

clear forces from acting against our vital interests and to convince it that seeking a nuclear advantage would be futile. In this regard, I consider the maintenance of a safe and reliable nuclear stockpile to be a supreme national interest of the United States.

I am assured by the Secretary of Energy and the Directors of our nuclear weapons labs that we can meet the challenge of maintaining our nuclear deterrent under a CTBT through a Science Based Stockpile Stewardship program without nuclear testing. I directed the implementation of such a program almost 2 years ago, and it is being developed with the support of the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This program will now be tied to a new certification procedure. In order for this program to succeed, both the administration and the Congress must provide sustained bipartisan support for the stockpile stewardship program over the next decade and beyond. I am committed to working with the Congress to ensure this support.

While I am optimistic that the stockpile stewardship program will be successful, as President I cannot dismiss the possibility, however unlikely, that the program will fall short of its objectives. Therefore, in addition to the new annual certification procedure for our nuclear weapons stockpile, I am also establishing concrete, specific safeguards that define the conditions under which the United States can enter into a CTBT.

In the event that I were informed by the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of Energy—advised by the Nuclear Weapons Council, the Directors of DOE's nuclear weapons laboratories, and the Commander of U.S. Strategic

Command—that a high level of confidence in the safety or reliability of a nuclear weapons type which the two Secretaries consider to be critical to our nuclear deterrent could no longer be certified, I would be prepared, in consultation with Congress, to exercise our “supreme national interests” rights under the CTBT in order to conduct whatever testing might be required. Exercising this right, however, is a decision I believe I or any future President will not have to make. The nuclear weapons in the United States arsenal are safe and reliable, and I am determined our stockpile stewardship program will ensure they remain so in the absence of nuclear testing.

I recognize that our present monitoring systems will not detect with high confidence very low yield tests. Therefore, I am committed to pursuing a comprehensive research and development program to improve our treaty monitoring capabilities and operations.

Thirty-two years ago, President Kennedy called the completion of the Limited Test Ban Treaty in Moscow a “shaft of light cut into the darkness” of the cold war. With it, he said, the Nation could “step back from the shadows of war and seek out the way of peace.” We did, and the world is a safer place because of it. I believe that we are ready to take the next step and lead the world to a comprehensive test ban. This would be a fitting tribute to all those, Republicans and Democrats, who have worked for a CTBT over the past four decades.

NOTE: A fact sheet on arms control and non-proliferation and a fact sheet on comprehensive test ban treaty safeguards were attached to the statement.

## Statement on Vetoing Legislation To Lift the Arms Embargo Against Bosnia

*August 11, 1995*

I am announcing today my decision to veto legislation that would unilaterally lift the arms embargo against Bosnia and Herzegovina.

I know that Members of Congress share my goals of reducing the violence in Bosnia and working to end the war. But their vote to unilaterally lift the arms embargo is the wrong step

at the wrong time. The American people should understand the consequences of such action for our Nation and for the people of Bosnia.

- First, our allies have made clear that they will withdraw their troops from Bosnia if the United States unilaterally lifts the arms embargo. The United States, as the leader

of the NATO Alliance, would be obliged to send thousands of American ground troops to assist in that difficult operation.

- Second, lifting the embargo now could cause the fighting in Bosnia to escalate. The Serbs will not delay their assaults while the Bosnian Government receives new arms and training. Getting humanitarian aid to civilians will only get harder.
- Third, unilaterally lifting the embargo will lead to unilateral American responsibility. If the Bosnian Government suffered reverses on the battlefield, we, and not the Europeans, would be expected to fill the void with military and humanitarian aid.
- Fourth, intensified fighting in Bosnia would risk provoking a wider war in the heart of Europe.
- Fifth, for this bill to become law now would undercut the new diplomatic effort we are currently engaged in, and withdrawal of the United Nations mission would virtually eliminate chances for a peaceful, negotiated settlement in the foreseeable future.
- Finally, unilateral lift would create serious divisions between the United States and its key allies, with potential long-lasting damage to the NATO Alliance.

This is an important moment in Bosnia. Events in the past few weeks have opened new possibilities for negotiations. We will test these new realities, and we are now engaged with our allies and others in using these opportunities to settle this terrible war by agreement. This is not the time for the United States to pull the plug on the U.N. mission.

There is no question that we must take strong action in Bosnia. In recent weeks, the war has intensified. The Serbs have brutally assaulted three of the United Nations safe areas. Witnesses report widespread atrocities: summary executions, systematic rape, and renewed ethnic cleansing in Bosnia. Tens of thousands of inno-

cent women and children have fled their homes. And now the Croatian army offensive has created new dangers and dramatically increased the need for humanitarian aid to deal with displaced citizens in the region. But these events also create opportunities.

Along with our allies we have taken a series of strong steps to strengthen the United Nations mission, to prevent further attacks on safe areas, and to protect innocent civilians:

- NATO has decided it will counter an assault on the remaining safe areas with sustained and decisive use of air power. Our response will be broad, swift, and severe, going far beyond the narrow attacks of the past.
- For the first time, military commanders on the ground in Bosnia have been given operational control over such actions, paving the way for fast and effective NATO response.
- And well-armed British and French troops are working to ensure access to Sarajevo for convoys carrying food, medicine, and other vital supplies.

Despite these actions, many in Congress are ready to close the books on the U.N. mission. But I am not—not as long as that mission is willing and able to be a force for peace once again.

I recognize that there is no risk-free way ahead in Bosnia. But unilaterally lifting the arms embargo will have the opposite effects of what its supporters intend. It would intensify the fighting, jeopardize diplomacy, and make the outcome of the war in Bosnia an American responsibility.

Instead, we must work with our allies to protect innocent civilians, to strengthen the United Nations mission, to bring NATO's military power to bear if our warnings are defied, and to aggressively pursue the only path that will end the conflict, one that leads to a negotiated peace.