labour Party.
U.S. SET TO OFFER AID TO REINFORCE U.N. BOSNIA TROOPS

HINTS LARGER ROLE

Door Left Open to Send American Soldiers to Help U.N. Regroup

By ALISON MITCHELL

WASHINGTON, May 30 — United States officials said today that the Clinton Administration was prepared to offer military equipment and logistical support to reinforce United Nations forces in Bosnia. They left open the possibility that Washington would contribute troops for a limited mission to help regroup and move the United Nations force into safer, more fortified positions.

The comments — carrying the strongest suggestion of a broader United States role in Bosnia to date — came as the United States and European powers began examining the military actions that would be necessary to strengthen the United Nations peacekeeping force in Bosnia, which now numbers 22,500. The moves come after NATO air strikes against Bosnian Serb ammunition depots last week, which in turn led to the seizure of more than 250 United Nations soldiers as hostages by Bosnian Serbs.

For more than two years, the Clinton Administration has limited its military role in Bosnia to participation in NATO air strikes and air drops of food, medicine and clothing. The White House has talked about the use of American troops in only two circumstances: a withdrawal of United Nations peacekeepers from Bosnia or to enforce a peace agreement reached by the warring parties.

Today the White House spokesman, Michael D. McCurry, said that the United States is prepared “to provide a variety of resources and material” to the United Nations forces. He added, “It’s a little premature at this point to suggest that those requests will be forthcoming.”

Asked repeatedly whether the President might consider a limited use of American troops to rescue members of the United Nations forces or help draw them back into larger, easier-to-defend contingents, he declined to speculate on what form any assistance might take.

“We’ve said that we will be there, we will be there to respond,” Mr. McCurry said, referring to NATO contingency plans to help the United Nations forces. At the Pentagon, spokesman Kenneth Bacon also declined to rule out the use of United

Continued From Page A1

States troops if they are asked to help with a redeployment of United Nations forces. “If we are asked to help NATO, we will consider those requests,” he said.

With military planners assessing options for strengthening the forces, Secretary of Defense William J. Perry said today that the United States would be willing to send military equipment like armored personnel carriers, helicopters and night vision equipment to the United Nations force.

Still, with an American aircraft carrier and ships carrying 2,000 American marines near Bosnia, officials played down the likelihood of a commando action to free the United Nations soldiers being held hostage by the Bosnian Serbs.

Moreover, in an appearance tonight on the MacNeil-Lehrer News Hour, when asked what role the 2,000 Marines might have, Mr. Perry replied, “They could be part of an extraction operation, if the U.N. called for assistance to extract the U.N. from some part of the country.”

“Could” if this could lead to American ground forces in Bosnia, the Defense Secretary said: “No, except for one contingency: where we send our forces in as part of NATO to extract U.N. forces in danger. It would be a NATO operation under NATO command. We’d go to Congress for support before we did it.”

The stand-off in Bosnia reached a new crisis point last week after the United Nations, under heavy pressure from the United States to get tough on the Serbs, authorized NATO air strikes against Bosnian Serb ammunition depots. But the move backfired as the Serbs, rather than agreeing to meet several international ultimatums, fired the deadliest single strike of the war — killing 71 people in the town of Tuzla — and took hundreds of United Nations soldiers hostage.

In the aftermath of the hostage taking, Clinton Administration officials continued to press its allies to keep the United Nations force in Bosnia under more robust rules of engagement.

On Friday Secretary of State Warren Christopher consulted in a three-way telephone conversation with Klaus Kinkel, the German Foreign Minister, and Douglas Hurd, their British counterpart, supporting the continuation of a United Nations presence in Bosnia, according to Administration officials. He also consulted with Hervé de Charette, the French Foreign Minister, and Willy Claess, the Secretary General of NATO.

On Saturday, President Clinton spoke with Prime Minister John Major of Britain and President Jacques Chirac of France, saying the United States would do what it could to help a strengthened redeployment. American officials said he mentioned logistical support, military equipment and a contribution to peacekeeping bills. But the French and British did not indicate at that time that they favored a strengthened force.

European officials said that decision came on Sunday when Mr. Chirac called Mr. Major and the two leaders, facing domestic political pressures, decided it was up to the British and French to look after their own people. The two leaders unilaterally decided to bolster their forces, they said. And early Tuesday morning, the United States, Britain, France, Germany and Russia said they would contribute a variety of resources and materiel” to the peacekeeping force.

The United States grew more willing than NATO’s other members to look after their own people. The two leaders unilaterally decided to bolster their forces, they said.

A senior United States official cautioned, however, that the President had made no decisions on any specific operations in the Balkans and called the movement of the marines a “precautionary measure, a prudent measure, given what’s going on on the ground.”

Campaigning in New Hampshire for the Republican nomination for President, Bob Dole, the Senate Majority Leader, agreed that United States troops could be used under limited circumstances. “Under certain conditions, yes, to help rescue personnel but not to rescue equipment,” Mr. Dole said.

Senator Richard Lugar of Indiana, another Republican presidential contender, said that the United Nations mission was at a crossroads and had to reinforce or withdraw.

“The President better begin to inform the American people that we are about to have American participation, because there is not really going to be much more U.N. peacekeeping there,” he said in an appearance on the ABC program “Good Morning America.” “The hostages show that. The strikes illustrated that vividly. We’ve been in a status of denial but we’ve got to face the facts.”

President Clinton, who has made no public comments on Bosnia in four days, is expected to speak on the latest crisis Wednesday during an address at the Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs.
Christopher said that the

management's decision, which brought the United States closer to sending American ground forces to the three-year-old conflict, came as NATO foreign ministers agreed to regroup the U.N. peacekeeping forces in the face of stepped-up assaults by Serb nationalist forces.

In U.N. position marked a shift from the administration's previous stance, more than a year ago, that it would not send U.S. forces to Bosnia only to protect an evacuation of U.N. peacekeepers or to monitor a peace agreement. Officials have portrayed the extension as one of past U.S. willingness to help a total U.N. withdrawal.

At a NATO summit meeting in the Netherlands, ministers pledged their military muscle to strengthen the crumbling U.N. operation in Bosnia and affirmed a determination to use allied air power again if necessary against the Serbs. At the Pentagon, Defense Secretary William J. Perry said the United States was willing to send armored personnel carriers, helicopters and night-vision equipment to bolster the U.N. forces.

Beneath the surface unanimity and tough talk, however, lay persistent differences and resolute doubts about whether the major powers have sufficient resources to ensure the initiative in the Bosnian morass.

The Serbs' defiance hardened yesterday, as they and their Bosnian allies, declared void all existing U.N. resolutions and vowed not to release their hostages until they receive a guarantee there will be no further NATO airstrikes [Story on Page A25].

NATO leaders refused to specify the consequences to the Bosnian Serbs if they ignore NATO demands, including immediate release of all U.N. peacekeepers held hostage. NATO officials also noted that any regrouping of some 20,000 peacekeepers in Bosnia would take weeks, given the week of an option paper by U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali and subsequent action by the Security Council.

Although the specific plans for regrouping the U.N. troops is in question, officials at the NATO meeting suggested they likely would include reinforcement with more powerful artillery and solidification of widely scattered U.N. observers into fortified redoubts and perimeter fortifications, as well as security corridors linking the various U.N. bases of operation in Bosnia.

In a move to advance a British army contingent flown into Bosnia, kicking off an influx of reinforcements that is supposed to bring the NATO-led alliance to the threshold of a major ground assault, the Serbs on the weekend flew into the pocket a U.N. peacekeepers.

In Washington, administration officials continued to describe a "cessation of violence" the decision on the 2,000 Marines on ships to the Adriatic off Bosnia and the possibility of further troop deployments.

Perry said in an interview last Wednesday on the "MacNeil/Lehrer NewsHour" that the United States was not changing its policy against U.S. troops participating in the U.N. force. But Perry also said that events in the Adriatic could be used in a NATO force sent to Bosnia for selective extraction of U.N. troops in danger. He said such action would be taken after consulting with Congress.

The administration for more than a year has been pushing United States closer to sending American ground forces out of Bosnia except in two clearly defined circumstances: to help protect the peacekeepers as they depart Bosnia if they were removed altogether; or to monitor a peacekeeping mission, if the warring parties in what had been Yugoslavia were to reach that elusive goal.

But White House press secretary Michael McCurry yesterday broadened the key U.S. commitment to include helping the British, French and other peacekeepers if the West moves to redefine its role in Bosnia.

In recent weeks, the Serbs defined U.N. ultimatums aimed at protecting "safe areas" in Bosnia, promising a U.N.-backed NATO bombing strikes last week.

But the Serbs, retaliating by sending some 350 peacekeepers hostage, setting off a round of intense diplomatic maneuvering over how to maintain but better protect the peacekeeping operation.

Lamenting that there are "not many happy choices available," McCurry said the foreign ministers of the five-nation Contact Group, which is attempting to negotiate a Bosnian peace settlement, "agreed to enhance the capability and strength of UNPROFOR [the U.N. Peace Force] to ensure that it can carry out its mission safely and effectively, and the United States stands ready to provide appropriate support to that end."

McCurry would not define "appropriate support," and others said plans are still preliminary for reconvening the peacekeeping force. But President Clinton said President Clinton's commitment to allow U.S. ground forces to protect withdrawing UNPROFOR troops was "not revolutionary Thinking about the U.S. to Sudan and provide it with the updrafts that will carry it to further stability in Bosnia."

"They were always looking at what could happen as the strength of UNPROFOR changed based on the events on the ground, and the role the United States could play if events on the ground changed," he said.

We've said that we will be there, we will be there to respond," McCurry said. "We understand what our obligations are as the leader of the alliance, and the president would be prepared to act on that type of request."

He added, however, that "it is a little premature at this point to suggest those requests would be forthcoming."

The NATO ministerial meeting at the Dutch seaside resort of Noordwijk convened only hours after the United States and major European powers had agreed to a "dual track" strategy of bolstering UNPROFOR in Bosnia, while trying to persuade Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic to abandon his long-term allies, the Serbs in neighboring Bosnia.

"We condemn in the strongest terms the utterly despicable behavior of the Bosnian Serbs," NATO Secretary General Willy Claes said.

"We will not be intimidated ... we will remain ready to use all means to support the United Nations."

But British Foreign Minister Douglas Hurd, suggesting that future military moves are contingent on first solving the hostage crisis, told reporters, "I don't think there's a likelihood of airlifts in the immediate future." Hurd also voiced skepticism about pinning diplomatic hopes on a deal with Milosevic.

Secretary of State Warren Chris- topherson announced that special U.S. envoy Robert Frasure, will be returning to Belgrade on Wednesday for further talks with Milosevic. Under the prospective deal, the Serbian government, in return for suspension of international sanctions, would recognize Bosnia's territorial integrity and help prevent war material from reaching the Bosni before or after a deal. "The last 15 percent is always the hardest," Christopherson said. "Frasure has got his work cut out for him."

Christopher said that the U.S. strategy was aimed at exploiting political divisions between who is believed to be tiring of the war in Bosnia because of the havoc it has wreaked on his country's economy, and the hard-line Bosnian Serb person, Radovan Karadzic.

"We want to isolate Karadzic," the secretary explained. "We wish to remove from the scene and place of power."

"We think it is a rather lonely world out there if everyone else is for the peace plan."

Aragone, domestic U.S. political response was muted to the latest Bosnian crisis because it erupted over the long Memorial weekend and because Congress is not in session.

Senior Majority Leader Robert D. Byrd (W.Va.), a long-time advocate of a more forceful U.S. effort to aid the Bosnian government, and Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Mike Gravel (R-N.C.) have told Clinton they would support the use of U.S. troops to assist an UNPROFOR withdrawal under certain conditions.

This includes a provision that the U.S forces be under NATO—not U.N.— command, Senate staff members said.

Sen. Richard G. Lugar (R-Ind.), a foreign Relations Committee member and, like DoE, a candidate for the GOP presidential nomination next year, said in a statement that Clinton must seek congressional approval before sending any U.S. troops to Bosnia.

"During both the Bush and Clinton administrations, American policy in the former Yugoslavia has been a series of minstrels," Lugar said in a statement.

"The Clinton administration will only compound those problems unless it portrays itself as a clear defender of the American people on why military intervention is needed, and Congress approves any U.S. troops deployment.

Administration officials also strongly played down the likelihood of a commando-style raid involving U.S. forces aimed at rescuing the peacekeeping troops being held by Serb forces."

One senior official said that "is not anything we are looking at now," and McCurry, out of Company, in weekend discussions with the French and British leaders, had not discussed any such military move.

In lo its own, the itself has taken a low- key stance in the current Bosnian crisis, declining to comment since last week's airstrikes produced little of the Krajina on the part of the Serbs, and not the backing down that was anticipated.

"Akhison reported from Noordwijk. Correspondents Michael Dobbs in Noordwijk and Fred Behanan in London, and staff writers Bradley Graham and Thomas W. Lippman in Washington contributed to this report."

U.S. to Allow Ground Forces in Bosnia
President Clinton intends to ap-
point economist Andrew F. Brimmer
today to head the powerful new fi-
cancial control board that will over-
see the District government in the
years ahead, a White House source
said last night.

The president also intends to ap-
point two other members of the
board—Joyce A. Ladner, interim
president of Howard University,
and Constance B. Newman, undersecret-
yary of the Smithsonian Institution.

The law establishing the five-member
board requires it to have at least three
members to operate. Clinton plans to
appoint the two remaining members
as soon as background checks are
completed, according to the source.

Brimmer is obviously delight-
ed to be able to constitute the board
with his three appointments on
Wednesday and will soon follow with
the remaining two," the source said.

Clinton delegated the job of finding
board nominees primarily to federal
budget director Alice M. Rivlin, an ex-
pert on the District and its finances.

The two had numerous conversations
about the District, a White House
source said, and Clinton approved Riv-
lin’s recommendations last week.

With the presidential appoint-
ment, Brimmer would become the
most important unelected D.C. offi-
cial since the city was granted home
rule 20 years ago. The unpaid posi-
tion gives Brimmer substantial re-
sponsibility for turning around a cri-
sis-ridden city that is running short
of cash and running out of credibility
in Congress.

Brimmer, 68, is a former member of
the Federal Reserve Board and
president of his own District-based
economic consulting firm. A director
of BankAmerica Corp. and numerous
other companies, he is considered an
expert on banking and financial mat-
ters and served as co-chairman of a
federal commission that analyzed the
savings and loan crisis.

Efforts to enforce fiscal discipline in
the District undoubtedly will meet
resistance. This year, D.C. Mayor
Marion Barry rejected staff recom-
endations that he severely slash
district government jobs and spend-
ing. In other cities, local politicians
have blamed fiscal control boards
for unpopular decisions, using them
as political shields.

Brimmer “is not going to sit back
and let the mayor get away with
See DISTRICT, A12, Col. 1
Clinton talks of ground role in Bosnia

U.S. Obligation Under NATO Is Invoked

By R.W. Apple Jr.

WASHINGTON, May 31 - President Clinton said today that the United Nations should be prepared to help the United Nations not only in withdrawing its forces from Bosnia if that became necessary, but in moving to strengthen those forces if needed.

"We have obligations to our NATO allies," Mr. Clinton said today in a report on the future of the peacekeeping operation that some members of Congress today in a report on the future of the peacekeeping operation that some members of Congress are discussing.

"As if to underline the failure of the Europeans," the President said, "the United Nations said it fully expected the Europeans to ask soon for troops to help safeguard a redeployment - an operation considered almost as dangerous by military experts as a withdrawal from Bosnia.

"If we decide to leave the country," Mr. Clinton said, "it's clear that the lightly armed peacekeepers were being drawn inextricably into the conflict and might be obliged to leave by this fall."

A ranking western European official described the situation in Bosnia as "very precarious," largely because, he said, there has not been a single credible indication that the heavily armed peacekeepers can be negotiated for.

"So the question becomes how long the countries with hostages can sweat it out," he said. "The longer the hostage situation goes on, the greater the domestic political pressure will be, and governments will have to judge whether or not the hostage situation is an uneasy standoff. If there is another major attack by the Bosnian Serbs, nobody will be able to wait longer." If there is another major attack by the Bosnian Serbs, nobody will be able to wait longer.

An ambassador based in Washington termed the outlook "very, very gloomy," with allied leverage having sunk to an all-time low.

"The American and Allied officials said, that President Slobodan Milosevic of Serbia was "continuing to make no decision without consulting Congress and seeking the public's backing. But senior American officials acknowledged that the latest intensification of the Balkan crisis, with more British and French troops headed for the area, had led the Administration to rethink its policies.

"Mr. Clinton has made no commitment to seek formal Congressional approval, opposed to pleading nonbinding consultations, before deploying troops."

A top State Department aide said that while Mr. Clinton did not explicitly state today that he was leery about the use of American troops to the ground in Bosnia, "he was equally contemptuous to ward Mr. Clinton's statements, which he described as "mincing up the problem," the aide said. "In fact, Clinton opposed the formation of a large NATO force of at least 100,000 men, perhaps one-third of them American, to enter Bosnia and force the parties to the bargaining table.

A smaller force, much more heavily armored than the present United Nations peacekeepers, will be behind to enforce any agreement that was reached.
President Clinton has promised federal workers he will do everything he can to combat anti-government sentiments and domestic terrorism. At Peterson Air Force Base in Colorado, the president met with workers who are concerned about citizen militias that in some cases have threatened them at work.

Officials at the University of Virginia Medical Center say actor Christopher Reeve is on a respirator after suffering a broken neck in a horse back riding accident.

Reeve, who starred in four 'Superman' movies, is paralyzed and unable to breathe on his own. Doctors say they may operate on Reeve to help correct some of the damage.

A man convicted of killing two people in a 1980 Texas robbery has been executed by lethal injection in Huntsville, Texas. Thomas Fletcher Mann's mother and sisters were on hand for the execution.

Texas officials have revised the death toll in the crash of an Air Force T-38 trainer at a Wichita Falls apartment complex from four to two. State officials say two maintenance workers reported missing at the complex after the crash have been found alive.

Upsetting standard weather-prediction models, scientists say a new, five-nation study of the northern band of evergreen boreal forests of the Earth shows the air above them is surprisingly dry.

NASA scientists speculated that this unexpected dryness explains why weather predictions often err on the cloudy, wet side.

Researchers say new evidence points to a prolonged drought as one of the forces that ended some 2,000 years of Maya civilization. The driest period during the last 7,000 years in Mexico, coincides roughly with the Maya collapse.

DreamWorks has announced plans for a joint venture with Silicon Graphics to develop a $50 million computer animation production system called DAD, or Digital Animation Dreammachine.

The partners say the high-tech system also will be adapted for use on non-animated features, television and music production.
SARAJEVO, Bosnia and Herzegovina, May 31 — Apparently convinced they can talk their way out of their current isolation, the Bosnian Serbs offered today to hold international talks on the release of hostages and to withdraw their forces from the Sarajevo area while ignoring the United Nations peacekeepers in the region.

"We are calling for immediate discussions," said Miroslav Tolujo, the self-styled information minister of the Bosnian Serbs. He added that the talks should focus on the release of the hostages and future "security guarantees" for the Bosnian Serbs.

The invitation was made to the United States, Britain, France, Germany and Russia, the five countries that make up the "contact group" that has tried to mediate in the Bosnian conflict. But the United Nations quickly rejected an offer whose aim appeared to be an exchange of hostages for assurances of no further NATO air strikes.

"Our reaction is really that the first step has to be the unconditional release of the hostages," said Lieut. Col. Gary Coward, a spokesman for the commander of United Nations forces in Bosnia. "That is the necessary first step. Then, perhaps, we can talk about other things."

This response reflected what appears to be a determination, born of anger, among Western governments and within the United Nations peacekeeping force in Bosnia. "That is the necessary first step. Then, perhaps, we can talk about other things." This response reflected what appears to be a determination, born of anger, among Western governments and within the United Nations peacekeeping force in Bosnia. "That is the necessary first step. Then, perhaps, we can talk about other things."

Continued From Page A1

town of Tuzla, shooting two French soldiers dead, taking hundreds of peacekeepers hostage and chaining some of them to potential NATO targets.

"They've finally crossed the Rubicon," said a senior American official.

Col. Eric Sandahl, the commander of a French battalion in Sarajevo, is one of the many United Nations officers here who felt committed to holding some middle line between the Serbs and the Bosnian Government, only to be shocked into a radical reappraisal by the violence of the Serbs' reaction to the NATO raids.

He has lost two of his men in a battle with Serbs for a United Nations emplacement and seen two other peacekeepers forced to kneel and threatened with summary execution. He does not know the whereabouts of 50 soldiers who have been taken hostage.

"Unconditional release of hostages is demanded."

"The Serbs created an entirely new situation when they decided to treat us as their enemies," he said. "I did not make the choice. They did. But in making it, they have taken an enormous risk and probably gone beyond the point of no return."


The capture of the 33 British soldiers appears to have had the reverse effect, prompting the British Government to send reinforcements and further souring relations between General Mladic and General Smith.

Underscoring the determination to bolster the firepower of the United Nations mission, France called today for a meeting on Saturday of NATO and European Union defense ministers. Alain Juppé, the French Prime Minister, described the detention of the hostages as "intolerable."

The streets of Sarajevo remained eerily deserted after an early-morning battle between Muslim-led Government forces and the Serbs on a hill near the center of town. For over an hour, shelling by artillery, mortars, heavy machine guns and rocket-rocked the city, but the shells all fell near front-line positions on the Debelo Brdo hill and there were no civilian casualties.

Rumors and questioning are rife in a city unsure where it is headed but convinced that something may be about to change after three years of almost uninterrupted encirclement and terror.

Continued on Page A12, Column 1
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U.S. LEADS NATIONS IN SURPRISE BUYING TO PROP UP DOLLAR

CURRENCY BOUNCES BACK

Agreement With Clinton foreign countries took the currency billions of dollars in an intervention that appeared to have stopped yet yen and the German sharply today against the Japanese U.S. not ability.

trading ended today, the dollar had Agreement With Clinton... Clinton... Clinton... Clinton agreement with Japan in the contentious trade dispute over American goods more expensive and less sal-
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able in the United States.

But the fall in the dollar has result-
ed this year in a steady rise in the prices of imported goods. The resulting threat of possible inflation has made it somewhat harder for the Federal Reserve to consider a re-
duction in interest rates, even though the American economy ap-
pears to be slowing.

Administration officials have also been watching with concern the growing number of indications that the economy may be weak during the 1996 election campaign. Prop-
ing up the dollar in currency mar-
kets, if successful, allows the Admin-
istration to continue confronting Ja-
pan while also leaving the Federal Reserve with the option of lowering interest rates at some point.

Lawrence B. Lindsey, a governor of the Federal Reserve Board, pre-
dicted in an interview this afternoon that the economy would continue to slow down but would not slip into a recession. "We're going to see con-
tinued moderation in the pace of growth, but we're going to have growth," he said.

Mr. Lindsey also acknowledged some concerns about the effect of rising import prices on inflation, but emphasized that imports accounted for only a small fraction of the goods and services sold in the United States. "I think it is a matter of concern but I think the numerical effects are relatively small," he said.

Currency traders said that if the Administration had not acted to sup-
port the dollar, it would have contin-
ued its recent decline. "You can characterize today as a pre-emptive strike before the dollar could test its lows again — that was the direction that market sentiment had been building," said Stephen Flanagan, a currency trader at Crédit Agricole in New York.

The dollar settled in New York late this afternoon at 84.34 yen, up 1.66 yen from Tuesday, after trading as high as 85.28 yen around 9 A.M. after the central banks entered the currency markets. It also jumped to 1.4157 marks today from 1.3965 marks.

Because the dollar did not end trading above 85 yen and 1.42 marks, two key psychological levels, traders said the dollar might still be vulnera-
ble to further attacks by speculators.

Still, traders cited several reasons why the Administration succeeded in pushing up the dollar today after previous interventions in currency markets this year had failed.

David P. DeRosa, the director of foreign exchange trading at the Swiss Bank Corporation in New York, said traders were reluctant to bet against the success of Government purchases of dollars because many traders' profits and losses were calculated today, the last day of the month.

Kevin J. Lawrie, a foreign ex-
change manager at the Mellon Bank in Pittsburgh, said traders were also content to let the dollar rise because they feared that today's currency market intervention might be part of a coordinated international strategy that could include a cut in German interest rates when the top council of the German Bundesbank meets on Thursday. Lower German interest rates would make it less attractive for international investors to put money there and more attractive for them to buy dollars and invest here.

For every dollar won in foreign exchange trading, somebody else loses a dollar, and traders said that losses today were probably heavy.

The heaviest damage probably was in Asia, where markets were closed when the intervention took place and some traders might not have been able to undo their bets against the dollar, said Neal M. Soss, a hedge fund manager in Manhattan.

The decision to intervene in cur-
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WASHINGTON, May 31 — The Clinton Administration and a dozen foreign countries took the currency markets by surprise today, buying billions of dollars in an intervention that appeared to have stopped yet another slump in the dollar.

After several days of sliding slowly down toward its record lows of mid-April, the dollar bounced back sharply today against the Japanese yen and the German mark. But when trading ended today, the dollar had not quite reached the levels that traders said would signal a new stability.

Still, the dollar's recovery contrib-
uted to a sharp rally on Wall Street. The Dow Jones industrial average posted its biggest percentage gain in a year, surging 86.46 points, or nearly 2 percent, to a record high of 8,865.14. (Page D1.)

Treasury Secretary Robert E. Ru-
bin issued a statement this morning that described the currency market intervention as consistent with a commitment in April by the United States and six other leading industri-
al nations to bring about an orderly reversal of the dollar's fall this year.

"We acted in the exchange mar-
kets this morning consistent with the exchange rate objectives expressed in the April 25 G-7 Communiqué," he said, referring to the Group of Seven nations. "We are prepared to continue to cooperate in exchange markets as appropriate."

American officials said privately that the Administration also wanted to make clear that it would not use a weak dollar as a weapon in the negotia-
tions with Japan in the contentious trade dispute over American automobiles and auto parts. They also indicated that the White House was leaning toward moving up the date of the next round of negotiations in the dispute.

Previous trans-Pacific trade dis-
putes have produced sharp drops in the dollar that have made Japanese goods more expensive and less sal-
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Clinton Vows Help for U.N. Troops in Bosnia

The Washington Post
Thursday, June 1, 1995
By John F. Harris

COLORADO SPRINGS, May 31—President Clinton vowed today he would not leave U.N. peacekeepers in Bosnia "in the lurch," even if there is a "no peace" to 8,000 U.S. ground troops to help the embattled international force to move to more defensible positions.

At the same time, Clinton emphasized in a speech to the U.S. Air Force Academy here that any U.S. role in the "reconfiguration" of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) in Bosnia would involve only a "temporary use of our ground forces" and would come "after consultation with the Congress." Clinton's statement, his first public comments on Bosnia since the current crisis began last week, was "no peace" to 8,000 U.S. ground troops to help the embattled international force to move to more defensible positions.

At the same time, Clinton emphasized in a speech to the U.S. Air Force Academy here that any U.S. role in the "reconfiguration" of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) in Bosnia would involve only a "temporary use of our ground forces" and would come "after consultation with the Congress." Clinton's statement, his first public comments on Bosnia since the current crisis began last week, was "no peace" to 8,000 U.S. ground troops to help the embattled international force to move to more defensible positions.

As separation Serbs used artillery to assail Bosnian government forces in another "no peace" to 8,000 U.S. ground troops to help the embattled international force to move to more defensible positions.
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As separation Serbs used artillery to assail Bosnian government forces in another "no peace" to 8,000 U.S. ground troops to help the embattled international force to move to more defensible positions.
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As separation Serbs used artillery to assail Bosnian government forces in another "no peace" to 8,000 U.S. ground troops to help the embattled international force to move to more defensible positions.

At the same time, Clinton emphasized in a speech to the U.S. Air Force Academy here that any U.S. role in the "reconfiguration" of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) in Bosnia would involve only a "temporary use of our ground forces" and would come "after consultation with the Congress." Clinton's statement, his first public comments on Bosnia since the current crisis began last week, was "no peace" to 8,000 U.S. ground troops to help the embattled international force to move to more defensible positions.
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At the same time, Clinton emphasized in a speech to the U.S. Air Force Academy here that any U.S. role in the "reconfiguration" of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) in Bosnia would involve only a "temporary use of our ground forces" and would come "after consultation with the Congress." Clinton's statement, his first public comments on Bosnia since the current crisis began last week, was "no peace" to 8,000 U.S. ground troops to help the embattled international force to move to more defensible positions.

As separation Serbs used artillery to assail Bosnian government forces in another "no peace" to 8,000 U.S. ground troops to help the embattled international force to move to more defensible positions.
The Slippery Slope in Bosnia

The Clinton Administration has recklessly blurred the clear and prudent line it once drew against using American ground forces in combat in Bosnia. Yesterday the President declared that he would respond favorably to any NATO request for American troops to help reposition the United Nations peacekeeping forces there. Such a mission could easily open the way to direct American involvement in the fighting, if, for example, the Bosnian Serbs chose to disrupt the U.N. redeployment.

Until now, the Administration had insisted that American ground troops would only be used to evacuate the U.N. peacekeepers from Bosnia or to police a negotiated peace that all sides committed themselves to observe. Those missions, though involving risks, would be defined and limited. Plunging into a redeployment mission would be an invitation to open-ended combat in U.N. operations whose goals and methods seem to change almost daily.

The Administration deludes itself if it really believes it could execute some kind of quick in-and-out ground deployment. What if American soldiers were surrounded or held hostage, as nearly 400 U.N. soldiers were last weekend? Surely they would not be abandoned to their fate to meet a predetermined Pentagon exit schedule.

It may seem unfair to resist exposing American soldiers to the risks that troops from other nations already face. But it would be even more unfair to thrust Americans into dangers that are justified by no vital interest of the United States. Serbian atrocities against civilians are an affront to civilized values. That is why Washington has involved itself diplomatically and through limited NATO air strikes. But two successive Administrations have rightly judged that America's direct interest in the conflict is insufficient to justify sending American troops for ground combat.

Europe's interests are more directly involved. Britain and France, two of Western Europe's main military powers, are already present on the ground in Bosnia, along with Russia and more than a dozen other nations. These countries have sufficient military resources to handle the humanitarian and protective mandate the U.N. has given them.

Yesterday Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali proposed several options for continuing the U.N. mission, including more muscular enforcement of U.N. resolutions, possibly under multinational command. But the U.N. is not capable of fighting a war on its own, and Washington should not be sinking rashly into a widening conflict.

The best course now is for countries that already have ground troops in Bosnia to reinforce their garrisons and redeploy those in the most vulnerable positions to safer ground. If it should turn out that they still face intolerable risks, the United States remains ready to assist in evacuation.

There is no middle course and no other legitimate use for American combat troops.

V.M.I., a Constitutional Throwback

Virginia, unmoved by social progress, continues to tax its citizens to subsidize the Virginia Military Institute. V.M.I. is the country's oldest military college. It also refuses to admit women. The Clinton Administration, like the Bush Administration before it, objects to this flagrant sex discrimination and now asks the Supreme Court to strike it down.

The V.M.I. case is ripe for high court review. The constitutional evasions offered by the state and the school are overripe for high court repudiation.

If lower court rulings are allowed to stand, V.M.I. will get away with a watered-down military program for women that may be worse than the exclusionary policy it practices now. As the Justice Department's petition makes clear, anything less than full equality will continue to send the message that women are not fit to share leadership at V.M.I.

V.M.I. boasts a rugged, bullying "Brother Rat" regime that knocks cocky young men into shape and booting them together. Unlike West Point, V.M.I. does not regularly send its graduates into immediate military service. Its program prepares them to be ready for military assignment when necessary. Because the bonding embraces a large alumni network, the program also confers the possibility of commercial success in civilian life.

None of that would be available to women who, though qualified for V.M.I., would be remitted to a "parallel" program at Mary Baldwin College, 35 miles away. There are no barracks there, no physical rituals, not even equal academic courses. The Constitution requires much more.

Virginia's and V.M.I.'s stance is reminiscent of the "separate but equal" rule for the races that the Supreme Court approved in 1896. Indeed, the U.S. Court of Appeals in Richmond, which sided with V.M.I., called the proposed arrangement "separate but substantively equal." Because of Virginia's stubborn resistance, the case might do for gender discrimination what Brown v. Board of Education did for state-sponsored racial apartheid.

Virginia has relied on the high court's refusal to hold sex discrimination to the searing scrutiny it demands in race cases. Still, just as the plaintiffs argued in Brown v. Board, lawyers now say that in some cases of gender discrimination, separate cannot be equal. Like the state graduate schools that offered separate institutions for blacks before 1954, V.M.I.'s "parallel program" cannot possibly provide equal resources or alumni networking.

The Justice Department does not argue that the Constitution always requires coeducation in state-supported schools. But it convincingly argues that Virginia, after years of stigmatizing women, may not maintain that course at taxpayer expense.
Buildup Suggests More Frustration Than Resolve

Secretary General Willy Claes this week called that option "a last resort." But it is not clear how much peacekeeping and humanitarian relief work can be done from the circled wagons of a firebreak. If not vulnerable to kidnap, the U.N. troops would still face Serb shelling and snipers; the suppression of those threats requires more robust counter-battery artillery, close air support and combat engineering units—all of which contribute much to the image of making war rather than making peace.

"It won't work," Canadian Gen. Lewis McKenzie, who commanded U.N. forces in Bosnia in 1992, told a radio interviewer. "By staying, we will be drawn ... to get more involved."

A related proposal entails establishing secure land routes for U.N. convoys, possibly including a corridor from the Adriatic coast to Sarajevo and to the outlying enclaves. Such a concept has been proposed before, notably by the French, but was always resisted because securing the high ground along such routes requires large numbers of troops.

"There are now 24 bridges and tunnels from Sarajevo to Tuzla, and it's like running the gauntlet the whole way," a senior NATO official said.

Pushing Serb roadblocks also would require more aggressive rules of engagement, the conditions under which troops are permitted to use their weapons. U.N. peacekeepers currently stop when challenged; keeping routes open implies either Serb complicity or a willingness to bull through blockades by force.

Other hazards abound. Defense Secretary William J. Perry this week said the United States may contribute helicopters as part of the beefing up of the U.N. force; but helicopters are extremely vulnerable to small arms and antiaircraft fire, as U.S. Rangers discovered in Somalia. Serb militia have recently captured at least 33 U.N. armored vehicles and a truck full of French military uniforms, making it difficult to tell friend from foe.

Finally, it remains unclear to many NATO officers what the military muscling up is ultimately supposed to achieve. A Serb defeat on the battlefield?

A restoration of the status quo between Bosnia's warring Serbs, Muslims and Croats?

A negotiated settlement in which the Serbs either settle for only half of Bosnia—rather than the 70 percent they now occupy—or face annihilation?

"There needs to be a whole package here, with the resources necessary to do a job that's poorly defined," a NATO official said. "But that definition hasn't been forthcoming yet. It's almost as if this is being done backwards, with resources coming into the theater before anyone has decided what to do with them.

The diplomatic spur of the dual track approach is likewise fraught with obstacles. Here the objective is to persuade Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic to abandon his Bosnian Serb kinsmen by recognizing Bosnia's borders—thus undercutting aspirations of a "Greater Serbia"—in exchange for gradually suspending international economic sanctions. U.S. envoy Robert Frasure returned to Belgrade today for more talks with Milosevic.

"Our sense of the Bosnian Serb military leadership is that there are tremendous tensions within the Bosnian Serb camp," a U.S. official said.

Yet it is not clear how much leverage Milosevic really has—or whether the major powers are well served by considering him to be one of the prime architects of the Balkans' current agony.

"The U.N.'s options are closing on them more and more," the NATO general said. "It's a lose-lose situation."

Correspondent Fred Barbarsh in London and staff writer Michael Dobbs in Noordwijk contributed to this article.
NATO Has Initial Talks With Russia

Stable Relationship In New Era Is Goal

By Michael Dobbs

The Washington Post Staff Writer

THURSDAY, JUNE 1, 1995

NATO, From A1

NATO expansion could result in the Cold War giving way to a "cold peace." Secretary of State Warren Christopher applauded the Russian change of heart as an "enormously important" shift for both Russia and the 16-member NATO alliance. Speaking at a special "16-plus-one" meeting in this Dutch seaside resort, he promised Russian Foreign Minister Pavel Kozyrev that there will be "no return" to the Cold War era of competing military blocs and a divided Europe.

Western governments view the new security dialogue between Russia and NATO as a "parallel track" to a series of gradual steps that are likely to result in the enlargement of the alliance by the end of the century. Taken together, the two tracks of NATO expansion and talks with Russia are designed to lay the basis for the most sweeping changes in European security arrangements since the period immediately following World War II.

In his meeting with the NATO foreign ministers, Kozyrev called for a transformation of NATO "from a military alliance to a political organization" to prevent a new East-West division of Europe. He asked for a "clear answer" to a question that the Clinton administration and other Western governments have so far been reluctant to grapple with in public: "Who is NATO going to defend in a conflict?"

"If one has in mind Russia, it is obvious that this would mean creating new dividing lines in Europe. If, however, one has in mind a third party threat, Russia and NATO could tackle the issue jointly, together with other European institutions," Kozyrev said.

By framing Russian objections to NATO enlargement in this way, Kozyrev avoided one of the key contradictions in the Western rationale for expanding the alliance. Polish, Hungarian and Czech leaders make little secret of the fact that they regard eventual NATO membership as another step in the long-term resurrection of Russian "imperialism." U.S. officials are not prepared to make such statements in public, for fear of offending Yeltsin, even though they are discussing them in private.

Formed in 1949 with the purpose of containing Soviet communism, NATO has spent the last four years searching for a new role following the collapse of the Soviet Union and the disintegration of the Warsaw Pact. The difficulties that the alliance has had in adjusting to the new post-Cold War era have been dramatically underlined by NATO's inability to develop a coherent response to the conflict in the Balkans, despite its overwhelming military superiority.

Unable or unwilling to extinguish the conflagration in Bosnia, NATO has devoted much of its energy to largely theoretical debates about its relationship with its former Warsaw Pact adversaries.

The opening one-hour session of dialogue today, in the margins of a NATO ministerial conference, was largely symbolic. Over the coming months, diplomats will attempt to flesh out the details of the new security relationship between NATO and Russia and establish the ground rules for future talks. The pace of the "NATO-Russia dialogue" is meant to mirror the similarly relaxed timetable for NATO expansion.

In talks with Western leaders, Kozyrev has already laid out some of the topics that Russia would like to address in these negotiations. These include the possible forward deployment of NATO troops in former Soviet Bloc countries, Russian access to the Eastern European arms market, and the modalities of NATO expansion. Western diplomats say they have no objection to discussing these topics, as long as Russia does not have a veto on expanding the alliance.

A senior Clinton administration official said that the United States is interested in sharing information with Russia on political-security problems, such as defense budgets, force deployment patterns and nuclear proliferation. He added that the NATO-Russia dialogue could also provide a forum for discussing European crises, such as the latest fighting in Bosnia.

After the formal NATO session, Christopher and Kozyrev met for 45 minutes. A U.S. spokesman said they agreed to promote military-to-military contacts between the two countries in addition to political contacts. Defense Secretary William J. Perry is expected to meet in Brussels next week with Russian Defense Minister Pavel Grachev during a NATO defense ministers' meeting.

According to Western diplomats, NATO officials have almost completed a statement declaring that the alliance is perfectly happy with the existing nuclear balance in Europe. The purpose of the statement, which is "held in reserve" for release at a later date, is to cast doubt on Russian concerns about the forward deployment of nuclear weapons in former Warsaw Pact countries, such as Poland.

A U.S. official said Washington expected the original round of consultations to produce a "set of understandings with Russia" on European security by the end of this year. Possible areas for negotiation include some kind of nonaggression treaty or charter between Russia and NATO, a joint commission to exchange security information, or a strengthening of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

In his speech today, Kozyrev reiterated Russian objections to NATO expansion. He said that "hasty resolution" of the expansion issue could threaten the establishment of "mutually advantageous and constructive relations" between Russia and the United States, and the "usefulness of Russia's involvement" in the Partnership for Peace.
FIGHTING IN BOSNIA FLARES OVER POSTS ABANDONED BY U.N.

PEACEKEEPERS MAROONED

Battle Rages Near 'Safe Area' in East as Serbs Tighten Grip Around Sarajevo

By ROGER COHEN

SARAJEVO, Bosnia and Herzegovina, June 1 — Heavy fighting erupted in the eastern enclave of Gorazde today as Bosnian Government forces and separatist Serbs battled over posts that had been abandoned by besieged United Nations troops. The fighting left 400 peacekeepers marooned in the town, which the United Nations troops had declared a "safe area" but has been unable to protect.

At the same time, the situation became more critical for the almost 300 United Nations troops in Sarajevo, with water and electricity cut, bakeries running out of flour, and the main streets deserted because of sniping.

The arrival in Bosnia of British reinforcements for the United Nations mission here was over-shadowed by the fighting in Gorazde, about 40 miles east of Sarajevo. The British commander on positions on the outskirts of town vacated by United Nations troops who were forced out or taken hostage by the Serbs after NATO bombed a Serbian ammunitions depot last week.

United Nations military analysts reported 350detonations today as Government forces and Serbs battled for five strategic observation posts abandoned by the United Nations on the east bank of the Drina river. One emplacement appeared to have fallen to the Bosnian Army.

Some shells fired by Bosnian troops on the east bank of the river, by the Serbs from positions on the west bank above Gorazde fell short and hit the town center, which has about 68,000 inhabitants, said a United Nations spokesman, Lieut. Col. Gary Coward.

After a long period of confusion, Western governments appear to have decided that they have had enough of "safe areas" like Gorazde and Sarajevo that are unsafe, peacekeepers who are potential hostages. Air strikes that offer no solution, and diplomacy that is not backed by any credible threat of force.

It is precisely this kind of impasse that the United Nations intends to prevent through the proposed redeployment of the 22,000 United Nations troops in Bosnia to safer positions and the suggested dispatch of a rapid reaction force of between 4,000 and 5,000 Western troops.

But several questions about future policy remained unresolved, most critically whether new troops in Bosnia now — perhaps including some Americans — would wear the white of United Nations peacekeepers or of the green of a fighting army. Moreover, if the reinforcements come as an army, who would be its enemy?

"I'm really not sure whether we are moving from where we are," said Colonel Coward said. "But since the end of the cease-fire here in April, our command has been looking closely at the need for a rapid reaction force."

Over the last week, the Bosnian Serbs, who want their own ethnically pure state, have designated the peacekeepers as their enemy and have taken more than 320 of them hostage. Formally, there has been no change in the neutrality of the United Nations force.

But in redeploying, withdrawing or liberating peacekeepers who are vulnerable, surrounded or detained, a rapid reaction force of the kind proposed by France would presumably use their helicopter gunships and other equipment to fight.

Another rumored objective of the force — opening a protected land corridor to break the siege of Sarajevo — would also require a battle with the Serbs.

Kemal Mutic, a senior aide to President Alija Izetbegovic of Bosnia, said his Government had not received any request for the dispatch of anything other than United Nations troops. The 1,200 British troops now moving into central Bosnia and providing peacekeepers with artillery for the first time will wear United Nations uniforms.

"We don't want this to be a battle-ground where international soldiers in all kinds of uniforms take care of their own problems," Mr. Mutic said.

"The fact, however, is that Bosnia is much more a European battle-ground than it is a European state. After three years of war, the Government only controls about a quarter of the country. Moreover, local Bosnian commanders in various parts of Bosnia have virtually set up their own fiefdoms.

As the new plans slowly evolved today in Western capitals, the appeal to be little immanent of helping the peacekeepers in Go-

raze or easing the threatening Serb encirclement of Sarajevo.

Continued From Page A10

With more than 320 United Nations soldiers held hostage by the Serbs as insurance against further NATO air strikes, it appeared certain that the NATO air power would not be used to deter the fighting in Gor-

azde or oblige the Serbs to surren-

der the several hundred heavy guns they have manned from the United Nations and pointed once again at the Bosnian capital.

The NATO air strikes last week were intended to force the Serbs to respect a ban on heavy weapons. Instead, the Serbs took back the guns they handed over last year to the United Nations, erasing the last vestiges of the Sarajevo "safe area."

There was no hint of any progress toward release of the hostages. "It is the opinion of this command that currently we should not negotiate on the issue of the hostages and that we should demand their unconditional release," Alexander Ivanko, a United Nations spokesman, said today.

The Associated Press reported that the Serbs detained a Swedish civilian official of the United Nations today in the Serbian stronghold of Banja Luka. "We were absolutely, absolutely sure that they had been mistreated," said a United Nations spokesman, Chris Gunness.

The Bosnian Serbs, who hold 70 percent of Bosnia, maintain that no further air strikes will take place before they release the hos-

tages. Increasingly abandoned by Belgrade, where the Government keeps talking about the possibility of recognizing Bosnia, the leader of the Bosnian Serbs, Radovan Karadzic, appears determined to drive a hard bargain.

He has the support of the Serbian Orthodox Church — the pillar of Serbian traditions through centuries of migration and armed struggle. He is also backed by several Serbian opposition parties and important Serbians in the Serbian-dominated Yu-

goslavia.

In the battered Bosnian capital, where more than 700,000 were living before the war, Serbs moved to the center of the city at the beginning of the war, conditions deteriorated further today. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees said its last 105 tons of wheat had been given to the main municipal bakery. Resi-

dents formed long lines for bread.

The Sarajevo airport has been closed to aid flights for over two months and to all flights for over a week. The Serbian-controlled road out of town has been mined. The Government-controlled mountain track out of the city is regularly targeted by the Serbs. And the en-

trance to the air power would not sup-

port that leads to the mountain track has been shelled.

"My concern is not whether all this activity will help Sarajevo, because after three years I'm sure it will not," said Amelia Filipovic, a journalist. "My concern is that one day I'll wake up and say, 'What's my name? We're all going crazy.'"
Hourly News Summary
Around the World, Around the Clock...with United Press International.

President Clinton has gone on the defensive over his offer to send U. S. troops in to Bosnia to help the United Nations troops reposition. Republicans are not only highly critical of the offer, but are talking about an emergency Senate hearing on the issue early next week.

Clinton admits that ground troops would probably be of little help in the area...but says sending them in still needs to be held out as a possible last resort.

The president plans to discuss Bosnian with his advisers today.

The prosecution in the O.J. Simpson case is expected to move into the third major portion of its case today...the coroner's report.

California state DNA analyst Gary Sims concluded his testimony yesterday (Thursday) after seven days on the stand.

The first lady has been promoting education again...this time in a speech at the Brooklyn college graduation in New York. Mrs. Clinton told graduates they should continue to speak out against Republican education cuts.

The man who was shot outside Madonna's Hollywood mansion has pleaded NOT GUILTY of stalking and terrorism. Robert Hoskins had allegedly threatened to kill the pop star if she refused to marry him. He was wounded Monday night by a security guard at Madonna's compound.

Thirty-year mortgage rates have gone down again...to their lowest level in nearly 15 months. The Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation says rates on 30-year loans sank to 7.71 percent from 7.85 percent, hitting their lowest point since March 10, 1994.

By Shirley Smith (UPI)
By KATHARINE Q. SEELYE

WASHINGTON, June 1 - Sentiment in Congress today was decidedly against sending American ground troops to fight in Bosnia, although members of both parties said they might support allowing United Nations forces to help withdraw United Nations peacekeepers.

Even Senator Jesse Helms, the North Carolina Republican who is chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and a pointed critic of President Clinton, said he would not object if the United States helped evacuate United Nations troops. But of the involvement of American forces for any other purpose, such as helping to move the peacekeepers to more defensible positions, Mr. Helms declared, "Not on my watch."

President Clinton said Wednesday that he might send troops to Bosnia not only to help with withdrawal but for "a reconfiguration and a strengthening" of United Nations forces. But he said that so far, he had not had any requests for such deployment and had made no decisions.

Among the voices of caution was that of Representative Newt Gingrich, Republican of Georgia, the Speaker of the House.

"We should wait to see what's happening," he told reporters in Georgia. He said it was unlikely that "we would say to our allies of a half-century in the U.S. and the world, but at the same time we don't want to go and get involved." He added, "It's very important for us to be very careful about this." He said he had been reassured by Gen. John Shalikashvili, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, that "there were no circumstances where we would come under U.N. command."

With the Administration's intentions undefined, Republican leaders in the Senate planned hearings on Bosnia next week, while Democrats were mulling in offering their wholehearted support for the plan. Republicans and Democrats alike renewed their calls for lifting the arms embargo to allow United States forces to fight without a massive deployment of personnel. They can't do it with 5,000, 10,000 or 20,000 troops, and not enough has been done yet to lay the foundation for a massive American invasion."

One of the few Democrats to issue a ringing endorsement of President Clinton was Representative John P. Murtha of Pennsylvania, ranking member of the Appropriations subcommittee on National Security. "I absolutely agree with President Clinton's position on Bosnia as laid out in his speech at the Air Force Academy," Mr. Murtha, a conservative, said. "The national security interest of the United States is to protect against a wider war in the region."

Administration officials gave a classified briefing on the Bosnia situation to some members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last week before the NATO air strikes. Senator Richard G. Lugar, Republican of Indiana and a member of the committee, said the officials outlined a scenario involving "a very large NATO force with about a one-third complement of Americans that would in fact be of sufficient size and military impressiveness and robust enough to extricate whosever is there."

Mr. Lugar said that such a force should then remain in Bosnia, secure major ports, airports and other strategic positions, that they are going to stay until a diplomatic accord is achieved. He also sees this force as the solution to the hostage crisis. By his figuring, it would be big enough to convince the Serbs that a failure to release the hostages would have dire consequences.

"The President is treading on very dangerous ground," said Representative Billy Tauzin, a conservative Democrat from Louisiana. "We should not get dragged into this war."

Representative Steny Hoyer, a Maryland Democrat, said he would go "further than the President in terms of unilateral lifting of the arms embargo."

But Representative Howard L. Berman, a liberal Democrat of California, a member of the International Relations Committee, and one who is somewhat sympathetic to the President, cautioned against such a move. "The existence of NATO is at stake here," he said.

As for using U.S. forces to fight, Mr. Berman said: "You don't want to fight without a massive deployment of personnel. You can't do it with 5,000, 10,000 or 20,000 troops, and not enough has been done yet to lay the foundation for a massive American invasion."
Clinton Tries
To Recapture '92 Campaign

By TODD S. PURDUM

BILLINGS, Mont., June 1 - The boy from the bus is back on the road, but now he is in the bubble. So when Bill Clinton sat down today to talk turkey with farmers at cedar picnic tables, flanked by picturesque hay bales, he was a far piece from the 1992 campaign in which he made such settings famous.

At the 7,000-acre wheat farm of Les Auer, where President Clinton paused outside this central Montana city for a noontime chat and a lunch of "pitchfork fondue" with local politicians, farmers and cattlemen, his motorcade froze the narrow road solid and a security helicopter swept the Big Sky overhead.

But on this two-day swing through Western states, which he carried for the Democrats for the first time in a generation in 1992, Mr. Clinton is doing his damndest to pierce the confining net of Presidential security. He has eaten antelope, ridden an Arabian gelding named Phire Power through a field of sage brush, faced voters upset with his performance in office, shaken hands and mended fences for 1996 in the kind of retail politicking he loves best.

And both the possibilities and the limits of the effort are clear: He can not move around as freely but he can still make a big splash. "If every kid in America were in 4-H, we'd have about half of the problems we've got," the President told Kelly Raths, a representative of the 4-H program, "but now he is in the bubble."

"One of the most frustrating things about being President is, with 260 million people in this country and so many intermediaries between you and the people out where they live, it's hard to know sometimes," Mr. Clinton told a cheering, sweaty crowd of hundreds in the gymnasium at Montana State University on his arrival on Tuesday evening. "I mean, look, half the time when I see the evening news, I wouldn't be for me, either. So I'm glad to be back at a place where we can be directly involved and know the truth, right?"

Mr. Clinton has made similar trips to Florida and Iowa in recent months, addressing state legislatures there. He is to make the commencement speech at Dartmouth College on June 11, in his initial foray into the thickets of New Hampshire's Presidential politics.

And the not-so-dirty little secret of these trips is that while Mr. Clinton may no longer be the fresh-faced outsider aboard his rolling buscape, his mere presence in smaller cities and media markets commands extraordinary — and generally sympathetic — attention, even at a time when he is bedeviled by the Republican Congress, or foreign policy crises back home.

"I'll tell you what," Heather Jennings, a reporter for KTVQ-TV, the local CBS affiliate station, said on Tuesday night in a breathless live report after interviewing the President aboard Air Force One on the way from Colorado Springs. "It is quite an experience, it really is."

And in a confession that Washingtonians like to pretend they've forgotten but that few people here seem to have, Ms. Jennings said simply: "It was really cool to meet the President."

**Continued From Page A1**
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on this trip, as when he gave a live telephone interview to a local television station covering Air Force One's landing in Billings on Tuesday night, allowing that his plane had never looked quite so beautiful as it did silhouetted against the Montana sky.

The official purpose of this visit is official: a commencement speech at the Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs on Tuesday, the farm lunch and a televised town hall meeting in Billings tonight. But the political overtones are inescapable, if not entirely obvious. After all, Montana has just three electoral votes, and Colorado only eight.

Yet Mr. Clinton's victories in the two states were the first for a Democratic Presidential candidate since Lyndon B. Johnson's in 1964, and aides believe his single visit to Montana in 1992 may have carried the state for him, with 38 percent of the vote to 35 percent for George Bush and 26 percent for Ross Perot.

Since then, voters in this independent-minded region have been angered at everything from the Administration's initial attempt to raise grazing fees on Federal lands — which Mr. Clinton later abandoned and pronounced "a mistake" on the trip — to his support for gun control and efforts to overhaul mining laws. This area is also a stronghold of anti-Government paramilitary groups.

For his part, Mr. Clinton went out of his way to explain and defend his policies on everything from the Federal ban on assault-style weapons (he is still for it), to pending Republican efforts to make deep cuts in farm subsidies (he is against them) to the war in Bosnia (he will help United Nations peacekeepers win ground troops if asked to help reconfigure their forces, but not too much and not for too long).

"One of the most frustrating things about being President is, with 260 million people in this country and so many intermediaries between you and the people out where they live, it's hard to know sometimes," Mr. Clinton told a cheering, sweaty crowd of hundreds in the gymnasium at Montana State University on his arrival on Tuesday evening. "I mean, look, half the time when I see the evening news, I wouldn't be for me, either. So I'm glad to be back at a place where we can be directly involved and know the truth, right?"

Mr. Clinton has made similar trips to Florida and Iowa in recent months, addressing state legislatures there. He is to make the commencement speech at Dartmouth College on June 11, in his initial foray into the thickets of New Hampshire's Presidential politics.

And the not-so-dirty little secret of these trips is that while Mr. Clinton may no longer be the fresh-faced outsider aboard his rolling buscape, his mere presence in smaller cities and media markets commands extraordinary — and generally sympathetic — attention, even at a time when he is bedeviled by the Republican Congress, or foreign policy crises back home.

"I'll tell you what," Heather Jennings, a reporter for KTVQ-TV, the local CBS affiliate station, said on Tuesday night in a breathless live report after interviewing the President aboard Air Force One on the way from Colorado Springs. "It is quite an experience, it really is."

And in a confession that Washingtonians like to pretend they've forgotten but that few people here seem to have, Ms. Jennings said simply: "It was really cool to meet the President."
My fellow Americans:  

I want to speak to you this evening about a challenge facing our country and our allies. It is a painful challenge, one that none of us would seek. But there comes a time for nations, as for individuals, when it is more dangerous to avoid trouble than it is to make a stand for what is right. That time has come in Bosnia.

Many of you will be asking, Why should we care about such a faraway country? Why should we get involved? It is a President’s duty to answer those questions — to explain our interests and our goals when we take action abroad.

Three years ago some of the Serbs in Bosnia launched an aggressive war against that state. Armed with weapons from the army of the former Yugoslavia, they captured much of Bosnia’s territory. They shelled civilians in the capital, Sarajevo, and other cities. They blew up churches and mosques. The outside world did not intervene militarily to stop the aggression and genocide. Instead the United Nations’ force, with its narrow mission, was impartial to aggression and genocide will prevail for the first time in Europe since the Nazis.

If our allies are not prepared for that kind of tough mission, one with real military aims, the U.N. force should be pulled out. Then we should help arm and train the Bosnian Government’s forces, and help with strategic bombing of Serbian military facilities and headquarters.

It is often said that air strikes will not tip the balance in war. But if that is so, why did the Bosnian Serb leaders react so outrageously when NATO carried out the first meaningful strikes of this war? They were worried — that is why.

When Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait, President Bush said: “This will not stand.” And it didn’t. Here again we have un concealed evil, the evil of leaders who kill children because they are of another faith. And this time the evil is in Europe, where we have invested so much to keep the peace for the last 50 years.

That is why it is vital for us to take a stand in Bosnia. The aggression there does not immediately threaten our lives, but it threatens our civilization in an insidious way. If we and our European allies cannot work together to stop this menace, the alliance may come apart — and all of us will be adrift in a dangerous world.

Ladies and gentlemen, some of the commentators have said that taking a stand against the evil in Bosnia will be politically damaging. If so, I am prepared to pay the penalty. But I do not believe that. Americans are afraid to stand up for what is right. Good night, and God bless you.
Bill Clinton’s War

President Clinton is not leading the United States to war in Bosnia. He has already done that. The question now is whether Congress and the public will stop him before he sends American troops into the land of their approaching death.

Until now, Americans did not much care or little note that they were at war. Only foreign lives were involved, not the real stuff. Congress and the press cheered, crying bombs away to Mr. Clinton and his sorrowful little team.

Americans are not cheering now that he is telling us that soon he is likely to send actual American troops. That is actual American blood in Bosnia, despite years of his promises of never ever.

Psychiatrists who examine the President’s weird record in Bosnia would understand what he is saying as he wanders the road from President Peace to Bomber Bill to Commando Clinton: Somebody please stop me. I warn you I may order in the troops any day now. Don’t you hear me? All the U.N. or our allies have to do is ask me and I will do it! Somebody — Russians, Serbs, allies, Congress, public, press, somebody — help me not do it.

Republicans and Democrats, even journalists, are rubbing their sweet sleepy eyes. Troops, they ask? That would mean war!

Where do they think we have been? When American planes bomb another nation, that is war. Bombers do not like it, you see. They fight harder. So we bomb them harder.

When harder fails, bombbomb must lead to a decision on whether to commit ground forces. There’s no free bombing.

But even when Mr. Clinton changed months ago from no, never, to saying that he would send 25,000 Americans to extricate U.N. forces if it came to that, Congress and the press did not understand that American soldiers were being prepared to meet live ammunition in Bosnia.

Congress did not even ask for a vote. But Bosnians understood, all sides.

Now Bomber Bill is getting ready to wade ashore; he says he may also send in troops while the U.N. “redeploy.” That is jargon for digging in against “the Serbs.” And that is politicized journalese implying rebel Serbs are not genuine “Bosnians” like the Muslims, whom the press just calls Bosnians. But these Serbs are native Bosnians fighting a Western-backed Government of other native Bosnians they see as enemies and from which they want out. The bombbomb brigade is beginning to understand, almost. No U.S. troops, they say! Just keep bombing, flatten them.

Bosnia’s Serbian Christians will kill more Bosnian Serbian Muslims and U.N. soldiers. American troops will go in eventually. Soon we may be on some embassy roof, praying for helicopters.

Mr. Clinton did something worse than just go to war without public or Congressional consent. He did it under pressure.

In the first years of the war he and his advisers believed the U.S. should not get in, with bombing or troops. It was not simply because of the sickening atrocities of the Serbian Christians against Serbian Muslims that Mr. Clinton changed his mind and brought America into war. The U.S. barely noticed when President Assad slaughtered thousands of Syrians in Hama. Now Mr. Clinton sends the White House lawn for him.

Rwanda, Chechnya, Sudan, Tibet — terrorism by slaughter, and the U.S. sends no bombers or troops.

But Mr. Clinton bowed to the line of American desk-warrior bureaucrats, politicians, academics and journalists that if the now-inevitable partition of Bosnia gave Serbian Christians any territory they had won in battle, NATO would die of sheer humiliation.

For a half-century, Americans thought correctly that the reason for creating NATO was to contain the Soviet Union. But, well, the NATO hierarchy is seriously in need of a little work.

Poignant. But when and by whom in American officialdom was NATO made responsible for putting down every rebellion or secession in Europe? When did Washington decide that NATO’s face was so vital that Americans had to rouge it up even at the cost of dying in the Balkans? At that price, who needs it?

While we think that over, Congress should at last bar U.S. bombing and U.S. troops, subject to swift release of U.N. prisoners. It will not end the war. Americans cannot do that — just Bosnians. But it will answer Mr. Clinton’s urgent need for help.

Can we save him?
Clinton Defends Policy on Bosnia
Advisers Try to Calm Fears as Criticism Builds

By Thomas W. Lippman and Ann Devroy
Washington Post Staff Writers

Facing a strongly negative bipartisan response to Wednesday's offer to send U.S. troops to help reposition U.N. peacekeeping forces in Bosnia, President Clinton and his senior national security aides scrambled yesterday to allay fears that the United States was being sucked into a dangerous new commitment in the Balkans.

In phone calls to members of Congress and in news briefings, senior officials said U.S. ground troops would not be used in any Bosnian deployment unless set up by Britain and France to support their contingents in the U.N. force.

Officials said Defense Secretary William J. Perry and Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman John Shalikashvili will attend a Paris meeting Saturday at which nations whose peacekeeping troops have committed to an increasing attack by Serb forces will discuss their next steps there. But, officials said, the United States will make no troop commitment at that meeting.

So far, the officials said, no one has even requested the participation of U.S. troops, for any purpose. But reports from Sarajevo that Bosnian capital, suggested that U.N. commanders already are considering how best to use U.S. troops and equipment to help them redeploy to more defensible positions. One possibility under discussion there would employ Apache helicopters to extract U.N. troops besieged by rebel Bosnian Serbs [Details, Page A25].

It appeared that Clinton and his aides miscalculated the effect of words Wednesday, when he said in a commencement speech at the Air Force Academy that he would allow U.S. troops to help British, French and other U.N. flag group inside Bosnia. With the exception of Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.), who issued a two-sentence statement of support, virtually no one in Congress, of either party, endorsed the president's decision and several members were strongly critical.

Twenty-two thousand U.N. troops are deployed in Bosnia to protect internationally designated safe haven areas and ensure the distribution of humanitarian aid while Bosnian Serbs attempt to wrest control of the country from its Muslim-dominated government.

As has happened many times over, see CLINTON, A20, Col. 1.

CLINTON, From A1

Clinton offered two U.S. administrations during more than three years of war in the former Yugoslavia, the White House found itself on the defensive yesterday, as did Sen. Claiborne Pell (R.I.), the senior Democrat on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Yesterday other voices joined the chorus. "Not on my watch," said Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms (R-N.C.), "Putting American soldiers in harm's way for a 'reconfiguration' of U.N. forces is totally and completely unacceptable to this senator." "Bad idea," said Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.). Aiding an UNPROFOR withdrawal might be acceptable, he said, "but to help re-shuffle the deck in a losing game would be a serious mistake."

Sen. Joseph I. Lieberman (D-Conn.) said he would support the use of U.S. troops to aid a U.N. redeployment "only if the redeployment was the first step toward withdrawal. The U.N. mission is a mission that doesn't make sense anymore, so I think [the president] has to come to Congress and try to negotiate an understanding of a very limited purpose for the smallest number of American troops possible in Bosnia."

Pentagon spokesman Kenneth Bacon said of the Saturday meeting in Paris, "We're prepared to participate in the planning for ways to strengthen UNPROFOR's mandate, its mission, and its ability to carry out its mission, including planning for changes" in the rules of engagement. "We are not—and I want to stress this—we are not prepared to offer troops that will participate in the UNPROFOR peacekeeping operation in Bosnia."

At the same time, Bacon said U.S. troops stationed in Germany were continuing to train for various contingencies in Bosnia, with a 10-day military exercise involving 1,900 Americans scheduled to begin this weekend at the training center at Grafenwoehr.

"The commanders in Europe, being prudent . . . committed to the welfare of their troops, are beginning to train in ways that will help them should their troops be asked to participate in a NATO-run evacuation plan from Bosnia," Bacon said.

Staff writer Bradley Graham contributed to this report.
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Watt's Token Takes Control

By Al Kamen
Washington Post Staff Writer

Remember the immortal line by former Interior Secretary James G. Watt? The one about appointing a commission composed of "a black, a woman, two Jews and a cripple?"

Quick quiz: Who was the black member? You guessed it: none other than economist Andrew F. Brimmer, the former member of the Federal Reserve Board who was sworn in yesterday as head of the powerful new financial control board to oversee the District government. (Two other members, Howard University intern president Joyce A. Ladner and Smithsonian Institution undersecretary, were former Office of Personnel Management boss Constance B. Newman, who were also sworn in at a private ceremony in Office of Management and Budget Director Alice M. Rivlin's office.)

Watt's 1983 commission was investigating a coal-leasing program run by Watt that critics said cost taxpayers $100 million.

Bonus question: Who were the other commission members? University of Illinois economist David Linowes, the chairman, who is Jewish; Julia Walah, who was an investment management adviser; Richard L. Gorden, then a coal policy expert at Pennsylvania State University, who is Jewish and whose right arm is paralyzed; and Washington attorney and former Internal Revenue Service commissioner Donald C. Alexander, who didn't fit any of the criteria. Alexander said yesterday the coal-leasing program was found to be a "reasonably substantial giveaway."

The irrepressible Watt, who lost his job not too long after that and several other presumably witty remarks and who now lives in Jackson, Wyo., also figures to be spending a fair amount of time here this fall: He goes to trial Sept. 26 on charges of perjury, lying to a grand jury and obstruction of justice stemming from his consulting days at the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

CIA Remembers Its Dead, Out Loud

Glasnost continues to take hold at the CIA under a new management team headed by Director John M. Deutch. Yesterday, the former MIT professor broke new ground at the CIA with a annual memorial service for fallen officers by reading aloud the names of all 59 employees who he said had "given their lives in the line of duty."

Previously, the identities of CIA officers who died in action were considered state secrets and divulged only to those with a need to know. The dead are represented only by unmarked stars on the north wall of the lobby at CIA headquarters, just above a locked case containing a secret book of the names and the year each died.

But Deutch invited an estimated 325 CIA employees and 75 family members of the dead officers to hear the roll call, according to spokesman Mark Manfield. The family members "recognize the importance of protecting (the) identities" and were not considered a security risk, he explained. Deutch paid special tribute to 17 intelligence officers who he said had lost their lives during the Vietnam War, including an Army officer assigned to the CIA's forerunner, the OSS, who was slain during a Vietminh ambush in 1945 and a retired CIA officer who was arrested after returning to Saigon during the 1975 North Vietnamese takeover and died in captivity six months later.

"During the long years of agonizing conflict," Deutch said, "the agency had the important and grim job of repeating messages that no one wanted to hear: that there would be no easy victory, that the struggle would be long and the cost would be high."

In his remarks, Deutch alluded to other CIA employees who he said had died in the Middle East—apparently referring to those killed in a suicide car bomb in Beirut and others—but did not provide details. "There is no way that this government, this agency, this country can adequately express our sympathy," he told the families.

Back to the Books

It's been only four months since we noted that former representative William J. Hughes (D-N.J.) was being talked about to fill the two-year-old vacancy at the U.S. Embassy in Panama. President Clinton said yesterday he would nominate Hughes for the job. That's the spot former Carter White House aide Robert Pastor was to get until Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) killed the nomination last year.

And the other long-open embassy, the one in Guyana that Clinton first was going to fill with AFL-CIO official William C. Doherty Jr., who 30 years ago helped out then-prime minister Cheddi Jagan, now president, is to go to career foreign service officer David L. Hobbs, who is now principal deputy assistant secretary of state for consular affairs.

Inside the Beltway Again

Former diplomat and senior State Department official Michael H. Armacost has been named president of the Brookings Institution as of Oct. 2. Armacost, former Undersecretary of State for political affairs and ambassador to Japan and the Philippines, had more recently been at the Asia/Pacific Research Center at Stanford. Brookings said Armacost was elected by a unanimous vote of the board of trustees after a year-long search.

Former Bush White House aide John A. Schall, who lost a bid for a congressional seat in Michigan in November, is back in town as an assistant to Senate Majority Leader Robert J. Dole (R-Kan.). Schall, who has worked on the House side as an aide to now-Sen. Connie Mack (R-Fla.), also served as chief of staff at the Labor Department in 1991-93.
Paris—June 1—France and Britain stepped up preparations today for a new rapid-reaction force in Bosnia to help reinforce and protect U.N. peacekeepers even as new questions arose over the feasibility of its mission and whether it might drag Western nations deeper into the Balkan quagmire.

As rebel Bosnian Serbs continued to hold about 370 U.N. peacekeepers hostage, the French and British governments signaled their willingness to show, including the United States, to pledge troops and weaponry to the planned 5,000-member contingent. French officials said it will be authorized to use force to open supply routes and defend strategic sites without having to go through the cumbersome U.N. chain of command.

In his first public comments on the Bosnian crisis since the hostages—nearly half of whom are French—were seized following Western airstrikes last week, France's new President Jacques Chirac said he would use all means necessary to protect his country's troops in Bosnia because Europe's security is at stake. France maintains about 3,500 troops there, the largest national contingent among the 22,000-member U.N. force.

"France will no longer tolerate its soldiers being humiliated, provoked or killed with impunity by those who have chosen to oppose their mission of peace and protecting civilians," Chirac said at the funeral in Vannes for two French peacekeepers.

Chirac, who has taken personal responsibility for France's security policy as commander in chief, declared, "We will not accept the return of ethnic hatred and barbarism to the continent." He eulogized the two French soldiers who died as heroic defenders of "a France that refuses to yield to fatality and irresponsibility.

Chirac's remarks were the first indication that he has decided to sustain France's peacekeeping force in Bosnia despite repeated warnings by Prime Minister Alain Juppe that the deteriorating situation could compel France to remove its troops—a step analysts predict would doom the U.N. peacekeeping force.

British Prime Minister John Major also sought to dispel suspicions the new force might be part of a rescue mission to free the hostages or even extricate the entire U.N. force from Bosnia. He emphasized the value of the U.N. humanitarian aid mission it has saved thousands of lives.

"It is necessary for us to be there," Major said. "It is not that long ago that people were desperately concerned about what was happening in Bosnia, the 'ethnic cleansing,' the racial-based murder, the mass rape we saw and the dangers of starvation."

Senior French officials said Chirac has given tough new orders to French commanders in Bosnia to show firmness against any transgressions by the Bosnian Serbs. The new orders to resist and fire back when necessary were followed Saturday when French soldiers seized a bridge that had been taken by the Serbs. The two French soldiers buried today were killed in the ensuing firefight.

British Defense Secretary Malcolm Rifkind backed the French plan for the force to serve as a "firefighting force" that would come to the aid of beleaguered U.N. peacekeepers. He said it would be "robustly equipped" and capable of being deployed at very short notice. He said the new international brigade, which is to be established at a meeting of defense chiefs from 14 nations here Saturday, would be authorized to use force whenever necessary to counter potential attacks against U.N. personnel.

French and British officials acknowledged that several key aspects of the rapid reaction force will have to be clarified at the meeting, notably how to coordinate the various commands, where to base them and how to avoid the "mission creep" that could push the force beyond the domain of impartial peacekeeping into using deadly force to compel one of the belligerents to behave.

Concern has been expressed about the Bosnian force crossing the "Mogadishu line"—becoming mired in the same sort of situation encountered by U.N. peacekeeping troops dispatched to Somalia whose mission deteriorated into a running conflict with forces of local militia leader Mohamed Farah Aiddeed. Casualties among the peacekeeping force, including the deaths of 30 Americans, eventually forced the United Nations to drop the mission.

"If you really sat down and thought about the situations in Somalia and now in Bosnia, you'd really see some similarities, wouldn't you?" a NATO general said. "There's a real need to think through all the consequences before you take decisive action in something like this. One has to wonder whether that was done."

Britain reportedly will muster 1,500 troops, including fresh elite units as well as some elements of its existing U.N. contingent, for what it calls a "theater reserve force." France has already sent 500 highly trained marines aboard the aircraft carrier Foch who are to serve in the force.

French officials said they also expect Dutch, Spanish and Italian troops to be assigned, while Germany has promised logistical assistance. A big question in French minds is what role the United States will decide to play. U.S. officials in Washington said the United States does not plan to contribute troops to the European reaction force being discussed in Paris but would help reconfigure the U.N. force in Bosnia if asked. Defense Secretary William J. Perry and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. John Shalikashvili, nevertheless will go to Paris for Saturday's meeting in a gesture of solidarity, they said.

"The Americans say they are willing to help in the repositioning of troops, which will be one of the first things the force will have to help carry out," a senior French military official said. "This will be an important test of American intentions in preserving European security. If they decide not to help, it will damage faith in American leadership."

Once the U.N. troops are moved into more defensible positions, French Defense Minister Charles Milon said, the principal tasks of the force would be to safeguard U.N. peacekeepers and prevent any further taking of hostages, to reopen and secure Sarajevo's airport and to clear a permanent land corridor between the main U.N. supply station in Kiseljac and the besieged Bosnian capital.

French officials said the force would be put at the disposal of the chief U.N. military commanders, French Gen. Bernard Janvier in Zagreb and British Gen. Rupert Smith in Sarajevo. However, it would remain outside the formal U.N. chain of command so that it would not be subject to the "dual key" restriction, which requires approval by the United Nations' chief civilian representative, Yasushi Akashi, as well as the military commanders for operations.

But British officials said they want to see the new force kept under U.N. command to avoid further confusion.

Correspondents Fred Barbash in London and Rick Atkinson in Berlin contributed to this article.
U.N., West Develop Plan To Move Troops Out of Besieged Areas

U.S. Might Fly Peacekeepers Out of Besieged Areas

By Joel Brand
Special to The Washington Post

SARAJEVO, Bosnia, June 1—Western planners said today that repositioning the U.N. peacekeepers in Bosnia to mean moving most U.N. troops out of isolated posts surrounded by Serbs, seizing control of a road to Sarajevo and using attack helicopters to protect the peacekeepers.

According to the view here at the center of the storm, the most likely role for the United States would be to provide Apache attack helicopters to cover nighttime evacuations from Serb-besieged enclaves and later, if needed, to offer highly mobile monitoring and firepower in Bosnia's mountainous terrain, the U.N. and Western military officers explained.

The repositioning, they said, would involve shifting thousands of U.N. troops from exposed positions in central Bosnia, which is under the control of an alliance between the Muslim-led Bosnian government and Bosnia's Croats, to the area of Sarajev,o, the capital, which is surrounded by separatist Serb forces. In addition, they suggested, the repositioning discussed in Europe and the United States would require a rapid-reaction force—along lines proposed by Britain and France—available to go wherever needed if peacekeepers get into trouble.

Some U.N. units in Bosnia would need to be replaced with better-trained forces from other countries. Overall, the United Nations would have to increase the number of troops from the current 22,000 in Bosnia, but the total would be less than 45,000—considered the minimum number of NATO troops required to cover a complete withdrawal—the Western and U.N. officials estimated.

U.N. and Western officials have formed these ideas in a mission review here that has been under way for several months but suddenly took on new urgency in the week-old standoff between U.N. peacekeepers and Bosnian Serb forces. Although decisions on the U.N. force's future are being made in Europe, Washington and at U.N. headquarters in New York, the officers headquartered here in Sarajevo have an important hand in setting requirements for the operation.
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Clinton administration officials in Washington said they have received no request so far for U.S. help despite their offer to be on standby if needed. Planning here indicated, however, that such a request is likely if the officers in charge here get their way.

The crisis over Bosnia grew out of NATO airstrikes on a Serb ammunitions dump near Sarajevo last Thursday and Friday. The Serbs responded by seizing about 370 peacekeepers as hostages, arousing indignation in Washington and particularly in France and Britain, the European countries whose armies contributed most of the troops to the U.N. force.

Bosnian Serb leader Radovan Karadzic warned today against any attempt to free the peacekeepers by force, saying it would be "an absurd, catastrophic mistake." Indications from Western capitals and New York were that the Western powers are not prepared to abandon the "safe areas" get under U.N. protection by Security Council resolutions, nor the heavy-weapons exclusion zones that are supposed to be enforced by NATO airstrike.

In what most peacekeepers say will be a radically more hostile environment between Serbs and the United Nations, the direction expected by officers here is likely to be that U.N. "blue helmets" move into more protected positions and still maintain a mission that the Serbs will find antagonistic.

U.N. commanders will be left to walk an even finer line between peacekeeping and peacemaking than before last week's crisis. Western and U.N. officers say, however, that with the help of attack helicopters, armored engineering units and artillery, the U.N. troops could be less vulnerable and more effective.

Their concern, however, is that with such an ambitious mission, the force could easily slide into open conflict with the Serbs, who are fighting for a separate nation preferably together with Croatian Serbs and Serbian proper. However, while stronger militarily, more U.N. troops could be killed in any clashes. "You can't peacekeep and war-fight at the same time," a U.N. officer said. After the standoff of the past week, an operation without the Serbs' "consent" could rapidly evolve into a "mini-gulf war," he added.

All five U.N.-declared "safe areas" are ringed by Serb forces who obstruct or block U.N. movements, supplies and relief efforts. Separatist fighters are likely to take a different view of the infusion of better-equipped troops and artillery to bolster U.N. defenses in those areas.

In Sarajevo, where about 4,500 French, Egyptian, Russian and Ukrainian troops are stationed, the probable solution is to establish a U.N.-controlled land corridor into the city through 10 miles of Serb-held territory from Muslim- and Croat-held central Bosnia. A current proposal for such an action, put forth by the French, would likely require 3,000 troops to secure the stretch of road. If successful, it would end a three-year siege of the capital and current Serb harassment, hijackings and blockades of U.N. convoys.

For the other four besieged "safe areas"—Gorazde, Srebrenica, Zepa and Bikar—the alternative is more likely to reduce the number of U.N. troops to a token monitoring force. "If we can't feed them, we can't supply them, and they're going to cross fire between two sides, what reason on earth is there for keeping them there?" the U.N. officer asked. "That's the case we have in Gorazde at the moment."

With miles of thickly wooded mountains separating those enclaves from one another and from central Bosnia, U.N. and Western officers agree that the only way for such a reduction, would be to do it at night, by helicopter.
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First the Hostages

IN WAR, THE capture of one's soldiers is considered a hazard of the military enterprise and is dealt with as a priority, but not the most urgent. But in the strange in-between-land of U.N. peacekeeping in Bosnia, where soldiers are put in harm's way without being provided the means for their protection, the captives are due urgent consideration. The Bosnian Serb regime says it is treating them as "prisoners of war." It is not. Prisoners of war are entitled to certain well-known protections of a sort denied the men shackled to possible military targets. If they are not to be released instantly, as they should be, they are due at the least safety, decent treatment and communication with the international agencies.

The arrogant Serb regime offers to negotiate their liberty in return for U.N. guarantees of no more air strikes. That is blackmail. A United Nations that paid it would only disgrace itself and invite further assaults on its dignity and its operational capability. The Serbs are due no favors merely for undoing a flagrantly abusive act that they were wrong to commit in the first place. Every day the prisoners are detained deepens the original offense and earns the Serb authorities more shame.

The NATO nations, which provide most of the peacekeepers in Bosnia, are augmenting and regrouping their forces to make them more defensible. This is a necessary stopgap measure and buys some time for decisions not yet made on whether and how to continue a more robust mission based on a more realistic awareness of the military risks.

So far, Washington has sent no ground soldiers to Bosnia. Now President Clinton is considering the dispatch of combat troops to help NATO consolidate and strengthen its forces. This would constitute a major and a risky new undertaking. The president would be foolish to proceed without full consultations with Congress, which will surely insist, at a minimum, that American troops be under NATO, not U.N., command. But it is not intrinsically a bad idea. It would put the United States in the position of sharing its closest allies' burden and would give its voice a stronger hearing in their councils. Whatever policy choices are finally made would have the added weight of having been made by the alliance. That will be a source of strength if the alliance proceeds further down a military path and a source of political reinforcement if it does not.

---

Saving D.C.: The New Board...

WITH THREE solid appointments to activate it, the necessary authority is now in place for the District of Columbia's financial recovery. Andrew Brimmer, Joyce Ladner and Constance Newman bring strong credentials to this mission—and they will need matching resolve to see it through. They and two more members still to be named must establish the discipline to make tough decisions stick while allowing responsible local officials the latitude to stand up and take the initiative.

That will likely be a most delicate balancing act, testing the courage and cooperation of elected officials and their capacity to respond to major financial surgery. The authority's charge is not to humiliate the citizens or their elected government. But neither is it to acquiesce to the politically weak-kneed who plead for a form of leniency that borders on relapse.

There are immediate emergencies to address: the city's need to borrow cash to pay employees and the bills later this month, and a review of the budget proposal for the fiscal year that begins Oct. 1. The cash will come—but not without two questions: exactly how much, and for what? The budget proposal at this point calls for more than what was allowed by a cap that Congress ordered last year. The new authority's surgery can begin right here.

There is another urgent clarification that the board should note. The fact that the law establishing this new board gives the city four years to balance its books is not an invitation to let up on the pressure for making spending cuts right now.

For the longer run, the board members should attempt to work through the local officials as much as possible. Thus, if or when the board sets spending limits, the mayor and council should meet them. If they balk or fail, it may be enough, the board should not hesitate to get into the details. Similarly, when the board offers proposals for structural changes and requirements for multi-year financial plans, the city's response will determine the extent to which the board must compel change.

What no board can order—but what true local leaders and an understanding citizenry can demand—is an end to the old and contradictory politics of demagoguery combined with lame calls for bailouts from Uncle Sam. Mayor Barry and members of the council can and should find common ground with the authority in ways that can strengthen home rule. But without sound financial management, self-government means precious little.

---
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THE EFFORT now underway to balance the District's budget is going to be the harder because of the effort also underway to balance the federal budget. Nearly a fifth of the money the District has available to spend each year comes in the form of federal grants. These are separate from the annual federal payment that the city receives in lieu of taxes for the various services the federal presence requires. They're the District's share of federal monies that go to all jurisdictions for health care, welfare, highway construction, education and the like.

The largest grants, together more than half the total, are for Medicaid and Aid to Families with Dependent Children, or welfare. To balance the federal budget, Congress is proposing future cuts or constraints in both these programs. The policy of trying to reduce if not eliminate the federal budget deficit is absolutely right, and there's no way to do that without reducing the growth rates of the health care programs—Medicare and Medicaid—particularly. But how and how fast to reduce them is a complicated matter. The District offers an extreme example of the complications, close to home.

This year the District is thought likely to receive about $420 million in federal matching funds for Medicaid. Under current law, that figure is projected to rise to the neighborhood of $840 million, meaning roughly to double, by the year 2002. Under the congressional plans for balancing the federal budget, however, the Medicaid growth rate would be cut by more than half, and the city's likely share of federal funds in 2002 would be perhaps $590 million, or about $250 million less. For welfare, the guess is that the city would receive about $30 million less.

The effect of the federal budget-balancing effort on other programs is harder to project, in that it would depend on the annual appropriations process. But total domestic appropriations would also be cut back; at the very least these other grants would lose ground to inflation.

The problem of the mayor and city council and new control board in achieving a durable balance in the city's budget can only be compounded by this prospect. It's important that they take it into account in making their projections, and Congress too. The effect of the federal budget cuts that seem to lie ahead would be to accentuate the District's fiscal isolation. Over time, the loss to the District in the form of federal grants could be as much as a third of a billion dollars a year. The annual federal payment, which itself is at risk in the appropriations process, would become an even more important lifeline than it is already.

Chile's Generals on Trial

EVERY COUNTRY that climbs from despotism to democracy must deal with the crimes of its former government. The results are rarely satisfactory. A failure to pursue these cases amounts to a tacit amnesty for torturers and murderers. But new democracies generally hesitate to go vigorously after the offenders, fearing to divide their people and reignite old enmities. Chile's prosecution of the two generals responsible for the assassination of Orlando Letelier here in Washington 19 years ago is a conspicuous exception to the general rule.

Mr. Letelier, a former Chilean ambassador to this country, was certainly an outspoken and effective opponent of the repressive military regime that took over Chile in 1973. He and an American colleague, Ronni Moffitt, were killed by a car bomb one morning three years later as they were driving to their office. The United States angrily demanded Chilean cooperation in the investigation, but got very little action until military rule collapsed in 1989 and was replaced by an elected government. It put on trial the former head of the secret police, Gen. Manuel Contreras Sepulveda, and his deputy, Brig. Gen. Pedro Espinoza, who were found guilty of organizing the bombing and sentenced to seven and six years respectively. This week Chile's Supreme Court upheld the conviction. But Gen. Contreras defiantly declares—on television, from his ranch—that he will never go to prison.

That confronts the government with a difficult question. So far the army has stayed out of this case, but it is less than totally reliable.

The Letelier murder is important not only to Chile's past but to its future. As a crime, it was no greater than any others among the thousands of murders committed under the military regime. But it was more spectacular, and, because it was here, it gained an international notoriety far beyond any of the deaths in police stations in Chile. It is also important because it is one of the few very political murders that has actually been prosecuted by the elected government.

That puts additional responsibility on the government to carry out these sentences—which, incidentally, are hardly severe in proportion to the crime. As it is working out, the Letelier case has become the surrogate for all the other human rights cases that the current government, for political reasons, has chosen not to pursue.
Stephen S. Rosenfeld

Bosnia: The Milosevic Gambit...

On the theory that the most urgent time to examine the prospects of negotiation is when everyone else is thinking of war, this has to be the prime moment to see what the diplomats might make of a Bosnia trembling on the brink of military escalation.

The prevailing view appears to be that the United States and its NATO allies,

It offers a slim chance for the Muslims to get the best deal remaining open to them.

stung by Bosnian Serb defiance, must somehow even the score and demonstrate their will. There is a certain hope that this can be done at acceptable battlefield, diplomatic and home-political cost, but perhaps a broader fear that the effort will trigger uncontrollable consequences.

A minority view holds that whatever are the requirements of a military response, they must either bolster or yield to the requirements of a negotiated settlement, if an acceptable political deal is within reach at all.

There is, I think, at least a remote chance for what is at best a hold-the-nose settlement. But it does meet the crucial minimal standard of offering to the principal Bosnian victims of Serb imperialism, the Muslim community and the Muslim-led government a better deal than they can plausibly expect to get in any other way.

This may be one of those situations that had to get worse before it could get better. Last week Bosnia got worse and, conceivably, riper for this sort of settlement. Until then it could be and was argued that the United Nations had in NATO a powerful military lever to bring Bosnian Serbs to accept the settlement plan offered by the international Contact Group (America, Russia, Britain, France, Germany).

But then the United Nations made the mistake of prematurely testing its military option, by random air strikes. The Serbs answered by seizing U.N. peacekeepers as hostages, deflating not just the option of air strikes but the whole military option. Keep in mind we are not talking here of whether the allies can inflict great damage—of course they can. We are talking of whether the allies can endure even modest but continuing casualties—the evidence is they cannot.

In short, the international bluff was called.

A flustered and defensive President Clinton has responded in part by a series of military-type words and deeds, including hints of an American combat role. Such are the signs of a tough posture. The closer the United States gets to anything snicking of putting American soldiers at risk, however, the less appealing the military option may look and the wider the possible opening for a political option.

There is a political option. Its name is Slobodan Milosevic, president of Serbia. His reckless power-seeking makes him the single person most responsible for ex-Yugoslavia’s agony; his record of broken promises and devious maneuvers has earned him a reputation as a snake. But by policy example, Serbia exercises more influence than any other country over its Bosnian Serb kin. This makes Milosevic’s cooperation indispensable if they are to be brought around.

It also makes his policy central not just to the relief of Bosnia but to the relief of Bill Clinton. The president is in a pickle. He is being pulled into a war he desperately wants to stay out of. The discredited Milosevic turns out to be better situated than anyone else to help him avoid it. Milosevic may need Clinton to spare his country further risk and deprivation. Clinton needs Milosevic, at least as an expedient partner, to get out of a political jam.

A negotiation between the Contact Group and Milosevic is proceeding. For an end to economic sanctions and a return to pre-war normality, he offers to further isolate the Bosnian Serbs and to repress their separatist political agenda. The talks are burdened by mutual distrust. They could easily collapse, increasing the sort of despair in which military choices become ever more undeniable.

But they could also move forward. Then the question would be whether the Bosnian Serbs would redouble their defiance or start buying into the Contact Group plan. The word from Belgrade is that Milosevic is probing political fissures among the Bosnian Serbs’ businessmen, military and intellectuals. If he wins them over, he is prepared to claim credit for bringing them peace; if he doesn’t, then he did what he could. Meanwhile, he argues to the West that carrots dealt to him for political concessions will show the Bosnian Serbs that concessions will earn them carrots too.

At once to compel the Bosnian Serbs to release the hostages and to persuade them they are better off yielding most of their territorial conquests: That is NATO’s challenge. With Milosevic, it’s a distinct long shot. Without him, it’s completely a non-starter.
Charles Krauthammer

...And the ‘Enclave’ Strategy

President Clinton wanted air strikes against the Serbs around Sarajevo. Within days, he got them. Two strikes, one Serb target hit. And then the debacle. The Serbs shelled civilians in the Tuzla “safe area” and, to emphasize Western impotence, took several hundred U.N. troops hostage.

It was all utterly predictable. A year ago, NATO launched two pinprick air strikes on the Serbs near Gorazde (a “picture perfect” operation, said U.N. Ambassador Madeleine Albright). Result? Savage Serb attacks on the city, the shelling of two other “safe areas” and the abduction of U.N. soldiers.

Yet the administration appears taken by surprise by this latest, standard Serb response to NATO air strikes. It is one thing for an administration to have no strategic vision or even tactical acumen. Is it too much to ask that it think two days ahead?

With astonishing aimlessness, the administration has maneuvered itself into the worst possible situation in Bosnia: No objective, no policy, only halting escalation that leaves the initiative in the hands of the adversary.

The newest idea being pushed by the Clinton administration is to add more NATO troops and redeploy them throughout Bosnia in more concentrated and fortified positions. This is eerily reminiscent of the short-lived “enclave” strategy of the early Vietnam War (circa 1965), under which the United States would hold the major coastal cities while the South Vietnamese army would do the dirty work in the countryside. It was a total failure. The South Vietnamese could not do it. The United States, faced with the alternative of defeat and withdrawal, was left with the job—and ended up in a hopeless search-and-destroy counterinsurgency war.

This is an administration that seems not to have asked itself what would follow an air strike. Has it asked itself what follows an enclave strategy?

Do the U.N. troops hunker down like the U.S. Marines in Beirut waiting to be attacked while the Serbs run around the countryside doing their will? Or do they use the strong points as bases from which to attack the Serbs, in which case we are back to search-and-destroy counterinsurgency?

The air strikes themselves are another melancholy echo of Vietnam, a feckless use of power not to achieve any military objective but to “send a message.” But air strikes that amount to pinpricks send a message of reluctance, not resolve. Serb defiance shows that the message has been received loud and clear.

What should be our policy in Bosnia? We should start from first principles: We have no obligation to Bosnia, but we have serious obligations to our NATO allies. Whatever our sympathy for the Bosnian people, we have no obligation, legal or moral, to underwrite the arbitrary borders of the Bosnian state—any more than we had an obligation to underwrite the borders of the Yugoslav state (a sovereign member of the United Nations at the time of its dissolution) when it was broken up by ethnic separatists exactly as Bosnia is today.

The only objective worth the risk of American ground troops is the evacuation of allied peacekeeping forces from Bosnia if their situation becomes untenable. Our allies, particularly those who fought with us in the Persian Gulf, deserve it: NATO solidarity—NATO’s existence—depends on it.

Events of the last week prove that the allied situation in Bosnia has indeed become untenable. It is time to get our friends out once and for all. Instead, Clinton is encouraging the Europeans to sink deeper into the quagmire by increasing their numbers. And he is risking protracted U.S. ground operations by pledging American troops to assist in their reinforcement and redeployment.

With the enclave strategy, the U.N. force in Bosnia officially graduates from peacekeeping to peace enforcement. Peacekeeping is the interposition of neutral forces between parties who are interested in staying at peace (as in Cyprus or the Golan Heights). Peacemaking is the U.N. euphemism for taking sides in a raging conflict to impose terms of peace by force of arms. In ordinary parlance, this is known as war making.

With the enclave strategy, mission creep becomes inevitable. We become an active combatant in a war and in the worst possible circumstances: fighting from scattered positions in a manner that no military planner would ever have designed for successfully rolling back the Serbs.

With the enclave strategy, the war goes on, the Serbs are in place, our allies remain vulnerable—and American ground troops have been committed. We will not repeat Vietnam, however. Not even this administration is capable of such madness. Instead, what awaits us down the road is precipitous and humiliating withdrawal, as in Beirut and Somalia.

Of this president, it is too much to ask wisdom in foreign policy. But one can demand coherence. A president who cannot tell us what we are doing in Bosnia and why has no business sending American troops while he is trying to figure it out.