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U.N. Peacekeeping Forces

Q. [Inaudible] -- about U.N. peacekeeping forces that may be in jeopardy because of the attitude of the Republican Party?

The President. Well, I don't agree with the attitude of the party with regard to the peacekeeping forces in Bosnia and with regard to at least some of what I've seen in the House of Representatives on peacekeeping generally. I believe the United States should participate in peacekeeping. I think we should pay our way. I think we should continue to be a strong force there.

With regard to Bosnia, I think we should -- the United States should support the Contact Group and should support those countries that do have their soldiers on the ground and at risk there. And we have said, for example, if we had to withdraw, if UNPROFOR collapsed, we would try to do our part to help people get out of Bosnia safely. But I think it would be a mistake for the United States to go off on its own and start making independent Bosnia policy. We don't have our soldiers there. The Europeans do have soldiers there; the Canadians have soldiers there. They have put their lives at risk. We have spent a lot of money in Bosnia, and we have supported from air and sea and from our hospital in Croatia, and a lot of other ways we've supported the operation of the U.N. in Bosnia.

Q. So you're with our Prime Minister and against the Republicans in this matter?

The President. That's correct. That's essentially.
Bosnia and Croatia

Q. Mr. President, if we could come back to foreign policy. Are you prepared to send American troops to Croatia at the end of the month to help in the withdrawal of U.N. peacekeepers if President Tudjman sticks to his deadline? And can you foresee beyond that any circumstances in which you would keep those troops there or expand the number of American ground troops in the region to help avert the wider war that so many people fear?

The President. Well, the United States has sent troops, as you know, to Macedonia as part of the United Nations effort to try to limit the scope of the Bosnian War. And we have committed to help get the U.N. peacekeepers out of Bosnia if the UNPROFOR mission in Bosnia collapses. We have done everything we could do to persuade President Tudjman not to suspend the U.N. mission in Croatia because we fear that it will lead to a wider war there. We feel a strong responsibility to our U.N. and, many of them our NATO allies as well, to try to help them, and we are trying to work through whatever plans would be appropriate to give that sort of assistance. But I do not foresee -- I have worked very hard to avoid the long-term commitment of American ground troops in that region, and I will continue to do that.

I think that this is something that has to be handled through the United Nations. I have offered NATO support, and I have been willing to work with our allies who were willing to put their troops on the ground there because they thought it was an area in which Europe ought to take the lead And that's generally the system I think we should continue to observe.
The President. Thank you very much, General Stein.

Audience member. Soo-o-ey! [Laughter]

The President. That’s my home State cheer, for those of you unused to foreign languages being spoken here in Falcon Stadium. [Laughter] Thank you very much.

General Stein, thank you. Secretary Widnall, General Fogleman, Governor Romer, Congressman Ramstad; to the distinguished faculty and staff; to the proud parents, family, and friends; to the members of the Cadet Wing: We gather here to celebrate this very important moment in your life and in the life of our Nation. Gentlemen and gentleladies of this class, the Pride of ’95, this is your day. And you are only one speech -- one pretty short speech -- [laughter] -- away from being second lieutenants.

I am honored to share this day with some exceptionally accomplished alumni of the Air Force Academy: General Fogleman, the first of your graduates to be the Air Force Chief of Staff; General Hopper, the first African-American graduate of the Academy to serve as the Commandant of Cadets; and a member of my staff, Robert Bell, who is the first graduate of the Air Force Academy to be the Senior Director for Defense Policy and Arms Control at the National Security Council. As I look out at all of you, I imagine it won’t be too long before there’s a graduate of the Air Force Academy in the Oval Office. If it’s all the same to you, I’d like to delay it for just a few years. [Laughter]

I also want to congratulate the Air Force Academy on extending its lock on the Commander in Chief’s trophy here that -- I’m in your in your stadium, I think I ought to mention that our winning squad came to see me in the White House not very long ago, and I said that before I became President I didn’t understand that when I heard that the Commander in Chief’s trophy was a traveling trophy that meant it was supposed to go back and forth between Washington and Colorado Springs every year.

I want to do my part in another longstanding tradition. By the power vested in me as Commander in Chief, I hereby grant amnesty to cadets who are marching tours or serving restrictions or confinements for minor misconduct. Now, General Stein, I have to leave it to
you to define which offenses are minor, but on this day, even in this conservative age, I trust you will be fairly liberal in your interpretation of the term. [Laughter] Members of the Class of 1995, you are about to become officers in the United States Air Force. You should be very proud of what you have already accomplished. But you should be sobered by the important responsibilities you are about to assume. From this day forward, every day you must defend our Nation, protect the lives of the men and women under your command, and represent the best of America.

I want to say here as an aside, I have seen something of the debate in the last few days on the question of whether in this time of necessity to cut budgets, we ought to close one of the service academies. And I just want to say I think that’s one of the worst ideas I ever heard of.

It was General Eisenhower who as President, along with the Congress, so long ago now recognized that national defense required a national commitment to education. But our commitment through the service academies to the education and preparation of the finest military officers in the world must never wane. And I hope your commitment to the cause of education as an important element in what makes our country great and strong and safe will never wane.

As President, my first responsibility is to protect and enhance the safety of the American people and to strengthen our country. It is a responsibility that you now have chosen to share. So today, I thought what we ought to do is talk about the steps that we will have to take together to make the world safer for America in the 21st century.

Our security objectives over the last 50 years have been dictated by straightforward events often beyond our control. But at least they were straightforward and clear. In World War II, the objective was simple: Win the war. In the cold war, the objective was clear: Contain communism and prevent nuclear war. In the post-cold-war world, the objectives are often more complex, and it is clear that American security in the 21st century will be determined by forces that are operating both beyond and within our own borders.

While the world you will face is far from free of danger, you must know that you are entering active service in a moment of enormous hope. We are dramatically reducing the nuclear threat. For the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there are no Russian missiles pointed at the people of the United States.

From the Middle East to South Africa to Northern Ireland, Americans are helping former adversaries turn from conflict to co-operation. We are supporting democracies and market economies, like Haiti and Mexico in our own region and others throughout the world. We are expanding trade. We are working for a Europe allied with the United States, but unified economically and politically for the first time since nation states appeared on the European continent. Just yesterday, Russia’s decision to actively participate in NATO’s Partnership For Peace helped to lay the groundwork for yet another important step in establishing a secure, stable, and unified European continent for the next century.
Clearly there are powerful historical forces pulling us together: a worldwide thirst for freedom and democracy; a growing commitment to market economics; a technological revolution that moves information, ideas, money, and people around the globe at record speed. All these things are bringing us together and helping to make our future more secure.

But these same forces have a dark underside which can also lead to more insecurity. We understand now that the openness and freedom of society make us even more vulnerable to the organized forces of destruction, the forces of terror and organized crime and drug trafficking. The technological revolution that is bringing our world closer together can also bring more and more problems to our shores. The end of communism has opened the door to the spread of weapons of mass destruction and lifted the lid on age-old conflicts rooted in ethnic, racial, and religious hatreds. These forces can be all the more destructive today because they have access to modern technology.

Nowhere are the forces of disintegration more obvious today than in Bosnia. For the past 2 1/2 years, the United States has sought to contain and end the conflict, to help to preserve the Bosnian nation as a multistate entity, multiethnic entity, to keep faith with our NATO allies, and to relieve human suffering.

To these ends, we have led the NATO military responses to calls by the United Nations for assistance in the protection of its forces and safe areas for the people of Bosnia, led efforts to achieve a negotiated settlement, deployed peacekeeping troops to the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to contain the conflict within the present borders of Bosnia, and conducted the longest humanitarian airlift to the people there in history.

Two weeks ago, the Bosnian Serbs unleashed 1,400 shells on the civilians of Sarajevo. The United Nations called this attack a return to medieval barbarism. They asked for a NATO air response, which we supported. Now we have joined our allies to develop a coordinated response to the Serbs' continued refusal to make peace and their illegal capturing of United Nations personnel as hostages.

We believe still that a strengthened United Nations operation is the best insurance against an even worse humanitarian disaster should they leave. We have a longstanding commitment to help our NATO allies, some of whom have troops in the U.N. operation in Bosnia, to take part in a NATO operation to assist them in a withdrawal if that should ever become necessary. And so, if necessary, and after consultation with Congress, I believe we should be prepared to assist NATO if it decides to meet a request from the United Nations troops for help in a withdrawal or a reconfiguration and a strengthening of its forces.

We have received no such request for any such assistance, and we have made no such decision. But in any event, we must know that we must continue to work for peace there. And I still believe that we have made the right decision in not committing our own troops to become embroiled in this conflict in Europe nor to join the United Nations operations.

I want to say to you, we have obligations to our NATO allies, and I do not believe we can leave them in the lurch. So I must carefully review any requests for an operation involving a
temporary use of our ground forces. But we have made the right decision in what we have
done and what we have not done in Bosnia.

I believe we must look at all of these problems and all these opportunities in new and
different ways. For example, we see today that the clear boundaries between threats to our
nation's security from beyond our borders and the challenges to our security from within our
borders are being blurred. One once was clearly the province of the Armed Services; the
other clearly the province of local law enforcement. Today, we see people from overseas
coming to our country for terrorist purposes, blurring what is our national security. We must
see the threats for what they are and fashion our response based on their true nature, not just
where they occur.

In these new and different times, we must pursue three priorities to enhance our security.
First, we have to combat those who would destroy democratic societies, including ours,
through terrorism, organized crime, and drug trafficking. Secondly, we have to reduce the
threat of weapons of mass destruction, whether they're nuclear, chemical, or biological.
Third, we have to provide our military, you and people like you, with the resources,
training, and strategic direction necessary to protect the American people and our interests
around the world.

The struggle against the forces of terror, organized crime, and drug trafficking is now
uppermost on our minds because of what we have endured as a nation, the World Trade
Center bombing, the terrible incident in Oklahoma City, and what we have seen elsewhere,
the nerve gas attack in Tokyo, the slaughter of innocent civilians by those who would destroy
the peace in the Middle East, the organized crime now plaguing the former Soviet Union --
so much that one of the first requests we get in every one of those countries is "Send in the
FBI; we need help" -- the drug cartels in Latin America and Asia that threaten the open
societies and the fragile democracies there. All these things we know can emerge from
without our borders and from within our borders. Free and open societies are inherently
more vulnerable to these kinds of forces. Therefore, we must remain vigilant, reduce our
vulnerability, and constantly renew our efforts to defeat them.

We work closely with foreign governments. We share intelligence. We provide military
support. We initiate anticorruption and money-laundering programs to stop drug trafficking at
its source. We've opened an FBI office in Moscow, a training center in Hungary to help
combat international organized crime. Over the past 2 years, we've waged a tough
counterterrorism campaign, strengthening our laws, increasing manpower and training for the
CIA and the FBI, imposing sanctions on states that sponsor terrorism.

Many of these efforts have paid off. We were able to arrest and quickly convict those
responsible for the World Trade Center bombing, to stop another terrible planned attack in
New York as well as a plan to blow up American civilian airliners over the Pacific, and help
to bring to justice terrorists around the world.

In the aftermath of Oklahoma City, our top law enforcement officers told us they needed
new tools to fight terrorism, and I proposed legislation to provide those tools: More than a
1,000 new law enforcement personnel solely working on terrorism; a domestic antiterrorism center; tough new punishment for trafficking in stolen explosives, for attacking members of the uniformed services of Federal workers; the enabling of law enforcement officials to mark explosive materials so they can be more easily traced; the empowering of law enforcement officials with authority to move legal, and I emphasize legal, wiretaps when terrorists quickly move their bases of operation without having to go back for a new court order; and finally, in a very limited way, the authority to use the unique capacity of our military where chemical or biological weapons are involved here at home, just as we now can call on those capabilities to fight nuclear threats.

I'm sure every graduate of this Academy knows of the "posse comitatus" rule, the clear line that says members of the uniformed military will not be involved in domestic law enforcement. That is a good rule. We should honor that rule. The only narrow exception for it that I know of today is the ability of law enforcement in America to call upon the unique expertise of the military when there is a potential threat of a nuclear weapon in the hands of the wrong people. All we are asking for in the aftermath of the terrible incident in the Tokyo subway is the same access to the same expertise should chemical and biological weapons be involved.

The congressional leadership pledged its best efforts to put this bill on my desk by Memorial Day. But Memorial Day has come and gone, and only the Senate has taken the bill up. And even there, in my judgment, there are too many amendments that threaten too much delay.

Congress has a full agenda of important issues, including passing a responsible budget. But all this will take time. When it comes to terrorism, time is a luxury we don't have. Some are even now saying we should just go slow on this legislation. Well, Congress has a right to review this legislation to make sure the civil liberties of American citizens are not infringed, anti I encourage them to do that. But they should not go slow. Terrorists do not go slow, my fellow Americans. Their agenda is death and destruction on their own timetable. And we need to make sure that we can do everything possible to stop them from succeeding.

Six weeks after Oklahoma City, months after the first antiterrorism legislation was sent by the White House to Congress, there is no further excuse for delay. Fighting terrorism is a big part of our national security today, and it will be well into the 21st century. And I ask Congress to act and act now.

Our obligations to fight these forces of terror is closely related to our efforts to reduce the threat of weapons of mass destruction. All of us, I'm sure, ached and wept with the people of Japan when we saw what a small vial of chemical gas could do when unleashed in the subway station. And we breathed a sigh of relief when the alert officers there prevented the two chemicals from uniting and forming poison which could have killed hundreds and hundreds of people just a few days after that. The breakup of the Soviet Union left nuclear material scattered throughout the Newly Independent States and increased the potential for the theft of those materials and for organized criminals to enter the nuclear smuggling business. As horrible as the tragedies in Oklahoma City and the World Trade Center were,
imagine the destruction that could have resulted had there been a small-scale nuclear device exploded there.

The United States will retain as long as necessary an arsenal of nuclear forces to deter any future hostile action by any regime that has nuclear weapons. But I will also continue to pursue the most ambitions agenda to dismantle and fight the proliferation of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction since the dawn of the nuclear age.

This effort is succeeding, and we should support it. No Russian missiles are pointed at America. No American missiles are aimed at Russia. Because we put the START I treaty into force, Russia is helping us and joining us in dismantling thousands of nuclear weapons. Our patient, determined diplomacy convinced Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and Belarus to give up their weapons when the Soviet Union fell apart. We are cooperating with these nations and others to safeguard nuclear materials and stop their spread.

And just last month, we got the indefinite and unconditional extension of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which will benefit not only this generation of Americans, but future generations as well by preventing scores of countries from developing and acquiring nuclear weapons. More than 170 nations have signed on to this treaty. They, vow they will either never acquire nuclear weapons or, if they have them, that they won’t help others obtain them, and they will pursue arms control and disarmament.

We have to now go even further. There is no excuse for the Senate to go slow on approving two other vital measures, the START II treaty and the Chemical Weapons Convention. START II will enable us to reduce by two-thirds the number of strategic warheads deployed at the height of the cold war. The Chemical Weapons Convention requires the destruction of chemical weapon stockpiles around the world and provides severe penalties for those who sell materials to build these weapons to terrorists or to criminals. It would make a chemical terror, like the tragic attack in the Tokyo subway, much, much more difficult. Both START II and the Chemical Weapons Convention will make every American safer, and we need them now.

There is more to do. We are working to complete negotiations on a comprehensive test ban treaty, to implement the agreement we reached with North Korea to freeze and dismantle that country’s nuclear program, to strengthen the Biological Weapons Convention. It is an ambitious agenda, but it is worthy of this moment, and it will make your future as officers in the United States Air Force, American citizens, and when you’re parents and grandparents more secure.

Finally, let me say that none of this will work unless we also are faithful to our obligation to support a strong and adaptable military for the 21st century. The men and women of our Armed Forces remain the foundation, the fundamental foundation of our security. You put the steel into our diplomacy. You get the job done when all means short of force have been tried and failed.

We saw your strength on display in Haiti, where a brutal military regime agreed to step
down peacefully only, and I emphasize only, when it learned that more than 60 C-130's and C-140's loaded with paratroopers were in the air and on the way. Now the Haitian people have a second chance to rebuild their nation.

We then saw your speed in the Persian Gulf when Iraq massed its troops on the Kuwaiti border and threatened regional instability. I ordered our planes, ships, and troops into the Gulf. You got there in such a hurry that Iraq got out of the way, in a hurry.

We saw your compassion in Rwanda where you flew tons of supplies, medicines, and foods into a nation torn apart by violence and saved countless lives.

All over the world, you have met your responsibilities with skill and professionalism, keeping peace, making peace, saving lives, protecting American interests. In turn, your country has a responsibility to make sure you have the resources, the flexibility, the tools you need to do the job. We have sought to make good on that obligation by crafting a defense strategy for our time.

And I'd like to say here today that one of the principal architects of that strategy was our recently deceased former Defense Secretary, Les Aspin. During his many years in the Congress as head of the Armed Services Committee, as Secretary of Defense, and as head of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, he devoted a lifetime to this country's defense. And we will miss him terribly. And we are very grateful for the legacy he left: a blueprint for reshaping our military to the demands of the 21st century, a blueprint that calls on us to make sure that any force reductions we began at the end of the cold war do not jeopardize our strength over the long run, that calls on us to provide you with the resources you need to meet the challenges of a world plagued by ancient conflicts and new instabilities.

All of you know here that after World War II a major drawdown left us at a major disadvantage when war broke out in Korea. And just 5 years after the post-Vietnam drawdown, in 1980, the Army Chief of Staff declared that we had a hollow Army, a view shared by most experts. We have been determined not to repeat those mistakes.

Even as we draw down troops, we know we have to be prepared to engage and prevail in two nearly simultaneous major regional conflicts. Some argued that this scenario was unrealistic and excessively demanding. Recent events have proved that they were wrong and shown that we are pursuing the right strategy and the right force levels for these times.

Last summer, just before the North Koreans finally agreed to dismantle their nuclear program, we were poised to send substantial air, naval, and ground reinforcements to defend South Korea. Just a few months later, we deployed tens of thousands of troops to the Gulf and placed thousands more on alert. And in between those crises, I gave the go-ahead to the 25,000 troops engaged in Operation Uphold Democracy in Haiti.

In Haiti, the operation was especially historic because it was the most fully integrated military plan ever carried out in our history. The four services worked together, drawing on
each other's special abilities more than ever before. And for the first time, we were ready to launch Army infantry and an air assault from a Navy aircraft carrier. When we decided to send our troops in peacefully, we did it in hours, not days. That kind of innovation and the ability to do that is what your country owes you as you walk out of this stadium today as officers in the United States Air Force.

This then will be our common security mission, yours and mine and all Americans': to take on terrorism, organized crime, and drug trafficking; to reduce the nuclear threat and the threat of biological and chemical weapons; to keep our military flexible and strong. These must be the cornerstones of our program to build a safer America at a time when threats to our security have no respect for boundaries and when the boundaries between those threats are disappearing.

Abroad, as at home, we must measure the success of our efforts by one simple standard: Have we made the lives of the American people safer? Have we made the future for our children more secure?

Let me say to this class, I know that the rewards of serving on the front lines of our foreign policy may seem distant and uncertain at times. Thirty-four years ago, President Kennedy said, "When there is a visible enemy to fight, the tide of patriotism runs high. But when there is a long, slow struggle with no immediate visible foe, your choice will seem hard indeed." Your choice, your choice, ladies and gentlemen, to take on the problems and possibilities of this time, to engage the world, not to run from it, is the right choice.

As you have learned here at the Academy, it demands sacrifice. In the years ahead, you will be asked to travel a long way from home, to be away from your loved ones for long stretches of time, to face dangers we perhaps cannot yet even imagine. These are the burdens you have willingly agreed to bear for your country, its safety, and its long-term security.

Go forth, knowing that the American people support you, that they admire your dedication. They are grateful for your service. They are counting on you, the Class of '95, to lead us into the 21st century, and they believe you truly do represent the best of America.

Good luck, and Godspeed.
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Bosnia

Mr. Gransbery. If U.S. combat ground troops are sent to Bosnia, what are the rules of engagement? Will they be there to secure the safety of the U.N. peacekeepers, or will they be asked to neutralize the Bosnian Serbs as well?

The President. Well, the answer is that, first of all, they have not been asked for, and no decision has been made to send them. But going back to a time before I became President, there was a general commitment made by the United States that if our NATO allies who were part of the U.N. force in Bosnia got in trouble and needed our help to evacuate them, that we would do that, because we have air and naval presence in the area and we can move manpower off of our naval presence into the area.

As you know, our role in Bosnia has been to try to confine the conflict to Bosnia. Our troops are in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. We have also supported certain efforts in Croatia to try to confine the conflict. And then we had played a major role in the airlift which is now the longest humanitarian airlift in history.

Now, the question has arisen -- if these people -- 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, would we be willing to give it? My instinct is, 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 war or to be part of the U.N. mission.

The United States -- first of all, Europe wanted to take the lead here. It was the fight thing to do. And we had no business involved in ground war in Bosnia.
Bosnia

[A 14-year-old exchange student from Serbian-occupied territory asked about efforts to bring peace to her country and to encourage more student exchanges in the meantime.]

The President. Thank you very much. Let me answer the second question first, because it's an easier answer. The answer to your second question is yes, I want to see young people come over here and live in America and have the experiences you're having. And I think it would be very beneficial for Americans to have people from your country who have been through what you have been through and your family has been through come here and talk about it. So, yes.

The first question is, can I do anything to bring an easier end to the fighting, or a quicker end to the fighting? We are doing what we can. Let me tell you what we're doing. First of all, we are leading the largest humanitarian airlift in human history now into Bosnia, trying to make sure we get as much food and medicine in there. Secondly, I have, near where you're from in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, stationed some American troops to try to make sure that the conflict can't spread beyond Bosnia and that no one believes they can in -- sort of start a whole regional war. The third thing we've tried to do through NATO is to support the British, the French, the Canadian, and the other European troops that are in Bosnia in their peacekeeping efforts. We have tried to make sure that we created safe areas in the eastern enclaves and around Sarajevo, that we tried to collect "all the heavy weapons that the Serbs have which give them such an enormous advantage on the battlefield. And that's what caused this latest trouble we had over there, because they broke the agreement they made and they put 1,400 shells into Sarajevo.

Now, I have to tell you, though, I think in the end this war will only end when the parties are willing to negotiate a peace, in peace, just the way we're bringing an end to the war in the Middle East, the way we're bringing an end to the conflicts in Northern Ireland. I do not believe there is a military settlement that the United States can enforce. And I do not favor sending our troops into combat there to try to assure victory or to force through military means an end to the fighting. All it would do is get a lot of Americans killed and not achieve the objective. So I don't think we should do that. But we should do everything we can short of that.
Good morning. I want to talk with you today about the conflict in Bosnia and the United States policy with regard to it for the last 2 1/2 years since I’ve been President.

Let me begin by saying that I know all Americans join with me in sending their prayers to the family and loved ones of an American pilot who was shot down yesterday while doing his duty flying over Bosnia.

When I became President, we found a war going on in Bosnia that was fueled by ancient, bloody divisions between Bosnian Serbs, Muslims, and Croats. The United Nations had a mission there whose purpose was not to fight the war but to help prevent the slaughter of civilians, to deliver humanitarian assistance, and to try to limit that conflict as much as possible while the peace process moved forward to end the conflict diplomatically and to preserve the Bosnian state.

I determined that the role of the United States should be to vigorously support the diplomatic search for peace and that our vital interests were clear in limiting the spread of the conflict. Furthermore, our interests were in doing what we could, short of putting in ground forces, to help prevent the multiethnic Bosnian state from being destroyed and to minimize the loss of life and the ethnic cleansing.

I determined that we certainly should not have ground forces there, not as a part of the military conflict, nor as a part of the United Nations peacekeeping mission, but that instead, we should do everything we could to limit the conflict to its present parameters and to support our other objectives.

In our efforts to limit the conflict, we have stationed some troops in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to make sure that we don’t have a Balkan-wide conflict. We must remember that the Balkans are a troubling area and that it was trouble in the Balkans that sparked World War I.

Secondly, we have used our air power in three ways in Bosnia. First, we have conducted the longest lasting humanitarian airlift in all history, and we’ve saved a lot of lives doing it.
Second, we have enforced the no-fly zone in order to stop the bombing campaign and at least take the war out of the air. That has saved a lot of lives, too, and that is what our brave young pilot was doing yesterday when his plane was shot down. And thirdly, with our NATO allies, we have made our air power available to maintain a fire-free zone around Sarajevo and other populated areas and to support the collection of heavy artillery. This, too, has largely been a successful effort, which has minimized the fighting and the killing and the dying.

This policy has not only worked to minimize the loss of life but also to maximize the chances for peace in a very troubling area. I know it's frustrating to everyone, as it is to me, that we can't completely solve all the world's problems and that more progress toward peace hasn't been made in Bosnia. Sometimes we have to do what is appropriate to minimize disasters that we confront, while we work over the long run on resolving them through diplomacy.

But let's look at what has been done. In 1999, the year before I became President, some 130,000 people were killed in the Bosnian conflict. In 1994, because of the policies that our allies and the United States have pursued together, including the presence of the United Nations troops in Bosnia, the causalities have dropped from 130,000 in 1992, to about 2,500 in 1994 -- still tragic, but dramatically reduced. And all of this has been accomplished without any involvement of American ground forces in combat or peacekeeping missions. The British, the French, the Dutch, the Canadians, and others have carried that burden.

This has not been a perfect peace. Recently, after the peace in Sarajevo broke down and 1,000 or more shells were dropped on the city, the United Nations asked for air support, as they have in the past, with success. We gave it, and unfortunately, the Serbs captured U.N. personnel. I have made it very clear to the American people all along that actions like this could occur because of the vulnerability of the U.N. peacekeepers who are spread out in small numbers all across the country. Now we are doing everything we can to secure the release of the U.N. personnel.

But let's not forget this policy has saved a lot of lives. And in the end, the conflict will only be resolved by diplomacy. Now, the United Nations faces a choice: It can either get out, or it can strengthen its forces in order to fully support the mission.

If our allies decide to stay, we want to support them but within the very careful limits I have outlined. I want to make it clear again what I have said about our ground forces. We will use them only if, first, if there is a genuine peace with no shooting and no fighting and the United States is part of policing that peace. That's exactly what we've been doing in the Middle East since the late 1970's without incident. It's worked so well that I imagine most Americans don't even recall that we still have forces there.

Second, if our allies decide they can no longer continue the U.N. mission and decide to withdraw, but they cannot withdraw in safety, we should help them to get out with our unique capacities. They have borne the risk for the world community of working for peace and minimizing the loss of life. And I think that's an appropriate thing for us to do.
The third issue is the remote, indeed highly unlikely event that Britain, France, and other countries, with their considerable military strength and expertise, become stranded and could not get out of a particular place in Bosnia. The question has been raised about whether we would help them to withdraw as a last resort. I have decided that if a U.N. unit needs an emergency extraction, we would assist after consulting with Congress. This would be a limited, temporary operation, and we have not been asked to do this. I think it is highly unlikely that we would be asked to do it. But I do believe that these people who have put themselves at risk are entitled to know that the U.S. will stand with them if they need help to move to safety.

Now, as this conflict continues and as the diplomatic efforts go on, we must remember that our policy in Bosnia has reduced the level of violence, has reduced the loss of life. In the last several days, our allies, in the face of their hostages being taken, have said that they expect those people to be released but that they do not want to give up their efforts to bring peace to Bosnia. They do not want us, they do not expect us to put American ground troops into Bosnia. But we do have an interest in doing what we can short of that to contain the conflict and minimize and eventually end the human suffering. I believe this is the appropriate, acceptable, proper policy for the United States.

Thanks for listening.

Note: The President spoke at 10:06 a.m. from the Oval Office at the White House.
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U.S. Pilot Missing in Bosnia

Mr. King. I just wanted to know. Anything you can tell us about the pilot?

The President. No, except that we're working on it very hard.

Mr. King. Is he signaling? Is there a report of signals out of Bosnia?

The President. Well, you know what the news reports are, but I can tell you that I have been keeping on top of this ever since the first report of the missing plane. And we're doing everything we can, but it's best that we say as little as possible.

Mr. King. Is this, Mr. Vice President, as some diplomat called it today "a great failure of Western diplomacy," all Western diplomacy?

The Vice President. Well, clearly, this is a tragedy that has been unfolding for a long time, some would say for 500 years. But certainly, it was a full-blown tragedy before we ever got here. But I think that it's important to realize that NATO, the most successful alliance in history, never really did that great a job when it was outside of the NATO area, dealing with a conflict between two countries, neither of whom was a part of NATO. And that's the situation here.

They have done a great deal. And I think a lot of people have not paid much attention to the change that has come about since President Clinton's policy was put into place. Some of the numbers aren't very well known, but the change has been pretty significant.

The President. Let me just say this. First of all, I disagree with that.

Mr. King. You disagree with the Vice President?
The President. No, I agree with him, and I disagree with those who say --

Mr. King. Oh -- it's failed.

The President -- that the whole thing has been a great failure. It has not been a success. But remember, how long has this war been going on? Since 1991, in essence. That's 4 years. It's tragic; it's terrible. But their enmities go back 500 years, some would say almost a thousand years.

Now, what are our interests, and what are our objectives there? First of all, we don't want the war to spread beyond Bosnia. Secondly, we want to alleviate the human suffering and reduce the killing. And thirdly, we want to support a diplomatic process for peace.

Now, let me just follow up on what the Vice President said. The war hasn't spread. We've worked hard on that. We've worked with our NATO allies and with the U.N. in the longest humanitarian airlift in history and to keep the skies free of bombers to take the war out of the air, which is what our brave pilot was doing when he was shot down. We have worked with the U.N. peacekeepers on the ground to try to establish safe havens through the use, again, of only of our air power; we have no ground forces there.

In 1992, the year we had our interview in Orlando, about 130,000 people were killed in Bosnia. Last year, 1994, less than 3,000 people were killed there. That's still tragic, but I hardly think that constitutes a colossal failure, especially -- now, let me just say one other thing. Look at -- you're going to go to the Middle East on Thursday with your interviews --

Mr. King. We're going to talk to all of them.

The President. We look at the progress in the Middle East. We look at progress in Northern Ireland. We look at the joy we have in the elections in South Africa. All those conflicts went on for a lot more than 4 years. And I'm proud of the role the United States is playing in the peace process in all those places, but it became possible when people decided they wanted to make peace and they wanted to stop killing each other there. That's the point I want to make.

So, I'm not happy with everything that's happened in Bosnia. I wish there were some clear-cut answer. I don't think we should have ground troops there in combat or in the peacekeeping force.

Mr. King. At all?

The President. No. I've said where I think -- if they make a peace, they stop fighting, they want us to help police it like we have in the Middle East since the late seventies, that's something that we would consider doing, after consultation with Congress. If our people -- if the U.N. has to pull out, they're our NATO allies and they need us, I'd be inclined to help them. If they get stranded and they're in desperate conditions, I'd be inclined to help them. I think that's something we should look at. But we shouldn't be involved on the ground there. We have achieved these other objectives.
And if you go from 130,000 dead down to under 3,000 dead and you've still got a talk going, you've got a chance of a diplomatic solution, what is the difference in that and Northern Ireland, the Middle East, and these other places? It takes time.

Mr. King. If it spreads, do we have to go? Like to Macedonia, would we have to go?

The President. We have to do -- we have troops in Macedonia because we are determined not to have a Balkan war. That, after all, is how World War I got started. We don't want this thing to spread across the Balkans, and I think all Americans would understand that.

Mr. King. Do we have a moral obligation, Mr. Vice President, to these people? Moral, if not strategic?

The Vice President. I think the world clearly has an interest in doing what is reasonable and necessary to stop an ethnically based conquering by one country of another. And our NATO allies have shown tremendous courage and fortitude in putting their troops there on the ground. We've chosen not to do that. They are closer to it. It is on the continent of Europe. We've provided some support to them, but our allies are the ones that are there on the ground. And I think that that's the correct choice for them to make.

The President But, Larry, first of all, we've spent a great deal of money there, running this humanitarian airlift, giving air support, trying to create free-fire zones, if you will, around Sarajevo and the other populated eastern enclaves, in doing all the things we've done to support the no-fly zone and to support the British, the French, the Dutch, the Canadians, and others there on the ground.

All of us have done this at a significant investment, and they are at some risk, as you see when several hundred of them got captured. If you reduce the casualties from 130,000 to under 3,000, and you at least have the possibility of cease-fires and ongoing negotiations and you continue humanitarian aid, it seems to me that is fulfilling a moral obligation.

Do we have the capacity to impose a settlement on people who want to continue fighting? We couldn't do that in Northern Ireland. We couldn't do that in the Middle East. And I would submit, if you look at the population and the geography and the history of Bosnia, we cannot do that there. So I believe we're doing the right thing.

Mr. King. There's a lot of bases to cover. One more -- are you now optimistic on Bosnia? Are you sounding like things are going to turn better?

The President What I think is that we have to continue to pursue a strategy of diplomacy and keeping people alive and minimizing the brutality and trying to make the peacekeeping mission work. If it fails, then we'll have to consider what our options are then.

Mr. King. But no troops.

The Vice President. Anyone who is worded about the U.S. sending ground troops there should not be. That's not going to happen.
President Clinton. It's a great pleasure to welcome President Chirac and President Santer to the White House, the first visit for both leaders in their present positions to the Oval Office.

I begin with congratulations to President Chirac on his outstanding victory last month. From our many contacts with him throughout his long public service, the United States knows that he is a true and reliable friend, and he will be a strong and effective leader for France and for Europe. In his short time as President he has already demonstrated this leadership. We applaud his determination to create jobs and economic growth for his own country, and with Jacques Chirac as President, we are sure that the French commitment to peace, stability, and progress is in excellent hands.

France, as all of you know, was America's first ally. We know that our relationships will grow even stronger in the coming years.

It was a pleasure as well to meet President Santer, whose leadership in the cause of Europe follows in the great tradition that began with Jean Monet. More than 30 years ago, President Kennedy spoke of a strong and united Europe as an equal partner with whom we face, and I quote, "the great and burdensome tasks of building and defending a community of free nations." This is more true that ever. And our summit today shows the United States partnership with Europe is a powerful, positive force.

The three of us reviewed a lot of economic and security issues: Our efforts to help the countries of Central Europe and the former Soviet Union. We reaffirmed our commitment to strengthening NATO and proceeding with the steady process of enlarging the alliance. We agreed to continue liberalizing trade. We agreed that senior representatives of the U.S. and the EU will work together to develop a common agenda for the 21st century. Secretary Christopher has "already provided a road map for this dialog in his recent speech in Madrid.

We discussed our efforts to strengthen the U.N. peacekeeping forces and to reduce the suffering in Bosnia. In the midst of the tragedy, we must not forget that the common efforts have already saved thousands of lives, and we must continue to work together.
We also explored a number of issues that the leaders of the G-7 will deal with in Halifax, and I'd like to mention a couple of them if I might. The Halifax conference marks another step in our effort to build the structures of the global economy for the 21st century. In the face of astonishing change, the growing economic ties between nations, the rapid movement of people and information, the miracles of technology, our prosperity depends upon preparing our people for the future and forging an international system that is strong enough and flexible enough to make the most of these opportunities.

At home we have been working hard to establish a steady record of growth, investment in our people, in bringing down our budget deficit. I am proud that our deficit today is now the lowest of all the G-7 countries. Our new budget proposal to balance the budget in 10 years will permit us to do this and continue to invest in the education and development of our people.

Abroad we have set out clear goals: To open world markets, to help the former Communist countries transform themselves into free market democracies, to promote economic reform in the developing world, to speed reforms in the international financial institutions. These efforts have yielded tremendous successes: NAFTA, GATE, agreements with the Asia Pacific region and in our own hemisphere. We have supported the nations in Central Europe, the New Independent States, and the developing world in their historic turn toward free markets. Now we have a chance to reap enormous benefits in better jobs, greater opportunities, and growing prosperity.

We will build on our agreements last year in Naples when we meet in Halifax to focus on reforming the institutions of the international economy. The IMF, the World Bank, the regional banks have served us very well over the last half-century. And they have grown, taken on new missions as the times demand. But to deal with a new economy we have to give them new guidance and new momentum.

First, we must work to identify and prevent financial problems like Mexico's before they become disasters and rock the global economy. And when crises occur, we must have efficient ways to mobilize the international community.

Second, we have to examine how best to adapt for a new era the multilateral development banks and the social and economic agencies of the U.N. These organizations have helped dozens of countries to build their economies and improve the lives of their people. We must not walk away from those banks and our obligations to the developing world. This is a point that President Chirac made to me in our meeting and one with which I strongly agree.

Finally, together with Russia, we will discuss a range of political issues that include Bosnia, Iran's nuclear ambitions, European security, and reform in Russia. We will consider new forms of cooperation to combat international crime, terrorism, and nuclear smuggling, because prosperity without security means little.
Also, I will be having some bilateral meetings, as all of you know, including a meeting with the Prime Minister of Japan, at which time we will review the position the United States has taken on our trade disputes with Japan with -- regarding autos and auto parts. As you know, we are going to be meeting about that again shortly after the Halifax summit. My determination there remains as firm as ever. I believe we can reach a successful conclusion, and I intend to do everything I can to see that it is done.

Q. I'd like to ask President Clinton, thousands of government troops are converging on Sarajevo vowing to break the 3-year-old Serb stranglehold on the capital. Do you think that a military solution is possible there? And do you think that the U.N. peacekeepers should get out of the way and open the way for any attack?

President Clinton. Well, you really asked two different questions there. In the first -- whether the road can be opened to Sarajevo militarily is not the same question as whether a military solution is possible in a larger sense. And my judgment is, and I think President Chirac agrees, that in the end a military solution is not available to the Bosnian Government. And I'm quite concerned about it.

And, therefore, I believe that what we are trying to do in strengthening UNPROFOR -- you know that President Chirac has taken the lead, and the United States certainly supports him in principle, in developing a rapid reaction force to try to strengthen the UNPROFOR troops there and to protect his own troops more. And we believe that and a vigorous continued pursuit of diplomacy offers the best hope of saving the Bosnian state and minimizing casualties.

In terms of whether in this narrow moment such an action would succeed, I think our military leaders' judgment would be better than mine. But I think the larger point is that we have discouraged all the parties frown continued violence. That's one of the reasons that we agreed with the U.N.'s request for a bombing support when Sarajevo was shelled by the Serbs recently. We think that the position of the United States should be to support our allies who are there on the ground, to support strengthening the U.N. mission, and to discourage all increases in violence, to try to keep the lid on the violence and put the pressure on all parties, including Serbia proper, to support those actions which would lead to a negotiated settlement.

President Clinton. If I might just make one other response to the original question. You know that the sympathies of the United States and this administration are with the struggle of the Bosnian Government to preserve the territory, certainly the territory that has been agreed to in the Contact Group proposal, and to end the kind of behavior that we saw in the taking of the U.N. hostages.
The question here is, therefore, would this action, even if it could succeed, ultimately strengthen or weaken the efforts of UNPROFOR to strengthen itself. President Chirac is taking bold actions here to try to strengthen UNPROFOR. Would it increase or decrease the chances that ultimately these objectives that we all share would prevail? What other consequences could occur in other parts of the country as a result of this? All these things need to be taken into consideration, which is why the United States has taken the position that, for the time being, all the parties should take as much care as possible to avoid further actions, because we believe that we have the best chance now of strengthening UNPROFOR and getting some new energy behind a lot of these diplomatic initiatives. This had nothing to do with where our sympathies are in terms of whether that road ought to be opened.

Q. Mr. President, is the United States prepared to pay its share of the creation of a rapid deployment force for Bosnia under the U.N.? And President Chirac, you have suggested that the time may have come for the United States to get tough on Bosnia. What did you mean by that remark, and what specifically are you asking the United States to do to help your troops on the ground?

President Clinton. The answer to your first question is that it depends upon whether the Congress is willing to participate as well. And so, I have received correspondence and contacts with Congress about this. I have begun opening discussions about it, and I am consulting with them. But that is up to the Congress as well as to the President. I support, in principle, this rapid reaction force, and I think it has a chance to really strengthen the U.N. mission there. To what extent we can contribute depends upon congressional consultations which have only just begun.
Q. Mr. President, the United States has told the United Nations that for budgetary reasons it could not be counted on to pay the lion's share for a rapid response force in Bosnia. My question is, can a rapid response force in Bosnia be effective without the major backing -- the major financial backing of the United States?

The President. Yes. I'd like to review for a moment how that decision was made, however. I want to begin by saying I strongly support the rapid reaction force. It will give some muscle, some support, some security to the United Nations troops there. It will be staffed primarily by the British and French, with contributions from other countries that are on the ground there. It will have the mission of preserving the integrity of the U.N. force, being able to rush in and help to redeploy them when necessary, to support them in fulfilling their mission, and to take the necessary action if they are under threat. This offers the promise of making the U.N. mission more effective. I strongly support it.

Because the financing of this would have to be, obviously, approved by the Congress, I consulted with the Senate majority leader and with the Speaker of the House. And because President Chirac was in Washington, he went by to see them as well. They sent me a letter saying that they supported the concept of the rapid reaction force, and they understood why President Chirac wanted a vote in the United Nations right now, because things are pretty tense in Bosnia and because he was coming here and that they would certainly understand if I voted for the resolution in the United Nations but that, in the absence of appropriate and thorough congressional consultations, they could not agree to pay for it through an assessment.

So Ambassador Albright last night was able to get a modification of the resolution, which simply leaves open the method by which the rapid reaction force will be funded, either through assessments or through voluntary contributions. We and others have made several voluntary contributions to the United Nations in the past for other important missions.

I believe the United States should pay a share of this. I will support that, and I will do my dead-level best to argue that case in Congress. This rapid reaction force gives these countries the power that they have lacked to protect their troops and to preserve the honor of their country and to pursue the U.N. mission in a way they have not been able to since they have become more vulnerable to being taken as hostages.
Q. Mr. President, how much are you hamstrung in the discussions on Bosnia here at the summit by the fact that you can't make a firm commitment on U.S. support for the rapid reaction force and the fact that the United States does not have troops on the ground in Bosnia?

The President. Well, I have made some firm commitments for support. We have promised some equipment. We have promised some strategic lifts. We have promised the kind of air cover which we have given to other U.N. missions.

The United States has spent a lot of money and provided a lot of support to the United Nations mission in Bosnia, through NATO, through participating in the humanitarian airlifts, which are now by far the largest humanitarian airlifts in history. I urge you to remember that not only has the death rate gone way, way down in the last 2 years, but there are now about 2.8 million Bosnians dependent upon the humanitarian aspect of this mission. Just because it hasn't succeeded in ending the war does not mean it has been a total failure in keeping people alive while we search for a political solution.

So I was able to make those commitments based on the resources we have now. And I have made it clear from the beginning that we would not be involved with ground troops in this U.N. mission. I have made it clear the circumstances under which we would help our NATO partners and our U.N. partners to withdraw or to help them if they were in a terrible emergency. And I think that everyone understands that and is more or less not only reconciled to it but supportive of it.

This is something that the Europeans wanted to take the lead on and decided to take the lead on before I became President. And we have taken, I think, a very vigorous and aggressive position through NATO. But I do not believe the United States should send ground forces into the U.N. mission as it is constituted, and I certainly don't believe we should send our ground forces into some sort of combat situation in Bosnia.

Our vital interests, I will reiterate, are in keeping the conflict from spreading. That's why we do have forces in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. That's why we have worked very hard to see that Bosnia and Croatia have an agreement which has shut down a big part of the war. In minimizing the human loss, in supporting our NATO allies, and preserving the integrity of this operation, we have done everything we could to those ends. I do not believe that this is a situation which warrants the introduction of America's ground forces.

Q. Mr. President, back on Bosnia for a moment, sir. Despite your support for the peacekeeping forces, the U.N. peacekeeping forces in Bosnia, are you at all moved by the appeal made at the White House the other day by Bosnian President Haris Silajdzic, who called the arms embargo an instrument of genocide. How do you answer him when he asks, "Why won't the U.S. let the Bosnian Muslims defend themselves?"
The President. First of all, the arms embargo would be an instrument of genocide if the U.N. mission weren't keeping more people alive. In 1992, 130,000 civilians, more or less, died in Bosnia. In 1994, the best figures we have indicate that fewer than 3,000 people died.

When NATO was working with the U.N., we were able to create some safe areas around Sarajevo and the eastern enclaves which have since been eroded by the taking of U.N. hostages. But that's why the rapid reaction force is so important, to put some real steel back into the U.N. mission.

On principle, you know that the sympathies of the United States are with the Bosnian Government, and more strongly than some of our allies feel. But the question is, will this thing ever be settled on the battlefield? I think the answer to that is, no. If that's true, shouldn't we support the Bosnian Government's position that it has accepted the Contact Group proposal, do everything we can to strengthen the U.N., keep as many people alive as possible, not allow an erosion of their territorial position insofar as we can prevent it, and keep pushing for a diplomatic settlement? That's what I believe is the best thing to do.

Lifting the arms embargo cannot be seen in an isolated circumstance. And I want you all to consider this. This is not an example where you can just kick the can down the road; this is the most complex problem in foreign policy today. If the United States -- first of all, our European allies simply disagree with lifting the arms embargo. If we were to lift the arms embargo unilaterally, what would happen? The U.N. mission would immediately collapse and withdraw. We would have immediate responsibilities to send our people in to help them withdraw if they asked for it and needed it.

After that happened, then what happens? There are a lot of people in the United States, including many in Congress in both parties, who say, "That is no concern of ours; all they have asked us for is to lift the arms embargo and let the arms flow in there."

But I ask you: If the United States -- if the United States created the U.N. mission by a unilateral lift of the arms embargo and then the lift of the arms embargo did not produce the military results on the ground that the Bosnian government hoped and if, instead, they began to lose more territory and more and more people started to die because of our unilateral action ending the U.N. mission, what would we do then? The chances that we would be drawn in are far greater than if the United States could walk away from an even greater mess that we had created all by ourselves with our European allies pleading with us not to do it.

Therefore, I will say again, if the U.N. mission does fail, if our allies decide to leave, I would strongly support lifting the arms embargo. It's the best alternative at that moment. But I cannot in good conscience support a unilateral lift of the arms embargo when the British and the French and the others are willing to say, "We'll send more troops there; we'll stiffen our capacity to keep the peace and to work for the peace." I cannot do that.
Q. Mr. President, how can you push for a diplomatic settlement if every proposal that's
been made, including the U.S.-backed proposal to give half the country to the Serbs, is
rejected by the Serbs? What ideas are out there? There's nothing going on; there's no
diplomatic initiative in the air right now. So what do you mean when you say push for a
diplomatic settlement?

The President. There's nothing -- there will never -- they will not make peace, sir, until they
get tired of fighting each other. I agree with that. Now, that is also true of Northern Ireland.
How long has this war been underway? Four years. How long has this peacekeeping initiative
been underway? A little less time than that. How long did they fight in Northern Ireland
before they began to do what they're doing now? Twenty-five years. How long have they
been fighting in the Middle East? Over four decades before we made the progress we're
making now. You cannot simply say, given -- how deeply rooted are the conflicts between the
Bosnians of -- that are Serbian, Croatian, and Muslim? At least, at least going back to the
11th century.

So I say to you, there is nothing great going on right now. What is the answer? To do
something else that might make it worse or to try to minimize human life, ensure that it
doesn't -- the loss of human life -- ensure that it doesn't spread, and keep working for what I
think is, based on the historical evidence, the only way fights of this kind ever get settled,
which is when they -- people decide that's it's better for them to make a deal than to keep
killing each other.

Q. It is the President of France who has pushed the hardest on the rapid reaction force, and he
has described it in terms of, "we can't be humiliated". These terms sort of harken back to the
Vietnam quagmire, if you'll forgive that word, and I was hoping that you could outline
exactly what you think the mission is -- would be of this force? Could you give it in the most
specific terms possible, because as many people have said, unless we know exactly what the
mission is, there could be a disaster.

The President. Well, in fairness to the President of France, I thought that Americans might
hear that in his rhetoric. But keep in mind, when the argument was made in Vietnam that we
couldn't be humiliated, the argument there was there that we had to do more to Americanize
the war, that is, we were involved in Vietnam supporting the side of the South Vietnamese
government in a conflict with the Vietcong and North Vietnam on the other side.

In this case, the French President is taking the position that the honor of the country is eroded
when U.N. personnel in blue helmets can be taken prisoner at will and they have no capacity
to defend themselves. So he is not suggesting that they should get involved in this conflict in
a military way on one side or the other. He is suggesting, however, that they ought to be able
to move on the roads at will, that they ought to be able to do what they're supposed to do
under the U.N. mandate without being taken prisoner, being shot at, being victimized; and
that the rapid reaction force is supposed to be able to get them out of tights if they get in it
and to support them when they need the support. He is not suggesting that the rapid reaction
force would increase the level of military conflict or that there would be any military
initiative taken by that force.
Q. The British have said that you here at this summit have committed the U.S. to paying its fair share of that rapid reaction force. Since the Republican leadership has said that they don't want Congress to pony up the money, just what options are available to you to come up with that money? And secondly, by the Republican leadership doing what they did in advance of the U.N. vote, does it unnecessarily tie your hands in the conduct of foreign policy?

The President. No, in this case, I think, what they did was to make it possible for me to vote for an initiative that they agreed with in principle but weren't prepared to say they would pay for. That is -- let me back up and say -- there are two issues here. One is, under our law, the President is plainly required to consult with the Congress before agreeing to a course of action that would require the expenditure of money. You don't have to agree with the Congress, but at least you have to consult with them.

President Chirac came in and said, "Look, timing is of the essence, and we need a vote on this, and we need it now;" So I called Senator Dole and Speaker Gingrich, and I have no -- we had a good conversation, and I have no quarrel with the letter they sent, because I said, "I don't have time to do the consultations if he is right and we need the vote now."

So the letter they sent to me said two things. But the most important thing, apropos of your point is, "You can do this, but our committee chairmen have very serious reservations about this mission, what its role is going to be, what it's function will be, and whether we should pay for it. So if you do it, you have to know that we are not committing in advance to appropriate the money.

Now, what I told the British was, and what I told all my colleagues last night was, that I would make my best efforts to secure funding for it because it's the right thing to do.

Now, the second issue I want to say is, as you know, the leadership of the Republican Party disagrees with our policy. They favor a unilateral lift which would collapse the U.N. mission. That's what they think the right thing to do is. But they know that the President has to make foreign policy and that I have no intention of pursuing that for the reasons I have already explained.

Q. -- and funding --

Q. Mr. President --

The President. We're working on that.

Q. Since UNPROFOR is now unable to carry out its mission to deliver humanitarian relief to Sarajevo or to maintain the weapons exclusion zone around the city and Sarajevo is once again being strangled, why have you urged the Bosnian government not to use force to defend itself?.
The President. Well, first of all, my sympathies are with them. I agreed to the statement that we all signed off on last night because the French and the British are doing their best to get more troops there through the rapid reaction force, which would permit the U.N. to fulfill its mandate which includes opening Sarajevo, and because I believe that has the best chance of opening Sarajevo without other adverse consequences to the Bosnians.

In other words, I tried to make sure that resolution was carefully worded to say, right now don't increase hostilities, because I don't believe this is a good time to do that when we are trying to strengthen the rapid reaction force and when, if we are successful, they will be better able to guarantee the openness of Sarajevo.

My sympathies with them are complete. They have a right to want their city to be open. And the Serbs have been shelling it on and off for 4 years whenever they could get away with it. So I don't agree with what's going on. But if the rapid reaction force works and the U.N. mission can work again and Sarajevo can be protected again, then I believe we're better off, and I believe, more importantly, they're better off if it can be done that way. I think there will be fewer casualties, and I think their political position will be stronger. That's why I agreed to support the settlement.

Q. Lift the siege --

The President. I'm saying, no, that's not their job. Their job is to back up and protect the U.N. mission. But I think it will show that the U.N. mission will have a greater capacity to do what the U.N. has authorized it to do, which is to be able to get in and out of Sarajevo.

Now, that is not the same thing as saying they will take a unilateral military action to lift the siege, but then the Serbs and everybody else, for that matter, will have to think about the Blue Helmets in a little different way before they just say, "I'm sorry, you can't cross this road; I'm sorry, we're going to take you a prisoner; I'm sorry, we're going to treat you like dirt; I'm sorry, we're going to ignore the U.N."

That is what President Chirac and Prime Minister Major want to avoid having happen to their troops again. And if it is seen in that light, then I think at least we have to give them a chance to try to make the U.N. mandate work again.

Thank you very much.

Note: The President's 99th news conference began at 4:20 p.m. at Dalhousie University. In his remarks, he referred to President Jacques Chirac of France and U.S. Representative to the United Nations Madeleine K. Albright. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.
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Ms. Yoachum, Mr. President, given the difficulties -- the highly publicized difficulties, of course, with the U.N. peacekeeping forces in Bosnia and other U.N. difficulties, doesn't it make more difficult for you to try to sell this to Americans, and don't you run some political risk in trying to do so?

The President. Well, I suppose there's -- in a time like this, when a lot of people are bewildered almost by all the things that are going on in the world and the apparent conflicts of all the good forces and the troubling forces rising up at once, there's some political risk in everything. But you have to do what you think is right.

I think the -- I think it's important not to define the first of all, I think it's important not to define the U.N. solely in terms of Bosnia. I mean, there was also -- I'd ask the United States to remember that we went into Haiti with a multinational force that restored the Aristide government and democracy, but we were able to hand it off to a U.N. force with even more nations involved, where there were more countries paying for it.

I think most Americans know that there are going to be problems all around the world that affect United States interests and that can affect United States citizens, and it's better to have a larger number of nations working on those problems and a larger number of nations paying for the solutions to those problems.

Bosnia is a unique circumstance because it's in the heart of Europe, but there's a war that's been going on there for 4 years. But if you look at it, the people in Northern Ireland fought for 25 years, the people in the Middle East fought for more than four decades before there was any peace progress there. And for all the frustration people in our country have with the problems in Bosnia, the casualty rates have gone way, way down since the U.N. forces went on the ground there and since the United States began to support them with massive humanitarian airlifts and with our operation to keep the war from going into the air. That's what Captain O'Grady was doing when he was shot down; lie was enforcing the no-fly zone. And I think it's important never to forget that. Before the United Nations became involved and before we became as aggressive as we were in trying to provide air help, in 1992, there were about 130,000 people killed in that civil war. In 1994, the death rate was down to under about 3,500. So I think that it's important, even in Bosnia, to keep tiffs in perspective.
The United Nations did not succeed in ending the war in Bosnia. The United Nations did not go in there to militarily defeat the Bosnian Serbs, and they're not capable of doing that, and that was never what they were established -- that's not what they were sent there to do. But the war has become less violent and has been at least contained to Bosnia and has not spread beyond its borders. So with all of our frustrations, I think it's important to remember that.

Ms. Yoachum. You'll be doing a number of things in your speech on Monday, which has been, I think, widely anticipated around the world. And certainly, the patron saint of the U.N. 50 celebration, Walter Shorenstein, says that it's a real opportunity for you to give a world-class speech. Having said that, and you having said that you're going to outline your hope for the U.N. given the changing circumstances of the world, what part of your speech -- what will you say in your speech to address some of the criticisms, particularly by key Republicans, of the United States' involvement in 1995 in the U.N.?

The President. Well, I will -- consider the alternatives. I mean, here the United States is, the world's only superpower militarily, with other countries becoming increasingly wealthy, where there are other countries willing to put their troops on the ground in their own trouble spots and not asking us to do it, like Bosnia, and willing to pay an increasingly large share of streamlining the United Nations. And now we have people in our country and, most importantly, people in our Congress, who want to walk away from our global responsibilities and walk away from the opportunity to cooperate with people in ways that permit others to carry some share of the load.

You know, sometimes I get the feeling that some of the critics of our cooperation with other countries want it both ways. They want to be able to run the world and tell everybody exactly how to behave, and then not have to cooperate with anybody when they have a slight difference of opinion from us or even if they're willing to put their troops on the ground and put their money up.

That's the case in Bosnia, where the Europeans said, "We'll take the lead. We'll put our troops on the ground. This will be paid for through the United Nations, so you won't have to pay for any more than your regular assessment. We ask you for your air power and the support of the NATO, but we're going to follow the prescribed United Nations policy. We're not going to let the U.S. dictate policy, especially when it's our troops and our lives that are at risk."

And I think we cannot have it both ways. We can't become an isolationist country, and we can't dictate every other country's course. We can't become the world's policemen. And it's better for us to be a leader within the framework of the United Nations, which means that from time to time we will have to cooperate with people and agree on a policy that may reflect more of a consensus than our absolute best desires. But that's what the United Nations was set up to do.
The U.S. is still clearly the dominant country in the United Nations. We still are able to do the things we need to do to be -- for example, to keep a firm hand with Serbia; we've been able to keep other countries from lifting the sanctions off Iraq; we've been able to get a tougher line -- in many ways, we were able to bare our policy in Haiti prevail. But the United Nations is about working with other countries and shared sacrifice, shared contribution, shared decision making, where the U.S. leads but can't control everything. And I think that's the way the world ought to be going forward.
Q. Mr. President, is it time for the U.N. troops to get out of Bosnia and for the U.S. to lift the arms embargo, as Senator Dole and others are proposing?

The President. Well, first of all, let me comment on the events of the last few days. I am very disturbed about what has happened in Srebrenica. We are very concerned about the fate of the refugees. And we have been working hard for the last couple of days to determine what options there are to deal with the immediate humanitarian problems. And we intend to do everything we can on that. And that is the first and foremost thing.

The truth is that the Bosnian Serbs should do what they did the last time this crisis arose, they should withdraw. And the United Nations should go back in there and reestablish the safe area, and the people should be able to go home. But we have to deal with the humanitarian crisis.

Now on the second issue, let me remind you of what my position has always been and what it still is today. The Europeans have tried to take the lead, under the umbrella of the United Nations, in minimizing the loss of life in Bosnia, in keeping the conflict from spreading, and in urging a diplomatic resolution of the war. They are still committed to do that.

I believe if the Rapid Reaction Force idea, which the French and the British have pushed, had been fully implemented before this occurred, this problem could have been minimized.

I still do not believe that it is in the interest of the United States to collapse and force the Europeans out of their willingness to put ground troops on the ground in Bosnia to try to minimize the loss of life and limit the spread. If the United Nations mission does collapse, then I believe that, together, the allies should all vote on the arms embargo. That is the best way to keep the NATO position unified, to keep the world position unified, and to avoid overly Americanizing the dealings in Bosnia should the U.N. mission collapse.

I'm quite concerned about that. The Europeans have been willing to try to solve what is clearly the toughest problem they face on their own continent in the aftermath of the cold war. I have tried to be supportive of that. There are serious problems now with this. Unless we can restore the integrity of the U.N. mission, obviously, its days will be numbered.

But let's not forget that it has accomplished a dramatic reduction in the loss of life since 1992, and the conflict has not spread. This is a serious challenge to the U.N. mission. It must either be resolved or there will have to be some changes there.
Q. Mr. President, your administration said that if the Congress voted to lift the arms embargo on Bosnia that would almost guarantee that U.S. ground troops would have to be sent in. The Senate voted that way yesterday by a margin that suggests you couldn't sustain a veto. The House looks like it's going down the same road. How close are we now to having to send U.S. ground troops in? And do you feel this is a vote of no confidence in your foreign policy?

President Clinton. I think it's a vote of no confidence in the fact that the United Nations did not move to do anything when Srebrenica fell after Srebrenica had been declared a safe area and the fact that the war seems to be dragging on without resolution. But I also wouldn't be so sure we couldn't sustain a veto. I think that depends entirely on the vigor and the strength of the response of the U.N. forces in Bosnia and their NATO allies.

And we are working hard in that regard. I have been very encouraged by what Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali said yesterday, and I have been very impressed by the determination of President Chirac and Prime Minister Major to set up this rapid reaction force and to fight back if attacked, not simply to be taken hostage.

So we're going to see what will happen in the days ahead. But I wouldn't be so presumptive about what would happen in the Congress. I noted that the French Prime Minister, Mr. Juppe, said not very long ago that if -- just a few hours ago -- that if, in fact, the Congress took this action and it became U.S. policy, that they would withdraw from Bosnia and that would require us to send our troops in to help them get out, which is exactly what I said. And if we do it alone, if we unilaterally lift the arms embargo, that means that the rest of the world will consider that we are responsible for what happens from then on, solely. And I think that we need to consider that.
Q. Mr. President, there is a perception that U.S. leadership, prestige, has really suffered under this devastating debacle of Bosnia. You wanted to bomb -- more than 2 1/2 years ago-heavy bombing to stop -- that peacekeeping per se, despite the humanitarian side, is a misnomer. What do you think are the lessons of Bosnia? And do you think that the U.S. leadership has gone down the drain?

President Clinton. No. Keep in mind, when I became President, a decision had been made -- a decision, by the way, that I couldn't criticize -- that in the aftermath of the cold war, the Europeans should take the lead in dealing with the First major security crisis on the European Continent at the end of the cold war and that they would do that under the umbrella of the United Nations, that our role would be to support that with airlifts of humanitarian goods and then later with enforcing a no-fly zone and then later with enforcing the peace agreements that the United Nations had made through the use of air power. That happened when I was President.

And we also would support this effort to some extent from the sea as well, and through enforcing the embargo and through putting our troops in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. That was the agreement.

And I still believe that, on balance, it was working better than the other alternatives, considering there was no peace to keep a lot. The death rate went down breathtakingly from 1992 to 1994, and there was a long period of time there where we had a chance to make a peace.

Then what happened? And as you know, I believe that a multilateral lift of the arms embargo early on would have helped us to make a quicker peace. I still believe that would have happened. What happened was, along toward the end of last year -- well, there was an agreement for a cease-fire. Then it expired. Since it expired, the Bosnian Serbs concluded that the United Nations would not keep its commitments to the safe areas if it took peacekeepers as hostages and that under the rules of engagement in which the peacekeepers were there, and given their fairly lightly-armed nature, they could be easily taken as hostages. Now, that happened.

That, I think, when that happened and the threat of hostage-taking and the effect of hostage-taking caused Srebrenica to fall without a terrific response in terms of air punishment, that collapsed the support for the United Nations. And all of us, including the United States and NATO, who had supported it suffered in prestige, if you will, not because we didn't win but because the U.N. didn't do what it said it was going to do. You can't go about the world saying you're going to do something and then not do it.

So I -- that's why I spent all that time, leading up to the London conference and since then, working with NATO to say, look, we have to reestablish the fact that we will have a strong -- not just close air support but a strong air response to raise the price of Serbian aggression. Secondly, I strongly support the decision of the French and the British to establish this rapid reaction force so that they just can't be taking hostages at will.
But I would remind you that this was -- the question of whether a lot of people still say, well, America ought to fix it. But we don't have troops on the ground now. And this distribution of responsibility all grew out of a decision made prior to my Presidency -- which I am not criticizing, I say again -- to try to say that, okay, here's a problem in Europe, the Europeans ought to take the lead, they would put people on the ground. We have had troops since I have been President, I would remind you, in Somalia, in Bwanda, in Haiti. We have not been loath to do our job. But we have tried to support the base commitment of the Europeans there. And it has not worked. No one can say it has worked.

So I decided we're either going to do what we said we were going to do with the U.N. For we'll have to something else. This is the last chance for UNPROFOR to survive. But I do believe if it can be made to work, it has a greater chance of securing a peace and minimizing death of the Bosnians. That's what I believe. And I also believe it would be a very great thing for Europe if the Europeans can take the lead in resolving the first post-cold-war security crisis on the European Continent.

United Nations Peacekeeping

Q. Mr. President, has this difficult experience that the United States has had in getting the U.N. to do, as you put it, what it has said it would do shaken your confidence in the U.N. as an institution through which the United States and with which the United States can work toward its various foreign policy aims?

President Clinton. No. But I think what it has done -- let me -- I would say there should be two lessons that we draw out of this as Americans. Number one, the United Nations cannot go to a place with a limited peacekeeping mission if there is no peace to keep, without considering what it's going to do if it can't fulfill its original mission. That's really been the fundamental problem here. The rules of engagement for the forces there have made them very vulnerable to be taken hostages and, therefore, to become the instrument in the last few months of Serbian aggression, Bosnian-Serbian aggression.

The second lesson I would ask the American people, all of us, to think about is, that if we determine that in various parts of the world at the end of the cold war it is appropriate for other countries to take the lead, and they have troops on the ground and people at immediate risk and we don't, then we have to be willing to accept the fact that we may not be able to dictate the ultimate outcome of the situation.

The difficulty for the United States is this: we are still the world's only superpower; people want us to fix things or, at least, say we're absolutely not involved in them. And here's a case where we decided to let someone else take the lead in a, to be fair to them, very difficult problem, but to be involved in a supporting role. And that, to some extent, has put our own prestige, the prestige of NATO, and the prestige of the United Nations all at risk. And because we don't have the large segment of troops on the ground, our ability to dictate the course of events has been more limited.
Now, having said all that, keep in mind, we are trying to work our way through, in this post-cold-war era, sort of an uncharted field in which the United States can lead the world, can be, in effect, the repository of last resort, of responsible power, but still give others the chance and responsibility to take the lead where they can.

So I think we have learned the hazards of that policy. And I think that the kinds of problems we have had here have led us to learn things that we won't repeat. But I would caution the American people that does not mean they should give up on the U.N. The U.N. is doing dozens of things today that you will not be able to show on the news tonight, Brit, for the precise reason that they are working and they won't rise on the radar screen.

So it's important that we not throw out the baby with the bath water here. We need to learn what went wrong in Bosnia, why it didn't work, what the limits of our partnership are. But we shouldn't give up on the United Nations, because it still has great capacity to do important things.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 100th news conference began at 1:12 p.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. President Kim spoke in Korean, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter.
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Mr. Edwards. Well, Croatia is back into it, and we wonder how the Croat offensive affects the prospects of a U.N. withdrawal and the accompanying commitment of U.S. ground troops.

The President. Well, my guess is that if the Croat offensive concludes successfully in the Krajina area, as it appears to be doing, and that is the extent of it, that it will not increase the chances of the U.N. withdrawing. But it does change the kind of balance of play in the area. And when you put that with the new resolve of NATO and the willingness of the U.N. to let NATO use air power and the establishment of the Rapid Reaction Force, two things we worked very hard for in the last few weeks, it may create some new opportunities to work toward a resolution of this.

Now, we're concerned, and we've told the Croatians we're concerned about anything that would spread the war, that would widen the war. But if the offensive concludes with the reestablishment of the dominance, the Croatia in the Krajina area, then I think it will not increase the chances of U.N. withdrawal.

Mr. Edwards. In the absence of direct U.S. involvement, why should the American people care about this conflict?

The President. The American people should care, first of all, because if the war spreads in the Balkans to other areas it could destabilize many, many countries in which we have a vital interest and bring America into the fray. Secondly, we should care because an awful lot of human damage has been done there, and a lot of people's human rights have been violated, and we should try to minimize the loss of life and human suffering. Thirdly, we should care because it's the first real security crisis in Europe after the end of the cold war, and it is important that we, working with our European allies through the United Nations and through NATO, do as much as humanly possible to do, given the fact that when you have these kind of intra-ethnic conflicts within countries, to some extent, any outside power is going to be limited in stopping the killing until there is a greater willingness to make peace. But we have to do our best to try to minimize the carnage, to try to keep it from spreading, and to try to demonstrate a consistent and determined and long-lasting commitment by our allies through the United Nations and through NATO to resolve this.
Ms. Liasson, Mr. President, there are tens of thousands of Krajina Serbs now who are being ethnically cleaned, and they're fleeing over the border into Bosnia. Can you tell us how that influx of Serbs into Bosnia will affect the conflict there? And also, what can you tell us about Croatian President Franjo Tudjman's intentions? Does he want to maintain the Bosnia Croat Federation, or do you think he wants an ethnically pure state of his own?

The President. Well, first, let's remember what gave rise to this offensive. There was a Bosnian Serb attack supported by the Krajina Serbs on the Bihac area of Bosnia, which is a Muslim area or at least a government area now. And President Tudjman ordered a counterattack to try to relieve Bihac, and in the process, to try to secure the areas within Croatia under control of his government.

I believe that he wants to see the Croats and the Muslims stay in their confederation within Bosnia. And you know, the United States took the lead in brokering that confederation. I think that it's very important because it ended, in effect, one-half of the civil war within Bosnia; so I felt good about that. And I think it will endure. I believe that confederation will endure.

What impact the Krajina Serbs going over into Bosnian territory will have is, frankly, impossible to determine at this time. If they become members of the Bosnian Serb army, then it could have a destabilizing impact. But no one knows for sure. That's why I say that circumstances have changed there in a way that might give us the opportunity to make some new efforts at a diplomatic settlement, and I'm going to be talking with our allies over the next few days to discuss that.

Ms. Liasson. But before the Croat offensive started you warned the Croatians not to target civilians and not to target U.N. peacekeepers. They seem to have ignored both of those warnings. Do you have any control over the Croats?

The President. No, but I think we have -- I think we and the Germans have some influence with the Croats. And I think what appears to have happened is they had more success than they had, I think, perhaps even imagined they might in the battle. And so they kept going until they had recovered that portion of their territory which had been previously under the dominance of the Krajina Serbs.

I do believe that President Tudjman will be reluctant to do anything that will knowingly spread the war and totally destabilize the situation in ways that undermine his interest and the interest of the Bosnian Croat Confederation within Bosnia. So, as I said, I'm hopeful that this will turn out to be something that will give us an avenue to a quicker diplomatic resolution, not a road to a longer war.

Mr. Edwards. This is the most important foreign policy problem of your Presidency, and you are seen as indecisive. Senator Dole has tried to take advantage of that. Is this frustrating to you in a situation such as Bosnia, where no action might actually be the best action?
The President. Well, first of all, I disagree that it's the most important foreign policy problem. It's the foreign policy problem that's the longest lasting and, therefore, the most publicized. But the most important things we have done, I think, you'd have to start out with our continued efforts with Russia and the other republics of the former Soviet Union to denuclearize, our efforts to stem the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, which have been very successful and which the United States has led, our efforts at peace in the Middle East. All those things, it seems to me, over the long run, in terms of America's vital interest, are more important.

The Bosnian situation is heartbreaking. And it is potentially very important to our security interests should it spread, which is why I have sent troops to the former Yugoslav republic of Macedonia to try to make sure that it doesn't spread. But is it frustrating? Sure it is, because most of the people who criticize don't have a better alternative. And many of them who criticize don't have any alternative.

The United States, before I became President, made a decision not to send troops in the U.N. peacekeeping mission in Bosnia. Frankly, at the time, it's my understanding that our European allies agreed with that. They wanted to take the lead in dealing with this big security problem, the first one of the post-cold-war era. The U.N., in any case, was not supposed to be trying to determine the outcome of the war but simply trying to minimize the violence and get the humanitarian aid through.

Now we have spent as much or more money as any country in supporting the peace process in Bosnia, in supporting the humanitarian aid and the airlift, and trying to keep the war out of the air, and doing all the things that we have done from our ships and from our bases, to fly literally tens of thousands of flights. We have also been responsible for taking the lead in establishing the alliance between the Bosnian Government and the Croatians. We took the lead in asserting the need for NATO to use its air power. In 1994, we had a pretty good year there because of this aggressive action on our part. And it fell apart when the United Nations decided not to let NATO use its power whenever a U.N. soldier had been taken hostage.

Now we have changed the ground rules on the ground with the Rapid Reaction Force, and we've got a new set of command and control rules for NATO. So we seem to be making some progress. There have been several convoys go in and out of Gorazde, for example, without being attacked.

I believe we have done all we could to work with our allies, and I think we have exercised all the influence we could, considering the fact that they have soldiers on the ground and we don't. And I do not believe that under these circumstances we should have put ground troops on the ground in the U.N. mission. So I think history will reflect that, given the options, none of which were very pleasant in a very difficult situation, that we have done the right things and that they were better than the alternatives available to us.
Ms. Liasson. Mr. President, recently you said the reason why the United States and NATO and the U.N. have all lost prestige in Bosnia is because they went around saying they were going to do something and then they didn't do it. In retrospect, would it have been better not to have said that you were going to lift the arms embargo and then help the Muslims with air strikes? Do you think you raised expectations there that couldn't be met?

The President. No because when I ran for President I made it clear that I would support a lifting of the arms embargo multi-laterally. I never said I would lift it unilaterally. I was, frankly, surprised, given the record we had of Serbian aggression when I became President, that our allies would not agree to lift the arms embargo multi-laterally. But they felt it would put their own troops too much at risk, and they believed that it would not do what I thought, which was to induce the Bosnian Serbs to make a quick peace.

Let me say that air strikes cannot win a war, but they can raise the price of aggression. And if you believe as I do, that territorial disputes between the sides now could be resolved without the legitimate interests of any ethnic group being eroded, I think that's a very important reason for using air strikes to increase the price of aggression.

But it didn't happen in '93, so in '94, we got a different kind of agreement to use air power -- our own air power -- in return for not lifting the arms embargo on the Bosnian Government. And it worked. The Serbs and the Bosnian Government brought their heavy weapons into collection points. The cafe areas were largely free from shelling and military activity. And the whole thing only came apart when, number one, no peace was reached in 1994, and number two, when military activity started in the central part of the country spread to these safe areas and the U.N. would not permit NATO to strike back.

So that's what I would say. If you say for sure you're going to do something, you simply have to do it. And if you don't do it, you suffer. And that's what happened to the U.N. and the NATO. And because the United States is a part of those organizations and has a leading role in NATO, it hurt us as well. And that's why I told our allies I would try one more time to have NATO play a role in this, one more time to try to support them with their Rapid Reaction Force. But the United States could not be part of any endeavor that made commitments which were not kept. We have to keep commitments once we make them.

Ms. Liasson. You've talked, though, about the limits of the U.S. being able to dictate the outcome of something when we don't have troops on the ground. Does that mean that the U.S. can only lead if it's willing to commit troops in situations like this?

The President. As I said, we have exercised a leadership role in pushing the air power and leading the humanitarian air lift and putting our troops on the border and in getting the Croatians and the Bosnian Muslims to agree to a confederation. So in that sense, we have. But our ability to exercise a leadership role when the British, the French, the Dutch, and the others who have troops on the ground believe that what we want to do will endanger their troops but not ours, since we're not there, is necessarily limited. But that is, after all, part of what we, I think, should be working toward in the post-cold-war world.
The United States, obviously, will have to make a decision whether we think we should run every show and totally dominate every crisis. But if we want to do that, we do have to be willing to have troops on the ground where others have troops on the ground. I believe that we have exercised a great deal of leadership, and I think it's been consistent with our interest in not having troops there in this U.N. mission. I could not have countenanced putting American troops in the position where they could be fired upon and taken as hostages without firing back. I don't believe in that. I don't think that's what the United States is all about. And I do not believe the United States should be there trying to win this war on the ground, as a combatant. I don't believe in that. So I have said that I would not send troops there unless it's necessary to take our allies out.
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Q. Mr. President, the war in Bosnia is widening. How long is the world, particularly the Europeans who have been there in the past, how long are they going to stand -- we all are going to stand by and watch this barbarism on both sides? And what are your new initiatives to end this suffering?

The President. Well, first of all, let me briefly review what our objectives are. Our objectives are to minimize suffering, to stop the war from spreading, to preserve the integrity of a Bosnian state. We have promoted the Muslim-Croat Federation. We have plainly succeeded in limiting the war. And except when the United Nations and NATO had not done what they said they would do, we have saved lives.

This is an important moment in Bosnia, and it could be a moment of real promise. Because of the military actions of the last few days, the situation on the ground has changed. There is some uncertainty and instability. It could go either way. But I think it's a time when we should try to make a move to make peace.

Now, since the fall of Srebrenica and Zepa, we have tried to do two things: first of all, to strengthen the presence of the United Nations through the Rapid Reaction Force of the French, the British, and the Dutch, which we are supporting; and through getting a clearer chain of command and a stronger, broader use of authority for NATO to have air power where necessary where the protected areas are threatened.

The second thing we want to do is to see whether or not some diplomatic solution can be brought to bear that would be fair and decent and just and that would take advantage of this moment where people are reassessing their various positions. And that's what Mr. Lake is doing in Europe. We are consulting with all of our allies, and we're going to do the very best we can. I think we need to try to make a decent and good peace here because, ultimately, that's the answer to all the questions you ask.

Q. [Inaudible] -- you have new ideas?

The President. Well, we're exploring some ideas with the Europeans. I will say again what I said from the first day I came here: I do not believe it is fight to impose peace on people. I don't think in the end you get a lasting peace. So the United States does not seek to impose peace. But we're exploring some different ideas. We don't have a set map; we don't have a set position. We have some ideas that the new events may make possible, and we're discussing it with our allies.
Ms. Soren. Senator Dole and Senator Helms have proposed asking for $100 million in arms aid for Bosnia. Do you support this legislation?

The President. Not now because the arms embargo is on. My position is that the United States should not, by ourselves, violate the U.N. rule against selling arms into Bosnia because it applies to all Yugoslavia, that instead, what we ought to do is have that U.N. mission there work to stop aggression against Bosnia by letting NATO use its air power and by strengthening the U.N. mission on the ground.

What happened in Srebrenica was awful. But it happened in large measure because the United Nations would not permit the United States and the other NATO allies to take strong action from the air against the Serbs. Now that there's been a real change on the ground and the Serbs have been rolled back in the western part of Bosnia and in Croatia by the Croats, I hope we have a chance to make a decent peace there.

I would not be against -- if the U.N. mission fails, I would be for selling arms to the Bosnians or making it possible for the Bosnians to buy arms, but only when we get everybody to lift the arms embargo at the U.N.

But let me just say this in closing. We have an embargo against Saddam Hussein in Iraq, and you see what happened. We put a lot of pressure on it; we now have some defectors coming over, weakening his power. If we say, "We're going to ignore you, and we're going to sell arms to the Bosnians," then what's to prevent other countries from saying, "Okay, we'll ignore the U.N. embargo in Iraq, and we'll bolster Saddam Hussein?"
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My fellow Americans, distinguished members of the diplomatic corps; most importantly, to the family, the friends, the colleagues, the loved ones of Robert Frasure, Joseph Kruzel, and Nelson Drew: Today we gather to honor three peacemakers who gave their lives seeking for others the blessings we Americans hold dear and too often take for granted, the opportunity to work and to dream, to raise our children to live and to love in a land of peace.

When I named Robert Frasure Special Envoy to the Former Yugoslavia, a key United States representative in seeking solutions to modern diplomacy's most difficult challenge -- ending the bloodshed and bringing peace in the Balkans -- he had already made diplomacy the steady dedication of a lifetime. He earned, justifiably, a reputation as a man for all crises, and many, many people around this world from Ethiopia to Estonia have better lives because of his superb work.

Joseph Kruzel put his mind to the test of creating lasting security in a world that has known too much war. Besides his outstanding work in Bosnia, he led the Pentagon's efforts on critical issues of NATO enlargement and the re-integration of Eastern Europe into the West after the cold war. His service to our country spanned 28 years, from an Air Force officer in Vietnam to work on SALT I to being a major force in bringing the nations of Europe into the Partnership For Peace. The world is a more secure place because of his dedication.

Colonel Nelson Drew was a soldier, a scholar, a teacher, and a gentle man. He was trained to fight war. But in more than 20 years of service as an Air Force officer, he gave his heart and soul to the search for peace. He was largely responsible for investing the military and diplomatic initiatives of our Nation in Bosnia with a coherent design. And he was universally respected for his knowledge, his negotiating skills, his strategic thinking about the future of NATO and Europe after the cold war. The White House and the Nation are better for his service.

Bob, Joe, and Nelson each represented the finest qualities of American citizenship. For their service and their sacrifice in the cause of peace and freedom, it is my honor on this day to award them each the President's Citizens Medal.
Let me say to Katharina Frasure and Sarah and Virginia; to Gail Kruzel and John and Sarah; to Sandy Drew and Samantha and Philip; and to all your other family members here, the American people mourn your loss and share your grief. America is profoundly grateful for the work your husbands and fathers did to make the world a better place.

I hope you will always remember, along with the personal memories you shared with me just a few moments ago, the pride they took in their calling and the passion they brought to the search for peace. And I hope that always, always, you will be very proud.

They were extraordinary Americans who made reason their weapon, freedom their cause, and peace their goal. Bob, Joe, and Nelson were in Bosnia because they were moved by the terrible injustice and suffering there. And they were there because they believed it could and must be changed. The sorrow we feel here reminds us of the suffering Bob, Joe, and Nelson sought to ease there.

So as we praise these men -- Robert Frasure, Joseph Kruzel, and Nelson Drew, quiet American heroes who gave their lives so that others might know a future of hope and a land at peace -- let us resolve to carry on their struggle with the strength, determination, and caring they brought to their families, their work, and their very grateful Nation.

May God bless their memories and lift up their souls.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:10 p.m. in Memorial Chapel at Fort Myer.
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We come to celebrate the courage and determination of the Americans who brought us victory in that war. But as we do, our thoughts and prayers must also be with the men and women of our Armed Forces who are putting their bravery and their professionalism on the line in Bosnia.

I want to restate to you and to all the American people why our forces and their NATO allies are engaged in the military operation there. The massacre of civilians in Sarajevo on Monday, caused by a Bosnian Serb shell, was an outrageous act in a terrible war and a challenge to the commitments which NATO had made to oppose such actions by force if necessary. The United States took the lead in gaining those commitments by NATO, and we must help NATO to keep them.

The NATO bombing campaign and the related artillery campaign against the Bosnian Serb military in which our forces are taking part skillfully is the right response to the savagery in Sarajevo. The campaign will make clear to the Bosnian Serbs that they have nothing to gain and everything to lose by continuing to attack Sarajevo and other safe areas and by continuing to slaughter innocent civilians. NATO is delivering that message loud and clear. And I hope all of you are proud of the role that the members of the United States Armed Forces are playing in delivering that message.

The war in Bosnia must end, but not on the battlefield, rather at the negotiating table. Just 2 weeks ago we lost three of our finest American diplomatic representatives in a tragic accident in Bosnia as they were working for a negotiated peace. Today our negotiating team continues its work as well. And in the skies above Bosnia, our pilots and crews and their colleagues from other NATO countries are risking their lives for the same peace. We are proud of those who fly and those who are seeking to negotiate the peace.
Student. Since you've been President, what's the hardest decision that you've had to make?

And the other thing that was -- son of the hardest thing to do was to decide what to do, how to deal with Bosnia. For a long time it was very difficult because I think the United States has to work within the United Nations and within the rules set within the United Nations for a problem like Bosnia. But it's hard for us when we're the strongest country in the world, when other countries are -- don't do what we think they should do. And we have no way to make them do it because we didn't have soldiers there. But that was very hard for me.

Now I have to tell you I agree with what we're doing in Bosnia. I strongly -- you may know this from the news, but NATO planes are striking the Bosnian Serb targets again today in Bosnia because they refused to take all their heavy weapons away from Sarajevo and stop shelling the city. And we strongly supported that.

So now we're working together, and I agree with the policy. But that was very hard for me. Now that the cold war is over, it's very important that other countries all take some responsibility for dealing with problems in their area and that we work with them. But it's hard when you're trying to work with somebody and what they want to do is not what you want to do. That's tough.

Now, the controversial things I've done were not so hard for me. For example, when I sent our troops into Haiti to remove the dictators it was -- the only difficult thing there was understanding how to do it in a way that would minimize the likelihood that any Americans would die. But whether we should do it or not seemed the right thing to me.
The most unpopular thing or the thing I've done that had the least popular support -- I don't know if it had the most opposition; it had the least popular support -- was to help Mexico when it was about to go bankrupt several months ago. A lot of -- nobody -- there was a poll on the day I made the decision that said the American people were against it 81 to 15. They thought I was doing the wrong thing to try to help Mexico. But I thought I was doing the right thing because I knew if Mexico collapsed, we'd have a lot more illegal immigration problems. I knew that they wouldn't be able to buy any of our products. I knew that there was a serious chance that there would be an economic collapse in other countries in Latin America. So basically, I had more information than most Americans did, so even though I was making a very controversial and unpopular decision, it turned out to be an easy one for me.

So sometimes the controversial decisions are not the hardest ones.
The President. Good morning. Today we take another solid step on the hard but hopeful road to peace in Bosnia. I'm pleased to announce that the parties in Bosnia have agreed to a cease-fire to terminate all hostile military activities throughout the territory of Bosnia-Herzegovina to become effective on October the 10th, if certain conditions are met.

At the same time, the Governments of Bosnia, Croatia, and Serbia have agreed to proximity peace talks in the United States, beginning about October the 25th, aimed at bringing them closer to a peace agreement. Those negotiations will take place with the assistance of our able negotiating team, led by Assistant Secretary Holbrooke, together with our Contact Group partners.

The talks will continue, then, at an international peace conference in Paris that can help to achieve an enduring end to the struggle. This is an important moment in the painful history in Bosnia, for today the parties have agreed to put down their arms and roll up their sleeves and work for peace.

We need to be clear-eyed about this. What matters is what the parties do, not simply what they say. There remain deep divisions to overcome. We are now on the right road, but we have by no means reached our destination, which is a serious and lasting peace in Bosnia. This cease-fire, however, greatly increases our chances to end the war and to achieve a peace. The United States, together with our European and our Russian partners, intends to use all of our influence and every ounce of our energy to seize this historic opportunity for peace.

Q. Do you think this statement, and do you wish you had done it sooner? If you had moved more aggressively --

The President. All I know is that we're on the verge of a cease-fire. We're going to do our best to get the cease-fire. We have 5 days of hard work to do on that.

Q. Will NATO police this cease-fire? How will this be enforced?
The President. We're going to brief you on all the details of the cease-fire. We intend to go forward with the cease-fire, then go forward with the talks here in Washington. We hope we can start the talks in Washington by October the 25th, and we feel very strongly that that will increase the chances of peace.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11 a.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House.
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With our purpose and with our position comes the responsibility to help shine the light of justice on those who would deny to others their most basic human rights. We have an obligation to carry forward the lessons of Nuremberg. That is why we strongly support the United Nations War Crimes Tribunals for the former Yugoslavia and for Rwanda.

The goals of these tribunals are straight-forward: to punish those responsible for genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity; to deter future such crimes; and to help nations that were torn apart by violence begin the process of healing and reconciliation.

The tribunal for the former Yugoslavia has made excellent progress. It has collected volumes of evidence of atrocities, including the establishment of death camps, mass executions, and systematic campaigns of rape and terror. This evidence is the basis for the indictments the tribunal already has issued against 43 separate individuals. And this week, 10 witnesses gave dramatic, compelling testimony against one of the indictees in a public proceeding. These indictments are not negotiable. Those accused of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide must be brought to justice. They must be tried and, if found guilty, they must be held accountable. Some people are concerned that pursuing peace in Bosnia and prosecuting war criminals are incompatible goals. But I believe they are wrong. There must be peace for justice to prevail, but there must be justice when peace prevails.

In recent weeks, the combination of American leadership, NATO's resolve, the international community's diplomatic determination: these elements have brought us closer to a settlement in Bosnia than at any time since the war began there 4 years ago. So let me repeat again what I have said consistently for over 2 years: If and when the parties do make peace, the United States, through NATO, must help to secure it.

Only NATO can strongly and effectively implement a settlement. And the United States, as NATO's leader, must do its part and join our troops to those of our allies in such an operation. If you were moved by the film we saw and you believe that it carries lessons for the present day and you accept the fact that not only our values but our position as the world's only superpower impose upon us an obligation to carry through, then the conclusion is inevitable: We must help to secure a peace if a peace can be reached in Bosnia. We will not send our troops into combat. We will not ask them to keep a peace that cannot be maintained. But we must use our power to secure a peace and to implement the agreement.
We have an opportunity and a responsibility to help resolve this, the most difficult security challenge in the hear of Europe since World War II. When His Holiness the Pope was here just a few days ago, we spent a little over a half an hour alone, and we talked of many things. But in the end, he said, "Mr. President, I am not a young man. I have a long memory. This century began with a war in Sarajevo. We must not let this century end with a war in Sarajevo."

Even if a peace agreement is reached, and I hope that we can do that, no peace will endure for long without justice. For only justice can break finally the cycle of violence and retribution that fuels war and crimes against humanity. Only justice can lift the burden of collective guilt. It weighs upon a society where unspeakable acts of destruction have occurred. Only justice can assign responsibility to the guilty and allow everyone else to get on with the hard work of rebuilding and reconciliation. So as the United States leads the international effort to forge a lasting peace in Bosnia, the War Crimes Tribunal must carry on its work "to find justice."

The United States is contributing more than $16 million in funds and services to that tribunal and to the one regarding Rwanda. We have 20 prosecutors, investigators, and other personnel on the staffs. And at the United Nations, we have led the effort to secure adequate funding for these tribunals. And we continue to press others to make voluntary contributions. We do this because we believe doing it is part of acting on the lessons that Senator Dodd and others taught us at Nuremberg.

By successfully prosecuting war criminals in the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda, we can send a strong signal to those who would use the cover of war to commit terrible atrocities that they cannot escape the consequences of such actions. And a signal will come across even more loudly and clearly if nations all around the world who value freedom and tolerance establish a permanent international court to prosecute, with the support of the United Nations Security Council, serious violations of humanitarian law. This, it seems to me, would be the ultimate tribute to the people who did such important work at Nuremberg, a permanent international court to prosecute such violations. And we are working today at the United Nations to see whether it can be done.

But my fellow Americans and my fellow citizens of the world, let me also say that our commitment to punish these crimes against humanity must be matched by our commitment to prevent them in the first place. As we work to support these tribunals, let's not forget what our ultimate goal is. Our ultimate goal must be to render them completely obsolete because such things no longer occur.

Accountability is a powerful deterrent, but it isn't enough. It doesn't get to the root cause of such atrocities. Only a profound change in the nature of societies can begin to reach the heart of the matter. And I believe the basis of that profound change is democracy.
Democracy is the best guarantor of human rights -- not a perfect one, to be sure; you can see that in the history of the United States -- but it is still the system that demands respect for the individual, and it requires responsibility from the individual to thrive. Democracy cannot eliminate all violations of human rights or outlaw human frailty, nor does promoting democracy relieve us of the obligation to press others who do not operate democracies to respect human rights. But more than any other system of government we know, democracy protects those rights, defends the victims of their abuse, punishes the perpetrators, and prevents a downward spiral of revenge.

So promoting democracy does more than advance our ideals. It reinforces our interests. Where the rule of law prevails, where governments are held accountable, where ideas and information flow freely, economic development and political stability are more likely to take hold and human rights are more likely to thrive. History teaches us that democracies are less likely to go to war, less likely to traffic in terrorism and more likely to stand against the forces of hatred and destruction, more likely to become good partners in diplomacy and trade. So promoting democracy and defending human rights is good for the world and good for America.

These aims have always had a powerful advocate in Senator Chris Dodd, who has defended the vulnerable and championed democracy, especially here in our own hemisphere, as has his brother, Tom, first as a distinguished academic at our common alma mater, Georgetown, and then as America's Ambassador to Uruguay. As a Peace Corps volunteer in the Dominican Republic, Senator Dodd helped some of our poorest neighbors to build homes for their families Twenty-five years later, when a brutal dictatorship overthrew the legitimate government of Haiti, murdering, mutilating, and raping thousands and causing tens of thousands more to flee in fear, Chris Dodd was the conscience of the Senate on Haiti. He urged America and the world to take action.

On this very day one year ago, an American-led multinational force returned the duly elected President of Haiti, Jean Bertrand Aristide, to his country. The anniversary we celebrate today was the culmination of a 3-year effort by the United States and the international community to remove the dictators and restore democracy. Because we backed diplomacy with the force of our military, the dictators finally did step down. And Haiti's democrats stepped back into their rightful place.

Our actions ended a reign of terror that did violence not only to innocent Haitians but to the values and the principles of the civilized world. We renewed hope in Haiti's future where once there was only despair. We upheld the reliability of our own commitments and the commitments that others make to us. We sent a powerful message to the would-be despots in the region: Democracy in the Americas cannot be overthrown with impunity.
We have seen extraordinary progress in this year. The democratic government has been restored. Human rights are its purpose, not its disgrace. Violence has subsided, though not ended altogether. Peaceful elections have occurred. Reform is underway. A new civilian police force has already more than 1,000 officers on the street. A growing private sector is beginning to generate jobs and opportunity. After so much blood and terror, the people of Haiti have resumed their long journey to security and prosperity with dignity.

There is a lot of work to do. Haiti is still the poorest nation in our hemisphere, and that is a breeding ground for the things we all come here to condemn today. Its democratic institutions are fragile, and all those years of vicious oppression have left scars and some still thirsting for revenge.

For reform to take root and to endure, trust must be fully established not only between the Government and the people but among the people of Haiti themselves. President Aristide understands that when he says, no to violence, yes to justice; no to vengeance, yes to reconciliation.

This is very important. Assigning individual responsibilities for crimes of the past is also important there. Haiti now has a national commission for truth and justice, launching investigations of past human rights abuses. And with our support, Haiti is improving the effectiveness, accessibility, and accountability of its own justice system, again, to prevent future violations as well as to punish those which occur.

The people of Haiti know it's up to them to safeguard their freedom. But we know, as President Kennedy said, that democracy is never a final achievement. And just as the American people, after 200 years, are continually struggling to perfect our own democracy, we must and we will stand with the people of Haiti as they struggle to build their own. Indeed, the Vice President is just today in Haiti celebrating the one-year anniversary.

And let me say one final thing about this. I thank Senator Dodd and Ambassador Dodd for their concern with freedom, democracy, and getting rid of the horrible human rights abuses that have occurred in the past throughout the Americas. The First Lady is in South America today -- or she would be here with me -- partly because of the path that has been blazed by the Dodd family in this generation to stand up for democracy, so that every single country of the Americas, save one, now has a democratically elected leader. And human rights abuses and the kinds of crimes that Senator Thomas Dodd stood up against at Nuremberg are dramatically, dramatically reduced because of that process and this family's leadership.

In closing, let me say that, for all of the work we might do through tribunals to bring the guilty to account, it is our daily commitment to the ideals of human dignity, democracy, and peace that has been and will continue to be the source of our strength in the world and our capacity to work with others to prevent such terrible things from occurring in the first place.
We will continue to defend the values we believe make life worth living. We will continue to defend the proposition that all people, without regard to their nationality, their race, their ethnic group, their religion, their gender, should have the chance to live free, should have the chance to make the most of their God-given potential. For too long, all across the globe, women and their children, in particular, were denied these human rights. Those were the rights for which the First Lady spoke so forcefully in China at the Women's Conference and for which the United States will work hard in the years ahead.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are living in a moment of great hope and possibility. The capacity of the United States to lead has been energized by our ability to succeed economically in the global economy and by the efforts we are making to come to grips with our own problems here at home. But I leave you with this thought that was referred to by the Governor in his fine remarks and that the president of this University has emphasized in his comments today.

It is important that we be able to act upon our values. And what enables us to do it is our success as a nation, our strength as a people, the fact that people can see that if you live as we say we should live, that people can work together across racial and ethnic and other divides to create one from many, as our motto says, and to do well.

Therefore, we should in the weeks ahead in Washington find a way to come together across our political divide to balance the budget after the deficit has taken such a toll on our economy over the last dozen years. But I ask you to remember this: We must do it in a way that is consistent with our values and with our ability to live by and implement and support those values here at home and all around the world.

Therefore, if our goal is to preserve our ideals and our dreams and our leadership and to extend them to all Americans, when we balance the budget we must not turn our backs on our obligation to give all Americans a chance to get an education, including a college education; to honor our fathers and our mothers in terms of how we treat their legitimate needs which they have earned the right to have addressed, including their health care needs; and not to forget the poor children, even though it is unfashionable to talk about poverty in this world today. They will be the adults of this country someday.

We are strong because we honor each other across the generations. We are strong when we reach across the racial and ethnic divides. We are strong when we continue to invest in education and the technology which opens all the mysterious doors of the future. We are strong when we preserve the environment that God gave us here at home and around our increasingly interconnected planet. We are strong when we continue to determine to lead the world.

These are the things which make it possible for us to meet here in Connecticut today and advocate the responsibility of the United States to lead in the protection of human rights around the world and the prevention of future horrendous circumstances such as those that Senator Dodd had to address at Nuremberg.
So I ask you to remember those lessons, as well. If we have an obligation to stand up for what is right, to advance what is right, to lift up human potential, we must be able to fulfill that obligation.

If there is one last lesson of this day, I believe it should be that prosperity for the United States is not the most important thing and not an end in itself. We should seek it only, only, as a means to enhance the human spirit, to enhance human dignity, to enhance the ability of every person in our country and those whom we have the means to help around the world to become the people God meant for them to be. If we can remember that, then we can be faithful to the generation that won World War II, to the outstanding leaders which established the important precedents at Nuremberg, and to the mission and the spirit of the Dodd Center.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:18 p.m. at Gampel Pavilion.
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Q. Mr. President, slight change of subject. Would you send peacekeeping troops to Bosnia if we do not get congressional approval? And you have never stated that you would only keep them for one year. Your people have and the Cabinet has, but is that a fiat commitment?

The President. Let me answer the question carefully. The reason I have never said that is that I wanted to define our mission and have the mission be defined in the way that we did in Haiti. We defined our mission in Haiti, and we said, okay, this is when we think we will complete our mission, and we did it. And then we said the United Nations would complete its mission with the next Presidential election, which occurs early next year.

In Bosnia, I wanted to make sure that we had a clear notion of what our mission was. Yesterday, General Joulwan, who is our NATO Commander, came in with the national security team, and we had a very extended session about the plans that are now being developed, which, of course, cannot be finalized until we get a peace agreement, because the nature of the map and the nature of the agreement among the parties will determine in part the nature of the commitments that the United Nations and that NATO will have to make.

But our commanders believe we can complete our mission in a year. That's what they believe. Before I make that pledge to the American people, I want to know what the peace agreement is finally, and I want to have a very high level of confidence that I can make that commitment and keep it. But it looks like we're talking about a commitment in the nature -- in the range of a year.

Q. Wait a minute. Would you go ahead, then, and send the troops, even if Congress does not approve?

The President. I am not going to lay down any of my constitutional prerogatives here today. I have said before and I will say again, I would welcome and I hope I get an expression of congressional support. I think it's important for the United States to be united in doing this. I believe that we had a very good meeting with the Speaker and Senator Dole and a large number of Congressmen, as you know, a couple of weeks ago. I expect that our people will be asked and will have to answer difficult questions; that's the job of the Congress. But I believe in the end, the Congress will support this operation.
Q. Mr. President, back on the subject of the deployment in Bosnia, many experts feel that by the very nature of a deployment, American troops would become targets for various groups who want to disrupt the situation. How do you prevent that? And having committed troops to Europe twice in this century because they got into a mess they couldn't resolve, why does the United States have to continue to come to Europe's rescue?

The President. Because now what we're trying to do is to avoid just what drug us into Europe. If you remember, I said we would not go into a situation in which we'd be in combat in Bosnia on one side of the conflict, nor would we be engaged with the United Nations mission because of the rules of engagement there, but that if we can make a peace, since NATO would have to be involved in implementing the peace agreement and assuring its success and we are the leaders of NATO, we would have to go into it. The reason we need to do this is to -- precisely to avoid the kind of convulsive conflict with massive consequences that drug us into Europe twice before and got huge numbers of Americans killed in the defense of freedom and decency. I strongly believe we can do that.

Now one of the things we are concerned about, obviously, is that if a peace is made, even in good faith, there may be people who don't like the peace. And we don't want -- not only the United States but any of the NATO soldiers or any of our allies not in NATO who will be taking part in this, and we expect a significant number of non-NATO members to contribute -- we don't want anybody to be targets, and we've given quite a bit of thought to that. And as this plan proceeds, we'll see what happens.

Let me just emphasize -- first of all, first things first: The leaders of the three countries have agreed to come here to the United States to meet in Ohio at the end of this month. We are very pleased by that, and that is the next big step. The most important thing, the thing that will reduce danger to everybody, is if these leaders will agree to an honorable peace and then do everything they can in good faith to keep it.

I must tell you, I'm somewhat encouraged by the fact that the cease-fire seems to be taking hold. The incidents seem to be dropping throughout Bosnia. There seems to be an atmosphere of mutual commitment taking hold there, and we obviously hope that can be sustained.
And, finally, we are building the transatlantic community of tomorrow by deepening, not withdrawing, from our security cooperation. Today, with the over arching threat of Communism gone, the faces of hatred and intolerance are still there with different faces: Ethnic and religious conflict, organized crime and drug dealing, state-sponsored terrorism, the spread of weapons of mass destruction. America cannot insulate itself from these threats, any more than they could insulate themselves after World War II. Indeed, we have less options to do so, because the world is becoming a global village.

By joining with our allies and embracing others who share our values, we can't insulate ourselves from these threats, but we can sure create a better defense. NATO's success gives us proof of what we can do when we work together. NATO binds the Western democracies in a common purpose with shared values. And I strongly believe that NATO does not depend upon an ever-present enemy to maintain its unity or its usefulness. The alliance strengthens all of its members from within, and defends them from threats without. If you just compare the stability, the economic strength, the harmony in Western Europe today, with the conditions that existed just a few decades ago in President Truman's time, you can see that. The alliance has brought former foes together, strengthened democracy. And, along with the Marshall Plan, it sheltered fragile economies and got them going again. It gave countries confidence to look past their ancient hatreds. It gave them the safety to sow the prosperity they enjoy today.

By establishing NATO, of course, America also did something even more important from our point of view: We established the security that we required to flourish and to grow. Now we have to build upon President Truman's accomplishments. He said when he announced the Truman Doctrine the world is not static, the status quo is not sacred. We have to adapt NATO, and I believe we should open NATO's doors to new members. The end of the Cold War cannot mean the end of NATO, and it cannot mean a NATO frozen in the past, because there is no other cornerstone for an integrated, secure and stable Europe for the future.
NATO's success has involved promoting security interests, advancing values, supporting democracy and economic opportunity. We have literally created a community of shared values and shared interests, as well as an alliance for the common defense. Now the new democracies of Central and Eastern Europe, and the former Soviet Union, want to be a part of enlarging the circle of common purpose, and in so doing increasing our own security. That's why we established the Partnership for Peace. In less than two years, we brought 26 nations into a program to create confidence and friendship. Former enemies now joining in field exercises throughout the year -- building bonds together instead of battle plans against one another. This has been good for us and good for Europe. Now those nations in the region that maintain their democracies, and continue to promote economic reform, and behave responsibly, should be able to become members of NATO. That will give them the confidence to consolidate their freedoms and to build their economies, and to make us more secure.

NATO has completed a study of how it should bring on new members. We intend to move carefully and deliberately and openly, and share the conclusions of that study with all of those who joined us in the Partnership for Peace. But we have to move to the next phase in a steady and careful way to consider who the new members should be, and when they would be invited to join the alliance. Throughout this I will engage with the Congress and the American people, and seek the kind of bipartisan partnership that made Harry Truman's important work possible.

Let me emphasize one important point: bringing new members into this alliance will enhance, not undermine, the security of everyone in Europe, including Russia, Ukraine, and the other former Soviet republics. We have assured Russia that NATO is, as it has always been, a defensive alliance. Extending the zone of security and democracy in Europe can help to prevent new conflicts that have been building up in many cases for centuries. For Russia and all of her neighbors, this is a better path than the alternative.

I also want you to know, as you saw from the laughing photograph with President Yeltsin, we are still building a positive relationship with Russia. (Applause.) Those of you familiar with the history of that great country know that its heroic effort to become a confident and stable democracy is one of the most significant developments of our time. One of our former colleagues, President Nixon, who is no longer with us, wrote me a letter about Russia a month to the day before he died, which I still have and reread from time to time, emphasizing the extraordinary historic significance of Russia's courageous reach for democracy and liberty. Russia too has a contribution to make in the new Europe, and we have offered them a strong alliance with NATO, and working through the Partnership for Peace.
Let me just tell you that partnership is going to deepen. Tomorrow, United States and Russian armed forces will begin a peacekeeping exercise together at Fort Riley, Kansas, under the auspices of the Partnership for Peace. (Applause.) We want our relationships with them to be daily, comprehensive, routine. We want to go every step of the way to build confidence and security and a democratic Russia. But we don't think NATO's opening to the east and our relationship with Russia are mutually exclusive choices. I want to emphasize one other thing: NATO is at work for us right now, as we speak, demonstrating in Bosnia how vital it is to securing the peace in Europe. The efforts of our negotiators, the military changes on the ground, and NATO's air strikes, have brought these parties to the negotiating table, and to an agreement on the basic principles of a settlement and a nationwide cease-fire. Next week, in an historic meeting, the presidents of Bosnia, Croatia, and Serbia, will travel here to Dayton, Ohio, to resolve the remaining issues. The political settlement that is taking shape will preserve Bosnia as a single state, and provide for a fair territorial compromise. It will commit the parties to hold free elections, establish democratic institutions, and respect human rights. There are many people who have played a role in bringing this process this far. I want to thank one of them tonight for his extraordinary efforts, President Carter -- thank you so much for what you have done. (Applause.)

I want to say to all of you there is no guarantee of peace, but it is possible in large measure because of NATO. And let me ask you one final thing: If the peace is negotiated, NATO must be prepared to help implement the agreement. There will be no peace without an international military presence in Bosnia, a presence that must be credible. NATO is indispensable to this to give the parties the reassurance they need to make peace. The question I have is this: If Harry Truman were president, would he expect the United States, as the leader of NATO, to be a part of the force in Bosnia? I think you know what the answer is. The answer is yes. And so must we. (Applause.)

My fellow Americans, make no mistake about this: If we're not there, many of our partners will reconsider their commitments. If we're not there, America will sacrifice its leadership in NATO. If we're not there, we will be making a sad mistake. I am determined that we will be part of this NATO mission. I am working with Congress, engaging in important dialogue. I met not very long ago with a bipartisan group of leaders, and I want to say a special word of thanks to Senator Nunn for his remarkable contribution to that meeting, and for his remarkable contributions to our country, which we will all miss when he is gone. (Applause.) My fellow Americans, if you want four years of bloody conflict to end, you have to support the United States being involved with NATO in enforcing a peace agreement. We have not sent troops into battle, we have not taken sides, we have not been a part of the UNPROFOR mission on the ground. But we must do this if you want your country and NATO to be effective in our time, as it was in President Truman's vision and in his time. (Applause.)
Let me also say, again, if we don't do this, the consequences for our country could be grave indeed. This is the most serious conflict on the continent of Europe since World War II. NATO must help to end it. If we fail to secure this peace, how can we achieve an integrated, peaceful, and united Europe? If we fail to secure this peace, our success around the world, and much of our success at home, which has come from American leadership, will be weakened. If we fail to secure this peace, the conflict in the former Yugoslavia could spread to other nations, and involve our sons and daughters in a conflict in Europe.

Let me say in closing that just a few days ago we were fortunate to have a visit in the United States from His Holiness John Paul II. And I spent about a half an hour with him alone, and he started -- it was the most unusual conversation I've ever had -- with him, or in some ways with any other world leader. He said, "I want to talk about the world, and I want to know what you think." I said, "The world?" He said, "Yes, the whole deal." I said, "Well, where shall I start?" He said, "Start in Bosnia." So we talked about Bosnia. Then we went around the world. At the end he said, "You know, I am not a young man. I have lived through most of this century. The 20th century began with a war in Sarajevo. Mr. President, you must not let the 20th century end with a war in Sarajevo." (Applause.)

I ask you to think of this, my fellow Americans, that first war in Sarajevo -- that was Harry Truman's war. That's the war that he joined up in, even though he was old enough, and his eyesight was bad enough, for him to get out of it. That's the war he showed people the kind of leadership capacity he had. And our failures after that war led Franklin Roosevelt into another war, led Harry Truman to end that war with a set of difficult, painful decisions, including dropping the atomic bomb, and led him to determine that it would never happen again. That's why he did all the things we celebrate tonight. If he were here, he would say, "If you want to really honor me, prepare for the future as I did." Thank you, and God bless you all. (Applause.)

END
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PRESIDENT CLINTON: Good morning.

I have just met with Secretary Christopher and our Bosnia negotiating team, led by Ambassador Holbrooke. As you know, they are preparing to leave for Dayton, Ohio, in just a few moments. There the presidents of Bosnia, Croatia and Serbia will start direct negotiations which we hope will lead to a peaceful, lasting settlement in Bosnia.

I want to repeat today what I told President Tudjman and President Izetbegovic when we met in New York last week. We have come to a defining moment in Bosnia. This is the best chance we've had for peace since the war began. It may be the last chance we have for a very long time. Only the parties to this terrible conflict can end it. The world now looks to them to turn the horror of war to the promise of peace. The United States and our partners -- Russia, Germany, France and the United Kingdom -- must do everything in our power to support them. That is what I have just instructed Secretary Christopher and our team to do in the days ahead in Dayton.

We will succeed only if America continues to lead. Already our military strength through NATO and our diplomatic determination have advanced the possibility of peace in Bosnia. We can't stop now. The responsibilities of leadership are real, but the benefits are greater. We see them all around the world: a reduced nuclear threat, democracy in Haiti, peace breaking out in the Middle East and in Northern Ireland. In Bosnia, as elsewhere, when the United States leads, we can make progress. And if we don't, progress will be much more problematic.

Making peace in Bosnia is important to America. Making peace will end the terrible toll of this war -- the innocent lives lost, the futures destroyed. For four years, the people of Bosnia have suffered the worst atrocities in Europe since World War II: mass executions, ethnic cleansing, concentration camps, rape and terror, starvation and disease. We continue to learn more and more even in the present days about the slaughters in Srebrenica. The best way, the only way to stop these horrors is to make peace.
Making peace will prevent the war from spreading. So far, we have been able to contain this conflict to the former Yugoslavia. But the Balkans lie at the heart of Europe, next door to several of our key NATO allies and to some of the new fragile European democracies. If the war there reignites it could spread and spark a much larger conflict, the kind of conflict that has drawn Americans into two European wars in this century. We have to end the war in Bosnia and do it now.

Making peace will advance our goal of a peaceful, democratic and undivided Europe, a Europe at peace with extraordinary benefits to our long-term security and prosperity, a Europe at peace with partners to meet the challenges of the new century -- challenges that affect us here at home, like terrorism and drug trafficking, organized crime and the spread of weapons of mass destruction. A peaceful, democratic, undivided Europe will be that kind of partner. In Dayton, our diplomats face a tremendous challenge. There is no guarantee they will succeed. America can help the parties negotiate a settlement, but we cannot impose a peace.

In recent weeks, thanks to our mediation efforts, the parties to the war have made real progress. The parties have put into effect a Bosnia-wide cease-fire. They have agreed to the basic principles of a settlement. Bosnia will remain a single state comprised of two entities; but, I repeat, a single state. There must be free elections and democratic institutions of government, at the national and regional levels.

Now, beyond this, many difficult issues remain to be resolved. These include the internal boundary between the Bosnia-Croat federation and the Serb republic; the status of Sarajevo; the practical steps that need to be taken to separate hostile forces; and the procedures for free elections. That's just a few of the difficult issues this team will have to confront, beginning today. I urge the parties to negotiate seriously, for the good of their own people. So much is riding on the success in Dayton, and the whole world is watching. If the parties do reach a settlement, NATO must help to secure it. And the United States, as NATO's leaders, must participate in such an effort. Again, I say there is no substitute for American leadership. After so many years of violence and bloodshed, a credible international military presence in Bosnia is needed to give the parties confidence to live up to their own agreements, and to give them time to begin the long hard work of rebuilding and living together again.

NATO is the one organization with the track record and the strength to implement a settlement. And as I've said many times, the United States, the source of NATO's military strength, must participate. If we don't participate in the implementation force, our NATO partners, understandably, would reconsider their own commitments. We would undermine American leadership of the alliance. We would weaken the alliance itself, and the hard-won peace in Bosnia could be lost.
American troops would not be deployed -- I say this again -- would not be deployed unless, and until, the parties reach a peace agreement. We must first have a peace agreement, and that is what I would urge the American people, and the members of Congress, to focus on over the next few days. They would -- if going into Bosnia -- operate under NATO command, with clear rules of engagement and a clearly defined mission. They would not be asked to keep a peace that cannot be kept. But they would make sure we'd do our part in helping peace to hold.

As the peace process moves forward, I will continue to consult closely with Congress. If a peace agreement is reached, I will request an expression of support in Congress for committing United States troops to a NATO implementation force. Our foreign policy works best when we work together. I want the widest possible support for peace.

But now it would be premature to request an expression of support because we can't decide many of the details of implementation until an agreement is clearly shaped and defined. Let me stress again, we aren't there yet. There are still difficult obstacles ahead. The focus on Dayton must be on securing the peace. Without peace, there will be nothing for us to secure. Earlier this month in New Jersey, I had the privilege of spending time with His Holiness Pope Paul -- Pope John Paul II. At the end of our meeting, the Pope said something to me I would like to repeat. He said, "You know, I am not a young man. I have lived through most of this century. This century began with a war in Sarajevo. Mr. President, you must not let it end with a war in Sarajevo."

All of us must do our part to hear the Pope's plea. Our conscience as a nation devoted to freedom and tolerance demands it. Our conscience as a nation that wants to end this mindless slaughter demands it. Our enduring interest in the security and stability of Europe demand it. This is our challenge, and I am determined to do everything I can to see that America meets that challenge. Thank you.

Q Mr. President, what do you do if --
Q Mr. President, what is the effect of the House resolution on these talks? And do you feel hemmed in by them -- by it, I mean?

PRESIDENT CLINTON: No. No, I wouldn't expect it to have any effect on the talks. I think we have to get the peace agreement first. I expect to consult intensively with the leaders of Congress. Beginning, I believe, tomorrow, the Congressional leadership is coming in, and I expect to talk to them about Bosnia in detail, and then to keep working with the congressional leadership and with members of Congress who are interested in this right along, all the way through the process.

And I expect them to say that they want to ask questions and to have them answered before they would agree to the policy that I will embark on. Q Mr. President, looking back on the advice that General Colin Powell gave you on Bosnia when he was chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was that bad advice, his reluctance to use air power to force the parties into negotiations?
PRESIDENT CLINTON: Let me tell you, today we're starting a peace process, and we have done things that have brought us to this point. I believe we have done the right things. But I think the American people should be focused on peace and on the process and the work before us.

Q Mr. President, are you going to be speaking with Republicans tomorrow to strike some sort of debt extension agreement?

PRESIDENT CLINTON: Well, I look forward to having the opportunity to discuss that with them. I know Senator Dole and Leon Panetta have had a brief conversation about it. I know that a lot of others are contacting the Congress about it. So we'll have a chance to talk about that tomorrow as well. Q Are you willing to accept a short-term, through November 29th -- as has been suggested -- extension?

PRESIDENT CLINTON: I think any responsible extension is a move forward. I think the main thing is we want to send a message to the world and to our own financial markets and to our own people that America honors its commitments, that we are not going to see the first example in the history of the Republic where we don't pay our bills.

Q Thank you.

PRESIDENT CLINTON: Thank you very much.

END
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PRESIDENT CLINTON: Good morning.

About an hour ago, I spoke with Secretary Christopher in Dayton, Ohio. He informed me that the presidents of Bosnia, Croatia and Serbia have reached a peace agreement to end the war in Bosnia, to end the worst conflict in Europe since World War II. After nearly four years of 250,000 people killed, 2 million refugees, atrocities that have appalled people all over the world, the people of Bosnia finally have a chance to turn from the horror of war to the promise of peace.

The presidents of Bosnia, Croatia and Serbia have made a historic and heroic choice. They have heeded the will of their people. Whatever their ethnic group, the overwhelming majority of Bosnia's citizens and the citizens of Croatia and Serbia want the same thing -- they want to stop the slaughter, they want to put an end to the violence and war, they want to give their children and their grandchildren the chance to lead a normal life. Today, thank God, the voices of those people have been heard. I want to congratulate America's negotiating team, led by Secretary Christopher and Ambassador Holbrooke, for their extraordinary service. Their determination, along with that of our European and Russian partners, along with NATO's resolve, brought the parties to the negotiating table. Then their single-minded pursuit of peace in Dayton made today's agreement a possibility and eventually a reality. The people of Bosnia, the American people, indeed, people throughout the world should be very thankful for this event today.

The peace plan agreed to would preserve Bosnia as a single state within its present borders and with international recognition. The state will be made up of two parts, the Bosnia and Croat Federation and the Bosnian Serb Republic, with a fair distribution of land between the two. The capital city of Sarajevo will remain united. There will be an effective central government, including a national parliament, a presidency and a constitutional court, with responsibility for foreign policy, foreign trade, monetary policy, citizenship, immigration and other important functions.
The presidency and the parliament will be chosen through free, democratic free elections held under international supervision. Refugees will be allowed to return to their homes. People will be able to move freely throughout Bosnia. And the human rights of every Bosnian citizen will be monitored by an independent commission and an internationally trained civilian police. Those individuals charged with war crimes will be excluded from political life. Now that the parties to the war have made a serious commitment to peace, we must help them to make it work. All the parties have asked for a strong international force to supervise the separation of forces and to give them confidence that each side will live up to their agreements. Only NATO can do that job. And the United States as NATO's leader must play an essential role in this mission. Without us, the hard-won peace would be lost, the war would resume, the slaughter of innocents would begin again, and the conflict that already has claimed so many people could spread like poison throughout the entire region. We are at a decisive moment. The parties have chosen peace. America must choose peace as well.

Now that a detailed settlement has been reached, NATO will rapidly complete its planning for the implementation force known as IFOR. The plan soon will be submitted to me for review and for approval. As of now, we expect that about one-third of IFOR's force will be American. The rest will come from our NATO partners and from other nations throughout the world. At the same time, once the agreement is signed, the international community will initiate a parallel program to provide humanitarian relief, to begin the job of rebuilding, to help the thousands of refugees return to their homes, to monitor free elections -- in short, to help the Bosnian people create the conditions of lasting peace.

The NATO military mission will be clear and limited. Our troops will take their orders only from the American general who commands NATO. They will have authority to meet any threat to their safety, or any violation of the peace agreement, with immediate and decisive force. And there will be a reasonable timetable for their withdrawal.

I am satisfied that the NATO implementation plan is clear, limited, and achievable, and that the risks to our troops are minimized. I will promptly consult with Congress when I receive this plan, and if I am fully satisfied with it when I see it in its final form, I will ask Congress to support American participation.

The central fact for us as Americans is this: Our leadership made this peace agreement possible and helped to bring an end to the senseless slaughter of so many innocent people that our fellow citizens had to watch night after night after night, for four long years, on their television screens. Now American leadership, together with our allies, is needed to make this peace real and enduring. Our values, our interests, and our leadership all over the world are at stake.

I ask all Americans, in this Thanksgiving week, to take some time to say a simple prayer of thanksgiving that this peace has been reached, that our nation was able to play an important role in stopping the suffering and the slaughter. May God bless the peace and the United States.
Q Mr. President, Congress seems deeply skeptical of sending American troops to Bosnia right now. How are you going to turn that around? And how soon would American forces have to go into Bosnia?

PRESIDENT CLINTON: Well, first of all, I believe it's important for the Congress to have a chance to review this peace agreement and to receive the assurances from the leaders of Bosnia, Croatia, and Serbia that they intend to do everything in their power to make sure the agreement is implemented in good faith, and with peaceful intent and absolutely minimal violence.

I think that will be an imperative part of this endeavor. I will work with the leaders of Congress to establish a schedule for implementing that. I have placed calls to the speaker, the majority leader of the Senate, and the minorities leaders of the Senate and the House, shortly before I came out here. I was only able to reach the speaker. The others were in transit, but I will speak to them all today. And I will work with them to establish a schedule for consultation with Congress, that will begin as soon as I approve the final NATO plan. I've had extensive briefings on this plan. And, as I said, I am satisfied that, based on what we knew at the time I was briefed, we had a clear, limited, achievable mission that minimized the risks to not only the uniformed forces of the United States, but others who would participate, as well. When I see the final plan, if I remain of that opinion, I will immediately consult with Congress, and we will have an agreed-upon schedule for consultations, which I think will begin immediately in terms of the detail of the peace agreement itself. And that is the responsibility that I have to bear, and I intend to assume it.

Now, we have assured Congress that there will be no complete deployment until they have a chance to be heard on this issue. The only things that will be done in the preliminary period, assuming that things go forward as we anticipate today; and you hear what I think you will hear, shortly, from the three presidents; is that there will be some preliminary planning done in the Bosnia area, which is absolutely essential and which we have already fully disclosed to the Congress.

But beyond that, the Congress will have a period of weeks before the final, formal signing ceremony, which would trigger the involvement of NATO's forces. That's what I expect will happen.

Let me say that -- I know you will have other questions about the peace agreement, how it was reached, the number of 11th hours that came and passed. And even last night at midnight, when I had my last conversation with Secretary Christopher, we were not sure whether there would be peace this morning. When I got up and we began to work on this, we were not sure there would be peace. As often happens in a process like this, as I think happened in the Middle East, something stirred among the leaders themselves and they decided that they should not let this moment pass, for the benefit of their people.
So I believe we'll be able to answer all the other questions in the days ahead, and the people in Dayton will be able to answer more of your questions when they have their press conference.
The main thing is, I ask all Americans to remember what we have seen and heard and read about for the last four years, and remember what the implications were not only for our consciences but for the prospect that conflict could spread. The fact that these leaders have voted to bring an end to this and to give the people of Bosnia a peaceful Christmas and a peaceful future is something for which we should be very, very thankful.
Thank you very much.

END
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THE PRESIDENT: Good morning. All across our nation this weekend American families are coming together to give thanks for the good things in our lives. Hillary and I wish all of you a happy and healthy Thanksgiving weekend. As we rejoice in our blessings in the company of our loved ones, let's also give thanks for America's blessings and for all we have achieved as a nation.

This week, after a tough debate on the federal budget, we made important strides toward what I hope will be common ground. Our government is open again, and the Republican leaders in Congress have agreed to work with me to find a process so that we can establish our nation's priorities together.

I hope we can balance the budget in a way that is true to our fundamental values: Expecting responsibility from all our citizens, but also providing opportunity so that we become a society in which everybody has a chance to win, not a winner-take-all society. Honoring our obligations to our senior citizens through Medicare and Medicaid while also making investments for the next generation in education, environment, research and technology. Helping our families to be stronger and stay together. And ensuring that America remains the strongest force in the world for peace and freedom, democracy and prosperity.

All around the world we are seeing the results of America's willingness to work and to lead for peace. We see it in the Middle East, where even in the wake of the tragic loss of Prime Minister Rabin, Arabs and Israelis continue to turn the page on past conflict. We see it in Northern Ireland, where bombs and bullets have given way to hope for the future -- where I will visit next week. And in this week of Thanksgiving, we have seen the results of America's leadership for peace in Bosnia.

After four years of terrible conflict, we have helped the people of Bosnia turn from the horror of war to the promise of peace. America's negotiating team, backed by NATO's resolve and air power, brokered a cease-fire. We got the parties to agree on
the principles of the settlement and brought them to the peace table in Dayton, Ohio. And now, the skill and dedication of our negotiators, working with our European and Russian partners, has enabled them to reach a comprehensive peace agreement.

Peace in Bosnia is important to America, to both our values and our interests. The Bosnian people have suffered unspeakable atrocities -- mass executions, ethnic cleansing, campaigns of rape and terror. Two hundred and fifty thousand people have died; two million have been driven from their homes, with over a million of them still homeless. The violence done to those innocent civilians does violence to the principles on which America stands. The only way to end the killing for good is to secure a commitment to peace. Now our conscience demands that we act.
Securing the peace will also prevent the war in Bosnia from reigniting and then from spreading, sparking an even wider and more dangerous conflict right in the heart of Europe in the Balkan regions where there is still a lot of tension and potential for conflict in areas near Bosnia. In 1914, a gunshot in Bosnia's capital, Sarajevo, launched the first of two world wars that drew America in to make great sacrifices for freedom. We must not let this century close with gunfire ringing in Sarajevo.

The peace agreement preserves Bosnia as a single state within its present borders and with international recognition. It settles the territorial disputes over which the war began. Refugees can return to their homes. People will be able to move freely throughout the country. The parties have accepted strong safeguards for human rights. They've pledged to cooperate fully with the international war crimes tribunal so that those responsible for crimes against humanity can be brought to justice.

Now that all the parties, including the Bosnian Serbs, have made a serious commitment to peace, America must help them to make it work. All the parties have asked for a strong international force to give them the confidence and the breathing room they need to implement the peace agreement and to begin the hard task of rebuilding.

NATO, the alliance of democracies that has preserved our security since the end of World War II, is clearly that force. And America, as NATO's leader, clearly must participate. Without our support the hard-won peace would be lost, the terrible slaughter would resume, the conflict that already has claimed so many lives could spread like a cancer throughout the region.

In the days ahead I will review the NATO implementation plan and continue to consult closely with Congress. As of now, we expect that about a third of the NATO force will be American, approximately 20,000 troops. Two-thirds will be from our NATO allies in other supportive countries.

Our men and women will take their orders from the American general who commands NATO forces. They will have the authority to meet any threat to their safety, or any violation of the peace agreement with immediate and decisive force. They will not be deployed until I am satisfied that the NATO mission is clear, limited and achievable, and until Congress has a chance to be heard.

I will discuss the peace agreement and the NATO mission in more detail when I speak to the nation on Monday. I will also be visiting with American troops in Germany next week to talk directly with them about the important mission their nation is asking them to carry out.

But on this Thanksgiving weekend, I ask my fellow Americans to think about who we are as a people, what we are as a nation. All around the world others look to us not just because of
our economic and military might, because of what we stand for and what we’re willing to stand against.

In Bosnia our nation has led the way from horror to hope. Hope for no more Srebrenicas, no more shelling of children’s playground, no more desperate winters, no more shattered lives. Now we have a responsibility to see this achievement for peace through. Our values, our interests and our leadership are at stake.

So let us give thanks for America’s role in bringing Bosnia’s nightmare to an end, and let us share the blessing of our nation’s strength to secure a lasting peace.

May God bless the United States on this Thanksgiving weekend.
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Bosnia Talks Make Progress On Some Issues

By Thomas E. Ricks
Staff Reporter of The Wall Street Journal
WASHINGTON - The foreign ministers of Bosnia, Serbia and Croatia, following up on a very prelimi
nary meeting in Washington on Sept. 5, met in New York yesterday with U.S. diplomats and endorsed
principles that would lay the groundwork for talks on the future Bosnian state.
These include a national presidency, a parliament and a constitutional court.

"Today's agreement moves us closer to the ultimate goal of a genuine peace, and it makes clear that Bosnia will remain a single international community," said a clearly pleased President Clinton.

But more than 35 years of war and ethnic violence have left the Balkan peninsula a divided territory.

"The key question because it affects how international institutions can make loans to rebuild Bosnia," said a clearly pleased President Clinton.

The most important issue still to be worked out are details of which side actually pays which land in Bosnia. The biggest question still to be determined is, the future status of Sarajevo. Negotiators have to discuss the Broko region-the

north, where a narrow corridor connects Serb-held land in western Bosnia to the bulk of Serb territory. Also, it appears that the remote Muslim enclave of Gorazde will remain Muslim in any peace accord, but U.S. military planners consider it likely that local Serb military elements would seek to alter that part by force.

U.S. Team Heads for Balkans

The U.S. negotiating team, led by As

sistant Secretary of State Richard Holbrooke, will leave for the Balkans today to try to make progress on territorial issues and clear the way for an eventual cease-fire.

On Tuesday, the U.S. will be on the hook to send as many as 25,000 troops to Bosnia to help monitor the peace agreement. Discussions about what to do are "well under way within the U.S. govern

ment. Defense Secretary William Perry said yesterday that he expected U.S. troops would be sent for a year or more," depending on the stability of post-war Bosnia.

France and other European nations that also would send peacekeepers are less concerned about the size of the U.S. troop contribution—which can be manipulated by holding combat forces in reserve in Italy or offshore—than they are about the duration of the U.S. commitment.

Their worry is that President Clinton, promised by election-year concerns, will trim the U.S. role.

What Role for Russians?

Another major issue being studied by the administration is the role the Russians would play in the peacekeeping force.

There is general agreement that the Rus

sians should be involved, but not too much.

Ideally, the U.S. would like to see the Russians monitoring the peace in parts of Croatia, perhaps, rather than in Bosnia proper. But it isn't clear how the Russian

force would be integrated into the larger peacekeeping force, which would be under the command of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

In addition, the U.S. is expected to play a central role in a parallel effort to arm and train the post-war Bosnian military.

The cost of that effort has been estimated at $1 billion, and President Clinton is expected to discuss the training, and what arms the Bosnians are judged to require.

Lately, Pentagon officials have been arguing that the Russians' battlefield success raises questions about whether the U.S. still needs to train them. But others argue that their presence could play a role in the tanks and artillery obtained by Croa

tia. In any event, the training the Bosnian government will receive may not be overwhelmingly defensive in nature: more anti-tank weapons than tanks, and train

ing the infantry in using the territory to establish blocking positions.

The Human Factor in Economics

By Stanley W. Augist

Nuala Beck, an economist, believes the national picture is much like that of her own poor job. Beck argues that now is the time to start looking for high-ratio industries, whether you are picking stocks, helping your child choose college courses or wor

king out your own job prospects. "It is wrong to claim the knowledge ratio and other measures have helped her spot the beginning of the commodity era of the economy—the mass-manufacturing period, driven by genetic en

gineering, biotechnology and artificial int

telligence. It is a new way of looking at the recyclable, probably more so than looking at pig-iron production. "Useful" is not a word that springs to mind when one considers the work of macroeconomic theoreticians. They spend much of their lives writing tedious technical papers, many of which try to explain, in the crudest possible terms, how many angels can dance on the head of a pin while not producing distortions in the gross national product. These articles, written mostly for academic colleagues, are based on the line that acade

mic careers are made or broken.

So do they feel when their work is cited or even read? The answer is, when it is sent out for review before publi

cation? You can find a number of enter

preneurs asking answers to that question in "Re

jected" (Three Horton and Daughters, 315 pages, $11.95), edited by George Shep

herd and Nathan H. Shep

hers.

Shepherd sent letters to more than 120 academic economists asking them to describe in

stances in which journals rejected their papers.

The most fascinating aspect of the book is the list of papers rejected by journals upon first submission that later became classics in the field. Included on this list are Fisher Black and Myron Scholes' 1973 paper on pricing options, Paul Krugman's 1979 work on monopolistic competition and international trade, and Robert Lucas's 1972 paper that introduced rational-expec

tations concepts into monetary theory and macroeconomics.

Essays in the book by Milton Friedman,

Paul Samuelson and others describe first-hand experiences, or reports from col

leagues, on interactions with John May

nard Keynes when he was editor of the Eco

nomics Journal. As Mr. Shepherd says: "A disturbing picture appears of an arro

nous powerful Keynes dispensing wisdom to ref

ers and shooting carelessly and inaccur

ately from the hip, with little patience for disputes or corrections.".

Jim Rogers tells the story of living nearly every middle-aged man's fantasy in "Investment Biker," now out in paperback. Rogers retired at age 37, Mr. Rogers retired from managing other peoples' money in order to look after his own not inconsiderable investments. After a few years he grew restless and de

sired he wanted to go around the world on a sailboat and write a book. But he didn't want to go alone. So in 1990 he persuaded his "longtime compan

ion," Tabitha Estabrook, then 24 years old, to accompany him. The book describes their experiences and how Mr. Rogers spotted investment opportunities, or the lack of them, along the way as they traversed China, Siberia, Africa, South America

ica and Australia. Will this book teach you how to do that, or even how to get attra

citive young companions to come along while you try? Not likely. But it will teach you how to have a good time just about anywhere, provided you start with more than lunch money in your pocket.

Bookshelf

"Shifting Gears: Thriving in the New Economy" (179 pages, $20).

"Investment Biker," now out in paperback. Rogers retired at age 37, Mr. Rogers retired from managing other peoples' money in order to look after his own not inconsiderable investments. After a few years he grew restless and de

sired he wanted to go around the world on a sailboat and write a book. But he didn't want to go alone. So in 1990 he persuaded his "longtime compan

ion," Tabitha Estabrook, then 24 years old, to accompany him. The book describes their experiences and how Mr. Rogers spotted investment opportunities, or the lack of them, along the way as they traversed China, Siberia, Africa, South America

ica and Australia. Will this book teach you how to do that, or even how to get attra

citive young companions to come along while you try? Not likely. But it will teach you how to have a good time just about anywhere, provided you start with more than lunch money in your pocket.
HONG KONG FINANCIAL MOVES

Hong Kong banks welcomed a government recommendation to free most remaining interest-rate caps on time deposits with a promise to pursue full privatization with a cleaner country's largest commercial bank, to buy a major building-materials supplier, and to post an unexpected investment house, said.

Separately, uncertainty about Hong Kong's political future shouldn't detract from the territory's strong sovereign-risk rating or diminish its appeal as a financial center, a major bank said.

Close reserves in their 1995 accounts. The Hong Kong Monetary Authority said it would allow banks to make rates on time deposits more competitive. Meanwhile, the Hong Kong Monetary Authority said it would recommend requiring banks to disclose reserves in their 1995 accounts.

Banks have disposed profits by moving some into secret reserves.

 Holdenbank Scores on Profit

Holdenbank Financiere Giratis Ltd. of Switzerland, a major building-materials supplier, posted an unexpected 26% increase in first-half earnings to 236 million Swiss francs ($204.9 million) from a year earlier. Sales fell 5.9% to 3.94 billion francs.

The profit jump came despite the strong Swiss franc, which cut Holdenbank's sales by 457 million francs. The earnings report sent Holdenbank shares up 8.1% to 590 francs ($807.33) in Zurich trading.

PHILIPPINE BANKS' DEBT DEAL

Philippine National Bank, which is 57%-owned by the state, agreed with the government to settle a dispute involving 21.63 billion pesos ($832.5 million) in debt. The accord paved the way for PNB, the country's largest commercial bank, to pursue full privatization with a cleaner balance sheet. The government in 1986 assumed some of PNB's bad loans, but the bank has paid financing costs, most of which the government will cover by issuing treasury notes to PNB.

EXOR TO BOOST CLUB MED STAKE

EXOR SA, the French investment arm of Italy's Agnelli family, will become the biggest shareholder in Club Mediterranee SA of France, a resort and travel firm, in a $10.6 million deal. EXOR is boosting its Club Med stake to 13% from 2.97% by buying Credit Lyonnais' 5.42% holding and participating in Club Med's $885 million-franc rights issue to fund renovation and expansion of resorts.

FOKKER'S SURVIVAL SUM IS LEAKED

NV-Fokker of the Netherlands, an aircraft maker, needs 2.3 billion guilders ($1.43 billion) to survive, a Dutch newspaper said. It cited a leaked restructuring plan in which Fokker said the money would allow it to return to profitability as soon as next year. The report didn't specify how much of the money would come from the Dutch government and from Fokker's parent company, the Daimler-Benz Aerospace AG unit of Daimler-Benz AG of Germany.

CHRYSLER'S JAPANESE SUPPLY IS CUT

Mitsubishi Motors Corp. of Japan suspended shipments of four car models to Chrysler Corp. because of slow sales and large inventories. The U.S. auto maker said the halt will apply through autumn to the Dodge Stealth, Eagle Summit two-door and four-door models, and Summit Wagon.

Chrysler blamed the supply glut on the strength of the Japanese yen, which appreciation of three years... Bouygues

Two Japanese Firms Fined For Price-Fixing Fax Paper

By WASHINGTON—Two Japanese paper companies agreed to pay $3.55 million in fines to settle federal charges that they fixed prices on imported facsimile-machine paper, the Justice Department said.

Mitsubishi Paper Mills Ltd. and New Oji Paper Co. Ltd. pleaded guilty in federal court in Boston. The Justice Department said the companies conspired to raise prices to U.S. customers, resulting in price increases of about 10%.

Mitsubishi Paper agreed to pay $1.8 million and New Oji Paper $1.75 million, the department said. The investigation of the firms was part of the department's continuing probe of international pricing practices in the $120 million industry.

United's Chairman Attacks Japan Stance on Air Trade

DETROIT - As Japan and the U.S. opened aviation-trade talks yesterday, United Airlines Chairman Gerald Greenwald charged that the Japanese were "seeking to control East-West commerce through a kind of economic imperialism."

Mr. Greenwald, speaking before the Economic Club of Detroit, said Japan wants to swap more than four-decade-old agreement allowing United and Northwest Airlines to fly to other markets from Japan. In doing so, he said, the Japanese were merely trying to "prop up" Japan Airlines, which has higher operating costs than its U.S. rivals. The Japanese, for their part, have argued that they want access to more flights exclusively assigned to U.S. carriers.

Citing a study commissioned by United, a UAL Corp. unit, Mr. Greenwald said the Japanese proposals would lift fares for flyers throughout the Pacific Rim, and negatively shift the U.S. trade balance with Asia by as much as $100 billion over the next two decades. Booze Allen & Hamilton, a management consulting firm, conducted the study.

OECD Sees Slow Growth In Mexico for Coming Year

By WASHINGTON—Dealing with Mexico's economy will rebound around the beginning of the year but won't grow as fast in 1996 as the government projects.

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, representing the world's industrialized nations, underscored that feeling, predicting the Mexican economy would contract 3% to 4% this year in the wake of last December's peso devaluation. The official forecast is for a 2% fall, though the government has said the drop could be steeper. The OECD pegged growth in 1996 at 2.5%, vs. the government prediction of at least 3%.

The report raised particular concern about the banking sector, hard hit by borrowers' inability to repay loans on which interest rates have soared. The experience of other countries suggests "that balance-sheet problems took considerable periods of time to resolve" and could weigh on the Mexican economy.

The OECD also raised concern about possible social unrest and unemployment. While growth has slowed to 2% a year, the work force is growing 3.5% a year as the large number of children reach working age.

Compiled by Richard L. Holman
Diplomacy is often a matter of timing and momentum, and the Clinton Administration is now using both to maximum advantage as it presses to end the murderous Bosnian war.

Yesterday Bosnian, Croatian and Yugoslav foreign ministers reached further agreement on the principles that will govern the constitution of a new Bosnia divided between Croats and Muslims on one side and Serbs on the other.

The agreement, coming after a more rudimentary accord reached in Geneva earlier this month, incorporates concessions from both sides. It offers reason to hope that Bosnia, while divided ethnically and geographically, can be governed effectively and can be a single nation in name, if not fact.

With no agreement yet on either a cease-fire or precise territorial boundaries, the fighting will continue. But the conflict seems, at last, to be edging toward a political settlement.

The principles approved yesterday provide for a single internationally recognized Bosnian state with a national presidency along the lines of the old Yugoslavia. The national Government will have, among other powers, full authority over foreign policy. There will also be a national constitutional court. In that sense the original American goal of preserving Bosnia's boundaries and sovereignty has been upheld.

But beneath this central Government, as previously agreed, there will be two linked but separate ethnic republics, running their own affairs. Their parliaments will be chosen through free and democratic elections under international supervision. This de facto partition has been accepted in the higher interest of saving lives.

The path to such an understanding opened earlier this summer after a radical shift: in the military balance greatly simplified the once jumbled Bosnian ethnic map. That put an end to the fading dream of multi-ethnic coexistence. But it made it possible for the first time to design a peace map that might be acceptable to all warring armies and would not have to be imposed by outside force. Today's actual combat map for the first time roughly coincides with the internationally proposed allocation of 51 percent of Bosnian territory to the Muslims and Croats and 49 percent to the Serbs.

American diplomats led by Assistant Secretary of State Richard Holbrooke were quick to seize this developing opportunity. The combatants have so far responded with more cooperation and compromise than seemed possible throughout this long war.

New York City appears poised for a monumental triumph in the history of government bureaucracy. The cook-chill crisis is about to be resolved.

In the real world “cook-chill” is a method of making pre-cooked meals, the kind the airlines serve. In its bureaucratic incarnation, the term refers to a plan to prepare food for the inmates at prisons on Rikers Island. To City Hall insiders, this is the Big One, a 20-year-old Mount Everest of legal tangles — the court agreement that launched a thousand intergovernmental meetings.

The story began in the 1970's, when prisoners' advocates sued the city over the deplorable conditions at the old House of Detention. In 1979, when Edward Koch was Mayor, the city gave up the court battle and signed a consent agreement, a 52-page list of promises to improve the local jails. There was an entire 24-item section on food, which covered everything from the availability of tea bags to keeping records of “plate waste.”

For more than a decade, a generation of New York City middle managers produced plans, proposals and pilot programs, none of which ever led to any actual change in the way the prisoners were being fed. In 1990 the frustrated court created a “brand new Office of Compliance Consultants, a seven-member city-funded agency dedicated to getting New York to do what it said it would do in 1979. Somewhere along the line, the ever-growing cast of interested parties agreed that the best solution to the prison food problem would be a central kitchen producing pre-cooked meals that could be frozen and reheated in the individual kitchens of each prison. “Cook-chill” was born, and its projected budget soon topped $300 million.

The Dinkins administration came up with the idea of contracting out the meal preparation to an underutilized state mental health facility in Rockland County. Corrections Department officials were very proud of this innovation, which they regarded as an excellent example of reinventing government.

But their triumph lasted just long enough for local politicians to discover that the Mayor was planning to ship cooking jobs out of the city.

When Rudolph Giuliani took office, he canceled the Rockland County deal and inserted $300 million in the capital program to build the kitchen in New York. But in a city where hundreds of school roofs are in need of repair, no one felt like spending that much money on a feeding facility for prisoners.

Nothing happened, except more meetings.

The cook-chill problem, which had taken on a legendary status, was assigned to Deputy Mayor Peter Powers, an official with a very, very large portfolio. The Powers team set up a series of — Yes! — meetings with all the parties involved. “Let's beat cook-chill!” he told his assistants, like a football coach urging his team to win the big game.

Eventually, all parties agreed that a large central facility might not be needed if existing prison kitchens were improved. A Federal court judge is now considering the proposal, and a final accord seems imminent.

Phrasemakers have dubbed the new, improved plan “cook-serve.” Mr. Powers says it may be the biggest victory of his career in city management.
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The New York Times appears poised for a monumental triumph in the history of government bureaucracy. The cook-chill crisis is about to be resolved.

In the real world “cook-chill” is a method of making pre-cooked meals, the kind the airlines serve. In its bureaucratic incarnation, the term refers to a plan to prepare food for the inmates at prisons on Rikers Island. To City Hall insiders, this is the Big One, a 20-year-old Mount Everest of legal tangles — the court agreement that launched a thousand intergovernmental meetings.

The story began in the 1970's, when prisoners' advocates sued the city over the deplorable conditions at the old House of Detention. In 1979, when Edward Koch was Mayor, the city gave up the court battle and signed a consent agreement, a 52-page list of promises to improve the local jails. There was an entire 24-item section on food, which covered everything from the availability of tea bags to keeping records of “plate waste.”

For more than a decade, a generation of New York City middle managers produced plans, proposals and pilot programs, none of which ever led to any actual change in the way the prisoners were being fed. In 1990 the frustrated court created a “brand new Office of Compliance Consultants, a seven-member city-funded agency dedicated to getting New York to do what it said it would do in 1979. Somewhere along the line, the ever-growing cast of interested parties agreed that the best solution to the prison food problem would be a central kitchen producing pre-cooked meals that could be frozen and reheated in the individual kitchens of each prison. “Cook-chill” was born, and its projected budget soon topped $300 million.

The Dinkins administration came up with the idea of contracting out the meal preparation to an underutilized state mental health facility in Rockland County. Corrections Department officials were very proud of this innovation, which they regarded as an excellent example of reinventing government.

But their triumph lasted just long enough for local politicians to discover that the Mayor was planning to ship cooking jobs out of the city.

When Rudolph Giuliani took office, he canceled the Rockland County deal and inserted $300 million in the capital program to build the kitchen in New York. But in a city where hundreds of school roofs are in need of repair, no one felt like spending that much money on a feeding facility for prisoners.

Nothing happened, except more meetings.

The cook-chill problem, which had taken on a legendary status, was assigned to Deputy Mayor Peter Powers, an official with a very, very large portfolio. The Powers team set up a series of — Yes! — meetings with all the parties involved. “Let's beat cook-chill!” he told his assistants, like a football coach urging his team to win the big game.

Eventually, all parties agreed that a large central facility might not be needed if existing prison kitchens were improved. A Federal court judge is now considering the proposal, and a final accord seems imminent.

Phrasemakers have dubbed the new, improved plan “cook-serve.” Mr. Powers says it may be the biggest victory of his career in city management.
The Slacker Myth

By John Tyler and Frank Levy

Since 1979, we have been deluged with bad news on wages, most of it true. But bad news can be taken too far.

Exhibit A is the popular perception of what happens to college graduates: They become waiters in coffee bars and clerks at the Gap. They have to take the jobs that teen-agers out of high school used to do. They live at home or accept money from their parents. They may have diplomas but no future.

Some truisms are based on statistics. This notion is based on anecdotal evidence. One's own child. A friend's child. Zonker in Doonesbury. We hear, "Isn't it crazy that the President keeps promoting education when college graduates can't get jobs?"

But much of this thinking is wrong. The market for new college graduates is reasonably solid.

In 1993, according to the most recent Federal data available, 96 percent of 30-year-old men with only a bachelor's degree were working, and "earned, on average, $34,000. Among 30-year-old women with only a bachelor's degree, 89 percent were working. Their earnings averaged $26,000, a figure that is low because it includes part-time workers.

The $34,000 is a decent income, but just $1,000 more (adjusted for inflation) than 30-year-old men made in 1979. Women's gains have been larger — $4,000 since 1979 — but half this gain reflects their working more hours. A quarter of college graduates in their late 20's and early 30's work at jobs that, by Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates, require no more than a high school education. But that fraction is no larger today than it was in 1979.

In sum, recent college graduates make about as much as graduates did in 1979. When we consider that their numbers have increased by 60 percent since then, this is no small achievement. Credit goes to their savvy in following the changing labor market. More of them trained for growing fields like science, engineering and business. Fewer went into lower-paying fields like social sciences.

What about the coffee bars and the graduates living at home? The stories are real but usually involve people in their early 20's. For most, there is a second act. The young people get older, find their niche, and their earnings rise sharply.

In 1993, the average earnings for a woman with a bachelor's degree ranged from $15,000 at age 24 to $26,000 at age 30 (again, including part-time workers). The curve for men ranged from $17,000 to $34,000. These patterns, too, are no different than they were in 1979.

Consider this: a 30-year-old man with only a high school diploma earned $20,000 on average in 1993. (Half of all 30-year-old men had not gone beyond high school.) While the earnings of men who have graduated from college have been stable since 1979, high school graduates' average earnings have fallen by $7,500.

There is a simple message here. Beneath the daily turbulence of the job market, education is becoming ever more valuable.