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The Alliance for GATT NOW, AG for GATT, and business and agriculture representatives rally to encourage the House to approve the GATT. Participants include the Vice President, Secretary Nappy, U.S. Trade Rep. Kantor and others. HC-5 Capitol.

Photo op at the beginning of the Senate Republican Working Group meeting on a legislative agenda for the 104th Congress. S-207 Capitol.

The Democratic Caucus holds its first meeting of the 104th Congress. 1100 LHOB.

EPA Administrator Carol Browner speaks at the start of the Superfund XV exhibition. Sheraton Washington.

Reps. McCollum (R-Fla.), Inglis (R-SC), Sen. Hank Brown (R-Colo.) and others hold a news conference following Supreme Court oral arguments on the term limits case. Front plaza, Supreme Court, or EP-100 Capitol in case of rain.

(approx.) Bobbie Hill, respondent in Arkansas vs. Hill; League of Women Voters President Beck Cain; Wilmer, Cutler and Pickering attorney Louis Cohen; and Friday, Eldredge & Clark attorney Elizabeth Robben are available for comment on the Supreme Court's hearing of the term limits case. Front plaza, Supreme Court.

(approx.) U.S. Term Limits executive director Paul Jacobs holds a news conference following the Supreme Court's hearing of arguments in the term limits case.

The House considers H.R. 5110 (GATT) with four hours of debate; vote scheduled.

Secretary Perry hosts an Honor Cordon to welcome Croatian Minister of National Defense Cojko Susak. The two will sign a Memorandum of Cooperation immediately following the ceremony. Pentagon river entrance.

Robert Shapiro, vice president of the Progressive Policy Institute, addresses the National Economists Club on the Clinton economic program. Montpelier Dining Room, Madison Building, 101 Independence Ave., SE.

The Congressional Black Caucus Foundation holds a ground-breaking ceremony for its new facilities. Between 2nd and K Sts., NE.

The Vice President and FCC Chair Reed Hundt preview LatinoNet, the first Latino community-based computer network. National Press Club.

Hearing in the case of Francisco Martin Duran, who is accused of trying to assassinate the President, before U.S. District Judge Charles Richey. U.S. District Courthouse, 3rd St. and Constitution Ave., NW.

The Vice President joins EPA Administrator Carol Browner to greet winners of the Presidential Environmental Youth Awards. 450 OEOB.

The International Fellowship of Christians and Jews holds a briefing following a summit meeting between the Jewish community and the "Christian Right." Participants include Ralph Reed of the Christian Coalition, Rev. Jerry Falwell, and others. 216 HSOB.

The American Jewish Committee holds a briefing on the national legislative priorities for the American Jewish community. Suite 1201, 1156 15th St. NW.

Hillary Rodham Clinton speaks at the final night of a series of "Evenings with the First Ladies," sponsored by the George Washington University. Mayflower Hotel.

Third in a series of Kalb reports, on whether the press should move more to the right. Participants include RNC Chair Haley Barbour, columnist Haynes Johnson, CNN's Bernard Shaw, NPR's Nina Totenberg. National Press Club.

The Vice President gives remarks at the Inaugural Award Dinner of the World Trade Center in honor of William Daley. Chicago Hilton and Towers, Chicago, Illinois.
ABC World News Tonight

1 UN/NATO Bosnia Policy in Crisis as Bihac Safe Zone Falls
   Tony Birtley Sarajevo 2:35
2 U.S. Marines May Have to Help Evacuate U.N Peacekeepers
   John McWethy Washington 1:50
3 Serial Killer Jeffrey Dahmer is Murdered in Prison
   Erin Hayes Chicago 2:00
4 911 Operators Fired For Not Responding in Philly Gang Case
   Peter Jennings Washington 0:20
5 Earlier Mamograms Are Better, Study Concludes
   George Strait Washington 1:55
6 Tobacco Co. Rejects Call to Testify Before Cong. Committee
   Peter Jennings Washington 0:30
7 Supreme Court to Hear Two Important Search & Seizure Cases
   Peter Jennings Washington 0:30
8 Old Congress Back to Vote on GATT; White House Selling Hard
   Brit Hume Washington 2:00
9 What the GATT Agreement Means
   Peter Jennings Washington 2:15
10 ABC Makes Deal With New Geffen/Katzenberg/Spielberg Team
    Aaron Brown New York 2:25
11 First Lady Places Star On Top of National Christmas Tree
    Peter Jennings Washington 0:10
12 Natl Parks Concessions Make Millions But Govt Gets Little
    John Martin Washington 2:05

CBS Evening News

13 Serial Killer Jeffrey Dahmer Murdered In Prison
   Frank Currier Portage, WI 2:30
14 UN, NATO, US Blame Themselves About Bosnia
   Dan Rather Washington 0:35
15 Serbs Making Gains At Bihac; West Wonders What To Do
   Allen Pizsey Sarajevo 1:45
16 U.S. Tells Allies They'll Help Pull Troops Out Of Bosnia
   David Martin Washington 1:55
17 Bosnia At Center Of Clinton's Agenda; No Good Solutions
   Rita Braver Washington 0:45
18 Yesterday's Wild Weather Leaves 14 People Dead
   Connie Chung New York 0:40
19 Clinton Gathers Together Bipartisan Support For GATT
   Bob Schieffer Washington 2:05
20 Philly Mayor Fires 911 Operators After Murder of Teen
   Richard Threlkeld New York 2:00
21 Studies Say Women Should Start Having Mammograms at Age 40
   Connie Chung New York 0:25
22 Convicted Murderer Leaves Body To Science, Leaving His Mark
   Connie Chung New York 0:20
23 Newt Gingrich Discusses U.N., Bosnia, 1995 Agenda
   Dan Rather Washington 3:10
24 Foul Play Not Suicide Caused CIA Germ Warfare Scientist's Death
   Anthony Mason Washington 3:30
NBC Nightly News

25 Cannibalistic Killer Jeffrey Dahmer Murdered In Prison
   Dawn Fratangelo Portage, WI 2:40

26 New Orleans Has Highest Murder Rate In The Country
   Jim Cummins New Orleans 2:00

27 Serbs Make Final Push In Bihac; Some Say UN Should Pull Out
   Richard Roth Sarajevo 2:10

28 Clinton Advisors Meet To Discuss Bosnia
   Andrea Mitchell Washington 2:05

29 Boutros Boutros Ghali Plans To Visit Sarajevo This Week
   Tom Brokaw New York 0:10

30 Yesterday's Fierce Weather Storm Caused Major Travel Delays
   Tom Brokaw New York 0:10

31 Hurricane Hits Kentucky; Snow Falls In North
   Bob Dotson no location 1:35

32 Clinton Gets Bipartisan Support For GATT
   Brian Williams Washington 2:10

33 Most Retail Chains Report Better Sales During Holiday Weekend
   Tom Brokaw New York 0:30

34 Pope John Paul's CDs, Books A Hit; All Proceeds Go To Charity
   Tom Brokaw New York 0:55

35 One-Third Of U.S. Population Overweight; Health Costs Rising
   Betty Rollin New York 3:30

36 First Lady Places Star On National Christmas Tree
   Tom Brokaw New York 0:25

37 59-Year-Old Grandfather Is Rookie In LA Police Department
   Kelly O'Donnell Los Angeles 2:00

Summaries are available for 30 days from date of broadcast
Call U.S. Newswire at 202-347-2770 for information
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Hourly News Summary
Around the World, Around the Clock...with United Press International.
-0-
GATT is up for a vote today. The House gets it first, then it's the Senate's turn on Thursday. Most observers expect it to pass in both houses of congress.
-0-
People are still talking about Jeffrey Dahmer's murder. Dahmer was in prison in Wisconsin for series of gruesome murders and dismemberments, when he was killed by another inmate.
-0-
Vice President Al Gore and first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton honored the six Americans who won Nobel prizes in the sciences this year. Gore said during an East Room ceremony the winners proved the "importance of investment in the basic sciences.''
-0-
A massive tragedy to report from China: 233 party-goers were killed and 16 injured when a fire engulfed a disco in one of China's northeastern provinces.
-0-
The American Civil Liberties Union says it will appeal a ruling against homosexual adoptions in Illinois. A Cook County judge has ruled that two lesbian couples from Chicago have no legal standing to adopt children under Illinois law.
-0-
A Roman Catholic priest has been convicted of participating in a $7.4 million Brinks armored car heist in upstate New York allegedly to help the Irish Republican Army.

The Reverend Patrick Moloney and an Irish ex-convict were both found guilty of conspiracy in the high-profile case.
-0-
Stanford researchers may have the aerial equivalent of a better mouse-trap. They say they used a 20-foot flying model of a wing to show that a radical design works for supersonic transport.

The design could ultimately be used to fly from the United States to Tokyo or London in half the time it takes current subsonic jets.
-0-
Sarah, the duchess of York, has arrived in Australia on a three-day visit to raise awareness of motor neurone disease, also known as amyotrophic lateral sclerosis or Lou Gehrig's disease.

More than 100 onlookers greeted "Fergie," who was given standard VIP treatment on her arrival at Sydney airport.
-0-
By Shirley Smith (UPI)

--------------------------
PM-News Digest, 1st Ld-Writethru, 1177 PMs AP News Digest= 5:30 a.m. Update= Tuesday, Nov. 29, 1994= All times EST
Updates:
PM-GATT Showdown: Gore meeting starts at 8 a.m.; House meets at noon.
PM-Scotus-Term Limits: Oral arguments to begin at 10 a.m.
PM-Tobacco-Parting Shot: Hearing to begin at 11 a.m.
PM-Mideast Aid: Developments expected.
PM-Leadership Races: Democrats meet privately at 10 a.m.
PM-Russia-Chechnya: will be led with more developments.

TRADE VOTES:

GATT Backers Confident As House Takes Up Historic Accord
WASHINGTON Lawmakers supporting a historic 124-nation trade accord are hoping a predicted 100-vote victory margin in the House today will build momentum in the Senate where the outcome remains in doubt.
Slug PM-GATT Showdown. Sent as a0435.
Editors: Gore meeting starts at 8 a.m. House meets at noon.
By Dave Skidmore. AP Photo WX101, Clinton with James Baker.

PM-Lame Ducks from WASHINGTON: Congress is back in town for its first lame-duck session in 12 years, giving old-timers one last hurrah, one last chance to legislate.

YUGOSLAVIA:

Serbs March On In Bosnia As NATO Unity Crumbles...
SARAJEVO, Bosnia-Herzegovina Serbs zeroed in on a key Muslim stronghold in northwest Bosnia, as Western officials scrambled to broker a cease-fire and assign blame for failing to protect the U.N. "safe area."
Slug PM-Yugoslavia. Sent as a0464.
By Srecko Latal.

... And the White House Tries To Get Serbs Back To Peace Table
WASHINGTON The Clinton administration is trying to draw Bosnia's Serbs into peace talks by offering to reopen a rejected international peace plan.
By Diplomatic Writer Barry Schweid.

SUPREME COURT:

Hears Arguments Over Term Limits for Congress
WASHINGTON States' efforts to limit the time anyone can serve in Congress are being contemplated by the Supreme Court, made up of nine people who can keep their jobs for life.
Slug PM-Scotus-Term Limits. Sent as a0416.
Editors: Oral arguments scheduled to begin 10 a.m.
By Richard Carelli.

With VERNONIA, Ore.-dated PM-Scotus-Drug Testing: His classmates say James Acton is one of the athletes least likely to take drugs. But Acton's case against his school district's mandatory drug testing policy for athletes has reached the U.S. Supreme Court.

TARGETING TOBACCO:

Waxman Gets Last Shot Before Industry Gets GOP Treatment
WASHINGTON Tobacco is facing its final trial before the current Democratic-controlled Congress and an anti-smoking California lawmaker who has mounted attack after attack on the industry.
Slug PM-Tobacco-Parting Shot. Sent as a0429.
Editors: Hearing scheduled to begin 11 a.m.
Continued From Page 1

U.S., IN SHIFT, GIVES UP ITS TALK OF TOUGH ACTION AGAINST SERBS

NATO CLOSES RANKS

Avoiding Confrontation
With Allies, Clinton
Drops Hard Line

By MICHAEL R. GORDON
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Nov. 28 — In a policy switch intended to close ranks with its Western European allies, the Clinton Administration has dropped talk of using air strikes and other forms of military pressure to stop Serbian attacks on the Bosnian Government. Instead, it is mobilizing support for an agreement to end the fighting in the Balkans.

For months, the Administration has been trying to mobilize support for tough actions or threats of action against the Bosnian Serbs. But facing a series of high-level meetings in Europe in early December, the Administration has begun issuing carefully delineated statements about the futility of military action to end the conflict.

As a cease-fire is nowhere in sight, the Administration is shifting to the more appealing strategy of a peace settlement. Clinton aides said the Administration's policy switch follows almost two years of alternating between taking a muscular approach and standing back and letting the Europeans take the lead.

In putting aside the threat of force and military action to end the conflict, Mr. Clinton and his top national security aides argued that it would be harder to persuade the Bosnian Serbs to accept a negotiated settlement without threat of force. But American officials are hoping the Bosnian Serbs will be attracted to an agreement by a new proposal that would give them a chance to form a political association with the Bosnian Croats and Muslims if they accept the territorial integrity of Bosnia.

Another goal is to encourage a peace settlement, if that's possible, while trying to make the best of a bad situation.

Mr. Clinton and Secretary of State Warren Christopher meet with European leaders at NATO and at the 53-nation Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe in early December. A second goal, the senior officials say, is to prevent the war in Bosnia from spreading throughout the Balkans.

The sudden change of tactics, the latest in a series of policy revisions by the United States toward the Balkans that began with the Administration of President George Bush and continued under Mr. Clinton, leaves Washington moving toward British and French policies it had long rejected.

It came a week after the United States pushed for broader air strikes to defend the embattled town of Bihac, which has been under attack by the Bosnian and Croatian Serbs, but were stymied by opposition from Britain and France, who have peacekeeping troops on the ground in Bosnia.

The United States' leverage with its allies has been sharply reduced by its reluctance to back up its demands by sending American soldiers to the Balkans, and its relations with Britain are at the lowest point since the Suez crisis of 1956.

Administration officials acknowledged that it would be harder to persuade the Bosnian Serbs to accept a negotiated settlement without threat of force. But American officials are hoping the Bosnian Serbs will be attracted to an agreement by a new proposal that would give them a chance to form a political association with the Bosnian Croats and Muslims if they accept the territorial integrity of Bosnia.

Another goal is to encourage a peace settlement, if that's possible, while trying to make the agreement more like a cease-fire, American officials said. Explaining the new American approach, a senior Administration official said the Administration's top goal at this time is to shore up NATO before Mr. Clinton and Secretary of State Warren Christopher meet with European leaders at NATO and at the 53-nation Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe in early December.

A second goal, the senior officials say, is to prevent the war in Bosnia from spreading throughout the Balkans.

The third and lesser goal is "to help preserve the republic of Bosnia," the official said.

"That last goal has been severely weakened as a result of the Serbian counteroffensive," the official said.

Clinton Administration officials argued that in making the shift, they were trying to make the best of a bad situation.

"We are not downplaying Bosnia," the senior Administration official said. "The problem is that we have no maneuver room. This time we have no leverage with the European allies as we did against the peacekeeping troops on the ground." But some former American officials said the Administration's policy switch has undermined the beleaguered Bosnian Government and hurt Mr. Clinton's recently improved image as a world leader.

"I am afraid what Bosnia shows is the inability of Europe to act and the failure of America to lead," said Zbignew Brzezinski, President Carter's National Security Adviser.

"The Administration itself has been hardly consistent." The Administration's policy switch follows almost two years of vacillation in which Washington has alternated between taking a muscular approach and standing back and letting the Europeans take the lead.

Mr. Clinton came into office urging tough action against the Serbs. Specifically, Mr. Clinton argued that Bush Administration officials had outlined a false choice by asserting that Washington was faced with the unpalatable decision of sending hundreds of thousands of ground troops to Bosnia.

There was a third way, Mr. Clinton and his advisers argued. The West could use the threat of a limited military intervention to press the Bosnian Serbs to agree to a peace settlement.

Western European nations never liked Washington's talk of lifting the arms embargo, arguing that it would expose their peacekeeping troops to greater risks. Some American officials also believe that London and Paris are also calculating that the Serbs have the upper hand and that the quickest route to a peace settlement is further concessions by the Bosnian Government.

Nonetheless, in late July, American, Western and Russian foreign ministers warned the Serbs that if they refused to agree to a peace settlement that reduced the territory they controlled from 70 per cent to 49 per cent of Bosnia, the pressure to lift the arms embargo against the Bosnian Government "could become unavoidable." The foreign ministers also pledged to vigorously enforce weapons exclusion zones in Bosnia and to consider creating new ones.

"We are not prepared to see the pressure relaxed," Mr. Christopher said at the time. "We cannot continue to sit where the victims are punished by the arms embargo and are denied the right to defend themselves."

But when the Serbs continued to spurn a peace settlement, the divisions between Washington and its allies sharpened.

In putting aside the threat of force to protect Bihac or pressure the Serbs to agree to a peace settlement, American officials said they were not saying that air strikes will never be used in Bosnia. The Administration is not excluding the possibility that bombs could be launched to defend United Nations peacekeepers, protect Sarajevo or help the Bosnian Government if United Nations peacekeepers are withdrawn.

Continued on Page A16, Column 1
Serbs Close In on Bosnian Town; U.N. and NATO Unable to Act

By ROGER COHEN
Special to The New York Times

ZAGREB, Croatia, Nov. 28 — Bosnian Serb forces pushed toward a complete encirclement of the Muslim enclave of Bihac in northwestern Bosnia today, demonstrating a military superiority that now seems likely to bring them political rewards.

With all international deterrents to the Serbs crumbling amid recrimination and disarray, they shelled the town center of Bihac and moved a surface-to-air missile system within range of the Sarajevo airport, a threat to any flights into the Bosnian capital, Western officials said.

A United Nations military report from Bihac said: "The town is all but surrounded, and Bosnian and Croatian Serb forces are right up against the town outskirts. Fighting continues in the outskirts."

Two shells landed near the town hospital today and one civilian was killed, a United Nations spokesman said.

As the United States, NATO and the United Nations all said they could do nothing to reverse the Serbian hold on Bihac, preparations were made to adjust an international peace plan for Bosnia in ways that might make it more attractive to the Serbs, officials said.

The plan, offering 51 percent of Bosnia to the Muslim-led Bosnian Government and allied Croats and 49 percent to the Serbs, was rejected by the Serbs in July. Although presented as a take-it-or-leave-it proposal, this American-backed plan appears to have become malleable as the possibility of bringing military pressure to bear on the Serbs has evaporated.

The officials said the "contact group" countries — the United States, France, Britain, Germany and Russia — were likely to offer the Bosnian Serbs the possibility of forming a federation with Serbia and make clear to them that they would not have to retreat to the lines on the proposed map until such constitutional arrangements were worked out.

Neither point was explicitly addressed in the original plan, which has been gathering dust since July. The "contact group" foreign ministers are to meet in Brussels on Friday.

Since the Serbs hold 70 percent of Bosnia after 31 months of war, the proposal requires them to give up about a third of the territory under their control.

One senior Western official said, "The idea now is to impress on the Serbs that they will not have to withdraw to the new lines unless constitutional arrangements are discussed, and also potentially acceptable mutual exchanges of territory."

In a sense, adjusting the peace plan in the Serbs' favor is now no more than a logical step. If the Serbs are not to be confronted even when they occupy 20 percent of a designated safe area like Bihac that the United Nations has vowed to protect, there appears to be little realistic alternative to appeasing them.

Under Secretary General Kofi Annan of the United Nations said today that NATO had told the United Nations that it could no longer provide close air support for United Nations forces around Bihac unless it also

International deterrents to a Serbian offensive have crumbled.

had the green light to attack Bosnian Serb missile batteries.

But Mr. Annan told a meeting of countries contributing troops to the protection force, known as Unprofor, that there were now so many missile batteries in the area that the United Nations refused to give such approval, fearing that to attack them all would be tantamount to a declaration of war.

"While Unprofor fully understands NATO's position," Mr. Annan told the New York meeting, "its commanders are unable to agree to such widespread use of air power, which would be tantamount to going to war with the Serbs and which would place the troops you have provided to us in jeopardy."

In the last week, the Serbs have held more than 200 United Nations peacekeepers from France and Canada as effective hostages, moved large numbers of troops over an international border from Serb-held parts of Croatia into northwestern Bosnia around Bihac, and placed a surface-to-air missile system within range of Sarajevo airport, though outside the weapons exclusion zone drawn around the city by the United Nations.

This military push has shown both the United Nations and NATO threats to be largely empty. But European Union foreign ministers, meeting today in Brussels, took refuge in the argument that only a force of 100,000 NATO ground troops could have changed anything and they were not forthcoming.

"Such an army has never been available," said Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd of Britain, adding that his Government's aim was "to achieve a negotiated peace and relieve human suffering. We have no reason to be ashamed of that."

By urging force could now achieve nothing, the American Defense Secretary, William J. Perry, appeared to align himself and the Clinton Ad-

ministration with that position.

The Bosnian Prime Minister, Haris Silajdžic, reacted angrily to the notion that the "contact group" plan could be adjusted or elaborated.

"Would they reward genocide and hand half of Bosnia over to a Greater Serbia?" he asked. "The 'contact group' is violating its own rules, because they said there was nothing to talk about unless the Serbs accepted the plan."

But Western countries, including the United States, appear to have concluded that even a bad peace is better than more war. In return for the concessions to the Serbs, they hope to gain Serbian recognition of the international borders of Bosnia and Croatia, the officials said.

While the Serbian lines on the outskirts of Bihac scarcely moved today, United Nations officials reported intense fighting in the town of Velika Kladusa in the north of the Bihac pocket.

Muslims who support a renegade businessman-turned-politician named Fikret Abdic have joined forces with Croatian Serb and Bosnian Serb forces in the attack on Velika Kladusa, which is encircled and has been without water or electricity for two weeks. About 18,000 people are believed to be in the town, among a total of 180,000 in the pocket.

In August, the V Corps of the Bosnian Army took Velika Kladusa from Mr. Abdic's supporters before embarking last month on a major and initially successful offensive against the Serbs. The current Serbian counterattack has cut the V Corps to shreds.

Lieut. Gen. Sir Michael Rose, the commander of United Nations forces in Bosnia, tried to secure agreement on a cease-fire and a demilitarization of the Bihac safe area. This was rejected by the Serbs as the only possibility of ending the fighting. While the Bosnian Government agreed to the proposal, the Bosnian Serbs said they needed more time to review it.

THE NEW YORK TIMES, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1994
WASHINGTON, Nov. 28 — President Clinton opened the White House global trade pact whose fate will be decided today as he warned lawmakers this morning to join forces “if there’s anything we Republicans and Democrats ought to be able to agree on.”

But behind the White House’s trumpeting today of trade- pact endorsements from two former Treasury Secretaries, three former Presidents, four former Commerce Secretaries and all 11 former budget directors was a recognition that opportunities for future collaboration may be rare.

To help guarantee that the agreement will not be derailed again, Mr. Clinton invited 75 House members from both parties to join him for breakfast at the White House on Tuesday. They also said that as early as Tuesday he will hold his first post-election news conference with Representative Richard G. Gephardt of Missouri, the Speaker of the House and who has given his support to the accord.

Even though Democrats still hold majorities in both Houses of the lame-duck Congress, the large number of liberal Democrats opposed to the trade pact means that to get the measure approved, the White House must rely on the same kind of support from Republicans that it will need beginning in January, when that party takes control of Congress. And among the opponents of the accord who were working to block it were politicians from both parties that Mr. Clinton offered a hint of urgency today as he warned lawmakers to work hand in hand.

Mr. Clinton offered a hint of urgency today as he warned lawmakers that if at all possible to stop action once more on a trade accord whose benefits he said would include a $1.700 increase in the annual income of an average American family. “We have to do it now,” he declared. “We can’t wait until next year. We don’t want to lose this opportunity.”

The pact would expand the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to include farming and lower tariffs by an average of one-third.

In addition to Mr. Arney, the Republican member of Congress who joined the President, half of his Cabinet and several Democratic House members included Carla A. Hills, the trade representative under President George Bush; Brent Scowcroft, the national security adviser under Presidents Bush and President Reagan, and even veterans like Herbert Stein, the chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Nixon.

The Nobel prize-winning economists in the audience were Wassily Leontief, Paul A. Samuelson, James Tobin, Lawrence R. Klein and Robert E. Solow. Among the opponents of the accord were Robert Reich, who is a Medal of Freedom winner, and Jerry J. Sanders, the budget director who was a member of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Reagan.

Among the opponents of the accord who were working to block it today, Senator Byron L. Dorgan, Democrat of North Dakota, asked at a news conference whether it was possible for the Democratic majority in the Senate to come together.

But proponents like Mr. Baker used their appearances at the White House to compare such doomsaying to what the former Secretary of State called predictions from “the misguided and misinformed,” including Ross Perot, the former President’s campaign manager, that the North American Free Trade Agreement would lead to a major loss of American jobs.

Like the other Democrats and Republicans who exchanged views this morning, Mr. Baker and Mr. Clinton appeared gracious toward one another as they sat side by side. But after Mr. Gore noted how happy he and the President had been to see "how much Secretary Baker is enjoying life outside Washington," the Republican could not resist a retort. "It’s always fun to come back to the White House in November," said Mr. Baker, who is trying to decide whether to run for President in 1996.
Three-year-old precedent to dismiss a prosecution for drug possession in Romulus, Mich. In that case, the police initiated only five accounts between yelling "police officer" and breaking down a door with a battering ram. Federal law requires a law enforcement agent to give "notice of his authority and purpose" before a forceful entry to execute a search warrant. New York State law also requires notice. Connecticut and New Jersey are among the minority of states that have no general law on the subject. The absence of a knock-and-announce requirement in another Northeastern state, Massachusetts, received wide public attention earlier this year when a 75-year-old retired minister, the Rev. Accelynne Williams, died of a heart attack in his Boston apartment after the police mistakenly broke in with a warrant that was intended for another resident of the building.

The drug-testing case the Court accepted today brings the Justices back to an issue they have not revisited since a pair of decisions in 1989. The cases, the Court ruled, required notice. New Jersey high school and held that, as compared with adults, students have a lower degree of privacy against reasonable searches and other restrictions needed to maintain order in the schools. But although that case is helpful to the Oregon school district, it is not conclusive. The search at issue in the New Jersey case was not random; the school principal, exercising the power of a purse of a girl who had violated a school rule against smoking in the bathroom, showed evidence to the girl that she had been selling marijuana to her classmates. These were among the Court's other actions as it returned from its Thanksgiving recess.

**Judge's Conviction**

Accepting the Justice Department's request to review a decision overturning the criminal conviction of a Federal district judge, Robert P. Aguilar, for obstructing justice and revealing the existence of a wiretap.

The judge, who sits in San Francisco, was convicted in 1992 and 1995 of his decision to reveal a wiretap. The wiretap was approved by the court, but the judge did not apply to his behavior. The jury found that Judge Aguilar had warned a distant relative who was a subject in a criminal investigation that his telephone might be tapped and then lied to agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation about his contacts with the man. The authorization for the wiretap was expired, the appeals court ruled, and said a person could not be convicted for revealing a wiretap after it was concluded. The appeals court also found that Judge Aguilar's comments to F.B.I. agents did not meet the legal definition of an obstruction of justice. The Justice Department's appeal is U.S. v. Aguilar, No. 94-270.

**Joe Camel Case**

Without comment, the Court turned down an appeal by R. J. Reynolds that sought to block a California lawsuit regarding the Joe Camel cartoon character that advertises the company's Camel cigarettes.

The suit, in California state court, argues that the advertising campaign violates the two-fifths test, a provision that says a person could not be convicted for revealing a wiretap after it was concluded. The appeals court also found that Judge Aguilar's comments to F.B.I. agents did not meet the legal definition of an obstruction of justice. The Justice Department's appeal is U.S. v. Aguilar, No. 94-270.
Vote in Norway
Blocks Joining Europe's Union

Only Nation to Say 'No'
Bucks a Nordic Trend

BY JOHN DARNTON
Special to The New York Times

OSLO, Tuesday, Nov. 29 — Bucking a trend set by its Nordic neighbors, Norway early today became the only country to turn down membership in the expanding club of nations known as the European Union.

With almost 99 percent of the votes counted in a two-day nationwide referendum, the "no" votes were ahead of the "yes" votes by 52.8 percent to 47.2 percent.

The conclusion seemed inescapable: with ample resources in oil and gas reserves and fishing and agriculture, the 4.3 million people who live here do not see any advantage in merging with a distant entity that could disturb their near-perfect society.

Norwegians are especially jealous of their sovereignty. The country only became independent in 1905, after 400 years of rule by Denmark.

They have clung to neutrality with an increasing sense of gloom. It is not about relinquishing authority to an outside power.

Pro-European politicians here were bracing for a defeat. Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland had campaigned vigorously to join the union and tonight’s rejection of her stand was a setback to her political prestige.

Early this morning, the popular Prime Minister said, "The Norwegian people have spoken and we will respect their decision."

In Brussels, European Union officials followed reports of the voting with an increasing sense of gloom. It was an emotional conclusion to a tense time. In 1972, Norwegians turned their backs on joining what was then the European Economic Community.

Early returns indicated that, as expected, the no vote was running strong in the coastal fishing towns and rural communities of the north and west and the yes vote was strong in the urban centers of Oslo and Bergen.

Also, judging from voter samples, women voted against membership by higher proportions than men — a reflection of a vast increase in the number of women in the work force, particularly in Government support services, which the "no" campaign emphasized might be among the jobs reduced by a net outflow of money to the European Union.

On Monday, voter samples pointed to a vote against joining the union. For weeks, and in fact months and years, polls had been saying the same thing. But the margin dropped in recent days after both Finland and Sweden approved membership in their own referendums.

Their admission on Jan. 1, together with that of Austria, will bring the number of countries in the European Union to 15. Had Norway opted to join, the Nordic countries — including Denmark, which gained membership two years ago — could have become a miniature power bloc. The Nordic nations would have had 13 of 90 votes, more than Germany — under the procedures in the Maasstricht Treaty on European Union that would be set up to give small countries extra muscle. A solid Scandinavian bloc would have shifted the political balance somewhat to the north.

Though they would not have been likely to vote the same on all issues, the countries share a concern for enacting social welfare programs and a strong independent streak that is wary of relinquishing sovereignty to a distant entity.

A no vote puts off the possibility of Norway joining for a decade or so and perhaps forever. Monday’s vote came after a long, hard-fought campaign on an issue that has obsessed Norwegians for years, almost since 1972 when 53.6 percent of voters rejected membership in what was then the European Economic Community.

At that time, Norway became the only European country to say no definitively to joining the ever-expanding club, which is intended to knock down the continent’s frontiers and make trade as easy as it is between New York and Illinois.

For months polls had placed the no vote well ahead, but the margin narrowed after Sweden approved its referendum on Nov. 13. Though Norwegians shrink from the thought of taking cues from their large neighbor, the prospect of being the odd man out on the Scandinavian peninsula was daunting.

The signs of ambivalence continued until, and beyond, the last moment. "I voted no but I’m not sure," said one young man, Stein Inge Jernes, stepping away from the blue curtains of a polling booth in the basement of City Hall. "I regret it already. But if I had voted yes I would be regretting that too."

On the no side, the basic argument was that Norway, blessed with abundant natural resources, is strong enough to go it alone. Why pay extra money to subscribe to a union whose standards are lower in everything from cradle-to-grave welfare support to environmental purity, ran the refrain.

The center of the opposition was the coastal areas to the north and the country’s small fishermen. Fishermen worried about opening the rich territorial waters to European Union countries like Spain and Portugal, and farmers were afraid of the thought of a reduction in subsidization of produce, which are among the highest in the world.

On the yes side, the contention was that oil and gas would not last for ever and that Norway must prepare for the future by joining the bandwagon for open trade and access to markets. If it did not, it would be left behind and isolated in the company of Switzerland, Iceland and Liechtenstein.

Norway, bucking a trend, was rejecting European Union membership.

"We would be the only industrial country in Europe not to join, except for Switzerland, which has a long history of neutrality while we've been a NATO member for 46 years," said Inge Lonning, a theology professor who heads the European Movement, the main group favoring the union.

"In 1972, when we rejected membership, we were at the starting point of our oil," he said. "Now we're at the last chapter. Production will go down. Gas will stay high, but will we be able to sell it? How about the fisheries? If Sweden is in the European Union and Norway is out, then fish products sold to Sweden would have a tax of 25 percent put on them."

The yes forces also promoted the idea that Norway’s security would be enhanced inside the large European organization, which could lend an extra muscle to small nations.

The Labor Party, which she heads, is a socialist Democratic Left Party, which has a strong agricultural base, was opposed, along with the smaller Socialist Left. 
For Aliens, a Bahamas Cruise Is an Easy Way Into the U.S.

By JOEL BRINKLEY
Special to The New York Times

FORT LAUDERDALE, Fla. — For illegal immigrants, getting into the United States can be as simple as climbing the gangplank of a cruise ship in the Bahamas and slipping off again in South Florida a few hours later — without ever showing any proof of citizenship or exchanging even a word with an immigration service inspector.

The Investigation

Smugglers Grow Bolder

Mr. Foster began work on Operation Sea-cruise in the autumn of 1987 after the Border Patrol noticed a rise in the number of aliens smuggling aboard the cruise lines. Over the next few years, he traveled to the Bahamas dozens of times. He concluded that the Bahamas, which had been an organized ring was carrying out the smuggling and that its leaders seemed to prefer that they be larger because the price was so low, generally just a little over $100. As Mr. Foster described it, Bahamian gang members living in New York City would obtain voter registration cards or some other false document and then board cruise ships pretending to be United States citizens. Before the ships docked in Freeport, the cruise lines gave each passenger a pass to take ashore. Before the passengers went ashore, each passenger generally had only to show that passes.

Sometimes, Mr. Foster found, a dozen or more smugglers would be aboard. One of the other passes and tickets from all the others, go ashore and then hand them over to aliens who had paid $1,000 or $2,000 to be smuggled into the United States. These people would then board the ship, showing the passes as they walked up the gangplank. Nobody counted to see if the number of people boarding the ship was the same as the number who got off earlier.

In Fort Lauderdale, the illegal aliens would simply walk off the ship.

As his investigation proceeded, Mr. Foster found, the smuggling began requiring some aliens to strap on several pounds of cocaine to smuggle into Florida payment for their passage. By the late 1980's, as the smuggling groups expanded in size and sophistication, they formed drug and arms trafficking rings in South Florida that grew ever more ambitious and dangerous, Mr. Foster said.

As one case report said, the operation "targeted a multidimensional criminal organization involved in the smuggling of aliens into the United States. It also targeted a ring involved in the manufacture of crack cocaine, the manufacture of crack cocaine, marijuana fraud, identity-document fraud as well as dealing in firearms." Before the investigation ended last year, Mr. Foster persuaded the cruise lines to make one procedural change: Instead of giving out passes, they would stamp the back of each passenger’s hand before the passenger got off in the Bahamas.

The new procedure was effective only briefly. The immigration service quickly found that aliens were washing off the stamps with rubbing alcohol so they could duplicate it onto the back of somebody else’s hand. In addition, said Mr. Verdi, cruise lines gave stamps for Sea Escape cruise lines, “we have had the stamps counterfeited in the past... The only real solution, Mr. Foster con-

cluded, was to inspect the passengers as they boarded the ship in Freeport, or when they got off in Fort Lauderdale. But the agency demurred, presumably for the same reasons Mr. Cadman now offers: delaying passengers as they disembark and possibly damaging the cruise industry. And today little has changed.

The Voyage

No One Is Stopped For Questioning

At check-in early one Wednesday morning, a cruise-line ticket clerk asked for proof of United States citizenship. She glanced quickly at a Maryland voter registration card, which is easily obtainable in the United States. She then issued the $123.99 ticket and waved the passenger through.

Just before the ship set sail at 8 A.M., the immigration inspector boarded. She settled into her state-room, but did not begin until the return trip more than ten hours later. In the meantime, she had little to do.

The ship docked in Freeport about 1 P.M. There, all 600 passengers debarked to spend the day as they chose — swimming, snork eling, sightseeing. As they stepped onto the gangplank, a cruise line employee

Continued on Page B12, Column 1
pressed a rubber stamp coated with ultraviolet ink onto their wrists. Ashore, Bahamian immigration officers simply watched as the passengers filed through the entry hall to toward taxis outside.

The passengers began returning shortly after 4 P.M. They passed easily through Bahamian immigration; an officer merely glanced at the ship ticket. Two cruise-line employees greeted the passengers at the top of the ship’s gangplank. The immigration inspector was nowhere in sight. One employee handed each person a United States Customs declaration form, to be filled out on the return trip. The other held a small ultraviolet light over each wrist to look for the stamp.

By now, many passengers had been swimming or snorkeling. Some had taken showers. As a result, many of the stamps were badly smudged. The Times reporter deliberately smeared his stamp with rubbing alcohol — mimicking the procedure investigators said smugglers use to copy the stamp — so that no distinct image remained. But the cruise-line employee simply waved the light like a talisman over his wrist and allowed him on board.

For more than an hour, no one was stopped for questioning, and no other identification was required to reboard the ship. As debarking passengers reached the end of the gangplank, the immigration inspector and another one who had joined her glanced at each person’s Customs declaration card, the forms that were freely available to everyone on board. Two Customs Service officers waited at tables inside the terminal to see if anyone owed duties on goods bought abroad. That was all.

The Agency
A Report Is Ignored

In a report issued last April, the Justice Department Inspector General urged the immigration service to abandon en route inspections, calling them “improper and inefficient.” The immigration service defended the practice, saying, “The risk of illegal aliens entering the U.S. using cruise ships is low due to the quality of cruise-line personnel, the general type of vacationing passengers who routinely travel on cruises and the low frequency of detected illegal aliens.”

After that, en route inspections continued unchanged, and Mr. Foster’s work seemed to have no effect on the agency. In fact, Mr. Cadman, the Miami district director since January 1993, said he had never heard of Operation Seacruise until a reporter brought it to his attention.

In a statement issued in September, the agency said the en route inspection procedure “benefits both the cruise lines and the I.N.S.”

But Martin Salzedo, president of Discovery cruise lines, disagrees.

“I would much prefer to have the inspections done just like at airports — just prior to boarding or when they get off,” he said. “That way we can save the cruise experience onboard. You don’t have to hear all these page announcements calling people for immigration. People can relax.”

When Discovery I redocks in Fort Lauderdale, “the passengers have to queue up for Customs,” Mr. Salzedo added. “So they might as well queue up for immigration, too. That’s just a part of traveling.”
U.S. Drops Effort to Oust a Gay Sailor

But Says Ban Policy Remains the Same

By STEPHEN LABATON
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Nov. 28 - The Clinton Administration said today that it would drop its effort to bar a homosexual from serving in the Navy and would not appeal the case to the United States Supreme Court.

Government lawyers insisted that their decision in the case of Petty Officer Keith Meinhold was not intended to convey the message that the military must admit homosexuals. Rather, they said, it was simply a tactical decision in the long-running court battle between the armed services and gay and civil rights groups over the Pentagon's policy on homosexuality.

Last August, the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, in San Francisco, said Mr. Meinhold could not be discharged merely for saying he is gay. The Navy had tried to remove him under the policy, in effect when Mr. Clinton took office in January 1993, that prohibited anyone who described himself as gay from serving in the armed services.

Administration officials, said that the Meinhold case was not worth appealing because the regulations under which the Navy sought to discharge Mr. Meinhold have since been rewritten and that the case could therefore be distinguished from others that have begun to arise under the new policy written by the Clinton Administration. The Meinhold decision had cast doubt on that new policy.

"Moreover, last week the Administration won a different case revolving around the old policy in a different appeals court. Government lawyers said that victory, in the case of former Midshipman Joseph C. Steffan, would have the effect of limiting any damage done to the military policy by the Meinhold case."

"Still, the decision means the Government may be prevented from taking disciplinary action against Petty Officer Meinhold, a Navy flight instructor whom the Government had tried to discharge after he said in a television interview in 1992 that he was gay."

The Government's decision not to appeal the Meinhold case was announced today by Joseph Krovisky, a Justice Department spokesman, who said it was made by Solicitor General Drew S. Days 3d, who represents the Administration before the Supreme Court. Government lawyers said that after the Steffan decision, it became clear that there was little to be gained by appealing the Meinhold case to the Supreme Court.

The Pentagon rules written by the Clinton Administration took effect in February 1994 and permit the military to remove members who say they are homosexuals. But Government lawyers say that because the new rules are more flexible, they are more likely to withstand constitutional challenges.

"The new rules strike a compromise between Mr. Clinton's 1992 campaign promise to remove the ban on homosexuals entirely and the sentiments of military leaders and Congress to keep the ban in place. "

Under the new policy, known as "Don't ask, don't tell, don't pursue," homosexuals may serve in the military so long as they remain silent about their sexual preferences, except in the most private of settings, and abstain from engaging in homosexual acts. The new policy also discourages supervising officers from opening sexual investigations without significant evidence of homosexuality.

John McGuire, Mr. Meinhold's lawyer, said today that his client was told last week that he would not be disciplined under the new policy so long as he did not repeat his earlier statement that he was gay.

"He was told by the executive officer of his squadron that he has a clean slate, and that he would be permitted to remain, but that if he says he's gay again, then they would be taking action against him under the new policy," Mr. McGuire said. "It's ridiculous."

In the Meinhold case, the appeals court said that the military could not discharge Mr. Meinhold and that the old policy violated the equal protection guarantees of the Constitution. Although the court said that it was not passing judgment on the newer regulations, the decision cast doubt on them because it said that Mr. Meinhold could not be dismissed merely for asserting that he was gay.

The court said it would defer to the Navy's judgment that homosexual conduct "seriously impairs the accomplishment of the military mission." But the court distinguished between words and deeds.

The Meinhold opinion conflicts with a decision handed down last week by another Federal appeals court involving Mr. Steffan, a top-ranking midshipman from the United States Naval Academy in Annapolis, Md., who was forced to resign six weeks before graduation because he acknowledged under questioning by a disciplinary board that he was gay.

In the Steffan case, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia upheld the right of the Government to impose restrictions on gays who wish to serve in the military. In contrast to the Meinhold decision, the appeals court in the Steffan case said that if a person declared himself to be gay, then it was reasonable to conclude that the person had engaged in conduct proscribed by the regulations. The decision said that rules prohibiting homosexuals were no different than other employment restrictions, like those imposing height or age restrictions or requiring good eyesight.
Tornado Leaves 3 Dead in Memphis Suburb

GERMANTOWN, Tenn., Nov. 28 (AP) — When a tornado smashed two dozen homes in this well-to-do suburb of Memphis on Sunday, it killed three people in one house where 16 family members had assembled for a reunion and another person in a nearby rural area.

The half-dozen tornadoes that hit in this area were part of a vast storm system that was still producing rain and snow across parts of the Northeast today. The Tennessee tornado deaths were among 14 storm fatalities that occurred on Sunday from North Dakota, where snow and ice glazed highways, to Georgia, where dense fog was blamed for the crash of a small plane.

The storm stranded or delayed hundreds of travelers, but the hardest-hit area was this Memphis suburb where 25 houses, a high school and a church were destroyed and 150 other houses were damaged.

Sixteen people — 8 children and 7 adults — were at the reunion when a house collapsed. Two of the bodies were not pulled from the wreckage until early today.

Many of the survivors were pulled to safety by bystanders who attacked the rubble with their bare hands.

"I could see children's hands sticking up and we just grabbed them and pulled them out," said a neighbor, Steve Johnston.

Survivors were treated for cuts, scrapes and a few broken bones, said Chief Eddie Boatwright of the Germantown Police Department.

After Thanksgiving, a stormy and deadly weekend.

Many residents of the neighborhood, where the houses are in the $250,000-to-$500,000 range, were new to the area. Several of the destroyed houses were not yet occupied.

Koji Kuroki, his wife and their two teenage children had been in their house only about two months. They were in the family room when the tornado hit, demolishing the house and leaving them under a mound of debris. They were not injured, and managed to crawl to safety.

"I thought we were being lifted off like the 'Wizard of Oz,' " said Megan Kuroki, 15. "I went down and nothing hit me, so I didn't think anything happened, but the windows blew open. But when I looked up the attic was on top of us."

Four houses that were destroyed had been built by Steadman Estes, and one was his own house. He said he and his wife and daughter crouched over his three granddaughters to shelter them when the tornado hit, ripping off the roof and blowing out doors and windows.

"When that door blew out I knew we might not save it," Mr. Estes said. "That flying glass, I think, is the worst enemy you can have."

Vice President Al Gore said he and President Clinton had directed James Lee Witt, head of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, to help Tennessee assess damages and plan its recovery.

High wind and tornadoes also struck in Mississippi, killing two people.

Hilda Allen of Magee, Miss., said she was home alone when the power went out on Sunday and she heard the storm approaching.

"When I first heard that sound, I got in the closet, she said, "I was in a panic, praying. Then the noise ceased and the water started pouring through the fourth floor of that side."" The heart of the storm moved across the Great Lakes today, spreading snow through New England and whipping up 14-foot waves on Lake Superior. Parts of Minnesota had 15 inches of snow, and schools were closed in Duluth, Minn.

Hundreds of travelers spent the night in motels or shelters in Nebraska, northern Minnesota and western Pennsylvania. Some travelers were forced off Interstate 80 in western Pennsylvania by an ice storm, more than 2,000 people took shelter in a Clearfield County fire station about 150 miles northeast of Pittsburgh late Sunday night. In Du Bois, an industrial city 75 miles northeast of Pittsburgh, the National Weather Service said there was a 90% chance of a tornado striking the area.

The three teenagers who were killed were members of a church youth group that was having a reunion in Germantown. The teenagers were identified as Dewan Drummond, Hope Lott and Benewell G. Rendell said today.

"They are being suspended for unsuitable and rude responses to calls they handled."

Mr. Rendell said that 11 operators who took calls about the incident that night would be transferred and 3 would be suspended and transferred.

"The operators are members of a public employees union, and dismissal procedures require a hearing before they would lose their jobs. The three who are to be transferred would not have to have a hearing. The dispatchers were not identified by name or by the specific telephone calls they handled."

"They are being suspended for abusive and rude responses to calls," Mr. Rendell said. "That is unacceptable."

The teenager was attacked in the Fox Chase neighborhood of the city by as many as 20 youths swinging baseball bats and knives.

I saw the worst enemy you can have."
No Bitterness for New York,
Pataki Tells City Officials
Gov.-Elect to Meet With Mayor Today

By IAN FISHER

Looking a shade sunburned from his Florida trip, Governor-elect George E. Pataki opened the first line of communication with New York City yesterday, noting eight top officials that the campaign's bitterness was behind him and that the city would not be neglected under his administration.

The second and more vital line is to be opened today: Mr. Pataki is to meet in a secret spot with Mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani, who, feeling the sting of Mr. Pataki's rebuffs after the election, refused to attend yesterday's meeting.

Mr. Pataki offered soothing words but few promises in the private meeting yesterday, telling the mostly Democratic group that he bore no grudge against a Mayor and a city that did not vote for him. Even so, one of his top supporters, Borough President Guy V. Molinari of Staten Island, a fellow Republican, continued his very public feud with his former ally, Mr. Giuliani.

"Too bad he's not here," Mr. Molinari, who was Mr. Pataki's city campaign chairman, said as he walked into the meeting at Mr. Pataki's campaign headquarters in Manhattan.

"He missed an opportunity to perhaps meet the next Mayor of the City of New York. That's a possibility in that room." Mr. Molinari elaborated only to explain his absence from the meeting but the implication was clear: he would prefer any of the six Democratic officials at the meeting as Mayor.

Participants said the meeting was an hour long and touched on several dozen issues, from concerns like restructuring the New York Board of Education and protecting the watershed that supplies the city's water, to worries like keeping the Yankees in the Bronx.

Meeting participants said Mr. Pataki stated bluntly that the state had no money for new programs, but also said that he tried to allay concerns that he would arbitrarily cut aid for city services to pay for his administration.

Mr. Pataki told the officials that he excluded himself from the running, obviously not a concluding message to the media. We are working together professionally in the best interests of the future of this city and state," said Mr. Pataki.

Adele Berliner, a program he voted against in the Bronx.

Mr. Pataki also made clear in a news conference afterward that his spot with Mr. Giuliani would not reflect how he governs.

"The success of the city is absolutely critical to the success of his state," said Mr. Pataki, who returned from a working vacation in Florida on Sunday night. "To look back, to hold political grudges, is something that would not just be a disservice to the people of the city. It would be a disservice to the people of the state."

He described the session as "a very policy-oriented meeting, talking about issues and how we can work together."

"That's precisely what I would hope the meeting with the Mayor would be like," he said.

Mr. Pataki declined to say where and when the meeting between him and Mr. Giuliani would take place. "We just want it to be private," he said. "We don't want it to be something where we are looking to get a message across to the media. We are looking to get a message to each other: that is, that we want to work together professionally in the best interests of the future of this city and state."

Aside from Mr. Molinari, the meeting was attended by Comptroller Alan G. Hevesi, Public Advocate Mark J. Green and the four other borough presidents: Fernando Ferrer of the Bronx, Howard Golden of Brooklyn, Ruth W. Messinger of Manhattan and Claire Shulman of Queens.

The second Republican was State Senator Joseph L. Bruno, who was in line to be the next majority leader, that New York City seems to receive a disproportionate share of state money.

Mr. Pataki also made clear in a news conference afterward that his spot with Mr. Giuliani would not reflect how he governs.

"The success of the city is absolutely critical to the success of his state," said Mr. Pataki, who returned from a working vacation in Florida on Sunday night. "To look back, to hold political grudges, is something that would not just be a disservice to the people of the city. It would be a disservice to the people of the state."

He described the session as "a very policy-oriented meeting, talking about issues and how we can work together."

"That's precisely what I would hope the meeting with the Mayor would be like," he said.

Mr. Pataki declined to say where and when the meeting between him and Mr. Giuliani would take place. "We just want it to be private," he said. "We don't want it to be something where we are looking to get a message across to the media. We are looking to get a message to each other: that is, that we want to work together professionally in the best interests of the future of this city and state."

Aside from Mr. Molinari, the meeting was attended by Comptroller Alan G. Hevesi, Public Advocate Mark J. Green and the four other borough presidents: Fernando Ferrer of the Bronx, Howard Golden of Brooklyn, Ruth W. Messinger of Manhattan and Claire Shulman of Queens.

Mr. Green, who ran for United States Senate in 1986, said he found Mr. Pataki's rebuffs after the election, refused to attend yesterday's meeting.

"This was an excellent initial meeting, obviously not a concluding meeting," said Mr. Green, who ran for United States Senate in 1986 against Mr. Pataki's political patron, Alfonse M. D'Amato. "It was more like a first date than a wedding night."

Mr. Green, who ran for United States Senate in 1986 against Mr. Pataki's political patron, Alfonse M. D'Amato. "It was more like a first date than a wedding night."

Mr. Ferger said: "He seemed very engaged, very aware, very interested. Now we'll see if he's very responsive."

Participants said the meeting did not touch on any issue for long — Mr. Molinari estimated that up to 50 separate concerns were raised in a roughly 60-minute session. Mr. Pataki made few promises, they said, other than to repeat a promise during his campaign not to block Medicaid aid funding for abortions for poor women, a program he voted against consistently during 16 years in the Legislature.

The meeting itself had a difficult history. Mr. Pataki had originally scheduled it in Staten Island with Mr. Giuliani and other city officials. It was later moved to Manhattan but Mr. Giuliani still refused to attend, demanding and ultimately getting today's private audience with Mr. Pataki.

At a news conference at City Hall, Mr. Giuliani disagreed with Mr. Molinari that he should have attended the session yesterday. Mr. Molinari suggested that "his ego got in the way."

"I think it's a lot better to do the meeting the way we are doing the meeting," Mr. Giuliani said. "So I differ with the Borough President. I think the meeting will be much more productive and the discussions between and among our staffs have been very productive to date."
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A Growing Rage in Bay Ridge

Change Begets Violence in a Once-Quiet Corner of Brooklyn

By JOE SEXTON
and JENNIFER STEINHAUER

David O'Connor describes his father's occupation as "drinker." He says that the man exited his life by his second birthday and that his mother, a diner waitress, let him take to the streets of Brooklyn at age 14. Now 15, he sleeps in a small bedroom in a group home. He has been arrested once, charged with stealing a car, and is described by administrators at Telecommunicators High School in Bay Ridge as a troubled student. Born to an Irish Catholic family, he says he has no great use for religion.

Instead, David has joined the Netas, a largely Hispanic gang that tends to draw its members from neighborhoods far removed from the middle-class streets of Bay Ridge, Brooklyn.

"They have given me a right way of liv- ing," David said of the Netas. "I'm trying to choose a life of living, I'm against abuse. And there is abuse going on all over." His decision to join the Netas made David O'Connor a rarity, but there are hundreds and the other teen-agers drinking outside his building in Bay Ridge.

The attacks reflect what enforcement officials say is an alarming increase in both random and calculated violence in otherwise stable enclaves of the city. In Bay Ridge, for example, prosecutors and the police have identified loose gangs of white middle-class teen-agers who talk about respect, loyalty and family and who engage in everything from innocuous rowdiness in local parks to the menacing of unsuspecting neighbors, often immigrants or minorities.

Because the assaults are often brutal, and the presence of guns is on the rise. Many residents contend that the attacks in southwest Brooklyn are unrelated aberrations. But for others, they share some traits with the 1986 racial killing in Howard Beach, Queens, and the 1989 murder of Yusuf Hawkins, a black teen-ager, in Bensonhurst, Brooklyn.

"The common thread is hate," said the Brooklyn District Attorney, Charles J. Hynes.

In Bay Ridge another thread is economics. The effects of a persistent recession, say the police and others, have hit households and commercial strips. Families have splintered. And despite the neighborhood's Irish and Italian roots, the Catholic Church is a mostly phantom presence for many, its influence diminished by declining resources, membership and relevance to the young. Local counselors talk of teen-agers coming in to centers for aid and listing "pagan" on medical forms as their religion.

The hardening attitudes among young people have created a number of paradoxes for the neighborhood. Though its politically conservative voters helped elect Rudolph W. Giuliani as Mayor, some now find themselves laments his budget cuts, saying the youth programs that are being eliminated could help keep kids off the street.

And in their urgent search for help, some elected officials and educators have turned to the directors of the Crown Heights Youth Council, for ideas on how to provide direction and guidance for their children.

"There are the same conditions here now as kids face in Harlem or elsewhere," said Neil Kenney, a Fort Hamilton teacher who was born and raised in the neighborhood. "Bay Ridge has created its own monster."
ean immigrant who was the last one left in Dyker Park one evening last September when a group of white teen-agers, enraged over an earlier dispute with other Hispanic men, stumbled upon him.

The police say the neighborhood boys, shouting anti-Hispanic epithets, took their fury out on Mr. Aucaquizhpi with baseball bats and table legs. He died several days later.

Late one night several weeks later Sgt. Louis Cosentino of the transit police confronted a group of teen-agers who were making a racket under his apartment window. They responded with a beating that broke more than a dozen bones in his face, and left him, his pants half off, bleeding in the street.

Anger and Despair, Soaked in Alcohol

The police and other experts say that money and alcohol are at the heart of much of the anger and dissatisfaction. The average household income in Bay Ridge is $42,000, yet more than half the households have two or more family members working full-time.

Ten percent of the neighborhood live below the poverty line. The service jobs at institutions like Metropolitan Life and the Equitable Insurance Company, once large employers of Catholic high school graduates, no longer exist.

One administrator at a Bay Ridge mental health clinic said more than half of the center's 1,000 neighborhood clients use public assistance to pay for the services.

When youth officers knock on the doors of teen-agers who have gotten into trouble, they are often surprised by the destitute quality of the apartments, units that from the street appear well-kept.
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In a sharp turnaround driven by a deepening of the AIDS epidemic, the World Health Organization announced plans this month ahead of plans for the first large trials of the two most widely tested experimental AIDS vaccines. The United States rejected plans for testing the vaccines in this country in June.

By a nearly unanimous decision last month, an advisory panel of experts gave the Geneva-based health organization a green light to design and carry out full-scale trials of the effectiveness of the two experimental vaccines against H.I.V., that are given.

Both vaccines have gone through the first two stages of a three-stage testing system in the United States. But the full-scale trials in third countries may begin substantially later than in the United States.

Because so much preparation needs to be done to design and conduct the phase 3 trials, the United States rejected plans for testing the vaccines in this country in June.

The United States panel said, however, that because public health needs vary among countries, those with higher rates of H.I.V. infection might reach a different decision. More than 80 percent of AIDS cases occur in third world countries, the World Health Organization then asked an international panel whether the vaccines should be tested in one of those countries.

The two widely tested vaccines currently available are derived from a protein, known as gp120, on the surface of H.I.V. that attaches to a human cell, an early step of infection. The two leading contenders are made by Biocine in Emeryville, Calif., a joint venture of the Geo-Gy Corporation and Genentech Inc.

"Panelists were not asked to discuss plans for a specific study because we did not have one," Dr. Piot said. He said the experts were concerned with the possibility of testing the vaccines in third world countries.

AIDS vaccine trials will be started in Thailand and W.H.O. has been working for several years with Thai doctors and scientists from the United States, who have agreed to conduct trials in their country. The United States rejected plans for trials involving 13 experimental vaccines. No vaccine has been tested in third world countries.

The trials will follow standard scientific guidelines. Some volunteers will be injected with an experimental vaccine and others with a placebo. Neither the volunteers nor the researchers will know which injection any of the volunteers received until the trial is completed several years later.

Still, before W.H.O. approves a protocol for the vaccine trials, many questions need to be answered.

One is, how should an AIDS vaccine's effectiveness be measured? Another is, which strains of H.I.V. should be used in making the vaccine? Because of the urgent need for an effective vaccine, many scientists think that an effective vaccine will be injected with a placebo, as is done in the United States.

The trials will follow standard scientific guidelines. Some volunteers will be injected with an experimental vaccine and others with a placebo. Neither the volunteers nor the researchers will know which injection any of the volunteers received until the trial is completed several years later.

If the trials are conducted in third world countries, W.H.O. would like the trials to be held in countries with relatively high rates of H.I.V. infection. The goal is to test vaccines in countries where H.I.V. is most prevalent.

Many issues will be debated before the trials begin. Dr. Piot said W.H.O. is encouraging debate "because we do not want to have any issues that might cause us to stop the vaccine trials in the United States, and to measure the impact of a vaccine in third world countries.

The tests will be performed in third world countries, particularly those with higher rates of H.I.V. infection. The vaccines currently available are derived from strains detected in the United States and in Africa. But the panel decided that no scientific or ethical short cuts could be taken. "We certainly stick to the idea that the first two phases of AIDS vaccine development must be done in the country or origin of the product," Dr. Piot said.

But the policy does not necessarily affect the third phase. For example, Dr. Piot said that 1,069 volunteers had to be interviewed and that several years later, W.H.O. would decide whether to test experimental vaccines in their countries. In particular, they will have to know whether the vaccine trials have been held in the developed world.
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According to the theory of the vaccine trials, the goal is to induce an immune response that will prevent infection with H.I.V. The two leading candidates are the gp120 vaccines. No vaccine has been tested in third world countries.
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U.S. Seeks To Loosen Bank Rules

Proposals to Allow Entry to New Fields

BY KEITH BRADSHAW

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Nov. 28 — In a step that could lead to big banks selling real estate, computer services or possibly even securities, Government regulators proposed rules today that would allow federally chartered banks to enter new lines of business.

The proposals represent the latest erosion of the Glass-Steagal Act, the landmark law that for 61 years has largely barred commercial banks from trading securities. Enacted during the Great Depression in response to the stock market speculation that sank many banks in the early 1930's, the act was aimed at limiting banks to more conservative practices, at least in theory, would be less likely to produce large losses and threaten depositors' savings.

The new rules would allow banks to set up subsidiaries that could undertake any activity "incidental to or within the business of banking." Until now, subsidiaries of federally chartered banks have been limited almost exclusively to banking.

The proposed regulations lay the legal framework for banks to seek permission to trade securities and enter other lines of business. The final decision to grant approval, however, would remain with the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal bank regulatory agency that issued today's proposal.

Comptroller Eugene A. Ludwig refused to say today whether the agency would approve applications to trade securities. But Julie L. Williams, the chief counsel of the Comptroller's office, said the intention was to make it simpler for banks to expand into other businesses. "What we're proposing to do," she said, "is make more flexible the standard for what operating subsidiaries can do."

The new regulations, which are subject to a 60-day public comment period and months of review after that, would also allow banks to own or control 51 percent of the operating subsidiaries, compared with 80 percent now. The lower restriction would make it much easier for banks to form joint ventures with other companies.

Experts differed over what types of businesses banks would be most likely to enter.

H. Rodgin Cohen, a New York banking lawyer familiar with today's proposals, said that the proposed regulations would most likely lead to banks' going into real estate brokerage and into processing data and into marketing activities with the trading subsidiaries. The Comptroller's office reserved the right today to draft rules requiring that each bank's subsidiaries be financially separate from the rest of the bank.

Today's proposal coincides with a push by Mr. Ludwig to discourage the federally chartered banks that are federally involved in the drafting of the regulations. But the proposals are consistent with the Clinton Administration's general position that banks should be allowed to diversify into other industries. Ms. Williams said that today's rules were the result of a yearlong review and that had already been drafted in their current form before Republicans won control of the House and Senate in the elections on Nov. 8.

The new regulations would also make it easier for banks to expand across state borders by allowing them to install automated teller machines anywhere in the country without regulatory permission. The only restriction would be that the machines must provide full access to accounts at many banks.

The proposal goes considerably further than the interstate banking legislation passed this fall by Congress. That law allowed banks to open branches in another state only after acquiring a bank there.

Ms. Casey of the Independent Bankers Association said that small banks might also fight this section of the proposal, which could in theory allow a big bank like Citibank to woo customers in every well-trafficked location, like airports, in the country. But Mr. Ludwig said that the machines provide full access to other financial institutions may discourage big banks from actually pursuing such a strategy.

The first major breach in the Glass-Steagall Act occurred a few years ago when holding companies of some big banks won permission from the Federal Reserve to set up separate subsidiaries for trading securities. J. P. Morgan & Company was the first to do so, obtaining the right to trade corporate debt in 1989 and stocks the following year.

But these holding-company subsidiaries are legally separate from the banks, unlike the operating subsidiaries that today's proposal would allow. The holding-company subsidiaries are also limited to securities trading and cannot engage in activities like real estate brokerage and data processing. Banks are also barred from engaging in joint marketing activities with the trading subsidiaries.

More erosion of financial rules dating from the Depression.
Hospitals' New Creed: Less Is Best

Continued From First Business Page

No Areas Immune From Cost-Cutting

By MILT FREUDENTHEIM

Duke University Medical Center, one of the nation's most prestigious
academic hospitals, has long operated dozens of specialized laborato-
ries, two for tests involving the thyroid gland, for example, and one for
the pancreas.

Now Duke is combining 79 special-
labs into four general units, eliminat-
ing the need for 100 of 360 tech-
icians. "There is no reason to have a
lab for every gland in the body," said
Dr. Mark Rogers, chief executive of
the hospital.

Hospitals like Duke's are rushing
to cut costs and improve their effi-
ciency amid growing pressures from
health insurers to reduce costs. Sometimes big numbers are
involved. Duke, for example, plans to
eliminate 1,500 of 6,500 hospital jobs
and cut its $500 million budget by $65
million a year.

The streamlining at hospitals
could be a good thing for patients,
easier to be treated considerately
and released as soon as is safety
possible. For instance, hospitals are
moving to trim unnecessary repeti-
tions of tests and questions, resched-
uling tests to shorten nerve-racking
waiting time, personalizing bedside
services by assigning a handful of
aides to tend to each patient (as
opposed to dozens) and cutting red-
tape at every step, from the admit-
ting office to departure from the
hospital.

Before checking out, patients are
asked to fill out satisfaction report
cards, which hospitals then use to
improve services and sell them-
sef to insurers, employers and
the community.

But the cost-cutting can go too far.
Dr. Manuel Lowenhaupt, a consult-
ing physician at Duke, said the two
decisions office to 10 minutes from more
than two and a half hours.

The Michigan medical center also
said it saved $35 million by switching
from expensive drugs to lower-cost equiv-
alents and reducing doses to standa-
dard levels.

Smaller, independent hospitals
are also streamlining.

The Brooklyn Hospital Center re-
duced its costs per patient by cutting
the average stay by 17 percent, to 6.5
days, largely by eliminating waiting
time for X-rays and other tests.

Patients with the same disease
are now grouped together. Cancer pa-
tients, for example, could then be
tested in their rooms or just down
the hall, saving the time employees
had spent moving them around the
building. Physicians got results within
hours of sending the sample.

Some employees were retrained.
Near Velez, formerly a dietary aide
who delivered meal trays, now helps
undercare a dozen of patients. "We do
get more done, and we spend more
time with each patient, feed them and transport them for tests," his partner, Damon Ellis,
said. "Patients feel much more com-
fortable - it's a big change.

The Sentara Health System in Vir-
ginia transformed a $2.5 million an-
nual loss to a $1.8 million surplus at
Norfolk General Hospital last year.

The process of billing 300 insurance
companies was cut from about 2 weeks
of bills through about 400 payers to an
average bill now goes through 25 steps,
down from as many as 125 before.

Sentara nurses care for patients and 15 minutes per shift from the time they
were spending on record-keeping.

Nurses no longer write orders on
the patient's request, breakfast, bath and oth-
er routine events. Temperature,
pulse and vital signs are briefly not-
ed on a printed chart. "Now the
nurse writes down only something
that is out of the ordinary," said
David Berndt, executive vice presi-
dent of Sentara.

Many hospitals are investing in
computer programs to save on pa-
perwork as they monitor patients
24 hours a day. Costs. Dr. Charles
securities analysts in San Francisco
with Volpe, Weedy & Co., said
hospitals spend $30 million a year
average alone last year. He projects an
increase to $60 million in four years.

Hospitals desperately need to esti-
mate their costs accurately under
managed-care contracts, which typi-
cally make the hospital responsible
for any cost overruns, said Law-
rence J. Frye, president of Jimeter
Inc., a hospital consulting firm.

Making better use of computers
already on hand is often a first step.

There is no

reason to have a

lab for every gland

in the body.
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Scott Raising Prices

PHILADELPHIA, Nov. 28 (AP) — The Scott Paper Company said to-
day that it would increase the prices
of its tissue paper brands by 3 percent to 8 percent in the United
States, effective Jan. 6. Scott prod-
ucts include Scott Tissue and Daily,
elle toilet paper; Viva paper towels;
Scotties facial tissue; Scott and Viva
kitchen and bath tissues, and Fresh
kims moistened wipes. Scott, with $5
billion in annual sales, sells its produc-
ts in about 80 countries.
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**CREDIT MARKETS**

**Strong Economic Signs Drive Bond Prices Down**

BY ROBERT HURTADO

Prices of Treasury securities were down across the board yesterday, as the bond market, having benefited from investors' shifting money out of stocks last week, reversed course.

Kevin McClintock, manager of fixed-income portfolios for Aetius Investment Management Inc. in Hartford, cited reports of October home sales growth and strong Christmas sales as a troublesome twosome for bonds yesterday.

In the first of a batch of economic reports expected this week, the National Association of Realtors said sales of existing homes rose an unexpectedly strong five-tenths of 1 percent in October to an annual rate of 3.91 million, after slipping a revised 1 percent in September to 3.89 million. Originally September sales were reported as a 1 percent gain.

The 30-year bond declined 13/32 of a percentage point, to 94 19/32, for a yield of 7.98 percent, up from 7.94 percent on Friday. Shorter maturities also fell in price.

**Key Rates**

---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8.50 | 7.45 | 5.83 | 5.56 | 7.98 | 8.90 | 7.24 |

**MUNICIPAL BONDS**

30-YR. TREAS. BONDS | 6-MO. TREAS. BILLS | 10-YR. TREAS. NOTES | DISCOUNT RATE
---|---|---|---
7.24 | 7.27 | 7.53 | 5.86

**Average Rates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Average Discounted Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec.</td>
<td>5.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td>5.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct.</td>
<td>5.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yesterday's biggest offering was by Smith Barney Inc. The 30-year bond declined 13/32 of a percentage point, to 94 19/32, for a yield of 7.98 percent, up from 7.94 percent on Friday. Shorter maturities also fell in price.
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The early signs of holiday sales matching or even surpassing last year's 6 percent gain helped put a floor on the bond market. Although yields rose, the Treasury sold $2.7 billion of new issues.
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Britain and France Criticize U.S. on Bosnia Positions

By RICHARD W. STEVENSON
Special to The New York Times

LONDON, Nov. 28 — The divisions between the United States and Western Europe over Bosnia erupted into unusually blunt public feuding today, as leaders of Britain and France lashed out at American pressure to lift the arms embargo on the Bosnian Serbs.

With frustration clearly mounting among NATO members after the assembly Bosnian Serbs on the Muslim enclave of Bihac, the British Defense Secretary, Malcolm Rifkind, said he was back at contacts by Senator Bob Dole that implied that Britain was primarily responsible for a lack of a strong military response by NATO.

Mr. Rifkind said American politicians who singled out Britain as blocking decisive action by the North Atlantic alliance in Bosnia were "behaving disgracefully," given that Britain has 3,500 troops serving in the United Nations peacekeeping force there while the United States has none.

In Paris, a joint statement by President Francois Mitterrand and Prime Minister Edouard Balladur said any moves to lift the arms embargo — a step that has gained in favor — would not take part in the only kind of military action and defended their stance.

British Prime Minister John Major told a radio interviewer: "I think that when we have thousands of brave British soldiers — some of whom have lost their lives in Bosnia — giving of their all to help the cause of peace, it ill becomes people in the countries that have not provided a single soldier on the ground to make that kind of criticism."

Today Mr. Dole issued a statement saying: "One of the keys to a healthy alliance has been close U.S. and British ties. I hope we can narrow our differences over Bosnia, and reaffirm our commitment to a credible NATO."

Mr. Major underscored Britain’s position today in a meeting with Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto of Pakistan, who called for military action to help the Bosnian Muslims. British officials said Mr. Major had argued that increased use of air strikes would be of little use militarily and would not help protect civilians. They said Mr. Major had told the Pakistani leader that lifting the arms embargo would only worsen the conflict.

The United States said two weeks ago that it would stop actively encouraging the Muslim-led Government of Bosnia. The UN-led Government of Bosnia. The

Unusually blunt public feuding by the allies.

French statement seemed to blame the American position for encouraging the Muslims to begin a new offensive, provoking counterattacks by the Bosnian Serbs and the siege of Bihac.

"The tragic events in Bihac show that any encouragement given to the reconquest of territory by force — and notably the prospect of lifting the arms embargo — is vain or dangerous," the French said. "It only feeds the cycle of violence to the detriment of the search for a negotiated settlement, which is the only durable solution to the conflict among the Bosnian communities."

Meeting in Brussels, European Union foreign ministers argued against American calls for tougher military action and defended their diplomatic efforts. Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd of Britain said Europe had "no reason to be ashamed" of its diplomatic efforts, especially when the United States would not take part in the only kind of military option that would have a chance of imposing peace, an extensive allied ground operation.

On Tuesday, Mr. Dole, the Republican from Kansas who will probably become the Senate majority leader when the new Congress convenes next year, is scheduled to meet NATO officials in Brussels and then to travel to London to meet Prime Minister John Major, Mr. Hurd and Mr. Rifkind on Wednesday.

Mr. Dole said on Sunday that there had been a "complete breakdown" of NATO caused by the vetoing of air strikes by "the British and the French, I must say, primarily the British." Responding to that, Mr. Rifkind told a radio interviewer: "I think that when we have thousands of brave British soldiers — some of whom have lost their lives in Bosnia — giving of their all to help the cause of peace, it ill becomes people in the countries that have not provided a single soldier on the ground to make that kind of criticism."

Today Mr. Dole issued a statement saying: "One of the keys to a healthy alliance has been close U.S. and British ties. I hope we can narrow our differences over Bosnia, and reaffirm our commitment to a credible NATO."

Mr. Major underscored Britain’s position today in a meeting with Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto of Pakistan, who called for military action to help the Bosnian Muslims. British officials said Mr. Major had argued that increased use of air strikes would be of little use militarily and would not help protect civilians. They said Mr. Major had told the Pakistani leader that lifting the arms embargo would only worsen the conflict, and that the only way to reach peace was through a negotiated settlement.

Without identifying the United States but in a barb aimed directly at Washington, Mr. Annan was critical of the Administration’s decision not to offer ground forces to augment the 25,000 United Nations troops already in Bosnia.

"I believe the U.N. is being made a scapegoat — of course we do have a scapegoat function," Mr. Annan said to reporters shortly after he held a news conference here.

"But it is absolutely unfair when member states do not want to take the risks — when they do not want to commit the resources — but blame the U.N. for failure to act," he added.
U.S.-Russian Space Mission Stumbles, With Delivery Delays at Customs

BY WILLIAM J. BROAD

The first major step in an effort to get beyond the cold war in space has stumbled as the delivery of gear for an American-Russian mission early next year has been delayed by, among other things, problems at Russian customs.

An American astronaut, Norman E. Thagard, is to fly into orbit atop a Russian rocket and work for three months in a Russian space station. Dr. Thagard, a physician, was to have performed biomedical experiments with American equipment while aboard the Russian space station, which is known as Mir.

But delays in the delivery of almost a ton of American gear have caused the launching date of its cargo module, Star City, Russia, next February, to fall months behind schedule. In response, NASA is struggling to find other ways for the physician to do productive work during his orbit stay.

The mission is the first stage of space cooperation that is to culminate in the building of a giant 60 billion space station for astronauts of East and West. In theory, the station is to be assembled in orbit between 1997 and 2002.

Officials of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration say the equipment delay is insignificant, especially since the first phase of cooperation was meant to uncover such difficulties.

"The whole purpose of the program was to learn how to work together," said Robert W. Clarke, NASA's top official for international affairs. "We expected that there would be some bumps in the road." But private experts say that the stumble bodes ill for future cooperation with Russia and that its timing is politically dangerous given the uncertainties the joint effort will face in the new Republican-controlled Congress.

"This whole thing is at a very delicate stage," said John E. Pike, head of space policy for the Federation of American Scientists, a private group in Washington. "It would not take very much destabilization for the whole thing to come undone."

Cooperation with Russia in space is a main foreign-policy initiative of the Clinton Administration. It is intended to symbolize a new era of accord and to engage Moscow in constructive space work in return for ending practices that upset Washington, like exporting advanced rocket gear to developing countries.

Dr. Thagard, who is in training in Russia, is a 51-year-old physician, electrical engineer and former Marine Corps aviator. His mission on the 110-foot-long, 90-ton Mir station is scheduled to begin March 14 and to end in June after the space shuttle Atlantis docks with the Russian outpost to pick him up and to rotate Russian crew members.

The Russian module at the center of the storm is known as Spectr, which is Russian for spectrum. It is 40 feet long and weighs 20 tons and is to be the third large add-on module to the Mir station, the core of which was lofted by Moscow in 1986.

Originally, Spectr was to have been launched into space next February, so its load of American equipment—worth $55 million—would be available for further joint research. So far, at least four stays by American astronauts are scheduled for Mir. NASA astronauts John E. Blaha and Dr. Shannon W. Lucid were recently selected for the second visit, and will begin training in Star City, Russia, next February.

"Spectr's going to be up there for the rest of the lifetime of Mir, at least until 1997, so there'll be plenty of time for us to shake the stuff out and get into it," Mr. Clarke said. "People who see this as the beginning of a collapse are looking at one small piece of a tree rather than the forest. We've made massive strides."

An ominous start for a new era of cooperation in space.
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Ukraine Gets Reformer at the Helm

Newly Elected President Is Trying to Free the Economy

By JANE PERLEZ
Special to The New York Times

MYRIONIVKA, Ukraine — Andriy K. Kuchma, one of this bankrupt country's progressive farm managers, is doing just about everything he can to make money. He has a contract with Italians to make smart leather atta-
cescases. A sewing shop is making expensive clothes for Germany. Caged minks and foxes are being readied for fur hats.

People are very angry about the economy, "and a small spark can bring a blowup here," said Mr. Deng a, a onetime local Communist Party boss who wears a suit as he shows weekend visitors plows and cows. "That's why we have to pro-
cess agricultural material here rath-
er than sell it at very low prices."

As Mr. Deng a tries to wean his farm here, 60 miles south of Kiev, from the state, he is setting an exam-
ple for the kind of flexibility that is being encouraged by the new Ukrainian President, Leonid Kuchma, the first economic reformer to come to power since Ukraine declared independence in 1991.
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Nepal to Have First Elected Communist Government in Asia

BY JOHN F. BURNS
Special to The New York Times

KATMANDU, Nov. 28 — Efforts by the ruling Nepali Congress Party to block Nepal's Communists from coming to power collapsed today, clearing the way for the first democratically elected Communist government in Asia.

Officials at the royal palace in Katmandu said they expected the Communist leader, Man Mohan Adhikary, to make an early visit to King Birendra, possibly on Tuesday, to begin the process of forming a government.

Despite lacking a majority of seats in the Parliament chosen in a general election two weeks ago, the Communists have said they will govern alone, relying on other parties for support on an issue-by-issue basis, starting with a parliamentary vote of confidence that a new government must win within 30 days.

The breakthrough for the Communists came when the Nepali Congress, which won 83 seats to the main Communist group's 88 seats in the 205-seat Parliament, abandoned attempts to form a center-right coalition with the New Democratic Party, a monarchist group that won 20 seats. Earlier, Congress party leaders rejected a Communist proposal to have the three parties govern Nepal in a "grand coalition."

Although Communists have contested parliamentary elections in India for decades, and have ruled in the Indian state of West Bengal for many years, the formation of a government in Nepal will mark the first time that Communists have ruled in any nation in the Indian sub-continent.

So far, the prospect has caused little concern among the Western nations, including the United States, whose aid donations are crucial to the economy of Nepal. Western diplomats here, including Carol Vogelguth, the United States Ambassador, said they will uphold the 1990 constitution and the multi-party democracy it enshrines.

Mr. Adhikary, the Communist leader, has said that a Communist government will not challenge the position of King Birendra, who has had mainly titular powers since conceding to protesters demanding democracy that shook Nepal four years ago.

In the election, the Communists said they would confiscate the land of some of the country's largest landowners, enforce land sales by absentee landlords who are not among the largest landowners and impose a ceiling for all land holdings. They also said they would encourage collective farming.

Among other things, they have said they will uphold the 1990 constitution and the multi-party democracy it enshrines. A coalition of mostly Marxist-Leninist parties, has been gaining momentum because of what political analysts say is growing voter dissatisfaction over political gridlock. The Broad Front, which includes Communists, socialists, and former Tupamaro guerrillas, won the municipal elections in Montevideo and was for the first time within reach of gaining the presidency.

Hundreds of other offices were also decided, including members of Congress, mayors and municipal courts. The three parties were expected to evenly split the seats in Congress. Perhaps Mr. Sanguinetti's greatest challenge will be forging a coalition within Congress to achieve a legislative agenda.

Moderate Leftist Elected in Close Uruguayan Presidential Race

BY CALVIN SIMS
Special to The New York Times

MONTEVIDEO, Uruguay, Nov. 28 — In what political analysts call Uruguay's closest election ever, former President Julio Sanguinetti of the opposition Colorado Party claimed victory today in a tight three-way race for the presidency.

Mr. Sanguinetti, 58, who was President for most of the country's modern history, won the presidency for the first time within reach of the leftist Broad Front. "With Sanguinetti, they know what they are getting," Mr. Linn said.
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Europe Lifts Its Embargo Against Syria

BRUSSELS, Nov. 28 (Reuters) — The European Union lifted its eight-year-long arms embargo against Syria today, angering Israel, which called the move a mistake.

The embargo was imposed in 1986 after suggestions that Syria was involved in a thwarted attempt to smuggle explosives onto an Israeli El Al airliner in London. It was lifted at a meeting of European Union foreign ministers here.

Foreign Minister Shimon Peres of Israel and Yasir Arafat, who is the leader of the new Palestinian self-rule Government in the Gaza Strip and Jericho, are holding talks in Brussels during the meeting. They said today that they discussed the prospects for elections in the self-rule areas.

They urged donors to keep their promises to pump money into the region. The donors are also now meeting in Brussels.

Mr. Peres called the lifting of the embargo on Syria a mistake.

Farouk al-Sharaa, the Foreign Minister of Syria, said the decision was a rebuff to Israeli attempts to meddle in other countries' internal affairs.

Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd of Britain said the decision had been made without dissent. He said Britain had proposed lifting the embargo earlier this year.

Other European Union sanctions against Syria had gradually been lifted from 1987 to 1990, when Syria sided with the West in the Persian Gulf war.

Mr. Arafat said an agreement on elections could be reached quickly.

"The Israelis understand our need for quick elections, but at the same time we also have to understand the necessity for security," he said, accompanied by Mr. Peres as he spoke to reporters.

Under the agreement for limited self-rule signed by the Palestinian Liberation Organization and Israel six months ago, elections were to have taken place in July. However, talks got bogged down over the nature and size of the elected assembly and whether Palestinian groups that reject the self-rule deal should be allowed to offer candidates for office.

"Basically whatever is democratic is acceptable to us," Mr. Peres said.

World News Briefs

U.N. Says North Korea Halted Nuclear Program

VIENNA, Nov. 28 (Reuters) — Inspectors from the United Nations atomic monitoring agency have verified that North Korea has halted its nuclear program and stopped building two nuclear reactors in accordance with its agreement with the United States, the monitoring agency said today.

The International Atomic Energy Agency said that its inspectors, who arrived in North Korea last week, had visited atomic sites there and had confirmed that work had been stopped.

A technical team from the agency held a series of talks with North Korean officials to develop a framework for making certain that North Korea was complying with the agreement.

The statement said that some verification measures, which were understood to include inspections, had already been carried out.

The agreement was sought because United States and its allies suspected that North Korea had used atomic fuel from its reactors to develop nuclear weapons.

North Korea agreed to freeze its nuclear program in return for Western help and money to replace its reactors with light-water models that produce less of the plutonium that can be used to make weapons.

Zairian Troops Seize Rwandan Refugee Camp

GOMA, Zaire, Nov. 28 (Reuters) — Zairian troops have taken control of a camp for Rwandan refugees where 19 people were killed last week, aid workers said today.

Zairian commandos were flown in from the capital, Kinshasa, over the weekend and took control of the Katala camp, which has a population of more than 200,000. Soldiers from the defeated Rwandan army and allied militias are reported to have taken over the refugee camps in Zaire, terrorizing the other refugees.

The Zairian troops expelled 27 Rwandans from Katala on Sunday, saying that the action was a crackdown on crime. Aid workers said the Zairians also burned down huts, looted Rwandans' property and confined the refugees to one site.

The 37 refugees who were expelled were handed over to troops of the new Rwandan Government, the former rebels who won the country's civil war. They were the first Rwandan refugees handed over to the new Government.

Rio Drug Raid Included Torture, Witnesses Say

RIO DE JANEIRO, Nov. 28 (Reuters) — Brazilian soldiers who took part in a raid on a Rio de Janeiro shantytown last week to look for drug traffickers tortured suspects with beatings and near drownings, a Roman Catholic priest said today.

"I saw about 15 youths lying on the floor of the church, their hands behind their backs with someone asking them questions," the Rev. Olindo Antonio Pegoraro said in an interview on Brazilian television. "There was blood, lots of blood, on the floor."

The priest said he saw soldiers forcing the heads of young men into a water tank and holding them there until they almost drowned.

The daily newspaper O Globo also reported allegations of mistreatment of suspects during the operation. A group of nuns told the newspaper they saw police officers applying electric shocks to various people.

No one was available for comment at the Eastern Military Command, which coordinated the raid.

The incidents were said to have occurred during the occupation of a shantytown called borel by more than 1,000 soldiers, the largest so far in a three-week military crackdown on organized crime in Rio.
The Poor Need Child Labor

By Kaushik Basu

S

ITHACA, N.Y. — Something like 100 million children worldwide work as laborers, 98 percent of them in poor countries. Many, if not most, work for long hours and minuscule wages. This tragic phenomenon is being used as a club with which to beat the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which Congress is considering this week. In a separate measure, some lawmakers have proposed banning the importing of goods produced using the labor of children under 15. GATT includes no such restrictions, although it might take up the issue in the future.

But while the effort to ban child labor has the support of many well-meaning people and groups, it is based on deeply flawed premises. First, its inspiration is clearly protectionist. An early version of the bill reads, "Adult workers in the United States are the child's parents. And while some parents in every country are callous and abusive, it is patronizing to pretend that the cause of mass child labor in so many poor countries is lack of parental concern.

Few parents would send their children to work unless they were driven to it by poverty and hunger. While child labor should be illegal where it is rampant, made her much heralded re-

CRITIQUE OF CONTEMPORARY THEORY.

"The Less-Developed Economy: A

STATEs and other developed countries should not have their jobs imperiled by imports produced by child labor in developing countries." (The current version, which is far more polished, omits that sentence.)

But even if the bill's sponsors are motivated solely by concern for children, their logic does not stand up. To seek the abolition of child labor is to claim that we are more concerned about the well-being of the child than are the child's parents. And while some parents in every country are callous and abusive, it is patronizing in the extreme to suppose that the cause of mass child labor in so many poor countries is lack of parental concern.

A ban might feel good. But it's no solution. As Ms. McNair launched into the second of two encores, Ms. Horne wheeled the cake out. "I couldn't have been happier," Ms. McNair said. "I'm not the sort of person who enjoys being in the spotlight. I prefer to deflect off someone else, especially someone like Martin Katz." (A review of the recital is on Page C13.)
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Culture
By Coercion

Robert Brustein is artistic director of the American Repertory Theater in Cambridge, Mass. His latest book is "Dumbocracy in America."

By Robert Brustein

CAMBRIDGE, Mass. — Of a number of years, American culture in their been asked to shoulder obligations once considered the responsi-

bility of our politics, and this has radically altered the way we now regard the arts.

Staggering under large-scale defi-
cits, our nonprofit cultural institutions are nevertheless being asked to vali-
date themselves not through creative contributions but on the basis of com-
munity services. As Alexis de Tocque-
ville observed: "For men of na-
tionations will habitually prefer the useful to the beautiful, and they will require that the beautiful be useful."

The current pressure on the arts to be useful increasingly causes those who support them to measure their value by outreach programs, children's projects, access for the handicapped and artists in schools.

Given the limited resources available for both social and cultural pro-
grams, the humanitarian agencies that disburse the grant money do not believe that a single dollar can fulfill a double purpose, just as many con-
temporary artists would prefer their works to function not only as a form of self-expression but also for the public good.

This is surely true not only of Federal, state and civic cultural agencies, where the arts are vulner-
able to populist political pressures, but also of most private funding or-
ganizations. In a recent issue of the newsletter Corporate Philanthropy Report, an unidentified contributions manager is bluntly quoted as fol-
lows: "We no longer 'support' the arts; we use the arts in innovative ways to support the social causes chosen by our company."

With a few significant exceptions (most notably the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and the Shubert Founda-
tion), large and small private foun-
dations now give their money not to general support as in the past but overwhelmingly to special programs conceived by the officers of the foun-
dations themselves rather than toward the choices of artists and the programming of artistic institutions, the foundation world is now engaged in what can only called coercive phi-

lanthropy.

For example, the Lila Wallace-
Reader's Digest Fund, which handed out $45 million to the arts in 1993, describes its three-year program for resident theaters thus: "To expand their marketing efforts, mount new plays, broaden the ethnic makeup of their management, experiment with colorblind casting, increase community outreach activity and sponsor a variety of other programs designed to integrate the theaters into their communities." What the foundation fails to "expand" or "broaden" or "sponsor" is an artistic goal.

Similarly, the Rockefeller Founda-
tion, among the most enlight-
ened supporters of artists and artistic institutions, now disburse about $15 million annually in the arts and hu-

manities division, mostly to scholars and occasionally to artists if their work "advance international and intercultural understanding in the United States." To judge by recent annual reports, the phrase alludes almost exclusively to African, Asian, American Indian and especially His-
panic countries and cultures. Only 8 out of 87 grants for 1993 could be construed as escaping these catego-
ries, while the largest award, almost $2 million, went to the International Film/Video Program, which enables video artists to "create work that explores cultural diversity."

As for the Ford Foundation — its dynamic arts division under W. Michel Lowrey in the 80s and 70's was largely responsible for the enor-
mous explosion of nonprofit dance, theater, symphony and opera com-
panies (many racially di-
verse institutions) — the diminishing arts budget ($3.5 million in 1993, out of $24 million for education and culture) is intended to "enlarge op-
portunities for minority artists and to strengthen minority arts institu-
tions."

There is no doubt that a lock-step mentality rules philanthropic fash-
tions: today's flavors of the week (or decade) are cultural diversity and multiculturalism. Even the John D. and Ca f. grants MacArthur Foun-
dation, originally devoted to reward-
ing "genius" regardless of race or ethnic back, went to the International Film/Video Program, which enables video artists to "create work that explores cultural diversity."

Of the four grants awarded to per-
forming artists this year (three to gifted people of color), the only white male recipient is a "theater arts educator," whose main qualification for genius was to have founded "a theater company, for inner-city chil-
dren of Manhattan's Clinton Neigh-
borhood and the Times Square wel-
fare hotels."

It is difficult to criticize this kind of philanthropy without being accused of insensitivity to minorities. But it may be a serious error to assume that all the foundation dollars being poured into developing diverse audiences are successfully democratizing American culture. What we need is rigorous documentation regarding the impact of these grants.

My own experience suggests that what typically attracts minority au-
diences to the arts is not mass indu-
sions of audience development mon-
ey, even special racial or ethnic projects. Rather, it is the quality of the art itself, though quality is now considered a code word for racist or elitism in most philanthropic cy-

cles.

The best way to stimulate appreci-
ation for quality is through arts edu-
cation in the schools, an area that has been unconscionably neglected. Effective projects like the Teachers

and Writers Collaborative, of New York City, in which poor kids are introduced to language and poetry by practicing poets, are rare and privately subsidized. No wonder the infrequent visit of a dance company on a grant often leaves children baffled and sullen when the system em-
ploys so few full-time arts teachers to stimulate their imaginations.

Whatever its impact on education or its success in minority communi-
ties, the new coercive philanthropy is demonizing many artists and artistic institutions. The entire cul-
tural world is bending itself into con-
tortions in order to find the right shape for grants under the new cri-
teria. Like other institutions that poorly perform the new calisthenics, my own theater has received no money for its customary activities from Ford, Rockefeller and Wallace for more than four years.

In a typical stab at conformity, a "diversity initiative consultant" was recently hired by a major symphony orchestra in my community to induce "cultural awareness" and to sensitize perceptions of the "diversity of cul-
tures in your work environment."

Given such pressing needs, it is understandable why phi-

lanthropy should rush to the aid of minority groups clamoring for rec-
ognition through creative expres-
sion. But to ask the impoverished agencies of culture to compensate for the failures of society is to divert attention from the systemic inertia and mismanaged social programs of our legislators.

By forcing artistic expression to become a conduit for social justice and equal opportunity instead of achieving these goals through basic humane legislation, we are distract-

ing our artists and absolving our politicians.
Political intellectuals are having a nasty argument about what history should be taught to American schoolchildren. Tales you hear indicate that whatever history may be taught in the future, at present kids learn practically none of any kind.

I remember (if you will allow me to wander off from the present) a teacher in a first-rate private school had hitherto let on? a teacher was exquisite. Students to hear words like that, and the out teacher's saying "seduced." most at once. What woke me was the sister was seduced by I've forgotten who, or whom as I would have written it was like being asked to choose mythology to orient himself In a complicated, passing tests, but utterly useless to a college was well behind me.

The one time I awakened in high school was at mention of some medieval drudge or king whose sister was seduced by I've forgotten who, or whom as I would have written it was like being asked to choose mythology to orient himself In a complicated, passing tests, but utterly useless to a college was well behind me.

My history learning was a bone-yard of unrelated facts useful for passing tests, but utterly useless to a person who should have been trying to learn about some history in a long-running show. What a shabby store of facts.

The names of the stars of that second-rate show were Romeo, Juliet, Othello, Macbeth. I thought they told the kids of some improbable future.

Evidence of equally preposterous ignorance turns up in the papers with comic regularity. Yet we have this serious quarrel among ostensibly serious people about what history in the second-rate show should be taught to American schoolchildren. Tales you hear indicate that whatever history may be taught in the future, at present kids learn practically none of any kind. Why? My friends and I remember hearing an apparently normal high school student. Amazed to hear a graybeard refer to the First World War! cries, "I never knew there was a First World War!"

Evidence of equally preposterous ignorance turns up in the papers with comic regularity. Yet we have this serious quarrel among ostensibly serious people about what history in the second-rate show should be taught to American schoolchildren. Tales you hear indicate that whatever history may be taught in the future, at present kids learn practically none of any kind. Why? My friends and I remember hearing an apparently normal high school student. Amazed to hear a graybeard refer to the First World War! cries, "I never knew there was a First World War!"

I doubt that many schoolchildren could be brought to value history or enjoy the delights of its tantalizing subjectivity. Much of its pleasure lies in discovering its ironies, and irony is uncommon in the typical school. It follows that we should limit our advice, especially on a country's internal affairs. The Public Safety program acquired an unsavory reputation that between 1974 and 1978 Congress phased it out and closed the International Police Academy. The more lurid allegations — that U.S. advisers had trained police forces in tortures and had provided electric-shock equipment — were unfounded and preposterous. Our police have often been the harsh enforcers of a repressive class structure.

The idea of "professionalization" is most appealing to career diplomats and bureaucrats who are well insulated from the grim realities of third world politics. The Public Safety Program represented an unthinking projection of a conventional police force into environments where policemen have often been the harsh enforcers of a repressive class structure.

As soon as the Administration added internal security to the program's agenda, American governments became much more interested in our equipment than our advice, especially on that would have been "professionalizing." The one time I awakened in high school was at mention of some medieval drudge or king whose sister was seduced by I've forgotten who, or whom as I would have written it was like being asked to choose mythology to orient himself In a complicated, passing tests, but utterly useless to a college was well behind me.

The one time I awakened in high school was at mention of some medieval drudge or king whose sister was seduced by I've forgotten who, or whom as I would have written it was like being asked to choose mythology to orient himself In a complicated, passing tests, but utterly useless to a college was well behind me.

The idea of "professionalization" is most appealing to career diplomats and bureaucrats who are well insulated from the grim realities of third world politics. The Public Safety Program represented an unthinking projection of a conventional police force into environments where policemen have often been the harsh enforcers of a repressive class structure.

As soon as the Administration added internal security to the program's agenda, American governments became much more interested in our equipment than our advice, especially on that would have been "professionalizing." The one time I awakened in high school was at mention of some medieval drudge or king whose sister was seduced by I've forgotten who, or whom as I would have written it was like being asked to choose mythology to orient himself In a complicated, passing tests, but utterly useless to a college was well behind me.

The idea of "professionalization" is most appealing to career diplomats and bureaucrats who are well insulated from the grim realities of third world politics. The Public Safety Program represented an unthinking projection of a conventional police force into environments where policemen have often been the harsh enforcers of a repressive class structure.

As soon as the Administration added internal security to the program's agenda, American governments became much more interested in our equipment than our advice, especially on that would have been "professionalizing."
It’s Time for Israel to Risk Peace With Syria

To the Editor:

"A Peace Pact? Only If It’s Genuine" (Op-Ed, Nov. 21), Benjamin Netanyahu paints a bleak picture of the prospects of a Golan Heights-for-peace deal with Syria in order to scare the American public away from supporting a peace treaty between Israel and Syria.

More than 20 years ago I walked with Mr. Netanyahu on the paths of the Golan Heights, on both sides of the border. The distance between Syrian and Israeli military forces was then only a few yards wide. Following the cease-fire and the disengagement agreements of the 1973 war, that distance grew to three to four miles. In future security arrangements the distance will increase to 10 miles.

According to the proposed agreement between the two countries, the Golan Heights will be demilitarized, and an international force will be positioned between the two sides. The strategic threat to Israel from its northern border will be neutralized, and a new era will dawn in the Middle East: a comprehensive peace between Israel and its neighbors. I would say to my friend Bibi Netanyahu that it is time to take risks. When we served in the military, we had a slogan written on the walls: He who dares will win. I am sure he remembers that!

The Israeli public is ready for peace and determined to achieve it. The peace negotiations initiated by the Rabin Government, and that when the day comes, the majority of the people will support the final agreement.

AVSHALOM VILAN
New York, Nov. 23, 1994

The writer is a co-founder of the Peace Now movement and the Meretz Party of Israel.

P.L.O. Pact’s Necessity

To the Editor:

The last time Benjamin Netanyahu piled on for your paper, I chastised his likening the Principles of the Israel-Palestine Liberation Organization accord signed last year at the White House to the Munich agreement. I also criticized his debating Israeli politics in The New York Times, an action no-no in Likud party practice.

Because of that, when I met him at a Jerusalem restaurant the Friday evening before the signing of the Israeli-Jordan peace, he scowled and told me that "this peace" (pointing east to Jordan) "is a good one, but that one" (thumping south toward the Gaza Strip) "is a bad one and will fail apart!"

Mr. Netanyahu should understand that there could not have been peace with Jordan without an accommodation with the Palestinians on the West Bank and in Gaza, and with their representatives known as the P.L.O. I would prefer to trust matters of Israel’s defense to an autonomous hero of Israel’s war independence and of the 1967 war, Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin.

The Israeli public has been told for decades, since the Golan Heights were seized in 1967, that their retention was vital to Israel’s security. Retention may be important psychologically, but in an age of missiles and other sophisticated weaponry, the military importance of those Heights may be debatable, especially if there are United Nations troops, American monitors, and whatever peace treaty is eventually signed. Token United States troops still sit in the Sinai as a result of the peace with Egypt.

On that evening in Jerusalem, I congratulated Mr. Netanyahu and his wife on the birth of their child. I trust that they would prefer that child to grow up in a peaceful Middle East.

EDGAR M. BRONFMAN
President, World Jewish Congress
New York, Nov. 22, 1994

Nurturing the Process

To the Editor:

"Israelp.L.O. Talks: A Growing Mistrust" (news analysis, Nov. 18) should lay to rest "the conventional wisdom" that existed when I founded Peace Now in 1978. Israeli leaders told me Jewish-Arab hatred would melt once Israel came to an agreement with Arab neighbors. I still believe that document the enmity has not even eroded among the Jewish and Israeli leaders who nurture peace.

For the last 18 years of experience in bringing together 80,000 Israeli Jews and Palestinians in business, education, sports, arts, women’s and community projects, I have witnessed how common action unites people and builds trust and understanding.

For the peace process to progress trust-building must now be nurtured by placing community peace worker trainees in every major Israeli Jewish and Israeli Arab city. During periods of calm in Gaza and the West Bank, Israeli-Palestinian cooperative enterprises and activities have been conducted by these Israeli and Palestinian trainees.

Indeed, the community worker-trainer, especially of Palestinians from the West Bank and Gaza, could prevent intracommunal Palestinian violence. The transition from occupation to autonomy in Gaza and the West Bank fosters social conflict.

Palestinians trained as community workers could reinforce and build upon the volunteerism and community activism in the West Bank and Gaza during Israeli occupation. Trained Palestinian community workers could help Palestinians identify their community needs and empower the people to set their community's agenda and thereby control their own destiny.

It is also time to lay to rest the conventional wisdom about the benefits of foreign aid. Economic prosperity helps. But throwing money at people never made them tranquil or like each other.

Indeed, in the volatile Middle East, emotions are historic, and disaffection for both Jews and Arabs. The large-scale training of Israeli and Palestinian peace workers to deal with communal emotions is critical. Palestinian Muslims must feel empowered for social and economic peace. Jews and Arabs must begin to recognize one another's humanity. (Rabbi) BRUCE M. COHEN
International Director
Interns for Peace
Tel Aviv, Nov. 21, 1994

Tumult in Suffolk

Even in Suffolk County, L.I., which likes its politics tough and noisy, District Attorney James Catterson is a standout, aggressive in manner and harsh with opponents. He says he makes enemies because he makes difficult decisions and does not suffer miscreants gladly. Prominent officials accuse him of threatening to use grand juries against them unless they bow to his wishes.

Those charges, amounting, if true, to abuse of office or misuse of the justice system, they need investigating—preferably by a special prosecutor or agency not based on Long Island. Governor George E. Pataki is considering a request by the county’s executive and legislature for a special prosecutor, is in the best position to devise a proper inquiry before he leaves office.

Tumult in Suffolk, Long Island’s tumultuous county, is a microcosm of the county’s tumultuous politics which were the best choice to investigate.
For Freer Trade — and Better Jobs

Senator Bob Dole, who once threatened to bury the global trade agreement signed by 124 nations, has now put America's interests first. He has signed onto the accord after extracting innocent side agreements from the White House. Mr. Dole, whose threats were harshly criticized on this page, deserves full credit for rising above politics to rescue an agreement fashioned over seven years of tortured negotiations. His leadership has made it likely, barring last-minute defections by Democrats, that the Senate will approve the trade agreement on Thursday after the House does so today. Countries around the world will quickly follow suit.

Though Mr. Dole's approval removed much of the drama, the importance of the vote should not be overlooked. The trade accord will deliver a shot of "economic adrenaline that few other government policies can match. By some estimates, it will raise living standards 10 per cent, or more per family. Rejection of GATT would not only squander these gains, but would also prove diplomatically calamitous. For 50 years the world has looked to the U.S. to lead it through a series of trade-opening agreements that have knocked down tariffs and other trade barriers. The measures have contributed mightily to worldwide growth. Had GATT's opponents won over Congress, the U.S. would have abandoned its leadership role and inflamed protectionist pressures abroad, eventually threatening living standards everywhere.

Like previous agreements, the latest GATT accord will also remove tariffs and other trade barriers. Unlike past agreements, it will cover agriculture and many services and insure that countries honor copyrights, patents and trade-secrets. It will also create the World Trade Organization, which, as Congress demanded in the 1980's, will impose tougher procedures to resolve disputes. All this amounts to a big victory for American exporters of everything from corn and pharmaceuticals to electronics to computer software and legal services. Most developing countries also win. Their exports will gain access to industrialized countries, and the World Trade Organization will protect them from any bullying tactics of wealthier trade partners. An odd coalition of conservative Republicans and liberal Democrats, led by Speaker Jim Wright, Ralph Nader oppose GATT. They make three arguments, none frivolous but none sufficiently important to turn down the accord.

First, critics say the W.T.O. threatens U.S. sovereignty because it can rule that U.S. environmental and safety laws are forms of backdoor protectionism. In one sense, the criticism has to be true: the agreement will not restrict U.S. action. But the danger is grossly exaggerated. GATT panels can rule against U.S. laws even under existing rules. These rules would survive even if the new accord were rejected.

There is one difference. Under existing rules the U.S. can veto an adverse ruling; under the new accord it cannot. But in practice this is a minor distinction. Even though Mr. Dole and others argued against the U.S. for such a veto, most do not do so out of fear that the U.S. would retaliate in turn. That is likely to be the case under the new GATT, in that sense, the accord poses no new threat. Indeed, it includes language that protects U.S. environmental and safety laws that are based on scientific principles and are not deliberately aimed at blocking imports.

Second, critics object to GATT's secret deliberations and skimpy legal protections. They have a point, but again, current dispute panels proceed underU.N. rules so nothing important is lost. Finally, critics like Ernest Hollings of South Carolina are understandably upset that textile manufacturers in their states would be subjected to low-cost foreign competition, which would force them to buy exports industries, which on average pay high wages. That is what the votes this week are all about. Barring catastrophe, the U.S. will once again launch the world on another wave of growth.

Lean on Serbia Now

The Bosnian city of Bihac is supposedly under U.N. and NATO protection, but by now it is probably no haven for anyone. Pro-Government forces were pushing forward Saturday if diplomacy is to be the focus, Washington will have to tell the Serbs that have moved on Bihac. Artillery moving on Bihac.

There is one difference. Under existing rules the U.S. can veto an adverse ruling; under the new accord it cannot. But in practice this is a minor distinction. Even though Mr. Dole and others argued against the U.S. for such a veto, most do not do so out of fear that the U.S. would retaliate in turn. That is likely to be the case under the new GATT, in that sense, the accord poses no new threat. Indeed, it includes language that protects U.S. environmental and safety laws that are based on scientific principles and are not deliberately aimed at blocking imports.

Second, critics object to GATT's secret deliberations and skimpy legal protections. They have a point, but again, current dispute panels proceed underU.N. rules so nothing important is lost. Finally, critics like Ernest Hollings of South Carolina are understandably upset that textile manufacturers in their states would be subjected to low-cost foreign competition, which would force them to buy exports industries, which on average pay high wages. That is what the votes this week are all about. Barring catastrophe, the U.S. will once again launch the world on another wave of growth.

The Bosnian city of Bihac is supposedly under U.N. and NATO protection, but by now it is probably no haven for anyone. Pro-Government forces were pushing forward Saturday if diplomacy is to be the focus, Washington will have to tell the Serbs that have moved on Bihac. Artillery moving on Bihac.

There is one difference. Under existing rules the U.S. can veto an adverse ruling; under the new accord it cannot. But in practice this is a minor distinction. Even though Mr. Dole and others argued against the U.S. for such a veto, most do not do so out of fear that the U.S. would retaliate in turn. That is likely to be the case under the new GATT, in that sense, the accord poses no new threat. Indeed, it includes language that protects U.S. environmental and safety laws that are based on scientific principles and are not deliberately aimed at blocking imports.

Second, critics object to GATT's secret deliberations and skimpy legal protections. They have a point, but again, current dispute panels proceed underU.N. rules so nothing important is lost. Finally, critics like Ernest Hollings of South Carolina are understandably upset that textile manufacturers in their states would be subjected to low-cost foreign competition, which would force them to buy exports industries, which on average pay high wages. That is what the votes this week are all about. Barring catastrophe, the U.S. will once again launch the world on another wave of growth.
U.S. Favors Making Concessions to Serbs
Allies Pushed for Conciliation in Bosnia

By Daniel Williams and Ruth Marcus

The Clinton administration yesterday abandoned its long-standing reliance on allied military force to prod separatist Serbs in Bosnia to the negotiating table and decided instead to offer them significant diplomatic concessions, U.S. officials said.

To get a cease-fire and eventual peace agreement, Washington is prepared to support concessions including some form of political link between the Bosnian Serbs and those in neighboring Serbia.

In return, the United States wants the Serbs first to sign a partition plan dividing Bosnia almost equally between Serbs and a Muslim-Croat federation. The Serbs, who now hold 70 percent of the country, would have to give up a significant amount of conquered ground.

The U.S. shift came as Serb forces tightened their hold on the Bihac pocket in northwestern Bosnia. [Details, Page A18] The continued Serb advance there, in defiance of United Nations and NATO efforts to prevent it, has triggered an international blame game over how to best handle the deterioration.

The Serbs were repeatedly warned that if they kept fighting, they would be subject to wider and more severe NATO bombing. That campaign never materialized, as demonstrated by the unwillingness of NATO and the United Nations to use heavy bombing to defend Bihac.

At yesterday's meeting, an administration official said, "We decided to ... get the contact group going and not push for military action.

For the second day in a row, top Bush administration officials signaled a drift from the drumbeat of pessimistic assessments of the war in Bosnia. "It's obviously a very difficult situation and our only hope is that at some point the parties recognize that there's no use in continuing the kind of carnage that's going on there," White House Chief of Staff Leon E. Panetta said on NBC's "Today.

On Tuesday, Defense Secretary William J. Perry indicated that the Serbs had essentially won the war. With that perspective, it was difficult to see how contact group diplomacy would succeed, particularly after the Bihac assault. The Serbs already rejected the proposal to divide Bosnia nearly in half with the Muslims, even before the success of the offensive. U.S. officials were strained to explain why, with a major victory over the Muslims, the Serbs would be ready to deal, even with concessions.

The decision to seek no further military action was made with an eye toward the upcoming meeting of NATO foreign ministers scheduled for Thursday in Brussels. Britain and France were pressing the position opposed the frequent U.S. calls for some sort of action to be taken, and the disagreements were straining the alliance. "We're favoring NATO unity over what we have long believed the course in Bosnia ought to be," an administration official said.

To get a cease-fire and eventual peace agreement, Washington and its mediating partners are relying on Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic to exert pressure on his erstwhile allies, the Bosnian Serbs. He already cut supplies that crossed his border, but a major loophole existed. Supplies going to Serbs in Croatia ended up in Bosnian Serb hands, U.S. officials said.

To close that loophole, Washington has now joined its European partners in offering Milosevic relief from economic sanctions that are strangling his country. The contact group also is pressing him to recognize both Bosnia and Croatia as a step toward eased tensions. Contact group negotiators met four hours with Milosevic yesterday in Belgrade.

While there was broad agreement on the diplomatic route as the only available potential solution, senior officials said the issue of what inducements to offer the Serbs to accept a cease-fire remains a subject of dispute. A key issue is what kind of political link would be offered between the Bosnian Serbs and neighboring Serbia.

Britain, France and Russia all want to let the Serbs join Serbia in a confederation. The United States is uneasy with a confederacy, which effectively dismembers Bosnia.

"Our concern is the scope of confederation," a senior U.S. official said. "The word may imply the continued unity of Bosnia will be a sham, and in fact a Greater Serbia will be born. That's where we'd draw the line.

Bosnia's ambassador to the United States, Sven Alkalaj, said he was assured by the State Department yesterday morning that the Clinton administration opposes any new concessions to the Bosnian Serbs until after the Serbs accept the internationally approved partition plan for Bosnia.

However, letters from Bosnian Prime Ministers Alija Izetbegovic and Haris Silajdzic to Clinton and Christopher, dated Oct. 14, make clear that the idea of accepting a partition between the Bosnian Serbs and Serbia proper as an inducement to accept the partition plan has been on the table for weeks.

The debacle in Bihac has triggered an international blame game played by almost everyone involved in trying to forge a settlement.

In Paris, French President Francois Mitterrand and Prime Minister Edouard Balladur jointly criticized Clinton's continued support for lifting U.N. arms embargo that would permit the Muslims to obtain heavy weapons.

"The tragic events in Bihac show that any encouragement given to the reconquest of territory by force—and notably the prospect of lifting the arms embargo—is vain and dangerous," the statement said.

In London, British Defense Secretary Malcolm Rifkind scolded the administration for wanting to use more NATO air power to punish the Serbs. He warned of adverse effects on relations with Russia and danger to U.N. peacekeepers, who include British troops.

But in Washington, also criticized Congress for not letting Clinton send troops to Bosnia as U.N. peacekeepers. Rifkind's comments appeared directed principally at Senate Minority Leader Robert J. Dole (R-Kan.), who was on his way to London to discuss Bosnia with British officials. Dole wants the United States to arm the Muslim forces.

In Washington, for the first time, U.S. officials began to blame the Bosnian Muslims for the battle in Bihac. They said the Muslims gravely contributed to this report.
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Higher Postal Rates May Not Lick the Problems

By Bill McAllister
Washington Post Staff Writer

The 3-cent increase in the price of a first-class stamp that likely will be approved Wednesday is the product of intense negotiations between Postmaster General Marvin T. Runyon and private industry, and it's rare that one can say what many say the Postal Service needs to address its long-term deficit and delivery problems.

It hinges on a large and independent Postal Rate Commission, as many industry officials expect, the higher rates—10.3 percent across the board for all classes of mail, bringing a first-class stamp to 32 cents—will be effective Jan. 1. But "the reality is that it is a stopgap rate increase," said Timothy May, a lobbyist who represents major mailers.

Another round of increases for various categories of mail is likely next year when the agency re-vamps its century-old mail classification system that places mail in one of four basic categories—letters, publications, parcels and bulk.

Even a brief delay in major rate increases represents a windfall of billions of dollars for major mailers—including magazine publishers and bulk mailers.

By agreeing to the relatively modest industry-proposed increase, Runyon was able to avoid a protracted battle with the mailers at a time when the Postal Service—as well as his stewardship of it—is under heavy fire for bad management and poor service.

Runyon said yesterday that he had backed the agreement because it made good business sense. He did not propose the current 10.3 percent rate increase and then plan for "a humongous" increase afterward, Runyon said. "We are going to keep the [proposed] rates as long as we can," he said, but conceded that an increase in 1997 is likely.

The Postal Service has a long history of price increases every three years, accompanied by brutal battles with major mailers. Two years ago, Runyon broke that cycle by insisting that the 29-cent stamp be continued for a fourth year.

The move saved mailers $14 billion, but also sent the Postal Service into the red for two years in a row.

Fearing that a sharp rate hike was likely in 1994, mailers first approached Runyon about 18 months ago. Fearing that a sharp rate hike was likely in 1994, mailers first approached Runyon about 18 months ago.

By Moderating Proposal on Postal Rates, Runyon Avoided Fight With Big Mailers

STAMP, From Al

ago. The postmaster general said yesterday that "the germ" for the current rate increase came in the summer of 1993 from "a major mailer" who urged him to seek the small, across-the-board increase rather than a large increase urged by postal executives and postal labor leaders. Runyon agreed—skirting an ugly fight with mailers.

The result of that agreement—ratified in a series of meetings between Runyon and lobbyists for large mailers in Washington's fashionable Hay-Adams Hotel and elsewhere—was unprecedented mailer support for a rate increase. Never before has industry been so united in a rate case or have such giants as Time Warner Inc., American Express and the Mailers Council played such an active role in helping orchestrate the Postal Service's request for more revenue.

The 10.3 percent across-the-board increase would give the agency $4.7 billion in additional revenue next year, reducing its red ink at least temporarily. With huge losses in each of the last three years, the Postal Service's cumulative net deficit now stands at $8.3 billion.

According to postal lobbyist May, Runyon's proposal is a high-risk gamble that emphasizes short-term benefits in order to gain breathing space from critics. "The new postmaster general seems to have risked a fortune in postal rate increases. And few seem to believe Runyon's pledge that a major increase is not anticipated in the offing. "Everybody knows that it really is not enough revenue to keep the post office going for very long and that, within a short period of time, we're going to get another, probably really big rate increase," May said in his speech. "Now, this is a huge cloud hanging over the post office, both the service and the financial condition."

Runyon rejected May's criticism. "We know what we're doing," he said in an interview. "We've got a plan" that projects a $200 million profit during fiscal 1996.

Arthur S. Sackler, a Time Warner executive who manages the Mailers Council, said that the Postal Service is "on the way to vindicating some of the [management] decisions Runyon made." But, he said, it "may take years" to reach a final verdict.

For the fiscal year that ended Sept. 30, Sackler said, the service may report a net loss of $948 million, well below the $2.4 billion loss some rate commission officials predicted earlier in the year and under the $1.3 billion loss amount Runyon had set as his target.

But many industry officials also fear that the rate commission will attempt to force a larger increase on bulk—that is, advertising—mail than the 10.3 percent across-the-board rise that Runyon has proposed. The last time the commission considered an increase, four years ago, it rejected a proposed 30-cent first-class stamp, instead raising the bulk mail rate.

Anticipating the commission's decision, the Postal Service Board of Governors has said it plans to impose the new rates on New Year's Day. Billions of non-denominated stamps, carrying the letter "G" for the flag "Old Glory" rather than a price, already have been printed and distributed for use on letters until stamps carrying the new rate are ready.

While service and personnel problems continue, mailers agree that the service's financial problems may not be solved by the proposed rate increase. And few seem to believe Runyon's pledge that a major increase is not anticipated in the offing. "Everybody knows that it really is not enough revenue to keep the post office going for very long and that, within a short period of time, we're going to get another, probably really big rate increase," May said in his speech. "Now, this is a huge cloud hanging over the post office, both the service and the financial condition."

Runyon rejected May's criticism. "We know what we're doing," he said in an interview. "We've got a plan" that projects a $200 million profit during fiscal 1996.

Arthur S. Sackler, a Time Warner executive who manages the Mailers Council, said that the Postal Service is "on the way to vindicating some of the [management] decisions Runyon made." But, he said, it "may take years" to reach a final verdict.

For the fiscal year that ended Sept. 30, Sackler said, the service may report a net loss of $948 million, well below the $2.4 billion loss some rate commission officials predicted earlier in the year and under the $1.3 billion loss amount Runyon had set as his target.

But many industry officials also fear that the rate commission will attempt to force a larger increase on bulk—that is, advertising—mail than the 10.3 percent across-the-board rise that Runyon has proposed. The last time the commission considered an increase, four years ago, it rejected a proposed 30-cent first-class stamp, instead raising the bulk mail rate.

Anticipating the commission's decision, the Postal Service Board of Governors has said it plans to impose the new rates on New Year's Day. Billions of non-denominat...
Norway Vote Rejects EU Membership
“For Unity in Europe\u201d

By Fred Barbash

LONDON, Nov. 29 (Tuesday)—Voters in Norway have rejected membership in the European Union, results of Monday's election showed this morning, leaving their country the only significant trading state of Western Europe outside the expanding economic powerhouse.

With the vote count nearly completed, opponents held a solid margin of about 13 percentage points. Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland, who led the campaign for membership, conceded defeat on Norwegian television moments after leaders of the opposition claimed victory.

Norway's vote was especially striking in light of earlier decisions to join by its Scandinavian neighbors, Finland and Sweden. Most analysts had predicted that Sweden's Nov. 13 approval of membership would turn a tide in Norway that has been negative for months. The gap did narrow in pre-referendum polls, causing a tight race in which the opposition sought to convince voters that membership threatened Norway's democracy, its economic self-interest and its very identity.

Brundtland predicted Norway will now have to take extra steps to stay competitive in Europe. "We have to explain to the world that we still wish to cooperate on an international basis. ... We respect the result," she said. "I've had a lot of questions about continuing as prime minister, but I will continue."

Norway's decision to stay out comes as Eastern European nations are lining up to get in.

The source of continuing controversy in member states and applicant countries is the authority they must cede to councils, commissions and courts that run the EU. The job of the EU's 18,000-strong bureaucracy is to ensure standardization of products and to make sure that member states do nothing that keeps fellow members from selling goods in their stores or fishing in their waters. It also tends to frighten small states, especially those too small to go it alone. The fish and oil industries, they said, would benefit more from "Nordic unity" than from membership in the European Union, the predecessor to the EU.

"Any Norwegian can get the train to and from Oslo and speak to their [legislators]. It would take you five days to travel by land from the north to Brussels. And even then, you wouldn't know whom you should talk to if you had a problem."

Norway, with 4.3 million people, has about one-thirtieth the people of the United Kingdom, but its land mass is five percent larger.

Similar arguments by anti-EU forces proved unproductive in Sweden, which approved membership by a margin of 15 percentage points. Sweden, some analysts said, was propelled toward approval by economic problems it experienced in recent years. Norway, by contrast, came through the Europe-wide recession in better shape than any other country and, with its North Sea oil and gas revenue, was said to feel more secure about going it alone.

Monday's vote was Norway's second referendum on European integration. In 1972, Norway's voters rejected membership in the European Community, the predecessor to the EU.

"We are a small people, a proud people," Anne Enger Lahnstein, a leader of the opposition, argued during one of dozens of recent debates. "Any Norwegian can get the train down to Oslo and speak to their [legislator]. It would take you five days to travel by land from the north to Brus­seis. And even then, you wouldn't know whom you should talk to if you had a problem."

Norway, with 4.3 million people, has about one-thirtieth the people of the United Kingdom, but its land mass is five percent larger.

In Scandinavia, it has been a wrenching year, with debate focused not only on the potential economic impact of membership but on the very spirit of Scandinavian nationhood.

Norway and Sweden have stood proudly apart from Europe, cultivating their own traditions, speaking their own language, from foreign relations to environmentalism, openness, government-to-literature and film. Norwegian literature and film is laced with alarming visions of cultural contamination from the outside. While Norway is a member of NATO, it signed on reluctantly in 1949 because it borders on what was then the Soviet Union and because of its memories of Nazi occupation.

"Our resistance to the EU is based on the experiences of generations," Lahnstein told an anti-EU rally in Oslo on Saturday. "We do not want to be ruled from abroad."

The future of Scandinavia's "Nordic unity" thus remained in doubt. In fact, one Norwegian official who asked not to be named suggested Sunday night that Sweden's favorable vote may have actually hurt pro-EU forces in Norway. The Norwegians, he suggested, have not forgotten that they were forced to accept a union with Sweden that ended in 1905, after 90 years of domination by their larger neighbor.

Since 1960, Norway has belonged to the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) with Austria, Finland, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Sweden and Switzerland. That group has served as a vehicle for trade agreements with the EU and other pacts. Its future effectiveness, minus Austria, Finland and Sweden, would be in serious doubt.

Norway's vote asde, the EU and the "single market" will move into 1995 vastly expanded geographically, stretching from the North Atlantic to the Aegean Sea to the Arctic Ocean. It is an unprecedented experiment in cross-border integration. Its ultimate goal—already well advanced—is free commerce among member states, a union in which goods, services and people cross through Europe as easily as they do among the states of the United States.

The source of continuing controversy in member states and applicant countries is the authority they must cede to councils, commissions and courts that run the EU. The job of the EU's 18,000-strong bureaucracy is to ensure standardization of products and to make sure that member states do nothing that keeps fellow members from selling goods in their stores or fishing in their waters. It also tends to frighten small states, especially those too small to go it alone. The fish and oil industries, they said, would benefit more from "Nordic unity" than from membership in the European Union, the predecessor to the EU.

It has been a momentous year for the EU, whatever the outcome in Norway. The member nations, in order of population, will be Germany, Britain, Italy, France, Spain, the Netherlands, Greece, Belgium, Portugal, Sweden, Austria, Finland, Denmark, Ireland, and Luxembourg.

While they continue to argue, often bitterly, about the extent of future integration, they have already made unprecedented progress.

In Scandinavia, it has been a wrenching year, with debate focused not only on the potential economic impact of membership but on the very spirit of Scandinavian nationhood.

Norway and Sweden have stood proudly apart from Europe, cultivating their own traditions, speaking their own language, from foreign relations to environmentalism, openness, government-to-literature and film. Norwegian literature and film is laced with alarming visions of cultural contamination from the outside. While Norway is a member of NATO, it signed on reluctantly in 1949 because it borders on what was then the Soviet Union and because of its memories of Nazi occupation.

"Our resistance to the EU is based on the experiences of generations," Lahnstein told an anti-EU rally in Oslo on Saturday. "We do not want to be ruled from abroad."

Special correspondent Sven Jensen in Oslo contributed to this article.
Poachers Felling World's Tigers, Rhinos

Carnage Overwhelms Conservation Efforts in India, Nepal

By John Ward Anderson

NEW DELHI—It began when a man who described himself as a buyer for duty-free shops in the Persian Gulf met in a posh Kathmandu hotel with a scruffy Kashmiri trader. They sized each other up, talked prices, the Kashmiri offering small samplings of the exotic animal furs he could deliver if they became partners.

Two weeks later in Srinagar, the war-torn summer capital of Kashmir, the trader laid out furs and garments made from 1,366 of the world's most endangered cats, including tigers, snow leopards and clouded leopards. One Bengal tiger skin was more than 14 feet long.

The buyer left, saying he was going to get money. But when he returned, it was with word of an undercover investigator, leading 36 police officers on one of India's largest anti-poaching sting operations. People were celebrating and congratulating each other, but it was a sad sight, the investigator said, of the haul, worth more than $1 million on the international market. "I never feel happy when I see it."

The Nov. 5 raid was the latest evidence that poaching, which had been curtailed in India in recent decades, has returned with a vengeance and threatens some of the world's most beautiful and endangered animals. Conservationists warn that the estimated 5,000 tigers left in the wild will be any tigers left in the world in three decades, victims of a booming market for wildlife products that is second only to narcotics as the contraband of choice for international smugglers.

"Unless we take immediate and drastic action, I don't believe there will be any tigers left in the world in three to five years," said Belinda Wright, head of Traffic India, the wildlife trade-monitoring arm of the World Wide Fund for Nature.

The 20-year-old CITES agreement, the international measure intended to protect endangered species, has emerged: trading in tiger bone for traditional Oriental medicines, which are especially popular in Europe, are setting the stage.

"The demand for bones and skins, occasional hunting for sport, destruction of wildlife habitat and the influx of wildlife trade into the drug trade is so valued for folk medicines that antique carvings reportedly are being ground into powder."

"Three of the eight tiger subspecies are now extinct. Conservationists estimate that there are only 300 tigers left in India, to make a typical jacket. An undercover survey in 1992 found only one operating by Kashmiri traders, some of them involved in narcotics and gold smuggling are now into wildlife trading."

In India, where hunters at the beginning of the century could bag dozens of tigers on a single safari, an even more lethal threat to tigers are particularly popular in Europe—centers for black-market furs, which is emerging: trading in tiger bone for traditional Oriental medicines, which are especially popular in Europe, are setting the stage.

"Unless we take immediate and drastic action, I don't believe there will be any tigers left in the world in three to five years," said Belinda Wright, head of Traffic India, the wildlife trade-monitoring arm of the World Wide Fund for Nature.

The 20-year-old CITES agreement, the international measure intended to protect endangered species, has emerged: trading in tiger bone for traditional Oriental medicines, which are especially popular in Europe, are setting the stage.

"Three of the eight tiger subspecies are now extinct. Conservationists estimate that there are only 300 tigers left in India, to make a typical jacket. An undercover survey in 1992 found only one operating by Kashmiri traders, some of them involved in narcotics and gold smuggling are now into wildlife trading."

Experts say that combating the smuggling syndicate is difficult because of the seemingly insatiable market for bone products. Experts say that combating the smuggling syndicate is difficult because of the seemingly insatiable market for bone products.
A Television Trend: Audiences in Black and White

Viewers Split on Racial Lines as Networks Find Diversity Sells—but Critics See Cultural Risks

By Paul Farhi

All across the country tonight, millions of households will tune to ABC's "Home Improvement." In a typical week, the situation comedy about the host of a household fix-it show is the most-watched program on the air.

Yet one group of viewers is decidedly sparse among the masses of "Home Improvement" fans. In African American households, the program barely makes the top 30.

Other big network hits are even less popular: "Seinfeld" and "Frasier" don't even crack the top 90 with blacks despite consistently finishing in the top 10 for viewers as a whole. The top show for black audiences this season: "Living Single," a Fox sitcom that ranks 69th among all audiences.

Network executives, as well as advertisers and their agencies, have known for years that blacks and whites have different viewing tastes. But as the relative popularity of "Home Improvement" and "Living Single" illustrate, these once-small differences have begun to widen into a vast chasm during prime-time viewing hours.

During the 1985-86 season, for example, 15 of the 20 shows most popular among blacks were also top 20 shows among all viewers. By last season, only three programs among the top 20 had "crossover" appeal among both black and non-black households—"ABC's Monday Night Football," "NBC's Monday Night Movies" and the comedy "Fresh Prince of Bel Air," also on NBC.

To some, the racial trends among prime-time audiences are a natural result of a positive trend: the increasing number of network programs created by, for or about blacks. According to BBDO Worldwide Inc., a major New York ad agency, the 20 shows most popular among blacks were also top 20 shows among all viewers. By last season, only three programs among the top 20 had "crossover" appeal among both black and non-black households—"ABC's Monday Night Football," "NBC's Monday Night Movies" and the comedy "Fresh Prince of Bel Air," also on NBC.

To some, the racial trends among prime-time audiences are a natural result of a positive trend: the increasing number of network programs created by, for or about blacks. According to BBDO Worldwide Inc., a major New York ad agency, the 20 shows most popular among blacks were also top 20 shows among all viewers. By last season, only three programs among the top 20 had "crossover" appeal among both black and non-black households—"ABC's Monday Night Football," "NBC's Monday Night Movies" and the comedy "Fresh Prince of Bel Air," also on NBC.
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TV Audience Splitting on Racial Lines

TELEVISION, From A1

there were 25 programs on the four networks with black performers in starring or major roles last year, up from 16 just two years earlier.

"TV was pretty much a white me­
dium for so many years; it was hard to find many black faces," said Doug Alli­
good, the BBDO vice president who conducted the agency's study. "This is a celebration of diversity, and it's wonderful."

To others, however, the fragment­
ing of the audience by race is evidence of increasing cultural separateness—

"another kind of American apartheid," in the words of Julianne Malveaux, an

African American columnist. From this perspective, the self-segregation of prime-time audiences represents a new era, unlike earlier decades when Americans of all kinds met around a national "electronic hearth" to see and hear the same stories.

"Our society, in general, has be­
come more polarized, and this is just another indication of it," said Jannette

Dates, acting dean of the school of communications at Howard University

and co-editor of a book about media portrayals of African Americans.

Part of a 'General Trend'

"Part of it is the general trend of race relations in this country," said

Robert Johnson, chief executive of the District-based Black Entertain­

ment Research Group, which has become a national cable network by

targeting black audiences.

"People are a little bit more sepa­
rate in their racial interaction than they were in the 1970s and '80s. Peo­

ple are identifying more with their own culture and ethnicity and feeling

comfortable about doing so, without the pressure to integrate or assim­
lilate cultures," Johnson said. He added that "that's not necessarily a bad thing."

Blacks and whites are not entirely in separate TV worlds. Teenage whites typically watch many of the shows popular among black house­
holds, the numbers show. But the channel choices tend to diverge among older groups.

Programs with black performers and themes have dotted the net­

works' schedules for years, starting with stereotypical sitcoms such as

"Amos 'n' Andy" and "Beulah" in the early 1950s, to more positive pro­
grams such as "Julia" in the 1960s and

"The Cosby Show" in the 1980s.

For years, too, many shows have had multiracial casts. One network executive explained that this is both good art and good business: A diverse group of actors lends a degree of au­
thenticity to a police or hospital pro­
grams such as "E.R." while also broadening the show's attractiveness to both black and white audiences.

But it is only recently that the net­

works have made "black" programs a staple of their lineups. The change in attitude is driven as much by the com­

petitive pressures that networks are feeling as any social or cultural fac­ors, TV executives and others say.

Simply put, blacks are television's best customers, and the networks can no longer afford to ignore this fact.

Varying Viewing Habits

According to Nielsen Media Re­

search, African American households

watch far more TV than other house­
holds. The TV set is in use 10 hours and eight minutes each day in the average black household, compared with six hours and 47 minutes for non-blacks. This makes African Americans a disproportionately larger part of the TV audience than their overall numbers (12 percent of the U.S. population) suggest.

Thus there are enough black view­
ers to provide "a solid base" of sup­

port for a network show, said David

Poltrack, executive vice president of planning and research for CBS.

Before the 1980s, Poltrack said, when ABC, CBS and NBC command­
ed more than 90 percent of the prime-time audience each night, it was unnecessary—even uneconomical—for them to "target" small seg­

ments of the mass audience.

That has changed dramatically, he said. With cable, independent broad­
cast stations and home video all erod­
ing the networks' dominance, blacks now constitute a very attractive bloc of viewers.

Fox, the upstart fourth network,
taught ABC, CBS and NBC this lesson when it went on the air in 1987.

Fox aggressively sought to appeal to black and young viewers, in part

because its most powerful stations were located in major urban centers (Washington, New York, Los Ange­

les, etc.) and because the other net­

works had largely overlooked blacks. Although Fox lately has been trying to broaden its appeal, its lineup last season included five of the 10 highest­

rated programs among blacks.

The networks have yet to apply these same dynamics to other minori­
ty groups, such as Hispanics and Asian Americans.

In the case of Hispanics, analysts say, this is because their numbers are only about half that of the black popu­

lation. In addition, the Nielsen system estimates that 40 percent of

Hispanics do not watch English-lang­

uage television.

Further, Hispanic culture is not as familiar to the rest of the country as

is black culture.

"Kids in Des Moines can relate to the music, the language and the style on 'Fresh Prince of Bel Air,' but the same may not be true of a show with a Hispanic theme," Poltrack said.

Universality Still Sells

But despite the growth of black-orien­
ted television, the fact remains that a strong black following alone can't keep a program on a network's sched­

ule.

Since the black population is still comparatively small, a program still must draw a sizable number of non­

black households to achieve ratings ac­
cetable to TV advertisers, said Steve

Sternberg, senior vice president of broadcast research at Bozell Inc., a

New York ad agency.

In fact, despite wide popularity among black viewers, such series as

ABC's "George" and "Thera," and Fox's

"Roc" and "Townsend TV" were dropped last season.

"Roc' had some great dramatic strengths," said Andy Fessel, Fox's top research and marketing executive, but he noted that it was ultimately doomed by its failure to finish among the top 100 programs in the overall Nielsen rankings.

Some African Americans charge

that the networks are quicker to yank underperforming "black" shows than other programs. They contend that this is the result of flaws in the Nielsen rating system, which they say under­
counts the size of the black audience.

The issue took on a federal dimen­
sion last year when Reps. Cardiss Col­

kins (D-Ill.) and Edolphus Towns (D-­

N.Y.), both members of the Congres­

sional Black Caucus, protested Fox's
cancellation of "Roc." "In Lengendary" and other shows with strong appeal to blacks.

Ultimately, some believe that the growth of "black" programming will lead not to social fragmentation, but to greater common understanding.

"Diversity on TV can be a very lib­
erating thing," he said. "Magazines have been catering to specialized audi­
cences] for years, and that's never been seen as a threat to the social fab­

ric."

What's more, he said, with the com­
ing of the 500-channel world, TV pro­
gramming is likely to grow even more specialized.

Said Johnson, "You can put this ge­

nies back in the bottle even if you want­
eto."
Clinton Assembles Bipartisan Support for Trade Pact

By Ann Devroy
Washington Post Staff Writer

President Clinton yesterday drew members of past administrations to the White House for a ceremony extolling the benefits of a new international trade pact and began privately lobbying lawmakers amid predictions the lame-duck Congress will approve it this week.

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) faces a House vote today and Senate vote on Thursday and vote-counters in both bodies, as well as in the White House, said yesterday the support of Senate Minority Leader Robert J. Dole (R-Kan.) will boost it across the finish line.

"GATT is about America's position in the world," said Vice President Gore read aloud at the ceremony to a letter in support of GATT from former presidents Ford, Bush and Jimmy Carter. "We have a golden opportunity here," he said, "to get on with the nation's business" and not let issues such as GATT get caught up in congressional and other politics.

"Equally important, it will demonstrate that the U.S. is committed to continue leading the world to address the challenges of a dynamic world economy." U.S. Trade Representative Mickey Kantor predicted the trade agreement this year will confer significant economic benefits on the United States and the global economy, the former chief executives wrote. "We have a head count," he said. "We're not overconfident, but we feel very good we can pass this legislation this week."

Rep. Robert T. Matsui (D-Calif.), at a news conference with Kantor, said, "We'll have pretty overwhelming support" for the trade accord in the House. In his speech, Clinton took aim at those who argue that opening U.S. markets would displace American workers and worsen conditions for blue-collar workers whose standard of living has not kept pace. "That is a wrong argument," he said, "but added it has been an "undercurrent" making trade agreements difficult to maneuver through Congress.

"We have a golden opportunity here," he said, "maintaining that GATT, like NAFTA, will increase American exports, create U.S. jobs and underscore American leadership around the globe.

Kolter Seeks Dismissal Of Charges

Ex-Congressman Says Rules Were Confusing

By Toni Locy
Washington Post Staff Writer

Lawyers for former representative Joseph P. Kolter (D-Pa.) asked a federal judge to dismiss corruption charges against him yesterday because law­makers were not given notice that long-standing practices on Capitol Hill are now considered criminal.

"The government seeks to criminalize, without notice, practices long known and conduct long allowed under House rules in violation of the basic tenets of due process," Kolter's attorneys said in papers filed in U.S. District Court in Washington.

Defense attorneys Alan I. Baron and Jonathan S. Feld said the five-count indictment against Kolter must be thrown out because it violates the former congressman's rights under the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution, which prohibits the government from depriving people of life, liberty or property without due process of law.

Kolter, a congressman from 1983 to 1993, is charged with-making taxpayers foot the bill for more than $33,000 worth of merchandise—including china, luggage and jewelry—that he got from the House stationery store.

"Before a person may be charged with a crime, there must be some reasonable basis for knowing that certain acts are subject to criminal prosecution," Baron and Feld wrote. "No such basis was present."

Prosecutors will file their responses to the defense motions next week.

Like the Rostenkowski lawyers, Kolter's attorneys argued that the ever-changing House rules confused even those who made them and should not be a basis for a prosecution.

As Rostenkowski's lawyers did, Baro and Feld also relied upon arguments that the charges against Kolter violate the Constitution's guarantee of separation of powers. Prosecutors and judges are prohibited from trying on legislative turf by interpreting House rules, the lawyers argued.

In October, U.S. District Judge Norma Holloway Johnson rejected Rostenkowski's arguments; the decision is on appeal. She is also handling Kolter's case.

The attorneys said that to defend himself, Kolter will have to show how his actions were part of his official duties and allow himself to be questioned about his actions as a lawmaker, in violation of the Constitution.

As a result, the lawyers said, "Judicial inquiry into these matters would directly impinge upon and threaten the legislative process."
Lawmakers to Pick Party Leadership

**GATT Votes Among Last Acts for 103rd Congress**

By Kenneth J. Cooper and Helen Dewar

Lawmakers return to Washington today to take their last votes in the 103rd Congress and prepare the transition to the next Congress, which convenes in January.

House and Senate Democrats and Senate Republicans this week elect their leaders, while House Republicans assemble next week both to elect their leaders and to ratify rule changes for the first GOP-controlled House in four decades.

Legislators are here in late November because of a rare post-election session to vote on a world trade agreement. The House is scheduled to vote today and the Senate on Thursday.

House Democrats, still stunned to have lost their majority of 40 years, planned to caucus privately this morning for an "open mike" airing of opinions and complaints before their elections Wednesday. The biggest Democratic casualty, Speaker Thomas S. Foley (D-Wash.), scheduled his final news conference for today and broke tradition by inviting television cameras.

Holdovers from the current leadership—Rep. Richard A. Gephardt (D-Mo.), David E. Bonior (D-Mich.) and Vic Fazio (D-Calif.)—are favored to pick their leaders, while House Republicans have predicted approval of the expanded General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) agreement. The House is scheduled to vote on a world trade pact today. More than 60 votes were required to overcome a Senate filibuster, which has threatened the pact's passage for two months.

Lawmakers were here in late November for a rare post-election session to vote on a world trade agreement. The House is scheduled to vote today and the Senate on Thursday. House Democrats, still stunned to have lost their majority of 40 years, planned to caucus privately this morning for an "open mike" airing of opinions and complaints before their elections Wednesday. The biggest Democratic casualty, Speaker Thomas S. Foley (D-Wash.), scheduled his final news conference for today and broke tradition by inviting television cameras.

Holdovers from the current leadership—Rep. Richard A. Gephardt (D-Mo.), David E. Bonior (D-Mich.) and Vic Fazio (D-Calif.)—are favored to pick their leaders, while House Republicans have predicted approval of the expanded General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) agreement. The House is scheduled to vote on a world trade pact today. More than 60 votes were required to overcome a Senate filibuster, which has threatened the pact's passage for two months.

With ideology playing little role in the contest, it breaks down largely along generational lines, with most seniors backing Dole and more junior members lining up behind Daschle. A half-dozen uncommitted senators could hold the key to the vote, which is by secret ballot.

On the GOP side, Dole, who has been Republican leader since 1985, has no opposition for the job of majority leader in the new Congress. But Sen. Trent Lott (Miss.) is challenging Republican assistant leader Alan K. Simpson (Wyo.) for the second-ranking post, which Simpson has held for most of the past decade.

Dole, who would probably turn many Senate duties over to the assistant leader if he runs for president, has endorsed Simpson over Lott, who aspires to Dole's job.

Meanwhile, Sen. John Breaux (D-La.) called for creation of a bipartisan centrist caucus in the Senate "so we can talk to each other about the problems that people really care about and move this Congress back to the mainstream," as he put it at a news conference.

Breaux said that up to five members from each party would be willing to join a bipartisan caucus, which he said could hold the balance of power in the new Senate split 53 to 47 in favor of Republicans.

Even as the legislators prepare for the 104th Congress, the 103rd Congress concluded its business with a rare post-election session to deal with the new world trade agreement.

House leaders from both parties have predicted approval of the expanded General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) after four hours of scheduled debate with only one up-or-down vote today.

Prospects for Senate approval of the trade pact improved dramatically last week when Senate Minority Leader Robert J. Dole (R-Kan.) reached agreement with the administration on procedures to expedite U.S. withdrawal from the new World Trade Organization if trade decisions consis-
tently go against American interests. With 60 votes required to overcome budgetary challenges in the Senate, the Clinton administration and other GATT backers were taking no chances, even launching a lobbying blitz that senators said was likely to continue until the vote is taken Thursday.
The Supreme Court announced yesterday it would decide whether middle and high schools can randomly test student athletes for drug use. The case, the first of its kind at the Court, involves an Oregon seventh-grader who was kept off the football team after his parents refused to sign a urinalysis consent form.

The case involves a seventh-grader in Oregon who was kept off the football team after his parents refused to sign a urinalysis consent form. The appeals court acknowledged that schools have some leeway in searching students to protect the safety of all pupils and maintain order. "Children are compelled to attend school," the court said, "but nothing suggests that they lose their right to privacy in their excretory functions when they do so. While they must attend classes and follow school rules, that does not indicate they have given up their basic privacy rights." The appeals court rejected the trial court's assertion that student-athletes have a reduced expectation of privacy because of their participation in activities with many rules.

Constitution's privacy protections. The appeals court acknowledged that schools have some leeway in searching students to protect the safety of all pupils and maintain order. "Children are compelled to attend school," the court said, "but nothing suggests that they lose their right to privacy in their excretory functions when they do so. While they must attend classes and follow school rules, that does not indicate they have given up their basic privacy rights." The appeals court rejected the trial court's assertion that student-athletes have a reduced expectation of privacy because of their participation in activities with many rules.

The Supreme Court will hear oral argument today from 10 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. in the following cases:

- Iverson v. Oregon Public High School Activities Association - consolidated - United States v. McAdams and United States v. McMorris - Tuesday, November 29, 1994 - consolidated - 9 a.m. to 10:45 a.m.
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Ames Calls CIA Wasteful, '10 Times' Too Big
Agency Produces Little Useful Data and Evades 'Hard Tasks,' House Investigators Told

By Walter Pincus
Washington Post Staff Writer

Confessed spy Aldrich H. Ames has criticized the CIA for being "10 times as big" as needed, and for devoting far too much effort on collecting "useless information" at great risk in friendly countries while neglecting targets like Cuba and North Korea.

Although Ames admitted the agency has "occasionally" had successes by penetrating Soviet and Russian intelligence, he said the information was rarely valuable to policymakers. Frequently Washington could not act on the data, for fear of exposing the source, he said.

Ames faulted his former employer, which he betrayed over nine years in the worst breach of security in CIA history, in an interview in August with two ranking members of the House intelligence committee. A transcript of the interview is likely to be released this week as part of the committee's report on the case.

In the interview, which was cleared for release by the CIA, Ames said that "discreed though my motives are, and impeached though my views," he still wanted to play a role in the debate "over the value, future or the functions of American intelligence."

Though they come from a man serving a life sentence for espionage on behalf of Moscow, Ames' views of the CIA sometimes parallel criticisms of the agency that have come across and had some successes," Ames said, "I think that we still need to have somewhere a small espionage service... on a short string." - Aldrich H. Ames
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TODAY IN CONGRESS

SENATE
Not in session.
Committees: none.

HOUSE
Meets at noon.
Committees:
Agriculture—1 p.m. Livestock subc.
1302 Longworth House Office Bldg.
Permanent Select on
Intelligence—1:30 p.m. Closed. Report
on Aldrich Ames spy case, H-405 Capitol.

—From Legi-State Inc.
High Court Clears Camel Suit
Activist in Calif. Case Says Ads Entice Children to Smoke

By Joan Biskupic
The Supreme Court yesterday cleared the way for a lawsuit that accuses a cigarette maker of using the hip "Joe Camel" cartoon character to tempt young children to take up smoking.

The justices without comment denied an appeal from Reynolds Tobacco Co. of a California court ruling that allows an anti-smoking activist to underwrite non-government securities for the first time since the Depression.

The rule, one of many proposed changes the Comptroller's Office said would lighten banks' regulatory burden, would let banks' subsidiaries apply to engage in activities—such as underwriting non-government securities or developing real estate—that banks themselves cannot. Although existing bank regulations do not address the activities of subsidiaries, in practice subsidiaries have adhered to the same rules that their parent banks are subject to.

"We're trying to do is go through all the regulations that have been on the books" to clarify and update them, Julie Williams, chief counsel at the Comptroller's Office, told a news conference yesterday. The agency has been reviewing regulations for more than a year, she said.

Other regulations proposed yesterday would make it easier for banks to set up automated teller machines, apply to open new branches and apply to operate securities brokerage or other activities. The proposed changes would "cut bank costs, which in turn will benefit bank customers," said Comptroller of the Currency Eugene A. Ludwig.

The proposed regulations will be published today in the Federal Register and the Comptroller's Office will accept public and industry comments until the end of January. The rule would affect only those banks that the agency regulates, or about 3,200 of the nation's roughly 10,000 banks.

Currently only subsidiaries of a bank's parent company—not a subsidiary of a bank itself—can underwrite securities, and then only with tight restrictions.

Under the proposed regulations, a bank could apply to operate a real estate agency, a travel agency or a finance company through an operating subsidiary, said Karen Shaw, president of ISD/Shaw Inc., a consulting firm that tracks bank regulation and legislation. The bank subsidiary's income would go to the bank, rather than to the bank's parent.

"Of course, the regulator might not approve an application, she said. "They're not saying, okay, now you can have all these different powers through your [operating subsidiaries]. They've set up a process," she said.

The proposal would require that the bank subsidiaries' activities be "within the business of banking or [be] incidental to banking." Bankers will have to wait and see what falls in that category because the Comptroller's Office would handle each application on a case-by-case basis, Williams said. She added that it is too early to predict which kinds of applications might be approved.

Other provisions in the proposed rules would establish streamlined application procedures for better-managed banks. Healthy, well-managed banks that meet their community reinvestment requirements would be rewarded with a simplified, faster procedure for certain types of applications.

In addition, the Comptroller's Office would process those applications more quickly.

For example, if one of these banks applied to open a branch, the application would be automatically approved after 30 days unless the Comptroller's Office raised concerns. Williams said that 80 percent to 90 percent of the banks regulated by the Comptroller's Office could qualify for the streamlined procedures.

The proposed rule would change the treatment of applications to open ATMs, which now are treated like applications to open new branches. The new procedure would be less costly.

The Comptroller's Office also would accept banks' filings to other federal regulators, rather than requiring banks to submit separate forms. Currently, Williams said, different agencies might require applications at different times—and banks might have to submit an application to more than one of the four traditional bank regulators: the Comptroller's Office, the Federal Reserve, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corp. and the Office of Thrift Supervision.
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JOE CAMEL, From C1

against the seven-year-old Joe Camel campaigns, which promote Camel cigarettes, were based on "health" concerns, normally falling under federal law, the allegations relate more to manufacturer's general obligation not to deceive and not to engage in unfair competition.

The case, which has yet to be tried on the merits, was initiated by Janet Mangini, a San Francisco lawyer and anti-smoking activist. In her papers urging the Supreme Court to reject Reynolds' appeal, she said, "This case is based on a rather unremarkable and universally accepted proposition: You cannot encourage someone to violate the law. . . . California, like practically every other state, prohibits minors from purchasing or possessing tobacco products."

Barbara McDowell, a Washington lawyer who is one of R.J. Reynolds' attorneys, said yesterday the company will continue to assert at trial that states may not regulate ads that allegedly target minors. "We think we have strong arguments not only on preemption [by federal law] but on the merits of whether Joe Camel entices minors to smoke," she said.

By Washington Post Staff Writer
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"Of course, the regulator might not approve an application, she said. "They're not saying, okay, now you can have all these different powers through your [operating subsidiaries]. They've set up a process," she said.
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In addition, the Comptroller's Office would process those applications more quickly.
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FDA Quickly Whittles Down Stack Of Applications for Medical Devices

For years, the Food and Drug Administration has been denounced as a bloated bureaucracy that suppresses innovation through over-regulation. The agency, which oversees products that take up about a quarter's worth of every consumer dollar spent, also has been lambasted for delays in processing applications for new drugs and devices that further harm competitiveness.

The favorite case in point: the Center for Devices and Radiological Health, which regulates a wide range of medical equipment that includes heart valves, X-ray machines and breast implants. The center had a backlog of about 2,000 applications to bring new medical devices to market by the end of 1993.

But in the last year, by streamlining the process and deputizing reviewers from the ranks of FDA bench scientists until new reviewers could be hired and trained, the center has made impressive progress in chipping away at its backlog—reducing it to less than 500 applications. "The world looks good again," said CDRH head Bruce Burlington, who explained that the average processing time for some paperwork has been slashed.

Burlington said that in 1993 it took 190 days to process 95 percent of the applications on hand for permission to export unapproved medical devices, and that has been reduced to 50 days. "If I sound proud of it, I am," Burlington said.

Far from rejoicing at Burlington's claims, industry representatives remain steadfastly pessimistic. While congratulating the agency for "some effort," Alan Magazine, the head of the Health Industries Manufacturing Association, explained away the agency's progress as "in essence, cherry picking" the easiest applications. "Once you've finished cherry picking, review times are going to climb again and your backlogs are going to increase," he said. The industry had agreed to pay user fees to speed up the review process, but that proposal died late in the 103rd Congress.

Magazine also said that the lab scientists who were put on temporary review duty should be permanently assigned to assessing new product applications to further speed the process and that the regulatory process itself needs to be loosened to approve more products.

Magazine said: "You can go over the line and be so careful that people are dying for . . . access to new technology. They have gone over the line. Companies have gone overseas. They are saving the lives of foreigners. They are not accessible to Americans. And that's a tragedy."

Burlington admitted that much of the progress has been made by clearing out the easy work. He said that he found the industry attitude "frustrating." It was not easy to go to our lab staff and say, 'Guys, you've got to pitch in here.'"

Burlington is known as one of the agency's prime fixers and has been credited with cleaning up the agency's Center for Drugs, which was rocked by a scandal in its generic drug division. FDA Commissioner David A. Kessler moved Burlington to CDRH in 1993 to right the mess there.

A June 1993 report by the staff of the House Energy and Commerce Committee criticized the center on two counts, saying it "has approved devices that have safety and effectiveness concerns, yet it also has been slow to approve potentially very beneficial devices." It cited such devices as the flawed Bjork-Shiley artificial heart valve and breast implants. The report acknowledged that the FDA had been making progress toward reform, however.

Soon after the Energy Committee report, CDRH announced new reforms to speed up the approval process for many devices. Under the new system, innovative products are put on a fast track; also, relatively uncomplicated products such as adjustable headrests for dental chairs now undergo a simple administrative review.

Getting rid of a backlog doesn't necessarily mean approving more products, however, because the agency is charged with ensuring that all medical devices brought to market are safe and effective. Even products that are seemingly safe, like a much-toasted silicone-filled pad to enhance finger sensitivity in breast examination, must be proved effective in scientific tests to pass FDA muster. "We don't want there to be an undue incentive to say yes," Burlington said. "Sometimes the consumer protection function of the agency is best served by saying no."

Now that the agency's review machinery is working more efficiently, about a quarter of the applications are either rejected or sent back for further work, Burlington said. "Sometimes the answer may be something they don't like—but they are getting an answer."
OMP Opt for Substance Over Standard Form 171

By Guy Gugliotta
Washington Post Staff Writer

As most federal workers have discovered to their eternal chagrin, there is nothing quite like Standard Form 171, the accursed Application for Federal Employment.

It’s six pages long and comes in one long sheet. It takes a couple of minutes to find Page 1, which is upside down, in the middle of the sheet and on the opposite side from the instructions. Page 2 is upside down (or right side up?) and on the back (front?).

You have to list every job you held in the last 10 years, confess any firearms violations, describe every college you attended (credit hours completed, please) and talk about any relatives who are in the armed forces (including your mother-in-law).

In the fine print it says that the "public burden" for this document (how long it’s supposed to take to fill out) is 20 minutes to 360 minutes (that’s six hours, if you do the long division). The consensus is that only a high school dropout with an IQ of 160 could make the low end.

Well, there’s good news. On Thursday—Dec. 1—SF 171 is history. "It’s gone, it’s outta here," said Leonard Klein, assistant director for career entry for the Office of Personnel Management.

“We’re replacing it with automated forms, telephone calls and resumes.”

OPM is the office that sends out SF 171, reviews the applications (by hand) and puts you on a list. If you’re lucky, your name might come up before the millennium.

Now, however, you can already telephone the Career America Connection, in which disembodied voices tell you all about openings anywhere in the country. And after Thursday you won’t have to file an SF 171. The Surf Analyst job in Palm Beach is open, so call today.

Just kidding.

Anyway, because of these new developments, Klein is extremely unhappy with a recent General Accounting Office report entitled "How Government Jobs Are Viewed on Some College Campuses." The short answer, GAO discovered, is "not well."

In interviews with placement officials and in student questionnaires, people complained that the money was lousy, the recruiters never came, information was unavailable, government work had a rotten reputation and "the application process was too burdensome."

Wrong, Klein said. GAO, he suspects, relied on "common knowledge and general impressions," which, when it comes to college students, can be risky. What they do is far more important than what they say.

"They quoted placement officials saying graduates had little interest in working for the federal government," Klein said. "Then they list 23 percent of students as having applied for jobs in the federal government. I'd say that's a pretty good share."

Worse, Klein continued, GAO said the government fails to attract good students, but Klein checked entry level federal hires for 1991-92 college graduates (the same ones who filled out GAO’s questionnaire) and found that 57 percent were Outstanding Scholars with a 3.5 grade point average on a four-point scale.

So government work is great, and smart people get into it. This may not be the conventional wisdom, but SF 171 proves Klein’s thesis. You got to love the feds to file one, and no dummy could figure it out.

From this angle, SF 171 could be seen as an effective Darwinian mechanism preventing all but the best and brightest from ever claiming a slot in the planet’s greatest bureaucracy. OPM may want to reconsider.

Just kidding.

Anyway, to test OPM’s new job search technique, The Washington Post decided to pose as a recent college graduate looking for a job. The Post called (912) 757-3000, and was duly welcomed to the Career America Connection. Invited to select options from a computer menu, The Post pressed "1" for “employment vacancies.”

Next, The Post was asked to "press 1" to hear "positions where current vacancies exist." Then it pressed 3 for a bachelor’s degree, and 3 again “to search by broad job category.”

On a roll now, The Post pressed 3 yet again for "engineering and related jobs," then pressed F-L-O: "You’ve selected Florida," said a voice that sounded like Kermit the Frog. "Press 1 if this is correct."

The Post pressed 1.

"We’re sorry," Kermit said. "There are no job listings in the category and state you have selected."

Bummer, but not surprising, according to Klein. In normal years the government hires about 130,000 people, but because of downsizing, it only hired 40,000 last year, and, he said, and will probably hire fewer than that in 1994.

Surf’s down.
The last resort for storing high-level radioactive waste from outside the state. Energy Department spokesmen pointed out that the facility, near Columbia, S.C., has hosted the nation's third-largest repository of spent fuel. The waste-processing facility where the fuel is stored, he reaches for his thick book on the facility's safety record. The pools were designed as a temporary facility, where fuel elements would remain for a maximum of five years before being reprocessed. But because the plant's reprocessing program has stopped, the spent fuel elements continue to pile up in the basins. Some have been there longer than 25 years. Across this town ringed by horse farms and quaint antebellum mansions, other residents are reacting to the waste issue with a similar skepticism. John Henry Thomas, a local taxi driver, wonders whether residue from the Savannah River Plant will end up in soil that nurtures the vegetables grown in his backyard. Ending this debate, she calls it, could only help to enhance the absorption process.

In Dump's Back Yard, Nuclear Waste Is Wearing Out Its Welcome

By Gary Lee

WASHINGTON POST Staff Writer

In Aiken and the surrounding area, where every third resident is an SRP employee, there is still considerable support for the use of the repository.

"We accepted the stuff without a fight and with good reason," explained Bradley. "There was a cold war on and there was a lot of waste from weapons production. We viewed it as our patriotic duty. We're still around here not against accepting the waste. But we realize the dangers it can pose. And with that realization comes some resistance."

Earlier this fall, that resistance led to a showdown between Energy Secretary Hazel R. O'Leary and South Carolina Gov. Carroll A. Campbell Jr. (R). When O'Leary ordered 409 spent fuel rods from foreign reactors to be stored at the SRP, Campbell balked.

With the first shipment of 153 rods almost a year ago from Europe, Campbell used O'Leary, alleging that she had failed to consider the environmental hazards of transporting spent nuclear fuel across South Carolina. U.S. District Judge Matthew J. Perry Jr. agreed, leaving shipment floating off the coast near Charleston for two days. The 4th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals supported the judge's decision, however, and the rods were shipped to the SRP earlier this month.

In a Nov. 1 court hearing in Columbia, lawyers for the two sides faced off over the fate of the remaining 256 rods, due to be shipped from Europe by next March.

During the session, federal officials described the plan to import the spent fuel as a cornerstone of the Clinton administration's nonproliferation policy. Originally sent to European countries by the United States, spent fuel elements were shipped to the SRP in early December.

A decision in the legal dispute over the remaining fuel rods is due in early December.

The court has also raised questions about the dangers of radiation from spent fuel rods.

Energy Department officials are adamant that the fuel elements are not a health risk. "We would not undertake such a plan if we thought it posed any environmental problems," said Thomas P. Grumbly, assistant energy secretary for environmental management.

In the area where the fuel will be transported and stored, however, local residents remain unconvinced. A coalition of environmental groups opposing the shipments has charged that they pose a severe health hazard.

Under the Energy Department's plan, the shipments are to be unloaded at Sunny Point, N.C., and shipped by rail through parts of both Carolinas before arriving at the SRP. The fuel rods reflect heightened sensitivity about environmental issues elsewhere in the state. In Hilton Head, S.C., residents recently campaigned against a plan to funnel water from the Savannah River into the local water supply.

"With all that's been dumped at that facility over the years, we don't know how much contamination could appear in our drinking water," she said.

Another example of the change in attitude was the closing last summer of a low-level radioactive waste site in nearby Barnwell, S.C., to material from anywhere outside of eight southern states. After 1996, under orders by the South Carolina legislature, the Barnwell plant is due to be shut down.

For the last two decades, that facility has been the principal dumping ground for two-thirds of all low-level waste generated in the United States, including medical waste from research facilities in many eastern states. As a result of the new regulations, facilities in the area closed the plant for dumping, including hospitals in the Washington-Baltimore area, now must store low-level radioactive waste on site.

"We took way more than our share of the country's waste," said Daisy Hollis, head of the Columbia-based environmental group CLEAN. "Enough was enough."
Gay Sailor's Victory To Go Unchallenged

The Clinton administration won't ask the Supreme Court to overturn the reinstatement of a sailor who declared his homosexuality on television.

Solicitor General Drew S. Days III, who represents the government in the Supreme Court, gave no explanation yesterday for his decision not to ask the justices to overturn a court order that reinstated Navy sonar operator Keith Krolfisky, attorney for the gay sailor.

Krolfisky said Days made no decisions on his other 10 old policy cases in district or appellate courts.

The administration would rather concentrate its attention on defending cases under the Clinton administration's new "don't ask, don't tell" policy, an administration official said.

From the Peanut Gallery

In the opening salvo of the 1995 farm bill debate over the peanut program, a coalition of farmers urged a big cut in the government's new "don't ask, don't tell" policy.

"In the opening salvo of the 1995 farm bill debate over the peanut program, a coalition of farmers urged a big cut in the government's new "don't ask, don't tell" policy."
New Study Yields Little on Death Of Biochemist Drugged by the CIA

By Brian Moor
Washington Post Staff Writer

Scientists investigating the 1953 death of Eric T. Olson, an Army biochemist who plunged 13 stories after the CIA drugged him with LSD, announced yesterday that they doubted his death was a suicide but had uncovered no evidence to prove a murder.

Olson's family enlisted the group of forensic researchers led by James E. Starrs, a George Washington University law and forensics professor, which announced its findings yesterday, the 41st anniversary of Olson's death. The six-month investigation yielded little new information and did nothing to shake long-standing suspicions by Olson's family that he was killed by the government.

"The scientific evidence we have garnered gives no strong comfort to either those who maintain that Dr. Olson committed suicide nor... those who are convinced his death resulted from a homicide," said Starrs, who conducted similar investigations into the deaths of Lizzie Borden's ax-murdered parents and assassinated Sen. Huey P. Long of Louisiana.

However, Starrs said his team's "nonscientific" investigation—which included interviews with police investigators and witnesses—was "starkly suggestive of homicide."

Starrs cited numerous inconsistencies in accounts of Olson's death at a New York hotel, and he questioned why a suicidal man would leap through a closed window with a drawn blind. The forensic experts found no cuts on his body nor traces of LSD, although it quickly dissolves in human tissue.

"I am exceedingly skeptical of the view that Dr. Olson went through that window on his own," Starrs said.

"That leaves the strong probability, in my view, that he went through at the hands of someone else. [But] I cannot say that with the scientific evidence alone."

Olson's sons, Eric and Nils, declined to comment yesterday on the findings of the scientific panel.

Members of Olson's family, who live in Frederick, Md., did not learn until 1975 that he had been drugged. They later received a $750,000 settlement from the government and a personal apology from President Ford.

But as family members read declassified documents in the years that followed, they were left with more questions than answers.

When their mother died last year, Eric and Nils Olson decided to have their father's body removed from a Frederick cemetery and reburied beside her in another cemetery nearby. Before moving the body, they asked Starrs to perform an autopsy.

Starrs said it now would be up to the Olson family and prosecutors to decide whether the case should be reopened, but he added, "It is clear to me there is a desperate need for subpoena authority."

Dave Christian, a CIA spokesman, said the agency was not inclined to investigate the matter, which was reviewed by Congress in the 1970s. But he said the CIA would cooperate if police reopened the case.

Olson's body was exhumed in June and underwent extensive testing to pinpoint the cause of death. The pathologists determined he struck a wooden barricade outside the hotel before hitting the pavement feet first.

Starrs said some team members were troubled by a wound above Olson's left eye that appeared to suggest a blow to the head.

Olson plunged from a room at the Hotel Statler on Nov. 28, 1953, nine days after the CIA gave him LSD without his knowledge. The experiment was part of a CIA program known as MK-ULTRA to study the effects of LSD and other drugs for intelligence and military purposes.

After learning he was given the mind-bending drug, Olson sank into a paranoid depression. He told his Army superiors he wanted to quit his job as one of the nation's top germ-warfare scientists, and his family now believes he was slain because he had become a security risk.

Olson was taken from Fort Detrick, in Frederick, to New York to meet with one of the few doctors then familiar with LSD-related behavior. Though Olson reportedly was behaving oddly, CIA handlers provided him with only cursory supervision.

Robert Lashbrook, the CIA employee who was with Olson in the hotel room on the night of his death, told police he was awakened by the sound of breaking glass. Reached by telephone yesterday at his California home, Lashbrook said he hoped the panel's conclusions would end suspicions that have dogged him for years.

"Sure I'm relieved," Lashbrook said. "I don't see that they had anything to begin with."

NAACP to Recall 26 Employees From Furlough

By Paul W. Valentine
Washington Post Staff Writer

Baltimore, Nov. 28—The NAACP national headquarters will return almost one-third of its furloughed employees to work this week to increase fund-raising efforts and membership solicitation.

The national office normally has about 90 employees. In a statement, board Chairman William F. Gibson and interim senior administrator Earl T. Shinhoster said the organization would review its financial condition weekly to see if additional employees can be called back.

Reeling from a $3.8 million debt, the 85-year-old organization is struggling to keep its stature in the civil rights world amid allegations of mismanagement to keep its stature in the civil rights world amid allegations of mismanagement and the firing of Executive Director Benjamin F. Chavis Jr. in Washington, they said.

Olson's family now believes he was slain because he had become a security risk.

Shinhoster and Gibson said the recalled workers will concentrate on fund-raising and membership solicitation.

Shinhoster and Gibson said the recalled workers will concentrate on fund-raising and membership solicitation. Some also will return to the NAACP's legal and lobbying offices in Washington, they said.

Council 67 of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, which represents 50 of the furloughed workers, has filed a grievance against the NAACP, saying it failed to consult the union before imposing the furloughs in October.
U.S. Bureaucratic Battle Threatens Private Funds For Russian Scientists

By Lee Hockstader
Washington Post Foreign Service

MOSCOW, Nov. 28—Two years ago, the American financier George Soros offered an extraordinary Christmas present: a $100 million "gift" to support the work of scientists of the former Soviet Union left penniless after communism's collapse.

By nearly all accounts the program has been a resounding success, furnishing a safety net for about 50,000 top researchers and for the first time using merit, rather than political connections, as the basis for awarding funds for basic scientific research in the former Soviet states. In Moscow, where three-fifths of the grant recipients live, it sometimes seems as if much of the city's academic and intellectual elite is at work thanks mainly to Soros's largess.

Now, with the Soros money dwindling and Russia's economic crisis sapping its own funds for scientific research, a bureaucratic battle in Washington has imperiled the future of the International Science Foundation, as the Soros program is known.

Western and Russian officials have stressed the importance of sustaining basic scientific research in the countries that once formed the Soviet Union, rather than having impoverished Russian scientists sell their services to terrorists or renegade states such as Iraq and North Korea.

Moreover, Soros officials say that his science program has been one of the few means of directing aid to a country with severe cuts in domestic funding. Scientific institutes, including prestigious ones, struggle simply to pay their electric bills and salaries. Wages are often paid months behind schedule. And many talented scientists have abandoned their research labs in favor of more lucrative opportunities in the private sector.

By Lee Hockstader
Angola's Fragile Peace Comes Too Late for Huambo, Pillaged by Both Sides

By Karl Maier
Special to The Washington Post

HUAMBO, ANGOLA—Residents of this devastated highlands city describe last week's tenuous peace accord in the 20-year-old Angolan civil war as anticlimactic: the central government's drunken, celebrating soldiers who had used Huambo as their headquarters and who plundered it in retreat.

Huambo, named New Lisbon by the Portuguese before independence—and before the start of the civil war—in 1975, is in ruins. Hundreds of houses and buildings have been blasted into rubble, burned-out vehicles and tanks litter its streets, once the scene of phosphorus bomb drops by government aircraft.

Residents say their spirit is broken. "I want to go to Luanda [Angola's capital] because there is nothing left for me in Huambo," said Maria Isabel Wasovava, 18, as she stood with her 9-month-old baby. "My husband was taken away with three friends by UNITA [rebels] in July, and we have had no word from him. I am sure he is dead."

Jonas Savimbi's rebel National Union for the Total Independence of Angola, or UNITA, pulled out of Huambo in the face of a government offensive even as the two sides were agreeing to their latest version of peace. An earlier attempt, signed in Portugal in 1991, was capped by a Russian-built Mi-17 helicopter in the southeast, killing 22 wounded and sick soldiers who were being evacuated. The four-man crew survived, the air force said, and were being held prisoner by UNITA.

The next day, residents of Huambo could hear distant artillery fire, which soldiers said was from the municipalities of Bailundo, Mungo and Andula, just north of the city, where UNITA troops holed up after the army retook the city on Nov. 9.

The husband of the woman at the airport was one of hundreds of Huambo's residents who witnesses and foreign aid workers say were killed by UNITA in the weeks before the takeover. His crime, said Wasovava, was to have conspired to escape the city by walking to the coast.

The accord, mediated by the United Nations, called for demobilization of troops from both sides, the arrival of a U.N. peacekeeping force, and UNITA's participation in government, with control of four ministries, three provinces and dozens of municipalities.

But some fighting has continued. The air force accused UNITA on Friday of shooting down a Russian-built Mi-17 helicopter in the southeast, killing 22 wounded and sick soldiers who were being evacuated. The four-man crew survived, the air force said, and were being held prisoner by UNITA.

As UNITA forces and sympathizers fled, they organized a massive sacking of the city, including millions of dollars' worth of food, cars and even toilets. A dozen international aid groups, including the International Committee of the Red Cross, tried to Save the Children, lost everything—down to workers' clothes.

Soldiers and aid workers say were being held prisoner during the sacking.

One barefoot soldier at the airport approached with a proposal: "I have a television, a big Sanyo. Do you want to trade it for some clothes? I want to go back to Save the Children lost every-thing—down to workers' clothes."
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Nepal Appears on Verge Of Rule by Communists

Other Parties Unable to Form Coalition

By John Ward Anderson
Washington Post Foreign Service

NEW DELHI, Nov. 28 — A Communist government for the Himalayan kingdom of Nepal appeared inevitable today after officials from the former ruling party declared they could not form a majority government and would therefore support the Communists in parliament.

Krishna Prasad Bhattarai, president of the Nepali Congress party, which lost its ruling majority in elections two weeks ago, said his party will give the Communist Party of Nepal (United Marxist-Leninist) "critical and constructive support" when it seeks a vote of confidence in the near future.

The announcement apparently clears the way for a Communist government that will survive, in the short term at least, by fashioning some sort of coalition with other opposition parties. But dissenters and, on critical votes necessary to keep the government afloat, members from the Congress party.

The Congress decision ended two weeks of political jockeying in the capital, Katmandu, during which both parties found it hard enough partners to form a ruling coalition. Congress abandoned its bid for power today after negotiations with the third-largest party, the pro-monarchy National Democratic Party, broke down, and King Birendra complained that the "prevailing condition" of uncertainty "cannot be good for the country."

A government led by the Communist Party will apparently make Nepal the world's first Communist monarchy, although the party is politically moderate and supports the country's recent free-market reforms and its ties to Western democracies.

Mohandas Adhikary, 72, the leader of the Communist Party, who spent 17 years in prison for fighting to restore democracy, appeared to become the new prime minister. His party must seek a vote of confidence by Dec. 15.

The Congress party and its prime minister, Girija Prasad Koirala, were stunned by the rebuke they received in the polls, which came three years into Koirala's five-year term. He called for early elections, seeking a fresh mandate after dissidents in his party abandoned him on a routine budget vote in July.

The Congress party's seats in the 205-member parliament were reduced from 114 to 83. The Communists lost 88 seats, from 68 in the last parliament. The royalist National Democratic party won 20, and several leftist and independent candidates captured the remainder.

By Sophon Sawikamin

Thai Police Cleared

BANGKOK—Prosecutors dropped charges against three top police officials in a kidnapping and murder case that stemmed from a $2 million jewel theft in Saudi Arabia.

Some of the jewelry, stolen by a Thai worker in 1989 and smuggled to Thailand, was recovered this year but disappeared in police custody.

More than a dozen people have been charged since August, after the wife and 14-year-old son of a Thai gem dealer were found beaten to death on a remote highway. But the attorney general's office said it did not have evidence to support some of the charges.

Prosecutors dropped charges that former police chief Prasart Sanitprapop ordered the abduction to pressure a merchant to testify. Charges also were dropped against Sophon Sawikamin, who said Prasart had ordered him and another official to carry out the kidnapping, and retired chief Sawai Amornwrat, accused of helping suspects avoid arrest.

—Associated Press

Brazilian Is Cleared

RIO DE JANEIRO—An Indian chief who became a symbol of an international campaign to protect the Amazon rain forest was cleared of a rape charge and allowed to leave his reservation after two years of house arrest.

A judge in Redenção, a city in the state of Para, said there was no evidence to support the charge by an 18-year-old woman who claimed she was gang raped and tortured by chief Paulino Paikan and his wife in May 1992.

The woman's claim that she had been raped by the couple on a deserted road shocked those attending the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro.

At the time, government officials intervened to prevent violence between farmers living close to the Indian reservation and members of the Kaiapo tribe.

In the years before the incident, Paikan had traveled the world, campaigning for Indian rights and against rain-forest devastation.
**Kentuckians Judge a Book by Its Author**

**FRANKFORT, Ky.** By midday you had to wonder how long David Dick would last. The former television reporter—who hied just about everywhere around the planet in his 19 years at CBS news before retiring in 1985 to teach at the University of Kentucky—sat at table 65 at the Kentucky Book Fair autographing copies of his new work, "Peace at the Center."

I was next to him at table 66. In our row—of five that stretched through wide lanes of book-lover traffic in the expanses of the Kentucky State University gymnasium—Dick was to use a can't-miss bluegrass metaphor, a thoroughbred.

Nearly 150 other authors—from spavined milhorses to mudders—assembled for a full day on Nov. 19 to grip, grin, sign and sell. I had never associated Kentucky with books—tobacco, coal mines and Happy Chandler yes—but I do now. Some 3,500 bibliophiles and a few out-of-my-way bibliomaniacs spent a record $117,675 in eight hours on such titles as "Mama Is a Miner," "Appalachian Values," "Galileo: A Life" and "In Days of Darkness: the Feuds of Eastern Kentucky."

This was the 13th Kentucky Book Fair. That may not place the state at the center of U.S. publishing but it does mean that readers avidly, admiringly and financially get behind their authors. More than 100 Kentucky writers were here, including Thomas Clark, the state's historian laureate, and Wendell Berry, the Henry County farmer whose prose, poetry and fiction about the foothills and endangered earth of his beloved has led him to write, "What I stand for is what I stand on."

The idea of state book fairs is catching on. New York began one eight years ago. It is having trouble, though: Only 2,000 people came last year, well short of the Frankfort turnout. New York's literati should count down this way to learn how Kentucky did it. They might drop by Plum Lock Press for a spell of porch-sitting with David Dick to study the art of book fair success: local authors as artful about making friends as making their advance.

**Health Plans Rated**

**By Mike Causey**

Mostly good news—with a little bad news—for federal workers and retirees looking for the most hassle-free health plan.

The two federal health plans with the highest ratings are SAMBA (Special Agents Mutual Benefit Association) and the Foreign Service Plan, according to an Office of Personnel Management consumer satisfaction survey. Both got top marks in the categories of access to care, quality of care, doctor availability, coverage and minimal paperwork.

The bad news is that SAMBA is open only to Justice Department employees and other federal law enforcement types and that the Foreign Service Plan is open only to Foreign Service personnel. But OPM's survey gave virtually all of the plans studied a B-plus in customer satisfaction.

Fee-for-service plans rating 90 or better (with 100 being perfect) in access to care were the Postmasters high option, SAMBA, Foreign Service, Postmasters standard, American Postal Workers Union, Blue Cross standard and GEHA (Government Employees Hospital Association).

Those ranked 90 or better in quality of care were Foreign Service, SAMBA, Postmaster high option, GEHA, National Association of Letter Carriers and Blue Cross standard. The Foreign Service plan was the only one scoring above 90 in the doctors-available category, and Postmasters was the only plan rated 90-plus for coverage of hospital Stay.

Among the fee-for-service plans with the best ratings in all categories were Blue Cross standard and Postmasters high option.

Most local health maintenance organizations included in the survey ranked well, with Columbia Medical Plan getting top marks (90-plus in all but one category). George Washington high option and Kaiser and MD-IPA also scored high, HMOs got their lowest ratings in the doctors-available category.

OPM sent copies of its eight-page "How Members Rated Their Health Plans" score card as part of the "Open Season Guide." But some agencies still haven't given them out. They should be available at the OPM health benefits office. They are most useful when combined with the advice—on premiums and benefits—contained in "Checkbook's Guide to 1995 Health Plans for Federal Employees" ($5.95 at most newstands) or the "Open Season Guide" ($5 at the National Association of Retired Federal Employees, 333 New Hampshire Ave. NW).

**Hawaiian Punch**

Here's another good reason to live in Hawaii. Uncle Sam has boosted the cost-of-living differential for federal employees working on Oahu (The "Island") from 17.5 percent to 20 percent. That new higher differential also applies to U.S. civil servants in Guam. Federal workers in the Virgin Islands, another nice place to be this time of year, get a 17.5 percent cost-of-living differential.

**Social Security Bite**

Starting next year, employees under the new Federal Employees Retirement System will pay 6.2 percent of their salary into the FICA portion of Social Security on taxable income up to $78,500. The 1.45 percent Medicare deduction (which also is paid by federal workers and retirees) will remain. But there is no salary limit for the Medicare deduction.

**Divorce and Insurance**

Federal workers and retirees who are legally separated but not yet divorced can enroll in one of the self-only plans in the federal health program, under new rules from the Office of Personnel Management.

**Sick Leave**

Federal workers may now use their own sick leave to care for relatives—spouse, in-laws, siblings, nieces and nephews—thanks to Public Law 103-388. President Clinton signed the bill earlier, but its provisions have just gone into effect.

Under the new law, workers may use at least five sick days for family leave, if they have 10 days left over for themselves. Workers with big sick leave accounts may use more time.
Ask a Biased Question...

In "Health Plan Was Albatross for Democrats," [front page, Nov. 18], which reported on a recent poll by Stanley Greenberg, commissioned by the Democratic Leadership Conference (DLC), the story may have created a false impression that a large portion of the public reacted harshly against health care reform. From reading the story, one might have concluded that poll respondents spontaneously offered critiques of health care reform.

In fact, the Greenberg/DLC poll asked which of several statements best reflected feelings of disappointment in Bill Clinton. Just short of half chose a pollster-drafted statement that "Clinton proposed big government solutions, like health care reform."

It was the pollsters themselves who characterized health care reform as a symbol of big government, not the poll respondents. Respondents who chose "big government solutions" as the reason for their disappointment did not necessarily have to focus on, or even agree with, health care reform as a specific example. Anyone who thought of other examples ("like, the crime bill") would still have selected the same statement. As drafted, the poll reflected a significant bias against health care reform per se.

Ironically, the Greenberg/DLC poll revealed that "control of health care cost" and the need to "ensure that everyone has health insurance" remained high in the public's identification of issues for action. President Clinton's health care plan would have fulfilled those goals.

As Stanley Greenberg himself has acknowledged, "People are deeply conflicted about the role and nature of government." In 1994 Congress may have rejected the president's health care plan, but as the new Congress convenes in 1995, the American public still wants health care reform.

ROBERT J. CAROLLA
Legislative Counsel
Consumers Union
Washington

Mary McGrory

Bosnia's Tragic Conclusion

It may not matter that nobody knows what to do about Bosnia. Bill Clinton, who is blamed for everything, will be blamed for the tragic ending, for the bloody chaos that is unfolding in BiHac, a so-called safe haven.

Bosnia's vicious civil war brought out the worst and the best in President Clinton, as it did in others. His instinct was to help, to fix, to repair. He sent Warren Christopher over to argue for "lift and strike"—lift the Bosnian arms embargo and strike from the air. The Europeans, who wanted to do something but not a lot, vetoed the idea. They had troops, not enough to make a difference but enough to counter charges that they had done nothing to halt savage Serbian aggression in the heart of Europe.

Clinton, spoiled by the loss of 30 U.S. troops in Somalia, put off going into Haiti for months, for fear of endangering American lives. He never dreamed of sending in the 200,000 that Defense Secretary William J. Perry says would be needed to matter in Bosnia.

The military, as usual, was opposed to intervention. But Haiti proved, Jesse Helms to the contrary notwithstanding, that the Pentagon does what it is told by the commander in chief. Clinton and the allies had one brief moment of harmonious resolve when they laid down the Sarajevo Ultimatum, and the people of that city, freed from shelling, began strolling in the streets and breathing.

But a Muslim offensive in the fall gave the Serbians an excuse to invade the U.N. safe haven, and bickering between NATO and the United Nations about targets and tactics and air attacks ended up with none to speak of, and the commander of the U.N. forces, Lt. Gen. Michael Rose spoke of withdrawing 23,000 "peacekeepers."

What the West proposes to do or to let happen, in short, is to let the Serbs and Muslims go at each other, as they have over the centuries; their history is one reason for European reserve, even in the face of concentration camps, torture and other atrocities. Another appalling moral dilemma faces us in this eventuality. Do we go through with the lifting of the arms embargo for the Bosnians, which would prolong and intensify the bloody struggle and not affect the final outcome?

Clinton, who is trying to redefine himself and his party in the wake of the Nov. 8 earthquake, must also try to redefine his country and its mission in the light of the catastrophe in BiHac. As the only remaining superpower and one that has prided itself on the moral content of its foreign policy, the United States has certain obligations to resist bullies, discourage aggression and right wrongs. But say critics, we have no vital interest and no duty to "send to know for whom the bell tolls."

In the whole wretched panoply of what-might-have-been, only the Serbs, from the first have known exactly what they wanted. They shielded markets and water fountains and bridge players and hospitals in their relentless advance to land and power. They now hold 70 percent of the territory they seek.

Europe seems reconciled to the idea of a Greater Serbia, despite the peril to the neighborhood. They apparently find it no more threatening than the Muslim power base they once feared.

In this difficult moment, when he is as surrounded and outmaneuvered as the Muslims in BiHac, Clinton can't look to anyone for help. The Republicans are committed to making his life miserable every day for the next two years, sniping at his credibility, his effectiveness and his right to be in the White House. Senate Minority Leader Robert J. Dole (R-Kan.) has occasional impulses of fairness and reason, but they have a short shelf life.

For instance on Nov. 20 on "This Week with David Brinkley," when asked about Clinton's performance in foreign policy, Dole was generous: "I think he's done a little better... with Haiti. I think he's doing better all the time."

But a week later on "Meet the Press," Dole sounded more in tune with House Speaker-to-be Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.): about Haiti, he said pettishly, "My view is the Americas never should have gone there in the first place."

Dole admitted that he doesn't know what we do now in Bosnia. But, the way things are, Republicans will find a way to make it Clinton's fault. When they see pictures of children in hospitals without anesthesia and old people dead in the streets, they will be sorry and guilty—and forget that the critical Bosnia decisions were made by George Bush.

By the time Clinton became president, it was too late to organize the West and to face down the Serbs. His fitful attempts to introduce U.S. remedies, with no force to back them up, did him no credit. For an activist president, who thinks there is something to do about everything, the miserable and violent conclusion in Bosnia is painful and humiliating—like just about everything else that has happened to him lately.
It seems a mite peculiar that while the incoming Republican majority in Congress says it opposes big government and all its works, most of the party’s rhetorical fire since the election has been directed at that rather small part of government that helps America’s poorest people.

The Republicans might be talking about how they intend to return agriculture to the free market or how spending by the Small Business Administration is a wasteful perversion of capitalism. If they get their way, they might even be preparing the ground for savings in really big (and popular) programs such as Medicare.

The Democrats are mentioning such things. But mostly they’re talking about Aid to Families with Dependent Children, food stamps and unemployment compensation. The Clinton administration, for its part, is saying that since most of the people who get money from these programs wouldn’t even consider voting Republican, you’d think this would provide an opportunity for the Democrats to lay down some markers for the coming debates. If the Republicans promise to zero out these programs that dole out cash to the well-off and only want to slash assistance to the poor, might the average citizen’s war on behalf of the government be a disguised class war against the needy? Naturally, the Republicans would say no, but at least some Republicans really are serious about reducing programs for their own constituencies. But notice that by pursuing this argument, Democrats could put the Republicans on the defensive, and (2) push them in more constructive directions.

Richard Cohen

Bosnia Is Lost

How many divisions does the pope have? This question, supposedly posed by Stalin, finally has a definitive answer. As many as the United Nations, or NATO. Both organizations in recent years have become militarily ineffective in Bosnia, which is where, at the moment, a terrible war is being fought. But note that even NATO, which was supposed to put in troops and fix bayonets, has not been able to stop the war, and it has certainly not been able to coerce the Serbs, but through ite common enemy—and there’s no use pretending that not. The Serbs can fill that role. Bosnia is lost and so, probably, is NATO. Only a renewed Russian menace can save it—true only of the cure being worse than the disease.

If Republicans come up with humane ways of promoting work and combating illegitimacy, Democrats should do business with them.

Some Democrats are finding their voices, but most of them seem scared to death of the coming welfare debate. They should be, because Democrats blew the welfare issue in the 1992 election. But while they were handed a large opportunity to reform a bad system, instead, the administration delayed, and when the issue finally came up with the economic package, some liberals in Congress set out to block it.

Who those prevented humane welfare reform from passing should be ashamed. The solution to poverty now seems bound and polarized, where there was once at least a chance for common ground. Democrats and Republicans now have the task of searching for that common ground under more hazardous conditions.

There are two broad arguments about welfare that currently carry the “conservative” label but ought to transcend ideology. The first holds that the country’s poverty problem is not economic but cultural. The number of kids being raised by young, single mothers because the fathers walked out is a national shame. So is the fact that the welfare system has become more a holding pen for the poor than an effort to help dependent people become independent. The tenacity in the system do need changing, and one Democrat who understands this well is President Clinton, who is why his failure to make welfare reform a priority was a large mistake.

The other so-called conservative argument that deserves broader respect holds that experimental approaches to welfare are best tried at the state and local level. This argument can get tricky because having a federally financed safety net is a useful way of evening out some regional economic disparities. Some communities have especially high concentrations of poor people and need special help. Different regions can need help at different times. If the farm states are in recession at a moment when New England is booming, it makes sense for Massachusetts taxpayers to give Kansans a hand. Still, there is a useful debate to be had over which welfare functions might be handled more creatively by the states and how this might be done without evincing aid to the poor.

All Republican welfare proposals should be tested against these two principles—in a sense, their principles. If the Republicans come up with humane ways of promoting work and combating illegitimacy, Democrats should do business with them. Democrats might also forge a constructive alliance with Representative Nancy Kassebaum, who is interested in decentering truancy programs out of the welfare state in order to combat poverty.

Where Democrats should be fearless and unequivocal is in resisting the use of happy talk about “values” or “federalism” as a mask for simply tearing the safety net apart. Arguments for doing just that are gaining much ground among conservatives, some of whom echo 19th century formulas about how doing nothing for the poor will make them virtuous. These conservatives would end public assistance for large groups, claiming that this would slash illegitimacy rates and push many into the work force. Private charities and families would step in. For the kids, there are always orphans. Oh, happy day!

It should tell us something that the prime opponents of this Dickensian approach are church leaders—particularly in the Catholic Church—who are doing more than anyone to promote wholesome values and provide alternatives to the welfare state. And it should tell us something that private charities don’t come close to having the resources needed to help the poor lift themselves from poverty.

While the church leaders speak out, the Democrats are wasting a lot of time trying to find appropriate principles to suit their current political needs. They’ve got it exactly backward. If they get the principles right, smart politics will follow. On welfare, the recipe for good politics and good policy is clear enough: Yes to work and good policy is clear enough: Yes to work and to the welfare system has become more a holding pen for the poor than an effort to help dependent people lift themselves up. Democrats might also forge a constructive alliance with Representative Nancy Kassebaum, who is interested in decentering truancy programs out of the welfare state in order to combat poverty.

Where Democrats should be fearless and unequivocal is in resisting the use of happy talk about “values” or “federalism” as a mask for simply tearing the safety net apart. Arguments for doing just that are gaining much ground among conservatives, some of whom echo 19th century formulas about how doing nothing for the poor will make them virtuous. These conservatives would end public assistance for large groups, claiming that this would slash illegitimacy rates and push many into the work force. Private charities and families would step in. For the kids, there are always orphans. Oh, happy day!

It should tell us something that the prime opponents of this Dickensian approach are church leaders—particularly in the Catholic Church—who are doing more than anyone to promote wholesome values and provide alternatives to the welfare state. And it should tell us something that private charities don’t come close to having the resources needed to help the poor lift themselves from poverty.

While the church leaders speak out, the Democrats are wasting a lot of time trying to find appropriate principles to suit their current political needs. They’ve got it exactly backward. If they get the principles right, smart politics will follow. On welfare, the recipe for good politics and good policy is clear enough: Yes to work and good policy is clear enough: Yes to work and...
Yitzhak Rabin, due in Oslo next week for the Nobel award ceremony, has been making speeches on peace and the Middle East, in which he has been raising funds for Israel. His visit to Oslo will be his first major trip abroad since he came to power in late 1992. Rabin, who has been a leader of the Labor Party in Israel, was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1994 for his efforts to bring about a comprehensive peace between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). Rabin's visit to Oslo is expected to be a significant moment in the peace process, and his presence will be a symbol of the progress made in the past three years.

The idea of replicating on the Golan the small U.S. Sinai force that monitors the peace treaty signed by President Jimmy Carter and Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin in 1979 is one that many people have been talking about in recent weeks. This idea is gaining momentum, especially among those who believe that a Syrian presence on the Golan is a threat to Israel's security. The Golan Heights is a strategically important area that has been a matter of dispute between Israel and Syria since the 1967 Six-Day War.

William Raspberry
The Clinton Thing

With George Bush, it was "the vision thing." What is it with Bill Clinton? The principle thing? The priorities thing? The who-am-I-really-thing? Whatever it is, it threatens the effectiveness of the Clinton presidency. It may have cost his party control of Congress. It may make it difficult for him to pass any major legislation. It threatens to make him a one-term president.

The fact is that after nearly two years in office, Clinton has yet to establish in the minds of the people the nature of his political core. We have no clear idea of what he stands for when the chips are down. If you go over the things he has done, you will not, no sense of what's he'll stand and fight for without weighing the political odds.

There are, of course, several ways of saying what I've just said. The first, flatteringly, is to say that Clinton is no huckster. He is telling the truth. He will not retreat, no sense of what he'll stand and fight for without weighing the political odds.

A second way of saying it comes more easily to me. It is my own way of dealing with interviewers who want to know whether I'm liberal or conservative. The question, I tell them, is an irrelevant one. I take issues as they come and try to make them relevant to the lives of ordinary people. I try to anticipate the way the government will change in the future and to influence it in a positive way.

A president is more like a conductor. The orchestra, if it is to perform successfully, needs the assurance of knowing how he will score the music. What can be intriguing or a conflict of interest, is a president, with no philosophical reference points, first confuses minds, then frustrates them and finally forces them to abandon him.

Those fears seem exaggerated to me, especially after listening to Rabin. For his part, Rabin pointed to the consequences if America refuses in 1994 to do what it did in 1979 in the Sinai and 1974 in the Golan. A refusal, he suggested, would provide a troubling answer to the question of what role America now intends to play in world affairs, and whether or not America is withdrawing into isolationism.

America can scarcely afford that answer. And Rabin knows that. Now it may be that Clinton really does intend to have in world affairs, and whether or not America is withdrawing into isolationism. The orchestra, if it is to perform successfully, needs the assurance of knowing how he will score the music. What can be recurring and unpredictable. The priority thing? The partisanship thing? The principle thing? The priorities thing? The who-am-I-really-thing? Whatever it is, it threatens the effectiveness of the Clinton presidency. It may have cost his party control of Congress. It may make it difficult for him to pass any major legislation. It threatens to make him a one-term president.

The question, I tell them, is an irrelevant one. I take issues as they come and try to make them relevant to the lives of ordinary people. I try to anticipate the way the government will change in the future and to influence it in a positive way.

A president is more like a conductor. The orchestra, if it is to perform successfully, needs the assurance of knowing how he will score the music. What can be recurring and unpredictable. The priority thing? The partisanship thing? The principle thing? The priorities thing? The who-am-I-really-thing? Whatever it is, it threatens the effectiveness of the Clinton presidency. It may have cost his party control of Congress. It may make it difficult for him to pass any major legislation. It threatens to make him a one-term president.

The question, I tell them, is an irrelevant one. I take issues as they come and try to make them relevant to the lives of ordinary people. I try to anticipate the way the government will change in the future and to influence it in a positive way.

A president is more like a conductor. The orchestra, if it is to perform successfully, needs the assurance of knowing how he will score the music. What can be recurring and unpredictable. The priority thing? The partisanship thing? The principle thing? The priorities thing? The who-am-I-really-thing? Whatever it is, it threatens the effectiveness of the Clinton presidency. It may have cost his party control of Congress. It may make it difficult for him to pass any major legislation. It threatens to make him a one-term president.
CLASS WARFARE AGAIN?
By Jack W. Germond and Jules Witcover
WASHINGTON The apparent split in the Clinton cabinet
between Labor Secretary Robert Reich on the one hand and
Treasury Secretary Lloyd Bentsen and Commerce Secretary
Ron Brown on the other over the need to cut what Reich has
called "corporate welfare" indicates that the
administration is wary of initiating another round of what
the Republicans like to call "class warfare."
Reich coined his term in a speech last week. "If we're
asking middle-class people to work smarter and welfare
mothers to play by the rules," he told the Democratic
Leadership Council, "it seems important to ask Corporate
America to get off welfare and play by the rules as well."
His target was various federal tax breaks, credits and
subsidies to business and agriculture that he estimated
could save the treasury more than $111 billion over five
years.
Bentsen and Brown, whose cabinet portfolios make big
business part of their special constituencies, quickly
distanced themselves from Reich's words. "I did not find
myself very excited about them," Bentsen said on CBS
News' "Face the Nation" over the weekend.
Nevertheless, Reich's call for Corporate America to pay
a greater share of the nation's tax bill is reminiscent of
the demand of liberal Democrats during the 1993 deficit
reduction debate that various tax breaks and loopholes for
business be closed, and that any tax increases fall most
heavily on the most wealthy, a category that includes the
top dogs of big business.
The deficit reduction package as enacted did restrict
federal income tax boosts to the top 1.5 percent of
taxpayers, a fact that was trumpeted thereafter by
President Clinton and deplored by Republican conservatives
as a classic Democratic pitting of the poor against the
rich "class warfare" in the GOP vernacular.
The poor, however, have not been much of an effective
political constituency at least since the days of the New
Deal, when there were enough have-nots in the society to
be a voting factor. Clinton in his 1992 presidential
campaign instead championed the middle class as the group
that was getting the shaft in spite of the fact that they,
in his favorite phrase borrowed by Reich, "work hard and
play by the rules."
After his election, Clinton reneged on his campaign
call for a middle-class tax cut but obviously hoped that
by hitting the top income category he would still cast
himself as the advocate of the beleaguered middle class.
But the assumption that the middle class sees itself at war
with the rich was disputed back in the Bush years. Then,
House Democrats found themselves pressured by middle-class
constituents who nourished the hope that they might be
well off someday to vote for a capital gains tax cut.
With the Republican majority certain to seek a cut in
the capital gains tax rate in the next session of
Congress, the cry of "class warfare" probably will be
heard again, this time from liberal Democrats who will
argue that such a cut will only make the rich richer. But
that lament, as with Reich's call for an attack on
"corporate welfare," is not likely to have much
resonance in a Congress under Republican control for the
first time in four decades.
Even before the Republican congressional avalanche of
Nov. 8, the tactic of making villains out of wealthy
Americans and the Corporate America to which many owe
their wealth taking care of the poor and middle class by
"soaking the rich" had become threadbare as an
inducement to embrace the Democratic Party. It does not
figure to be the answer now that lower- and middle-income
voters apparently no longer see that party as their
protector in the way they did in the days of Franklin D.
Roosevelt.
Still, if the congressional Republicans go overboard in
cutting programs of primary benefit to the welfare poor
and working poor such as Newt Gingrich's harebrained
notion of relying on orphanages rather than welfare
mothers to care for needy children they may yet
unwittingly breathe life into the Democratic "class
warfare" argument once again.
Rob Shapiro of the DLC's Progressive Policy Institute,
who agrees with Reich's pitch to end corporate tax breaks
that undermine economic health, says he hopes that won't
happen. He expresses a fear of "ideologues capturing
economic policy" and a hope that rhetoric about "class
warfare" can be cooled.

(C) 1994 TRIBUNE MEDIA SERVICES, INC.
Russ Gough

A Sporting Chance

Several months ago I accepted an invitation from Illinois Democratic Rep. Cardiss Collins—on behalf of the Black Coaches Association and numerous black educators—to take a long, hard look at race and college sports. I and several other academicians were asked to review the research on eligibility requirements, graduation rates, racial inequities and academic integrity in general.

I accepted with some trepidation. After all, I'm not a member of a minority group, I do not have leftish tendencies; and I'm not a political correctness zealot. I am a college educator who believes in the educational benefits of athletics, who cares about the educational well-being of student-athletes and who is deeply concerned about some of the things going on in college sports these days.

Until recently, I had pretty much ignored most of the shrill criticism concerning the impact of ever-tightening NCAA entrance requirements on minority student-athletes. Like many university insiders, I had treated these criticisms as the moans and groans of special interest groups whose priorities did not lie in high academic standards.

Like many university insiders, I was wrong.

Hard facts demonstrate that, starting with concerns about new eligibility rules back in the early 1980s, the Black Coaches Association, the Congressional Black Caucus and other critics have been right all along about NCAA efforts to restore academic integrity in college sports.

Most of their concerns, then as now, center on the NCAA's arbitrary minimum standardized test score requirements and the ways these specific requirements affect minority student-athletes.

But—as Rep. Collins and numerous educators like myself continue to argue to disbelieving media and the public—this is not fundamentally either a racial or an athletics issue. It is at its core an education and an ethical issue. It is not a debate about high vs. low standards but about high standards for all.

Question: Is it fair to exclude a sizable number of students who are at present being barred from athletic participation who would in fact graduate from college?

There is precious little evidence that students who are at present being barred from athletic participation would not succeed academically (i.e., graduate). Quite the contrary, several studies—including some conducted by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA)—suggest that a large proportion of these casualties would not succeed academically. Quite the contrary, several studies—including some conducted by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA)—suggest that a large proportion of these casualties would not succeed academically. Quite the contrary, several studies—including some conducted by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA)—suggest that a large proportion of these casualties would not succeed academically. Quite the contrary, several studies—including some conducted by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA)—suggest that a large proportion of these casualties would not succeed academically.

On this point nearly all the experts agree.

Question: Have NCAA leaders actually taken the time to familiarize themselves with the research they so often appeal to, or might it be the case that the NCAA's standardized test score requirements—the very symbol of NCAA reform efforts—continue to represent a quick-fix PR campaign designed more to burnish the NCAA's image than restore academic integrity in college sports?

• For several years now, even before the NCAA's standardized test requirements were instituted, the overall graduation rates of athletes have been equal to or higher than the overall graduation rates of non-athletes.

Question: Given this fact, why does the NCAA continue to talk and legislate as though raising graduation rates were the key to academic reform?

• Despite repeated claims by NCAA leaders that standardized test scores are the single best predictor of academic success, an overwhelming majority of the relevant studies shows this to be patently untrue. On the contrary, these studies show that high school grade point averages, not standardized test scores, are the single best predictor.

To say the least, the addition of SAT and ACT test scores adds absolutely nothing in terms of predictability to high school GPAs, and in some cases it worsens predictability. On this point nearly all the experts agree.

• FinaUly, it is a matter of scientific fact that raising SAT and ACT test standards—as NCAA leaders continue to push for—is not at all the same as raising academic standards. Other than slight, albeit artificial, increases in graduation rates, there is no hard evidence to suggest that the NCAA's current exclusionary policy is ameliorating the problems of academic integrity in college sports.

These problems, as the NCAA's own data help bear out in the final analysis, are not primarily questions of whether high school seniors are qualified for higher education but whether, after becoming college freshmen, they are in fact being well educated.

Question: If the experts who create standardized tests have serious misgivings about using their tests to establish eligibility rules, why would the NCAA go ahead and use them anyway?

• There is a very strong correlation in all of the research between a student's standardized test scores and his or her family income. (Ironically, if not mysteriously, the NCAA's own studies have completely ignored this well-documented and well-known correlation.) The upshot here is that, under the present rule structure, the NCAA might as well throw out its standardized test score requirements and simply allow a freshman to play or not play on the basis of his family's income.

• Finally, it is a matter of scientific fact that raising SAT and ACT test standards—as NCAA leaders continue to push for—is not at all the same as raising academic standards. Other than slight, albeit artificial, increases in graduation rates, there is no hard evidence to suggest that the NCAA's current exclusionary policy is ameliorating the problems of academic integrity in college sports.

The writer, a 1994 Sports Ethics Fellow with the University of Rhode Island-based Institute for International Sport, is an associate professor of philosophy and ethics at Pepperdine University.
Mr. Dole's Bosnia Lament

WAT CAN the new Senate majority leader possibly have in mind when he calls on the European allies to stop blocking a full-fledged air assault on Bosnia's Serbs? Has Sen. Dole forgotten that successive American administrations have declined to pay the "entry price"—putting American peacekeeping forces on the ground—that would let Washington write strategy? Mr. Dole would like to punish the Serbs. Many would. To make it more than a feel-good gesture, however, requires the consent of those countries whose soldiers would then be exposed to Serb retaliation. In turn, those countries would have to be persuaded, against the grim logic to the contrary, that "bombing or lifting the arms embargo on Bosnia could somehow reverse Serb gains and alter the outcome of the war.

In fact, Mr. Dole knows all this perfectly well. He conceded by saying on Sunday that the war in Bosnia has "almost run its course." At this point, he said, there's "not much you can do." This is the dismal reality that Secretary of Defense William Perry also recognizes. It was not the goal of either the Bush or Clinton administrations, Mr. Perry said, to affect the outcome of the war, but merely to limit to the extent possible its violence and its spread. This has been done—not well, but done. Was it an insufficient and ignoble goal? Without a doubt. But it is also a goal that represents a political consensus and that has been supported for a couple of years, tacitly if not out loud, by most people, including many who now find their stomach churning as they view the cadavers.

The United States and the Europeans and the structures through which they worked, the United Nations and NATO, will be objects of shame in future years for their failure to help provide a soft landing to Yugoslavia as it disintegrated and especially for their particular failure to prevent mult-ethnic and therefore especially vulnerable Bosnia. The implicit premise of the arms embargo that the company of nations imposed on the combatants was that the chief victim, Bosnia, having been denied adequate means of self-defense, would be sheltered by others. A common weakness and myopia aborted delivering on this premise.

You can tell that it is, in the minds and hopes of most of the actors, near the end of the day. A wretched negotiating cover is being put on the residual hostilities, and recriminations are in full swing.

Why Not Save Stamps?

TWENTY-FIVE years ago, the federal food stamp program was barely a blip in the federal budget. Today more than one American in 10—some 27 million people—receive part of their income each month in the form of these food stamps at a cost to the government of more than $25 billion a year. The House Republicans, as part of their "Contract With America," want in effect to abolish it by submerging it into a new block grant to the states. Also in the block would be the other federal feeding programs, mainly school lunch and WIC, a supplemental program for low-income pregnant women, infants and children.

The block grant would serve two functions, the authors of the contract say. The first is to save money. The food stamp program would cease to be an open-ended entitlement whose cost each year depends on how many eligible applicants show up. Instead, all the feeding programs would together become subject to the annual appropriations process. The states would receive each year whatever the appropriators thought the government could afford.

Second, the amount the feeding block grant could go up each year would also be limited so that, no matter what the appropriators decided, the cost to the government would be less than the projected cost of all the current programs. Proponents say, however, that the spending cut wouldn't necessarily translate into a benefit cut, since the states could administer the programs more efficiently.

The problem is that the food stamps program is different from other welfare programs. Unlike welfare proper and perhaps Medicaid, it isn't clear that the stamps program is broken and in need of being fixed. To the contrary, it's possible to argue that it's working pretty well. It's the most straightforward of all the welfare programs in that, to qualify, all a household needs to be is below a certain income level. The program thereby creates if not quite a national income floor at least a veneer. That underpinning is a form of federal protection not just for people with low incomes but for the states and localities that would otherwise have to support such people. The states can build on the stamps program in setting other assistance, and in fact they have for years. In letting welfare payments lag behind inflation, they have implicitly relied on stamps to pick up the slack. A greater part of the cost of supporting those who qualify for assistance has been federalized. Who gains from shifting that cost back? The stamps program also has the advantage of being countercyclical. As incomes go down in recessions, more people become eligible for stamps, and stamps spending goes up, which in turn helps to keep the recession from getting worse.

The stamps program is far from being either perfect or cheap, and it could no doubt use improvement. But even its critics tend to acknowledge that it performs a vital function pretty efficiently. It has long had bipartisan support. It is one thing to say it ought to be changed but quite another to set about changing it so drastically. The burden of proof is really on those who would bring about these drastic changes to show that they would in fact be an improvement.
Deciding on a D.C. Arena

Another deadline arrives Thursday in the timetable for building a downtown home to host the Bullets, Caps and other events—and it has to do with the site. The Redevelopment Land Agency is scheduled to act on a recommendation to turn over city land at Gallery Place to a nonprofit coalition of business and neighborhood representatives and religious and university leaders. This group, called the National Capital Development Corp., would build the arena through the sale of bonds, roughly half of which would be publicly issued and backed by the city, with the rest of the financing coming from private sources, to be covered by revenues from the arena. Up to now, city representatives and negotiators for the coalition have come up with what they think is a sound agreement.

A second proposal, put forth by television executive Robert L. Johnson, is tied to an insistence that he would eventually own the Bullets or whatever NBA team played there. But the Bullets as well as the Caps belong to Abe Pollin, who is not prepared to sign away future control of the Bullets to anyone.

That is Mr. Pollin's personal and private decision, and no arena decisions can or should be premised on any other ownership of the basketball team. Mr. Pollin has indicated that he would consider offers from investors for shares in his basketball/hockey enterprise, but not any deal that would limit his ability to sell or turn over the teams as he sees fit.

Mr. Johnson is free to pursue his business interest in the Bullets, but the decision on moving ahead with the arena must be based on its own financial merits. The project still requires the mayor to certify to the council that it will generate the revenue to pay off the city-issued bonds and that all other numbers are solid.

Mr. Johnson's campaign has included one disturbing swipe at home rule. He has said he is not hesitant to take his case to the new Republican-controlled Congress—in effect an end run around local government decision-making. That's a way of doing business in this town that District residents fought long and hard to eliminate. Clearly, Congress has legitimate interests in much that the city does. But local decisions should be addressed first and foremost by locally elected officials, not by private interests going over their heads to the Hill.

Gun Control in Haiti

As the United States continues to withdraw its troops from Haiti, anxieties about law and order there are rising. That's why President Jean-Bertrand Aristide is pressing the Americans to disarm the troublemakers now. But the American commanders resist being drawn into routine police work and argue that sweeping the whole country for firearms is impossible.

Crime has become more prevalent in recent weeks, but the American troops dismiss it as routine thievery with no political significance. The Haitians, having lived most of their lives under one kind of despotism or another, believe that crime always has political significance and that it will destroy a government incapable of enforcing the law.

The Americans say—and they are right—that only Haitians can effectively police Haiti. But that only sharpens the dilemma. Under the American semi-occupation, the police are being reorganized and, for the first time, separated from the army. The United Nations is bringing in a corps of police trainers and monitors to help. But the Haitians consider it naive of the Americans to think a policeman who worked for the brutal and corrupt military regime and its predecessors can be transformed by a few weeks' indoctrination into Officer Friendly. The Americans have confiscated thousands of guns, but no one doubts there are many more in the hands of people who are no friends of any government trying to control racketeering.

The United States has now withdrawn slightly more than half the 21,000 troops that landed in September. The plan is to keep pulling them out until, presumably some time early next year, they turn the primary responsibility for supporting the Aristide government over to the United Nations. A contingent of 3,000 Americans is to stay as part of the U.N. force. But their job isn't to run the country. It's to prevent local thugs from overthrowing President Aristide a second time and destroying another elected government.

Mr. Aristide, reasonably enough, wonders how long the soldiers are going to stay. He knows that a lot of Republicans are drumming on President Clinton to bring them home. He wants to see the professional criminals and gunmen-for-hire disarmed before that happens. But guns are hard to find and easy to replace. The survival of Haitian democracy is likely to depend more directly on the country's ability to organize competent police and an impartial court system. There, unfortunately, Mr. Aristide is starting from scratch. That's where he needs—and is entitled to—more help.
Hillary Clinton kicked off the holiday season yesterday when she took the traditional ride aboard a hydraulic lift to place a stained-glass star atop the National Christmas Tree behind the White House.

The lift apparently lurched and stopped repeatedly as it traveled up 40 feet to present Mrs. Clinton. When she tried to step off, the First Lady snagged her heel on the lift's floor and had to hobble down in one stockinged foot. "My slipper," she giggled as a Park Service employee helped put her shoe back on. "Like Cinderella."

Yesterday, for his morning jog, the president wore a blue running suit with the words "Commander in Chief" emblazoned in huge gold letters across his chest. Clinton spent about 30 minutes running at Fort McNair, accompanied by soldiers from the local base.

The official Christmas card will be revealed Friday, and all we can tell you is that unlike last year, it is not a mug of Bill and Hillary Clinton. Our sources tell us the card was made by American Greetings and features an image of a White House room. And, for the first time, it will be available for viewing on the Internet at http://www.whitehouse.gov/.

The First Lady's office tells us that some 30,000 folks are expected to traipse through the White House—among the private parties, special tours and general public—between next Monday and Dec. 22, when the house shuts down for the Clintons' private holiday celebration.

Clinton, Taking Command

If you thought Bill Clinton might become a tad self-conscious about his lack of military service in light of Jesse Helms' recent comments that he's not up to the job of commander in chief—think again. Yesterday, for his morning jog, the president were a blue running suit with the words "Commander in Chief" screaming in huge gold letters across his back. Clinton spent about 30 minutes running at Fort McNair, accompanied by soldiers from the local base.

Princess Di's French Connection

Princess Diana showed up in Paris yesterday and, escorted by former French First Lady Anne-Aymone Giscard, visited a day-care center in a working-class district of the city. She spoke to a few toddlers, and seemed moved when told that most of the children's parents are divorced.

After the tour, to the dismay of spectators in front of the center's playground, Diana skipped the hand-shaking and jumped into a waiting car.

In the evening, she was the guest of honor at a gala at the Palace of Versailles, which was expected to raise $1 million for the Foundation of Endace, a children's charity founded by Mr. Giscard. A year ago, after endless begging by Fleet Street reporters, Princess Diana announced she was withdrawing from public life.

An embassy spokesman said yesterday that Diana's trip to Paris was indeed private.
**What's News—**

**Business and Finance**

**ABC WILL CREATE** a television-production venture with the entertainment group formed last month by Jeffrey Katzenberg, David Geffen and Steven Spielberg. The $200 million venture, which will produce programming to be sold to ABC and others, signals that Capital Cities/ABC, which had talked about merging with Paramount Communications and Turner Broadcasting, is prepared to build its own production company instead. (Article on Page A3)

Campbell Soup agreed to buy privately held Pace Foods, the biggest producer of salsa in the U.S., for $1.12 billion. The price led some analysts to question whether Campbell will be able to recoup its investment. (Article on Page A3)

American General is negotiating to buy the life insurance operations of American International Group in a transaction that would be valued at about $1.2 billion, people familiar with the talks said. (Article on Page A3)

Boeing and McDonnell Douglas are expected to announce today that they are teaming to compete for contracts to build the new space shuttle. (Article on Page A3)

Mellon Bank will take a fourth-quarter charge of $130 million to compensate institutional customers for losses, some involving derivatives. (Article on Page A2)

USA Waste Services agreed to acquire Chambers Development for $66 million, or $7.50 a share. (Article on Page A2)

Ameritech will take a fourth-quarter charge of $130 million to compensate institutional customers for losses, some involving derivatives. (Article on Page A2)

Goldman Sachs has raised $250 million in equity capital from an institutional investor, lifting outside ownership above 20% for the first time. (Article on Page C1)

Union Pacific's plan to put Santa Fe Pacific into a trust was approved, eliminating Santa Fe's main objection to Union Pacific's takeover offer. (Article on Page A6)

The Supreme Court cleared the way for a lawsuit accusing R.J. Reynolds Tobacco of targeting children with its Joe Camel ad campaign. (Article on Page A24)

The chief executive of Piper Jaffray's money-management unit, Edward Kohler, was forced out after losses at some of the unit's funds. (Article on Page B6)

The sales pace of previously owned homes held steady in October despite a sharp increase in interest rates. (Article on Page A27)

Time Warner is considering a re-structuring plan that could involve dismantling its partnership with U.S. West and two Japanese investors. (Article on Page B1)

Ford agreed to acquire a 45% stake in an assembler of Ford automobiles in South Africa, moving toward becoming the first U.S. auto maker to make a major investment in that country since apartheid was dismantled. (Article on Page A18)

Markets—

**World Wide**

The world trade pact seemed headed for passage by Congress. Clinton administration officials voiced increasing confidence that they'll win majorities on GATT in both houses of Congress this week's lame-duck session of Congress. In a House vote scheduled for today, aides to both GOP and Democratic leaders predicted the trade agreement would receive 450 or more votes, comfortably above the 218 needed for passage if all members vote. In the Senate, Dole's decision to back the accord has won over some wavering Republicans. (Article on Page A2)

The White House rally for GATT, the administration produced a letter signed by three ex-presidents, Ford, Bush and Carter, urging approval. (Article on Page A2)

The U.S. and major powers offered Bosnia's Serbs key concessions in a bid to stop an assault against Srebrenica, diplomats said. The concessions were said to include a right for Bosnian Serbs to join in a conference with Serb-led Yugoslavia in return for accepting a peace plan. U.N. chief Boutros-Ghali is to visit Sarajevo tomorrow. (Article on Page A2)

The British government won a crucial parliamentary victory to increase the country's contribution to the European Union budget. Prime Minister Major had said he and his cabinet would resign and call a general election if he suffered a defeat in the vote. (Article on Page A19)

Norwegians rejected European Union membership. With over 95% of the votes counted, 53% opposed joining the EU, with 47% in favor. The vote was a disappointment for Prime Minister Brundtland, who urged voters to follow the lead of Sweden, Finland and Austria, all of which recently voted to join the EU. (Article on Page A19)

Harvard's president is taking an indefin- ite leave of absence at the insistence of his doctors to recover from "severe fatigue and exhaustion." the university said. Neil Rudenstine, 59, has been president since July 1981. During his absence, provost Albert Carnesale will serve as acting presi- dent. (Article on Page B7)

The European Union tried to bolster Mideast peace efforts by lifting an eight-year-old ban on weapon sales to Syria, but Israel's foreign minister called the action a mistake. Peres, who was meeting in Brussels with PLO leader Arafat, said the ban should have remained in place because Syria is blocking peace talks with Israel. (Article on Page A26)

The Supreme Court agreed to decide whether middle- and high-school athletes may be subjected to random drug testing in the absence of specific suspicions that students are using narcotics. An Oregon town has banned and says it will not be cited as a policy violated the Fourth Amendment's ban on unreasonable searches. (Article on Page A2)

North Korea has halted its nuclear program and has stopped building two nuclear reactors in accordance with a recent pact signed with the U.S. and its atomic safeguard agency said. The International Atomic Energy Agency said inspectors vis­ ited North Korean atomic sites and con­ firmed that all activities have ceased. (Article on Page A2)

Palestinian guerrillas attacked Israeli troops with mortar shells in southern Lebanon, slightly wounding one soldier and pro­ voxing a counterattack by Israeli helicopters that killed at least four guerrillas. The radical Islamic Jihad movement claimed respon­ sibility for initiating the attack on the Israeli military convoy. (Article on Page A2)

Serial killer Jeffrey Dahmer died of massive head injuries after he was attacked in a maximum-security prison in Portage, Wis. A fellow inmate was taken into custody. Dahmer, 34, who confessed to murdering 17 men and boys and cannibalizing some of them, was clubbed to death while he was cleaning a prison toilet, officials said. (Article on Page A2)

A former president was returned to power in Uruguay and said he would put regional free trade at the top of his agenda. Julio Sanguinetti of the centrist Colorado party, defeated the ruling party's candidate, businessman Alberto Volonte, by a narrow margin. Sanguinetti, 58, was presi­ dent from 1985 to 1990. (Article on Page A2)

Mexican President-elect Zedillo held dis­ cussions with his leftist opponents and pledged to undertake a series of deep-rooted political changes as well as economic reforms that favor the poor. The meeting came just three days before Zedillo takes office. His predecessor, Salinas, never met publicly with Mexico's opposition leaders.

---
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The new Republican Congress "doesn't assume the employer is a bad guy," says an
related Dan Yager, general counsel at Labor Policy Association, a corporate lobbying
group in Washington. Rep. William Good-
ing of Pennsylvania, the probable chair-
man of the House Education and Labor
Committee, wants workplace disputes, from
sexual harassment to discrimination, to be
settled through mediation "without going to
court."

A Republican draft agenda suggests
plans to change wage and hour laws to give
companies more flexibility to abandon the
40-hour week and adopt biweekly or monthly
schedules that let companies tell workers to
put in seven days, for instance, and then
take four-day breaks. It also would ease
rules requiring overtime pay and allow
companies to offer compensatory time in-
stead. New lawmakers have already voiced
opposition to ergonomics standards and in-
door-smoking reforms planned by the Occu-
pational Safety and Health Administration.

OSHAd chief Joseph Dear drew laughs
from a post-election industry audience
when he quipped: "I sleep like a baby. I
wake up every two hours screaming."

OLDER WORKERS continue their battle
to win respect at work.
Younger managers complain that older
workers remind them of their parents in
"intergenerational conflicts," says Uni-
verst of Vermont Prof. Barbara McIntosh,
who consults with companies to shed stereo-
types about older workers.

After one layoff, some Cigna workers
dubbed a downsizing "RAPE," as in "Retire
Aged Personnel Early." The American Asso-
ciation for Retired Persons in New York City
adds a "Job Hub" program to market older
workers to firms, arguing they have "the
work ethic to get a job done."

WORK BABIES hang out with mom and
pop at their parents' shops.
In a back room at Adams Morgan Dry
Cleaners in Washington, Grace Danbee
Chung, age two, giggles to a Korean chil-
dren's video. "She is happy," says her
mother, Eun Young Chung. Kathy Dang's
Chung, age two, giggles to a Korean chil-

DREAM IN DANGER? Worker content-
ment is on the wane.
A new report from Roper Starch World-
wide Inc., "The Dream in Danger," shows
job satisfaction among about 2,000 workers
surveyed at its lowest in 21 years. Satisfac-
tion with hours, opportunities, benefits, ca-
maraderie and work's contribution to soci-
ety falls below 1970s and 1980s levels. In 1973,
nearly four in 10 workers deemed them-
selves "extremely satisfied" at work, while
today it is one in four.

This is "a shellshocked generation."
battered by layoffs, tight job markets and
stagnant wages, says New York psycholo-
ist Mitchell Marks. BellSouth Telecommu-
nications, which has cut its work force by
about 5,000 and will slash another 5,000 by
1996, makes "Healing the Wounds." a self-
help book on post-layoff trauma, must-read-
ing for its 7,700 managers.

Wild Oats Markets, a Boulder, Colo.,
natural-foods store, gauges employee morale with a "Happiness Index" ques-
tionnaire.

THE CHECKOFF: Who says office sup-
plies aren't versatile? Recently spotted on
the Washington subway: a woman who
pulled her hair up with an industrial-
strength binder clip. . . . The National Or-
ganization for Women sells funky "shat-
tered glass ceiling" earrings.

MERRY CHRISTMAS is a fine greeting,
says Postmaster General Marvin Runyon.
So are Happy Hanukkah and Happy Kwan-
zaa. He puts out an advisory to correct
misunderstandings about a recent regula-
tion prohibiting seasonal religious displays
at the Postal Service.

DAILY GRIND: National Park Service
photographers Terry Adams, 45, sped up a
hydraulic lift to beat First Lady Hillary
Rodham Clinton's lift to the top of the
towering National Christmas Tree yester-
day. He got a surprised look from Mrs.
Clinton when her lift lurched to a start, but
the photographer missed snapping Mrs.
Clinton hobbling on one foot when her shoe
snagged on the floor of the lift. Mr. Adams's
job pays in the neighborhood of $50,000 and
requires him to tag along with the president
to Easter-egg rolls and such.

'NAME-AVOIDANCE' is common among
employees who aren't comfortable calling
superiors by first name or last, says a
Pennsylvania State University study. "List-
ten for the silence," says researcher David
Morand, who also concludes first-name call-
ing is growing increasingly popular as work-
places decentralize.
Head Counts in House and Senate Show
GATT Accord Headed Toward Passage

ECONOMY

BY JOHN HARWOOD
And HELENE COOPER
Staff Reporters of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL
WASHINGTON

The world trade pact appeared headed for passage as Clinton administration officials expressed increasing confidence that they'll win the necessary majorities in both houses of this week's lame-duck session of Congress.

In a House vote scheduled for today, administration Democratic and Republican leaders alike predicted that the sweeping trade agreement would receive 240 or more votes, comfortably above the 218 needed for passage if all members vote. The outlook is less certain in the Senate, where budget rules require a three-fifths vote to pass a resolution of legislation required to implement the accord. But with Senate GOP leader Robert Dole joining his retiring Democratic counterpart George Mitchell and President Clinton in backing the
deal, U.S. Trade Representative Mickey Kantor declared yesterday that "we're in a very strong position" there as well.

That assessment was shared by the Senate's chief opponent of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, Sen. Ernest Hollings (D., S.C.). A Hollings aide, citing confidential administration lobbying campaign, acknowledged that "things are breaking their way" in advance of Thursday's scheduled vote in the Senate. Proponents say the agreement now has more than 50 Senate votes in favor; roughly 20 senators remain undecided.

Mr. Dole's backing has helped garner support from some wavering Republicans, including his potential 1996 presidential rival, Sen. Phil Gramm of Texas. Mr. Gramm said yesterday he'll vote for both GATT and the so-called "waiver" from budget rules needed to finance its implementation, explaining that the new Republican Congress will "cut spending enough to offset GATT many, many times." But passage of GATT's implementation legislation requires a simple 51-vote majority, the budget-waiver vote requires 60 votes.

GOP Sen. Hank Brown of Colorado, usually a free-trade backer, announced his opposition yesterday. And some prominent GOP conservatives, including Sen. Trent Lott of Mississippi remain undecided. But other Republicans expect Mr. Lott, a Gramm ally, to join a majority of his Republican colleagues in backing the agreement on the eve of his bid later this week to win the job of Senate GOP whip.

Indeed, some proponents were growing more concerned about erosion among Democrats, some of whom see opposition to GATT as a way of demonstrating support for U.S. workers damaged by international economic competition. Sen. Max Baucus (D., Mont.), who heads a Senate trade subcommittee but faces a tough 1996 re-election race, declared his opposition, as did retiring Sen. Howard Metzenbaum (D., Ohio); Sen. Thomas Harkin (D., Iowa) was described as leaning against GATT as well. The aide to Mr. Hollings said only about 20 senators were firmly committed to opposing GATT, but the contest retains an air of uncertainty because members have been scattered across the country since the election.

"We're not having the kind of senator-to-senator contact that gives you the accurate count you need on a vote this big," said Lawrence O'Donnell, a top aide to Senate Finance Committee Chairman Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D., N.Y.), who's leading the effort to round up votes for the accord.

Yesterday, the White House hailed out heavy artillery in its battle to get GATT passed. At a news conference, the administration presented high-level officials from every administration since Harry Truman's to show their support. A letter signed by Presidents Gerald Ford, Jimmy Carter and George Bush urged Congress to ratify the agreement. "The

world will correctly read any rejection of GATT as an American retreat from international leadership," said James Baker, who was Mr. Bush's secretary of state.

"This GATT agreement doesn't just break down trade barriers, it also builds new agreements in party, philosophical and political ideology," Mr. Clinton said. "We have to do it now. We can't wait till next year. We don't want to litter it up like a Christmas tree and risk losing it."

But GATT opponents, who span the political spectrum from consumer advocate Ralph Nader to conservative commentator Pat Buchanan, have kept up a media blitz to pressure wavering lawmakers. One group of dissenters staged a demonstration, complete with live ducks, outside the Milwaukee offices of Democratic Sen. Herbert Kohl, urging him to oppose the agreement. And even though Mr. Dole may consider the association of senators voted to ratify GATT as a way of demonstrating sup-

port for U.S. workers damaged by interna-
tional trade agreements, the sovereignty threat on national security has buttressed their own efforts.

"What Dole did is he raised the legitimacy of the sovereignty threat on national television in a way that congressional opponents hadn't been able to," said Lori Wallach, of Public Citizen, a self-styled public interest lobbying group.

"It's the soothing of the sea," said Steve Wallack, the NAR's chief economist, "the alliteration of the sovereignty threat on national television in a way that congressional opponents hadn't been able to." He noted that while the public was "fed up" with the housing market, they still expect the market to continue for a while. "We don't want to litter it up like a Christmas tree and risk losing it."

The sales pace of previously owned homes held steady in October, despite a sharp rise in interest rates, according to the National Association of Realtors. On an annualized seasonally adjusted basis, sales of existing homes increased 0.5% to 3.75 million last month from September. But sales slipped 2% when compared with the annualized rate of four million sales reported for October 1993. The National Association of Realtors still expects resales to register their best

Home Resale Pace Steady in October, Despite Rate Rise

Showing this year since 1978, but analysts expect the housing market to slow some steam next year.

John A. Tullcito, the NAR's chief economist, said he expects the sales rate to drop to around 3,750,000 by March, but expects that level of activity to continue as interest rates stabilize and top off near their current level.

"Of the next few months we'll see sales begin to slip," he said. That will continue for a while."

Last week, the rate on a conventional 30-year mortgage hit 9.36%, up almost two full percentage points from 7.40% a year earlier, according to HSH Associates, a New York, mortgage publisher.

Mr. Tullcito said rates could still rise by as much as half a percentage point, but that he doesn't expect the psychologically important threshold of 10% to be crossed anytime soon.

"It's probably the end of the road," he said. "Rates will top off and settle down."

Mark Zandi, chief economist at Regional Financial Associates, said many consumers have remained in the home market by switching to adjustable-rate mortgages, which have been much slower to increase than fixed rates.

"Market activity is still very high, surprisingly high," he said. "The effect of mortgage rates is much less pronounced than you would have expected. But the best days for the housing market are clearly over."

The West reported the greatest in-
crease, with the resales rate growing 3.2% month-to-month in October but down 5.7% from a year ago. The South posted flat resales, compared with September but showed a 2.7% yearly drop. The Northeast was also flat but down 5.1% year-to-year. The Midwest slipped 1.8% last month and held steady from a year ago.
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SEC Charges Two Ex-Merrill Employees With Violations in 1980s Bond Trades

By JOHN CONNOR
Special to THE WALL STREET JOURNAL
WASHINGTON - The Securities and Exchange Commission charged a former bond salesman at Merrill Lynch & Co. and a former executive of the firm's junk-bond unit with securities violations in connection with bond trades the firm made in the 1980s with a Florida insurer.

Named in the administrative complaint were Richard Allerton, the former bond salesman, and Joseph Cote, who co-managed Merrill Lynch's junk-bond department for several years during the 1980s.

The SEC's complaint against the two men is the latest in a series of enforcement actions resulting from what the agency alleges was a scheme whereby Guarantee Security Life Insurance Co. of Jacksonville, Fla., masked its deteriorating financial condition and avoided reserve requirements on its junk-bond holdings through a series of year-end junk and Treasury bond trades with Merrill Lynch during the mid-to-late 1980s. The trades involved hundreds of millions of dollars of securities.

The SEC's Division of Enforcement alleged that Mr. Allerton, 49 years old, violated the anti-fraud and recordkeeping provisions of federal securities laws. Mr. Cote, 52, was accused of aiding and abetting and causing recordkeeping violations by Merrill Lynch.

Recordkeeping Charges

The SEC also charged Mr. Allerton with recordkeeping violations arising from bond dealings unrelated to the Florida insurer or its parent. The transactions involved Merrill Lynch repurchase agreements with an unnamed customer of Mr. Allerton for six different corporate bond issues at prices totaling about $68 million.

Charles Stillman, Mr. Allerton's lawyer, said his client denies any wrongdoing and intends to contest the SEC's allegations. Gary Naftalis, Mr. Cote's lawyer, said his client was inappropriately tagged with "a technical recordkeeping charge," and said, "we expect to be vindicated."

"Arguments in the case will be heard by an SEC administrative law judge. The matter reportedly first came to the SEC's attention on a tip from a reporter in the Southern California area," the SEC's attorney, said.

Guarantee Security, a unit of Transmark USA Inc., was declared insolvent and seized by Florida regulators in 1991.

In the bond trades in question, the insurer would sell junk bonds to Merrill Lynch at year end and buy Treasury bonds from the securities firm. These trades then would be reversed early in the following year. The SEC said the trades "were structured to eliminate any real market risk to the parties." The agency said Mr. Allerton "knew or should have known" by the end of 1988 that the bond trades "had no true economic substance but were designed to artificially improve Transmark's reported financial condition."

SEC Alleges Misrepresentation

Transmark sold securities to the public in 1986 and 1987 based on "a materially false and misleading description" of Guarantee Security's financial condition, and continued to misrepresent the insurer's condition in filings with the SEC between 1987 and 1990, the SEC said.

The agency said the year-end trades were reversed "at prices designed to generate an upturn" to Merrill Lynch, and that Mr. Cote was aware of this arrangement when over several years he "implemented the high-yield trades and was responsible for their being recorded as unrelated and bona fide purchases and sales."

Merrill Lynch, which last year settled SEC recordkeeping charges in the matter without admitting any wrongdoing, issued a statement saying the junk and Treasury bond trades in question were "bona fide and legitimate," that its conduct was "ethical and proper," and that the SEC enforcement action against two former employees "does not alter this position. The firm said it backs Mr. Allerton and Mr. Cote in their denial of wrongdoing.

Merrill Lynch remains among the defendants named in pending lawsuits filed by Florida authorities and the Resolution Trust Corp. growing out of the insurer's bond trades.

---

Stocks Rise And Bonds End Lower

Industrials Gain 31.29, But Advance Is Narrow As Many Shares Drop

MONDAY'S MARKETS

By DAVE KANSAN
Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

Stock prices gained, shrugging off declining bond prices. The dollar was mixed.

Bolstered by strength among economically sensitive stocks, the Dow Jones Industrial Average gained 31.29 to 3739.56, building on the 33.64-point gain made on Friday. The Standard & Poor's 500-stock index rose 1.87 to 434.16, the New York Stock Exchange Composite Index added 0.86 to 248.46 and the Nasdaq Composite Index climbed 3.21 to 745.73.

Despite the two days of gains, however, the industrials have a lot of rebounding to do. The benchmark has fallen 105.64 points since Nov. 18. Moreover, yesterday's stock-market advance was narrow, with many stocks falling. On the Big Board, advancing issues outnumbered decliners by a slim margin.

"With such thin breadth, I wouldn't be inclined to ascribe much significance to the move," said John Shaughnessy, director of research at Advest Inc. "Instead, I think we'll continue to see these violent oscillations in the market as investors try to determine where we are with respect to the economic cycle."

Worries last week about a possible recession helped boost the bond market and sent stock prices sharply lower. Yesterday, reports of robust holiday sales over the Thanksgiving weekend did the opposite, rattling the bond market and helping economically sensitive stocks.

Adding to the bond market's nervousness about the economy is an active calendar of economic statistics this week. A revision of third-quarter gross domestic product is due out tomorrow, and the important November employment report will be released Friday.

World-wide, stock prices rose in dollar terms. The Dow Jones World Stock Index gained 0.38 to 112.69.

In major market action:

Stock prices rose. Volume totaled 305 million shares on the New York Stock Exchange, where 1,360 issues advanced and 1,091 issues declined.

Bond prices fell. The Treasury's benchmark 30-year bond lost about 4/ point, or $5 for each $1,000 amount, to yield 7.97%.

The dollar was mixed. In late New York trading the currency was quoted at 1.5665 marks and 98.67 yen, compared with 1.5598 marks and 98.78 yen on Friday.
To Senate Centrists Nunn and Lugar Falls Task Of Steering Foreign Policy While Veering Right

By ROBERT S. GREENBERG
Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL
WASHINGTON—Shortly after the elections, Democratic Sen. Sam Nunn of Georgia, the incoming chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, phoned GOP Sen. Richard Lugar of Indiana, his partner in several foreign-policy actions. “If you think we were at the top of the hill during the last three years, we’re going to have to be at the neck for the next two,” Mr. Nunn quipped.

Sen. Nunn and Lugar helped forge the bipartisan coalition on foreign aid over much of the past few years. But the ground is shifting beneath their feet amid the GOP political earthquake in Congress. The new chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Sen. Jesse Helms of North Carolina, recently shocked colleagues by questioning President Clinton’s competence as commander in chief and suggesting that it might not be safe for him to visit U.S. military bases.

Despite the attention generated by Sen. Helms’s inflammatory remarks, though, centrists such as Sens. Nunn and Lugar still will play a leading role in guiding foreign policy in Congress. But now they will have to do so by steering to the right to accommodate the new GOP majority that is leery of U.S. involvement and spending abroad. The moderates will push to smooth the edges on some of the more hard-line proposals of the new congressional GOP leaders. At the same time, Sens. Nunn and Lugar also will seek to make sure that President Clinton treads the middle ground.

A number of Republican lawmakers, for instance, strongly oppose the agreement reached by North Korea in an effort to end Pyongyang’s nuclear-weapons program. They claim the U.S. made too many concessions to a regime in exchange for commitments North Korea doesn’t have to meet for years. Sen. Lugar shares some of those concerns but wants to cure, rather than kill, the deal. “He wants to see if there are things you can do outside of the agreement to get North Korea to come cleaner won’t,” says a Lugar aide. Sen. Lugar headed the Foreign Relations Committee the last time the GOP controlled the Senate a decade ago, but Sen. Helms—who opted to head an agriculture panel back then—has the seniority to take the post now.

Sen. Helms and several other GOP members of the foreign relations panel also will send blazing signals of hostility toward China. They are set to turn the spotlight on human-rights abuses, weapons sales and freedom for Tibet in a way that will infuriate Beijing and clash with administration policies. President Clinton, who came into office criticizing George Bush for “coddlng aging dictators” in Beijing, last May reversed course and cut the links between China’s human-rights behavior and its U.S. trade privileges.

The GOP senators likely will be joined in their blasts against China by human-rights and labor groups. A GOP staffer says there will be more emphasis on weapons-proliferation issues. “We have to let China know they can’t get away with selling weapons to outlaw regimes. he

Such efforts could provoke angry responses from Beijing, whose leaders are engaged in a succession fight and aren’t likely to brook any criticism. “It is a general rule that when the Peoples Republic of China is publicly denounced, U.S.-ruled or otherwise demeaned, that the Peoples Republic of China tends to react by not ignoring but responding rhetorically,” says Robert Kapp, president of the U.S.-China Business Council.

The congressional centrals will try to push a more balanced view regarding Beijing. They would emphasize both the need for the U.S. to stay engaged with strategically important China, as well as the need for improvements in China’s behavior.

At the same time, Sens. Nunn and Lugar recently have been searching for a way to extricate the administration from the困境 of its commitments in Bosnia. Bosnia thicket. Currently, some lawmakers, including GOP Senate leader Robert Dole of Kansas, want the U.S. to unilaterally lift its arms embargo of Bosnia and help even the odds for the Bosnian Muslims in their war against the Serbs. These legislators argue that such a move would “level the playing field” in that conflict.

Sens. Nunn and Lugar recently suggested to Defense Secretary William Perry that the same goal might be accomplished by trying to persuade the combatants to accept the notion of extending a weapons exclusion zone across the country. An administration official noted, however, that such a plan would require the kind of leverage that the U.S. and its European allies have been unable to exert thus far in the Bosnian war.

The bipartisan middle is likely to be engulfed on several other fronts as well. Administration officials are bracing for a big fight with Republicans over continued aid to Haiti. “Where are we for now?” Sen. Dole asked last weekend on NBC-TV’s “Meet the Press” program. “There may come a time when we may want to cut off funding.”

Battles also loom over funding levels for United Nations operations. The failure of the latest efforts to end the Serb advance in Bosnia is sure to increase the opposition to international peacekeeping, which is likely to spill over into congressional support for Israeli-Syrian peace negotiations. A number of conservative object to deploying American peacekeepers on the Golan heights, a likely prerequisite for Israeli-Syrian peace. Perhaps the easiest example of how the political center will adjust to Congress’s skeptical mood is the Nunn-Lugar bill, a model of post-Cold War legislation that provides funds to help former Soviet states dismantle nuclear weapons once aimed at the U.S.

Sen. Helms supported the idea when Sens. Nunn and Lugar proposed it in 1991. But now the program—along with other economic aid to the former Soviet states—likely will be reduced. Conservative critics complain that the Nunn-Lugar measure has departed from its original goal and wandered off into such “soft” areas as funding defense conversion in the former Soviet Union. There also are widespread complaints that these efforts are inefficient and haven’t produced solid results.

Even Sen. Lugar now seems more cautious. He states carefully that there is a consensus for the part of his bill that deals with dismantling weapons and says that economic aid to the former Soviet Union “needs to be viewed very carefully.” He adds that “getting people interested in Russia was never an easy process. It wouldn’t have succeeded if it hadn’t become a bipartisan effort.”

One reason the center could prevail in some cases is that Republicans themselves are divided on several major issues, such as House Speaker-to-be Newt Gingrich of Georgia supports aid to Russia; Sen. Mitch McConnell of Kentucky, who is slated to become chairman of the Senate appropriations committee dealing with foreign aid, has serious reservations.

Nevertheless, the prevailing congressional atmosphere of budget-cutting and isolationism will reinforce Mr. Helms’s overall foreign-policy views. The result will make it more difficult for the bipartisan middle and strengthen those who back less U.S. involvement in foreign affairs.

Says Ted Carpenter, director of foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute, a think tank whose libertarian views are increasingly influential among GOP lawmakers: “I think we’re in for a period of less collegiality, less bipartisan pabulum—and a much more confrontational style involving key members of Congress and the administration.”
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Against Tobacco Concern's Cartoon Ads

**Supreme Court Gives Green Light to Suit Against Tobacco Concern's Cartoon Ads**

**By Paul M. Barrett**

**Staff Reporter of The Wall Street Journal**

**WASHINGTON** - The Supreme Court cleared the way for a lawsuit accusing R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. of targeting children with its Joe Camel ad campaign.

The justices, without comment, declined to hear R.J. Reynolds's appeal of a ruling last year by California's top court, which had allowed a San Francisco lawyer to proceed with a suit seeking to block the Camel ads and force the company to run "corrective" messages focusing on the health hazards of smoking. Yesterday's Supreme Court action didn't address the merits of the case, which will now return to a California state court for trial.

At a preliminary stage, a state judge had ruled that the suit was precluded by the federal law governing cigarette labeling and advertising. The federal statute requires health warnings but prohibits the states from separately imposing on promotional material any "requirement or prohibition based on smoking and health." A state appeals court reversed that ruling and was upheld by the state's high court. The California Supreme Court said the allegation against R.J. Reynolds was based not on smoking and health, but on a "more general" duty imposed under state law "to not engage in unfair competition by advertising illegal conduct," namely, smoking by minors.

It's unclear how the California case will affect lawsuits in several other states aimed at curbing the marketing of cigarettes to young people. At least two of them, filed by the attorneys general of Mississippi and West Virginia, singled out the Joe Camel campaign by name.

Efforts on the federal level haven't progressed as far. The Coalition on Smoking or Health, an antismoking group, petitioned the Federal Trade Commission to stop the campaign, but the FTC decided in June to take no action. (R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. vs. Mangini)

**Cases in Brief**

**In other actions yesterday, the U.S. Supreme Court:**

* Agreed to decide whether middle- and high-school athletes may be subjected to random drug testing in the absence of specific suspicions that students are using narcotics. An Oregon town has appealed a lower-court ruling that such a policy violated the Fourth Amendment's ban on unreasonable searches. (Vernonia School District vs. Acton)
* Declined to disturb a lower-court ruling that expanded lawyers' liability to third parties for allegedly misleading opinions they write for clients. At issue in the case are opinion letters in which a Chicago law firm, Arvey, Hodes, Costello & Burman, told a client that a tax-shelter vehicle he had created could be used to seek deductions for investors.
* When the Internal Revenue Service later denied the deductions, investors in the tax shelter sued Arvey Hodes for securities fraud. The investors said they had been shown the opinion letters and had relied on them in seeking tax breaks. A federal trial judge threw out part of the suit, but the federal appeals court in Philadelphia said that the entire suit could go forward. The appeals court ruled that the law firm in such circumstances may be sued by customers of its clients, even if the law firm makes clear in the opinion letters that its legal advice is intended only for its client and is based on factual assumptions provided by the client. (Arvey, Hodes, Costello & Burman vs. Kline)

**Economic Outlook**

**For Rest of the Year Is Brighter in Survey**

**By a Wall Street Journal Staff Reporter**

**WASHINGTON** - The economic outlook for the rest of this year and next is brighter than it was just three months ago, according to a quarterly survey of 30 economic forecasters conducted by the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia.

The forecasters expect the economy will grow at a rate of 3.9% this year, 0.2 percentage point higher than their earlier forecast, and 2.9% in 1995, up 0.4 point from the previous survey. For the current quarter, the forecasters expect growth at a 3.2% annual rate.

The outlook for inflation is little changed; the forecasters expect consumer prices will increase by 2.9% this year and 3.4% next year. Over the next 10 years, the forecasters predict inflation will average 3.5% a year, again little changed from earlier projections.

But the forecasters are revising their interest-rate outlook, the Fed said. They now predict the three-month Treasury bill rate will average 4.3% this year and 5.9% next year, up 0.2 point and one percentage point, respectively, from a forecast made three months ago and an indication they expect the Fed to raise short-term interest rates further. The economists say rates on 10-year Treasury notes will average 7.1% in 1994 and 7.9% in 1995.

The yield on three-month Treasury bills yesterday was 5.39% and on 10-year notes was 7.89%.

**General Motors Corp.**

General Motors Corp. said it is recalling 403,000 of its 1991 to 1993 model Cadillac DeVilles equipped with 4.9-liter engines because of a problem that could result in engine-compartment fires.

GM said it knows of 27 such fires in the U.S. but no related injuries or deaths.

The Detroit auto maker said that a fire could break out in the car's engine compartment - in extremely cold conditions and if an ignition source is present - if the upper transaxle oil cooler hose separates at a crimped coupling, which holds the hose to a cooler pipe.

Auto industry analysts said the recall, though involving a large number of vehicles, will not require GM to make costly repairs. The company will install new upper transaxle oil cooler lines in recalled vehicles at no charge to owners.
U.S. Plans to Ease Rules for Banks Trying to Expand

By JOSH CHETWYND
Staff Reporter of The Wall Street Journal
WASHINGTON — The Comptroller of the Currency moved to ease filing requirements for banks that want to expand operations.

In some cases, a federally chartered bank deemed adequately capitalized could establish an operating subsidiary to perform certain low-risk activities without prior approval from the comptroller's office. These activities include data processing, check and credit-card guaranty services and money-order and savings-bond sales.

For banks that meet higher eligibility standards, the comptroller would streamline the approval process for setting up new branches and establishing higher-risk operating subsidiaries, such as dealing and trading in foreign currency and underwriting securities. These applications would be approved automatically unless the office notified the bank otherwise in 30 days. For more routine filings, such as relocating the main office or establishing a short-distance branch, the waiting period would be 10 days.

"We are trying to set up a framework for some predictability," said Julie Williams, chief counsel at the comptroller's office. "There ought to be an expectation for [eligible] banks that they are going to receive an expedited review process."

American Bankers Association spokesman James McLaughlin called the streamlining effort "a very significant improvement for banks that usually have to go hat-in-hand" to do almost anything. The comptroller regulates national, or federally chartered, banks. Agencies that regulate other banks said they were studying the move.

The comptroller's office defines an eligible bank as a national bank that is well-capitalized and meets certain rating standards, including a satisfactory performance under the Community Reinvestment Act. Also, the bank cannot be subject to certain enforcement orders. Of the 3,200 national banks regulated by the comptroller, 80% to 90% meet these criteria, according to Ms. Williams.

To cut regulatory costs, the comptroller's office also proposed that banks be allowed to set up automatic teller machines without applying through the office as long as the ATMs can be used by customers of other banks on a comparable basis. "We were receiving 1,600 applications a year for ATMs," said Lee Cross, a spokesman for the comptroller's office. "This will provide significant savings for banks in time and money."

The comptroller will also increase public notice requirements on banks planning any activities that involve innovative or significant policy, supervisory or legal issues in order to increase input. Ms. Williams said.

The public has 60 days to comment on the proposal before the office decides on its final form.

Res-Care Inc. Gets Contract
LOUISVILLE, Ky. — Res-Care Inc. said it received a $1.6 million contract from the state of West Virginia to manage Colin Anderson Center, a St. Marys, W.Va., care facility for people with mental retardation.

U.S. to Reduce Penalty Under SBA Loan Program
By a WALL STREET JOURNAL Staff Reporter
WASHINGTON — The government is providing partial relief to thousands of small-business borrowers whose desire to pay off or refinance certain federally guaranteed loans has been thwarted by high prepayment penalties.

The Small Business Administration said some 3,500 borrowers under one affected program are carrying loans with average remaining terms of 11 years and average interest rates of 10.5%. The loans were guaranteed by the SBA and sold to the Federal Financing Bank, part of the Treasury. "Many borrowers would like to prepay or refinance their loans but have been precluded from doing so by the prepayment penalty clauses which were made a condition of their borrowings," the agency said.

New regulations issued by the SBA will reduce the penalties, and the SBA will make up the difference to the financing bank with $30 million that Congress has appropriated for the purpose.

The SBA said it will notify eligible parties and give them 45 days to tell the agency if they intend to participate. Participants will be required to make a nonrefundable deposit of $1,000. The size of the reduced penalties will depend on the terms and interest rates of affected loans. The SBA said its rules for the program are open to public comment until Dec. 23.
French Workers Shift Attitude On Job Actions
Goal of Strikes Is to Win A Share of the Profits In Recovering Economy

By THOMAS KAMM
WALL STREET JOURNAL Staff Reporter
PARIS - In the past month, France has been beset by a series of strikes as workers, perhaps emboldened by coming presidential elections, seek a share of the country's improving economic and corporate results.

The return of profits marks the end of the social truce," writes the business daily La Tribune Desfosses. Across Europe, as economic growth returns, more workers are abandoning their acceptance of wage moderation and are placing pay raises in the forefront of their concerns. In Germany, for instance, the powerful metal-workers union, IG Metall, is demanding a 6% increase for 1995. A Problem for Balladur

In France, the demands have taken a more militant turn. The ultramodern Dunkirk plant of state-controlled aluminum and packaging group Pechiney was paralyzed for 13 days over a pay dispute. Journalists at state-run Radio France also struck for higher wages, as did workers at cognac maker Martell. Several of heavy-struck for higher wages, as did workers at cognac maker Martell. Several of heavy industry, including the powerful metal-workers union, IG Metall, is demanding a 6% increase for 1995.

In France, the demands have taken a more militant turn. The ultramodern Dunkirk plant of state-controlled aluminum and packaging group Pechiney was paralyzed for 13 days over a pay dispute. Journalists at state-run Radio France also struck for higher wages, as did workers at cognac maker Martell. Several of heavy industry, including the powerful metal-workers union, IG Metall, is demanding a 6% increase for 1995.

For new, economists and government officials are confident the isolated strikes won't affect the country's economic recovery or the government's anti-inflation policy. Most of the strikes ended with modest pay raises being granted. Despite signs of a third-quarter slowdown, Economists Minister Edmond Alphandery is sticking to projections of at least 2% growth this year and as much as 3.5% next year; he expects inflation to remain about 1.9%.

"The fact that there is a lot of talk of a recovery incites this sort of action a bit, but I don't expect anything too economically significant because France's high unemployment is a moderating factor," says Philippe d'Arvisenet, chief economist of Banque Nationale de Paris. Divisive Issues

But the questions of how best to consolidate France's budding recovery and whether the emphasis should be on jobs or wages are divisive. "Wage earners are asking for higher salaries just as we are asking ourselves if we shouldn't be creating more low-wage jobs," says Michele Debonneuil, chief economist at Banque Indosuez, in a television interview. Noting that growth is export-led and consumer demand low, many economists and trade unionists say purchasing power must be increased to sustain France's recovery. "Raising salaries is the only way to relaunch demand and amplify the recovery," writes economist Andre Garaon, an adviser to former Prime Minister Pierre Beregovoy, in the daily Le Figaro. "The question is: Do we do that through strikes or through negotiations?"

"But, others retort, raising salaries will further inhibit job creation. Jean Gandois, former chairman of Pechiney and the new head of France's employers federation, urges a "collective commitment to make jobs the priority." If France is serious about fighting unemployment, says a recent report on the challenges facing the country, commissioned by Mr. Balladur, then wage moderation is a necessary ingredient, along with cutting labor costs on low-wage jobs to encourage new hiring and introducing more-flexible labor laws.

"We can't say how awful it is to have three million people out of work and make fighting unemployment a priority and then do things that have the opposite effect," says Alain Minc, who presided over the commission.
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FAA Reviews Boeing 737s For Flight-Control Trouble

WASHINGTON - The Federal Aviation Administration has begun a review of Boeing Co.'s 737 airplanes to determine whether they have any problems with the design of their flight-control systems.

The move comes as the National Transportation Safety Board explores the possibility that a rudder malfunction caused the fatal crash in September of a USAir 737 near Pittsburgh. But investigators still are looking into other possible causes, and the FAA said its review will include other components that alter a plane's direction or position, including ailerons, elevators and spoilers.

The FAA said the review team, which includes representatives of the safety board, the defense Department and the Canadian aviation authority, will examine the popular 737's "design philosophy" and any records of in-flight difficulties related to flight controls.

A spokeswoman for Seattle-based Boeing said FAA officials had planned, but didn't pursue, a similar review after a United Airlines 737 crashed near Colorado Springs, Colo., in 1991. The spokeswoman said the review will be "helpful," Boeing has said rudder problems couldn't have caused the Pittsburgh crash.

EPA Nearly Doubles List Of Reportable Chemicals

WASHINGTON - The Environmental Protection Agency said it will nearly double the list of chemicals whose release by industry must be made public. The regulation, which will take effect Jan. 1, will substantially increase reporting requirements for pesticide manufacturers and processors under the 1986 Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act. The list is slightly smaller than the one proposed in January, however. About half of the chemicals on the new list are pesticides.

The EPA last January proposed expanding the so-called Toxic Release Inventory by 313 chemicals. Some chemicals were dropped and other listings were deferred because of technical questions, so that the final additions number 286.
Burma's Military Hints at Easing Reins

By MARCUS W. BRAUCHLI
Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

Burma, one of the world's poorest, most autocratic states, is riding a wave of foreign business interest to greater international prominence. Eager to share in the dynamism of its Southeast Asian neighbors, the country's military regime is relaxing some political controls and accelerating economic change. At the moment, there is almost no political freedom, inflation is rampant and underemployment is prevalent. Yet, in a striking development, the country's leaders have met twice recently with their chief opponent, Nobel Peace Prize winner Aung San Suu Kyi, whom they have long denounced and kept under house arrest. They also have hosted a spate of diplomatic and business delegations, most of which have pushed for reform in Burma, also known as Myanmar.

Desperate for Cooperation

"One must assume they are desperate for some form of cooperation," says Bur­ton Levin, director of the Asia Society's Hong Kong office, who was the last U.S. ambassador assigned to Burma. He left in October 1990. "But it's going to take some term policies of economic development." Diplomats hope the government, which installed itself in 1988 after throwing out the results of a popular election, may be moving to allow a more pluralistic political system and an open economy. Even the U.S., until recently opposed to contact with the regime, has opened talks with it.

Such openings, however narrow, are viewed by many Asians as validation of a policy of "constructive engagement" as opposed to international isolation. The strategy, promoted by the Association of Southeast Asian Nations despite U.S. resistance, has produced a flurry of business activity in the past year.

Foreigners, mainly Asian, are building hotels, factories and mines, and infra­structure. Unocal Corp., of the U.S. is a partner in a historic $500 million project signed in September to pipe natural gas from Burma into Thailand. Burmese are starting to buy products from abroad, too: The number of automobiles in the country has swelled to 300,000 from 72,000 about five years ago.

Even financial companies are taking an interest. Banks are opening offices in the Burmese capital, even though the government still can't obtain international loans. It is too early to compare Burma, a country of 44.3 million where incomes average about $250 a year, with the vast developing markets of its giant neighbors, China, Vietnam and India, businesspeople say. But the arrival of the Asian venture capitalists who often pioneer new economies may start to unsettle Burmese society.

"The government is loosening up," says Jeremy King, managing director of Hong Kong's Kerry Financial Services Ltd., a Hong Kong securities company that has set up the first mutual fund for investing in Burma. "And moving from parish status to nonparish status can happen very fast."

What has kept most investors out of Burma has been a mixture of political chaos and economic quagmire. "The government is trying hard, but it's hard for them to grasp the concepts" of reform, says A. Cushman May, a director of Peregrine Capital Ltd. of Hong Kong, which wants to establish a $30 million investment company in partnership with the regime.

Quashed Election Results

The ruling State Law and Order Restora­tion Council, or Slorc, came to power when it quashed the results of a 1989 election that took place in the aftermath of a student uprising in which as many as 10,000 may have been killed or summarily executed by the army. The military put the election's winner, the National League for Democracy's chairmanwoman, Aung San Suu Kyi, under house arrest. Aung San Suu Kyi has refused a deal to leave the country in exchange for her freedom, and won the 1991 Nobel Peace Prize for her courage.

While political life was in limbo, economic life worsened. Prices have soared, foreign assistance all but dried up and the financial system is bankrupt.

Only when Southeast Asian countries began their "constructive engagement" policy did conditions start to improve. The confrontational attitude was like pounding your head against a wall," says one Rangoon-based diplomat. "It was a different approach."

And there it's a sign of progress to show for it. In addition to the growing business interest in Burma, the World Bank has sent two study missions in the past two months. The United Nations has sent three human rights official three times. Japan's powerful Keidanren industry federation and the British chambers of commerce in Hong Kong and Singapore have passed through.

All of them have pushed reform. "We aren't interested in isolating or seeing Burma isolated," says a European diplo­mat in Rangoon "But there has to be an element of criticism in the dialogue."

Some delegation members think the blunt talk has made a difference. They note that the Burmese leadership held its two meetings, on Sept. 20 and Oct. 29, with Aung San Suu Kyi amid indications that a clearer political future might bring eco­nomic gain. Some even say they were led to believe she might be released next year.

The military government wants to gain her support, they say, for a constitutional reform that would create a government in which the military retains a substantial say, but relinquishes much day-to-day con­trol to elected legislators. "I think they genuinely want to move toward reconciliation," says Mr. King of Kerry. "And we want to be there when they do."

NEC Corp.

NEC Corp., the Japanese maker of electric machinery, posted a consolidated pretax profit of 30.88 billion yen ($211 million) in the fiscal first half ended Sept. 30, rebounding from an 8.54 billion-yen loss for the year-earlier period on the strength of cost cutting and the global rebound in demand for computers and semiconductors.

Sales rose 26%, to 1.741 trillion yen from 1.642 trillion yen.

The latest results for the first half were marginally better than NEC's forecasts for the six-month period.

NEC said domestic sales were helped by strong growth in demand for personal computers and mobile communications equipment, such as mobile phones.
We will know whether 1994's was a landmark election not in a few months, but in a few years. The delay is partly to see whether 1996 reverses history: 1964 and 1984 gave shape to FDR's triumph in 1932, in a way that 1982 and even 1981 didn't do for Reaganism, and that 1948 of course didn't for the Taft-Hartley Act. But a lag also follows from the fact that great feats of lawmaking are usually slow affairs.

Make no mistake what the really terrible legislative challenge is. After the Contract With America is fulfilled (and let us pray Congress is cleaned up, the budget is balanced, and the government is run on a faster growth track. That we didn't get there. The alternative is to such a tax debate next term. But the debate should be structured and begun. And if open congressional rules and the new media permit it, millions of Americans actually could follow such a process and have an ongoing say in it.

The 1996 presidential race, which unfortunately will be set by early spring of that year thanks to the primary and money dynamics, could be a useful clarifier in such a tax debate next term. But the debate should be structured and begun. And if open congressional rules and the new media permit it, millions of Americans actually could follow such a process and have an ongoing say in it.

The 1996 presidential race, which unfortunately will be set by early spring of that year thanks to the primary and money dynamics, could be a useful clarifier in such a tax debate next term. But the debate should be structured and begun. And if open congressional rules and the new media permit it, millions of Americans actually could follow such a process and have an ongoing say in it.

The 1996 presidential race, which unfortunately will be set by early spring of that year thanks to the primary and money dynamics, could be a useful clarifier in such a tax debate next term. But the debate should be structured and begun. And if open congressional rules and the new media permit it, millions of Americans actually could follow such a process and have an ongoing say in it.

The 1996 presidential race, which unfortunately will be set by early spring of that year thanks to the primary and money dynamics, could be a useful clarifier in such a tax debate next term. But the debate should be structured and begun. And if open congressional rules and the new media permit it, millions of Americans actually could follow such a process and have an ongoing say in it.
A Pro-Gay, Pro-Family Policy

By Jonathan Rauch

If you listen carefully, you can hear the sound of a taboocraking. In September, William Bennett told the Christian Coalition: "In terms of damage to the children of America, you cannot compare what the homosexual movement has done to what divorce has done. It is not even close." Last month, when Rep. Steve Gunderson (R., Wis.) publicly came out of the closet, Rep. Newt Gingrich pronounced the matter of no political importance. Then this month, the Washington Blade quoted Mr. Gingrich as saying that the GOP's stance on homosexuality "should be tolerated." Maybe Republicans are ready, at last, to begin burying the death of the old deal—heterosexuals pretending to say nothing of unrealistic. Because fewer rare human traits that affect only a small fraction of whites, suffer as a result. All Americans, black and white, need to rise above the obsession with homosexuality. They now have the chance to build pro-family policies that embrace all responsible Americans, homosexual and heterosexual alike.

During the debate on race in the 1960s, Republicans stood on the sidelines and on occasion pandered to racist whites. "We Republicans had a great history, and we turned it aside," Jack Kemp wrote in 1993. Republicans could have constructed stable, principled ground between the politics of intolerance and the politics of radicalism. And if they let the moment slip by, the cost to society may be steep— as we have seen once before.

Avoid the Race Mistake

On the one side, blaming homosexuals for the decline of the family also allows the family's friends to avoid the real issues. It fools them into believing they are talking about saving the family when in fact they are merely talking about hammering homosexuals. David Boaz of the Cato Institute recently counted reports and articles by "pro-family" groups and discovered that they devoted obsessive attention to homosexuality while virtually ignoring divorce. This is pro-family!

On the other side, blaming homosexuals for the decline of the family also allows the enemies of the family to avoid the real issues. Instead of confronting the real problems, they can point to the ugly rhetoric of anti-gay activists and say: "See what 'family values' really means." It means beating up on people who are different and snoozing in our bedrooms. "In just that same way," advocates of ethnic entitlements have been able to point to racists and say, "See what 'colorblind' really means?"

In recent years an alternative has emerged, a principled, pro-family but not anti-gay position:

At a stroke, the pro-family movement could enlarge its tent, disarm the charge that "family values" means intolerance and, most important, bolster the family itself.

...nothing to do with homosexuality. Whatever one may think of gay people's sexual practices, they do not produce illegitimate children or account for more than a tiny fraction of divorces. Conversely, condemning homosexuality does no good for the beleaguered family. Indeed, anti-gay rhetoric is today an obstacle to dealing squarely with the crisis of the family, on both sides of the debate.

On the one side, blaming homosexuals for the decline of the family leads the family's friends to avoid the real issues. It fools them into believing they are talking about saving the family when in fact they are merely talking about hammering homosexuals. David Boaz of the Cato Institute recently counted reports and articles by "pro-family" groups and discovered that they devoted obsessive attention to homosexuality while virtually ignoring divorce. This is pro-family.

On the other side, blaming homosexuals for the decline of the family also allows the enemies of the family to avoid the real issues. Instead of confronting the real problems, they can point to the ugly rhetoric of anti-gay activists and say: "See what 'family values' really means." It means beating up on people who are different and snoozing in our bedrooms. "In just that same way," advocates of ethnic entitlements have been able to point to racists and say, "See what 'colorblind' really means?"

In recent years an alternative has emerged, a principled, pro-family but not anti-gay position:
An Orphan on Orphanages

BY ROBERT B. McKENZIE

At the heart of the movie “Annie,” Miss Hannigan—the dejected, overbearing housemother of 30 or so little girls—says, in obvious exaggeration, “Why any kid would want to be an orphan is beyond me.”

The stark contrast between the movie version of life in the orphanage and the life Annie comes to know with her adoptive father, the extravagantly wealthy Daddy Warbucks, is probably left many movie-goers convinced that Miss Hannigan was right; no one in his or her right mind would ever want to be an orphan. Social critics continue to paint dreadful pictures of life in homes for children, which give them license to tag proposals to bring back orphanages as “extreme” (columnist Ellen Goodman’s word).

A funny thing has happened in the emerging debate: No one has thought to ask us orphans, the children who grew up in institutions, what we would prefer.

I’ve spent a lifetime quietly listening to others disparage orphanages as cold and loveless institutions where every child longs to be adopted. I know that this description is out of date and out of whack, and should have no bearing on the debate of how to help some of the least fortunate children among us. I was there. I grew up in a home with 150 or so other girls and boys in North Carolina in the 1950s—and I’m damn proud of it, and thankful.

Life in The Home (which is what we called it) was no picnic. When we were young, we had two baths a week and whatever clothes a week, regardless of whether we needed more. We went barefoot to school during World War II, when the military rejected the best of what this country is: mothers-in-the-main, good, well-meaning volunteers, away from a destructive course and the requisite level of encouragement to read and study.

Critic’s of orphanages stress what the children there did not have. Those of us who were there have a different perspective. We were, and remain, able to draw comparisons between what we had at The Home and what we would have had outside it.

If any of us had had a choice between growing up with Ozzie and Harriet or in The Home, each would surely have taken the former. However, we either didn’t have parents or left parents behind who were not worthy of the roles they had assumed. Those who think that private orphanages are “extreme” solutions to the problems many children face do not appreciate the realistic options available to many children. Few of us would have entertained adoption, and virtually all of us today shudder at the foster-care option.

The dominant emotion for those of us who return each year to homecoming is neither hostility nor regret, but sheer joy.

We understand that we have not always set the world on fire. At the same time, we realize that we would not be where we are today had we not had the opportunity to grow up the way we did. With all the current talk about family values, critics must never forget that some families value very little. Sometimes, families work much less well than even the worst of institutions.

Besides, the popular images of orphanages do not square with the many good things we had and were taught. We got a real education and stability. We got security in the knowledge that The Home would always be there, no mean advantage for children whose families had failed them. We had 1,200 acres of pastures and woods to roam, and we made dozens of lifelong friends and sisters.

I know many people, with unforgettable pictures of Miss Hannigan in their minds, harbor fears about workers in homes for children. They, however, have never had the good fortune of meeting Albert McClure and Rebecca Carpenter, the highly religious leaders of The Home, who devoted their lives to making sure, as best they could, that we learned (best reluctantly and imperfectly) the difference between right and wrong. The critics could not have known Mrs. Mac, one of the many house mothers with big hearts, who, after I left The Home, sent a birthday card every year until her death in the late 1980s.

The critics have never had the opportunity to sit in Frances Moore’s seventh-grade class. By her unbounded force of character, she turned my life, and the lives of so many of my classmates, away from a destructive course to one that had prospects. She made us believe what then was surely a myth that it was as, not our circumstances, that would ultimately determine how far we would go in life. Would you believe that after nearly four decades of her following my career, she sent one of the following my career, she sent one of the :original verses in needlepoint on what it means to be a “brother and sister.”

The critics would like the public to believe that those of us who went through orphanages were throttled by the experience. No doubt, some were. However, most have charged on. In many ways, we represent the best of what this country is about—plumbers and nurses, ministers and managers, teachers and baggage handlers—in the main, good, well-meaning Americans who have answered the call to rise above expectations.

Most would be surprised to learn that during World War II, when the military was turning down close to 40% of drafted men from the general population, it rejected a scant 1%, of the boys from The Home. We gave more than our share. Moreover, of the boys and girls who graduated from high school in my class and the classes immediately before and after, more than my now have college degrees, and a third have advanced degrees, no minor accomplishment for kids who supposedly grew up the “hard way” in an era when only a minor fraction of high school students went on to college.

I often watch the television program “Cops,” and I am especially drawn to the episodes involving domestic violence and abuse of children. My heart goes out to the children caught off at the side in the pictures. I know that many will remain mired in their unfortunate circumstances. Few will have the opportunity that the kids at The Home had to be catapulted into a totally new environment and onto a totally new life course.

Miss Hannigan, you should have asked us, the ones cast in Hollywood or Washington, what a home for children cannot be. If children’s homes are ever reinvigorated, many reforms are obvious and needed. However, people should understand that homes for children must remain a viable option for many children. Those of us who were there share an array of experiences that children from many families—the traditional ones and the publicly supported variants—can only envy.

Mr. McKenzie is a professor in the Graduate School of Monuments at the University of California, Irvine. He grew up at the Bar­num Springs Home for Children.

An Orphan on Orphanages
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Quota System

In India ṅ

Is a Killer

BY A.S. ABHINAI

TheTEA--Some 130 demonstrators
were reported to death last week in
Bombay. Most of the 50,000 protesters
were members of the Congress-Ghade clan
demanding that New Delhi declare to the
quota of government jobs. The protest
was organized by the conservative
Janata Party, which in the past
opposed quotas as harmful to Hindu unity.

The BJP faces elections next month
and knows a vote-winning issue when it
comes the ruling Congress Party, archi-

tects of India's tree market reforms,

posed quotas as harmful to Hindu unity.

Some 130 demonstrators
were reported to death last week in
Bombay. Most of the 50,000 protesters
were members of the Congress-Ghade clan
demanding that New Delhi declare to the
quota of government jobs. The protest
was organized by the conservative
Janata Party, which in the past
opposed quotas as harmful to Hindu unity.

The BJP faces elections next month
and knows a vote-winning issue when it

appears that just as the cultural im-
portance of caste was receding, even-in-

dian became acutely aware of caste poli-
tics. Things are so bad that some Indians
are demanding quotas in the private sec-

Recently, economic reform and global com-
petition mean that men and women will be
judged by their skills and productivity,
not by their social background. Under the
market-oriented program of Finance
Minister Manmohan Singh, India has be-

tomed a popular destination for multinatu-

tional investors. Indeed, U.S. Commerce
Secretary Robert Brown is expected to lead
an official delegation here early in the new

So does the ruling Congress Party, archi-
tects of India's tree market reforms, become
the dominant force in India's political
arena. Preferences have been
steadily vacillated up until some 26% of
Indians are eligible for special privileges.
As last week's killings show, affir-

mation is becoming India's most

'rescued' state, one in which a brain drain as upper

educational opportunities. In 1990, the
Congress Party may well find itself un-
der pressure later to compensate yet an-
other aggrieved group by offering more

In the hill regions of Uttar Pradesh,
though, the current beneficiaries are
exactly those who have been in the past
 defenders of the principle of reservation.

But the modernizers may underesti-

mattered for them. To veto the extension would please

the state Party needs to stay popular with Tamil
voters.

Consider the case of Uttar Pradesh in
northern India. The state government,
which is allied with the Congress j
party, and Samajwadi, a backward class
party, recently sought to introduce
2% quotas for underprivileged tribes
and other backward classes. The
former set-aside of 22% had covered only
the tribes and castes but not the other
backward classes.

In the hill regions of Uttar Pradesh,
though, the current beneficiaries are
exactly those who have been in the past

The Congress Party finds itself in the
dilemma that increasingly be-
sets politicians who pander to group teel-,
ines. To veto the extension would please

the state ruling coalition, which is allied with the Congress
Party.

Whatever the outcome of this decision,
the Congress Party may well find itself un-
der pressure later to compensate yet an-
other aggrieved group by offering more

The same dilemma faces the state
BJP, which despite its formal opposi-
tion to quotas, may follow the lead of its
counterpart in Nagpur, scene of last
week's protests, and bow to political expe-

in India. The latest effort, John Brummett's
"Highwire: From the Backroads to the
Beltway--the Education of Bill Clinton"
(Hyperion, 525 pages, $25.95), is no dif-
ferent in this respect. Mr. Brummett, a
columnist for the Arkansas Democrat-
Gazette who has covered Mr. Clinton for
more than 15 years, explores the events on the first
year of the Clinton presidency, offering a

Like other chronicles of the Clinton
presidency, "Highwire" sketches a picture of
astonishing arrogance and disarray at the
White House. Mr. Brummett is particularly touchy
about Whitewater--in its broadest sense a

The book shines in its often shrewd insights into Mr. Clinton's Arkansas past and how it has shaped his performance in Washington. He notes that Mr. Clinton's political "pattern in Arkansas--noble speeches, great initial salesmanship, then a holl while his staff tried to actually do the bills reflecting his speeches--repeated itself in Washington." During the budget fight, he writes, Con-

gress saw "the Bill Clinton I had seen in
Arkansas: an over-compensator and strategic blunderer who spent half of his time during state legislative sessions
walking a tightrope, wheeler and deal-
ing wildly at the end to pass something rea-

sonably bold and meaningful.

However, arrogance and con-
tempt for Mr. Clinton's GOP predecessors
at the White House also can be ascribed to
Mr. Brummett. The American people,
writes, are "superficial"--easily swayed
by the tax-cutting Master of Darkness.
Ronald Reagan. Mr. Brummett's ideas for
"bold" policy moves include tax hikes and
asking for "real sacrifice" from a "pam-
pered" middle class.

Mr. Brummett is particularly touchy
about Whitewater--in its broadest sense a
symbol for all the cozy deals, overlooked infractions and unethical if not illegal
acts that have come, via the Clintons,
into the political culture of Arkansas. Of

course, Mr. Brummett has good reason to
be touchy. The Arkansas media, of which
he is a proclaimed member, are as

As Americans seek to understand the
first president from the baby-boom genera-
tion, the library of studies of the Clinton
dominant state sector to infect the emerging
private sector. But the symbol of the qua-
tas has become a passionate political issue
for the groups involved.

Party politics increasingly revolves
around castes and tribal identities. In the

southern state of Tamil Nadu, for in-
stance, the quotas now cover 15% of

job and education slots. The federal govern-
ment has not opposed the Tamil Nadu legis-
lation, because the ruling Congress Party
needs to stay popular with Tamil voters.

Consider the case of Uttar Pradesh in
northern India. The state government,
which is allied with the Congress j
party, and Samajwadi, a backward class
party, recently sought to introduce
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and other backward classes. The
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The same dilemma faces the state
BJP, which despite its formal opposi-
tion to quotas, may follow the lead of its
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week's protests, and bow to political expe-

in India. The latest effort, John Brummett's
"Highwire: From the Backroads to the
Beltway--the Education of Bill Clinton"
(Hyperion, 525 pages, $25.95), is no dif-
ferent in this respect. Mr. Brummett, a
columnist for the Arkansas Democrat-
Gazette who has covered Mr. Clinton for
more than 15 years, explores the events on the first
year of the Clinton presidency, offering a

Like other chronicles of the Clinton
presidency, "Highwire" sketches a picture of
astonishing arrogance and disarray at the
White House. Mr. Brummett is particularly touchy
about Whitewater--in its broadest sense a

The book shines in its often shrewd insights into Mr. Clinton's Arkansas past and how it has shaped his performance in Washington. He notes that Mr. Clinton's political "pattern in Arkansas--noble speeches, great initial salesmanship, then a holl while his staff tried to actually do the bills reflecting his speeches--repeated itself in Washington." During the budget fight, he writes, Con-
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However, arrogance and con-
tempt for Mr. Clinton's GOP predecessors
at the White House also can be ascribed to
Mr. Brummett. The American people,
writes, are "superficial"--easily swayed
by the tax-cutting Master of Darkness.
Ronald Reagan. Mr. Brummett's ideas for
"bold" policy moves include tax hikes and
asking for "real sacrifice" from a "pam-
pered" middle class.

Mr. Brummett is particularly touchy
about Whitewater--in its broadest sense a
symbol for all the cozy deals, overlooked infractions and unethical if not illegal
acts that have come, via the Clintons,
into the political culture of Arkansas. Of

course, Mr. Brummett has good reason to
be touchy. The Arkansas media, of which
he is a proclaimed member, are as

As Americans seek to understand the
first president from the baby-boom genera-
tion, the library of studies of the Clinton
dominant state sector to infect the emerging
private sector. But the symbol of the qua-
tas has become a passionate political issue
for the groups involved.

Party politics increasingly revolves
around castes and tribal identities. In the

southern state of Tamil Nadu, for in-
stance, the quotas now cover 15% of

job and education slots. The federal govern-
ment has not opposed the Tamil Nadu legis-
lation, because the ruling Congress Party
needs to stay popular with Tamil voters.

Consider the case of Uttar Pradesh in
northern India. The state government,
which is allied with the Congress j
party, and Samajwadi, a backward class
party, recently sought to introduce
2% quotas for underprivileged tribes
and other backward classes. The
former set-aside of 22% had covered only
the tribes and castes but not the other
backward classes.

In the hill regions of Uttar Pradesh,
though, the current beneficiaries are
exactly those who have been in the past
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though, the current beneficiaries are
exactly those who have been in the past
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be touchy. The Arkansas media, of which
he is a proclaimed member, are as
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first president from the baby-boom genera-
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private sector. But the symbol of the qua-
tas has become a passionate political issue
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northern India. The state government,
which is allied with the Congress j
party, and Samajwadi, a backward class
party, recently sought to introduce
2% quotas for underprivileged tribes
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former set-aside of 22% had covered only
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Arkansas voters in one measure of his character and trustworthiness. Yet despite the fact that unspecified extramural activities on his part were commonly accepted trust with political insiders. Mr. Brummett and his colleagues apparently decided that issues of character did not matter. “We met and his colleagues apparently decided that matters here in Arkansas. Yet despite those matters, Mr. Clinton's fantastic situ.

Co. land partnership. Here Mr. Brummett argues, but are part of Arkansas's 'single-party system,' which he places the blame for missing Whitewater on the Arkansas media's lack of coverage of 'the intersection of business and politics.' While noting the presence of a tight network of wealthy elites, Mr. Brummett admits he was timid in investigating it. "Since I used that network to develop sources, I was not inclined to attack its interconnectedness or coordinate power."

Despite the book's failings, Mr. Brummett's candor on this point is admirable. He chose his book on a wistful note, hoping that "the president's name makes a better man" of Mr. Clinton. Too bad the Arkansas press didn't.

Mr. Morrison is a Journal editorial page writer.

**Bookshelf**

*High Wire: From the Rock Roads to the Beltway* - *The Education of an Editor* by John Brummett

Arkansas investment giant Stephens Inc. Many of the connections are not sinister. The policy was clear from the outset, when the Bush Administration acceded to Milosevic's request to impose a U.N. embargo that mainly disrupted the region. Indeed, the humiliation has reached such proportions that the Serbs irregulars this weekend made hostages. 82 British and 102 Dutch soldiers. But if we have arrived at the beginning of the end in the struggle over Bosnia, then we should look back to see where we are and how we got here.

As to where we are, the answer is we're in a Europe where a small state can be mauled and robbed by a larger neighbor; where large and powerful nations with the capacity to help have opted instead to stand by and tolerate what has been nearly one-sided aggression; where, in an effort to observe multilateralism and impartiality, these same states have been drawn to approaches that consistently favor and help the aggressor to pursue his goals.

To many people, the terminus of this policy was clear from the outset, when the Bush Administration acceded to Milosevic's request to impose a U.N. embargo that mainly disadvantaged Belgrade's target populations. (Remember Dubrovnik in 1991?) The bare facts are that the United States and concerned nations have failed because the policies that could have made a difference—such as ending the one-sided arms embargo or punishing the Serb aggressors in a meaningful way (for example, striking their planes, not just air fields)—were deemed too risky.

In place of policies that would have leveraged the odds for the Muslims, these states busied themselves with creating the appearance of taking action. They purported to believe that Serb aggression would cease, even after such pledges had been broken repeatedly. They waved weapons-exclusion zones into existence, then ignored numerous violations. They installed peacekeeping forces that while making possible the provision of humanitarian aid, did not differentiate between victim and aggressor.

And ultimately these states used these same peacekeeping forces as an excuse for refraining from taking punishing military action on the by-then rational grounds that the peacekeepers could become the subjects of reprisals. Of course, when peacekeepers stand in the way of hurting the aggressor's ability to wage war, their utility grows dubious. Indeed it appears that the peacekeepers truly have been hostages.

Now the West arrives at a dead end, one of its own making. In the process, we have not helped Bosnia and have managed to hurt the institutions that should have helped to solve such a crisis. NATO members have allowed the alliance to become weakened by their own determination not to deal with the conflict's realities. The trans-Atlantic partnership appears more fragile than ever.

As revealed in the U.S. decision to discontinue enforcing the arms embargo against Bosnia as well as the sharp European reaction, differences over Bosnia created a major fault line in trans-Atlantic relations.

Getting out of Bosnia—even if the war is nearing an end and only an ugly peace of sorts remains—will prove more difficult now that the accumulated weight of failures and public humiliations have burdened the reputations of these institutions. With this poor record behind it, NATO and the kind of diplomacy run by the U.S., Germany, Britain, France and Russia will now be viewed by the world's other predatory nations and warlords as incapable of carrying out their goals. The trans-Atlantic partner ship appears more fragile than ever.

Alas, this is not part of history now; it's operative policy.

A round of retribution and finger-pointing has begun among the Americans, French and British. One may hope that serious people in all three nations will begin soon the more useful exercise of pointing foreign policy in the direction of security structures and lines of command that deter such horrifying aggressions.

---

**Bosnia’s End of Illusions**

Secretary of Defense William S. Perry said it bluntly enough: "It seems that the Serbs have demonstrated military superiority on the ground." In other words, the rules and restrictions that the United States created and Europe enforced have had a predictable effect: The Bosnian Muslims can't defend themselves. They have lost.

At least the Defense Secretary was honest enough to drop the pretense that Western states have accomplished something positive in the region. Indeed, the humiliation has reached such proportions that the Serb-regulars this weekend made hostages. 82 British and 102 Dutch soldiers. But if we have arrived at the beginning of the end in the struggle over Bosnia, then we should look back to see where we are and how we got here.

As to where we are, the answer is we're in a Europe where a small state can be mauled and robbed by a larger neighbor; where large and powerful nations with the capacity to help have opted instead to stand by and tolerate what has been nearly one-sided aggression; where, in an effort to observe multilateralism and impartiality, these same states have been drawn to approaches that consistently favor and help the aggressor to pursue his goals.

To many people, the terminus of this policy was clear from the outset, when the Bush Administration acceded to Milosevic's request to impose a U.N. embargo that mainly disadvantaged Belgrade's target populations. (Remember Dubrovnik in 1991?) The bare facts are that the United States and concerned nations in Europe have failed because the policies that could have made a difference—such as ending the one-sided arms embargo or punishing the Serb aggressors in a meaningful way (for example, striking their planes, not just air fields)—were deemed too risky.

In place of policies that would have leveraged the odds for the Muslims, these states busied themselves with creating the appearance of taking action. They purported to believe that Serb aggression would cease, even after such pledges had been broken repeatedly. They waved weapons-exclusion zones into existence, then ignored numerous violations. They installed peacekeeping forces that while making possible the provision of humanitarian aid, did not differentiate between victim and aggressor.

And ultimately these states used these same peacekeeping forces as an excuse for refraining from taking punishing military action on the by-then rational grounds that the peacekeepers could become the subjects of reprisals. Of course, when peacekeepers stand in the way of hurting the aggressor's ability to wage war, their utility grows dubious. Indeed it appears that the peacekeepers truly have been hostages.

Now the West arrives at a dead end, one of its own making. In the process, we have not helped Bosnia and have managed to hurt the institutions that should have helped to solve such a crisis. NATO members have allowed the alliance to become weakened by their own determination not to deal with the conflict's realities. The trans-Atlantic partnership appears more fragile than ever.

As revealed in the U.S. decision to discontinue enforcing the arms embargo against Bosnia as well as the sharp European reaction, differences over Bosnia created a major fault line in trans-Atlantic relations.

Getting out of Bosnia—even if the war is nearing an end and only an ugly peace of sorts remains—will prove more difficult now that the accumulated weight of failures and public humiliations have burdened the reputations of these institutions. With this poor record behind it, NATO and the kind of diplomacy run by the U.S., Germany, Britain, France and Russia will now be viewed by the world's other predatory nations and warlords as incapable of carrying out their goals. The trans-Atlantic partnership appears more fragile than ever.

Alas, this is not part of history now; it's operative policy.

A round of retribution and finger-pointing has begun among the Americans, French and British. One may hope that serious people in all three nations will begin soon the more useful exercise of pointing foreign policy in the direction of security structures and lines of command that deter such horrifying aggressions.
No Uncertain Terms

Today, the Clinton Justice Department will tell the Supreme Court that state term limits “pose a particular threat to the federal system.” The Court is hearing oral arguments in an important Arkansas case that will decide if states can impose term limits on their own Congressional delegations.

The states have often used federalism to pioneer election reforms. Oregon, Montana and Oklahoma scrapped the original method of having state legislatures select U.S. Senators and led the nation in requiring their popular election. Some states let women and 15-year-olds vote before the adoption of the relevant Constitutional amendments. Should Congress disagree with any state election law, it is explicitly granted power in the Constitution to overturn such laws with a simple majority.

The precise issue before the Court today is whether states retain some powers not explicitly given the federal government in the Constitution and whether they can limit access to their ballots. Should the Court say no, that will fly in the face of its prior decisions. In those cases, the Court upheld state laws that required that Congressional candidates be registered for a year with a certain party before running, disqualified judges from running for Congress and prevented candidates who lost a party primary from running as an independent in the general election.

No matter what the Supreme Court’s decision, term limits are likely to become a reality. Carter Phillips, the lawyer representing Congressman Ray Thornton in his suit against Arkansas’ term limit, acknowledges there is “significant momentum” for the idea. If the Court supports state-imposed limits, Mr. Phillips believes Congressmen from states disadvantaged by having them will join with Members from other states to ensure term limits apply nationally. If the Court agrees with him and strikes down state limits, he still thinks “the Constitution will likely be amended to include term limits.”

We suspect he’s right. Democratic Senator David Boren resigned this month and moved home to head the University of Oklahoma. An acknowledged expert on political reform, he says he is a convert to term limits. Though he spent 25 years in public office, he thinks long careers are generally a mistake. “Politics has become too professionalized,” he says, noting that term limits may be the only way to ensure that people from a wide range of backgrounds are elected to Congress. Career politicians “become part of the system” and end up worrying too much about staying in office. “I believe term limits would encourage more people to do what’s right rather than what furthers their political ambition,” Mr. Boren says.

The American people obviously agree. Since 1990, voters in 22 states and an extraordinary 270 cities and counties have voted term limits as an average of two to one. Minority support is strong, too, as shown by Washington, D.C.’s overwhelming passage of term limits this month.

It’s no surprise many GOP incumbents are unenthusiastic about term limits, despite the fact that the GOP Contract promises a House vote on term limits in the first 100 days of the new Congress. Even Rep. Dick Armey, the likely new Majority Leader, told National Public Radio he thought voters “will find their enthusiasm for term limits waning quite a bit.” If the new Congress succeeds, a flood of angry calls and faxes prompted Rep. Armey to quickly reaffirm his belief that “term limits are essential.”

Republicans whose support for term limits fades as their congressional power grows deserve whatever fate Rush Limbaugh and other talk show hosts can dish out. But it’s equally hard to work up much enthusiasm for Democrats who now suddenly believe term limits can work only if they kick out all sitting incumbents immediately. Democratic Senator Jeff Bingaman says term limit backers “will scream” if any Members are grandfathered.

We doubt it. All those voters for term limits aren’t personality driven or intent on wholesale off-loading of all incumbents. In fact, the only genuine defeat for term limits has been in Washington state, where in 1991 voters rejected a retroactive term limit that would have immediately forced Speaker Tom Foley and other incumbents. “People saw it as mean-spirited and personal,” says Seattle Times columnist John Carlson. The next year Washington state approved term limits that allowed all incumbents to serve a minimum of six additional years. The grandfathering argument is a political tactic, not a serious contribution to managing a huge change in the system.

What term limit advocates fundamentally want is institutional reform that will make legislators more representative of their electorates. Whatever the outcome in the Court or Congress in the next few months, term limits are an idea pressing itself inexorably into the American political system.
USA SNAPSHOTS

GATT's long road
Congress votes on legislation implementing the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade this week. What's happened since negotiations?

By Marilyn Greene and Judy Keen
USA TODAY

Voting begins today in the lame-duck Congress for the expected approval of U.S. membership in a sweeping new global trade agreement. The House vote on GATT — the 118-nation General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade — is scheduled this afternoon; the Senate on Thursday.

"This GATT agreement not only tears down trade barriers, it also builds differences of party, philosophy and ideology," President Clinton said Monday at a White House rally. Joining Clinton: Republican members of Congress and former Bush administration figure James Baker.

"A vote to delay is a vote to kill," says Baker.

The administration also offered a letter signed by former presidents Gerald Ford, George Bush and Jimmy Carter urging approval.

Approval requires a simple majority vote. A comfortable majority is expected in the House. But Senate dissenters plan to use all 20 hours allotted to them for debate.

Two senators — Max Baucus, D-Mont., and Hank Brown, R-Colo. — said Monday they still oppose the agreement.

GATT took seven years of negotiation by the United States and 123 other countries.

But incoming Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole says his concerns about the WTO have been allayed and is urging Republicans to back the pact.

Opponents say term limits would make Congress a hodgepodge of members elected under different rules and dependent on lobbyists and staff.

But even with the Republican surge, Jacob says, 96% of incumbents were re-elected, making the limits “necessary.”

Opponents, spending thousands on ads, consider the Senate their best shot to stop it.

Conservative columnist Patrick Buchanan, an unsuccessful bidder for the 1992 GOP presidential nomination, says he’s so disturbed about GATT he’s considering another run:

“Somebody’s got to speak up... for national interests.”

Philadelphia to fire three 911 operators
By Gary Fields
USA TODAY

Three of the 911 operators on duty in Philadelphia when a mob of teenagers beat a former altar boy to death will be fired, Mayor Edward Rendell said Monday.

Three other operators working the 40-foot ride to the tree’s top, Eddie Polce, will be suspended 30 days and transferred. A fourth will be referred to a disciplinary board for a hearing.

“If the system worked... could we have saved his life? There is no way of knowing, but we could have improved his chances," Rendell says.

Polce was beaten with baseball bats Nov. 11 by teens avenging a rumored sexual assault of a neighborhood girl.

The assault never happened.

Operators took 46 minutes after the first of 18 calls to send police, who arrived in five minutes and found Polce on the steps of St. Cecilia’s Church.

The victim’s father, John Polce, told his local TV station: “Eddie’s dead because of the people that are in jail, not because of operators.”

But City Councilman Brian O’Neill says of the operator firings: “Hopefully this puts the fear of God in them.”

Five young men have been charged with murder.

Ronald Mauldin, a local union official, says operators only get a week of training.

“What the police are doing is they need a scapegoat.”

Hillary kicks off season, loses shoe

The start of the White House holiday season took a fairy tale twist Monday.

Hillary Rodham Clinton, stepping off the lift that took her to the top of the National Christmas Tree, caught her heel and lost her shoe.

She stood on one foot as a National Park Service employee, kneeling, replaced it.

”My clipper, Clinton giggled. “Like Cinderella.”

Moments earlier, on a foggy 40-foot ride to the tree’s top, the first lady nervously gripped the basket’s rails as the lift shimmied.

It streaked long enough for her to place a star donated by GE Lighting of Cleveland atop the national tree.

It’s on the Ellipse behind the White House.

The glass star, with 15 blue bladed, is illuminated with a 175-watt lamp.

President Clinton is to light the tree Dec. 7, opening the 1994 Payment of Peace.

The first lady plans to unveil the White House Christmas decorations Dec. 3.

By Doug Mills, AP

WASHINGTON (AP) — The Supreme Court wades into a constitutional battle between voters and their representatives today as it hears debate on the constitutionality of term limits on Congress.

Six states passed term limits Nov. 8, bringing the number of states with such measures to 22. Most Limit House members to three, two-year terms; senators to two, six-year terms.

"Our founding fathers envisioned Congress as being composed of citizen legislators who would serve a while, then return and mix with the people," says Arkansas Attorney General Winston Bryant, who is defending that state’s congressional term limit law in the case before the court.

States Paul Jacob of the pro-term group U.S. Term Limits Inc. “It’s an epic battle of the people vs. the politicians.”

Opponents say term limits would make Congress a hodgepodge of members elected under different rules and dependent on lobbyists and staff.

“The election Nov. 8 shows that people can make a change without term limits,” says Becky Cain of the League of Women Voters.

But even with the Republican surge, Jacob says, 96% of incumbents were re-elected, making the limits “necessary.”

Opponents, spending thousands on ads, consider the Senate their best shot to stop it.

Conservative columnist Patrick Buchanan, an unsuccessful bidder for the 1992 GOP presidential nomination, says he’s so disturbed about GATT he’s considering another run:

“Somebody’s got to speak up... for national interests.”

By Cindy Hall and Bob Laird, USATODAY

Christina’s Tree, caught her shoe to the top of the National Christmas Tree, caught her heel and lost her shoe.

She stood on one foot as a National Park Service employee, kneeling, replaced it.

"My clipper, Clinton giggled. "Like Cinderella."

Moments earlier, on a foggy 40-foot ride to the tree's top, the first lady nervously gripped the basket's rails as the lift shimmied.

It streaked long enough for her to place a star donated by GE Lighting of Cleveland atop the national tree.

It's on the Ellipse behind the White House.

The glass star, with 15 blue blades, is illuminated with a 175-watt lamp.

President Clinton is to light the tree Dec. 7, opening the 1994 Payment of Peace.

The first lady plans to unveil the White House Christmas decorations Dec. 3.
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Net closing on Muslim 'safe area'

U.N. peace effort in Bosnia could fall along with town

By Lee Michael Katz and Tom Sutliff
USA TODAY

Bosnian Serb forces are poised to seize the besieged Muslim town of Bihac amid reports of hand-to-hand combat in the town's "safe area."

Hoping to avoid a total collapse of the U.N. peace effort in Bosnia-Herzegovina's bloody civil war, Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali said Monday that he plans to visit Sarajevo on Wednesday. The Serbs launched the war 32 months ago when they rebelled against the move by Bosnia's Croats and Muslims to secede into the Croatian Republic. The bitter war, which the Serbs appear close to winning, has left 300,000 people dead. The Serbs are within 500 yards of Bihac's hospital, overrunning 2,000 patients. The advancing Serbs forces also continued to bomb UN personnel in a serried volley of rockets, policy denounced by the United Nations.

The Serbs are holding more than half of Bihac, where 60,000 Muslims are trapped. U.N. military spokesman Lt. Col. James Iveson says Serbs are "able to enter the town any time they wish."

Brussels has criticized the nominee Senate majority leader Robert Dole of Kansas, who says U.N. peacekeeping troops were "not doing their job" and should be withdrawn.

"It ill becomes people who come to Washington and demand a single soldier on the ground to make that kind of criticism," British Defense Secretary Malcolm Rifkind says.

Dole faces his NATO critics during a visit to the alliance's Brussels headquarters today.

Diplomats say U.S. officials have moved toward the European allies, offering to revise a "time out" plan to get the Serbs back to the peace table. The plan offered Serbs control of 6% of the country, with a Muslim-Croat federation in the north, the Bosnian Serbs in the east, and the Serbs in the west.

U.N. Undersecretary-General Kofi Annan, apparently returning in time for the Serbs' troops in Bosnia, says "it's absolutely unfair when member states have set the agenda... that the U.N. be left with a risk... but blame the U.N. for failing to correct it.

Annan says NATO refused to conduct more U.N.-requested air strikes in Bihac, unless it was also given U.N. authorization to attack Serb air defenses.

Dole says that places 500 U.N. troops held by Serb forces "in jeopardy."

White House chief of staff Leon Panetta offers this bleak assessment: "They're continuing to move progress further away from... but it doesn't appear that even the use of air strikes can deter them."

"We're allowing foreign bureaucracies for the first time in history to challenge American leadership in Bosnia," says the White House statement.

The sovereignty issue is a red herring," says Renee Mar- lborough, international politics specialist at American University in Washington. "If we don't like the ruling, she says, "we can accept the retaliation."

"The other option is simply to negotiate the ground rules of the operation, with six months' notice."

First vote today, 1A

Sovereignty an uncertainty

The most frequent argument against GATT: The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The 124-nation agreement, or WTO, to restructure the United States can withdraw if membership goes sour, the administration says.

Clinton rejects dictates calls for postponing the vote until the next session, when the agreement would likely be subject to crippling amendments. A delay would amount to defeat, the administration says. "We have to do it now," Clinton said. "It's not a Republican or a Democratic issue. It's an American agreement designed to benefit all the American people in every region of our country, from every walk of life."

The administration says tariffs could make the agreement "the biggest international tax in history."

Diplomats estimate it will boost global trade by $10 billion by 2005.

Opponents include the AFL-CIO, which opposes GATT for omitting language on worker rights; the Sierra Club and consumer advocate Ralph Nader, who argue environmental protection and consumer laws will be overridden by the WTO; and Texas billionaire Ross Perot, who argues environmentalists have "lost the fight against the Serbs."

The other option is simply to negotiate the ground rules of the operation, with six months' notice."

First vote today, 1A

CLOSING THE Bosnian Serb soldiers cook next to their shelter overlooking the town of Velika Kladusa, about 25 miles north of Bihac. They say they have taken over 80% of the enclave.
Both chambers of Congress get their houses in order

Tight race for GOP's No. 2 post in Senate

By Judi Hanson
USA TODAY

Senate Republicans this week face their first big test since becoming the majority: deciding who should be No. 2 to Robert Dole. The choices: a pragmatic veteran now in the job, or a challenger with an aggressive, conservative agenda.

All leadership posts, Democratic and Republican, are up for grabs as Congress returns this week, but one of the hottest races is the fight for the assistant leader's job in the new GOP-controlled Senate.

The battle, for the 53 GOP senators voting in day, is about both style and philosophy.

Sen. Trent Lott of Mississippi backs the activist-conservative agenda laid out by incoming Speaker Fred Thompson, D-Tenn, and wants Senate Republicans to use more of Gingrich's confrontational tactics.

But the main man in the job, Sen. Alan Simpson of Wyoming, is a centrist who backs abortion rights and warns against straying too far from social issues like school prayer.

The choice will have implications for the direction of the party. Lott, the House's top Republican, is a Gingrich ally and is widely liked humorist who's highly able to take over if Bob Dole decides to run the race.

But Simpson is banking on Senate Republicans rejecting the conservative battle cry of Gingrich and others who want a total commitment from GOP leaders to conservative fiscal and social agenda.

"It is not my intent to try to give people the salvia test of purity," says Simpson. "My job is to work with the House, and I don't think we're going to do it."

"Trent will be different from Bob Dole," Simpson says. "I am perfectly capable and highly able to take over if Bob Dole decides to run the race." Simpson — a tall, folksy, widely liked senator who's held the assistant post 10 years — had the job sewn up until Lott decided to challenge him.

"This race isn't about me, it's about Bob Dole," Simpson says. "We need to let members do things differently or is it going to be business as usual?"

Lott's supporters are some of the more conservative members of the party, including Sen. Phil Gramm of Texas.

"This race isn't about me, it's about Bob Dole," Simpson says. "It is not my intent to try to see where the world is our oys-

Democrats grapple for answers

By Richard Wolf
USA TODAY

Defeated, defeated and in disarray, House Democrats gather today to begin picking up the pieces from an electoral disaster that put them in the political minority for the first time in four decades.

When last they met, there were no tears of the House majority leader. Thomas Foley of Washington state. He's hoping close ties with the House, where he served for 25 years, will pay off.

Lott has "the House contacts that will remain in a Republican-controlled House run by Newt Gingrich of Georgia."

"We need to let members vent their deepened frustrations," says Rep. Bill Richardson, D-N.M. "There's a sense that the battle of the Democratic Party is at stake."

"I don't think we're going to see any blood on the floor," says Rep. John Lewis, D-Ga. "We all must continue to fit un-

rebuke to his party Monday, arguing it lost at all levels of government because it "did not live up to what we said we were going to do in 1993."

But, despite demands for change, Democrats are expected to elect leadership incumbents. Richard Gephardt of Missouri is expected to easily win minority leader over North Carolina's Charles Rose.

"We have to do something more tangible: a total commitment from GOP leaders to conservative fiscal and social agenda."

In any case, there is concern from all quarters:

"Liberal Rep. Charles Rangel, D-N.Y., wants Wednes-

day's elections delayed so Democrats can "see where the party is going." His effort is expect-

Moderate Sen. John Breaux, D-La., issued a singing
President sports ‘commander’ label

Despite remarks by conservative Sen. Jesse Helms, R-N.C., President Clinton let it be known when he went for a jog Monday that he is the U.S. commander in chief. Clinton wore a navy-blue-and-gold exercise suit with the words “Commander in Chief” emblazoned in huge gold letters across his back as he jogged at Fort McCarra, a U.S. Army base a short ride from the White House. The president was accompanied on his half-hour morning outing by soldiers from the base. The symbolism of the president’s attire was not lost since only a few days ago Sen. Helms said in a CNN interview that Clinton was unfit to be commander in chief.

POST OFFICE SCANDAL: Lawyers for ex-representative Joseph Kolter argued that embezzlement charges against him should be thrown out because House members can’t be prosecuted for actions related to official conduct. In challenging a five-count indictment, Kolter’s lawyers invoked the Constitution’s speech or debate clause, which gives the House sole authority to question members about their actions. Kolter, a Pennsylvania Democrat defeated in 1992, is accused of embezzling $11,000 from taxpayers in cash disguised as stamp purchases from the House Post Office. He’s also accused of billing taxpayers for $33,000 worth of luggage, china and other personal items from a congressional stationery store. Kolter is the second current or former House member charged in a federal probe of House Post Office corruption. Dan Rostenkowski awaits trial.

DEMOCRATIC POST-MORTEM: Clinton met at the White House with several Democrats who recently lost reelection bids, including House Speaker Thomas Foley. The meeting, in the White House Map Room, was described as a social occasion for chitchat and brainstorming.
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ELSEWHERE IN THE WORLD

Norwegians buck trend, say no to European Union

Norwegians rejected European Union membership Monday, bucking a regional trend by voting to stay out of the world’s largest trading and political bloc. It was the second time Norway has opted out of the EU. And it kept the European Union from claiming a clean sweep this year in its campaign to bring in wealthy new members following “yes” votes in Austria, Finland and Sweden.

"It was the people who made the decision, and we as a country have to live with that," said Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland, who favored membership.

With 80.6% of the vote counted, 52.1% voted against union membership and 47.9% were in favor. Norway, a country of 4.3 million people, is Western Europe’s largest oil exporter, with one of the world’s highest standards of living.

JAILLED IN GUAYANA: A pregnant New York teen-ager was sentenced to four years in a Guayan prison Monday for drug trafficking in spite of pleas for leniency by her defense lawyer, Ademide Harvers, 18, was convicted last week of attempting to smuggle nearly 30 pounds of cocaine onto a New York-bound plane June 27 at the Timehri International Airport near Georgetown, the capital.

MAJOR VICTORY: Prime Minister John Major’s government won a crucial parliamentary vote to increase Brit­ain’s contribution to the European Union budget. The Major government, which said it would resign and call a general election if it were defeated, won by 330-303 votes.

ISRAEL-PLO TALKS: Israeli Foreign Minister Shimon Peres and PLO leader Yasser Arafat met in Brussels, Bel­gium, to try to injecting new life into Palestinian self-rule. Their agenda included discussions on withdrawing Is­raeli troops from the West Bank and dates for Palestinian elections. Peres and Arafat asked donors to pump money into the region to bring stability.

URUGUAY VOTE: Former president Julio Sanguinetti was returned to power by a narrow margin Sunday and promised to put national free trade at the top of his agenda.
Seventh-grader's case puts drug testing on the line

By Tony Mauro
USA TODAY

The future of required drug testing for student athletes at public schools and universities could be decided in an Oregon case docketed Monday by the U.S. Supreme Court.

The court agreed to consider this spring whether the Vernonia School District violated the rights of seventh-grader James Acton when it required him in 1991 to submit to a urine test before he could play football for his school.

Acton refused and was not allowed to play.

A federal appeals court ruled that the drug test would violate the boy's right against unreasonable government "searches and seizures" unless school officials had reason to suspect Acton of drug abuse.

Acton, now 15, is a 10th-grader in Vernonia, a logging community northwest of Portland.

Vernonia officials argued in a brief that the mandatory drug-testing program, which was begun in 1988, "may be the only effective way to deal with a drug-use epidemic among school children."

"The safety of the students on the athletic field and in the basketball gymnasium is of paramount importance," Vernonia schools Superintendent Ellis Mason said Monday.

Acton declined comment Monday but his lawyer, Thomas Christ, said: "I'm confident the court will agree that this is a serious deprivation of James' privacy rights."

Christ said the school offered no proof of widespread drug use by Vernonia athletes.

Drug testing is still relatively rare at the pre-college level, says John Heeney of the National Federation of State High School Associations.

Many school systems shy away because of the cost of drug testing and the fear of being sued, says Heeney.

"There's also the feeling that at this level, it's not too late to do some education, to integrate some drug education into the athletic programs," he says.

At the college level, nearly two-thirds of Division I campaigns require some form of drug testing, says Frank Uryasz of the National Collegiate Athletic Association. Some have been challenged in lawsuits similar to Acton's.

"It's certainly possible that any Supreme Court case could affect college drug testing," Uryasz says.

The NCAA has run a limited drug-testing program since 1986, but likely would not be affected by Acton's case because the NCAA legally is not viewed as a government agency.

Also Monday, the court:
• Agreed to take another look at the corruption case of Spring County, Ark., convicted Sheriff Robert Aguilar.

Aguilar's 1990 conviction on charges of disclosing a wiretap and obstructing a grand jury was thrown out on appeal.

And refusal to disclose details about officials' contradictory statements closed window with the shade pulled down, "but there's nothing so obvious that it leaps right out at you," said Starrs.

But the six-month investigation into Olson's death was inconclusive.

"We didn't find any smoking gun," Starrs said. But he said government officials' contradictory statements and refusal to disclose details about Olson's death suggest homicide.

"There's nothing so obvious that it leaps right out at you," said Starrs.

Eric Olson initiated the probe about a year ago by contacting Starrs, who has conducted forensic investigations into the deaths of explorer Meriwether Lewis, the ax-murdered parents of Lizzie Borden and, Carl Weiss, blamed in the 1935 killing of Louisiana Sen. Huey Long.

Now, said Eric Olson, "I want to study the report and consider what I'm going to do." Olson, 49, a psychologist in Frederick, Md., who was 9 when his father died, says the event "is something from which, in a lot of ways, I've never recovered."

There were no cuts from window glass on Olson's body, said Starrs, a professor of law and forensic science at George Washington University.

But the six-month investigation into Olson's death was inconclusive. "We didn't find any smoking gun," Starrs said.

Still pending are results of hair analysis to show if LSD or other drugs were present at the time of Olson's death, Starrs said.

Nine days before Olson's death, a CIA scientist spied Olson's after-dinner drink with LSD at a secret Maryland retreat, and the normally gregarious Olson became depressed.

The CIA transported Olson to New York City to meet one of the few doctors then knowledgeable about LSD-related behavior. Two nights before he died, Olson tossed away his wallet and wandered the streets before being found sitting in the hotel lobby the next morning.

Then-hotel manager Armond Pastore's opinion: "Being in the hotel business my whole life, I never heard of anybody jumping through a closed window with the shade pulled."

Starrs's priority now, he says, is re-burying Olson's remains.

His scientific study of the case will continue, he said, "I think we've done everything that can be done for the family."
Dow rally continues as retail stocks rise

By Eric D. Randall
USA TODAY

Stocks extended their comeback Monday from last week's early rout, but analysts say it's wrong to assume the selling spree is over on Wall Street.

The Dow Jones industrial average gained 31 points to 3,740. Broader indexes also rose.

Last week, the Dow tumbled 141 points Monday through Wednesday as many fund managers sold stocks and bought bonds in a flight to safety. The Dow recovered 34 points in a half-day post-Thanksgiving session Friday.

"I don't know if you can read anything into (Monday's rally)," says Richard Meyer of Ladenburg Thalmann.

Monday, just 265 million shares traded on the New York Stock Exchange, down from October's daily average of 303 million. Volume was 385 million shares last Tuesday, when the Dow sank 92 points.

"I don't think the real players are back at work yet," says Steven Van Brunt at Nikko Securities.

Strong holiday retail revenue and a National Association of Realtors report showing that existing home sales rose 0.5% in October set off inflation jitters in the bond market. Prices fell for the first time in a week, driving the yield on 30-year Treasury bonds to 7.98% from 7.94% Friday.

That could keep a lid on stocks for some time. Economists expect the Federal Reserve to continue raising short-term interest rates to slow the economy and check inflation.

"We're still uncertain of where rates are going to be and uncertainty is something the market doesn't like," says UBS Securities trader Bill Lord.

Stan Weinsteln, editor of The Professional Tape Reader newsletter, says the Dow will seesaw, then slide to 3,200 in 1995. "Sell on rallies," he says.

Market highlights, 3B

Tipper Gore recalls her 'animal magnetism' with Al

Al Gore may have a reputation for being a little, er, wood- en, but wife Tipper says he melted her at first sight when they met at a 1963 school dance.

"It was absolutely pure animal magnetism," she tells the Dec. 6 Women's World magazine. "He was sexy, serious, smart and funny."

The Gores celebrate their 25th anniversary in May, but "I learned something new about Al every day," Tipper says. "He's changing, growing, maturing, and I hope I'm doing the same."

Another thing not widely known about the vice prez: He's a practical joker. His wife says he recently held out a half-used bottle of hair-removal cream while taking a shower and asked her if he had used enough of the shampoo.

"I took one look at him and screamed, 'Quick, get that off your head!' I thought all of his hair was going to fall out."
Snow exits East and re-enters West

As the first major winter-like storm of the season moved out of the East Monday, it also brought record snowfall to parts of the West. Northern New England received about half a foot of snow from the remnants of a storm that dumped up to a foot of snow Sunday in the Midwest and spawned tornadoes that killed four in Tennessee and two in Mississippi. Accidents on icy roads killed at least six in the Midwest. In Georgia, a pilot died when his small plane crashed because fog prevented him from finding two Atlanta-area airports. A new storm Monday brought up to 2 1/4 feet of snow to Utah ski resorts, pushing total November snow to a record 185 1/2 inches at Alta and 172 1/4 inches at Snowbird.

PRIEST CONVICTED: The Rev. Patrick Moloney, a Catholic Melkite priest who runs a New York City youth shelter, and one-time Irish Republican Army terrorist Samuel Miller, 39, were convicted in Rochester of conspiring to possess a part of the $7.4 million stolen from a Brink's armored-car depot in 1990. They face up to five years in prison at sentencing Feb. 9. The jury acquitted former Brink's guard Thomas O'Connor, 55, and unemployed teacher Charles McCormick, 30. The FBI recovered about half the money.

DR. DEATH: Police in Royal Oak, Mich., continued their investigation into the 21st death that assisted-suicide advocate Jack Kevorkian has been present at the past five years. Margaret Garrish, 72, died Saturday after a long bout with cancer. The Michigan medical examiner ruled her death a homicide because fog prevented him from finding two Atlanta-area airports. A new storm Monday brought up to 2 1/4 feet of snow to Utah ski resorts, pushing total November snow to a record 185 1/2 inches at Alta and 172 1/4 inches at Snowbird.

FLESH-EATING DISEASE: California health authorities said Thomas Lakin, 50, died Sunday in Thousand Oaks of necrotizing fasciitis, the streptococcus A virus dubbed a "flesh-eating" bacteria because it produces a toxin that destroys human tissue. The disease claimed at least three others in the U.S. since June 11 in Britain this year.

CLINIC DAMAGE: Abortion opponent John Arena, 73, of Rome, N.Y., pleaded guilty in Syracuse to state charges that he paid a woman to spill foul-smelling butyric acid in the bathroom of a two-story medical offices. He faces up to seven years in prison at sentencing Jan. 24. The acid sickened 35 to 45 people and caused $50,000 damage, authorities said.

RABIES DEATH: A bat is suspected in the rabies death of a 42-year-old Cumberland County, Tenn., woman — the USA's third rabies death this year. Rabies is rare in humans but always fatal once symptoms appear.

SOUS KILLED: Susan Smith won't have to undergo an immediate psychiatric examination, a judge in Union, S.C., ruled. Judge John Hayes said the required pre-sentence examinations were premature. Smith, 23, has confessed to drowning Michael, 3, and Alex, 14 months, on Oct. 25 when she rolled her car down a bridge with the boys strapped into safety seats. Smith, being held on two murder charges, had launched an nationwide search for the boys by claiming a carjacker took them. Meanwhile, Union residents Sunday honored Sheriff Howard Wells for cracking the case. He said it was "a team effort from the start."

ALSO MONDAY . . .

PRISON MELEE: Guards at the maximum-security state prison in Calipatria, Calif., shot four inmates during a fight in which four inmates also were stabbed, authorities said. None of the injuries is life-threatening. The fight was between black and Hispanic prisoners, authorities said.

RABIES DEATH: A bat is suspected in the rabies death of a 42-year-old Cumberland County, Tenn., woman — the USA's third rabies death this year. Rabies is rare in humans but always fatal once symptoms appear.

In Georgia, some good nanny news

Four months after a flood swept away her house and car, Jimmy Carter's childhood nanny is about to move into a new house built in part by Carter and his wife, Rosalynn. Annie Mae Rhodes, 77, and her disabled brother will share the three-bedroom house built by Habitat for Humanity, the charity for which Carter volunteers. Rhodes, who went to work for the Carter family when the Flint River flooded in July. The Carters helped build the frame and put up the roof trusses. Said Rhodes of her new home: "If heaven is this beautiful, I'll take wings and fly away."

Written by Paul Leavitt. Contributing: Leo Mullen, Robert Davis and Carrie Dowling

IN GERMANTOWN, TENN.: After tornado cleanup begins.
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CAMBRIDGE, Mass. — Why? Why are we arguing about putting prayer in the schools? Do we want prayer in the schools because we as a nation are abandoning our belief in God? Because we as a nation have quit going to church? Because we as a nation are rejecting religion as a force in our lives?

No, no and no. This argument is about politics, not about religion. It's about Newt Gingrich, not God. So if we're going to argue, let's put it in context. Let's understand that religion — religion without school prayer — is a growing part of life in the United States.

Look at the figures:

Some 155 million of us are members of churches. That's 63% of America's population. That percentage — the figure is for 1990 — is up markedly from the 60% of 1985 and the 59% of 1980. It's the same as the figure of 1970 and down just one percentage point from 1960.

Some 25 million of our children go to Sunday school. Another 54 million go to private or parochial elementary and secondary schools, where religion often is a staple of religious training in addition to whatever they get in regular church services and whatever they get at home.

And they're getting a lot at home. "While attitudes toward government and the political system have shifted in recent years, along with values on race, welfare and economics, religious faith has remained relatively steady," the Times Mirror Center for the People and the Press reported recently.

"Today, 98% of the public say they never doubt the existence of God, the same as in 1987. Seventy-eight percent say prayer is an important part of their daily life, and 83% agree we will all be called before God on Judgment Day to answer for our sins," the survey says. And it adds: "If anything, religious values have grown stronger in recent years."

We give our churches vast amounts of our money and time. We give more than $6 billion to churches each year, double the amount of a decade ago. That's the largest category of giving in America, more than three times what we give to schools and colleges, more than four times what we give to arts and culture.

And more than 26 million of us do volunteer work for our churches every year — five times the number who volunteer in politics, four times the number who volunteer in arts and culture organizations and nearly twice the number who volunteer in schools. More volunteers work in churches than anywhere else.

It's hard to find an exact count, but there probably are more than 100 religions practiced in the United States today, from Adventism to Zoroastrianism. There are 360,000 church structures. There are Jains and Sikhs and Confucians and Shintoists and Hindus alongside the Baptists and Methodists and Lutherans and Catholics. Again, figures are hard to come by, but there probably are as many Muslims in America today as there are Jews.

So this nation doesn't need school prayer to make us religious or to keep us religious. We're doing just fine on our own.

Leaders of 20 of so religions and religious denominations — Jews, Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, Lutherans and Seventh-Day Adventists, among others — say they will lobby against it.

We all should join in that opposition. "This is a wrongheaded, misguided, divisive agenda," said Rabbi David Saperstein of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

There is much that is wrong in America today. Wages are falling, health care is unaffordable, welfare may indeed need revamping. Hope is being taken from the young, and dignity is being stripped from the old. Those are matters of the mind and body, and we — and probably even God — need all the help we can get on those. But neither we nor God need Gingrich's help on matters of the soul.

End tyranny of the courts over people's laws

Take back democracy; end federal judges' veto power over what the public wants.

By James Delmont

The instant lawsuits now pending in various courts against California's Proposition 187 prove once again that the wishes of the Founding Fathers — that the Supreme Court should not have veto power over legislation — have been forgotten.

In fact, long before the election, pundits and opponents were arguing that the proposed law limiting services to illegal aliens and opponents were arguing that the provision that the Constitution include language — "until tested in the courts." The abuse of this privilege has led to a situation in which all laws in our country are tentative. The law itself has lost its historic notion of authority — that it comes from the power of the people, through their elected representatives. Instead, it has to be cleared with the courts.

The initiative and referendum, the direct primary and the ability to recall elected officials were great achievements of the progressive era in U.S. politics a century ago. But today, as with California's Proposition 187, they are routinely smothered by court rulings based on an uncheked veto power that is being abused. What recourse do we have?

If Americans are to restore both the original intent of the framers of the Constitution and the vitality of majority-rule democracy, we should create, either by law or by constitutional amendment, a separate Constitutional Court. It alone would have the power of "judicial review," accepting cases on recommendation from the Supreme Court. It would be subject to a check and balance from the Congress, as the presidential veto is. Term limits for the court's judges also would be a good idea.

At present, hundreds of federal judges promiscuously wield a veto power never intended by the Founding Fathers — one that diminishes democracy while institutionalizing an elite, unelected group of men and women appointed for life who can nullify any law, ruling or regulation simply by declaring it "unconstitutional." This is folly, and the time has come to do something about it.

James Delmont is an adjunct professor in history at the University of Nebraska at Omaha and a columnist for the Omaha World-Herald.

No tears for Dahmer?

Who will bother to mourn Jeffrey Dahmer, convicted murderer and confessed cannibal, killed Monday while cleaning a bathroom in a maximum-security Wisconsin prison?

Perhaps only Justitia, who sits with blindfold, sword and scales as the personification of justice.

Mere mortals are more likely to recall Dahmer's sins. He hunted men and boys. He took them home, drugged them, tortured them, killed them, defiled them, dismembered them, ate some of their organs and put others in a pot. And when arrested, as "I carried it too far," he said, "That's for sure."

Dahmer is not — was not — an easy figure to defend in the name of justice. But justice had handled him properly. After a fair trial in an open court, he was sentenced to 16 consecutive life terms. His murder is not a punishment but yet another crime. The slaying of a hated killer — satisfying as it may feel — is no more legal than the dreadful death of a beloved innocent.

That's a hard truth to swallow, and many may prefer not to try. Rather, there is frequent public support for those who choose to dispense their own justice. Among the better examples in recent years:

- Bernard Goetz shot four subway thugs because they allegedly tried to rob him.
- Lorena Bobbitt cut off her husband's penis because he allegedly abused her.
- Ellie Nesler shot Dan Devine five times in the back of the head because he allegedly molested her child.
- Lorena Bobbitt cut off her husband's penis because he allegedly abused her.
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- Lorena Bobbitt cut off her husband's penis because he allegedly abused her.
- Bernard Goetz shot four subway thugs because they allegedly tried to rob him.
- Lorena Bobbitt cut off her husband's penis because he allegedly abused her.
- Ellie Nesler shot Dan Devine five times in the back of the head because he allegedly molested her child.

In each case, retribution was delivered quick and certain, and framed against our ponderous courts, many found those attacks a refreshing change.

But it's not clear why Dahmer was killed. Perhaps the attacker saw himself as an avenging angel. But prisons are violent places; scores of inmates are murdered each year. So did Dahmer's assailant intend to take up where the courts left off? Or was this just some pedestrian prison beef?

In one sense, it really doesn't matter. Dahmer's murder simply adds a final miserable layer to a profoundly miserable life. Bury the body; bury the hurt.

But more broadly, there's no such thing as no-harm, no-foul homicide. Jeffrey Dahmer was an evil being, but there's little cause to celebrate his brutal killing. That's another step toward vigilantism, and we are too close to that already.

Dahmer's death, 1A
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Treat pilots as individuals; end forced retirement

OUR VIEW

There's nothing magic about age 60 that automatically disqualifies an experienced pilot from flying.

When a plane ride suddenly turns rocky, nervous fliers want a veteran pilot in the cockpit to ensure a safe landing. Usually, they get one.

But not as often as they'd like. Aging pilots are yanked from the controls prematurely. A mindless 34-year-old rule arbitrarily grounds pilots from flying large, commercial aircraft at age 60.

Older pilots have chafed at the rule for years and, on Monday, lawyers for their 800-member Professional Pilots Federation sued the Federal Aviation Administration in hopes of getting the rule changed.

The FAA will have trouble defending its case. A cursory look suggests the rule makes no sense.

While the FAA is pushing older pilots out of the biggest, safest aircraft, it continues to allow them to fly planes with fewer than 30 seats. Those smaller planes often demand more of their pilots.

And oh, yes, the FAA lets older pilots fly the agency's own planes.

If there's reason to believe over-60 pilots are dangerous, then they shouldn't be allowed to fly at all. But, in fact, the "evidence" is as flimsy as the rule is arbitrary.

Even the FAA concedes that there are virtually no data on over-60 pilots flying large commercial planes precisely because they've been barred from those cockpits for so long. Data on other over-60 pilots — commercial and private — suggest their accident rates are higher than those of pilots in their 50s but lower than pilots in their 20s and 30s.

So where should the age line be drawn? It shouldn't be drawn at all. There's a better way.

Pilots should be licensed or grounded regardless of age based on their ability to pass carefully tailored physical and mental tests.

For younger pilots, that's already the practice. Those with histories of heart attacks or other ailments can fly provided they can pass a physical, which the FAA requires for all pilots every six months.

The only justification for setting an arbitrary age is that it saves money on medical tests — hardly a valid excuse for age discrimination. No less an authority than the National Institutes of Health concluded that "there is no medical or scientific evidence to support age 60 for the mandatory retirement of airline pilots."

A new survey of the 110,000 members of the International Airline Passengers Association showed overwhelming support for healthy experienced pilots keeping their hands on the controls.

If passengers, pilots and medical authorities all know the rule is senseless, why does the FAA seem so perplexed, so unable to act despite studying the issue for years?

Perhaps the rule continues to exist simply because it's so old and familiar that regulators can't bear to change it.

It's not the pilots who need mandatory retirement. It's this arbitrary policy.

Keep the retirement rule

OPPOSING VIEW

No test can predict when it will become unsafe for an aging pilot to fly.

By George Thompson

Every pilot worth his wings knows "there are bold pilots, and old pilots, but there are no bold, old pilots."

Take it from this former skyjockey. Once bold, I reluctantly became old, and wisely avoided being both bold and old in the cockpit by turning in my pilot's license on my 53rd birthday.

Now approaching my 70th, I refuse to fly or be flown by anybody over age 60.

Why? Reflexes, short and sweet.

It simply takes too long to get old and increasingly fickle fingers to flick switches. Lag time increases with age.

So does danger to both pilot and passengers.

Most pilots would readily agree that flying has been described as "many hours of boredom, punctuated by a few minutes of sheer terror." Toughest are those all-too-short intervals immediately following takeoff and just prior to landing — especially in any kind of bad weather or reduced visibility.

Oh, this ex-pilot has many fond memories of more than 4,000 hours in the air, of who-knows-how-many landings on beaches and short strips, and hundreds of miles over jungles and open ocean where the senses stretched like rubber bands.

But it was that increasing inability — perhaps even an inherent reluctance on my part — to continue pushing those senses to the limit that made me decide to quit.

Unlike most commercial airline captains, I didn't have to balance an awareness of stretching my physical and mental capabilities to assure my continued employment. It was my decision to stop flying. Mine alone.

And there's the rub.

Neither the Federal Aviation Administration, nor the National Institutes of Health, nor any of the professional pilots organizations has any foolproof way of determining whether an aging pilot should continue to fly.

Until they do, it is up to each individual pilot, as the years go by, to continually assess his or her physical and mental capabilities to captain the aircraft, secure in the knowledge that at age 60 — for all our sakes — retirement will be required.

That's why the 34-year-old federal law that bars pilots over 60 from flying large commercial aircraft should continue to be enforced.

George Thompson is a columnist for Florida Today, Melbourne, Fla.
Col 1: Thigh creams didn't exist a year ago and they still have not been proven to work. The federal Food and Drug Administration, concerned that not enough is known about the product's effects, is monitoring thigh cream closely. But thanks in large part to Frome's energetic leg work, Skinny Dip, Slim-Thigh and dozens of other brands, some based on the asthma drug and some not, have taken cosmetic counters by storm. (THIGHCREAM, will move overnight).

Cols 2-6: With the Serbs blatantly ignoring the United Nations and NATO in their war against Bosnian Muslims, the Clinton administration says it isn't prepared to send U.S. troops into combat but would consider a request to help evacuate United Nations forces from the region. (with art). (BOSNIA-TIMES, moved).

Above fold:

Col 2: The world trade agreement wins another potentially key vote as Sen. Phil Gramm, R-Texas, declares his support for the giant treaty, which would reduce tariffs and other barriers to trade between 124 nations. (GATT-TIMES, moved).

Col 3: Spielberg-Katzenberg-Geffen, one of Hollywood's most powerful entertainment troikas, will develop television shows with Capital Cities-ABC Inc. (STUDIO-TIMES, moved).

Col 4: Jeffrey Dahmer, who brought new dimensions to the horror of serial killings, is beaten to death while cleaning a bathroom at the prison where he was serving his life sentence. (DAHMER-TIMES, moved).

Col 5: In a stark illustration of the U.N. Protection Force's vulnerability to the unraveling Balkan conflict, Bosnian Serb rebels took three U.N. officers captive last week, bound their hands and feet and laid them out like lumber on the Banja Luka air base runway as human shields against an ongoing NATO air strike. (BOSNIA-RETREAT, moved).

Below fold:

Col 3: Amid a sharp last-minute shift in public opinion that indicates a cliff-hanger result, Norwegians vote in a key vote as Sen. Phil Gramm, R-Texas, declares his support for the giant treaty, which would reduce tariffs and other barriers to trade between 124 nations. (GATT-TIMES, moved).

Col 4: Jeffrey Dahmer, who brought new dimensions to the horror of serial killings, is beaten to death while cleaning a bathroom at the prison where he was serving his life sentence. (DAHMER-TIMES, moved).

Col 5: Spielberg-Katzenberg-Geffen, one of Hollywood's most powerful entertainment troikas, will develop television shows with Capital Cities-ABC Inc. (STUDIO-TIMES, moved).

Col 6: In a stark illustration of the U.N. Protection Force's vulnerability to the unraveling Balkan conflict, Bosnian Serb rebels took three U.N. officers captive last week, bound their hands and feet and laid them out like lumber on the Banja Luka air base runway as human shields against an ongoing NATO air strike. (BOSNIA-RETREAT, moved).

Cols 1-2: Ever since Albert Einstein showed that the three-dimensional space we live in actually curves into an unseen fourth dimension, mathematicians have been trying to understand the shape of our universe. Now a physicist has made a quantum leap forward. (SHAPE, moved).

Cols 5-6: Feature on the Los Angeles Police Department.

Sent: 10:50 p.m. EST. For questions, call (800) 283-NEWS, ext. 77832. Los Angeles Times-Washington Post News Service=
imposed on it for arming and instigating the Bosnian Serbs to rebel against the Sarajevo government. Washington previously opposed any easing of the sanctions until negotiated settlements are achieved to end the war in Bosnia and Croatia.

However, U.S. officials were cautious in describing the "confederation" plan that Washington endorsed, insisting that any confederation would be limited in scope and similar to the alliance now in effect between the Muslim-run Bosnian government and neighboring Croatia. "Reports that this is a green light for the Serbs to create the so-called Greater Serbia that they have always wanted are incorrect," one senior U.S. official said. He also stressed that the offer would be made contingent on the Serbs accepting the Contact Group peace plan.

Officials of the Contact Group plan to consult with Serbian leaders in Belgrade this week about the U.S. concession on the issue of Bosnian Serb confederation rights. But some say the diplomats may be pursuing the wrong path.

The Bosnian Serbs ceased insisting on the right to unite with Serb-lead Yugoslavia this fall, after Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic ostensibly cut off supplies to the Bosnian Serb rebels in hopes of getting sanctions lifted.

Since then, Bosnian Serb rebel leader Radovan Karadzic has demanded international recognition of his conquered territory as a state in itself, said Williams, the U.N. mission's chief spokesman. Karadzic appeared to still be working out his conditions for a cease-fire in the Bihac region and an overall settlement late Monday, as he let pass a 7 p.m. deadline for accepting a U.N. truce that calls for Bosnian government forces to retreat from the Bihac "safe haven."

---

3 Captive U.N. Officers Used by Serbs to Shield Air Strip (Zagreb)
By Carol J. Williams=
(c) 1994, Los Angeles Times=
ZAGREB, Croatia In testimony to the U.N. Protection Force's increasingly untenable position in the Balkan conflict, Bosnian Serbs took three U.N. officers captive, bound their hands and feet and laid them out on a rebel air strip as human shields against NATO bombing.

That incident in the rebel stronghold of Banja Luka last week, coupled with an unrelenting campaign of hostage-taking, beatings, gunfire and other harassment, has prompted the peacekeeping mission here to review its evacuation plans "with a new sense of urgency and reality," one U.N. official disclosed.

And what the military and civilian chiefs discovered Monday when they talked through their detailed withdrawal proposals is that they were designed in expectation of a massive infusion of NATO ground forces that the peacekeepers now realize will never happen.

"We're looking at a withdrawal by which we can't count on any support from the United States or NATO, with the possible exception of air cover," said the U.N. official privy to the evolving pullout plans.

No decision has been made yet about whether or when to move the 24,000 U.N. peacekeepers in Bosnia-Herzegovina out of harm's way, but mission officials warn that tough choices on the future of the mission are imminent.

"Without a political breakthrough in the next couple of weeks, the withdrawal option will loom very large," said the mission's chief spokesman, Michael Williams.

Mission chief Yasushi Akashi and the U.N. commander for troops in Bosnia, Lt. Gen. Michael Rose, had long fought the use of NATO air power to punish Serbian aggression for fear that getting tough with the rebels would expose UNPROFOR troops to retaliation and brinkmanship like the Banja Luka incident last week.

But the virtual removal of the threat of NATO air strikes apparent now with the international community's concession that it is helpless to stop a Serbian onslaught against the "safe haven" has failed to have the expected effect of reducing harassment and pressures on the U.N. troops, Williams said.

More than 400 Canadian, British, Russian, Dutch and Ukrainian troops remain hostages of the rebels throughout Bosnia, and thousands of others are surrounded and could easily be taken captive.

Officials at UNPROFOR headquarters say the mission's failure to protect the Bihac area has stunted a creeping realization that the peacekeepers are neither out of danger nor in any position to help the Bosnian civilians they were deployed to protect.

"One lesson you could draw from it is that we cannot operate anymore," said a senior mission official.

That no-win situation has prompted UNPROFOR to accelerate the plans for withdrawal, and to begin contemplating a worst-case-scenario of a hostile, humiliating and dangerous retreat.

---

On top of long-held fears of ending up trapped between the warring factions, Monday's examination of the pullout plans formulated over the past six months by military officials from the United Nations and NATO highlighted a number of misjudgments built into the planning.

Breakout contingencies assumed the deployment of two NATO divisions about 20,000 soldiers, at least half of them Americans. But U.N. officials acknowledge that such deployments would be subject to political endorsement in each member country, and that the prevailing mood in the United States and Western Europe suggests cobbling together an assistance force of that size would be impossible.

U.S. Defense Secretary William Perry has made it clear in recent days that the 2,000 U.S. Marines being positioned off the Adriatic Sea coast for support of UNPROFOR evacuations will not set foot on Bosnian ground.

The head of U.N. peacekeeping operations, Kofi Annan, told reporters in New York it would take as much as six months to withdraw the Balkans mission unless the operation draws considerable ground support from member countries.

One source criticized the withdrawal planning as "schoolboy stuff," noting that its U.N. and NATO drafters had expended much energy examining unrealistic contingencies, such as the circumstances for a withdrawal prompted by UNPROFOR's mission having been accomplished.

U.N. officials warn that as incidents of harassment multiply and continued involvement in peacekeeping becomes more difficult for the participating governments to justify to their populations, unilateral withdrawal moves are likely to further undermine a safe conclusion of the mission.

---
Gramm Declares Support for World Trade Pact (Washn)
By James Risen and Paul Richter= (c) 1994, Los Angeles Times=
WASHINGTON With critical congressional votes looming, the world trade agreement won another key ally Monday, when Sen. Phil Gramm, R-Texas, declared his support for the pact, which would reduce tariffs and other barriers to trade among 124 nations.

As the agreement heads for a ratification vote in the House Tuesday and the Senate Thursday, Gramm told reporters that he will join Senate Minority Leader Bob Dole, R-Kan., in supporting the pact on all votes in the Senate.

Gramm, a leader among conservative Senate Republicans and a likely presidential candidate, said he decided to support the accord which would create a new World Trade Organization to succeed the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade as the regime that governs global trade despite what he sees as dangerous and extraneous provisions in the ratification bill.

Gramm's support was hailed by the White House and other proponents of the pact as critical to shoring up support among Senate Republicans during this week's lame-duck legislative session. Gramm's decision was especially significant because he said he would vote yes on the most critical issue a waiver of the Senate's budget rules, which requires 60 votes.

Some advocates of the trade pact had feared that Gramm might declare his support for the agreement but vote against the the budget waiver. And they feared that other conservative senators might follow that lead. Such a position could have provided some political cover, while possibly killing the agreement.

The budget waiver is necessary because the trade agreement calls for deep reductions in import tariffs potentially reducing federal revenues by $30 billion to $40 billion over 10 years. Despite that, the Clinton administration has not proposed offsetting tax and revenue increases to finance those cuts, meaning that the budget deficit would be allowed to grow in violation of the current budget rules.

One administration official, told that Gramm had pledged to vote for the waiver, predicted the move "would send a very strong signal" to other undecided members of Congress. Others added, however, that proponents of the trade agreement were close to having the needed 60 votes in the Senate even before Dole and Gramm announced their support. Dole gave his endorsement in a White house ceremony last Wednesday.

Administration officials said they believe they will easily achieve the 218 votes needed for passage in the House. Most observers had said that the Senate would provide the toughest test for the trade agreement because of the budget waiver rule. And as President Clinton began phoning senators Monday afternoon to line up their support, some administration officials remained worried that, under pressure from opponents, some senators might try to delay the vote until next year. Such a move, they argued, could kill the agreement.

"We can't take anything for granted," said one administration aide.

Meanwhile, a bipartisan array of Washington notables from previous administrations crowded the East Room of the White House Monday to join Clinton in expressing their support for the agreement. Among them were James A. Baker III, secretary of state in the George Bush administration; James C. Miller III, director of the Office of Management and Budget under President Reagan; former Federal Reserve Board Chairman Paul N. Volcker; six members of the Clinton Cabinet and economists from both the private sector and government.

But the White House could not line up appearances from all the living former presidents, as it did last year before the vote for the North American Free Trade Agreement. Officials blamed logistical difficulties.

(Original add end)

Three former presidents, Gerald R. Ford, Jimmy Carter, and George Bush, signed a joint letter of support that was read at the event. (White House officials said they did not want to bother Reagan, in light of his recent announcement he is suffering from the early stages of Alzheimer's disease.)

Baker, in an allusion to the dark predictions of Texas billionaire Ross Perot, said that during the debate over NAFTA, "the misguided and the misinformed predicted a vast sucking sound as American jobs went south." Instead, he said, the pact between the United States, Mexico and Canada had brought only the "powerful wind of economic freedom."

In his remarks, Clinton expanded on the same theme, asserting that since the North American agreement went into effect expanding U.S. auto exports to Mexico by 500 percent auto workers' biggest complaint is excessive overtime. "That's what, at home, we called a high-class problem," he said.

Miller, the former budget director, said the world trade agreement's merits were demonstrated by the fact that 11 former budget directors were willing to stand up for it. They "all came at things in a little different way ... but they all think it's extremely important," Miller said.

Gramm, echoing the concerns of other conservative Republicans, said he remains troubled by many provisions included in the world trade agreement and complained that Clinton "had made it hard even for a free trader like me to support this agreement."

Law on Sender Identity in Political Mailers Upheld (San Francisco)
By Maura Dolan=(c) 1994, Los Angeles Times=
SAN FRANCISCO In a ruling that could limit last-minute "smear attacks" during campaigns, the California Supreme Court ruled Monday that political candidates and their campaign committees must identify themselves in mailers sent to voters.

In a unanimous decision, the court upheld the constitutionality of a state political reform law that requires such disclosure in mailings of more than 200 advertisements in a calendar month by a candidate or committee.

The ruling comes at a time of widespread consternation over the use of negative campaign literature in high-stakes campaigns. The Fair Political Practices Commission, the state's political watchdog, receives 20 to 25 complaints during each election year about candidates who fail to identify themselves in mailers.

Most of the violations occur in local elections and result in sanctions, said Darryl East, chief of enforcement for the FPPC. Several pending cases will be affected by the court's decision, he said.

Justice Joyce Kennard, writing for the court, said that the law requiring disclosure by candidates and committees they control "tends to prevent smear attacks" and permits candidates to confront their accusers.

"This is likely to reduce irresponsible attacks on candidates for public office," Kennard said, "and it will enable the voting public to appraise the source of the attacks, thereby assisting them in giving the attacks
the weight they deserve."

The court ruling came in the case of former Santa Ana (Calif.) Councilman Daniel Griset, who along with two campaign committees was fined a total of $10,000 for sending out five separate mailers in 1988 against an opponent for the city council.

At least one of the mailings was sent under the name of the Washington Square Neighborhood Association. "Prospective voters reading this mass mailing," Kennard wrote, "may have been deceived into believing that this mailing came from a 'grass-roots' group of concerned neighbors, rather than from a candidate for public office."

Griset won the race, and his opponent Richard L. Norton, filed a complaint against him with the FPPC. Norton eventually won election to the council in a subsequent race.

Griset appealed the commission's decision to fine him and his committees. A court of appeal in Santa Ana, ruling in his case, upheld the constitutionality of the disclosure requirements for candidates and their committees but struck it down for partisans of ballot measures.

The California Supreme Court specifically declined to rule on whether partisans of ballot measures must disclose their identity, nullifying the lower court's earlier ruling on that provision.

But the U.S. Supreme Court, considering an Ohio case, will rule on the constitutionality of such requirements for ballot measures within the next several months.

At issue in the legal debate is the First Amendment, which protects free speech.

The U.S. Supreme Court has previously ruled that government may not restrict the right to anonymity in speech by requiring disclosure without a substantial justification. The court also has held, however, that the government's need to protect the integrity of the electoral process may be adequate justification in some instances.

---

**Plans Announced for S33M Commercial-Satellite 'Spaceport'**

By James F. Peltz=

(c) 1994, Los Angeles Times=

A group led by ITT Corp. on Monday announced plans for a $33 million commercial-satellite "spaceport" at Vandenberg Air Force Base, near Santa Maria, Calif., in an effort to capture part of the booming launch business that is now concentrated in South America, China and Russia.

The spaceport would specialize in preparing and aiding the launches of small- to medium-size payloads of up to 5,000 pounds and, if successful, would be the only major site for commercial satellite launches in the United States.

Between 400 and 500 jobs would be created by the facility, which hopes to host 15 launches by the end of 1997.

But the spaceport will face stiff competition from the likes of Europe's ArianeSpace, which already dominates the commercial-launch industry and operates its own spaceport in Kourou, French Guiana.

A satellite customer typically will hire a company to build its satellite, and they then will decide where to launch the spacecraft and on what type of rocket. The launch site is often chosen on the basis of reliability, price, convenience, its proximity to the satellite's intended orbit and the satellite's size.

Besides Kourou, China and Russia are major providers of commercial-launch services and facilities. A limited number of commercial launches also occur each year at Vandenberg and at Cape Canaveral in Florida.

Nonetheless, the Vandenberg partnership called Spaceport Systems International, orSSI, hopes to snag what could be a burgeoning part of the satellite business: the spacecraft needed for the various wireless communications systems that are now planned.

Several groups of manufacturers are proposing such systems, which would use dozens of lightweight satellites in low Earth orbit to link portable telephones, fax machines and other devices around the globe.

---

**Riven Ruling Party Faces Critical Transition (Mexico City)**

By Mark Fineman=

(c) 1994, Los Angeles Times=

MEXICO CITY With just two days remaining before the most challenging transition of power in recent Mexican history, the long-ruling Institutional Revolutionary Party scrambled to close ranks and present a solid front for president-elect Ernesto Zedillo at a time when his party appears under unprecedented attack from within.

Amid reports of death threats against their most potent detractor, top leaders of the party that has governed Mexico for 65 years made a last-minute effort to discredit and isolate Mexico's former deputy attorney general, Mario Ruiz Massieu. He resigned from the party and his post last week after accusing the leaders of covering up the assassination of his brother, the PRI's second-ranking official who was gunned down outside a Mexico City hotel in September.

Attorney General Humberto Benitez, who is among those accused by his former deputy of conspiring to cover up the murder, used his final hours in office to declare in a communiqué published Monday that Ruiz Massieu's investigation found insufficient evidence to charge any PRI officials with wrongdoing.

The attorney general's staff also was reviewing possible criminal charges against the former deputy, based on a formal declaration filed Friday by PRI President Ignacio Pichardo. Pichardo, named as a principal in the
Norwegians Say 'No' to Membership in EU by Slim Margin (Oslo)
By Tyler Marshall
(c) 1994, Los Angeles Times

OSLO, Norway In a move heavy with significance both for Norway and the drive toward a united Europe, Norwegians voting in a national referendum Monday narrowly rejected membership in the European Union.

With more than three quarters of the vote counted, Norwegian Television Corp. computer projections indicated Norway would say no by a slim 53 percent to 47 percent. Norwegian Television Corp. computer projections indicated Norway would say no by a slim 53 percent to 47 percent. With more than three quarters of the vote counted, Norwegian Television Corp. computer projections indicated Norway would say no by a slim 53 percent to 47 percent.

The result is virtually an identical repeat of a referendum held on the same issue 22 years ago.

The result is virtually an identical repeat of a referendum held on the same issue 22 years ago.

The result is virtually an identical repeat of a referendum held on the same issue 22 years ago.

Monday's ballot effectively split the country. The rural, agrarian north, fearful of losing subsidies, had enough no votes to counter the urban, business-oriented south, which voted strongly in favor of EU membership.

After several hours of tense vote-counting, Anne Enger Lahnstein, the leader of the agrarian-based Center Party who was dubbed "The No Queen" during the campaign gave what amounted to a victory statement.

"We've experienced that people at the grass-roots got involved and fought with a will we've never seen the likes of before," she said. "They have worked for the values they believed in. We've not said 'no' to Europe or 'no' to international cooperation; we've said 'no' to union."

The biggest personal loser in the referendum is undoubtedly the country's prime minister, Gro Harlem Brundtland, who staked much of her political prestige in heading the yes movement. "The result is a heavy defeat for her," said Knut Heidar, an Oslo University political scientist.

However, her overall popularity and the absence of any obvious challenger within her own party would seem to assure her future as premier for at least the short term.

The implications for Norway and for the drive to create politically and economically united Europe seem less certain in the wake of Monday's vote.

For Europe, the impact of Norway's rejection is likely to be blunted by several factors. It follows strong yes votes in three other countries earlier this year Austria, Sweden and Finland a development that means the EU next January will expand from 12 to 15 nations.

While the Norwegian rejection must still be seen as a psychological setback for advocates of deeper European unity, some analysts Monday argued it could be a blessing in disguise for those advocates.

Speaking before the results were announced, one Brussels-based political analyst said he was hoping for a no vote.

"I prefer Norway to say no," said Daniel Gross, a senior research fellow at the Center for European Policy Studies in Brussels, Belgium. "They would be another problem country. It would be a help if they are not at the 1996 conference because they'd just put the brakes on."

In 1996, the EU is committed to a wholesale review of the Maastricht Treaty that commits member states to political and economic union. That conference is expected to be a de facto constitutional convention.

"In the end, this is going to make it tougher for Norway than for Europe," predicted Uwe Nertich, deputy director of the Ebenhausen Institute, a German think thank near Munich.

Certainly conditions for Norway outside the EU are likely to be much more difficult than they were in the years following its 1972 rejection.

With Sweden and Finland soon to be members, Norway risks being isolated from all its traditional Nordic partners. It would also be outside any EU defense union that might develop over the next few years.

(Monday's vote followed an emotional, sometimes bitter, campaign that at times brought tempers to the boil in a country known for its low-keyed approach to life. In recent days, Brundtland and some other leading figures of the yes campaign received veiled threats including letters containing live ammunition.

For many Norwegians, the vote was about nothing less than the future of the nation itself whether Norway, which for most of this century has so carefully avoided tying itself politically to any outside institution, should now cast its fate with that of mainstream Europe or go forward alone.

(End optional trim)
Turkey’s Foreign Minister Resigns, Coalition in Crisis (Istanbul)
By Hugh Pope
Special to the Los Angeles Times
ISTANBUL, Turkey Turkey’s controversial foreign minister, Mumtaz Soysal, resigned with a characteristic flourish on Monday, plunging the coalition government of this Muslim nation of 60 million into fresh political crisis.

Soysal, a Social Democrat, cited “deep differences in our understanding of government” in his terse resignation note to Prime Minister Tansu Ciller, leader of the conservative True Path Party. She lost no time in accepting it.

“Mr. Soysal’s departure was influenced by some basic approaches to foreign policy,” Ciller said. Soysal is suspicious of the United States, pro-Iraq and wary of foreign investment positions diametrically opposed to those of his coalition partners.

The impact of the resignation is more likely to be felt first in the domestic arena. The ruling coalition, and Turkish politics in general, has been in turmoil since a dispute over electoral lists last week forced the postponement of parliamentary by-elections due on Dec. 4.

Ciller has not announced a new date, saying Turkey must concentrate on more important issues. She wants to work to stabilize Turkey’s shaky finances by raising a hoped-for $5 billion from privatization of state businesses next year. Also needed are new laws on free competition, patents and copyright vital if Turkey is to successfully conclude talks with Europe on a special trade status by the end of the year. Soysal also imposed visa requirements on U.S. and other Western nationals in pursuit of what he called a foreign policy “with honor.”

“Only a general election can solve the problem,” wrote Hasan Cemal, one of Turkey’s most respected commentators. “In the current political conditions, Parliament and government can carry Turkey no further.”

Ciller had clashed with Soysal over several issues since she approved his appointment as foreign minister four months ago. She had accepted him in the vain hope that he would be less obstructive of her privatization plans on the inside of government than on the outside.

But all these projects are overshadowed by the apparently insoluble weakness of the coalition, and Ciller’s lack of any other real alternative within the current arithmetic of the 450-seat Parliament. “Only a general election can solve the problem,” wrote Hasan Cemal, one of Turkey’s most respected commentators. “In the current political conditions, Parliament and government can carry Turkey no further.”

Ciller has not announced a new date, saying Turkey must concentrate on more important issues. She wants to work to stabilize Turkey’s shaky finances by raising a hoped-for $5 billion from privatization of state businesses next year. Also needed are new laws on free competition, patents and copyright vital if Turkey is to successfully conclude talks with Europe on a special trade status by the end of the year.

But almost all commentators believe Soysal’s resignation marks the end of the road for the coalition government that has ruled Turkey since 1991. Ciller has so far failed to find a new partner in Turkey’s fractured Parliament to carry her through to the next general election, in 1996.

The current leader of the Social Democrats, Deputy Prime Minister Murat Karayalcin, has shown he will stay on at any price. But many expect that Soysal, now out of government, will resume his campaign to end the coalition.

Many Social Democrats approved of his principled stand after Ciller failed to deliver on a promise to reform Turkey’s much-criticized anti-terrorism laws. More than 100 writers and intellectuals languish in Turkish jails for simply speaking out, mostly about ethnic Kurdish or Islamic grievances.

Republicans Ignore Women’s Agenda at Their Own Risk

By Paige Gold
Special to the Los Angeles Times
The polls were barely closed Nov. 8 before Republicans all over the country uncorked the champagne, and the celebrating hasn’t stopped since.

Having won with the male vote in 1994, Republican strategists who are, not coincidentally, all themselves men will undoubtedly continue to rely on this group as the key to 1996. A key component of their strategy involves catering to the religious-right groups claiming credit for this year’s Republican success. The so-called gender gap, which helped Democrats take so many races in 1992 by winning a majority of the women’s votes, proved inconsequential this year. The social issues that tend to be a priority for women voters were not factors in 1994.

But if Republican movers and shakers believe that they’ve overcome the problems that cost them the executive branch in 1992, they’re in for a rude awakening come November, 1996.

By keeping counsel only with those like themselves, these men are ignoring the gradual change in the national electorate over the past decade, which has seen a steady erosion in party loyalty. Human nature being what it is, they will probably continue to do so until they’ve lost enough national elections that they’re supplanted by a younger, more in-touch and, dare I say it? perhaps more diverse group of strategists.

Consider this: Since 1989, I have spoken with many lifelong Republican women all over the country who have re-registered as Democrats or independents because they perceive a party dominated by religious extremists as no longer representing their interests. Others remain registered Republican but privately confide to one another that they’re ashamed to admit it to others.

Even many Republican women candidates themselves shy away from too close an association with the party. During the Washington mayor’s race, Republican nominee Carol Schwartz was quoted in the New York Times as saying she considered herself “a Republican in name only.” The article went on to characterize Schwartz as a fiscal conservative and strong supporter of tough crime control who nevertheless favors abortion rights, gay rights and easier access to drug rehabilitation.

Once, such beliefs would have been seen as exemplifying the true Republican principles of individual liberty and personal responsibility. By today’s Republican standards, they’re considered radical and liberal.

Continued acceptance of an anti-abortion platform, along with other religious-right doctrines that repudiate the essential tenets of Republicanism, will doom the national party to the same situation the Democrats found themselves in from the McGovern years until 1992, or worse, to a slow and painful demise. In future years, political historians may view the religious right as a Trojan horse that the Republican Party initially welcomed with open arms, only to see itself destroyed as that minority cost Republicans national elections by driving away mainstream voters.

The ranks of women voters turned off by the present Republican Party transcend any one social or economic
group. A recent Times Mirror study revealed that the middle of the national political spectrum is now dominated by a largely female swing vote. Termsing this group "new economy independents," the study reported that this segment is composed of almost one-fifth of all voters and is not anchored in either party.

These women's conflicting political values make them a potential source of votes for either party. At the same time that they associate themselves with fundamental religious beliefs, favor mandatory sentencing for violent criminals and dislike government regulations, they are also pro-choice and highly tolerant of homosexuality. Because many are financially pressured single mothers, their priorities differ in crucial ways from those of men in the same socioeconomic group. For example, they solidly support government spending on job-training programs.

The male Republican movers and shakers haven't bothered to take these women into account and are likely to continue to overlook them in 1996, an oversight that will very likely cost them the presidency. But it's still not too late for them to wake up and start reaching out to other potential Republican constituencies.

But I'm not holding my breath. Chances are, come November, 1996, when I and other women arrive at the voting booth, we will once again find ourselves looking at the top of the ballot and reluctantly pulling the Democratic lever.

Latin American Nations Have to Face Immigration Problem
(Mexico City)

By Jorge G. Castaeda-

Special to the Los Angeles Times-

MEXICO CITY Just about everything that could be said and written about California's Proposition 187 was published or stated before the Nov. 8 election, with one possible exception: what the actual consequences of approval might be for the home countries of the soon-to-be disentitled migrants, the 15 or so nations of Latin America and the Caribbean that generate migratory flows representing, over time, more than 15 percent of their total population. Leading this category are Mexico, most of Central America, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and the Caribbean states. (Colombian and Caribbean emigrants are concentrated in the American East, but the ripples of Proposition 187, which would restrict access by illegal immigrants to government services, will be nationwide.) For all these countries, the change in immigration attitudes in the United States will have a crucial impact.

First, a shift in U.S. immigration policy may have a paradoxically beneficial impact on Latin American immigration policy. Already Mexican President-elect Ernesto Zedillo, in a quick swing through El Salvador and other Central American nations last week, was forced to acknowledge that Mexico's treatment of undocumented Salvadoran migrants is not much better, and often worse, than U.S. behavior toward Mexicans.

This problem is far more widespread than is suspected, and extends beyond the case of Central and South Americans passing through Mexico on their way north. Bolivia and Paraguayans in Chile, Argentina and southern Brazil, Colombians in Venezuela, Peruvians just about everywhere all suffer many of the same manifestations of extortion, discrimination and human rights abuses that Mexicans are subjected to in the United States. In the coming confrontation on the fallout from Proposition 187 and in subsequent negotiations on migratory matters, Latin American self-righteousness will appear particularly unseemly in the light of wanton abuses by immigration authorities south of the Rio Grande.

Secondly and more important, most Latin American governments, and above all Mexico, will now have to retreat from what had been a notably successful posture on emigration issues for nearly half a century: looking the other way. For Mexico, El Salvador, Guatemala, the Dominican Republic, Jamaica, Cuba (in its own way), Ecuador and Peru, emigration has not only not been a problem; it has functioned largely as a partial solution to many of these nations' domestic dilemmas. True, the unemployment safety-valve theory is not totally accurate. Most emigrants have jobs and leave to seek better-paying ones. And there is a high cost involved for a society that sees its most dynamic and adventurous souls depart for another land. But by and large, the advantages of large-scale outflows, legal or not, far outweighed the drawbacks, which were, for the governments in question, minor indeed: the indignity of abuses committed against Latin American nationals by U.S. authorities, employers or rival minorities, and the political fallout from confronting or caving in to Washington on these issues.

The new attitude in the United States is admirably for change in immigration policies, ranging from the Draconian remedies of Proposition 187 to the less emotional recommendations of the U.S. Commission on Immigration Reform. These, along with the Border Patrol's stepped-up policing across from Tijuana and its blockade in El Paso, all indicate that Latin American governments will no longer have the luxury of looking away. The plight of "undocumented" Mexicans and other nationals in the United States their actual or perceived disentitlement to constitutional protection or even civil decency will be seen in the home countries as outright abuse, forcing governments to "do something." Even so, migration will continue; more rigorous enforcement of U.S. laws and borders will make crossing more difficult and expensive but not impossible.

Herein lies the third consequence of Proposition 187. It will in all likelihood put migratory matters where they have never really been in hemispheric relations: on the negotiating table.

The Central American presidents who met with Zedillo have already taken a first step with their Mexican counterpart by deciding to include the migration issue on the agenda of the Western Hemisphere summit in Miami next month. Many business and political leaders in Mexico are now espousing the stance that very few (including this writer) staked out during the NAFTA debate: that Mexico should have pressed for a chapter on immigration, even if that meant complicating the treaty's ratification.

But negotiations on migratory problems between generating and receiving countries are a complicated process. They generally end in a basic trade-off, as happened most recently between Washington and Havana: expanded legalization of out-migration in exchange for sharing the responsibility of regulating it. This does not necessarily mean that Mexico should patrol its own borders, as Fidel Castro basically agreed to do with the beaches of Cojimar. Nor does it imply that the United States, after a decent interval, would begin, for example, to accept far more legal immigrants from El Salvador than it publicly acknowledges, as it had done with the Cubans in Guantánamo.

But it does signify that the governments of Latin America must soon face a cruel conundrum. They will have to negotiate the numbers of their countrymen who wish to leave, by inference leaving the others to a cruel limbo. And in order to reach agreements with the United States on these flows and their legal status, they will have to be prepared to become involved in regulating them, by volume, destination, season and profession or type of skill. None of this will be easy or pleasant or palatable to large
California's record of anticipating swings in U.S. public attitudes is any indication, it will probably be unavoidable: The sentiment behind Proposition 187 seems to be more than a sideshow if its details and mechanics are not.

The Politics of America's Changing Work Experience

Friedman is an attorney and urban economist.

By David Friedman

Special to the Los Angeles Times

What accounts for American voters' visceral anger that so spectacularly erupted in the November elections? A crucial, but overlooked factor is the dramatic change in the way most Americans experience work.

In the past, most voters toiled in large, bureaucratic entities giant corporations or government and had little direct control over their economic destinies. Their careers were largely a matter of seniority and learning to protect themselves as they moved up the corporate hierarchy. Along the way, they could expect fairly secure pay and regular increases in benefits.

In the heyday of the old economy, the dominant political battles, especially in Washington, centered on getting a "fair" piece of this corporate pie and on regulating big business' fiscal, environmental and other excesses. An agenda of workplace entitlements, anti-business skepticism and centralized social programs enjoyed considerable appeal when the interests of workers, the middle class and various activist groups were plausibly enjoyed considerable appeal when the interests of workers, the middle class and various activist groups were plausibly pitted against the homogenous corporate bureaucracies. All this has changed in the last two decades. Upstart Asian producers, sophisticated Europeans and talented Latin American and other companies from newly industrializing nations learned to meet, then greatly exceed, the price and quality standards of America's giant industrial institutions. Suddenly, the comfort afforded by stable job and skill classifications became a huge liability for even the most powerful companies.

What these once-slumbering enterprises did next almost completely reshaped work in America. A large share of formerly in-house production and service activity was shifted outside and placed with independent subcontractors. These companies learned to combine their skills to design and deliver high-quality goods that were labeled and sold by brand-name companies like IBM, Boeing, Ford or MCA. Many of the larger organizations themselves, such as AT&T and Motorola, broke up into smaller, independent profit centers of larger companies. Their careers were far riskier and unstable. The choices they made directly affected their organizations' survival and their futures in ways that never occurred in the giant, paternalistic institutions that once offered them seemingly permanent employment security.

By the early 1990s, the vast majority of Americans were either working in these smaller companies or in the newly independent profit centers of larger companies. Their careers were far riskier and unstable. The choices they made directly affected their organizations' survival and their futures in ways that never occurred in the giant, paternalistic institutions that once offered them seemingly permanent employment security.

Out of this dramatic transformation grew a new political agenda. As small companies and individuals increasingly shoudered the burdens of product and market development for the national economy, capital availability became a crucial problem, especially since traditional tax policies and bank and venture-capital lending practices largely ignored their needs. Firms in the new economy discovered that they had to build regional institutions to support or help stimulate the concentrations of skill and talent as in Hollywood or Silicon Valley that allowed them to dominate world markets, a requirement made more difficult by the federal government's virtually total usurpation of local authority and economic resources. The Byzantine regulatory and entitlement schemes previously imposed on the nation's giant companies created overly burdensome constraints on newly entrepreneurial enterprises investing heavily in their futures, and thus operating close to their financial limits.

The passions unleashed by the midterm elections are in no small part attributable to the enormous tension between the America being molded by the new economy and the bureaucracies that survive from an earlier era. Far from embracing the new concerns of America's ascendant economic classes investment capital, tax relief, local autonomy or regulatory reform political elites, responding to their bureaucratic patrons, scorned them as selfish and reactionary. In response, America's new economy increasingly resented leaders who so frequently derided their interests while exclusively championing those that directly opposed them.

The first casualties of this exploding tension, apart from Democrats, are many of the institutions that are at the core of the bureaucratic economy. One is the mainstream media, which underestimated the changes sweeping through the nation's airwaves and newspapers in support of the traditional political agenda. Unable to find outlets for their viewpoints, many in America's new economy turned to such novel information sources as talk shows and on-line newsletters, which ultimately proved more prescient of the election results. Also convincingly defeated were economic and social policies that rely on transferring tax funds to big government or big business to "help" the underprivileged or to "create" new industries. The denizens of the new economy lost faith in social-entitlement programs when their legitimate concerns about worker's compensation fraud, illegal immigration or the negative effects of procurement or education quotas were dismissed as racism or insensitivity. Economic programs that would further tax America's growing firms and industries so that ponderous bureaucracies could provide "new" technologies, "green" industries or social services were rejected in favor of returning resources directly to the firms that are already successful in global competition.

While it was the Democrats who first paid for America's new economic realities becoming political, it is unclear whether the Republicans earned more than a temporary victory. Much of their support is negative; they attracted the disillusioned as the lesser of two evils, the party that would do the least harm, not the most good. Indeed, there are already signs the Republicans may not understand the revolutionary economic agenda they've putatively inherited.

Tax cuts, for instance, would be welcomed by newly emergent and growing companies, but only if the savings directly returned to their pockets. But most of the post-election Republican tax proposals focus on capital gains or other measures that benefit aloof institutions, Wall Street or the already wealthy.

Similarly, the authoritarian, dog-eat-dog world view of many Republican constituencies does not resonate with many of the most talented people behind America's emergent companies. The most successful, post-bureaucratic industries and regions computer specialists in San Francisco and media experts in Los Angeles, for example combine intense competition and a strong sense of mutual collaboration with their peers, a strategic mix that has economists grooping for models. But whatever their logic, it seems no accident that these new economies are growing in the heart of some of the most liberal areas of the country, peopled by iconoclasts for whom the regressive politics of the right is anathema.

Finally, if the people shaped by the new economy reject ethnic-group victimization as the starting point of social
policy, they also equally eschew demonizing such groups as welfare cheats. In California the center, in many ways, of what the nation's economy is becoming Asians, Latinos and blacks are more productive in, and essential to, vibrant, responsive industries than in virtually any other part of the country; they are among the state's most creative work force and managers of the future. Alienating them, even in the name of much-needed welfare, immigration and social-service reform, is simply suicidal economics and politics.

Some pundits believe the midterm elections realigned America to the right. But the results are better interpreted as the first skirmish in a battle to force the nation's two-party system to address the country's new industrial realities. As the people who are reshaping U.S. industry become more powerful, they will transform the nation's politics as well.

Can the Palestinians Live With the Reality of Defeat? (New York)
Mead, a presidential fellow at the World Policy Institute at the New School, recently returned from the Middle East.

By Walter Russell Mead=
Special to the Los Angeles Times=
NEW YORK The Middle East peace process, the most positive development in world affairs since the collapse of European communism and the brightest jewel in the tarnished crown of the Clinton administration, is at a crossroads. Yasser Arafat has agreed to make peace with Israel, but the terms of the agreement are destroying his political authority.

On the West Bank and in Gaza, one can see the decline in Arafat's influence. In refugee camps, in the comfortable homes of the Palestinian elite and in the offices of what Palestinians hope will one day be the government of an independent state, Palestinians talk about their disappointment with the agreement and their disillusionment with Arafat.

Israelis won't much happier. Agreement with the Palestinians furthered peace with Jordan, but it hasn't brought peace to the Israeli people. Soldiers are still being attacked, terrorists are still hitting civilian targets and ordinary Israelis are still haunted by insecurities as they go about their business.

The problem is this: Israelis and Palestinians are both weary of war, but neither side is quite ready for peace. It is the same problem that has haunted the Middle East for 50 years of Middle Eastern warfare. With tenorist attacks continuing, Israelis cannot easily put their siege mentality behind them. Taking risks for peace goes against the grain for many Israelis; to make concessions to a defeated enemy seems foolish to people who have spent too many concessions early withdrawals from certain settlements, generous economic terms, imaginative proposals on contested issues like Palestinian sovereignty and the status of Jerusalem peace between Israelis and Palestinians will remain a distant dream.

Israel must learn the lesson today that the United States cannot quite forget Pearl Harbor, then by 50 years of Middle Eastern warfare. With terrorist attacks continuing, Israelis cannot easily put their siege mentality behind them. Taking risks for peace goes against the grain for many Israelis; to make concessions to a defeated enemy seems foolish to people who have spent their lives in a struggle for survival. Yet, without concessions early withdrawals from certain settlements, generous economic terms, imaginative proposals on contested issues like Palestinian sovereignty and the status of Jerusalem peace between Israelis and Palestinians will remain a distant dream.

As Arafat walks the tightrope, he needs help from the Israelis and the West. The West's job is the easy one; it is already familiar to U.S. taxpayers. Our job is to pay. Western governments and donor organizations must help the Palestinians set up a new government, compensate refugees and provide a network of social services so that Palestinian public opinion will be convinced that the benefits of cooperation outweigh the psychological satisfaction of continued hostility.

The West accepts this responsibility in principle but so far both governments and donors, worried about the lack of transparency in Palestinian accounting procedures, have been slow to deliver. This is ridiculous. As Arafat and his allies fight their political battle against nationalist and religious extremists, the Palestinian Authority must have the funds to improve the lives of ordinary Palestinians and, though it isn't polite to say so, to buy political support with liberal offers of contracts and jobs.

The important thing is to get the money moving. Spend now, audit later. Ten years from now, nobody will care how the money was spent or whether some of it was siphoned off en route, but they will care about whether peace was advanced.

The Israelis have a tougher job. If Arafat and the peace process are to survive, the Israelis must let him win political victories that will bolster his support among Palestinians. Given their strong bargaining position, the Israelis can force their Palestinian counterparts to accept almost any concessions. It is unwise to press this advantage far; Arafat cannot effectively resist Israeli demands, but neither can he sell too many concessions to the Palestinians.

If Arafat walks a tightrope, so must Yitzhak Rabin. The Israeli prime minister cannot make concessions that undercut Israeli security or alienate a sensitive and divided Israeli public. But he must avoid forcing Arafat to comply with demands that discredit both Arafat and the peace process among the Palestinians.

This, unfortunately, is something that will be extremely difficult for Rabin to do. Israeli public opinion has been conditioned first by the Holocaust, then by 50 years of Middle Eastern warfare. With terrorist attacks continuing, Israelis cannot easily put their siege mentality behind them. Taking risks for peace goes against the grain for many Israelis; to make concessions to a defeated enemy seems foolish to people who have spent their lives in a struggle for survival. Yet, without concessions early withdrawals from certain settlements, generous economic terms, imaginative proposals on contested issues like Palestinian sovereignty and the status of Jerusalem peace between Israelis and Palestinians will remain a distant dream.

Israel must learn the lesson today that the United States cannot quite forget Pearl Harbor, then by 50 years of Middle Eastern warfare. With terrorist attacks continuing, Israelis cannot easily put their siege mentality behind them. Taking risks for peace goes against the grain for many Israelis; to make concessions to a defeated enemy seems foolish to people who have spent their lives in a struggle for survival. Yet, without concessions early withdrawals from certain settlements, generous economic terms, imaginative proposals on contested issues like Palestinian sovereignty and the status of Jerusalem peace between Israelis and Palestinians will remain a distant dream.

Israel must learn the lesson today that the United States cannot quite forget Pearl Harbor, then by 50 years of Middle Eastern warfare. With terrorist attacks continuing, Israelis cannot easily put their siege mentality behind them. Taking risks for peace goes against the grain for many Israelis; to make concessions to a defeated enemy seems foolish to people who have spent their lives in a struggle for survival. Yet, without concessions early withdrawals from certain settlements, generous economic terms, imaginative proposals on contested issues like Palestinian sovereignty and the status of Jerusalem peace between Israelis and Palestinians will remain a distant dream.
These lessons came relatively easy for the United States; they will be much harder for a small country like Israel, surrounded by former enemies whose goodwill is far from assured. But facts leave Israel no choice. Despite all his weaknesses and shortcomings, Arafat is the best hope the Israelis have to reach an understanding with the Palestinians. If the Israelis don’t give him a helping hand, they will lose him and lose the prospect of turning the peace process into a permanent peace.

Aristotle wrote that magnanimity—greatness and generosity of soul—is the greatest quality of a statesman. It is the quality of victors, and it is the quality that Israel needs if its long struggle for survival and security is to succeed.

Cities Draw a Bead on Handguns
(c) 1994, Los Angeles Times

The following editorial appeared in Monday's Los Angeles Times:

As some congressional Republicans plan attacks on the tough new federal gun control laws, a few cities are showing signs of a welcome new resolve to curb firearms.

After a heated debate that generated national attention, the Stockton, Calif., City Council last Monday rejected a measure that would have allowed any “law-abiding” city resident to carry a concealed pistol. The council agreed that the proposed ordinance would escalate street violence, not reduce it as supporters insisted.

However, the Stockton vote can only be seen as a victory in holding the line against today’s reality, which is that society is awash in firearms. By contrast, Indianapolis and Kansas City, Mo., are using existing law to curb illegal gun possession. Their experimental efforts, while raising a host of questions, may offer lessons for other cities.

Police in those two cities now focus on guns the way they once did on drugs and drunk drivers. Concentrating on neighborhoods with a high incidence of gun violence, officers with the support of community groups stop cars for traffic violations such as an expired license plate or a broken headlight that permit them to lawfully peer inside for illegal firearms, which they have the authority to confiscate. Early results from this program, according to Kansas City officials, include a 50 percent drop in gun-related crimes in that area.

Is this approach worth a try elsewhere? A forthcoming U.S. Justice Department evaluation may provide some answers.
Reversal comes amid urgent bid to salvage peace

By Martin Sieff

U.S. officials said yesterday that Washington was prepared to reverse a long-standing policy and permit Bosnian Serbs to form a federation with Serbia if they accept an international peace plan. The statements came as officials held meetings in a desperate effort to forge a new policy on Bosnia, and as Serbian forces appeared poised to conquer the embattled Muslim enclave of Bihac.

The federation plan is an issue "that is certainly on the table," said one U.S. source, who spoke on the condition of anonymity. He said the State Department had yet to agree on such a proposal.

"It is still for us to sign on," he said. "We have many concerns that would have to be met first. It will be a very complex negotiation."

State Department sources said the federation proposal, pushed by Britain and France, was presented Sunday in Paris at a five-nation Contact Group meeting on Bosnia attended by U.S. officials.

Secretary of State Warren Christopher, who yesterday canceled a key speech on Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Germany—the other Contact Group members—Friday in Brussels to discuss new ways to end the Bosnian war.

Mr. Christopher will carry "new ideas but no proposals" to the meeting, said State Department spokesman Mike McCurry. Those ideas include a new willingness to consider the Serbian federation, U.S. sources said.

Mr. McCurry took pains not to rule U.S. acceptance of a Bosnian Serb federation, a departure from previous U.S. statements on the issue.

But that depends "entirely on the willingness of, one, the Bosnian Serbs to stop the fighting, and two, to recognize that there is a territorial entity of Bosnia-Herzegovina that must be honored," Mr. McCurry said.

"You can't envision a discussion of that type of federation or confederation absent a willingness...to cross-recognize the territorial integrity of Bosnia, and that hasn't happened," he added.

"We're going...with an understanding that the situation is different now than it has been, and that it requires a reinvigorated effort to bring the conflict to a negotiated solution," Mr. McCurry said.

Those comments were an apparent reference to the deteriorating situation in Bihac, where Bosnian Serb forces yesterday closed in on the enclave's defenders.

Serbian forces were just a few hundred yards from the town's center and were moving house to house, Bihac Mayor Hamdija Kabuljagic reported. He claimed hand-to-hand combat occurred in some cases, according to reports.

"We don't know how long we can hold out," Mr. Kabuljagic told foreign journalists in a conference call.

The commander of the Bosnian government's 3th Corps in Bihac, Gen. Atis Dudakovic, reported that 114 government soldiers were killed or wounded yesterday in the 32-square-mile Bihac area. Ninety-four casualties were reported Sunday.

Dr. Tutelic said staff had run out of bandages and plasma to treat the injured, who included 64 children.

One U.S. official said "even trades on the map" might be considered by negotiators looking for a way out of the conflict.

"The basic strategy is to try, at all cost, to get the peace process back on course and to get a countrywide cease-fire," the official said.

"The aim is to try to convince the Bosnian Serbs there are still many issues to be negotiated on the nature of ties to neighboring states," he said.

The United States in recent months has insisted that the Bosnian Serbs, who control 70 percent of the former republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina, retain control of only 49 percent of the area's territory. A remainder of 51 percent would go to a new federation of the remaining Bosnian Muslim lands with Croatia.

The new proposal currently being discussed would still only offer the Bosnian Serbs half of Bosnia, and not the full 70 percent they currently occupy. But it would give them the freedom to join with the Belgrade state that has backed them to form a "greater Serbia," diplomatic sources said.

Serbia would also be offered relief from U.N. sanctions if it gets the Bosnian Serbs to accept the plan, according to one report.

As Serbian forces blasted into Bihac, Mr. Christopher, Defense Secretary William Perry, National Security Adviser Anthony Lake and Gen. John Shalikashvili, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, reviewed U.S. policy at a White House meeting.

But Mr. Perry told reporters before the meeting there was little outside forces could do to end the war and there was "no action under way today which will lead to a peace."

Only the deployment of huge forces of outside troops would bring an end to the fighting, he said, and NATO is not prepared to do that.

"NATO is not going to war with the Bosnian Serbs," Mr. McCurry agreed.

Leon Panetta, White House chief of staff, said on NBC's "Today" show earlier in the day that there were not a lot of good choices in Bosnia.

Mr. Panetta said the United States was considering sending any troops beyond a 2,000-Marine contingent that will stand offshore in the Adriatic Sea to be available to help rescue U.N. peacekeepers.
Washington takes a beating over Bosnia
By Martin Sieff

U.S. international prestige took a plunge yesterday as the Clinton administration policy in Bosnia appeared to collapse along with the last defenses in the embattled town of Bihac.

On the eve of a trip to Europe to meet with NATO and British leaders, Sen. Bob Dole warned that America's failure to provide strong leadership in Europe on the Bosnia issue endangered both NATO's proposed expansion and the stability of the Atlantic alliance itself.

"NATO's inability to respond to a war of aggression in southeastern Europe raises serious questions about NATO's future plans to expand to central and eastern Europe," said the Kansas Republican. "Without strong American leadership, NATO cannot bridge the differences within the alliance."

But Mr. Dole was slammed by his own critics a day after he called the British "the biggest stumbling block" to stronger military action against Serbian forces in Bosnia.

"It ill becomes people in the countries that have not provided a single soldier on the ground to make that kind of criticism," British Defense Minister Malcolm Rifkind, speaking on BBC radio, angrily responded yesterday.

Mr. Rifkind wasn't the only one to blast U.S. decision-makers. A joint statement issued in Paris by President Francois Mitterrand and Premier Edouard Balladur implicitly blamed the United States for the breakdown in Bosnia.

"The tragic events in Bihac show that any encouragement given to the reconquest of territory by force — and notably the prospect of lifting the arms embargo — is vain and dangerous," the statement said.

Congress has been pushing hard to lift the international arms embargo on Bosnia. Britain and France have strongly opposed the idea, fearing it would lead to Bosnian Serb retaliation against thousands of Western European troops serving on the ground with the U.N. force in Bosnia.

Congressional leaders and others have slammed the United Nations for not permitting stronger NATO air action against Bosnian Serb attacks on the Bihac enclave.

But a top U.N. official angrily hit back yesterday against such claims.

"I don't think it is unfair to blame the U.N. absolutely unfair when member states do not want to take the risk, when they do not want to commit the resources but blame the U.N. for failure to act."

Mr. Annan told reporters in New York that NATO air power was not a realistic way to force the withdrawal of Bosnian Serb attackers from Bihac.

"We are ready to use air power if it will help, but not if it will pour fuel on the fire," he said.

In Ottawa, Canadian Prime Minister Jean Chretien blamed the United States for encouraging the latest round of fighting in Bosnia by wanting to lift the arms embargo.

"I told President Clinton in June that it is unwise to lift the embargo at this time. ... It will not create peace there, it will just accelerate war," Mr. Chretien told Parliament.

Western European defense sources agreed with Mr. Annan's assessment. They said only a strong ground force, something U.S. policy-makers again ruled out yesterday, could effectively contain Bosnian Serb forces.

U.S. and Western European defense sources both said senior Pentagon officials, including Defense Secretary William Perry, agreed with British and French military assessments that more vigorous use of air power alone could not deter the Bosnian Serbs.

Speaking in Brussels, where he is going to attend a meeting of European Union foreign ministers, British Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd joined the chorus against congressional and media critics.

He said it was "a cruel illusion" that air power could be used to silence Bosnian Serb guns, unless that force was backed by a huge allied army.

"We don't have that. We won't have that," he added.

"We have a scapegoat function, but it is unfair to blame the U.N."

"We have a scapegoat function, but it is unfair to blame the U.N."
Clinton focuses on blue-collar men in rally for GATT

By Paul Bedard and David R. Sands
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

Desperate for a postelection pick-me-up, President Clinton yesterday staged a bipartisan White House lovefest in support of the global GATT trade deal.

The House of Representatives is expected to approve the accord by a comfortable margin in a vote today, but the contest is expected to be much closer in the Senate, which votes Thursday.

Flanked by his Cabinet, prominent Republicans, Nobel laureates, and portraits of George and Martha Washington, Mr. Clinton is issuing a targeted appeal to the class of Americans who dislike him the most — non-college-educated male workers.

The free-trade accord, signed by more than 120 nations in April, would provide American families with a $1,700 income bonus and help "solve the underlying anxiety" of blue-collar workers, whose real incomes have shrunk over the past 15 years, Mr. Clinton argued.

Top administration aides predicted GATT would pass but added see CLINTON, page A13

House Speaker Thomas Foley (left) and Rep. Robert Michel talk during a GATT rally at the White House.
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they were not overconfident.

U.S. Trade Representative Mickey Kantor refused to reveal the administration's private vote counts in the Senate, where 60 votes will be needed to clear a procedural hurdle relating to GATT's effect on the federal budget.

"We hope we are going to get there," said Rufus Yerxa, Mr. Kantor's top deputy. Capitol Hill sources conceded that the administration still hasn't nailed down the votes it needs in the Senate, even with last week's much-touted endorsement by Senate Minority Leader Bob Dole, Kansas Republican.

GATT foes gained a convert yesterday when Sen. Hank Brown, Colorado Republican, announced he would vote against the pact, concluded under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Mr. Brown passed a 12-question test on the complex accord prepared by consumer activist and GATT foe Ralph Nader. Mr. Nader and an unusual coalition of liberals and conservatives have argued that few in Congress have read the text of the trade deal, which they say will hurt certain U.S. industries, expand the federal budget deficit, and submit U.S. environmental, safety and health laws to an international court system... without due process.

At yesterday's White House rally, Mr. Clinton, Vice President Al Gore and Republican luminaries such as former Secretary of State James A. Baker III and Reagan administration budget chief James C. Miller put forward a number of arguments in favor of the deal, which supporters say will boost U.S. exports and lower consumer prices at home.

The White House also released the text of a letter signed by former Presidents Carter, Ford and Bush, all urging ratification of GATT, reminiscent of a similar lobbying blitz for last year's North American Free Trade Agreement.

Mr. Clinton went out of his way to underscore the bipartisan support for GATT, linking election survival to congressional approval of the accord.

The agreement "not only tears down trade barriers, it bulldozes differences of party," he said.

Mr. Clinton's unusual focus on the impact that GATT would have on blue-collar Americans comes on the heels of two recent promises to look out for "ordinary Americans" and appears aimed at defusing complaints from liberals that his new shift to the political center was alienating the traditional base of Democratic voters.

His direct reference to the economic woes of "non-college-educated male workers" — the largest group of voters to reject the president in recent polls — was also apparently meant to mollify big labor's hostility to GATT, which unions fear will lead to fewer American jobs and declining wages as corporations look overseas for cheaper labor.

Mr. Clinton gathered dozens of current and former administration officials dating as far back as the Truman administration to join in the final push for the agreement, which has been the subject of negotiations dating back to the Reagan administration.

Mr. Baker, secretary of state under President Bush, said the country "once again faces a momentous choice."

"We really face a choice between escapism or engagement," Mr. Baker said that delay on voting for GATT, as sought by conservatives and liberals alike, "could prove fatal."

He added that "the world will correctly read any rejection of GATT as an American retreat from international leadership."

Mr. Miller, who headed the Office of Management and Budget in the mid-1980s, attacked arguments that the trade agreement would break the budget and sacrifice American sovereignty.

"In my judgment, this would not be a budget buster," he said, while noting that the OMB and the Congressional Budget Office agree that losses from tariff reductions would be made up through expanded trade.

Separately, Sen. Howard M. Metzenbaum, Ohio Democrat, and Sen. Byron L. Dorgan, North Dakota Democrat, both announced plans to vote against GATT. Both had been expected to oppose the accord.

Mr. Dorgan said Senate sentiment on the make-or-break budget vote was still extraordinarily fluid.

This is a much more difficult vote to cast," he said. "I don't quite know where the votes are."
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Working under the auspices of the Association of Higher Education Facilities Officers, the team of experts reviewed the gallery's facilities in March at the request of the building's administrators. They found "extensive" leaking from skylights and the roof, as well as moisture entering the building through the facade.

Temperature and humidity affect the extremely fragile state of old paintings. Maintaining constant temperature and moisture conditions is vital to the integrity of artworks, which is why most galleries use expensive climate monitoring and control systems to protect their priceless collections.

"The Gallery's mechanical systems are operated in a 'by-the-seat-of-the-pants manner,'" the report says. "Unsafe temperature and humidity situations 'are common-place and could easily exceed poorly trained workers' abilities to bring such excursions under control before serious damage is done to the artwork.'"

Ruth Kaplan, the gallery's public information officer, said plans were in place to correct many of the problems cited in the report even before it came out. She said the gallery will begin installation of a new climate-control system next year. It will not be completed, however, until 1997.

"The existing system is operational," she said. "It has been functioning. It's labor-intensive in that it requires a lot of manpower. The system is not dysfunctional."

She said the running of the press system "has always been very tight" and denied that the gallery's collection is now or has ever been at risk. "The National Gallery's collection is fully protected and not in any danger."

Yet the report states that until the new system is up and running, "the Gallery's collection is at risk from continuing temperature and humidity excursions."

At least two such situations already have occurred, the report says. WJLA-TV (Channel 7), which broke the story last night, reported the "walls were wet like some- thing, maintenance worker James Ford said."

"I was told not to say anything, not to tell anybody and not to come back in that area," Mr. Edwards said.

"There was no damage sustained to any of the pictures. In the place where this happened, the pictures were immediately vacated," he said.

She added that "to the best of our knowledge, there has never been a restriction placed on conversations by any supervisor to an employee."

The second incident was reported in a gallery memorandum dated Oct. 13 and obtained by The Times. It details the discovery of sections of plaster falling "dangerously close to a number of works of art" kept in two storerooms. The memo, written by facilities manager Greg Reynolds, was sent by Sally Freitag to NGA Director Earl "Rusty" Powell III's office and by Gordon Anson, who oversees design and installation for the museum.

"There was no damage sustained to any of the pictures. The re- ports of damage are errors," an employee said.

Upon further investigation of the ceiling space above the store- rooms, gallery administrators found "a lot of old water damage as well as a bucket which contained water."

"Since the Art Storage Rooms contain a large concentration of art (00 paintings);" the memo reads, "these areas should be treated with the same degree of care as the Gallery space."

The problem appears this is not the case in these storerooms, and if we had not investigated the problem, there could have been damage to the art in these spaces."

According to the report, operations engineers regulate the temperature in gallery rooms manually, by turning up the heat full blast when a room is too cool, or running the air conditioner at the coldest setting if a room is too warm.

"The independent report paints a portrait of a top-heavy bureaucr a- cy riven with administrative dis- organization," said Regula. "There was no damage sustained to any of the pictures. In the place where this happened, the pictures were immediately vacated," Mr. Edwards said.

"I can't believe they'd let this happen. It just astounds me," he said.
Clinton's credibility up in air

President riding unpredictable currents of trade winds

By Donald Lambro

Once again the stakes for President Clinton in this week's congressional vote on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade are as high as they can get: his political credibility.

As with so many down-to-the-wire legislative battles he has fought over the course of his presidency, Mr. Clinton now faces yet another do-or-die scenario.

If he fails to win House and Senate approval of the international trade accord, his administration will suffer a serious blow to its prestige both at home and abroad. If he wins, he will have emerged from another hard-fought trade battle, but not without an embarrassing political structure and the last-minute help of his Republican opponents.

"After what happened this month (in the elections), he needs this one badly," said a Democratic Party official.

"A loss on GATT would be a disastrous blow in the postelection period," said Jerry Jasinowski, president of the National Association of Manufacturers. "It would reduce his leverage on both international and domestic issues." Politically weakened after the massive defeat his party suffered in the midterm elections, Mr. Clinton cannot afford another political rejection, especially from a lame-duck Congress still controlled by Democrats.

With his job approval scores stuck in the mid-40s, Mr. Clinton is trying to reposition himself in the political mainstream, and centrist Democrats think a victory for the worldwide free-trade agreement will help him do that.

"One of the high points of his presidency was his victory on the North American Free Trade Agreement, which is a New Democrat position," said Al From, the president of the Democratic Leadership Council. "We think that's where the future of our party is." For Mr. From, the "old Democrat position" on trade is represented by the party's left wing and its protectionist allies in organized labor opposed both to NAFTA and GATT. He sees the Clinton position on trade as a historic "break with the past" that will help move the party back to the center.

This week's vote in the House and Senate is in many respects a replay of last November's bitter battle over NAFTA, which also was a test of Mr. Clinton's political credibility at a time when he was sagging in the polls.

Then, as now, Mr. Clinton was faced with opposition from such strange bedfellows as the AFL-CIO, Ralph Nader, Greenpeace and the Sierra Club on the left and conservative commentator Pat Buchanan and Texas billionaire Ross Perot on the right.

The issue then, as now, was between those who wanted to lower trade tariffs to encourage international trade and those who want to raise tariffs to protect vulnerable U.S. industries and jobs from foreign competition.

The political fight over NAFTA deeply divided the Democrats, embittered some of the president's strongest supporters in organized labor and triggered threats of political retribution from labor leaders against those who voted against him.

Eventually the administration and labor, renewed their alliance over health care and other measures, and the unions threw their support to Democratic incumbents and challengers.

But Democratic strategists said yesterday that the opposition to GATT is not as deep or as intense as it was in the NAFTA dispute. One sign of the change is the support of House Democratic Leader Richard A. Gephardt of Missouri, who was a fierce NAFTA opponent.

"I don't think a whole lot of people are paying a lot of attention to GATT," said a Democratic Party strategist. "We don't see a whole lot of money being spent by the special interests lobbying for or against it, as you did with NAFTA."

"There's not as much controversy or debate over GATT as there was over NAFTA, and there is more bipartisan support," said Ed Lazarus, chief of strategic communications at the Democratic National Committee. "It was not raised as an issue in many election campaigns. I don't see as much rancor over it this time."

Nevertheless, the White House pulled out all the stops yesterday to show bipartisan support for the agreement, releasing a letter of support from former Presidents Ford, Carter and Bush and joining forces with prominent GOP supporters of GATT.

Privately, some Democrats criticize the administration for not building earlier support for GATT and waiting too long to mount a lobbying campaign. "They didn't learn their lesson with NAFTA and started too late," said a Democratic campaign strategist who requested anonymity.

In the end, say pro-GATT supporters, the outcome will be determined by House and Senate Republicans who overwhelmingly support free-trade policies.

"You're going to see more Republicans voting for GATT in the House than the Democrats," Mr. Jasinowski said.

In the end, say pro-GATT supporters, the outcome will be determined by House and Senate Republicans who overwhelmingly support free-trade policies.
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Losers get set to leave House
President meets with lame ducks

Rep. Patricia Schroeder says she's "obviously in line" to become the ranking Democrat on the Judiciary Committee.

By Sean Picoli

While his colleagues politicked, the chairman packed.
Rep. Dan Rostenkowski, Illinois Democrat, padded around his Capitol Hill office yesterday in khakis and a blue-collared shirt, content to let others legislate while he sorted belongings and tucked them into cardboard boxes to be sent home to Chicago.

"We're putting everything to rest," said Chuck Pizer, an aide to the recently defeated House Ways and Means chairman.

As Congress convened its first lame-duck session in 12 years, ousted or retiring Democrats observed what one journal, Congressional Quarterly, called "First and Last Rites," dividing the remaining days in office between a global trade package and the personal business of cleaning out desks.

"Obviously, it's a time of reflection," House Speaker Tom Foley said after a meeting at the White House with defeated Democrats and President Clinton.

"The president kindly invited members of the [current] 103rd Congress who will not be members of the 104th Congress to share a few minutes with him," said smiling Mr. Foley told reporters.
"It was a personable and very warm meeting."

Asked how he felt on these rounds, the Washington Democrat spoke only of "a great sense of gratitude."

"I've been enormously grateful to the people in my congressional district who for the past 30 years allowed me to represent them," he said. "I'm grateful to my colleagues for the honor of serving with them."

Mr. Foley said that between Hill chores she is weighing job offers and helping staffs look for new work. She did not sound like somebody grieving over her loss.

"Right after the election, I took a week in St. Martin's and I feel great," she said. "I was kind of hop­ing (when I returned) they would take up term limits before the end of the year, since the Republican leadership seems to be backing away from them now. That would be a nice farewell message."

It was a day filled with reminders that a chapter was closing.
At a morning White House news conference promoting the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, Vice President Al Gore all but eulogized the careers of "the two national leaders of our Congress," Mr. Foley and retiring Minority Leader Robert Michel of Illinois, "who have served this country with grace, distinction, and total commitment. Our nation is going to miss them and their service very dearly."

Still others chose to treat the day like any other.

"I'm working the same as if there had not been an election and as if the political picture had not changed," said retiring Sen. Howard Metzenbaum, Ohio Democrat, sounding cheerful as he emerged from his own afternoon news conference on GATT. "I think not one vote will be gained or lost because of that."

For Rep. Leslie Byrne, Virginia Democrat, housecleaning meant calling banks, answering letters, deciding how to vote on GATT and sealing the articles of her congressional career under packing tape.

"We're getting the plagues bounce-wrapped," said Ms. Byrne, who lost to Fairfax County Board Chairman Tom Davis in the GOP sweep of the House.

"It's difficult," she said. "I think we've got till the 14th of December to get packed up. But as Tip O'Neill once said, 'The world is round.' I think everybody here recognizes that this is an end, but also a beginning."
Crime busting costs
GSA officer his job
Citations from police make no mark

By Greg Pierce
THE WASHINGON TIMES

A member of the Federal Pro-
tective Service in St. Louis was
praised by the U.S. attorney there
for stopping a theft and trying to
arrest the culprit. A few weeks
later he was fired because the
crime did not occur on federal
property.

"I thought I might have to fight
a letter (of reprimand) or a few
days off without pay," Mr. Ratliff
said. Now he is appealing his
dismissal to the Merit Systems
Protection Board.

"I doubt I'm going to get my
job back, but I'd like to clear my
name," said Mr. Ratliff, who had
moved back to his hometown of
Moultrie, Ga., and is empir.

The Federal Protective Service
is a branch of the General Ser-
vice Administration. Officers
protect GSA property where var-
ious federal agencies operate.

Their jurisdiction extends to:

On May 18, Mr. Ratliff was mak-
ing his rounds, which sometimes
meant driving over 100 miles a day
to government offices in the area,
when he spotted broken glass from
a recreational vehicle in a parking
lot near the Gateway Arch in
St. Louis. Mr. Ratliff said he
thought the lot was under National
Park Service jurisdiction.

He was sitting in a passen-
ger seat of the van. The GSA of-

Officer Ellower Barganier,
chairman of the Fraternal Or-
d of Police's Department of Correc-
tions Labor Committee, said the
complex's corrections officers
have few options to guarantee the
safety of even the most notorious
inmates like Jeffrey Dahmer, ex-
perts said yesterday.

"We try to keep these things
from happening, but anything can
come up in the corrections environ-
ment," said Annette Gordon, a
spokeswoman for the Federal Bu-
reau of Prisons.

Out of about 85,000 inmates in
federal prisons, more than 3,000
were assaulted last year and 14
were murdered, Ms. Gordon
said. She added that some of the
violence in the prison is attributable
to crowding, ex-
perts said. The federal prison sys-
tem is at 127 percent of its ac-
capability capacity now, according
to Ms. Gordon. State prison systems
vary but most have at least some
overcrowding.

Joan Diliby, a spokeswoman for
the American Civil Liberties
Union's ongoing Prison Project,
said that of the roughly 1 million
inmates in U.S. prisons, there were
at least 5,900 documented assaults
per year. And she noted, "Not all
of the facilities reported back to us,
so the total would be higher."

The ACLU figures showed that
assaults on officers and parole
officers also wrote letters support-
ing Mr. Ratliff.

Soon Mr. Ratliff was out of work.
"If you're not in jurisdiction,
you don't have any police power,"
said Jack Nesbit, a GSA spokes-
mans in Kansas City, Mo. He said
he did not matter that Mr. Ratliff
thought the parking lot belonged
to the National Park Service.

"We're only funded to take care
of our own buildings," Mr. Nesbit
said. He likened Mr. Ratliff's ac-
tions to a private security guard
trying to recover a truck stolen
away from his employer's property.

Mr. Ratliff's dismissal came
after the incident. GSA maintains
that Mr. Ratliff was fired the day
before his one-year probationary
period would have ended.

The date is important because
probationary employees do not
have standing before the Merit
Systems Protection Board. Mr. Ratliff
said he was paid beyond
June 24 and is appealing the dis-
missal of his case by an admin-
istrative law judge.

A suspect in the theft was cap-
tured a couple of weeks after Mr.
Ratliff's pursuit and is awaiting
trial. St. Louis police had recog-
nized the suspect's vehicle from
Mr. Ratliff's description.

Lorton ‘lucky,’ so far
Shortage of staff endangers officers

By Ted Gotch
The Washington Times

Lorton corrections officials have
been "dumb and lucky" that
more incidents last year of seri-
ous incidents, 38 from execu-
tions and 971 inmates have been as-
saulted by fellow prisoners in the
same period, according to the D.C.
Department of Corrections, but it
was not known whether this was
an increase or decrease.

Officer Barganier said the union
has tried to explain what ef-
fect overcrowding had on the D.C.
Council and Mayor Sharon Pratt Kelley, but to no avail.

"The limits to which we have been
pushed is ridiculous," she said.
"We understand the problems.
Amid overcrowding,
"Corrections officials were not
available for comment yesterday.
Other local jurisdictions have
less gloomy outlooks, saying vio-
"Department of Corrections figures showed.
Of the 2,597
AIDS, suicide claim more inmates

Overcrowding cited
in prison homicides

AIDS, suicide claim more inmates

By Michael Hodges
The Washington Times

Prisons are dangerous, over-
crowded places where officials
few options to guarantee the
safety of even the most notorious
inmates like Jeffrey Dahmer, ex-
perts said yesterday.

"If you're not in jurisdiction,
you don't have any police power,"
said Jack Nesbit, a GSA spokes-
mans in Kansas City, Mo. He said
he did not matter that Mr. Ratliff
thought the parking lot belonged
to the National Park Service.

"We're only funded to take care
of our own buildings," Mr. Nesbit
said. He likened Mr. Ratliff's ac-
tions to a private security guard
trying to recover a truck stolen
away from his employer's property.

Mr. Ratliff's dismissal came
after the incident. GSA maintains
that Mr. Ratliff was fired the day
before his one-year probationary
period would have ended.

The date is important because
probationary employees do not
have standing before the Merit
Systems Protection Board. Mr. Ratliff
said he was paid beyond
June 24 and is appealing the dis-
missal of his case by an admin-
istrative law judge.

A suspect in the theft was cap-
tured a couple of weeks after Mr.
Ratliff's pursuit and is awaiting
trial. St. Louis police had recog-
nized the suspect's vehicle from
Mr. Ratliff's description.
Air Force withdraws report after top admiral complains

Adm. Jeremy Boorda, chief of naval operations, has accused the Air Force of distributing inaccurate information about the Navy to a high-powered commission on future military roles.

Adm. Boorda telephoned Gen. Ronald Fogleman, the new Air Force chief of staff, last week to complain that the air service had provided the Commission on Roles and Missions of the Armed Forces with "very questionable" statistics about Navy carrier battle groups, sources said.

Gen. Fogleman, who inherited his predecessor's aggressive posture from his predecessor, Gen. Merrill McPeak, responded by asking the commission to disregard the Air Force's entire paper on overseas presence.

A Navy official, who asked not to be named, said the McPeak paper claimed the Navy owns 23 carriers, when in fact it maintains only 12. The Air Force had counted 11 large-deck amphibious ships as carriers.

The officials also said the proposal inflates the cost of deploying a carrier battle group.

Gen. McPeak's motive was to bolster his case for maintaining a healthy number of long-range B-1B and B-2 bombers, which the Air Force argues project power overseas at a fraction of the cost of maintaining a carrier.

"General Fogleman wishes to afford Admiral Boorda the opportunity to correct the information," wrote Maj. Gen. Charles Link, Air Force special assistant on roles and missions, in a Nov. 21 letter to the commission. "Therefore, I wish to withdraw the classified and unclassified versions of the Overseas Presence Issue Papers."

The request to withdraw the position paper marked a retreat by the Air Force in an increasingly bitter behind-the-scenes struggle among the four military branches.

The commission, which includes retired military brass, former Congressmen and corporate leaders, was created by Congress last year to sort out the myriad roles performed by each branch. Its recommendations on abolishing or consolidating future missions are to be presented in March to Defense Secretary William Perry and to Congress.

With defense budgets smaller in the post-Soviet era, the services view the commission's findings as important to their futures. Since the summer, each has bombarded the panel with written and oral presentations arguing why it should take over the others' roles and missions.

The Navy, for example, wants to assume the Army's role in ballistic-missile defense. The Army is questioning the need for the Air Force's futuristic stealth fighter, the F-22.

But the Air Force by far has been the most combative participant. In papers prepared under the guidance of Gen. McPeak, an ex-fighter pilot whose four-year term ended last month, the Air Force criticized some of the other branches' most cherished projects.

It said the Army should scrap ATACMs (Army Tactical Advanced Missile System) because ballistic missiles would interfere with Air Force flight operations behind enemy lines.

The Air Force said Marine Corps aviation should be transferred to the Navy. And it recommended the Navy terminate its future carrier strike plane, the F-18E/F, in favor of "more advanced, stealthy aircraft" — i.e. the F-22.

The McPeak papers have infuriated the other branches, but none more than the Navy.

This was the backdrop to the Air Force submission on naval forces that prompted Adm. Boorda to complain.

"McPeak alleged a lot of things and said a lot of things that were not true," a senior Navy official said. "They don't match any of our numbers. There are some figures for the cost of carriers that just weren't true."

A senior Air Force official, who spoke on condition he not be identified, said Gen. Fogleman is now in the process of reconsidering many of Gen. McPeak's proposals to the commission — not just the paper on overseas presence.

For example, the official said the air chief does not believe the Army should terminate ATACMs.

The commission currently has 18 commissioners and is due to get an 11th.

The panel is chaired by John White, the director of the Center of Business and Government at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government.

---

Ruling keeps Joe Camel on court docket

**By Tony Munroe**

The U.S. Supreme Court yesterday kept alive a lawsuit against R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., which is accused of using its cool cartoon character Joe Camel to lure youngsters to smoke.

The suit also named as defendants to launch a "corrective" advertising campaign warning of the health hazards of smoking.

Ms. Mangini's suit cited American Medical Association figures putting Camel cigarettes to teen-agers at $6 million in 1991 and $7 million the next year. The suit also named as defendants the agencies involved in the campaign, Young & Rubicam Inc. and a unit of the Interpublic Group of Companies.

It seeks to stop the Joe Camel advertising campaign and to require the defendants to launch a "corrective" advertising campaign warning of the health hazards of smoking.

Ms. Mangini said the ruling enables her and her attorneys to begin discovery proceedings in preparation for a trial in State Trial Court in San Francisco, which she expected will begin about a year and a half from now.

She said an integral component of her case would be internal documents from R.J. Reynolds and the advertising agencies, which she said would show that the defendants knowingly and illegally targeted minors.

"I think our case will be made by their documents," Ms. Mangini said.
Elections hold no economic, political cure

Poverty deepens in Bulgaria

By Andrew Borowiec

Isolated from the mainstream of Eastern Europe's reforms, Bulgaria limps toward its Dec. 18 general elections in a state of political deadlock in which former Communists are the main united force.

Polls indicate no single party will be able to form a government by itself, so deadlock and economic paralysis are likely to continue in that "forgotten nation" of 9 million.

While politicians hurl insults at each other and people complain of the growing poverty and skyrocketing crime, Bulgarian diplomats say anti-Americanism is on the rise.

For no reason except convenience and old, Cold War habits, Washington is getting blamed for Bulgaria's misfortunes, with Communists who call themselves Socialists poised to exploit the growing national despondency.

"We have to admit that the Socialists succeeded, and that we used the time to solidify its position," Mr. Zhelev said.

"But reality turned out to be unsatisfactory situation may just come about more quickly, much more easily, much more smoothly."

"We are now paying for our illusions."

Bulgaria trails behind most former East bloc countries in the forefront of reforms: Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic.

Snezhana Botusharova, Bulgaria's ambassador to Washington, feels that such an attitude is driving Eastern European countries back toward communism, pointing out that ex-Communists have already scored major gains in Hungary, Poland and Lithuania.

She says Bulgaria's expectations after communism's collapse "have not been met" by the Western countries, which showed "no adequate reaction to human feelings."

In this predicament, Bulgaria's intellectuals and politicians are locked in debate over whether the country should keep the economic "shock absorbers" of the communist era, and whether the current unsatisfactory situation may just be a transitional period to some new "revolution," yet to be defined.

"Weak laws and poor social security resulting in a miserable existence and gradually turned Bulgaria into a kingdom of swindlers."

"I

Bulgarian President Zhelyu Zhelev, cheered by Sofia residents at the polls in 1992, has dissolved parliament and called early elections.

"Weak laws and poor social security resulting in a miserable existence and gradually turned Bulgaria into a kingdom of swindlers."
Parking for a king

Mayor-elect Marion Barry doesn't have to worry about a parking spot as he awaits inauguration day. The city has removed all the parking meters along one side of the 1000 block of Vermont Avenue NW to provide Mr. Barry and his inaugural committee convenient, sufficient and very affordable places to park.

"Special inaugural permit parking only," say the signs erected in front of 1029 Vermont Ave., where Mr. Barry and his transition staff have set up shop.

More bad news?

Was that outgoing Rep. Mike Synar, the eight-term Oklahoma Democrat stunned in his primary runoff by a 71-year-old retired school principal, consulting a New Orleans fortuneteller?

"I'm 95 percent sure that was Mike Synar," says our Capitol Hill source, who believes he spotted the congressman seated in a fortune teller's booth in historic Jackson Square.

"He was getting his fortune told through tarot cards," our source adds.

Anxious to learn what the future might hold in store for Mr. Synar, we telephoned his office three times during the past week, but to no avail.

See you again soon

Vice President Al Gore yesterday introduced former Secretary of States James Baker at a White House ceremony for supporters of GATT.

"Mr. Vice President, thank you for that generous introduction," Mr. Baker said. "It's always fun to come back here to the White House in November."

No simple task

It took an eight-page, step-by-step interoffice memorandum to explain to Treasury Department employees and computer users how to insert a tilde above the letter 'i,' instructions that came down after Treasury appointed an assistant secretary a person with a Hispanic surname.

James Baker, who reportedly has designs on the White House, paid a visit to back GATT.

A reporter's incite

The White House had hoped President Clinton's jogging attire for his canter around Fort McNair yesterday — navy blue and gold with the words "Commander in Chief" emblazoned across his back — would serve to quiet the nonbelievers.

The White House reporter who accompanied the president, though, suggested in her pool report that the outfit "looked like an official Navy outfit, perhaps a display of bipartisanship since he was jogging on an Army base and the Army-Navy game is this weekend."

Bill and J. Edgar

FBI Director Louis Freeh has come under sharp attack for his "all-out commitment" to Clinton affirmative-action policies and sensitivity sessions, and for blasting J. Edgar Hoover.

"Freeh's FBI seems on its way toward becoming an agency that could have been put together by Donna Shalala," writes columnist James K. Fitzpatrick in the Wanderer, the leading national Catholic weekly.

"But if there were still some doubts about Freeh, his speech at the Al Smith dinner in New York . . . should have put them to rest. He's a Clintonite, Catholic or not. "In case you missed it, Freeh got off a few digs at the expense of J. Edgar Hoover. He scored points with his New York audience by reminding it that 'I don't take the FBI airplane to my speaking engagements; I don't take the FBI limousine to the racetrack in Maryland; and I don't have a friend named Clyde.' Nice, eh?"

"What's the message here, Director Freeh? The liberals who have been seeking to disparage the FBI since the 1950s have been spreading these rumors about Hoover's homosexual relationship with his longtime associate, Clyde Tolson. . . . Up until now there has been nothing more than innuendo. Is Freeh telling us he has found something more in the FBI records?"

Mr. Fitzpatrick says "common decency" should require Mr. Freeh to respect reputations, unless he "intends to spill the beans about the peccadilloes of every other American of note in these files, too — such as those of the man who appointed him to his job."

Elvin plug

John Elvin, chief scribe of this column for a number of years before reinventing himself as an expert on antiques and collectibles, is headed back into the thick of the political battleground.

"The recent revolution at the polls has brought Washington back to life," opines Mr. Elvin, who has accepted an offer from Soundview Publications, a major newsletter firm headquartered in Atlanta, to produce a new grass-roots-oriented monthly letter, John Elvin's Political Dynamite.

As the title suggests, it "probably won't be contributing much to the kinder-gentler school of journalism," Mr. Elvin notes. "It'll be an old-school reporter's letter to the home folks about what goes on in Washington, with an editorial outlook somewhere between the Old Testament and the National Enquirer."

For further information, write John at PO Box 3341, Annapolis, Md., 21403.
Term limits
The term-limits argument today in the Supreme Court stems from the anger of some political outsiders about Democratic dominance in Arkansas. I came to believe that Arkansas has the most rigged political system in the entire country because it's so one-sided, so narrow, so lacking in real competition," said contractor Skip Cook.

Mr. Cook told the Philadelphia Inquirer's Aaron Epstein that he used to work as a stockbroker, depleted his savings and "lived like a pauper" so he could campaign for term limits and kick out politicians of any party. Aided by Washington-based U.S. Term Limits, he stunned the big boys. Sixty percent of Arkansans backed a 1992 state constitutional amendment to limit the number of times a politician can be re-elected.

Clinton fund sinking?
The Philadelphia Inquirer's Donna St. George reports that something happened to President Clinton's legal defense fund. Mr. Lott and Mr. Simpson, of Wyoming, are competing to be the next Senate majority leader. Mr. Powell is not saying how much he contributed to the president to fight his legal battles. Meanwhile, the fund has been sued by two conservative groups that contend it is unlawful. That means the fund has to raise more money to pay its own legal bills before it gets around to shelling out for the president.

Better and less
Analyst Charles E. Cook's interpretation of the data collected by presidential pollster Stanley Greenberg is that voters like "New Democrat rhetoric, but they haven't seen New Democrat performance. Still many give [President Clinton] the benefit of the doubt, but those numbers are declining fast."

He adds, "Voters neither want more government as most Democrats in Congress seem hellbent on offering, nor do they want to dismantle it, as many Republicans seem to prefer. They want somewhat less government and they want it to work more efficiently."

Phil Gramm
Hotline caught Democratic strategist Bob Shrum on CNN on Phil Gramm: "He's the Doctor Kevorkian of American politics... His prospects of winning the nomination are excellent."

Tally
Vote Tally found Mr. Simpson to be the seventh-most-fiscally-conservative Senate member and Mr. Lott to be 35th. Mr. Corz said the rating is "too limited" to give a full picture of fiscal conservatism.

"It does not, as it might appear, reflect a preference for Sen. Simpson in the Senate majority whip race. We hold both you and Senator Simpson in the highest regard," he wrote. He said neither the NTU nor the foundation would endorse a candidate.

Pro-life election
Analyst Ray Kerth in the New York Post: "The United States is rapidly, astonishingly and mercifully revolting against abortion. The election result is not one sign of the new climate taking hold, but its impact is a blockbuster... America is yearning to go back to basics..."

"Not one single pro-life incumbent senator, member of the House or governor of either party was defeated by a pro-abortion challenger. But pro-life challenges defeated nearly 30 hard-core pro-abortion incumbents. If these results had been reversed, they would have been Page One news across the country."

Edgar report
GOP Gov. Jim Edgar of Illinois told the Chicago Tribune that he has not foreclosed the possibility of running for a third term. "I came to believe that Arkansas has the most rigged political system in the entire country because it's so one-sided, so narrow, so lacking in real competition," says Mr. McCartney.

Not Newt
While betting for person-of-the-year focuses on Rep. Newt Gingrich, the Richmond Post-Dispatch's John Hall is mistraining a couple — Harry and Louise.

Mr. Hall observes that some-thing similar may be back when other interest groups — from re-sidues to farmers — discover the power of advertising to derail the massive spending cuts promised by Republicans.
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By Major Garrett

The political debate over the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade has rarely been about the merits of free trade vs. managed trade.

That's because GATT itself is a trade agreement that makes trade among the 117 signatory nations freer but retains many management tools to protect potentially vulnerable industries in the United States, Europe and elsewhere.

GATT would reduce tariffs worldwide by 40 percent and bring many previously closed markets to U.S. goods and services.

All of which makes GATT an attractive trade pact to both Republicans and Democrats. The debate surrounding it has never reached the volume or intensity of the debate over the North American Free Trade Agreement, and political opposition has been comparatively muted.

Nevertheless, GATT's passage is not assured and the reasons have less to do with the merits of freer world trade than with these blunt political questions:

- How does GATT affect campaigns for the 1996 Republican presidential nomination?
- Will Republicans, fresh from their historic victories in the midterm elections, cooperate with the Clinton administration on a high-visibility economic issue?
- Can GATT rehabilitate President Clinton's image in the aftermath of a disastrous midterm election?

For several days, incoming Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole of Kansas toyed with the Clinton administration over changes he wanted in GATT.

The White House met most of Mr. Dole's demands but balked when he tried to link passage of GATT to a cease-fire next year when Republicans try to cut the capital gains tax.

Even some in Mr. Dole's party objected to the trade-off, which had the look and feel of the kind of backroom deal Republicans said they opposed during the election campaign this year.

Mr. Dole's efforts appeared to have been aimed at pleasing two important Republican constituencies should be run for president in 1996: conservatives worried that GATT would trample on U.S. sovereignty, and business leaders who strongly favored GATT.

Eventually Mr. Dole won enough concessions from the White House to give him room to support GATT as well as demonstrate his sensitivity to conservative Republicans. Conservative Republicans and supporters of Ross Perot have long worried that the World Trade Organization, a tribunal GATT would create to settle all trade disputes, could rule in ways that override U.S. law.

Mr. Dole persuaded the administration to create a separate legal mechanism that Congress could use to pull out of GATT if it found fault in WTO rulings. Many trade experts believe this escape hatch only duplicates language in GATT that allows nations to leave the trade alliance with six months' notice.

But it has apparently provided Mr. Dole and others some political cover with conservative Republicans and Perot supporters — key constituencies for any contender for the GOP presidential nomination in 1996.

Incoming House Speaker Newt Gingrich has pledged to support GATT and deliver as many Republican votes as possible. A majority of the 178 House Republicans intend to support GATT, but they may not be able to deliver the 134 votes they gave to NAFTA in 1993.

Still, House Democrats are less hostile to GATT than they were to see POLITICS, page E2.

The budget act requires Congress to pay for all tax cuts with equivalent reductions in federal spending.

Budget analysts estimate GATT will cost the Treasury some $12 billion in lost tariff revenue due to the reduction or elimination of trade tariffs. Congress and the administration have come up with $10 billion in savings, but that covers only five years of the estimated lost revenue.

Senate rules require Congress to come up with budget savings to cover tariff losses for the entire decade. Before the Senate can vote on the merits of GATT itself, it must vote to waive that requirement.

Waiving Senate rules requires a 60-vote majority, meaning support of Mr. Dole and other Republicans is crucial to GATT's survival.
There’s no general agreement on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

A complex, 12-nation compact that was seven years in the negotiating, GATT’s Uruguay Round faces a make-or-break vote in Congress this week.

Behind the mind-numbing jargon and conflicting cost-benefit analyses, the GATT debate reveals the ad rift since U.S. trade policy debate: the breakdown of an American consensus for freer trade and open markets.

The first signs of a bitter split in opinion on U.S. trade policy came during last year’s battle over the North American Free Trade Agreement.

To illustrate how far apart the opposing sides are, consider these statements:

• "GATT is worth five NAFTA’s," Treasury Secretary Lloyd Bentsen said.

• "GATT is 100 times worse than NAFTA," consumer advocate Ralph Nader said.

When the Senate last voted on a GATT pact in the Tokyo Round in 1979 — the vote was 90-4. This time, the Clinton administration is scrambling to assemble the 60 Senate votes needed to assure the pact’s passage.

Once primarily a mutual tariff-cutting exercise, GATT has become a victim of its own success.

With supporters touting significant cuts in import taxes around the world, the GATT controversy has focused on issues that were never on the trade agenda before: trade in services, patents and copyright protection, environmental and labor standards, even national sovereignty.

Sir James Goldsmith, the British billionaire who has emerged as the unlikely leader of a populist anti-GATT movement in Europe, has been a frequent visitor across the Atlantic in recent months, warning that GATT will "improve and destabilize the industrialized world while at the same time being the leading candidate for the Third World." Debates over trade pacts never used to be this vicious.

In a lengthy statement outlining Clinton’s case for GATT, many economists attribute much of the industrial output economic growth of the West to freer trade, with international trade expanding faster than overall growth — a sharp contrast to the pre-GATT period that coincided with high barriers to trade.

Many economists attribute much of the industrial growth economic growth of the West to freer trade, with international trade expanding faster than overall growth — a sharp contrast to the pre-GATT period that coincided with high barriers to trade.

Trade has become a growing force in the U.S. economy. When GATT came into existence in the late 1940s, U.S. merchandise exports totaled $13.3 billion, or 0.005 percent of the economy.

Last year, exports of goods and services equaled 11.6 percent of the gross domestic product, with one in six American manufacturing jobs linked to foreign sales.

With official tariff rates so low, trade diplomats meeting in Punta del Este, Uruguay, in 1986 set an ambitious agenda for the next round of talks, one that would broaden the pact to cover such sensitive areas as agriculture and intellectual property rights and focus on such "non-tariff barriers" to trade as government regulations and subsidies.

Again led by the United States, the negotiators agreed to toughen the penalties for "free-rider" nations that ignored the GATT secretariat’s pleas to play by the rules.

But the new World Trade Organization, a trade referee that was planned but never established over new commercial restrictions on the use of software and seed technology.

Even measuring the agreement’s benefits to the U.S. economy has proved a matter of debate.

The Clinton administration claims that GATT will create up to $500,000 jobs and boost U.S. exports by $132 billion over the next decade. A family of four, to cite a favorite pro-GATT statistic, can expect the equivalent of $7,700 in extra income per year from the tariff cuts and other efficiencies in the Uruguay Round accord.

Jeffrey Schott and Johanna Buurman, analysts with the Institute for International Economics, a Washington think tank, put the benefit to the U.S. economy at $65 billion a year by 2004, or an extra 1 percent a year in GDP growth.

GATT critics cite a study by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development in June. It found that 38 of 58 U.S. industries studied would see modest gains in exports of less than 5 percent from GATT, 13 would see minor losses, and one — textiles and apparel — would suffer losses of 12 percent or more.

Only the U.S. pharmaceutical industry would see gains of more than 15 percent, according to the ITC analysis.

The North American Free Trade Agreement has proved controversial abroad as well. Mr. Goldsmith’s fledgling L’Europe des Villes, a political force in France and Italy over what they see as threats to their economies, and a number of developing countries have grumbled over new commercial restrictions on the use of software and seed technology.

Even GATT fiercest partisans say the accord wouldn’t begin to solve a number of the U.S. government’s major trade complaints — including nasty battles with Japan, China, Canada and the European Union.

Sen. Max Baucus, Montana Democrat, and one of the Senate’s strongest GATT opponents, said the GATT pact provides a "least common denominator" for world trade.

Although Japan and the European Union have yet to endorse the agreement formally, most observers say GATT will wink or swim on the outcome of the congressional votes this week.

Because the United States is the largest trading nation on earth and the traditional bulwark for free trade, U.S. ratification of the pact is considered vital.

GATT Executive Director Peter Sutherland, the Irishman credited with a key role in bringing the faltering Uruguay Round talks to a conclusion last December, says the U.S. will essentially determine the success or failure of the accord.

The GATT vote also comes at a crucial time for Mr. Clinton, already reeling from the Democratic loss of control in Congress in the elections this month.

Mr. Clinton recently obtained a pledge from 13 East European nations to move toward freer trade and investment in the Pacific by 2020, and he travels to Miami next month for a trade summit with Latin American leaders.

Administration officials talk of a trade "triple play" that would boost exports and Mr. Clinton’s prestige.

GATT supporters say the vote must be cast by the end of the year or else the package could unravel.

Mr. Clinton requested the extraordinary lame-duck sessions of both houses of Congress in part because putting off the vote until next year would almost certainly leave the treaty open to deal-killing amendments.

But even the fight to get a vote on GATT reveals the unresolved division on trade.

Unhappy with Clinton administration requests to include environmental and labor standards in future trade accords, congressional Republicans managed to catch Democrat leaders in "fast-track authority" used by the executive branch to negotiate trade agreements.

Mr. Clinton thus finds himself in the unusual position of pushing through a major agreement on trade while lacking the authority to negotiate the next one.
GATT will give way to WTO

By David R. Sands
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

The success of GATT would be the death of WT0. Trade Clinton administration has its way, one of the world's clunkiest acronyms will be history. The change could be mean more than just ordering new stationery. If the Clinton administration has its way, the World Trade Organization (WTO) will replace the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) as the primary international body for regulating world trade. The WTO, with 126 nations, would be the successor to GATT, which was established in 1947.

The WTO would oversee a wide range of trade issues, including tariffs, subsidies, and intellectual property rights. It would also have the power to settle trade disputes between nations. The WTO has been described as a "super-GATT" because of its expanded role.

The WTO's main goal is to promote free trade around the world. It does this by setting rules for trade and providing a forum for resolving trade disputes. The WTO's rules are based on the idea that trade should be free from discrimination and be conducted in a fair and transparent manner.

Critics of the WTO argue that it is too powerful and that it gives the United States too much control over the organization. They also say that the WTO's rules are not fair to developing countries.

Some argue that the WTO has been too weak in enforcing its rules. Others say that it has been too strong, particularly in its ability to resolve trade disputes.

In recent years, the WTO has faced criticism for its role in the global economy. Some argue that it is too powerful and that it gives the United States too much control over the organization. Others say that it has been too strong, particularly in its ability to resolve trade disputes.

The WTO has faced criticism for its role in the global economy. Some argue that it is too powerful and that it gives the United States too much control over the organization. Others say that it has been too strong, particularly in its ability to resolve trade disputes.

Despite these criticisms, the WTO remains an important institution in the world trade system. It plays a key role in promoting free trade and in resolving trade disputes.

The WTO will continue to be a key player in the world trade system. It will need to address the concerns of its critics, particularly in developing countries, in order to remain relevant in the future.
For an institution with the most bland of names, the World Trade Organization has managed to inspire some pretty heated passions.

To conservative columnist Pat Buchanan, the WTO is "a pillar of the rule of law." But to Joe Cobb, economics fellow at the conservative Heritage Foundation, the WTO promises to bring to the world economy the essential system of the rule of law.

For liberal consumer activist Ralph Nader, the WTO would be "a grave threat to the improvements in non-commercial living standards won in recent decades by citizen activists, especially in the United States, and not also around the world."

For U.S. Trade Representative Mickey Kantor, "the question is whether the WTO will affect our sovereignty and the answer is clear: no."

Nothing else in the domestic debate over the GATT trade accord has inspired such emotion or provided so much radio talk-show fodder as the World Trade Organization, which is something of a surprise because it was U.S. negotiators who pushed hardest in the 8-year negotiations for a strengthened WTO.

A little history is needed to put the clash in perspective.

In the years just after World War II, U.S. and British economists proposed three major multinational organizations to oversee the post-war economic reconstruction: The World Bank would provide development funding for war-ravaged economies, the International Monetary Fund would monitor currency flows, and the International Trade Organization would oversee international trade.

They got two out of three. While the proposed ITO was being debated, 23 countries also approved a temporary "General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade" to start the business of cutting tariffs and other trade barriers.

Owing largely to U.S. fears, the WTO never lived up to Pat Buchanan's promise to provide a "stopgap, voluntary GATT become[d] by default the vehicle for eight rounds of trade liberalization."

But U.S. exporters have long complained that GATT was more cheerleader than rulemaker, and countries that didn't like a particular decision to open a market or lower a trade barrier could simply ignore GATT rulings. Under the WTO's less-than-transparent processes have drawn an unusual rebuke from 51 U.S. media organizations, including the Society of Professional Journalists, the Radio-Television Directors Association, and the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

In a Sept. 14 letter to President Clinton, the groups complained that the WTO's dispute-settlement processes are "riddled with provisions denying access to governmental deliberations that are an affront to the democratic traditions of this nation."

Even Mr. Kantor conceded that the WTO's methods are not to the Clinton administration's liking. "That's one thing we definitely would like to change," he said.

Mr. Packwood jokes that there's one more thing supporters might want to change about the World Trade Organization — the name. "It sounds like something created by international bureaucrats," he said. "No one understood 'GATT.' We could have kept that name forever and calmed a lot of fear."
Betraying on behalf of corporate masters

N ewt Gingrich campaigned for Republicans throughout the country on a platform that calls for a balanced budget, decentralizing power from Washington to the states and returning power to the people. A cruel joke! Usually politicians who win elections in November at least wait until January before they start betraying you on behalf of their corporate masters.

Mr. Gingrich is supporting the measure that says trade judges can rule for a foreign country's claim against our federal laws. With his support of U.S. membership in the WTO's secret tribunals, whose trade standards -- in food safety or pollution standards. These tribunals are closed to the press and the public, and may not allow anyone to object to the decisions. They are like kangaroo courts. Fifty-one leaders representing 118 nations have called on U.S. President Clinton on Sept. 14 denouncing those secret processes as breaking a "sacred pact with the American people."

The United States is likely to be a frequent defendant precisely because its market laws are generally higher than those of most countries. The United States can block these tribunals for allegedly unsafe chemicals, cars, food, clothing, medicine or federal standards. If the United States loses before these tribunals -- and there will be many cases brought, judging by the European Union and other countries that are likely to file suits.

But the fight over GATT has moved far beyond economics and U.S. sovereignty.インタデペンドンス is here

n a world punctuated by uncertainty, one thing is clear. The nations of the world are becoming increasing interdependent.

There are some who think that's a bad idea, and they are Washington, everything they can to restore the balance. The United States.

These opponents have locked onto the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) as the embodiment of a shrinking world. They have transformed the GATT from the global forum for the discussion of free trade into a haggle about U.S. sovereignty, national heart and the loss of American jobs.

The arguments against free trade began taking root. But all the ranting from soapboxes doesn't make the opponents' arguments true. A look at the GATT shows it is an economic reality that those countries will be the best consumers of American-made products and services. The developing countries are expected to import more goods from the United States. The GATT, with 118 nation members, tempts Mr. Gingrich to try to do what the European Union and other countries have failed to do: create a trade standard that a peer to compete.

The international free trade agreement is supported by presidents from Ronald Reagan to Bill Clinton, by organizations from the National Consumer's Union to the Heritage Foundation and by leadership associations from the National Governors Association to the National Association of Attorneys General.

But the fight over GATT has moved far beyond economic issues. There are those who argue that the GATT is an economic winner for the United States. The Bush administration opposed the WTO for just over the American people."

The WTO advances that process. The United Nations is here

The fact that our federal laws can be challenged and overturned by foreign courts that have no connection to U.S. justice is a threat to the sovereignty of the United States. The United States is likely to be a frequent defendant precisely because its market laws are generally higher than those of most countries. The United States can block these tribunals for allegedly unsafe chemicals, cars, food, clothing, medicine or federal standards. If the United States loses before these tribunals -- and there will be many cases.

GATT's successor, the World Trade Organization (WTO), has not been immune to criticism. Some argue that it is an autocratic world government, and many argue that it is a threat to U.S. sovereignty. The United States is likely to be a frequent defendant precisely because its market laws are generally higher than those of most countries. The United States can block these tribunals for allegedly unsafe chemicals, cars, food, clothing, medicine or federal standards. If the United States loses before these tribunals -- and there will be many cases.
Charles W. McMillion

Get real: GATT is about pricing, not prosperity

The cynicism of the American people is perhaps nowhere more justified than with the misleading information they are routinely fed concerning international economic matters that now shape U.S. jobs, incomes and business profitability. The media are dominated by suckers talk about expanding U.S. exports while ignoring the far larger growth of imports. This is extremely misleading, and tells only about 40 percent of the story. Of course, what matters is the full picture: the net effect — exports minus imports.

The U.S. trade position has collapsed since the mid 1970s. Our 1994 trade deficit could reach a world record of $160 billion for merchandise. Since the Tokyo Round in 1979, the U.S. has accumulated trade deficits of more than $1 trillion for goods and services, almost $1 trillion for manufacturing.

With NAFTA, there is so much hyperbole about U.S.-Mexico trade. But U.S. imports from Mexico are growing faster than exports. The U.S. surplus fell by 72 percent from 1992 to 1993 and by another 51 percent since NAFTA went into effect. For the year-to-date as of June, 1994, the U.S. deficit in electronics trade with Mexico doubled to $1.4 billion and the deficit in autos and parts worsened to $1.1 billion.

Some promise hundreds of thousands of new trade-related U.S. jobs, but no net jobs have been added in internationally traded industries for over twenty years; all net new jobs have been in non-tradable (and inflationary) services.

If government estimates are correct that each $1 billion in net exports equals 20,000 high wage jobs, this year’s $160 billion deficit would eliminate over 3 million such jobs. California, with its estimated $21 billion deficit would lose 400,000 high wage jobs and New York, with a $13 billion deficit, would lose 250,000 jobs.

But with flexible U.S. labor markets, the major effect of chronic deficits is on income as workers and businesspeople give up wages and profits to hold on to their jobs and markets. While some people promise increased prosperity, real wages that once grew by 3 to 5 percent a year, have plummeted for 20 years. Even for the college educated, wages have remained stagnant. But this has been entirely ignored while attention has focused only on the growing gap in wages and on retraining needs.

Productivity growth has also slowed as trade has shifted the economy from productive traded industries to far less productive services. The identity that long existed between productivity and wages has now been shattered. Since 1978, productivity has grown by 17 percent but wages have grown only 1 percent.

The Census Bureau reports that every category of household and family and individuals of every race suffered from the trade deficit in 1994, the U.S. has plunged from being the world’s leading creditor to its biggest debtor by far. And the once proud US. dollar has collapsed in value; it brought 360 Japanese yen in 1970, 260 in 1985, and less than 100 today. This collapse in both wages and the purchasing power of the dollar is pricing more and more Americans out of foreign travel and into isolation. In 1989, for the first time in the post-World War II period, the U.S. became a net host in world travel. Travel and tourism, by the way, represent the lion’s share of our service trade in services.

Finally, while some promise pie-in-the-sky profits from more liberalized trade, the reality of fierce global competition has clearly shown that each business cycle brings tighter margins and ever lower rewards for productive business investment.

I believe this is also why good, aggressive firms are fighting so fiercely for access to foreign markets, and for every short-term advantage that trade liberalization can bring to the best and the quickest firms.

Individual firms — however large and powerful — do not have the ability to affect the longer term and the bigger picture. They must play with the hand that is dealt them. But governments do have the ability and the responsibility to affect the longer term and the larger, global picture.

The end of the Cold War and today’s information technologies have given us the same sort of primitive market conditions for the global economy that existed for many individual national economies 100 years ago.

The current directive for GATT and the World Trade Organization is not some high-minded “world government” but a sort of world anti-government to management. Its mandate is not to seek prosperity for workers, adequate profits for business and a healthy environment for everyone. Instead, its idealized mandate — although bureaucratic and secretive — is to assure that nothing interferes with raw market forces.

I cannot stress enough how extremely naive and dangerous this is. It must be completely reconsidered.

Despite almost universal recognition of historic change, global economic issues continue to be framed as the same old traditional battles of small-minded protectionists vs. enlightened globalists or as the greedy rich vs. the little guy.

The real issue of course, is how to cope with a fundamentally new, post-Cold War global economy in which our new information technologies have radically transformed the way national economies work.

Until we face the fact that it costs a company $50,000 to $100,000 a year to hire a first-rate software engineer in the U.S., but it costs the same company (or their competitor) only one tenth of that, or $5,000-$10,000, to hire the same talent in Bangalore, India or Moscow, we are not facing the real world. The unhappy consequences of avoiding this real world are increasing everyday.

Clearly, international trade is vital in today’s dynamic global economy. Yet trade now serves largely to facilitate the equalization of global factor pricing, rather than to raise levels of productivity and standards of living.

Indeed, by undermining relatively productive industries, wages and aggregate demand in the U.S. and elsewhere, trade is now perversely inhibiting the growth of productivity and living standards, and trade is contributing to the need for far too much government borrowing in order to compensate for the shortage in worldwide private demand.

The U.S. role in the new global economy is not about this theory or that ideology. It is about jobs, income, business profits and our country’s future prosperity and stability. America should lead the international community in an urgent new effort to address today’s new realities and to provide growth and prosperity for ourselves and the world.

Mr. McMillion is president of MBG Information Services in Washington, D.C., and a contributing editor to Harvard Business Review.
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n a few days, the Senate and the House are scheduled to vote on the legislation needed to implement the Uruguay Round trade agreement. This is unquestionably one of the most important bills to come before the 103rd Congress. It is also one of the most unexpectantly controversial.

Opponents of trade liberalization have bombarded the American public and their legislators with assertions that they have nothing to gain and everything to lose from the implementation of the GATT trade agreement. U.S. sovereignty will be endangered, they say; our environmental and health standards will go down; workers' rights will be abandoned; and unemployment will soar.

Frightening words! But these arguments carry about as much weight as RAIT's imaginary "giant sucking sound" and have been disproved by economists and trade experts. Nevertheless, they have served to politicize the real trade issues, to weaken the resolve of some legislators and to thoroughly confuse the American people. Ironically, it is the American people, American consumers as well as consumers in all trading nations, who stand to benefit the most from the GATT agreement.

Let's set the record straight. By lowering trade barriers and reducing tariffs, such as those on textiles and apparel, the agreement will add $200 billion to the U.S. economy and create 4.1 million high-wage jobs.

Furthermore, the trade liberalization and expansion called for in the agreement virtually guarantee Americans a greater choice of consumer goods in the marketplace at affordable, competitive prices. It has been equated to a reduction of global tax bills by $7.44 billion over the next 10 years.

This is good news indeed for Americans, who have been paying a $770 billion tariff bill on more than $230 billion a year on clothing costs. Steel tariffs will be eliminated, which will reduce the cost of many household appliances. Consumers' food bills can be expected to come down by $1.2 billion annually when import quotas on dairy products, peanuts and sugar disappear, and $51 million a year will be saved as high tariffs on frozen orange juice are reduced.

In view of these estimates, how can some of the well-known arguments by economic experts still be found to claim the agreement will devastate the U.S. economy? Furthermore, the trade liberalization and expansion called for in the agreement virtually guarantee Americans a greater choice of consumer goods in the marketplace at affordable, competitive prices. It has been equated to a reduction of global tax bills by $7.44 billion over the next 10 years.
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The WTO challenges our laws

G
ood trade agreements should help to improve the quality of life; they should foster democracy, promote stability, and encourage progress and innovation. The proposed Uruguay Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) fails on all these criteria. Global trade has major environmental consequences and is often conducted in such a way as to improve the well-being of people throughout the world. Trade agreements should not promote pollution havens for the about the world and increase the amount of child labor. Unfortunately, the new GATT not only fails to address these problems but actually puts the existing GATT, but we can walk away from these rulings with minimal political resistance, and we can walk away from these rulings with minimal political resistance.

This new GATT would establish a World Trade Organization (WTO) with the power to supersede all other social and democratic goals. Under GATT we could not reject products based on how they were made or harvested. Thus, suppose we had two pencils which were identical in appearance and chemical content, although one was made by 10-year-olds in Bangladesh working until two in the morning and the other was not. We could not reject the impurities of the pencil made with child labor. Nor could we reject the impact of products made by factories destroying local fisheries or subjugating workers to terrible toxic conditions.

If GATT's agricultural formula — maximum production with minimum labor — succeeds, the two-thirds of the three billion rural people in developing countries are not needed. They become superfluous. Where do they go? Certainly the overcrowded cities are not needed. They become superfluous. They become superfluous.

The GATT agriculture formula — maximum production with minimum labor — succeeds, the two-thirds of the three billion rural people in developing countries are not needed. They become superfluous. Where do they go? Certainly the overcrowded cities are not needed. They become superfluous. They become superfluous.

Brent Blackwelder

WTO cannot U.S. change laws

Congress is scheduled to return in a post-election session to vote on the bill to implement the Uruguay Round of negotiations. The General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT), the most fundamental economic decision affecting the lives and well-being of our people.

The dispute-resolution provisions of GATT's successor, the World Trade Organization (WTO), would not be allowed to testify in Switzerland before the WTO panels. Congress could not reject products based on how they were made or harvested. Thus, suppose we had two pencils which were identical in appearance and chemical content, although one was made by 10-year-olds in Bangladesh working until two in the morning and the other was not. We could not reject the impurities of the pencil made with child labor. Nor could we reject the impact of products made by factories destroying local fisheries or subjugating workers to terrible toxic conditions.
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As world's largest importer and exporter, let's pass GATT

Wasting billions of defense dollars on non-defense spending

By Tillie Fowler

The renewed debate about our nation's military readiness recently spurred by Rep. Floyd Spence is a powerful reminder of the change wrought by this year's elections. The readiness concerns of Congress next year, the time that will be vital to U.S. military capability, is already upon us. By Dec. 1, Congress must decide whether to approve or reject the bill to implement the "Strong National Defense," or keeping defense dollars in the U.S. and out of foreign hands. The U.S. defense budget is a national security issue of sovereignty, not a threat to the United States. The fast-track procedures that have been in effect since 1947, we must remember, were devised to ensure that once a trade-agreement bill is introduced, it cannot be amended. The reason for this is that Congress cannot risk the whole package, voting it up or down. Either amending or deferring violates the fast-track process and kills the treaty. The budget issue should not be an issue at all. Virtually every economist who has looked at this non-defense spending has exacted a huge toll on a defense budget already strained to the breaking point by enormous, large-scale waste. If we don't honor our defense obligations to provide for the common defense, we have to honor our obligation to provide for the common defense, and the Earth Conservancy. Clearly, we have to honor our obligation to provide for the common defense, and the Earth Conservancy.
Term limits and the quaint notion of ‘political questions’

By Cleta Deatherage Mitchell

Today the United States Supreme Court will hear oral arguments in a case that could serve as a turning point in modern jurisprudence: The court is being asked to decide whether the states—and the citizens—have the authority to impose restrictions on long-term congressional incumbency. The state of Arkansas asked the court today to decide whether the state law that limits terms of service in Congress is constitutional.

There is no question that the court has the authority to do so, but the question is whether the court should do so. The court has heard cases in the past that have involved similar issues, but this case is different. The state of Arkansas is asking the court to decide whether term limits violate the Constitution.

One sad fact in this case is that no one has asked the court to conclude that the courts should not have become involved in this case in the first place. This would have been a perfect example at one time of what was called a “political question”—one that the courts refrained from deciding.

The elasticity of the American political process and its capacity to change and evolve without interference by the courts is essentially dead. Absent judicial activism, the people of Arkansas acted within their sovereign authority to impose restrictions on congressional service. The state of Arkansas could maintain that the people of Arkansas have the right to limit the terms of service of their congressional representatives. The court could decide that the state restricts the power of the federal government.

I just hope it happens soon—before the people lose their willingness to try to take control of their democratic processes.
Let’s clear the decks by getting the GATT deal done

By David Dreier

Congress is poised to act on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) Uruguay Round within the whirlwind of the historic transition to a Republican Party in control. As we look to Republican leadership, the American people will be best served by their representatives following the example of Newt Gingrich and Mr. Helms.

Newt Gingrich, the incoming speaker of the House, is a better example of Republican leadership. He took significant heat from the press in the days after the election when he said he was prepared to “cooperate” with Mr. Clinton, not “provide opposition” or “resistance.” He was right. “Cooperate,” he meant work together to accomplish shared objectives. His view that the GATT was a product of consensus, not confrontation, was right.

Mr. Helms, the prospective chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, recently wrote a letter to President Clinton urging delay of the GATT in Congress. He threatened to be tough on the administration’s foreign policy next year — and from deep within the Republican Party. Mr. Helms is right.

While it is presumptuous to think he wouldn’t even begin to loosen the vice grip of the Democratic Party on the American people, Mr. Helms is right.

It is the reasoning of Rep. David Dreier

The Stupid Party’s contractual obligation touck the real issues

Not even a month has passed since the Republican landslide in the House, and the Stupid Party is starting to unravel. At the Republican governors’ conference last month, state leaders waffled on what special interests mattered about what a blunder it would be for them to take a stand on “cultural issues” — i.e., issues the voters were mainly worried about — and from deep within the Republican Party on Capitol Hill there rumbled similar sounds, all before the lowing herd of the 103rd Congress had even lumbered into adolescence.

What is most distressing about the reaction is that Republicans in particular. A boy already knew about Republicans: They’re not a unified party, and their lack of ideological unity is essential for success in Republican government.

Samuel Francis

"Contract with America," of which Republican rightists are bunting with pride these days, is a series of 10 "pledges" on the issues that Nancy Reagan and other GOPsagamores believed were important for the party to run on this fall and get to work on as early as possible when they return in the 104th Congress next year. But these pledges are harmless enough, though sometimes dressed up in bumper-stickerese — like the "American Dream Restoration Act" — that political cynics find embarrassing.

But what is most striking about the rat line is what isn’t in it — among other things, the aforementioned "cultural issues," about which liberal GOP governors are so worried. Since it is precisely these issues that define the core of the conservative critique of the Clinton administration and indeed of the liberalism that has dominated this country for 60 years, there’s very little incentive for me to contract for real rightists to mo around the time.

The Contract does nothing about abortion or school prayer, the staple issues of the religious right that have been so important to the Republican victory. It says nothing about reversing judicial activism or its anti-constitutionalist roots that brought us those issues. It says nothing about homosexuals in the military or about the notion of "homosexual rights" in general.

The Contract does nothing about health care, the elderly, the armed forces. Most of the Contract’s promises are pure political points. Unnecessary, the party. Republicans should cooperate with the administration when we agree, not delay to score political points. Unnecessary, the American people that we will participate in a lame duck session that will bust the budget. That charge is a grave mistake for the Republican congressional leadership. It says nothing to break with or reverse the New Deal.

The Contract does nothing to break with or reverse the New Deal model of Big Government, by which the federal Leviathan manages social and economic relations for the benefit of specific client interests.

Administration, the Environment Protection Agency and a dozen others. It says nothing about foreign affairs except that U.S. troops shall not be placed under U.N. command; good enough, but there’s nothing about reversing globalism, protecting national sovereignty, let alone trade issues.

The Stupid Party’s contractual obligation to douse the real issues

The new majority may or may not have enough unity to pass the Contract’s promises, but even if it does, they’re not even close to serious, conservative, and protecting serious conservative, and passing serious conservative. They wouldn’t even begin to loosen the grip in which a dominant liberalism has held this country for so long.

Finally, some partisans claim that Republicans should not par­

The delay was a good idea. The American people and members of Congress deserve ample time to review important legislation. However, now is the time to follow through and vote. Everyone has had time to study the Uruguay Round agreements and the bill itself cannot change. Further delay threatens to kilt the GATT agreement; to protest the bill could be improved next year in the most meaningful way.

Many of the opponents have latched onto the claim that GATT will bust the budget. That charge is simply not credible. While opponents cite the projection of the Congressional Budget Office that federal tariff revenues will fall $43 billion over 10 years (a $43 billion tax cut on U.S. consumers that Congress deserves ample time to study the Uruguay Round agreements and the bill itself cannot change. Further delay threatens to kilt the GATT agreement; to protest the bill could be improved next year in the most meaningful way.
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A scribe's guide to scientific correctness

When it comes to keeping up with styles, I'm hopeless. My friends nearly wore two different looks last year. Likewise, my political ideas haven't kept pace with the times. In the 1950s, I was a card-carrying liberal, and while my views haven't changed, everyone else's have. The same opinions that prompted the U.S. Army to declare me a security risk back then are now cited by some late model liberals as proof positive I work for Attila the Hun. Go figure.

Fashion is in the jeans. Like owning a Calvin Klein, you either have it or not, and I don't. That's why I can't keep up with the changing whims of environmental science. No field is more faddish. At the turn of the century, saving big game animals was the rage. Officials fed elk, bred bison and bashed wolves. Today they do the opposite — batter bison, breed wolves and encourage hunters to shoot elk. A generation ago, old-growth forests were called "biological deserts." Now they are revered for "biodiversity." Over the years, the forest known as "restoration ecology" went into, then out of, then back into popularity, without once having been tried. Wildfires were first thought good, then bad, then good and seem to be their way out again. Ditto the mysterious doctrine called "sustainable development."

Clearly, it is easier to trace changes in hemlines than to follow the mercurial vagaries of science. That's why I was so puzzled after reading scholarly articles challenging what I had been taught during my university days. Larry L. Tieszen, along with colleagues from his biology department and the Nature Conservancy, found that along the Niobrara River in Nebraska "woodland expansion ... has occurred since European settlement" due in part to fences, agency bosses, Washington journalists. And it should offer career opportunities to scientists. The researcher who says grazing is good might starve to death. But the one who predicts it will cause galactic meltdown gets the fat National Science Foundation stipend.

I hung up the phone, troubled. Grandtgrabber's observation, I mused, means the end of science as a liberating force. In the 17th century, this inquiry freed society from coercive church orthodoxies. But scientists have been losing their independence. In the 18th century, they formed professional societies and became a bit less autonomous. By the 19th, they were salaried employees of universities. And today, most earn a living, directly or indirectly, from government. If they feel pressure to justify coercion, then science has returned to where it was on June 22, 1633, when the Catholic Inquisition compelled the great physicist, Galileo, to deny the Earth moved.

Thank goodness, I concluded, nonconformists such as Messrs. Seastedt and Tieszen are still around, freely pursuing their intellectual curiosity. And I wondered, do they wear tweeds and chinos, too?

Alston Chase is a nationally syndicated columnist specializing in environmental issues.
These efforts came to naught, as the initiators proposed a succession of set into motion. International negotiators, against Serbia, after it lost control be enforced by NATO troops. All of weapons, and economic sanctions Serbs, had no local source of Bosnia, which, unlike the Bosnian emplacements were embarrassingly. But even a more serious air effort would not likely change the outcome of the war. And intervention with ground troops would be jumping into a bloody tar pit, with no prospect of “victory.” Despite their oft-expressed humanitarian concern, neither the Western European nations nor the United States has sufficient interests at stake to warrant taking the painful military steps necessary to defeat the Serbs.

For instance, while the fighting in Bosnia is horrifying, it is no worse than that in Afghanistan, Angola, Armenia and Chechnya, Liberia, Somalia, Sudan, Tajikistan, and elsewhere.

The coming change in party control of Congress gives the administration a good excuse to remake a failed policy that has drawn us closer to military involvement in a bit- ter civil war. It is time to disengage, dropping both sanctions against Serbia and the arms embargo against Bosnia—without becoming the latter’s armorer—and letting the Europeans handle what is a European problem.

This federal agency is a model of reinventing government.

I wish to respond to the item “More red tape” in your Oct. 24 edition of the Beltway column.

John Mc Castlin’s portrayal of the recent realignment of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s (NOAA) headquarters was the mark. Rather than “beefing up” bureaucracy, as the article would lead the reader to believe, we have accomplished the opposite.

In the full spirit of Vice President Al Gore’s National Performance Review (NPR), we undertook a thorough reassessment of the NOAA headquarters structure with an eye toward streamlining functions and eliminating unnecessary layers of bureaucracy. A simple count of the number of offices before and after the realignment indicates the fact that abolishing the Office of External Affairs (OEA) in NOAA, eliminated an entire layer of bureaucracy that was over-seeing the work of NOA’s headquarters staff offices.

We created a flatter organizational structure with a broader span of supervisory control consistent with NPR recommendations. In the process, we were able to reduce the overall staffing level at NOAA headquarters by 12 percent. Moreover, we have been able to empower the staff offices and individual employees at headquarters by providing them with a clearer sense of their roles and responsibilities.

NOAA is committed to reinventing government and improving our performance and service to the American public. As an example, NOAA volunteered to serve as a pilot for implementation of the Government Performance and Results Act and was selected as one of 10 exemplary federal agencies. I believe it does a disservice to our employees to ridicule the hard work and efforts that are under way to improve government and eliminate red tape.

DOUG BANDOW

Balkans pornography

flared anew.

After going on a short-lived offensive a few weeks ago, the Muslim government of Bosnia is losing ground, with Bosnian Serbs threatening the Muslim enclave around the town of Bihac. Western nations have responded with a torrent of words — Bosnia’s U.N. proclaimed “safe area” was a few military pinpricks, such as cratering a Serb airfield. The Serbs barely noticed and continue to advance. The United States, with no forces on the ground, demanded a more severe bombing campaign, which could endanger U.N. peacekeeping forces, so the Europeans demurred. Now Defense Secretary William Perry says additional air strikes would be ineffective. Bihac burns while NATO bickers.

But how could it be any other way? The alliance’s earlier raids against tents and abandoned gun emplacements were embarrassments, but even a more serious air effort would not likely change the course of the war. And intervention with ground troops would be jumping into a bloody tar pit, with no prospect of “victory.” Despite their oft-expressed humanitarian concern, neither the Western European nations nor the United States has sufficient interests at stake to warrant taking the painful military steps necessary to defeat the Serbs.

For instance, while the fighting in Bosnia is horrifying, it is no worse than that in Afghanistan, Angola, Armenia and Chechnya, Liberia, Somalia, Sudan, Tajikistan, and elsewhere.

where. What makes the former Yugoslavia unique is that white Europeans are killing each other, guaranteeing a level of media attention and popular concern denied to dead Muslims in the Transcaucusans and black animals in Africa.

The fact that Bosnia is closer to the major industrial powers of Europe has led to numerous strained analogies to World War I, which was triggered by an assassination in Sarajevo. But that conflict resulted because a handful of European powers were willing to go to war over what should have remained a local struggle. No nation has made the same mistake today, creating an effective firebreak to the war’s spread despite three years of intense fighting.

Indeed, even if the United States wanted to try to remap the map of the Balkans, it is unclear what it should do. Although one may rightfully ascribe a large measure of villainy to the Serbs, the Croats and Muslims are hardly innocents. Consider: If Croats have the right to secede from a Serb-dominated Yugoslavia, then why don’t Serbs have the right to secede from Croatia? Bosnia’s Muslim government says that it wants to maintain a multi-ethnic republic, but, of course, it did not want to remain in Yugoslavia as part of a larger multi-ethnic republic. There are few self-evident rights or wrongs in the Balkans imbroglio, other than the profoundly ugly resort to force and murder of noncombatants.

The coming change in party control of Congress gives the administration a good excuse to remake a failed policy that has drawn us closer to military involvement in a bitter civil war. It is time to disengage, dropping both sanctions against Serbia and the arms embargo against Bosnia—without becoming the latter’s armorer—and letting the Europeans handle what is a European problem. Then the American public would no longer have to be curious about a policy that is as ineffective as it is incoherent.
**THOMAS SOWELL**

The Republicans seem to be trying to decide what they want to be when they grow up. And they have only two years in which to make up their minds, with the sound of knibitzers and critics ringing in their ears and a skeptical public looking on.

The most important question is whether they want to be anything at all, other than a collection of miscellaneous political careerists serving a group of special interests that help them to keep their jobs. This would distinguish them from the Democrats only by the fact that they represent a different set of interests.

Robert Reagan succeeded as president, not only politically, but in terms of changing the policy direction of the country and in leaving behind a corps of federal judges who appreciate the value of law as law, rather than as a pretext to the end of doing fashionable things and feeling good about themselves. Mr. Reagan had a vision and George Bush did not.

Whatever lessons the Democrats may or may not learn from the elections of 1994, surely the Republicans need to learn the lessons of the 1992 elections and go into the 1996 presidential election campaign with the thought: No more George Bushes.

President Bush was the perfect illustration of the motto: "If you don't stand for something, you will fail for anything." The broken no-tax pledge symbolized a much wider range of issues on which Mr. Bush wobbled and waffled, and appeased his enemies to the dismay and demoralization of his supporters.

It used to be called "Me-too Republicanism." The idea was that, whatever the Democrats proposed, one segment of the Republicans were sure to say in effect, "Me too — only cheaper, more efficiently and not quite as much." If the Democrats advocated that all Americans jump off a thousand-foot cliff today, the me-too Republicans would offer to compromise by having most Americans jump off a 500-foot cliff next week.

Despite the repudiation of Mr. Bush at the polls in 1992 and the repudiation of the Democrats in 1994, this wing of the Republican Party is still alive and well. The latest example of its resilience is the announcement of Sen. Arlen Specter, Pennsylvania Republican, that he will seek his party's presidential nomination in 1996, in order to save the party from its right wing. This will no doubt win him plaudits from the liberal media, but surely the 1994 elections showed

THOMAS SOWELL

**Dilemmas for the GOP to chew on**

that you need more than that.

With the announcement of conservative Republican Sen. Phil Gramm of Texas that he too will seek the party's 1996 presidential nomination, a clear choice of direction will be evident when they decide how to face the voters and the issues two years from now.

The biggest unannounced 1996 presidential hopeful is of course Sen. Bob Dole of Kansas. Savvy and shrewd, he would undoubtedly make a formidable majority leader to push through some Republican president's program. But what his own program would be, other than re-election, is not very clear.

Mr. Dole could in fact be a major impediment to a principled cutback in federal spending, which would have to include cuts in federal subsidies to farmers, an important part of his constituency. But if the Republicans target welfare recipients for cutbacks and leave farmers with the sound of knibitzers and critics continuing to drain more money from the federal treasury than teen-age mothers do, then they will be rightly seen as representing just another hypocritical collection of special interest groups.

Those who want to make the Republican Party a party of principles — though of very different principles — include Pat Buchanan, Jack Kemp and Bill Bennett, as well as Mr. Gramm. Mr. Bennett's announcement that he will not run for president in 1996 may make him a more influential voice for principles than if he were trying to get something for himself out of it.

People do not rally to the barri­cades carrying signs saying, "Me too." If the Republicans want their control of Congress to be something more than a two-year interlude, and expect to take the White House by something other than default, then they are going to have to articulate a vision.

No one has a more coherent vision, or a more consistent record in support of it, than Sen. Phil Gramm. He does not have to tell people to read his lips when it comes to controlling government spending. You can tell him to read his record, beginning with the Gramm-Rudman Act.

Mr. Gramm did not walk around

**The Washington Times** TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1994
Climate claims wither under luminous lights of science

S. FRED SINGER

The Global Climate Treaty and all attempts to limit the emission of greenhouse gases are driven by hyped fears of a global warming catastrophe—what's based on climate model calculations, rather than on actual climate data. By now, thanks to generous spending of "taxpayer's" funds, a widespread constituency has been created in support of policies to overcome this phantom threat, consisting mostly of international conferenceers: U.N. bureaucrats, assorted politicians, environmental activists, and some compliant scientists. (By the way, the research budget "global climate" is now at the $1.8 billion level in the United States; the global total is of course much higher, particularly when nonresearch activities are added.)

But just how trustworthy are the calculations for major global warming? A 1990 Policymakers Summary by the U.N.-sponsored Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) assures us that the global temperature record of the past 100 years is "broadly consistent with predictions of climate models." Nothing could be further from the truth! With the public becoming less concerned about greenhouse warming, partly because of the cooling effect which the volcanic eruption of Mt. Pinatubo produced, the IPCC felt compelled to stir up fears by issuing a press release on Sept. 15. Intended to scare forecasts, the IPCC was also claiming to have found "greater confidence in the computer models." But the underlying, just completed IPCC report does not support this claim, which is pure invention. To add embarrassment: A news account in a recent issue of the journal Science revealed that modelers have to "cheat a little" and fudge their numbers to get the models to reproduce the correct current climate, throwing even more doubts of forecasts.

Nevertheless, the IPCC claim of "broadly consistent" has become the mantra of activists pushing to limit energy use. By now, thanks to financial backing of assorted politicians, environmentalists, and some compliant scientists, IPCC, by National Aeronautics and Space Administration modeler James Hansen, or by University of Wisconsin climatologist Reid Bryson? A good question — just one of many.

How can there be more than one climate record? Simplicity: It all depends how the record from hundreds of observing stations is "glued" together, how one combines the temperatures from land stations in the Northern and Southern Hemispheres and how one corrects and adjusts the sparse and not always accurate sea surface data, with the ocean covering 70 percent of the Earth's surface.

Which of the many "records" is the best one? Hard to say. Without making any prejudice, let's just note that all three show a temperature increase before 1940 that exceeds what the models predict. And none of the models show a post-1940 increase compatible with even the lowest predicted value. What's more: The IPCC record shows a slight increase post-1940; the Hansen record shows none; and the Bryson global record shows a definite cooling, a climate that's consistent with both the surface data for the United States, independently analyzed by National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration climatologist Tom Karl, and with the weather satellite data, available only since 1979, that show a slight global cooling.

We can look at the comparison in another way. Suppose we use only post-1940 data, arguing that the sparsity and poor quality of pre-1940 data make the record unreliable. The discrepancy between model prediction and climate data becomes even more striking.

One final question: Why did the IPCC choose the temperature record it did rather than a Hansen-Bryson-like record? Had it chosen one of these others, the claim of "broad consistency" would have been laughed out of court. But by glibly talking about a 0.5 C temperature increase (without defining its timing) and using the lowest model estimate of 0.75 C, the IPCC leaders have managed to bamboozle the politicians and even a few scientists.

—S. Fred Singer, professor emeritus of environmental sciences at the University of Virginia, directs the Washington-based Science & Environmental Policy Project.

GLOBAL WARMING'S PHANTOM THREAT

Variance evident in three sets of data.
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PHILIP TERZIAN

One of the more amusing dividends of Republican control of Congress has been the horror with which Jesse Helms is anticipated as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. During a brief visit to New England recently, I was asked on a half-dozen occasions if (in so many words) the Republic could endure two years of Chairman Jesse. It will endure, I replied; it always has.

Of course, in my view, anyone who causes such special discomfort must be doing something right. After 40-plus years on the Democratic plantation, "responsible" Republicans (Senators on Capitol Hill have fallen into the age-old subservient habit of currying favor by tugging their masters' check, sincerely apologizing to their masters for dissent, and thankfully scraping up those legislative crumbs tossed in their direction every now and then.

Jesse Helms does not fit this description. He has no interest in accumulating brownie points with people who dislike him — or even with those who generally agree with him. He is wholly indifferent to Newsweek's approval, or the blessing of the Council on Foreign Relations, or the American Enterprise Institute, or any university which has not yet awarded him an honorary degree.

One of the dangers of public life in the nation's capital is the tendency of people such as Mr. Helms to go native: To worry, in time, whether the permanent managerial class (the press, the think tanks, the Democratic hostesses) will invite them to dinner, or David S. Broder will praise them as moderates. Mr. Helms is completely unconcerned with such matters.

Which is good. Part of what draws Mr. Helms from Washington for The Providence Journal is his fondness for perversity, his willingness to tilt at hallowed windmills, to irritate contemptuous Yankees: His tendency to mumble, his fondness for perversity, his willingness to withstand the provocation. Yet his one abiding characteristic is his tendency to diminish as his profile is enhanced. Indeed, the Republicans have happily tolerated the premises of policy — may very well result in an unexpected bonus: Painting the White House in certain directions, forcing Bill Clinton to devise a foreign policy, earning him the title of commander in chief.

Mr. Helms, as a Southerner, is bound to irritate contemptuous Yankees: His tendency to mumble, his fondness for perversity, his willingness to tilt at hallowed windmills, will keep the home fires burning with derision. Yet his one abiding passion — endlessly discussing the premises of policy — may very well result in an unexpected bonus: Painting the White House in certain directions, forcing Bill Clinton to devise a foreign policy, earning him the title of commander in chief.

In the face of taunts and provocation from this erratic leader, we must not wave! Therefore, as commander-in-chief, I have ordered a surgical air strike at noon today!
Today, the debate over whether the commander in chief is qualified for his job now has sunk low, lower, lowest. Bob Dole was heard from early on. He ruefully acknowledged that the son of his late boss, the senator from Kansas, has become the Republicans’ major­ity leader in the U.S. Senate soon, and he did the tactful, statesmanlike thing. He said, yes, Bill Clinton was qualified for the job.

The chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff by the president’s leave, Gen. John Shalikashvili, already done the groveling. He then said his commander was qualified.

These statements were anything but surprising; what has ceased to be a shock is that the American people should be having this debate. How long has it been since it was neces­sary to debate a president’s cre­dentials as commander in chief? What a pity BiU Clinton never com­promised the American people with the United Nations and multilateral- effort. Mr. Abramowitz, now president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, has as­sembled a steering committee that in­cludes Oscar Arias, former pres­i­dent of Costa Rica; Crown Prince Hassan bin Talal of Jor­dan; Malcom Fraser, former prime min­ister of Australia; Hans-Dietrich Genscher, former foreign minister of Germany; Paul Martin, former Canadian foreign minister; Robert McNamara, former U.S. de­fense secretary; President Carlos Salinas of Mexico; and Anglican Archbishop Desmond Tutu of South Africa.

Salute to Steuben
Charles Redman, the U.S. ambas­sador to Germany, yesterday unveiled a bronze statue of Gen. Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben, a hero of the American revolution.

Mr. Redman was joined by Manfred Stolpe, governor of the state of Brandenburg, to dedicate the statue in the city of Potsdam, von Steuben’s home.

Von Steuben, a Prussian army officer, came to the United States in 1777 and offered his services to George Washington. He in­s­tituted discipline in the demoral­ized American army encamped at Valley Forge and is credited with helping to defeat the British.

Pre-summit lectures
Think tanks are preparing for the Summit of the Americas, which begins in 10 days in Miami. Heritage Foundation specialist­ists, led by Kim Holmes, will hold a panel discussion Thursday at 9:30 a.m. Call 202-675-1761 for reservations.

The New York-based Council on Foreign Relations will hold a briefing on Friday at the National Press Club at 9 a.m. Call 202/357-2000 for reservations.

If you have a tip, suggestion or question, call Embassy Row at 202-636-3297.

Group to the rescue
With the United Nations and other multilateral group flailing about the world and fac­ing increasing criticism, Morton Abramowitz thinks there’s a better way to deal with conflicts.

The former U.S. diplomat has gathered a distinguished group of world leaders to explore the possibility of launching the Inter­national Crisis Group, sort of free-lance ambassadors of good will who would try their hand at defusing hot spots before they ex­plode.

Too many lives are being lost and too many dollars are being wasted by inadequate or tardy re­sponses to crises such as Rwanda,” Mr. Abramowitz said.

The former ambassador to Tur­key and Thailand has dispatched Stephen Solarz, a former New­York congressman and foreign policy expert, to head an ex­p­loratory effort to find out whether such an ambitious, inde­pendent group would work.

The ICG would identify and monitor potential and actual trou­ble spots and send in teams of ex­p­erts to assess the situation and the national response. It would try to advise government and nongov­ernment groups and mobilize re­sponses. Surely no American could take such talk lightly, not after the Persian Gulf War and not on Nov. 29, 1994 — 31 years to the day after Dallas and an event riveted in the minds of a gen­eration of people.

Jesse Helms made a more than passing reference to the possibility that he better not happen again — which was the bur­den of the snippy statement he made earlier this week. He didn’t have enough grace or sense to amplify the statement, but put this in perspective: There’s bound to be more to come from Mr. Helms, since he’s due to chair the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He’s already making know-nothing sounds about Haiti, the Middle East and the world in general. His latest idio­cy was completely unacceptable even from him. This is the kind of thing one might expect to hear over a beer, or from the louder mouths in a barbershop, not from a U.S. sen­ator.

There was a time when the U.S. Senate was known as a deliberative body, not just a sounding board for jerks write large.

Cheers up, Democrats. Things could be worse. But after a couple of years of barbari­ties like this from the Jesse Helms to­ward the British, the American people will soon grow as disgusted with Republicans as they are with Democrats.

With the estimable Richard Lugar also on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Repub­li­cans will have only themselves to blame if they let Jesse Helms serve as their chairman. This is an embar­rassment waiting to happen again and again. If the Republican majorities in the next Congress are serious about fostering a climate of self-restraint in government and public decency in society, let them begin with themselves.

Yes, if Republicans are serious about investing politics with a new moral authority, let them shun their Jesse Helms. The spirit of liberal­ism that the Republicans in the next Congress are serious about fostering a climate of self-restraint in government and public decency in society, let them begin with themselves.
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Saying a kind word for a rowdy press

MEXICO CITY

Bill Clinton, who cut class at Hot Springs High the day he was supposed to study American history, complains a lot that no president has ever suffered at the hands of press meanies like he has. Mr. Clinton should study John F. Kennedy's famous aphorism inscribed in the consciousness of pondits, publishers and even parents, to be whipped out when the occasion demands: "Life is unfair."

But JFK, too, thought he was mistreated in print. He once canceled the White House subscription to the old New York Herald-Tribune because it printed something he didn't like. (Like most subscriptions canceled in righteous anger, it was reinstated several days later.)

Please always come with this dog, but a group of press secretaries, current and former, and editors, all current, from 12 nations sat down here thought the press was abusing his wife, Raisa. Mrs. Gorbachev is suspicious of any attempt to enforce responsibility from the outside, whether through press secretaries, current and former, and editors, if press secretaries, current and former, and editors, or through the press itself.

The blindness of rights

Cindy is a 26-year-old woman with the mental capacity of a toddler. She cannot speak. She takes seven different medications daily to control severe epilepsy. Unlike many people in her situation, Cindy has a loving and caring family—particularly her mother. She was maid of honor at her sister's wedding. Though she now lives in a group home and works at a sheltered workshop, she spends every other weekend, and holidays, with her mother, Dolores Wasiek, who plays with her and takes her shopping at the mall.

When Cindy was 19, Ms. Wasiek sought permission in Philadelphia's Orphans Court to have her daughter's tubes tied. Twice, men have been found in Cindy's bedroom in her group home (she now lives in anuserName home), and she had made affectionate overtures to strange men. Ms. Wasiek did not want Cindy to get pregnant—not primarily because of the inconvenience of an unwanted grandchild whose mother couldn't possibly care for it. Ms. Wasiek worried more about the effect of a pregnancy on Cindy's very fragile health. To avoid the possibility, she petitioned for the tubal ligation, fully expecting it to be a routine matter. And so it might have been—11 similar petitions had been granted that same year with no difficulty. Until Lorrie McKinley, then an eager young instructor at the University of Pennsylvania Law School, was appointed Cindy's legal guardian by the court. An appointed guardian is required in such cases to safeguard the rights of people who can't take care of themselves.

Lorrie McKinley adamantly opposed sterilization, saying, "We are making women subservient to the state... ." Her petition to the Orphans Court was denied by the Superior Court of Pennsylvania, which is expected to turn her down too. Ms. McKinley knows that the court has spent $7,000 she could ill-afford, and Cindy has had her contact with men severely limited, because Lorrie McKinley reflexively opposes sterilization for retarded people and got caught up in a frenzy of lip-service to the disabled. Ms. McKinley insists that for her the case is about rights. "I asked the doctors testifying if they had a young patient with the same medical condition and who was not retarded and wanted sterilization," she recently told The Washington Post, "and they all said no. To me it all came down to retardation. I'm trying to say her rights are equal to everyone else's."

No one would disagree with the principle. But young — and young — women who are not retarded are getting themselves tubal ligations every day in this country; it happens to be a very popular form of birth control, because it doesn't require major surgery and is reversible. And if a young woman who is not retarded ought to avoid pregnancy for medical or other reasons, chances are she is capable of understanding that Cindy is as unable to grasp the situation as she is to realize that hugging strange men on the streets is dangerous. The patent absurdity of Ms. McKinley's comparison illuminates very plainly what underlies this seven-year nightmare.

Anyone who cared to consider Cindy as a particular human being in a particular situation with particular needs and difficulties could see in one minute that her mother loves her and wishes only the best for her.

Ms. McKinley chose not to look at it that way, despite the encouragement of every court in the state of Pennsylvania to look at it that way. And so she went to the state system, which is expected to turn her down too.
Mrs. Sauerbrey's tenacity

Nearly three weeks after the general election for governor of Maryland, Republican candidate Ellen Sauerbrey has not officially conceded defeat. It took several days of counting absentee ballots before state election officials formally declared Democrat Parris N. Glendening victorious, with a slim margin of 6,000 votes on the nose. Nonetheless, Mrs. Sauerbrey is forthrightly maintaining her assertion that the election was very close. But Mr. Glendening was surely qualified. Ronald Reagan's former bud­dying public regime, a powerful Hill position for which he has neither the name recognition nor the organiza­tion held by sometime-Repub­lican John Wamer. He couldn't overcome those deficiencies during his last campaign, but he might have done so.

Maryland has an election law that establishes safeguards to reduce the possibilities of abuse. One safeguard requires absentee voters to submit affi­davits swearing to their identities and their reasons for voting in absentee. However, in this election and possibly in others, some election officials failed to follow the rules. Because some requests for absentee ballots came in close to Nov. 8, voters were allowed to mail in letters in lieu of sworn affidavits. To some people, there might not be a scintilla of difference between a letter and a sworn affidavit. But requiring the latter does offer some reassurance about the integrity of the process.

The old dictum, "vote early and often," some people have acknowledged lest they surface in the stated electoral contests again. Mrs. Sauerbrey is challenging the validity of sev­eral thousand absentee ballots. This form of voting offers a fine opportunity for fraud, if fraud there is going to be. In obeisance to the tradition of that age­old dictum, "vote early and often," some people have figured out ingenious if not patently bold ways of doing so.

One measure of that seriousness is Mr. Miller's decision to turn down the opportunity to run the Con­gressional Patician or for position under the incoming Repub­lican regime, a powerful Hill position for which he was surely qualified. Ronald Reagan's former bud­get chief, Mr. Miller is an experienced numbers-cruncher whose vision of limited government is one with which prospective Senate Majority Leader Robert Dole and House Speaker Newt Gingrich would doubtless be very comfortable. But Mr. Miller apparently wants to help set policy for a change, not just follow it.

Another sign of his seriousness is that the announcement comes while the election is yet two years off. For all Mr. Miller's Beltway credentials, he has neither the name recognition nor the organiza­tion of the man who defeated him for the 1994 nom­i­nation, Oliver North. He couldn't overcome those deficiencies during his last campaign, but he might by this time.

The good news for the Republican Party is that Mr. Miller's possible candidacy may have the agreeable side effect of concentrating party attention on the general election next year, which Republic­ans might otherwise overlook in their disappoint­ment over small statewide gains in 1994 or their anticipation of the presidential campaign of 1996. If Mr. Miller doesn't run, the kind of grass-roots cam­pa­igning for statehouse candidates necessary to build up his own campaign, then a concerned Mr. Warner may actually deign to do the same. If other possible candidates, former candidate for lieutenant governor Mike Farris or Mr. North himself, join the fray, even aspiring Republican dogcatchers may wind up getting high-profile help.

Democrats too may find all this competition bracing. The prospect of facing someone other than the supposedly invulnerable Mr. Warner — Democrats did not run a candidate against him in 1990 — might encourage a Doug Wilder, a Gerald Baliles or state party Chairman Mark Warner to join the race. That means more choices for voters.

As welcome as a Miller candidacy might be for all the above reasons, Virginia Republicans need to keep a couple of things in mind. If they think, for example, that the media would greet a Miller candidacy any more warmly than it greeted Mr. North's, they are kidding themselves. The two men agreed on almost every issue, and where they didn't — say, abortion — Mr. Miller actually ran to Mr. North's right. Mr. Miller played a key role in Mr. Reagan's attempt to limit federal spending. With a record like that, Washington Post columnists are likewise going to find Mr. Miller "embarrassing" and "dangerous" to Virginia.

It's also bound to make Mr. Warner unhappy because it would give voters an attractive alternative to him. It's doubtful he could win a convention vote against Mr. Miller, and a primary is no sure thing either. If Mr. Warner chooses to run as an inde­pendent, he could split the Republican vote and hand the seat to a Democrat. But then it wouldn't be the first time Mr. Warner has sabotaged his own party. Ask Messrs. North and Farris.

Mr. Miller said he was not actually announcing his candidacy, and this editorial is not an endorsement. It's just an invitation: Run, Mr. Miller.
Farm groups debate effect of GATT deal

By GEORGE ANTHAN
and JERRY PFLUM

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) deal is expected to open markets to U.S. agricultural products and create jobs, but it has also been met with opposition from environmentalists and some workers. This debate is highlighting the complex issues surrounding international trade and the challenges faced by farmers and workers alike.

At the same time, several farm organizations and at least one major commodity organization — representing soybean, potato, and corn producers — oppose the new pact under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade or are staying on the sidelines. Congress is expected to vote on the pact this week.

Agriculture's effort to ratify changes in world trade rules negotiated by officials of the Reagan, Bush, and Clinton administrations includes some 300 organizations and private companies organized into Ag for GATT.

The group claims the new pact will reduce trade barriers and other unfair practices and boost U.S. agricultural exports to $1.4 trillion over five years, creating 110,000 jobs and generating an additional $25 billion in ag trade and an additional $85 billion in the overall economy.

However, opponents say the benefits of the pact to increase exports will be more than $13.5 billion over five years.

The proposed effort is led by the American Farm Bureau Federation and its president, Dean Hodde. The group has been joined by some 50 organizations and private companies organized into Ag for GATT.
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Farmers beware of GATT

by A. V. Krebs

Before Iowa's farmers accept the false economic panaceas of the Uruguay Round's General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) being promoted by corporate agribusiness and awaiting congressional ratification, they need to carefully consider who will profit and who will lose if it is enacted.

Recently, AG for GATT, a coalition of some 100 organizations, many representing corporate agribusiness, urged House and Senate approval of the pact. AG for GATT claimed that GATT is "essential if U.S. agriculture is to remain a growth industry."

One could argue that if this unprecedented trade agreement would create new and reliable markets for what our farmers grow, harvest and sell and increase their net income besides, AG for GATT might have some legitimacy.

But that is not the objective of GATT when it comes to agribusiness. The objective of GATT is to increase the market shares of those corporate agribusinesses, many of which are headquartered in the United States, that already dominate our domestic value-added food products market.

Currently, our nation's most profitable industrial sector, the food and beverage processing industry, as has been its hallmark, is constantly in search of ways to substitute technology for labor and capital for efficiency, which usually means cheap raw material prices and cheap labor.

In that effort it has also sought and continues to seek even safer control over the economic, social, political and ecological environment as a means of attracting capital. By a pro-

The objective of GATT is to increase the market shares of those corporate agribusinesses, many of which are headquartered in the United States, that already dominate our domestic value-added food products market.
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Bosnia abandoned

U.N. and NATO indecision raises questions about the organizations' futures.

By GEORGE ANTHAN
THE REGISTRY'S WASHINGTON BUREAU CHIEF

Washington, D.C. — The impact of the new trade deal between the United States and the United Kingdom on agriculture is positive, though modest, according to an analysis by economists at Iowa State University.

They estimate that the new pact will result in increased farm income by $1.4 billion a year and reduce federal agricultural subsidies by $1 billion a year, after the deal is fully implemented in 2000. Since the United Nations is ineffective in the Balkans, it's clear that there was never a concerted effort to begin with. The United Nations and NATO, divided by bickering and indecision on the scope of their involvement, offered only cosmetic solutions to a complex problem.

The United Nations sent "peacekeeping" forces to a region where there is no peace. During the 24-year civil war in the Balkans, more than 210,000 have been reported dead or missing. Serbs occupy 70 percent of Bosnia and continue to take land "by force," said Defense Secretary William Perry said the Serbs have all but won the war and that there's no hope of the Muslims regaining the Bosnian land taken by the Serbs. The Muslim-led Bosnian government balks at a desk offered the best defense they could — to protect the Belgrade hospital, U.N. troops from Bangladesh offered the best defense they could — they parked their vehicles in front of the hospital, then hid behind the hospital when that didn't stop the attacks.

The white flag has been waved. Defense Secretary William Perry said the Serbs have all but won the war and that there's no hope of the Muslims regaining the Bosnian land taken by the Serbs. The Muslim-led Bosnian government balks at a peace plan that called for them to occupy 49 percent of the land in Bosnia; the Muslim-led Bosnian government balks at a peace plan that would allow the Serbs to keep the land they now occupy.

Since the United Nations is ineffective in Bosnia and its troops are vulnerable, it's time to pull them out. More than 400 U.N. peacekeepers have been taken hostage by the Serbs, and the half-hearted efforts by the United Nations and NATO have only prolonged the war by sending mixed signals and false hopes to the Bosnia under siege.

As they waited for the Western Alliance to force the Serbs into accepting a peace plan, the Serbs simply reloaded their weapons.

When it's time for some soul-searching, starting in Brussels and New York. Are NATO and the United Nations still viable after failing this first post-Cold War test in Europe? Can the alliances be strengthened? Should they be?

In Washington, the question is whether the United States should still lead the way in shaping Europe, Atlantic security, or whether it should abandon its leadership of the Western Alliance.

The only answer we have now is that NATO and the United Nations can't bring peace to the world when its members can't make peace among themselves.

By DAVID VEPSEN
REGENCY'S WASHINGTON OFFICE

The 1998 presidential campaign, which is heating up on the GOP side, warms a bit for Democrats this week when the Rev. Jesse Jackson visits Des Moines.

Jackson, who won in the 1984 and 1988 Iowa caucuses, has scheduled appearances in Des Moines and Cedar Rapids. He is scheduled to attend a rally at Mount Habor Baptist Church in Des Moines between 6 and 8:30 p.m. Wednesday, said the Rev. Larry Davis, one of the organizers of Jackson's trip. At 8:30 a.m. Thursday, Jackson is to attend a student rally at North High School in Des Moines, school officials said. Both events are open to the public.

Later Thursday, Jackson is scheduled to address a group of educators in Cedar Rapids. Jackson has held open a door to another run for the presidency, and his Iowa supporters say he is raising his visibility in Iowa because of the state's first-in-the-nation precinct caucuses.

"He's keeping his options open and wants to keep his contacts in Iowa," said Jay Howe, a Greenfield lawyer who was a leader in Jackson's 1988 campaign.

Jackson is among those left-of-center Democrats who have been upset with the Clinton administration. Jackson has said he might challenge President Clinton or run as a third-party candidate because Democrats have taken minority voters for granted.

Clinton is under pressure from some in the Democratic Party to take a more centrist line, but party liberals argue Clinton should remain true to party traditions.

Clinton "is on a narrow path," Howe said. "If he elects to go too far, he could find himself with opposition for the nomination from the left."
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cess of "worldwide sourcing" corpo­
rate agribusiness is perpetually
seeking to cut its production costs,
both in terms of raw materials and
labor costs, and increase profit mar­
gins.

As Sir James Goldsmith, a former
corporate raider and now a member
of the European Parliament, reminds
us, "One of the characteristics of de­
veloping countries is that a small
handful of people control the over­
whelming majority of their nation's
resources ... Thus, it is the poor in
the rich countries who will subsidize
the rich in the poor countries."

It has been estimated by Gold­
smith that of the 3.1 billion people in
the world who live from the land,
GATT, by managing to impose
worldwide the sort of productivity
achieved by countries where corpo­
rate agribusiness now thrives, would
likely cause about "2 billion of these
people to become redundant."

"Modern economists," he adds,
"believe that the definition of effi­
cient agriculture is one that pro­
duces the maximum amount of food
for the minimum cost, using the least­
er number of people. That is bad eco­
nomics even in purely mathematical
terms. When you intensify the meth­
ods of agriculture and substantially
reduce the number of people employ­
ed on the land, those who become re­
dundant are forced into towns.

"Even in one dimensional econom­
ic terms, you should add to the direct
cost of producing food by intensive
methods, the cost of building infra­
structure and paying welfare to
those who have as a consequence
been uprooted."

One only needs to look to Ameri­
ca's heartland to see such ravaging
of farm communities, most recently
visited on the region in the 1980s
and continuing in large measure to
this day.

Pro-GATT supporters also like to
boast of the anticipated rise in ex­
ports from the United States as a
reason for supporting GATT. They
ignore, however, that in the post­
war period while the value of U.S.
food exports (largely due to an in­
crease in value-added food products)
has generally risen, net farm income
(measured in inflationary-adjusted
dollars) has been steadily deteriorat­
ing.

In addition, these same pro-GATT
advocates fail to add that in the past
four years alone as exports have
shown an increase, imports have
been growing much faster.

From 1991 to this year, the U.S.
net export deficit has grown from
$66 billion to an estimated U.S. Cus­
tons Department deficit of $166 bil­
ion.

Examining ag imports alone, for
example, we see that from
1977-1989 complementary agricul­
tural imports (those that do not com­
pete with U.S. agricultural products)
remained fairly steady. Supplemen­
tary agricultural imports (those that
compete with U.S. produced prod­
ucts), however, increased by nearly
100 percent over the same time peri­
od.

Clearly those legislators and the
public alike who are concerned
about the quality, quantity, safety
and availability of our food, the na­
ture of our traditional family farm
system of agriculture, the future of
their jobs, and the environment in
which they live have a vital stake in
this new GATT agreement.

Only a major outcry from their con­
stituents can now prevent a con­
gressional rush to vote on a GATT
agreement that clearly needs more study,
thoughtful consideration and
rafting by the public and our law­
makers.

A.V. KREBS is research director for
PrairieFire Rural Action in Des
Moines and author of "The Corpora­
tive Reapers: The Book of Agribusiness."

Embedded in its some 26,000
pages of text and over 1,000 pages of
implementing legislation are provi­
sions which will assuredly have con­
sequences for every man, woman,
and child on this planet. It is not
something that should be treated
lightly or rushed into at the behest of
special interests.

Only a major outcry from their con­
stituents can now prevent a con­
gressional rush to vote on a GATT
agreement that clearly needs more study, thoughtful consideration and
rafting by the public and our law­
makers before a July 1996 ratifica­
tion deadline.

A.V. KREBS is research director for
PrairieFire Rural Action in Des
Moines and author of "The Corpora­
tive Reapers: The Book of Agribusiness."
Welfare that works — food stamps

It's assistance that's targeted for one of life's essentials.

It's hard to believe that it was the intent of voters in the off-year election to make life tougher for hungry children, the working poor and the elderly. But that's how some victorious Republicans seem to be reading the results.

House Republicans plan to scrap nutrition programs that have been bright spots in the otherwise murky world of welfare. Money now channeled into food stamps, feeding programs for infants and pregnant women and some school lunches would instead be given to states as block grants. States might or might not try to maintain the effort to feed their hungry.

Food stamps feed roughly 5 to 6 percent of Iowans, providing $140 million or more yearly to put square meals on the table. In Iowa and nationwide, about half of the benefits go to feed children of poverty, much of the rest to feed their low-income parents. The program, launched during the Eisenhower administration, was sold as a means to bolster markets for agricultural output, and hence has long enjoyed healthy support from Midwestern lawmakers.

It is one of the most visible of welfare programs, because stamps are used as cash in the grocery checkout line. It is also one of the least maligned. (President Reagan repeated the fact that a user buying an orange with food stamps and buying vodka with the change. The maximum cash food-stamp users can get in change is 49 cents.) Like the free school-lunch program and commodity-distribution programs, it attempted not only to bolster agriculture but to ensure that taxpayer efforts to aid the poor would be targeted where they would have maximum impact rather than being misspent on non-essentials. As with any charitable enterprise, there have been some abuses. But the programs have put food on otherwise barren tables.

One of the major benefits of the food-stamp program is the cushioning effect it has on the disparities in state-run welfare programs. While federal funds pay at least half of every state's Aid to Families with Dependent Children program, the cash grants vary wildly, from Alabama's average of $119 per family per month to California's $654. (The 1990 figures show Iowa's monthly benefit averaging $379, the national average, $388.) Because food-stamp benefits are highest for those with the lowest incomes, stamps help make up for state differences. The Republican plan to give direction of food-programs to the states would eliminate that function, making the accident of geography an even greater factor in determining how well the poorest among us are cared for.

While proponents of ditching the food programs speak of saving money, some harsh realities indicate that that's a phony premise. For children, good nutrition translates into a greater ability to learn, longer attention spans and higher grades. A dollar "saved" by shorting programs to feed children in their formative years can mean several dollars spent later through educational efforts to compensate for their poor start on life.

Too many of Iowa's elderly, particularly in small towns and rural areas, simply lack the resources to afford good meals. Many elderly Iowans have had to be coaxed into the food-stamp program through outreach efforts. Ditching it now, in the name of economy, could be a serious setback to the health of many Iowa seniors.

The House Republicans who boastfully promise the demise of proven programs seem somehow intent on behaving like punitive conquerors rather than liberators. If the new kids who have taken over rule of the block want to show how tough they are, they might offer more convincing proof by picking on something other than children, the poor and the elderly.
Politics of trade vote make strange bedfellows at White House ceremony
By Michael Kranish Boston Globe

WASHINGTON President Clinton, tying his hopes for a political comeback to this week's vote on a world trade deal, on Monday joined former Secretary of State James A. Baker III and other usual Republican foes in a final, sometimes-awkward push for bipartisan cooperation on the agreement. With the House scheduled to vote Tuesday on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the Senate expected to vote Thursday, Clinton assembled a bipartisan "Who's Who" of economists and political leaders who support GATT. Clinton said the pact "builds differences of party, philosophy and ideology.

Leaders of both parties said Monday they expect GATT to pass by a comfortable margin in both chambers.

Significantly, Sen. Phil Gramm, R-Texas, a possible presidential candidate who had declined to declare his stance on GATT, announced that he would vote for it. With Gramm joining Senate Republican leader Bob Dole in favor of the accord, Republican support was expected to grow.

Gramm said he had problems with GATT and would prefer to rework it for a later vote, but he said: "I'm afraid it's like Humpty Dumpty. We couldn't get it back together again.

However, a GATT supporter, Sen. Hank Brown, R-Colo., said he had changed his mind about the agreement.

"I started off believing I would probably vote for it. I'm a strong advocate of free trade, but, after reading it, I'm going to vote against it," Brown told reporters.

GATT foes, meanwhile, launched a last assault, airing television ads charging that the agreement violates U.S. sovereignty.

"We voted against big government. GATT creates world government," television commentator Pat Buchanan said in one ad. In a dig at Republicans, who ran for the House on a "contract" to diminish the size of government, Buchanan added: "Don't break your Contract With America before the ink is even dry.

White House officials, who have been working since the Republican election victories to come up with a strategy to boost Clinton's standing, indicated Monday that they would try to use GATT as evidence that the president can cooperate with Republicans.

But it was far from clear whether the cooperation on GATT would be an indicator of relations when the Republicans take over in January.

The East Room ceremony Monday was a bittersweet and awkward moment for the president and the leaders of his party. On the podium, Clinton stood next to Baker, who had called Clinton's foreign policy "confused" and who had chided Clinton for changing Haitian policy "more than most of us change our shirts."

Meanwhile, departing House Speaker Thomas S. Foley, who had a seat in the audience, got a resounding ovation when he was introduced. Foley, who was flanked by Republicans who will control Congress next year, will preside for the last time during the GATT session. Foley lost his seat in the election as well as his speakership.

Vice President Al Gore, who led the audience in applause for Foley, tried to defuse the tension, saying jokingly that "both President Clinton and I are delighted at how much Secretary Baker is enjoying life outside of government." The audience laughed appreciatively.

Then Baker, who managed the late stages of President George Bush's 1992 campaign against Clinton and who is considering entering the race for the presidency in 1996, rejoined. "It's always fun to come back here to the White House in November." The audience laughed even louder.

One reason Baker was invited to the ceremony was his willingness to criticize Ross Perot, the former independent presidential candidate who played a major role in Bush's defeat and who has pledged to form a third party if GATT is passed.

Referring to Perot's warning that last year's passage of the North American Free Trade Agreement would cause U.S. jobs to be drawn to Mexico, Baker said: "The misguided and misinformed predicted a vast 'sucking sound' as American jobs went south. Today, the only sound to be heard is the powerful wind of economic freedom raising prosperity on both sides of the border.

With White House officials confident that Dole's support provides insurance that GATT will pass, Monday's ceremony appeared more of a celebration than a last-ditch lobbying campaign. Clinton and Gore congratulated their Cabinet for working to pass GATT, which would reduce or eliminate tariffs in 123 nations. The president said it would boost average family income by $1,700 and would create hundreds of thousands of jobs.

The trade pact is expected to easily pass in the House, where a vote is scheduled for late Tuesday afternoon. Significantly, it is supported by Majority Leader Richard A. Gephardt, D-Mo., who opposed NAFTA, and it is backed by House Minority Whip Newt Gingrich, R-Ga., the expected speaker in the next House, who until recently had threatened to bring down the deal.

The most significant test will be in the Senate, where 60 votes are needed to waive a budget rule that requires all losses in revenues to be offset by spending cuts or tax increases.

------------------------------------------

GATT a thorn in sides of several '96 hopefuls
By Michael Kranish Boston Globe

WASHINGTON After eight years of negotiation and controversy, a lame-duck Congress is scheduled this week to vote on a world trade pact, with the deal's fate being shaped by several senators who may be thinking ahead to the 1996 presidential campaign.

The basic goals to ease trade barriers by cutting tariffs, banning national quotas, and superseding local content and local manufacture requirements have been supported by both Republican and the current Democratic administrations.

But as the debate over the details of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade reaches a peak, the politics of GATT are clearly being felt.

Senior Minority Leader Bob Dole of Kansas, who wavered for weeks on GATT, signed onto the deal Wednesday after reaffirming that the United States could withdraw from it.

Dole, who will be the majority leader next year, said Sunday that he expected lawmakers to approve the deal and that it would win "fairly widespread support" in the Senate.

Senate Finance Committee Chairman Daniel Patrick Moynihan of New York said signs indicate "a very solid vote." The committee's senior Republican, Bob Packwood of Oregon, predicted: "This is going to pass overwhelmingly because of Bob Dole."

The White House hailed Dole's support as a sign that the pact will pass easily. But Dole's potential arch-rival for the Republican presidential nomination, Sen. Phil Gramm of Texas, has refused to make a commitment until the day of the vote.

"This is the first salvo in how Republicans will deal with the president" after the Republican landslide in the midterm elections, said Sen. Judd Gregg, R-N.H., a supporter of GATT.

Dole, Gramm and several other senators engaged in their last-minute jockeying over GATT at a time when the issue remains controversial in many key electoral states, from
New Hampshire to Iowa to a wide region of the South.

Ross Perot, meanwhile, said he would push through on his long-threatened idea of creating a third party if GATT is passed. Dole had hoped that his reaffirmation of the right of the United States to withdraw from the treaty would satisfy Perot, but the Texas billionaire pointedly made his third-party threat at an anti-GATT rally in Dole's home state last week.

Kevin Phillips, a Republican analyst, said GATT is a dangerous issue for the Republican presidential candidates because a recession in the next two years could lead to a torrent of economic nationalism which could lead to a second-guessing of the trade deal and support for a third party. Phillips said the jockeying over GATT has already hurt Dole, saying Dole's failed effort to tie the trade deal to a capital-gains tax cut was "one of the most surprising mistakes I've seen him make in national politics."

While U.S. Trade Representative Mickey Kantor predicted in an interview that GATT will easily pass, the White House on Monday unleashed a full-court press in advance of votes Tuesday in the House and Thursday in the Senate.

Treasury Secretary Lloyd Bentsen said he believed GATT would pass, but he told CBS's "Face the Nation" on Sunday, "I don't think it's a slam dunk."

The question of how GATT plays in key electoral states such as New Hampshire is significant enough for both parties that the Clinton administration has devoted attention to try to make the case that the first primary state is a winner under the deal. Kantor, for example, conducted a telephone interview with a New Hampshire radio station last week to spell out the benefits of GATT for the state, lobbing a pre-emptive strike against critics who want to use the issue against President Clinton in the 1996 primary. GATT is an equally important issue for Republicans who have an eye on New Hampshire and the 1996 campaign, particularly Dole and Gramm, because they have to vote on the issue this week. Sen. Arlen Specter, R-Pa., who may run for president, said under questioning in New Hampshire that he supported GATT with some reservations.

Several other prospective candidates, such as former Vice President Quayle, former Secretary of State and the Treasury James A. Baker III and former Defense Secretary Dick Cheney, were part of a Bush administration team that fought for GATT. Former Housing Secretary Jack F. Kemp has recently pushed the deal.

It may be an exaggeration to say that the vote on GATT will have a direct impact on the 1996 election. After all, the suggestions that the North American Free Trade Agreement would have an impact on the midterm elections turned out to be mostly untrue.

Despite Perot's insistence that his followers would "remember in November" who supported the North American trade deal, it is questionable whether it decided a single race. Administration officials say NAFTA has created thousands of U.S. jobs and is the best argument for passing GATT.

In an echo of the last presidential campaign, in which he ran in the New Hampshire primary on a protectionism plank, Pat Buchanan this year is running a series of anti-GATT ads claiming that the deal is a "crime against democracy" and would cost U.S. jobs. The Buchanan campaign has targeted its ads in Dole's home state of Kansas and in the key presidential campaign states of Iowa and New Hampshire, where the Manchester Union-Leader has railed against GATT in editorials.

New Hampshire's two senators, Bob Smith and Judd Gregg, represent the split in the Republican Party. Smith is ardently against GATT on grounds similar to those raised by Buchanan.

But Gregg has joined with such unlikely allies as Clinton in backing GATT. In an interview, Gregg bristled at GATT critics and said New Hampshire is better positioned to benefit from the trade deal than any other state in New England. He said the state's exports have increased significantly since NAFTA was implemented. Gregg said his state will benefit because the high-tech industry is well-positioned to export products.

Similarly, leaders in both parties have paid special attention to how GATT plays in the first caucus state, Iowa. Although the deal generally favors agriculture, there are enough concerns about it in Iowa that Sen. Tom Harkin, a Democrat, has refused to say whether he will support it and has called for postponing the vote.

Under the 123-nation deal, many tariffs would be eliminated, providing new markets for U.S. products abroad but also opening some U.S. industries to international competition that might result in a loss of jobs.

The two sides in the debate on GATT are far apart on the merits of the deal. Kantor said it is a winner for the United States, producing tens of thousands of new jobs and increasing the average family income by $1,700. Critics, such as consumer advocate Ralph Nader, have said the deal would cost more jobs than it would create and that it would result in the erosion of U.S. sovereignty.

The deal is controversial partly because it would result in the creation of a World Trade Organization that would settle trade disputes.

GATT is expected to pass the House on Tuesday. The big test will be in the Senate, which must first come up with 60 votes to waive a budget rule before GATT itself can be voted on. Waiving the budget rule is a controversial matter because it would result in a higher deficit an action that some Republicans feel uncomfortable about, considering that they want to enact a balanced-budget constitutional amendment as one of the first orders of business next year.

(EDITORS: STORY CAN END HERE)

A group of New Hampshire residents is doing its best to make sure GATT does become an issue in 1996. The New Hampshire Presidential Greeting Committee, which sounds like it a quaint Granite State group, is actually an organization of GATT opponents who hope to apply pressure on Dole, Gramm and Specter. Some of the group's members belong to Perot's political organization, United We Stand.

"We do not want politicians coming to our state to curry our favor in 1996 unless they are also willing to absorb their agenda issues from the citizens," said committee spokeswoman Vicky Turner.

"We are not going to support a "bad GATT in exchange for capital gains," according to Gramm spokesman Larry Neal. "Dole has a capital-gains vote on its own merits."

Democrats sift for leaders in a strange new world

By Bob Hohler Boston Globe

WASHINGTON Congressional Democrats, their ranks whittled this month by the nation's voters, began to struggle back to the Capitol on Monday for leadership elections that many viewed as referendums on changing their party's tattered image.

While members of the lame-duck 103rd Congress gather to vote on the world trade pact, Democrats who will be in the
new leaders would send voters the message that Democrats as vice chairman of the caucus under Steny H. Hoyer of chairman of the Democratic Caucus. Fazio currently serves party's House whip. "We need to redefine our party to trying to unseat David E. Bonior of Michigan as the the current leadership has taken us in policy matters," election, it's that people are not too excited about where the Senate Republicans are scheduled to choose their leaders Friday, with House Republicans due to vote on leaders next Monday. But with no one challenging Newt Gingrich of Georgia for House speaker or Bob Dole of Kansas for Senate majority leader, the only closely contested races for major leadership posts in both chambers are for majority whip.

Not so among the Democrats. In the House, Rep. Richard A. Gephardt of Missouri, who has served as majority leader under outgoing Speaker Thomas S. Foley, faces a challenge from Rep. Charlie Rose of North Carolina for the job of minority leader. Gephardt appears close to securing the 102 votes he would need for a majority of the 203-member Democratic caucus, the smallest in more than 40 years. But Gephardt and others in the current Democratic leadership face a potential backlash from members who blame them in part for the party's disastrous election results.

"If this is one message that came out of the election, it's that people are not too excited about where the current leadership has taken us in policy matters," said Charles W. Stenholm, a Texas conservative who is trying to unseat David E. Bonior of Michigan as the party's House whip. "We need to redefine our party to include middle America," Stenholm said.

In another call for change, Rep. Kweisi Mfume of Maryland, chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, is taking on Rep. Vic Fazio of California in the race for chairman of the Democratic Caucus. Fazio currently serves as vice chairman of the caucus under Steny H. Hoyer of Maryland, who must step down under party rules.

Mfume has campaigned on the theme that failing to elect new leaders would send voters the message that Democrats did not hear their call for change.

Meanwhile, Senate Democrats are deciding who will replace Sen. George J. Mitchell of Maine, their current leader, who is leaving Congress. Christopher J. Dodd of Connecticut is waging a late bid to overtake an early entom, Tom Daschle of South Dakota, and become minority leader.

Daschle, who announced his candidacy last spring, appears close to having the 24 votes he will need to secure a majority of the 47 Senate Democrats. But he faces a strong challenge from Dodd, who joined the race after Daschle's lone opponent, Jim Sasser of Tennessee, lost his Senate seat in this month's election.

WASHINGTON fights to save face on Bosnia By Paul Quinn-Judge Boston Globe WASHINGTON Amid deep pessimism in Washington and further infighting within the Western alliance, U.S. officials scrambled Monday to reassemble the remnants of a Bosnia policy. In indirect but clear terms, State Department spokesman Mike McCurry on Monday signaled a willingness to offer the Serbs important concessions if they recognized Bosnia's sovereignty. These included a readiness to accept a confederation joining Serbs in Bosnia with Slobodan Milosevic's republic of Serbia.

In the past this has been considered absolutely unacceptable to the Bosnian government and the Bosnian Croats, as well as many international observers. All fear that this will prove the first step in the creation of a militarily nationalist and authoritarian Serbia under the leadership of Belgrade. British and French officials have spoken of the idea with varying degrees of openness in recent months, but the United States until now has been reluctant to back the idea.

President Clinton met Monday with his top advisers, including Defense Secretary William Perry; Secretary of State Warren Christopher; the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. John Shalikashvili; and national security adviser Anthony Lake, to take stock of the situation.

The administration's grim mood was caught earlier in the day, when White House Chief of Staff Leon E. Panetta remarked to NBC that "there are not a lot of good choices" facing it in Bosnia.

U.S. officials spoke of continued fighting around the embattled town of Bihac, theoretically a safe area under United Nations protection, despite assertions of a lull by Lt. Gen. Michael Rose, the U.N. commander in Sarajevo. The Serbs "continue to shell the safe area," McCurry said. About 60,000 people are trapped in the town, and there are "reliable reports" that the Serbs are torching some of the villages they capture during their advance, he added. Reports from the area Monday indicated that Serbs and government soldiers were using artillery and fighting hand-to-hand as Serbs moved to within a half mile of Bihace's center.

Meanwhile, top U.N. officials in New York directed further recrimination at Washington, a senior U.S. official spoke in private of "unprecedented" bitterness in relations between Washington and western European capitals, and Perry once again voiced deep gloom about the chances of stemming the Serbian tide in Bosnia.

During a long briefing largely devoted to Bosnia, McCurry seemed to hold out the possibility of other significant concessions to the Serbs. According to an international peace plan accepted reluctantly by the Bosnian government but rejected outright in August by the Serbs the Bosnian government and its Croatian allies would receive 51 percent of the present state and the Serbs 49 percent.

Asked if the U.S. government was "married" to the idea of 51 percent of the land going to Bosnia, McCurry answered: "We're married to an internationally recognized boundary of Bosnia. The configuration within that has been the subject of the Contact Group negotiations."

Reports from Europe said the five-nation Contact Group Britain, France, Russia, the United States and Germany had raised the possibility of more concessions in talks Monday with Milosevic, the Serbian leader. The Contact Group is also reported to have offered Milosevic inducements to bring his Bosnian Serb allies into the peace process.

In theory, Milosevic has closed the border between his country and Bosnia in an effort to pressure the Bosnian Serbs into concessions. Some U.S. officials, however, have voiced the suspicion that Milosevic provided the Bosnian Serbs with advanced weaponry for their counteroffensive in Bihace.

During Monday's briefing, McCurry also tried to soften the controversially categorical tone Perry had used on Sunday in declaring the Bosnian war lost. Perry said on NBC's "Meet The Press" on Sunday that he saw "no prospect" of the Bosnians' winning back the territory
seized by the Serbs.

"The Serbs have demonstrated their military superiority on the ground," Perry said, and could not be stopped now by air strikes.

McCurry told journalists Monday that they were "over-reading" what Perry had said. Perry's real message, McCurry asserted, was simply that little can be done militarily "at this point" to reverse Serbian battlefield gains. But, he stressed, "there's going to be ebbing and flowing in who wins territory on the ground."

In private, however, another senior State Department official said Perry's statement "enormously complicates" U.S. diplomacy at a time when Washington has "precious little" leverage left.

(EDITORS: STORY CAN END HERE)

Perry's statements sparked a bitter reaction from Bosnia's U.N. ambassador, Mohammed Sacirbey. "My government and particularly President (Alija) Izetbegovic are deeply saddened by comments from Defense Secretary Perry," Sacirbey told reporters.

Perry seemed to restate his position Monday, saying there was no way of forcing the outcome of the war without deploying large numbers of Western troops on the ground.

In New York, the U.N. official in charge of peacekeeping, Kofi Annan, also had harsh words for Washington.

"I believe the U.N. is being made a scapegoat, and of course we do have a scapegoat function," Annan, an undersecretary-general, told reporters.

"But it is absolutely unfair when member states do not want to take the risk, when they do not want to commit the resources but blame the U.N. for failure to act," he said, apparently referring to the United States.

Angry words in New York were echoed in London and Paris, underlining what a senior State Department official described as the "unprecedented bitterness" of exchanges between the United States and its traditional allies. Even British officials, long loyal allies of the United States, "are using words like 'incompetent,' 'cynical' and 'stupid' to describe U.S. policy," the official said.

Senior Republican members of Congress, meanwhile, continued to criticize the United Nations and Western allies for their perceived capitulation to the Serbs.

The most influential critic, soon-to-be Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole, flew to Brussels, Belgium, on Monday. He is expected to press his view that the U.N. forces should leave, the embargo should be lifted and the Bosnian government should be armed.

McCurry made clear his skepticism about this approach. And the senior official quoted earlier remarked that Dole would learn "a lesson in the nasty realities of the Bosnia question and our angry allies' views of this question" during his stay there.
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Elizabeth Neuffer in London contributed to this report.

And he said that at about 1 million troops (including active duty units, national guard and reserves) the army remains at and will remain at just the right size.

Earlier this month, Defense Secretary William Perry acknowledged that some training for three of the 12 army divisions has been postponed because money was diverted to unbudgeted operations in Haiti, Rwanda and Kuwait. Some Republicans pounced, arguing that the Pentagon is being underfunded because of U.N. peace-keeping tasks, which they oppose.

Having dodged some potshots from that quarter in Washington, Gordon, a native of Quincy, Mass., came to Boston Monday for meetings at Harvard and Massachusetts Institute of Technology. In an interview he responded to questions based on the opposite premise:

With military threats shrinking in most parts of the world and with casualty-sensitive U.S. politicians steering clear of peace-keeping tasks in places like Bosnia, why should U.S. taxpayers continue to support an army big enough to fight two simultaneous major wars?

Gordon, schooled through decades of bureaucratic warfare, had a answer that was concise, if not precise: "We've got to be careful we don't sub-optimize."

The Pentagon's readiness calculation is based on the premise that it is necessary to meet two "major regional contingencies" sometimes referred to as "a Korea and an Iraq" war at the same time. Scanning an inventory of the world's trouble spots, Sullivan agreed it is becoming hard to imagine a double-headed threat that alarming. Analysts say, for example, that Russian military spending has dropped to the $20 billion to 30 billion range, and is mainly allocated for salaries. Meanwhile the North Korean force, though large, is ill-equipped, far less formidable than Saddam Hussein's pre-war Iraq. In two large regions Latin America and sub-Saharan Africa Sullivan flatly dismissed the threat as "tiny." In the Middle East he acknowledged that both Iran and Iraq are short of aircraft and less than half as strong as pre-Gulf War Iraq.

For all these reasons, Sullivan said, it is safe to reduce the army below the current 12 active duty divisions, as the Clinton administration plans. "I'm going to 10," he said. That will leave an active army of 495,000 people, backed by a national guard and reserve of 575,000.

But why not cut even deeper, he was asked, given the diminishing threats and the acknowledged unlikelihood of another Iraq-sized regional crisis. "We've got to be careful we don't sub-optimize now," Sullivan said. "This is a pluralistic society. OK? And there are others out there saying that a million is not enough."

But aren't the others wrong? "Wait a minute," said Sullivan. "I'm not saying they're wrong. I'm not saying anybody's wrong. I'm a loyal servant of the republic."

During the 1980s, the U.S. military adopted a post-Vietnam War doctrine that was formulated by former Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger and Gen. Colin Powell, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. "The gat was: Have a clear cut objective. Get in. And get out," Sullivan said.

Asked whether the so-called Weinberger Doctrine is consistent with the realities of peace-keeping or nation-building operations, which sometimes require an extended presence, Sullivan said this was "an interesting point."

"What is top of the Reichstag in Berlin at the end of World War 2. It's very elusive. I don't think there is a clear-cut definitive victory in Haiti in the Weinberger terms."

And are American politicians mistaken to imply that military operations even peace-keeping can be casualty-free?

"I don't want to criticize anyone for anything. But
expectations are very high. I think we have to be realistic. When you put soldiers in that situation, there is every likelihood and danger that some will be killed or injured. That's part of the job. That's what we sign up for."

Supreme Court takes up legality of term limits
By Ana Puga  Boston Globe
WASHINGTON Underscoring voter impatience with incumbents, the Supreme Court on Tuesday will hear arguments in the most significant case of the 1994-95 session -- a dispute over whether state measures that limit the terms of members of Congress are constitutional.

If the court's decision, expected by June, strikes down term-limit initiatives that voters have already approved in 22 states, it would doom similar efforts in other areas of the country. Supporters of the increasingly popular measure would then have to resort to amending the Constitution, a difficult process requiring a two-thirds' majority in Congress and a three-fourths' majority of states.

Republican House candidates pledged in their "Contract With America" to bring a term-limits amendment to a vote in Congress. But soon after winning control of the House, Republican leaders signaled that Republican enthusiasm for the amendment may be waning. Thus term-limit supporters are hoping that a favorable Supreme Court decision will spare them the amendment process.

Most of the state term-limit provisions would allow three to six terms for House members and two terms for senators. The measures already approved would make 40 percent of the current Congress subject to limits, analysts say.

"Congress has chosen not to deal with term limits. Instead, they have gone to the courts," said Paul Jacob, executive director of U.S. Term Limits Inc.

For the purposes of Tuesday's argument, the Supreme Court has combined two Arkansas cases, U.S. Term Limits vs. Thornton and Bryant vs. Hill, that raise the issue of whether Article 1 of the Constitution has exclusive jurisdiction over the qualifications of federal lawmakers. The Clinton administration has joined the term-limits opponents.

Article 1 details minimum age, citizenship and residency "qualifications" for House and Senate members, but also adds that state legislatures have the right to mandate the "times, places and manner of holding elections."

Most of the states that have enacted term limits have tried to word them as a time, place and manner restriction. For example, the Arkansas measure does not actually ban lawmakers from running for office but prevents those who have served three terms in the House or two terms in the Senate from putting their names on the ballot. Theoretically, a longtime office holder could run as a write-in candidate. But write-ins almost never win.

The Supreme Court must address the question of whether the Arkansas term limits measure is a constitutional restriction on time, place and manner or is actually an unconstitutional attempt to add a qualification to those already outlined in Article 1.

In November 1992, Arkansas voters approved a term-limits amendment to the state constitution by an overwhelming margin. Activist Bobbie E. Hill and the League of Women Voters sued in Arkansas state court, arguing that the amendment violated their constitutional rights as voters. Arkansas Circuit Judge Chris Piazza, and later the Arkansas Supreme Court, ruled in their favor and found the term-limits proposal unconstitutional.

Hill said in a statement Monday that term limits are "one more government regulation that the people don't need. Term limits restrict the voter's freedom. They strike a blow against democracy."

Becky Cain, president of the League of Women Voters, argued that term-limit laws are unnecessary because voters can simply vote against incumbents they want to turn out of office.

On the other hand, term-limit supporters argue that the current system is rigged in favor of incumbents, who usually enjoy the advantage of greater exposure to the public and greater financial resources. Term-limit proponents invoke the vision of a citizen lawmaker, as opposed to what they argue is the corrupting professionalism now dominating Congress.

Advocates also argue that term limits would keep lawmakers from intruding into Americans' private lives, a key goal for Republicans and libertarians.

"If you don't have a Congress that thinks its business is to run our lives, then you don't have a need for a professional Congress," said Roger Pilon, head of constitutional studies at the libertarian Cato Institute.
GATT Fans Gather at White House to Show Support for Pact (Washn)
By Glenn Kessler (c) 1994, Newsday

WASHINGTON The fallen. The disgraced. The victorious. And a bunch of would-be Comeback Kids. It was a quintessential Washington gathering Monday in the ornate East Room of the White House, ablaze with camera lights and packed with reporters. A group of all-star politicos was there to provide a bipartisan show of support for a world-trade pact that will be considered this week in a special postelection session of Congress.

But the event also underscored the quickly shifting tides of power and control in the nation's capital.

There was Tom Foley, the speaker of the House who lost his seat in the Republican landslide three weeks ago.

Bert Lance, who was ousted from his job as former President Carter's budget director over a banking scandal, was also there.

So was Rep. Richard Armey, R-Texas, in line to be the majority leader in the House next year. It was Armey who last year said first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton "hangs around a lot of Marxists; all her friends are Marxists."

And sitting next to President Clinton on the dais was James A. Baker III, the former secretary of state who ran former President Bush's unsuccessful re-election campaign and would like to be president himself one day. To Clinton's evident discomfort, Baker joked, "It's always fun to come back here to the White House in November."

The East Room event underscored the remarkable support the sweeping trade agreement commands among the nation's political and business elite, even among the fiercest political competitors. The House of Representatives Tuesday begins four hours of debate on the expansion of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, or GATT, with a vote expected in the afternoon.

Clinton devoted most of his remarks to disputing a recent column by Newsday columnist Lars-Erik Nelson that argued that GATT would hurt most the working-class people who formed the bulk of his support in 1992 and deserted him in the midterm elections. "Our responsibility is to do what is right for those people over the long run," Clinton said. "And the only way to do that is to open other markets to American products and services even as we open our markets to them."

Despite defections from a number of Democrats on GATT, few expect the House vote to be a nail-biter. Lawmakers said that incoming House Speaker Newt Gingrich, R-Ga., has been twisting arms to make sure Republicans vote overwhelmingly for GATT.

"I'm confident it will get well over 220 votes," giving GATT proponents a victory, Armey said.

The situation is considerably more dicey in the Senate, where budget rules require a supermajority of 60 votes to bring GATT to the floor for a vote. But administration officials expressed increasing confidence that they would win when the Senate concludes debate Thursday.

Ralph Nader, the consumer advocate who has worked tirelessly to defeat or delay the vote, insisted that the administration still did not have the votes to win in the Senate.

Nader won one convert Monday when Sen. Hank Brown, R-Colo., successfully passed a 12-question quiz on GATT designed by Nader and then announced that he would vote against the agreement because of information he had learned while studying for the quiz.

Nader, who said he wasn't expecting Brown's announcement, said it proved his point: that lawmakers would vote against the 22,000-page agreement if they actually read it. Brown is the only lawmaker known to have taken Nader's quiz.

Distributed by the Los Angeles Times-Washington Post News Service
GATT gets a last nudge from Clinton

BY RANDY LILLESTON
Democrat-Gazette Washington Bureau

WASHINGTON — Surrounded by officials from every administration of the past 40 years, President Clinton began a final push for a new world trade treaty Monday, using a White House speech to implore Congress to pass the pact.

"It is not a Republican agreement or a Democratic one. It is an American agreement designed to benefit all the American people, in every region of our country, from every walk of life," Clinton said at a White House ceremony featuring dozens of officials from past administrations.

The treaty in question is the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, better known as GATT. It would reduce dozens of trade barriers and tariffs among 123 nations worldwide, including virtually all of the world’s major industrial powers.

In a rare postelection session, Congress will vote on ratifying the treaty this week. The House is expected to vote on the treaty today and ratify it easily, but a struggle looms in the Senate.

There, instead of a simple majority, the administration must have a “supermajority” of 60 votes to waive Senate budget rules. The waiver is necessary because the treaty is expected to cost the United States $40 billion in tax revenues over the next 10 years. Under Senate budget rules, that money must be replaced with spending cuts or tax increases, or the “supermajority” vote is needed.

The Senate is expected to vote Thursday on the treaty.

Administration officials declined Monday to comment on how many votes they felt they had. However, the treaty was given a substantial boost last week, when Sen. Bob Dole, R-Kan., and the likely Senate majority leader next year, said he would vote for the measure and would urge other Republicans to do likewise.

Monday’s event at the White House was an attempt to build on that momentum, administration officials said. Dozens of former Cabinet officials from the Bush, Reagan, Carter, Nixon, Johnson, Kennedy and Eisenhower administrations came to the White House to hear speeches from the president and some of their former colleagues.

"We all know, as everyone in this room knows, that a vote to delay is a vote to kill," said James Baker III, a holder of several top posts under the Bush and Reagan administrations, including presidential chief of staff. He was referring to a push by some GATT opponents to put off a vote until the new Congress meets next year.

Baker said the vote was a choice "between escapism and opportunity ... where escapism has failed, opportunity has succeeded."

Jim Miller, director of the Office of Management and Budget under President Reagan, dismissed claims from some conservative GATT opponents that the treaty would increase the deficit.

"In my judgment, this would not be a budget buster," he said, explaining that he believed the treaty would create American jobs and industries, providing new tax revenues.

The president focused on a central argument by more liberal opponents — that GATT would kill American jobs in textiles and other manufacturing areas. Opponents argue the jobs would be shifted overseas.

"That has great superficial appeal," the president said. "It’s wrong because, number one, if we don’t do anything, we’ll have some displacement from foreign competition. But if we move and lead, we will open other markets to our products."

"Every time I talked to a world leader in the last six months, they have asked me the same thing: When is the United States going to act on GATT? The rest of the world is looking at us."

GATT has drawn an unusual mix of opponents, nonetheless similar to the group that opposed the North American Free Trade Agreement. They include conservatives such as Pat Buchanan, independents such as Ross Perot and liberals such as Ralph Nader.
With Clinton, it's personal

More notes on our increasingly less boyish president:

What the Republicans in Congress have done very well, and what Bill Clinton has utterly failed to do, is define Bill Clinton. In a political season when it is best to remain inscrutable and hazy, bound in fog, the GOP has succeeded in producing a clear, if caricatured, portrait of a president in crisis.

They've made Bill Clinton into a "liberal."

Put aside for the moment the rather esoteric argument we from time to time make in this space that "liberal" is neither a dirty word nor a synonym for a lover of government intrusion (well argue about that later).

Think about what you've read in the wake of the recent elections: how now Clinton has to find some way to move back to the center, how he campaigned from the center but governed from the left, how as someone said on these pages, "as liberal a president as this country is likely to get."

Now exactly how has Clinton done to deserve that onerous, all but meaningless label? He certainly did not campaign as a "liberal."

Once, a few years ago, he even offered the opinion that he was perhaps "too conservative" to ever become president.

Despite the rhetoric of his political enemies, Clinton is no liberal, at least not in the sense that that word is understood by true liberals. Howard Metzenbaum and Barney Frank certainly don't consider Clinton their ideological soulmates.

So why is he perceived as such? Why do most Americans consider this pathological pragmatist a left-leaning liberal? He stands accused of betraying the "New Democrat" strategy he campaigned on for a kind of big government neo-liberalism.

They've charged him with wanting to expand government, with raising taxes.

Understand, only Bill Clinton himself could make the case for Bill Clinton as conservative. A handful of his appointments and attempted appointments — Donna Shalala, Dr. Joycelyn Elders and Lani Guinier — were at least culturally left of center.

Clinton was never in favor of a Canadian-style, single-payer system, the pure model favored by most self-styled "liberals," but instead favored a jury-rigged, excessively bureaucratic combination of government price controls combined with market incentives.

It was an ambitious plan, but in the end it seemed contrived as much to placate insurance companies and health care vendors as to improve Americans' access to care.

Similarly, Clinton caved in on his promise to lift the ban against gays in the military.

Though he found an artful way to break his campaign promise, he nevertheless broke his promise when it proved difficult.

Though Clinton's political enemies have cast him as tax-raiser, he has raised income taxes for only the highest brackets.

The top 12 percent of income earners in the country have had their taxes raised, while an expanded earned income tax credit lowered income taxes for about 13 percent of the population.

Although there may be some legitimacy to the argument that increased taxes on the wealthiest Americans slow down the economy, that's not the perception of the Limbaugh-listening rabble.

They think Clinton has gone directly after their pay packet.

But if Clinton is not a liberal, what is he?

It might be fair to call him a well-meaning opportunist. That, because it seems clear that Clinton means no harm. It appears that if he believes in anything, he believes that government can and should play an important role in the everyday lives of citizens, a proposition with which most of us can probably reasonably and justly agree.

What we argue about is the appropriate amount or form of government involvement — or, more distressingly, the style of governance and the moral fitness of the people carrying out policy.

(Or at least we can understand that government has evolved to the point where it must necessarily be engaged, that laissez-faire fantasies are just that. Even a superhero like Newt Gingrich would have to confront the bureaucracy in order to dismantle it.)

Clinton is the classic middle-of-the-road on most issues. He exasperates both sides as he gropes toward some imagined common ground. That word is anathema to the guy who wants to please most of the people most of the time and ends up infuriating people on both ends of the political spectrum precisely because he seems unfettered by first principles or any coherent moral vision.

It's not because of his politics or policies that we dislike him. With this president, it's personal.

---

Phil Martin's column appears here every Tuesday and in Perspective every Sunday.
Clinton rallies supporters of trade treaty

By George Rodrigue  Dallas Morning News

WASHINGTON With his own political cloud damaged by a Republican takeover of Congress, President Clinton rallied bipartisan supporters Monday for a last-minute appeal on behalf of the world trade accord known as GATT.

The president was host to members from every Cabinet since Harry Truman's at the White House. As he spoke, aides handed out a letter in which former presidents Gerald Ford, Jimmy Carter and George Bush endorsed the agreement.

Supporters and foes predicted that the House would overwhelmingly approve the trade treaty after Congress reconvenes Tuesday in a lame-duck session. But opponents hope to block the pact in the Senate. It will consider the measure on Thursday, and 60 votes are required to waive special budget rules.

An informal survey of the Texas congressional delegation Monday found solid support for the pact. Of the 30 House members, 18 were planning to vote for it. The rest were undecided or could not be reached.

"The world population needs to be fed, and the American farmer and rancher are the most effective producers of food and fiber in the world," said Rep. Charles Stenholm, D-Texas. "What we have to have is a level playing field. Once GATT is passed, the world rules will be established."

Sen. Phil Gramm, R-Texas, also expressed support for GATT, saying, "Trade is the lifeblood of economic growth and job creation."

Clinton criticized some liberals in his own party for arguing that the proposed changes to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade would harm lower-income workers.

Former Secretary of State James Baker, meanwhile, attacked the isolationists in his Republican Party for using tariffs to shield favored industries from international competition.

"We really face a choice between escapism and engagement," said Baker, who served in the Reagan and Bush administrations.

GATT's supporters say approval would add hundreds of thousands of jobs to the U.S. economy, primarily by boosting U.S. exports and lowering the prices that manufacturers and consumers pay for imported goods.

Opponents range from conservative commentator Pat Buchanan, a former GOP presidential candidate, to consumer advocate Ralph Nader to Ross Perot, a former independent presidential candidate. They say the agreement would harm many U.S. workers and give a new, secretive international bureaucracy too much control over U.S. policies on labor, consumer protection and the environment.

"Countries that use brutalized child labor won't be held accountable," Nader said. "They'll file charges (of unfair trade) against countries with higher standards (of safety and welfare)."

Sen. Max Baucus, D-Mont., the influential chairman of the Senate Finance subcommittee on trade, said Monday he would oppose the agreement because the new World Trade Organization the pact would create had not been thoroughly studied, and its one-country, one-vote system "sticks in my craw."

Clinton's trade representative, Mickey Kantor, predicted the measure would pass. "We're not overconfident, but we feel very good we can pass this legislation this week," he said Monday.

The proposal before Congress has been negotiated since the Clinton administration estimates the net benefit to the U.S. economy at $100 billion to $200 billion, or perhaps 500,000 new jobs.

Independent analysts say the effects will undoubtedly be positive, though perhaps less dramatic than predicted, because the new agreement mostly sets procedural rules for future negotiations.

But several aspects of the plan have drawn criticism, which Clinton and his Republican allies rebutted Monday. Though cuts in U.S. import tariffs would directly benefit U.S. consumers, they also would cost the federal Treasury up to $40 billion over the next 10 years. GATT opponents have branded the agreement a "budget buster."

However, James Miller, director of the Office of Management and Budget in the Reagan administration, said the tariff cuts also should boost U.S. trade more than enough to offset those losses.

Under current GATT rules, nations can unilaterally veto trade sanctions against themselves. U.S. officials, presiding over one of the world's most open economies, have long demanded a more binding form of fair-trade enforcement.

The proposed World Trade Organization, with power to judge and impose tariff sanctions, was the result of their labors. The new organization cannot change U.S. laws but can authorize other nations to impose sanctions on the United States if it disagrees with those rules.

Nader said that would endanger everything from auto-safety standards to tuna-fishing rules designed to spare the lives of dolphins.

Rep. Sam Johnson, R-Texas, is concerned the accord gives too much power to the World Trade Organization. He "sees the potential for the WTO getting larger and larger until it turns into a U.N.-type organization that the United States gets saddled with funding," said spokeswoman Mindy Tucker.

Rep. Lamar Smith, R-Texas, said the accord addressed those concerns.

"The GATT-implementing legislation specifically guarantees that our interests cannot be ignored," Smith said in a statement. "The U.S. may withdraw at any time with six months' notice."

Brookings Institution economist Barry Bosworth said that as a practical matter the United States was unlikely to be victimized by the organization.

"Who's going to want to get into a (pushing) match with the U.S. over this issue?" he said. "We're too big."

The trade pact's provision for lowering tariffs is designed to provide all nations a "level playing field," free of government subsidies. U.S. experts say that should benefit the supple and competitive U.S. economy, where subsidies generally are a thing of the past.

But some liberal Democrats argue that GATT will also subject the United States' lower-skilled workers to more direct competition from poorer nations.

Clinton said Monday the argument "has great superficial appeal." But he added that "if we don't do anything we'll (still) have some displacement from foreign competition. But if we move and lead, we'll open other markets for our products."

Bosworth agreed. Though the GATT revisions would reduce all tariffs an average of 40 percent, he said, American tariffs already are down to about 5 percent of the value of imported goods. Poorer nations' tariffs remain far higher, he said, so a 40 percent cut in their rates will be of proportionately greater benefit to U.S. exporters.

Rep. Bill Sarpalious, D-Texas, said the accord should be a boon to the state's agriculture industry. "It will increase cotton sales by about a million bales, and it will help increase grain exports," he said. "For somebody who represents a largely rural farming district it is a good piece of legislation."

(Staff writers Kristi Wright and John Raga contributed to this report.)
The United Nations-designated "safe haven" of the Bosnian city of Bihac is anything but safe. The area could very well fall to the Serbs any time now. In the meantime, the so-called "contact group" — the United States, Russia, France, Germany and Britain — continues to dither about reaching some sort of negotiated settlement to end the merciless Serb assault on territory that the U.N. has declared off limits.

The NATO airstrikes launched against Serb targets were intended to demonstrate U.N. resolve. Obviously they were not enough. But the NATO allies are reluctant to hit the Serbs harder. In the meantime, the Serbs are exploiting the NATO split to their maximum advantage. It certainly played into their hands to have Secretary of Defense William Perry all but conceded less inclination to accept peace on any terms they don't like. So what are the British, French and Russians going to negotiate about if they aren't willing to use the only leverage they have?

Sen. Bob Dole in Paris rightly blasted the Europeans for their impotence. And his call for withdrawing U.N. peacekeepers may be the only option left if the allies cannot stand firm on protecting the safe havens. And in that sad event, the casualties will include a deflated world body and an obsolete military alliance.

Bihac is the Serbs in stunningly ill-chosen remarks over the weekend. U.N. peacekeeping and collective security virtually finished if the European members of the contact group don't go along with the U.S. pressure to launch a more robust military response to repel the Serb forces and uphold the integrity of the Bihac safe area. The fall of Bihac could be the downfall of U.N. credibility for a long time to come. Any new role for NATO will be, drastically undermined.

If the U.N. doesn't make a stand in Bihac, the other five designated safe areas, including the capital Sarajevo, are sitting ducks. With every inch of new territory the Serb forces take, the less likely they will ever agree to give any of it back. The Serbs did not accept a U.N.-brokered peace plan that would give them 49 percent of Bosnia when they were in control of 70 percent of the country. With that percentage now at nearly 75 percent, and rising, there will be even les inclination to accept peace on any terms they don't like. So what are the British, French and Russians going to negotiate about if they aren't willing to use the only leverage they have?

With the U.S. House voting today on improvements to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, desperate opponents are sounding like the Wizard of Oz, whose exaggerated claims and fiery belches instilled so much fear and confusion in innocent Dorothy.

In a radio ad, Patrick Buchanan bellows that a new World Trade Organization puts U.S. trade "under foreign bureaucrats forever." Ralph Nader grimly foresees an erosion of America's environmental laws. And Ross Perot claims that the pact threatens U.S. sovereignty.

Well, to paraphrase the Wizard himself, pay no attention to those men behind the curtain. Their scare tactics should not deter Congress from approving a pact that would open world markets, creating jobs and prosperity for Americans.

The pact is a boon to America, not a threat. It preserves America's sovereign right to enact its own laws and to write environmental rules tougher than international norms. Should the pact prove harmful to U.S. interests, it allows countries to pull out with six months' notice.

The House should approve the pact, and the Senate should follow suit Thursday. Messrs. Buchanan, Nader and Perot should board a hot air balloon for Kansas.
NATO's stature as history's most successful alliance may be latest casualty of war

By R.C. Longworth Chicago Tribune

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization's stature as history's most successful alliance may be the latest casualty of the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Even though NATO has stayed mostly on the fringes of the fighting in the former Yugoslavia, its leading members have fallen out, bitterly and publicly, over their strategy toward that conflict.

Washington blames Britain and France for blocking strong NATO action to protect the mostly-Muslim enclave of Bihac against advancing Serbs. London and Paris say the U.S. refused to contribute American troops to the United Nations force in Bosnia deprives Washington of any right to criticize those countries such as Britain and France which actually have soldiers there.

NATO is not likely to collapse. But the alliance is America's only institutional tie to Europe; the dispute could weaken U.S. relations with its traditional allies while sapping NATO's ability to stand up to any future aggressors, including a resurgent Russia.

The dispute, which could have been papered over during the Cold War, comes now at the worst possible time with the alliance facing crucial decisions on its own future and with ill-wishers, especially Russia, using every lever to split it apart.

Both President Clinton and Secretary of State Warren Christopher fly to Europe in the coming week for important meetings on trans-Atlantic security.

Christopher is to meet other NATO foreign ministers in Brussels on Thursday to discuss expanding the alliance to include Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic and possibly other ex-Communist nations of central Europe. A day later, he will meet with other members of the so-called Contact Group Russia, Britain, Britain, France and Germany to plot further strategy over Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Next Monday, Clinton will attend a Budapest summit of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), aimed at giving that unwieldy 53-nation body a greater role in European security.

The fallout from Bosnia could roil both meetings.

Sen. Bob Dole, R-Kan., the Senate's next majority leader, said over the weekend that the British and the French, and primarily the British, are to blame for a complete breakdown of NATO over Bosnia.

British Defense Secretary Malcolm Rifkind retorted, "It all becomes people in countries who have not provided a single soldier on the ground to make that kind of criticism."

A French government statement said the U.S. decision to lift the weapons embargo on Bosnia and its call for more bombing of Serb forces "only fuels the cycle of violence" and is "vain and dangerous."

In one of the most startling developments, Britain and France are siding with Russia in their opposition to NATO bombing and the lifting of the arms embargo.

This Paris-London-Moscow link shows how the end of the Cold War has shattered the alliances that kept Europe in a tense equilibrium for 40 years. It also demonstrates the gravitational pull of history over European affairs: When the 1914 asassination of Austrian Archduke Franz Ferdinand at Sarajevo triggered World War I, Britain, France and Russia belated to the Triple Alliance that opposed Germany and Austria.

NATO has endured internal splits before, most notably during the Vietnam War when the Europeans opposed U.S. policy. But the common threat from the Soviet Union overrode even those divisions.

Now the Soviet Union is gone. The Poles, Czechs and Hungarians all are clamoring for NATO membership as a security anchor for their new democracies. Russia opposes this NATO expansion and has some support from France. Russia also sees a bigger role for the CSCE, to which it belongs, at the expense of NATO.

The split between Washington and its allies began in 1991 when then-President George Bush let the Europeans, and particularly the European Community, take the lead on Western policy toward the Yugoslav crisis. The decision, praised at the time, was based on the belief that, with the Cold War over, the West Europeans should take more responsibility for their continent, free of American tutelage.

At the same time, the U.N. Security Council dispatched troops to the former Yugoslavia with authority to shepherd humanitarian relief shipments to stricken communities.

United Nations troops were to stay absolutely neutral, so as not to upset U.N. peace talks, which were led then, as now, by former British Foreign Secretary Lord David Owen.

British and French troops comprise the bulk of the 24,000 United Nations troops in Bosnia. The United States, stung by public reaction to U.S. casualties in Somalia, has refused to send troops.

To the Europeans, this U.S. refusal symbolizes America's post-Cold War withdrawal from its European responsibilities. It has led to a new emphasis on defense cooperation among Britain, France and Germany and to a new role for the West European Union (WEU), a previously moribund European grouping, as a "defense arm" of the European Union.

Officially, the United States has cheered on these new, tighter European defense groupings. But some Europeans, especially the French, make it clear they see the WEU as a means to weaken U.S. leadership in Europe.

When the European Union and the U.N. failed to bring peace in Bosnia, the United States began pushing for NATO air strikes on Serb positions, to punish Serb aggression. In addition, the Clinton administration has sought a new role for NATO, which had been established to contain a Soviet Union that no longer exists. Keeping the peace in the new, post-Cold War Europe seemed a natural evolution.

The European governments in general have sought peace at almost any price in the former Yugoslavia. Many have longstanding ties with Serbia. More important, Bosnia is a quick flight from much of Western Europe, which fears any prolongation or expansion of the war.

The United States is more inclined to prolong the war if necessary to punish Serbia and gain justice for Bosnia's Muslims. Among other things, this would please America's Muslim allies such as Egypt and Turkey. In addition, a spreading war is less threatening to Americans, an ocean away.

All these conflicting national interests became focused on Bihac. American leaders felt the European-dominated U.N. force sold out the Muslims, while the Europeans rejected the U.S. criticism as the unjustified whine of a great power that refuses to put its muscle where its mouth is.

In the United States, the Republican victory in this month's election has put new pressure on the Clinton administration's foreign policy. In effect, the administration now resembles the West European governments, most of which are weak regimes with uncertain parliamentary majorities, lacking either the vigor or power to take decisive steps to rebuild the alliance.
Stone Mountain and the gay card

The kind of persuasion Stone Mountain City Councilman Kevin Coons wants to use on the Olympic committee usually comes in a midnight phone call or a note put together with letters cut from magazines.

Coons' threat to introduce an anti-gay resolution in order to pressure the Atlanta Committee for the Olympic Games into helping his city prepare for the Olympics is a stupid form of extortion. City Council should have none of it.

There are better ways to deal with the serious question of whether Stone Mountain will get assistance in handling the crowds from the 1996 Games.

It is bad enough that Coons wants to emulate the Cobb County Commission by passing an anti-gay resolution in the name of promoting "family values." Anyone who paid attention to what happened in Cobb knows that the commission's ill-considered and gratuitous slap at gays didn't advance family values; it simply stirred up intolerance and animosity inside Cobb and bad publicity beyond its borders.

What is worse is that Coons sees some benefit in forcing Olympic officials into a Cobb redux, with gay activists trying to get Olympic venues moved out of nearby Stone Mountain, Park if the city passes his resolution.

The question of whether the city of Stone Mountain should get or even needs the Olympic committee's help in dealing with Olympic crowds is too important to be resolved through Coons' clumsy machinations. Olympic officials should be willing to sit down and talk with Stone Mountain officials about the burdens they expect to bear, as long as the city officials also acknowledge the benefits that will come as a result of the Olympics being nearby.

If the City Council should be foolish enough to go along with Coons' scheme, those who wish to protest should deal directly with the city and leave the Olympic committee out of it. There are no Olympic venues for officials to remove from the city of Stone Mountain.

Kevin Coons has the idea that he can get what he wants by making his city the metro area's squeaky wheel. The best response to his strategy may be to ignore him.
MAKING A POINT: Jorge Mas Canosa says he has told the administration that his foundation is ready to pay the bill for admitting and resettling refugees in Guantanamo and Panama.

Cuban exile leader says he didn't support refugee detention camps

FABIOLA SANTIAGO
Herald Staff Writer

In his trademark passionate delivery, Cuban exile leader Jorge Mas Canosa on Monday took his vision of a free Cuba to a largely friendly crowd of West Palm Beach businesspeople and got his toughest question from a high school student.

Tatiana Bido, 17, wanted to know: How does the chairman of the Cuban American National Foundation explain his initial decision to support the Clinton administration policy of detaining Cuban rafters at Guantanamo?

He didn't support the policy, Mas Canosa contended, and blamed "the Castro regime's disinformation campaign" on the widespread belief he aided President Clinton in formulating it. Mas went on to tell of meeting with Clinton during the crisis sprinkling details about interrupting the president's birthday barbecue and vowed he stood firm against long-term detention. He said he simply insisted that Castro be punished for unleashing the exodus with the curtailment of remittances and family flights.

In fact, Mas said, he has told the administration that the foundation is ready to pay the bill for all costs in admitting and resettling the 30,000-plus refugees now in Guantanamo and Panama. "It will not cost American taxpayers one penny," Mas said to applause.

Bido, a senior at Forest Hill Senior High School and part of a group of Hispanic students who came to the luncheon hosted by Forum Club of the Palm Beaches, left with mixed feelings about Mas.

"I'm kind of shaky on it," she said. "He's here to please people, and I don't know if he's real or not."

But Beatriz Corrales, a 17-year-old senior who came from Cuba five years ago, had a different opinion. She was favorably impressed with Mas' post-Castro plan of a transitional government leading to multiparty elections supervised by international observers, a free market economy and the elimination of the armed forces and national police.

In the process, she overcame an initial reservation about attending the lunch. Corrales had wanted to ask Mas a question in Spanish.

"No," Gayle Pallesen, the forum's executive director told her.

"Why?" Corrales demanded.

"Because this group is made up of people who speak English," Pallesen said.

Corrales responded then that she would not ask one of the two questions allocated to students.

After Mas' speech she changed her mind and in flawless English asked why the United States does not take more aggressive action against Cuba.

She was pleased with his answer: "When it comes to Communist dictators, the press in this country treats them with kid gloves. ... Fidel Castro's image was of a Robin Hood who came to power to take from the rich to give to the poor, and we in Miami were the bad ones, the bomb throwers. It took a long time to expose him."

Corrales was delighted. "I do believe him 100 percent. He would be a good president for Cuba."
Challenge for Zedillo

Political murders damage Mexico's credibility. But new President Zedillo can help to restore it.

Instead of moving forward, the investigation into the murders of two prominent leaders of Mexico's ruling Institutional Revolutionary Party has stagnated amid scandal. Assassins shot PRI presidential candidate Luis Donaldo Colosio in March and high-ranking PRI official Jose Francisco Ruiz Massieu in September.

Mr. Massieu, the chief investigator into his brother's assassination, quit after implicating several PRI officials in the crime. He also accused others of blocking his probe. All the accused priests deny the allegations. They say that Mr. Ruiz Massieu is hurling unfounded accusations at party officials out of bitterness over his brother's murder. Yet for Mexicans it is no secret that PRI conservatives and reformers have long been vying for power. Moreover, various detained suspects have fingered PRI Deputy Manuel Murillo Rocha as the man who allegedly masterminded Mr. Ruiz Massieu's assassination. Compounding the problem, the probe into both murders has moved at a snail's pace, thus fueling suspicions of a cover-up.

The political uncertainty engendered by these unsolved murders could hurt Mexico's reform process more than fragile Zapatista insurgency movement, has. That also can further Mexico's flourishing relations with the United States, including the North American Free Trade Agreement. It's due for revision early.

Therefore, Mexico's President-elect Ernesto Zedillo, who takes office on Thursday, needs to move fast to end the scandal by bringing out into the open all the truth about these murders. Before resigning, Mr. Ruiz Massieu turned over all his collected evidence to Mr. Zedillo. Mr. Zedillo would be wise to use it to serve justice and political stability.

An apostle of peace

The steep road toward peace in Central America is paved with the quiet feats of people such as El Salvador's Archbishop Arturo Rivera y Damas. Sadly, Mr. Rivera y Damas died of a heart attack over the weekend as he was beginning to witness the first fruits of a peace that he helped forge. He was 71.

Ever since his sudden death was announced, San Salvador's Basilica of the Sacred Heart, where Mr. Rivera y Damas delivered his Sunday homilies, has been filled with Salvadoran faithful. They are paying their last tribute to the beloved prelate who courageously spread the gospel of peace in a country at war for years.

It was anything but easy for Mr. Rivera y Damas to become a champion of peace. Before accepting the role of mediator between the government and the guerrillas, he replaced Oscar Arnulfo Romero in the archbishopric. Mr. Romero was murdered by a right-wing death squad while celebrating Mass in 1980. So naturally, every Salvadoran feared that Mr. Rivera y Damas would meet the same tragic fate as his predecessor. But his legacy endures.

Salvadorans mourn the loss of their archbishop. But his legacy endures. Unlike his predecessor, Mr. Rivera y Damas was never suspected of having political motives other than achieving peace for his country. That, coupled with his humble origins, gained him the respect and love of most Salvadorans. Until the last moments of his life, he also devoutly defended the poor and criticized the use of violence as a method of social control. Salvadorans will sorely miss that truly remarkable apostle of peace. But they'll never forget his legacy.
Continued from page 1A

who will be the next speaker of the House and who supports the accord.

However, Clinton and GATT supporters suffered three setbacks in the Senate on Monday with the announcements that Sens. Paul Wellstone, D-Minn., Max Baucus, D-Mont., and Hank Brown, R-Colo., would oppose the agreement.

The stakes are immense.

The administration, with support from former President George Bush, Jimmy Carter and Gerald Ford, argues that GATT will benefit U.S. industries greatly by giving them entry to new markets worldwide and save consumers $11 billion by the turn of the century.

Opponents argue that certain industries such as textiles will be endangered, that U.S. labor, consumer and environmental protections will suffer and that the nation's very sovereignty is at risk.

GATT reduces the tariffs countries levy to protect their farm products and domestic goods by an average of 38 percent worldwide. GATT also extends protection for the first time to intellectual property, such as movies and software, and to services such as banking and insurance.

To give GATT teeth, the agreement creates a new international agency, the World Trade Organization, to enforce the new rules. This is where the question of sovereignty arises.

If two nations get into a dispute over tariffs, the organization would apply new rules. This is where the question of sovereignty arises.

In the Senate, Republican Dave Durenberger, who will vote, six support GATT, three oppose it — and one is still agonizing over his decision.

"I have to see how the day evolves and then decide," said Rep. Martin Sabo.

The Minneapolis Democrat said his "biggest concern is the potential impact on the wage structure." Sabo is concerned that GATT would "plunge those lower tariffs all around the world.

"I don't expect this agreement to be detrimental to the citizens or businesses, and if it is, we could pull out. ... At the moment I believe there is much more to be gained than there is to lose."

Retiring Democratic Rep. Tim Penny, whose final vote will be cast in favor of GATT, said: "This is a major issue. I like the idea of closing my career with a big note."

All of Minnesota's Republican members of Congress support GATT.


Rep. Rod Grams was worried about sovereignty and said he had reviewed that section in detail.

Oponents fear that U.S. laws against child labor and setting consumer and environmental protections could be interpreted as tariff violations and overturned by this body.

These opponents come from both the left and the right of the political spectrum, including consumer advocate Ralph Nader, black leader Jesse Jackson, environmental groups, labor groups, conservative columnist Patrick Buchanan and billionaire businessman Ross Perot, who says he will form a third party if GATT passes.

The domestic political stakes riding on GATT are clearly high. The vote is the first test of whether the administration and the Republicans who will control the new Congress can act in a bipartisan fashion.

Dole has put his prestige on the line. He supported GATT after a compromise with Clinton that addresses the sovereignty fear by setting up a U.S. panel to monitor the decisions of the international judges. Congress would be able to respond if the U.S. panel found the laboratory to be unsatisfactory.

All the debate over GATT, of course, comes down to 335 votes on the floor of the House of the 104th Congress. Of those 335 votes, 67 will be in the hands of people who will vote, six support GATT, three oppose it -- and one is still agonizing over his decision.
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Poll Shows Erosion of GATT Pact Support
By John Maggs, The Journal of Commerce
Knight-Ridder/Tribune Business News

WASHINGTON--Nov. 29- President Clinton on Monday said today's House vote on the Uruguay Round trade pact will be the first test of bipartisanship in the new Republican Congress.

Instead, however, the vote may be an early indicator of just how little influence Mr. Clinton will have with the Democratic minority.

At a final strategy session Monday morning, staffers for Democratic and Republican House leaders compared vote counts and found that the expected overwhelming support for the agreement was eroding, especially among Democrats. When Republicans asked who on the Democratic side would be leading the effort to round up votes, no one was willing to take that responsibility.

There are several reasons for this reluctance, but all are connected to the electoral earthquake Nov. 8 that returned both houses of Congress to Republican control.

"There's not a lot of loyalty to the president right now, and that is going to be reflected in the House vote," said one Democratic House staffer. "This is not a popular vote."

The Democratic staffer estimated that the number of votes in favor of the agreement, thought only last week to be as high as 320 or more of the House's 433 members, could be as little as 245, mostly from Democratic defections.

A Republican staffer working to "whip" the House vote estimated the likely outcome at about 285 in favor, based on an estimate that half of undecided and half of those House members leaning in favor of supporting the agreement would vote for it.

U.S. Trade Representative Mickey Kantor estimated that more than half of House Democrats would vote in favor of the trade agreement, suggesting a comfortable margin, since Republicans are likely to be strongly in favor of it.

For the current House majority leader, Richard Gephardt, the Republican landslide has earned him a close race among Democratic colleagues for the job of minority leader next year. Although Mr. Gephardt has been an early and consistent supporter of the trade pact, his ability to twist arms has been restricted, especially since his base in the party is among Midwestern, pro-labor liberals who generally are opposing the agreement.

At a final White House rally for the trade pact, the reversal of fortune for Republicans and Democrats was not far from the surface. The embodiment of Republican rule, former Secretary of State and the Treasury James Baker, evoked laughs and groans when he offered that "it's always nice to come to the White House in November."

The event Monday in the stately East Room was supposed to recreate a similar one a year ago for the North American Free Trade Agreement, but it suffered in comparison.

While that rally included the unusual presence of three former presidents to push a piece of legislation, the three - Presidents Ford, Carter and Bush - only saw fit to send a supportive letter for Monday's session. While there were present a number of prominent former officials like Mr. Baker and former Federal Reserve Chairman Paul Volcker, Vice President Al Gore singled out for an introduction every member present from the Clinton cabinet.

Two people not present were the leaders of the new Republican Congress- Newt Gingrich and Bob Dole. Mr. Gingrich is expected at a meeting between Mr. Clinton and House members early today.

At the East Room rally, President Clinton departed from the familiar rhetoric on the trade agreement to make a remarkable observation about opposition to the new trade agreement. He related that a columnist - one usually supportive of Clinton - had warned that the GATT agreement would be political suicide for the president because it would hurt American workers, long the base of support for the Democratic Party.

In declaring that analysis "simply wrong," and arguing that freer trade will benefit American workers, Mr. Clinton nevertheless made a sobering observation about where he is left as a Democratic free-trader whose reelection campaign is only a year away.

"This is really the undercurrent against this (agreement)," he said. "And this is the problem we face. The resentments of people who keep working harder and play by the rules and think they have gotten the shaft, they will play themselves out in election after election after election, in different and unpredictable ways like they did in 1992 and 1994."

"But our responsibility is to do what's right for these people in the long run," he said.

Meanwhile, in Geneva, Switzerland, other governments warned that a failure to pass the agreement this week would hurt the world economy and U.S. leadership abroad.

Don Kenyon, Australia's trade ambassador, said that failure to approve the deal "would be a very serious blow to the credibility of the whole package which took seven years to negotiate and a serious blow to the credibility of the U.S. in that process."

- John Zarocostas in Geneva contributed to this report.
Lame-Duck Legislators Return for GATT Vote (Washn)
By Karen Hosier
(c) 1994, The Baltimore Sun
WASHINGTON The beleaguered 103rd Congress, whose Democratic leaders lost majority control in this month's election, returns to Washington Tuesday in hopes of scoring one final achievement: approval of a sweeping trade agreement that could boost global prosperity.

It will be the first time in nearly five decades that Washington has been witness to the odd spectacle of ousted leaders presiding over a lame-duck session. And the stakes are much higher this week than they were in 1948, when the defeated Republicans returned for a two-hour post-election session to take care of housekeeping matters.

"The rest of the world is looking at us," President Clinton said Monday in a last-minute pitch for approval of the 126-nation accord known as GATT, which aims to cut or eliminate most tariffs and trade barriers.

"We have a golden opportunity here to add $1,700 in income to the average family's income in this country over the next few years, to create hundreds of thousands of high-wage jobs, to have the biggest global tax cut in history, and to fulfill our two responsibilities our responsibility to lead and remain engaged in the world, and our responsibility to try to help the people here at home to get ahead," Clinton said at a White House ceremony. "We need to get on with it and do it now."

With Democratic Rep. Thomas S. Foley performing his last day of service on the Speaker's rostrum, the House is scheduled to vote on GATT early Tuesday evening after about four hours of debate.

The trade agreement is expected to pass the House by a comfortable margin.

Later Tuesday night, the departing representatives will bid farewell to each other at a reception in honor of Foley, who was turned out of office by the voters of eastern Washington state after 30 years in the House. The returning members are already actively politicking for new leadership elections to be held over the next few days.

Sen. George J. Mitchell of Maine, the Democratic majority leader who is retiring this year, is likely to have a more difficult task shepherding GATT through the Senate Wednesday and Thursday. Opponents are expected to raise a procedural hurdle that will require 60 votes to surmount.

(Optional add end)

Critical support for the trade agreement is coming from Republican Sens. Bob Dole of Kansas the majority leader-to-be and Phil Gramm of Texas, who is expected to compete with Dole for the 1996 GOP presidential nomination.

Democratic Sen. Howard Metzenbaum of Ohio and Byron Dorgan of North Dakota, both GATT opponents, said Monday they are counting on the roughly one-third of the Senate that has not yet made a commitment on the procedural vote.

"The American people know nothing about the GATT agreement," said Metzenbaum, who argues that approval of the trade pact should be put off until next year after controversial features such as GATT's failure to address the issue of child labor can be fixed.

But James A. Baker III, former U.S. secretary of state who served in the Reagan and Bush administrations and led the bipartisan endorsements of GATT at the White House Monday, argued: "A vote to delay is a vote to kill" and "a retreat from international leadership."

The urgency of the lame-duck session is prompted by the belief that any U.S. effort to change the agreement, which took seven years and three presidents to negotiate, would prompt other nations to pull out and bring on in economic chaos.

Fall of Bihac Punctuates Demise of U.S. Role in Europe (Washn)
By Mark Matthews and Gilbert A. Lewthwaite
(c) 1994, The Baltimore Sun
WASHINGTON The collapse of the Muslim town of Bihac to the Serbs is more than a setback in efforts to end the 2&1/2-year-old Bosnian war: it shakes the foundation of European security and the U.S. role in maintaining it.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the mightiest military alliance the world has ever seen, has shown itself to lack the will to fulfill even the modest assignment of deterring Serb attacks on Bihac and other Muslim safe areas.

The result is one of the most bitter splits in the four-decade history of the alliance that has undermined not only Bosnia peace efforts but the chances of resolving any of Europe's ethnic crises. The split also raises doubts about NATO's ability to broaden its protective umbrella to Eastern European states that are clamoring for it.

Senate Republican Leader Robert Dole's call Sunday for withdrawal of United Nations peacekeepers and a lifting of the arms embargo on Bosnian Muslims triggered a torrent of anger Monday from high-ranking European and U.N. officials, all accusing the United States of being unwilling to make a serious effort toward peace.

"I think when we have thousands of brave British soldiers, some of whom have lost their lives, in Bosnia ... it ill-becomes people in countries who have not provided a single soldier on the ground to make that kind of criticism," British Defense Secretary Malcolm Rifkind said.

The recriminations over Bosnia also show that NATO and the United Nations are incompatible. And the Clinton administration's inability to impose its will on other NATO members casts doubt on the United States' continuing to be NATO's leader, manager and chief bankroller.

"There have always been problems in NATO," said Eliot Cohen, director of strategic studies at Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies. "But this is qualitatively different. This is a sign that the alliance is in very bad shape."

With the demise of the Soviet Union, NATO was thrown into an identity crisis. As a vehicle for limiting conflicts, it overlapped with the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which includes East European states and Russia.

NATO has managed to survive for several reasons: Unlike the CSCE, which has no military arm, it is a superpower machine, developed through years of coordination among its members. It also acts as a brake on inter-European rivalry and any expansionist tendencies by a wealthy and unified Germany, and it provides insurance against renewed imperialism by Russia.

But a longtime pillar of NATO's strength has been the idea that America and Europe were indivisible. This pillar started to crack in 1992, when the Bush administration declared that the first post-war military crisis in Europe, the war in the former Yugoslavia, was a problem for the Europeans themselves to solve.

Driven by outrage over Serbian aggression and atrocities, the United States has been unable to stay out of the conflict completely. Standing mostly on the sidelines, it has repeatedly taken the side of the conflicts' victims, but has refused to put American ground troops' lives on the line to help them.

From the beginning, this stance has provoked tension
between the United States and France and Britain, who want to avoid taking sides, end the war and keep it from spreading.

After once vowing to help the Muslim-dominated Bosnian government side achieve a settlement it could live with, the Clinton administration has been pulled closer to neutrality.

By now, it is even willing to accept what it once considered repugnant: something akin to a greater Serbia linking the Bosnian territories already seized by the Serbs with Serbia proper.

Although the U.N. Security Council has yet to grapple with the possibility, its peacekeeping forces may be forced to withdraw if not now, then when heavy fighting resumes next spring.

The United States is committed to helping with the withdrawal, a task that may require tens of thousands of ground troops and expose U.S. soldiers to hostility on the ground.

The peacekeepers would certainly be forced out if Dole and others in Congress force the Clinton administration to lift the arms embargo currently imposed on Bosnian Muslims.

This, State Department spokesman Michael McCurry warned Monday, would get the United States so deeply involved in a spreading conflict, training and equipping the Bosnian Muslim forces, that "ultimately, you're looking at the situation where you'd have to commit ground troops."

"This obviously is a tough moment and there's not any miracle cure that you extract from your bag of options and say, "This is the way we're going to solve the problem of Bosnia,"" a top State Department official said.

Despite American prodding, NATO has been unable to mount effective air strikes against the Serbs. While Britain and France go along with the United States in Brussels, they work through the United Nations, using their peacekeepers on the ground as a reason to limit the NATO threat.

On Monday, NATO told the United Nations it would provide close air support around Bihac only if it is also authorized to eliminate a number of fixed Serb air-defense systems, but the United Nations rejected the proposal.

Inside the Pentagon, NATO's subordination to U.N. authority is now more of a concern than any perceived threat to the alliance's survival from the disputes in Bosnia.

"The sense in the cage (the Pentagon) is that the strength of the alliance is such that it will not be riven asunder by the issue of Bosnia, although clearly there is concern about that issue," said a senior Pentagon officer. "What this all boils down to is you either do it with NATO and without the U.N, or you don't do it. You can't do it with both of them. The U.N. doesn't have what it takes to get it done."

(Optional add end)

This raises the question of whether the United States can continue its role as first among equals and coordinator of NATO, particularly when it is unwilling to commit its own forces to a festering European conflict.

Continued American leadership in all NATO's doings looks increasingly out of place in modern Europe, whose wealthy nations are already embracing the former east bloc economically, David Calleo, professor of European Studies at Johns Hopkins' SAIS, said. And it is preventing Europeans themselves, particularly Germany, from assuming responsibility for their own security.

"They're large, rich countries. Why the hell can't they manage their own security?" he asked.

Loren B. Thompson, international security director with the Alexis De Tocqueville Institution, a moderate-conservative think tank, said: "With the external threat gone, most of the glue that bound the alliance has gone too. The prognosis is that NATO will continue to exist on paper, but as a practical self-help organization it will be less and less important."

Distributed by the Los Angeles Times-Washington Post News Service=

----------------------------------------

Social Security May Open Its Files to Outside Agencies (Washn)
By John B. O'Donnell=
(c) 1994, The Baltimore Sun=
WASHINGTON The Social Security Administration, in a step that experts warn could imperil its computer system and confidential information it holds on virtually every resident of the United States, is considering giving computer access to outsiders for the first time.

In what one agency analyst called "a giant step," outside organizations that file applications for disability claimants would get limited access to send them directly into the computer. And, in a separate step they might also be allowed to seek limited information from the computer.

Agency employees and outside computer specialists worry that this could lead to unauthorized changes in records, distribution of confidential records, or sabotage of the system itself. They say that once the government's computers were able to breach internal security barriers.

Documents obtained by The Baltimore Sun and information from sources outside the Social Security Administration indicate the agency is considering a test of electronic filing next spring, but agency officials insist that no final decision to do it has been made.

Outside organizations that file applications, and might eventually be given computer access, include social services agencies, hospitals, legal aid offices and private for-profit companies, among others. At Social Security, they are known as third parties.

Computer security is just one of the fears raised in connection with the plan. Agency personnel also warn of the possibility of fraud and conflicts of interest, saying some third parties have a financial stake in the success of an application.

In addition, union officials argue that new employees should be hired to do the work.

Agency officials insist they will do nothing to compromise the security of the computer or confidential information.

Whether they can live up to the promise is a question that worries security experts.

Willis Ware of the Rand Corp., a Santa Monica, Calif., think tank, who has studied Social Security's computer system extensively, said, "It is a legitimate concern, in principle. Whether it is a legitimate concern in fact depends on how carefully Social Security equips the system with appropriate safeguards."

The the Social Security Administration's main computer contains information on anyone who has a social security number, including detailed earnings information and in some cases confidential medical information. It is tied directly to 1,300 field offices and processes 22 million transactions daily from those offices.

The computer system has numerous built-in safeguards. It tracks and records transactions so the agency can find out which employee obtained each bit of information and it strictly limits access to the records of prominent individuals.

Renato A. DiPentima, the Social Security official in charge of systems, said he has security concerns "all the
time." Asked if the agency had ever experienced a computer security breach by outsiders, he responded, "Not that we know of."

Said one expert who works on government computer systems, "That's the problem. They don't know."

Until recently, the closed system allowed access only through a dedicated telecommunications network. The system wasn't open to telephone-line access through modems, the route that hackers often use to break into computers.

Now, for the first time, the agency is using phone lines. Employees who visit remote towns and villages to meet with applicants and recipients can use inexpensive computers and modems for access by telephone into the computer. DiPentima insisted that sufficient security measures are taken to avoid problems.

He expressed confidence that the agency can allow third parties to send applications to an isolated area of the computer without giving them access to the rest of the system. The applications would be reviewed by Social Security employees, who would then move them into the main system.

Computer experts agree that such a system is possible without jeopardizing security. But, they said it is another, more complicated matter to give third parties limited access to information about claims and claimants, a step that agency officials acknowledge may be taken.

"You are opening Pandora's Box," said Evan Hendricks, editor of Privacy Times, a Washington newsletter. "There is no controversy at all that the right kind of hacker could exploit that system."

Distributed by the Los Angeles Times-Washington Post News Service
By GERRY BRAUN
Staff Writer

Contending widespread voter fraud robbed him of a U.S. Senate seat, Rep. Michael Huffington yesterday said he still hopes to defeat Democratic opponent Diane Feinstein, but he first must persuade the GOP-controlled Senate to overturn his narrow election loss and order a rematch.

Huffington said a volunteer "task force" is canvassing the state door by door and compiling examples of voter misconduct that, all told, 'could eclipse the 160,000 votes that separated him and Feinstein on Nov. 8. He said he's not funding the effort, which he described as bipartisan.

California election officials, among them acting Secretary of State Tony Miller, have dismissed Huffington's allegations as overblown, saying actual incidents of voter fraud are exceedingly rare. But the Santa Barbara Republican said he won't concede his loss to Feinstein until all the evidence is in.

"We're finding out daily that new things are coming in where people either are illegal citizens who are voting, they've moved and they're voting in the wrong place, we have boarded-up shacks where people say they live, we have people voting in vacant parking lots," Huffington said last night on CNN's "Larry King Live" call-in talk show.

Huffington said all he wants is "to have all the evidence. When we have it, we will present it to the Senate and, if it's so overwhelming, I would hope we would have a new election.

"I would ask for a new election for the simple reason that citizens of the state of California who are legally entitled to vote should not have their votes countermanded by either illegal citizens or those who are not legally voting."

Huffington said only six votes per precinct could have tipped the election in Feinstein's favor. He was not asked, nor did he explain, why he assumes the illegal votes went to his opponent.

However, he did link the fact that Feinstein outpolled him in the late absentee ballots with his belief that many late-absentee voters were illegal immigrants who

See Huffington on Page A-4
Stick together on Bosnia

Bihac will not determine the war’s outcome

Western attempts to stop the Serbian advance on the Bosnian town of Bihac have been futile. Secretary of Defense William Perry said it plainly enough: “Air strikes cannot determine the outcome of the ground combat.”

But Bihac will not determine the fate of Bosnia, whose prospects for survival are still good, particularly since the alliance with Croatia was signed. If Bosnia survives, the role played by the United Nations and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization will have been crucial.

Too much is being made of allied differences over Bihac. New Senate leader Bob Dole, setting off for a trip to Brussels to tell NATO what he thinks, set off a firestorm Sunday by accusing Britain and France of blocking NATO air strikes against Serbs around Bihac.

The criticism drew justified responses from Britain and France, both with large peacekeeping forces in Bosnia. “It ill become people in countries who have not provided a single soldier on the ground to make that kind of criticism,” said British Defense Secretary Malcolm Rifkind.

French Foreign Minister Alain Juppé accused Washington of encouraging the Bosnian offensive from Bihac, an accusationlevelled by the United States earlier.

The Bosnian government took a gamble at Bihac, an isolated pocket cut off from central Bosnia and designated a safe area by the U.N. NATO has promised to protect designated safe areas — mostly cities within central Bosnia — with air power.

In launching an offensive from Bihac against the Serbs last month, the Bosnian government clearly put at risk Bihac’s status. The gamble was that NATO air power would not be used to stop the government’s offensive, but would be used to stop a Serb counter-offensive.

It was an attempt to bring NATO into the war as a belligerent, and it failed. No NATO member has expressed any desire to become a belligerent in this war.

The war has produced strong evidence that the Bosnian Serbs cannot destroy Bosnia as an independent state, and growing evidence that the Bosnian Serbs are isolated, including from Belgrade.

That is a basis for negotiations. The course the United Nations and NATO are on is the right course, and it should be maintained.

Why GATT is good

Congressional delegation’s would unite

California’s export-oriented economy stands to benefit enormously from congressional approval of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

That is why California’s lawmakers should be united in their support of the trade pact, which is on today in the House and by week’s end in the Senate. Regrettably, however, backing for the measure among San Diego County’s five-member delegation in the House is far from unanimous.

Only Rep. Ron Packard, R-Oceanside, is solidly committed to the treaty, whose reduced tariffs would save U.S. families thousands of dollars in lower consumer prices.


Hunter, Filner and Schenk all voted against the North American Free Trade Agreement, which has proved to be a stunning success story for this region.

In the first eight months after NAFTA’s implementation, California’s exports to Mexico increased by 13.5 percent. The surge in cross-border trade has been a particular plus for San Diego’s sluggish economy.

The new GATT accord would be an even bigger boon to the state and local economies, because it would bring about a 50 percent reduction in tariffs on many goods and services. The lowering of tariffs would enable U.S. products to penetrate world markets like never before.

In short, San Diego’s congressional delegation should support the global trade pact because it would benefit San Diegans.