

Oseola McCarty. Ms. McCarty, of Hattiesburg, has spent her life as a laundress. Due to her compassionate nature, she quit school in the sixth grade to take care of her ill aunt who was unable to take care of herself. At that time she began to wash and iron clothes for people in the Hattiesburg community and began to put money in the bank, dollar by dollar. But she was not thinking of herself. She only took one vacation as a young woman to Niagara Falls and, despite the heat of summer in Mississippi, she just recently purchased a window air-conditioning unit for the home she has lived in for most of her life. She only made the purchase at the insistence of her friends at the bank.

She is no longer able to iron clothes due to her arthritis, but she has given the University of Southern Mississippi \$150,000 in order to set up a scholarship for needy black students in her name so someone will have the education she had to give up. She made the statement, "I just want it to go to someone who will appreciate it and learn. I'm old and I'm not going to live always." She gave 60 percent of her savings to the university near her home. The business community in Hattiesburg is overwhelmed with her generosity and has come together to match her donation. Ms. Oseola McCarty has been recognized by local and national media alike, and I am proud to have this opportunity to share this remarkable story of generosity with everyone here today.

Not only should we commend Ms. McCarty, but also her community. At this time of budget cuts and welfare reform, we should use the people of Hattiesburg as a model for our future. Yes, it is going to be tough to bring our Nation to fiscal order, but if we all pool our efforts we can do great things for those who need help. Ms. McCarty lived a frugal existence so that she could give to others. What a wonderful example for us all.

#### THE PEACE INITIATIVE IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise today both to congratulate the Clinton administration for having taken the lead in the search for peace in the former Yugoslavia and, at the same time, to offer words of caution, even warning.

Mr. President, Benjamin Franklin once wrote, "There never was a good war or a bad peace." These sentiments are indeed seductive, for no one who has seen the carnage of war could wish for anything more fervently than an end to the bloodletting.

Yet, for all his wisdom, Franklin was ultimately wrong. There are good wars. The American Revolution that gave birth to our country was but one example. And there are bad peace settlements. Most historians agree that the Versailles Treaty that ended World War I was fatally flawed and was one of

the fundamental causes of World War II.

The point obviously is that a good, sensible peace settlement that eliminates the root causes of conflict—or at least ameliorates the worst injustices—can prevent future war.

Conversely, a peace settlement unduly influenced by important, but secondary considerations such as perceived world opinion, a passionate yearning for an end to hostilities, or deference to sensibilities of allies or even enemies, all at the expense of hard realities, will only temporarily halt the fighting and postpone the attainment of a lasting peace.

Mr. President, it is profoundly unfortunate that for more than 4 years, two administrations abdicated this country's leadership in solving Europe's bloodiest crisis since 1945.

The dismal series of broken promises, aborted cease-fires, and ongoing atrocities in the former Yugoslavia attests to the stark fact that unless the United States takes the lead, no foreign and security problem will be solved in Europe. I do not say this to brag; this is a simple fact echoed by many Europeans.

So I applaud President Clinton for having broken the Balkan logjam this summer through an energetic combination of military action and diplomacy.

Let us recall, however, that in this effort we have paid a grievous price. I take this opportunity to pay tribute to the memory of three immensely talented and patriotic Americans—Joseph Kruzel, Robert Frasure, and Nelson Drew—who last month gave their lives on the Mount Igman Road near Sarajevo in the pursuit of peace.

And now, thanks to the efforts of these men, and to the labors of Assistant Secretary of State Richard Holbrooke and his new team, we are on the brink of another Bosnian cease-fire. This one is being praised:

For having secured a promised withdrawal of Bosnian Serb heavy weapons around Sarajevo and for opening land and air routes into the city—in return for a halt in the NATO bombing campaign.

For thereby having prevented a split in the Atlantic Alliance that reportedly was developing because of the bombing campaign.

For having put a stop to a potentially dangerous confrontation with Russia.

For allowing a framework for a peace settlement to be fleshed out.

And yet, Mr. President, despite the apparent merits of this agreement and of the peace framework, I am worried.

I am worried precisely because I fear that too much attention has been given to secondary considerations at the expense of primary ones.

I am worried because fundamental principles appear to have been sacrificed for short-term gain.

In other words, I am worried that we may be seeing the beginnings of what Benjamin Franklin could not envis-

age—a bad peace that will inevitably lead to another bad war.

More specifically, I am worried that Assistant Secretary Holbrooke has misjudged the character of the Serbian strongman Milosevic and has unnecessarily and unwisely involved, or even considered involving, Russian troops in the most delicate aspect of the proposed agreement.

Finally, I fear that the administration has seriously overestimated the willingness of this Congress to support the emerging settlement with massive development aid and the commitment of American troops to the former Yugoslavia as peacekeepers.

The joint statement issued on September 8, in Geneva, despite vigorous denials by Assistant Secretary Holbrooke, manifestly abandons the ideal of a multiethnic, multireligious, democratic Bosnia.

Instead, the so-called Republika Srpska, of Karadzic and Mladic—two indicted war criminals—is accorded status equal to the legitimate Government of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, whose territory must be divided between the Pale Serbs and the Moslem-Croat federation. This, Mr. President, is a huge concession.

And what is gotten in return? The Bosnian Serbs agree to only 49 percent of the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina. This acceptance has been trumpeted as a major concession on their part, usually described as sacrificing one-third of the territory they currently occupy.

In actuality, however, it has been weeks since the Bosnian Serbs have controlled 70 percent of Bosnia and Herzegovina despite the persistence of the media in erroneously describing it as such.

At the time of the Geneva signing they controlled perhaps 62 percent; this week they lost another 6 or 7 percent.

In short, Mr. President, the military fortunes of the Bosnian Serbs have been on the wane. The NATO bombing campaign has contributed marginally to their difficulties by disrupting their communications, but the Bosnian Serbs' problems run much deeper.

The Serbs' capture of the supposedly safe U.N. areas of Srebrenica and Zepa in July was actually a desperate gamble by General Mladic and his Serbian patron Milosevic to halt their military reverses. The Bosnian Serb Army is outmanned and is plagued by rapidly sinking morale. In the west and north it has lost allies with the ouster of the Krajina Serbs by the Croatian Army.

The Bosnian Serb Army retains a strong base in Eastern Bosnia and, of course, the capability to indulge in its favorite maneuver, lobbying artillery and mortar shells at defenseless civilians, as shown by the latest massacre in the Sarajevo market.

So it is highly probable that within the near future the situation on the ground would have dictated a willingness of the Bosnian Serbs to sue for

peace—without our offering the formal recognition which they have craved for so long.

Now we face the prospect of a recognized, ethnically cleansed Bosnian Serb entity in a shotgun marriage with the part of Bosnia and Herzegovina that is struggling to maintain the ideals of multiethnic tolerance and compromise. Can one blame the citizens of Sarajevo, Moslems, Croats, Serbs, Jews, and other nationalities, for feeling betrayed?

What is the lesson that other potential ethnic cleansers will learn from this carve-up?

Assistant Secretary Holbrooke was quoted in the *New York Times* as worrying about the implementation of the details of this strange and contradictory government structure. And well he should worry. But it is the violence done to fundamental principles of decency and democracy that is the real tragedy, not how the mugging is accomplished.

In conceiving both the peace framework and the latest cease-fire, Assistant Secretary Holbrooke has relied on Milosevic to deliver. According to the same *New York Times* article, Mr. Holbrooke praised the Serbian strongman as a peacemaker.

Mr. Holbrooke is, of course, entitled to his opinion, which is no doubt well-informed. However, I also have dealt personally with Mr. Milosevic, and I much prefer the portrayal of him given by our former Ambassador to Yugoslavia, Warren Zimmerman: A habitual liar who condoned and organized unspeakable atrocities.

Mr. President, these are not just harmless differences of opinion. Rather, they impact directly on the chances for the cease-fire and the peace settlement succeeding.

Because I consider Milosevic to be a liar and a war criminal, I am not at all surprised that he has continued to support the Bosnian Serbs with weapons, training, and vital infrastructural assistance—even during the NATO bombing campaign of the last 2 weeks—all the while assuring us that he has abandoned Karadzic and the Bosnian Serbs in Pale.

I would ask, what is the next step? Are we to reward Milosevic's brazen duplicity with further sanctions of relief for Serbia?

Assistant Secretary Holbrooke was quoted as saying that we did not sell out the Bosnian Moslems. "They wanted this agreement," he assured the *New York Times*. "They knew this was a good deal."

Well, I hope so, but pardon my skepticism. Other than having to abandon their ideal of a unitary, multiethnic State, the Moslem-led Bosnian Government has had to put up with criticism this past week for having had the nerve to launch an offensive with their Bosnian Croat allies to try to liberate parts of western Bosnia that were ethnically cleansed of Moslems and Croats in 1992.

And we certainly do not want to offend the Russians. These are the people who this week accused NATO of genocide for its bombing campaign specifically targeted to avoid civilian areas, even when it meant sparing legitimate military targets.

Other than desecrating the memory of millions of people who really did die as a result of genocide, the Russians with their apoplectic rhetoric and big lie techniques make even the most well-disposed American wonder if much has changed since the bad, old days of Soviet rule in the Kremlin.

So what do we do? If one is to believe press reports, we contemplate a deal that puts Russian forces around Sarajevo to enforce the withdrawal of the Bosnian Serbs' heavy weapons.

This would be a master stroke! We would now put the fate of the long-suffering citizens of the Bosnian capital in the hands of people for whom Bosnian Serb war crimes are allegedly part of a people's struggle for existence.

Suppose, just suppose, that the unthinkable happens and the Bosnian Serbs cheat on the deal and the Russians back them up. Now instead of having the option of resuming the bombing of the Bosnian Serbs, we would have to worry about hitting Russian soldiers.

Mr. President, this reported part of the deal is so incredible that at first I could only believe that it was some sort of a trial balloon. This morning the White House told my staff that it may have been a deliberate piece of disinformation by the Russians. I hope so, because the idea is a nonstarter.

What is the role of Congress in this peace process? In order to cement the bargain the Congress apparently will be asked to pony up half-a-billion dollars as a downpayment on an even larger aid package to follow.

And, as the final stroke, we will be asked to send American soldiers to Bosnia and Herzegovina as apartheid cops to enforce the destruction of the unitary, multiethnic State.

Well this Senator is frankly revolted at the whole thing. Will we be asked to bankroll the fiefdom of the war criminals Mladic and Karadzic who orchestrated vile ethnic cleansing, mass rapes, and mass murder all across Bosnia?

Moreover, now that our pilots have bombed the Bosnian Serbs—as they rightfully have done—does anyone seriously think that Americans would be treated by the Bosnian Serbs as just any old neutral peacekeepers?

Mr. President, I realize that Mr. Holbrooke and his team have worked long and hard and in good faith. I also understand that we are describing work in progress.

But let these concerns that I have raised today be viewed unambiguously as a shot across the bow of the administration's Bosnian peace flotilla: Do not come to Congress with a bad peace to end a bad war.

It has not worked in the past. It cannot work in the future. And Congress, I

am confident, will not approve it this time.

#### FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE STAFF REPORT ON TURKEY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, during the August recess two members of the Foreign Relations Committee minority staff traveled to Turkey at my direction to assess a range of issues related to United States-Turkish bilateral relations. Turkey, one of the largest recipients of United States military assistance, is an important United States ally in a dangerous and unstable region. It is therefore, incumbent upon us to take a close look at what is occurring in Turkey—the threats to its security, its political struggles, and its human rights situation. In particular, I asked my staff to focus on Turkey's Kurdish problem, which has broad implications for regional stability, as well as Turkey's relations with the West.

Among the staff's findings is that the Kurdistan Workers' Party [PKK] poses a grave threat not only to Turkey, but to regional stability as well. At the same time, the Government of Turkey is unable—or unwilling—to distinguish the genuine threat posed by the PKK from the legitimate rights and aspirations of the Kurdish people. Turkey is responding with a heavy-handed, indiscriminate military campaign against the Kurds, even as it shuts off opportunities for nonviolent, Kurdish political expression. Consequently, Turkey may be fomenting, rather than preventing Kurdish separatism.

I believe this report makes an important contribution to the Congress' consideration of the United States approach toward Turkey. I ask unanimous consent that the "Summary of Key Findings" be placed into the RECORD at this point, and would commend the full report, which is available at the Foreign Relations Committee office, to my colleagues' attention.

#### SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

Turkey, which places a high priority on good relations with the West in general and the United States in particular, is an important U.S. ally in a dangerous and unstable neighborhood: Three of its immediate neighbors—Iran, Iraq, and Syria—are on the U.S. list of state sponsors of terrorism; it is engaged in an economic and political competition with Russia for influence in and access to the resources of Central Asia and the Caucasus; there is ongoing conflict to Turkey's north—in Georgia and between Armenia and Azerbaijan. Turkey is not, however, a disinterested in neutral party, it is openly sympathetic to Azerbaijan's position, and although it has opened an air corridor to Armenia, Turkey maintains a road and rail blockade; it continues to spar with Greece over Cyprus and other issues, in particular, a dispute over maritime boundaries in the wake of Greece's ratification of the Law of the Sea treaty threatens to bring Turkey and Greece into outright conflict.

The Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK) poses a grave threat not only to Turkey, but to regional stability as well. The PKK—which employs deadly terrorist tactics against innocent noncombatants in Turkey and