

The current scholarly debate over the Armenian deaths focuses on three principal sources of evidence: the memoirs of Henry Morgenthau, who was the United States Ambassador to Turkey from 1913 to 1916; a remark that Hitler reportedly made in 1939, and cable traffic and other messages from German diplomats stationed in Turkey during World War I.

Vahakn N. Dadrian, a sociologist who wrote "The History of the Armenian Genocide" (Berghahn Books, Providence, 1995), said that Ambassador Morgenthau's memoirs—published in 1918—provided "conclusive proof" that the Turks committed genocide.

"Morgenthau reported that when he complained to top Turkish leaders about reports that women, children and old people were being marched into the desert to be killed," Professor Dadrian said, "he was told: 'We can't make distinctions. Those who are not guilty today will oppose us in the future.'"

But Professor Lowry counters that official records he discovered show that Robert Lansing, the Secretary of State then, rewrote parts of the memoirs, and that the book—long considered a standard in the annals of diplomatic history—is filled with "outright lies and half-truths". His findings were published in 1990 by an academic press in Istanbul.

The remark by Hitler is another matter of contention among scholars. He is reported to have said in a private meeting with SS chiefs at Obersalzberg, on the eve of the invasion of Poland: "Be merciless in exterminating Polish men, women and children. Who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians?"

Professor Lifton said the quotation not only confirms the genocide of the Armenians but indicates that "if you don't confront genocide, the next group inclined toward it can see itself as carrying out the genocide with impunity."

Professor Lowry said he believes the Hitler quote is probably apocryphal and has been used to establish a false link between the tragic history of the Turkish Armenians and the Holocaust a generation later.

"The Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal discarded this version of Hitler's speech and relied instead on a version which does not contain any reference to the Armenians," he said.

The third source of evidence, German diplomatic traffic reporting the Armenian massacres, is considered particularly important by scholars, because Turkey was a German ally in the World War I and because in their confidential reports to Berlin, the German diplomats had no discernible reason to falsify what they saw.

Roger W. Smith, a professor of government at the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Va., who specializes in genocide studies, said the German cable traffic proves that the deaths were genocide.

In an interview, he said, "Hans Wengert, the German Ambassador to Turkey, reported to Berlin in July 1915 that the Turkish Government 'is really pursuing the aim of destroying the Armenian race.'"

Professor Lowry said he still needed to be persuaded. "If this material and newly available archives from Russia, the Ottoman Empire and the various Armenian revolutionary organizations, points to genocide as an accurate description of what actually took place," he said, "I'll be the first to use the word."

#### NO BRIDGE TOO FAR

Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized

for 30 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I signed up for 60 minutes, but my colleague from the beautiful adjoining Southern California district to the south, which has some of the most beautiful surf in the Nation, I am landlocked, Mr. DANA ROHRBACHER, will follow me. I gladly gave him 30 minutes of my time. He has some very important things upon which he will report to his district, the Nation, the Members of this House, all through you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I just left Speaker NEWT GINGRICH's office, and he told us earlier that if he got 235 signatures on a letter to Mr. Clinton asking him in the name of duty, honor and country, to remove from his legal pleadings to get out of giving Paula Corbin Jones, the young lady who is claiming sexual harassment, alleging a case of something beyond sexual harassment, at the high end of it, that category where it is a crime, that he not have to give her her day in court, that he not appear in court, because, among many other frivolous reasons, that he should be considered an active duty military officer as the Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States.

He refers to a not obscure, but not often used, act of this Congress in 1940, and it is called the Soldiers and Sailors Relief Act of 1940, and that is what he is claiming through his lawyer, Bob Bennett, that is a Republican activist and good friend of mine, Bill Bennett's older brother, that Bob Bennett, the principal lawyer on what some people in the press are calling Clinton's dream team, hoping for the same impossible outcome as killer O.J. Simpson got, that they are claiming this 1940 act.

Back to Speaker GINGRICH. He said you get 236, of course I will be on there, make it unanimous. Well, the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. BOB STUMP, who is the point man on this, I am flying tight wing on World War II veteran BOB STUMP, combat veteran, so this Korean peacetime fighter pilot is right there with him, and in two days we got all 235 signatures. I just left NEWT GINGRICH's office. He is 236. We picked up a couple of veterans on the Democrat side of the aisle, and we are off and running with 238 signatures.

I will read the letter, in a moment when it arrives, to the President, or the press release. The letter will be finally constructed tomorrow, delivered to the White House tomorrow afternoon, on this Memorial Day weekend, asking Mr. Clinton and company to take that example of a pleading out of his case, to delay until 1997 Paula Corbin's day in court, or if he were to win a second term, to delay it until the next century, 2001 is when Mr. Clinton would leave office, at noon on January 20 if he gets a second term, and then Paula Corbin Jones can have her day in court.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you, who was one of the first signers of the letter out of 238, I think you might have been so

busy today, you missed the inimitable Maureen Dowd, her column in the New York Times, America's paper of record. All the news that fits—I mean all the news that is fit to print. That was not deliberate. I have said it the other way so often that I did not mean to do that. All the news that is fit to print.

Maureen Dowd was going to title her column on Mr. Clinton "Hiding Behind the Soldiers and Sailors Relief Act of 1940," and I will explain that in some brief detail, what it is and what it is not. It involves only civil cases, by the way, not criminal charges. It does not cover sexual harassment. But Maureen Dowd told me she was going to call her column "Sergeant Bilk." I said well, I would have called it "No Bridge Too Far." Cross my heart, that is what I said, Mr. Speaker, right in that Speaker's lobby. And guess what she calls her column? "No Bridge Too Far."

Above her name, which appears because she would be one of their senior columnists, above her own name Maureen Dowd appears "Liberties." It is kind of a top headline. And then a subject-headline says, I can hear the music, "He's in the Army now." And here is her column, dateline "Washington." That is where Maureen Dowd covers the whole wild scene inside the Beltway, from right here in the arena listening to the screams of the Christians and the roars of the lions.

She says, "As A society, we haven't preserved our sense of shame." Billy Graham signed off on that on May 2 in the rotunda.

□ 1630

We have not preserved our sense of shame. "But Bill Clinton is doing his best", his best—

To preserve our sense of shamelessness.

The President and his Rasputin, Dick Morris, have broken creative new ground in brazenness.

First they snatch Republican positions counting, not unreasonably, on the forgetfulness of voters and the expediency of Democrats who want their Republican in the White House to win. And now they are both embroiled in kerfuffles on Capitol Hill, where it takes a lot to be called shameless.

At my age, Mr. Speaker, when I come across a new word, it is a thrill. When I was a young college kid I used to read a Bill Buckley column and find five words I did not know. I now know that Bill Buckley and I are peers because I have not read a column of his in at least 2 years where I have not known every word in the column, but this one is a new one.

Mr. ROHRBACHER, would you do me a favor? As you prepare your succinct remarks and trenchant comments for tonight, would you go to the big dictionary and look up this word, K-E-R-F-U-F-F-L-E-S, kerfuffles. That is what Maureen Dowd says, and I will read this sentence again. I love to learn a new word, "And now they are both embroiled." the President and his people on the other side of the aisle, "in kerfuffles on Capitol Hill, where it takes a lot to be called shameless."

"In a move that marks a new level of chutzpah in American politics, Mr. Clinton's lawyers mentioned in their appeal to the Supreme Court", this is the Supreme Court across the street there on the east side of this beautiful Capitol Hill, Mr. Speaker, "on Paula Corbin Jones's sexual harassment suit that the President may be protected by the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, which was designed to give American troops some protection from civil suits while on active duty."

And if people wonder why that is 1940 instead of 1941 or 1942, remember, Mr. Speaker, that in this Chamber, in August of 1941, the draft, which had been in existence for a year, was saved by one vote in this Chamber. It past a little more comfortably in the Senate. And it was because we were taking young men off the farms and out of high schools and colleges and putting them in the military. No one could foreclose on their home or hit them with a civil suit while they were on active duty and pretty soon about to face the Japanese warlord's treachery at Pearl Harbor.

Mr. BONO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORNAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BONO. It appears from your dialogue here that you are rather emotional about an issue, and I may be going the wrong way, and I certainly do not want to go against a colleague, but I thought it would be a nice gesture on our part to collect funds and buy a flak jacket for the President.

I just want to make sure that that is not offensive to the line of dialog that you are using here.

Mr. DORNAN. Well, you made a credible case earlier to me on the floor, not just in humor, that if he pursued this and got a finding of the Supreme Court that he truly was on active duty, at our press conference, one of the press, Less Consolving, of a local radio station, I think he is syndicated, said, "Does that mean he would have to test for HIV?" HENRY HYDE, our distinguished colleague and chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, said maybe he would have to go through boot camp. An abbreviated one, to be sure. And imagine him on active duty and all the repercussions and fallout from that.

Mr. BONO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DORNAN. I have just been joined by Mr. BOB STUMP. I wish you would take that microphone, chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. BOB STUMP has brought to me NEWT GINGRICH'S signature. That makes it 236. SUSAN MOLINARI called in from crib side with her brand new baby.

Mr. STUMP. Yes.

Mr. DORNAN. I remember the baby's middle name, Ruby. I forget the first name. Maybe it is Susan Ruby Paxon. So that makes it 236. So it is official.

Let me just thank you, Mr. Chairman, and if you would tell us briefly why you as a World War II veteran find

this the bizarrest of stretches, or as Maureen Dowd put it, "No Bridge Too Far", that Clinton's pleadings in the Supreme Court on the Paul Corbin Jones case is offensive to you a veteran.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. DORNAN, let me just thank you for all your hard work on this, and the reason we got so involved in this, it is so offensive to anyone that has ever worn the uniform of the United States services. The fact that this man that said one time that he did not like the military and now he is trying to hide behind the service of the military is incredible.

So I just want to thank you, and the Speaker signing that letter now makes, and I thank we are waiting for one person to call in from the airport that we somehow happened to miss, but that is 236.

Mr. BONO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORNAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BONO. I would like to enter into a question and answer process, if I may, with you for a second.

I am baffled. You would assume that the President of the United States and what he does would be considered news, especially if you are a newspaper. Would that be a correct assumption?

Mr. DORNAN. Absolutely.

Mr. BONO. Do you find it interesting that a President who has now stated that he is in the military and is using that for a defense and, therefore, should not be brought before any justice system while he is in the military, is only reported, and I get three papers, but it was only reported in the Times.

I am just curious, and perhaps you have the answer, why would not the Post and the Gannett paper give us that story? It is impossible that they would be embarrassed to relate such a story, is it not?

Mr. DORNAN. Well, at our press conference, two reporters began to argue, I do not like debates at press conferences, that it was only an example. They asked who had read it. Well, Mr. STUMP of Arizona had read the Bennett part of their pleadings, I had, and it was more than an example. It was a hint to the judge that we will put this in formal language if you will go this far with this.

And I think the answer to your question is buried in the fact that in a recent poll 91 percent of the elite news media, New York, Hollywood, all the major papers, and all the major papers here except the Washington Times, 91 percent said they voted for Clinton over George Bush. So that is the reason.

I tell you what, I have here the one paper, the great Washington Times, that has driven the story. I see they have a lead editorial that says "Bill Clinton Military Man?"

So let me finish Maureen Dowd's column, stay right where you are, if you have the time. Mr. ROHRBACHER looked up the word in this big diction-

ary and kerfuffles is not in the dictionary. So I will ask Maureen if she is using a British dictionary. That one is so old, though, it still has sodomy in it and does not have homophobia, so maybe it has not been updated.

But here is the rest of Maureen Dowd's column, and then I will read the lead editorial in today's Washington Times.

She says, and I will go back one sentence.

In a move that marks a new level of chutzpah in American politics, Clinton's lawyers mentioned in their appeal to the Supreme Court on Paul Corbin Jones's sexual harassment suit that the President may be protected by the aforementioned act of 1940, which was designed to give American troops some protection from civil suits while on active duty.

President Clinton here thus seeks, these are the exact words of Bob Bennett,

President Clinton here thus seeks relief similar to that which he may be entitled as Commander in Chief of the armed forces, and which is routinely available to service members under his command. Not for criminal action.

Robert Bennett, the President's lawyer, said he had only cited the act as an example that might extend to the Commander in Chief, not as his main argument. But Mr. Bennett is getting paid too much money to make the hideous mistake of reminding the public of one of Mr. Clinton's improvidences—his maneuvering on the draft—in defense of another—his wandering eye.

Some veterans groups and BOB STUMP, the Arizona Republican who is chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and I would add for Maureen, since she spoke to me, the chairman of military personnel subcommittee, myself, did not care for Mr. Clinton's opportunistic enlistment—Hello sailor.

Mr. STUMP is sending the President a letter signed by 170 Republicans, addendum, 236, the entire conference plus two Democrats, asking him to withdraw his "ignoble suggestion", that is from our letter, from the brief. Quoting from our letter:

The Founding Fathers wanted to enshrine the principle of civilian control of the military in the Constitution and did so by making the President the civilian Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces.

And the same for the Secretary of War, now called the Secretary of Defense, and the three service secretaries, Navy taking care of the Marine Corps. All of them are civilians, and civilians rule in this great land. And that is what makes us unique in all of American history, Mr. Speaker.

Maureen continues from our letter "You are not" italicized, "a person in military service nor have you ever been."

Also in the President's mailbag is a letter from Republican Congresswomen: Our troops here of about 8 had a press conference yesterday, demanding that Dick Morris, otherwise referred to as Rasputin, be fired for doing

jury duty polling, jury duty polling, for Alex Kelly of Darien, CT, the unsavory teenage burglar who fled the country after he was accused of raping two young girls. He was a fugitive in Europe for 8 years living the posh life of a ski bum while his parents supported him.—Family values.

It is the worst thing an adviser to the President could be doing at this time when crime and crimes against women are such a deep concern to the American people, wrote Representative JENNIFER DUNN on our side of the aisle.

The Republican women are attempting to spruce up Mr. DOLE gender-wise, but they have a good feminist point. Ordinarily, in a case like this, the Democratic women would be yelping, but there was only the occasional brave mutter. Representative NITA LOWEY of New York, "This is beyond the pale."

One female Democratic lawmaker explained if this were a Republican President and Dick Morris was helping an accused rapist, you know we would be screaming. But it is not worth picking a fight. We just want to win in '96.

So Democrats have suppressed their distress as Mr. Morris has helped the Clintons shape-shift, when Hillary Clinton told Larry King, "There is no left wing in the Clinton White House," and when Mr. Clinton embraced the radical Wisconsin plan to abolish welfare.

Maureen Dowd, that was not a radical plan. Governor Tommy Thompson's plan is highly reasonable and it is going to sweep the Nation. That is my own, DORNAN, aside.

Maureen finishes, "Until yesterday, homosexual groups had fumed as the President slithered away from same sex marriage." What a great verb, slithered away. "But the overly eager White House announcement yesterday that Mr. Clinton would sign a law denying Federal recognition for same sex", that is homosexual, "marriages if they ever reached his desk was too much. The Human Rights Campaign", misnamed, "the largest homosexual rights group, accused the President of caving in to the right wing, and disinvited George Stephanopoulos as a dinner speaker."

And here is Maureen Dowd's closing paragraph, Mr. Speaker. "So Bill Clinton is in the Army. He's against gay marriage. His adviser did work for an alleged rapist. He moves from the left wing to the right wing because what he really believes in is the West Wing."

Mr. Speaker, unless you are one word ahead of me, we found it in the dictionary. Our hats are off to Maureen Dowd, who is becoming the next Bill Buckley. Kerfuffle is to become disheveled. Disturbance. A fuss. A mess. So now I will read that sentence.

□ 1645

And now both the White House and the Democrats in this Chamber are embroiled in kerfuffles, disheveled, disturbances on Capitol Hill, where it takes a lot to be called shameless.

Now to the Washington Times. Bill Clinton, Military Man, lead editorial.

When Bill Clinton famously declared that he loathed the military while doing his best to stay out of it, he was obviously not yet familiar with some of the fringe benefits that military service affords. But the President wants those benefits now, even though he has never spent a day in uniform, though perhaps Mr. Clinton thinks that his spiffy leather bomber jacket counts, the one with the Velcro where he puts on the First Armored Division patch and mixes it in with other visits to uniforms. Remember, Mr. Speaker, this is to be the year of Clinton posing in uniforms. Posing with Catholic schoolgirls and schoolboys in their uniforms but voting for partial birth infanticide. Posing with police officers anywhere in the country at the drop of a hat but with his own State troopers of Arkansas having condemned him for using them to procure. And now he is posing with the military at every drop of the hat. Just spoke to the Coast Guard Academy, and it is to be the year of Mr. Clinton surrounded by uniforms.

So the Washington Times continues: The benefit the President is groping for is the protection from civil litigation provided to active duty military personnel under the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act of 1940.

I will be putting in at the end of this, Mr. Speaker, Clinton's infamous disgraceful letter to Colonel Eugene Holmes, who was head of the ROTC at the University of Arkansas in 1969. He has been the head for a decade. I spoke to him last night. I will have something about his words later. Then I am going to put in Colonel Holmes' letter from September 7, 1992, which I put in the RECORD that day, the only paper in America, in America that published those two letters, the 1969 letter and the 1992 letter in their fulsome horror, could have changed the election, the only other paper in America, the only paper that put them in was this Washington Times.

So my staff will get those over to me, which I know they are working on. I will put those in at the end of this 30 minutes.

Perhaps Mr. Clinton thought that this new and audacious gambit would go unnoticed. That seems to be what his lawyer Robert Bennett was hoping: If you read the 24-page petition through the first time, you would miss it. That is what Bennett says, it hit me in the face on the first reading, the paragraph pushing the military service claim, Mr. Bennett told the Washington Times. But Mr. Clinton cannot always be that lucky. The chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs noticed the claim and has expressed his outrage as he just did here on the House floor and in a letter to the President. The commander of the American Legion is similarly nonplussed. They plan a press conference today—we had it; it was terrific—suggesting that the issue is not going to

be dispelled with the wave of Mr. Bennett's legal hand.

According to Joseph Cammarata, who together with Gilbert Davis, I have spoken to them, represents Paula Jones in her lawsuit: The President's claim is not only legally inappropriate, it is inappropriate in light of those who served and those who have died in our military over the centuries.

Perhaps if the Soldiers and Sailors Relief Act actually provided a shield to Mr. Clinton, it would have been worth it to the White House to weather the well-earned scorn now being heaped on the President.

What I said, Mr. Speaker, is he should give Robert Bennett the Johnny Cochran award. Anything that works, no matter how shameless, lying, distorted, twisted, or ignominious. But the claim is almost little more than a bad joke, suggesting that Mr. Bennett has been driven to extraordinary and desperate measures to block the discovery process. For starters, as Daniel Ludwig, national commander of the American Legion, points out, the Commander in Chief is a civilian. The President isn't subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice. He is not eligible for military retirement. His service doesn't fit the legal definition of active duty. It is bizarre that anyone would suggest the civilian President of the United States is on active duty.

I would add to that, as I did before, or Mr. William Perry, Secretary of Defense.

Back to the Times: That was certainly the ruling of the Los Angeles County superior court in Bailey versus Kennedy and Hills versus Kennedy to avoid being sued over damages from a traffic accident. President John F. Kennedy asserted that the Soldiers and Sailors Relief Act protected him as Commander in Chief. It wasn't such a moral stretch for Mr. Kennedy who, after all, had worn a Navy uniform in combat and had been wounded when his boat was cut in two by a Japanese destroyer. But it was such a legal stretch that the judge in LA denied John F. Kennedy's motion without even writing an opinion.

I just learned something reading that in the Washington Times. I didn't know John F. Kennedy had an automobile accident out there.

The President should also have consulted the Supreme Court's interpretation of the Soldiers and Sailors Relief Act in the 1943 case of Boone versus Lightner. The defendant had speculated in the market unwisely and had done so with money improperly taken from his own daughter's trust fund. When sued by the daughter, the defendant relied on the SSRA and the fact that he was a uniformed Army captain in wartime. The high court ruled the captain was not protected from litigation because he had a desk job and was himself a lawyer. Thus unlike the GI in the foxhole, he would certainly be able to make his court appearances.

The court's language is piquant, saying that charges struck at his honor as

well as his judgment. Does that sound like Paula Corbin Jones? It does to this Air Force captain, me.

The justices concluded that discretion is vested in the courts to see that the immunities of the act are not put to such an unworthy use.

I am going to remember those words. To defend yourself from a charge that you exposed yourself and offended a 23-year-old young lady who had just been hired by the State of Arkansas, by the CEO of the State of Arkansas, the Governor. When Mr. Clinton traveled in his Guard airplanes in Arkansas, he would have been called a code 2. The President of the United States is code 1 in the Coast Guard, Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine airplane, code 2 is Vice President Gore in this case, any one of our 50 Governors and any U.S. Senator or Congressman. We are all code 2. I was in an Air Force base as the air-drome officer when they said a code 4 was coming in. That would be a major general. The place turned upside down.

I had never seen a 2-star in my life. One day when they said a code 1 was coming in, I froze in fear. It was President Eisenhower. No, a code 1, excuse me, President, yes, President Eisenhower. A code 2 is pretty special. That is what the CEO is of the State of Arkansas, second only to the President in military respect.

So this is an amazing series of legal cases here, such an unworthy use in that case, whatever I said it was, Boone versus Lightner.

The Washington Times concludes: Mr. Clinton seems willing to use any ruse, however unworthy of his office it may be, to delay answering what, if anything, he was doing or trying to do in an Arkansas hotel room, second floor mezzanine, Excelsior Hotel, Little Rock, with Paula Jones. This ignoble pleading is a slap in the face of the millions of men and women who either are serving on active duty or have served on active duty in the armed forces of the United States, Mr. STUMP and Mr. DORNAN wrote in the letter to their congressional colleagues.

He concludes that the President's most recent legal maneuver makes a mockery of the laws meant to protect the honorable men and women who serve their country. True. Just stop the legal goofiness, Mr. President, the Times concludes. Raise your right hand and get on with it.

I would add, giving the young woman her day in court.

Here is my press release today, Mr. Speaker. Washington, D.C.: It is disgraceful that while the rest of the Nation is honoring our fallen heroes of military service this long Memorial Day weekend, Bill Clinton is seeking shelter behind a military he once claimed to loathe, in an attempt to delay the sexual harassment suit filed by Paula Corbin Jones. On May 15, 1996, attorneys for Mr. Clinton filed an appeal with the U.S. Supreme Court seeking to delay the sexual harassment lawsuit filed by Paula Jones, former

Arkansas State employee, under the supervision, all the way up to the top of the Arkansas pyramid, of then Governor Bill Clinton.

Lawyers for Clinton try to use the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act of 1940, passed because we were, I repeat, we were drafting young men. I repeat some of the things that Mr. STUMP and I said in the letter we circulated on the floor. Repeat again the purposes of the act. And this should be in this formal RECORD today, it is persons in the military service who are devoting their entire energy to the defense needs of the Nation, not traveling around on his two Air Force 747's campaigning and reimbursing only a first class ticket.

I will put the rest of my press release in with my closing line that he mocks his job as civilian Commander in Chief and the honorable men and women who have given their lives to the protection of this great Nation. Tomorrow I go up to Annapolis for the graduation. I spent last Friday at West Point. Believe me, we are turning out honorable men and women.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following material:

TEXT OF BILL CLINTON'S LETTER TO ROTC  
COLONEL

The text of the letter Bill Clinton wrote to Col. Eugene Holmes, director of the ROTC program at the University of Arkansas, on Dec. 3, 1989:

I am sorry to be so long in writing. I know I promised to let you hear from me at least once a month and from now on I will, but I have had to have some time to think about this first letter. Almost daily since my return from England I have thought about writing, about what I want and ought to say.

First, I want to thank you, not just for saving me from the draft, but for being so kind and decent to me last summer when I was as low as I have ever been. One thing which made the bond we struck in good faith somewhat palatable to me was my high regard for you personally. In retrospect it seems that the admiration might not have been mutual had you known a little more about me, about my political beliefs and activities. At least you might have thought me more fit for the draft than ROTC.

Let me try to explain. As you know, I worked for two years in a very minor position on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I did it for the experience and the salary but also for the opportunity, however small, of working every day against a war I opposed and despised with a depth of feeling I had reserved solely for racism in America. Before Vietnam, I did not take the matter lightly, but studied it carefully and there was a time when not many people had more information about Vietnam at hand than I did.

I have written and spoken and marched against the war. One of the national organizers of the Vietnam Moratorium is a close friend of mine. After I left Arkansas last summer, I went to Washington to work in the national headquarters of the Moratorium, then to England to organize the Americans here for demonstrations Oct. 15 and Nov. 16.

Interlocked with the war is the draft issue which I had not begun to consider separately until early 1968. For a law seminar at Georgetown I wrote a paper on the legal arguments for and against allowing the Selective Service System, the classification of se-

lective conscientious objection for those opposed to participation in a particular war, not simply participation in war in any form.

From my work I came to believe that the draft system itself was illegitimate. No government really rooted in limited parliamentary democracy should have the power to make its citizens fight and kill and die in a war they may oppose, a war which even possibly may be wrong, a war which in any case does not involve immediately the peace and freedom of the nation.

The draft was justified in World War II because the life of the people collectively was at stake. Individuals had to fight if the nation was to survive, for the lives of their countrymen and their way of life. Vietnam is no such case. Nor was Korea an example where, in my opinion, certain military action was justified, but the draft was not for reasons stated above.

Because of my opposition to the draft and the war I am in great sympathy with those who are not willing to fight, kill and maybe die for their country (i.e. the particular policy of a particular government) right or wrong. Two of my friends at Oxford are conscientious objectors. I wrote a letter of recommendation for one of them to his Mississippi draft board, a letter which I am more proud of than anything else I wrote at Oxford last year. One of my roommates is a draft resister who is possibly under indictment and may never be able to go home again. He is one of the bravest, best men I know. His country needs men like him more than they know. That he is considered a criminal is an obscenity.

The decision not to be a resister and the related subsequent decisions were the most difficult of my life. I decided to accept the draft in spite of my beliefs for one reason to maintain my political viability within the system. For years I have worked to prepare myself for a political life characterized by both practical political ability and concern for rapid social progress. It is a life I still feel compelled to try to lead. I do not think our system of government is by definition corrupt, however dangerous and inadequate it has been in recent years. (The society may be corrupt, but that is not the same thing, and if that is true, we are all finished anyway.)

When the draft came, despite political convictions, I was having a hard time facing the prospect of fighting a war I had been fighting against, and that is why I contacted you. ROTC was the one way left in which I could possibly, but not positively, avoid both Vietnam and resistance. Going on with my education, even coming back to England, played no part in my decision to join ROTC. I am back here and would have been at Arkansas Law School because there is nothing else I can do. In fact, I would like to have been able to take a year out, perhaps to teach in a small college or work in some community action project and in the process to decide whether to attend law school or graduate school and how to begin putting what I have learned to use.

But the particulars of my personal life are not nearly as important to me as the principles involved. After I signed the ROTC letter of intent, I began to wonder whether the compromise I had made with myself was not more objectionable than the draft would have been, because I had no interest in the ROTC program in itself and all I seemed to have done was protect myself from physical harm. Also, I began to think I had deceived you, not by lies—there were none—but by failing to tell you all the things I'm writing now. I doubt that I had the mental coherence to articulate then.

At that time, after we had made our agreement and you had sent my ID deferment to

my draft board, the anguish and loss of my self-regard really set in. I hardly slept for weeks and kept going by eating compulsively and reading until exhaustion brought sleep. Finally on Sept. 12, I stayed up all night writing a letter to the chairman of my draft board, saying basically what is in the preceding paragraph, thanking him for trying to help in a case where he really couldn't, and stating that I couldn't do the ROTC after all and would he please draft me as soon as possible.

I never mailed the letter, but I did carry it on me every day until I got on the plane to return to England. I didn't mail the letter because I didn't see, in the end, how my going in the Army and maybe going to Vietnam would achieve anything except a feeling that I had punished myself and gotten what I deserved. So I came back to England to try to make something of this second year of my Rhodes scholarship.

And that is where I am now, writing to you because you have been good to me and have a right to know what I think and feel. I am writing too in the hope that my telling this one story will help you to understand more clearly how so many fine people have come to find themselves still loving their country but loathing the military to which you and other good men have devoted years, lifetimes of the best service you could give. To many of us, it is no longer clear what is service and what is disservice or if it is clear the conclusion is likely to be illegal.

Forgive the length of this letter. There was so much to say. There is still a lot to be said, but it can wait. Please say hello to Col. Jones for me.

Merry Christmas.

Bill Clinton.

A COLONEL SETS THE RECORD STRAIGHT  
[Sept. 7, 1992, Memorandum for Record]

Subject: Bill Clinton and the University of Arkansas ROTC Program

There have been many unanswered questions as to the circumstances surrounding Bill Clinton's involvement with the ROTC department at the University of Arkansas. Prior to this time I have not felt the necessity for discussing the details. The reason I have not done so before is that my poor physical health (a consequence of participation in the Bataan Death March and the subsequent 3 years internment in Japanese POW camps) has precluded me from getting into what I felt was unnecessary involvement. However, present polls show that there is the imminent danger to our country of a draft dodger becoming Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States. While it is true, as Mr. Clinton has stated, that there are many others who avoided serving their country in the Vietnam War, they are not aspiring to be the President of the United States.

The tremendous implications of the possibility of his becoming Commander-in-Chief of the United States's Armed Forces compels me now to comment on the facts concerning Mr. Clinton's evasion of the draft.

This account would not have been imperative had Bill Clinton been completely honest with the American public concerning this matter. But as Mr. Clinton replied on a news conference this evening (Sept. 5, 1992) after being asked another particular about his dodging the draft, "Almost everyone concerned with these incidents are dead. I have no more comments to make." Since I may be the only person living who can give a firsthand account of what actually transpired, I am obligated by my love for my country and my sense of duty to divulge what actually happened and make it a matter of record.

Bill Clinton came to see me in my home in 1969 to discuss his desire to enroll in the

ROTC program at the University of Arkansas. We engaged in an extensive, approximately two (2) hour interview. At no time during this long conversation about his desire the program did he inform me of his involvement, participation, and actually organizing protests against the United States involvement in Southeast Asia. He was shrewd enough to realize that had I been aware of his activities, he would not have been accepted into the ROTC program as a potential officer in the United States Army.

The next day I began to receive phone calls regarding Bill Clinton's draft status. I was informed by the draft board that it was of interest to Senator Fulbright's office that Bill Clinton, a Rhodes Scholar, should be admitted to the ROTC program. I received several such calls. The general message conveyed by the draft board to me was that Senator Fulbright's office was putting pressure on them and that they needed my help. I then made the necessary arrangements to enroll Mr. Clinton into the ROTC program at the University of Arkansas.

I was not "saving" him from serving his country, as he erroneously thanked me for in his letter from England (dated Dec. 3, 1969). I was making it possible for a Rhodes Scholar to serve in the military as an officer.

In retrospect I see that Mr. Clinton had no intention of following through with his agreement to join the Army ROTC program at University of Arkansas or to attend the University of Arkansas Law School. I had explained to him the necessary of enrolling at the University of Arkansas as a student in order to be eligible to take the ROTC program at the university. He never enrolled at the University of Arkansas, but instead enrolled at Yale University after attending Oxford. I believe that he purposely deceived me, using the possibility of joining the ROTC as a ploy to work with the draft board to delay his induction and get a new draft classification.

The Dec. 3 letter written to me by Mr. Clinton, and subsequently taken from the files by Lt. Col. Clint Jones, my executive officer, was placed into the ROTC files so that a record would be available in case the applicant should again petition to enter into the ROTC program. The information in that letter alone would have restricted Bill Clinton from ever qualifying to be an officer in the United States military. Even more significant was his lack of veracity in purposely defrauding the military by deceiving me, both in concealing his anti-military activities overseas and his counterfeit intentions for later military service. These actions cause me to question both his patriotism and his integrity.

When I consider the calibre, the bravery, and the patriotism of the fine young soldiers whose deaths I have witnessed, others whose funerals I have attended . . . . When I reflected on not only the willingness, but eagerness that so many of them displayed in their earnest desire to defend and serve their country, it is untenable and incomprehensible to me that a man who was not merely unwilling to serve his country, but actually protested against its military, should ever be in the position of Commander-in-Chief of our Armed Forces.

I write this declaration not only for the living and future generations, but for those who fought and died for our country. If space and time permitted I would include the names of the ones I knew and fought with, and along with them I would mention by brother Bob, who was killed, during World War II and is buried in Cambridge, England (at the age of 23, about the age Bill Clinton was when he was over in England protesting the war).

I have agonized over whether or not to submit this statement to the American people.

But, I realize that even though I served my country by being in the military for over 32 years, and having gone through the ordeal of months of combat under the worst conditions followed by years of imprisonment by the Japanese, it is not enough. I'm writing these comments to let everyone know that I love my country more than I do my own personal security and well-being. I will go to my grave loving these United States of American and the liberty for which so many men have fought and died.

Because of my poor physical condition, this will be my final statement. I will make no further comments to any of the media regarding this issue.

EUGENE J. HOLMES,  
Colonel, U.S.A., Ret.

NO BRIDGE TOO FAR  
(Maureen Dowd)

As a society, we haven't preserved our sense of shame. But Bill Clinton is doing his best to preserve our sense of shamelessness.

The President and his Rasputin, Dick Morris, have broken creative new ground in brazenness.

First they snatch Republican positions, counting (not unreasonably) on the forgetfulness of voters and the expediency of Democrats who want their Republican in the White House to win. And now they are both embroiled in kerfuffles on Capitol Hill, where it takes a lot to be called shameless.

In a move that marks a new level ofchutzpah in American politics, Mr. Clinton's lawyers mentioned in their appeal to the Supreme Court on Paula Corbin Jones's sexual harassment suit that the President may be protected by the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, which was designed to give American troops some protection from civil suits while on active duty.

"President Clinton here thus seeks relief similar to that to which he may be entitled as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, and which is routinely available to service members under his command."

Robert Bennett, the President's lawyer, said he had only cited the act "as an example" that might extend to the Commander in Chief, not as his main argument.

But Mr. Bennett is getting paid too much to make the hideous mistake of reminding the public of one of Mr. Clinton's improvidences (his maneuvering on the draft) in defense of another (his wandering eye).

Some veterans' groups and Bob Stump, the Arizona Republican who is chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, did not care for Mr. Clinton's opportunistic enlistment. (Hello, sailor).

Mr. Stump is sending the President a letter, signed by 170 Republicans, asking him to withdraw his "ignoble suggestion" from the brief: "The Founding Fathers wanted to enshrine the principle of civilian control of the military in the Constitution and did so by making the President the civilian Commander in Chief of the Armed Services. You are not a person in military service, nor have you ever been."

Also in the President's mailbox is a letter from Republican Congresswomen demanding that Dick Morris be fired for doing jury-related polling for Alex Kelly of Darien, Conn., the unsavory teen-age burglar who fled after he was accused of raping two girls. He was a fugitive in Europe for eight years, living the posh life of a ski bum, while his parents supported him. (Family values.)

"it is the worst thing an adviser to the President could be doing at a time when crime and crimes against women are such a deep concern to the American people," wrote Representative Jennifer Dunn.

The Republican women are attempting to spruce up Mr. Dole gender-wise, but they have a good feminist point. Ordinarily, in a case like this, the Democratic women would be yelping, but there was only the occasional brave mutter. "This is beyond the pale," said Representative Nita Lowey of New York.

One female Democratic lawmaker explained: "If this were a Republican President and Dick Morris was helping an accused rapist, you know we would be screaming. But it's not worth picking a fight. We just want to win in '96."

So Democrats have suppressed their distress as Mr. Morris has helped the Clintons shape-shift—when Hillary Rodham Clinton told Larry King "There is no left wing of the Clinton White House," and when Mr. Clinton embraced the radical Wisconsin plan to abolish welfare.

Until yesterday, gay groups had fumed as the President slithered away from same-sex marriage. But the overly eager White House announcement yesterday that Mr. Clinton would sign a law denying Federal recognition for same-sex marriages if it ever reached his desk was too much. The Human Rights Campaign, the largest gay-rights group, accused the President of carving in to the right wing, and disinvited George Stephanopoulos as a dinner speaker.

So Bill Clinton is in the Army. He's against gay marriage. His adviser did work for an alleged rapist. He moves from the left wing to the right wing because what he really believes in is the West Wing.

#### CLINTON'S LATEST DISCRACEFUL DODGE

"It is disgraceful that while the rest of the nation is honoring our fallen heroes of military service this weekend, Bill Clinton is seeking shelter behind the military he once claimed to loath, in an attempt to delay the sexual harassment lawsuit filed by Paula Jones," commented Congressman Robert K. Dornan, Chairman of the House National Security Subcommittee on Military Personnel, after the announcement that Bill Clinton will use The Soldier's and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 as part of his legal defense before the United States Supreme Court.

On May 15, 1996, attorneys for President Clinton filed an appeal with the U.S. Supreme Court seeking to delay the sexual harassment lawsuit filed by Paula Jones, a former Arkansas state employee under the supervision of then-Governor Bill Clinton.

Lawyers for Clinton contend that the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 provides temporary protection from civil suits while the President is in office. This Act requires that civil litigation against members of the armed services be postponed while they are on active duty. According to his plea, "President Clinton here thus seeks relief similar to that which he may be entitled as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces."

However, the purpose of the Act is to allow the United States to fulfill the requirements of national defense, by enabling "persons in the military service . . ." to "devote their entire energy to the defense needs of the Nation." Furthermore, this Act clearly states that only members of the Army, Navy, Marines, Air Force, and Coast Guard, and officers of the Public Health Service when properly detailed, are eligible for such relief. This Act goes further in defining the term "military service" to include the period during which one enters "active service" and ends when one leaves "active service."

Under the Constitution, Bill Clinton is the civilian Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. The Founding Fathers wanted to enshrine the principle of civilian control of the military in the Constitution and did so by

making the President the civilian Commander in Chief.

"Bill Clinton has never been an active duty member of the military. In fact, in 1969, he dodged the draft and ran from his obligations to both his military and his country. And now as the civilian Commander in Chief, he mocks the honorable men and women who have given their lives to the protection of our great nation."

#### BURMA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOSS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] for granting me this time from his 1-hour special order.

There are several issues that I would like to speak about today. Perhaps there is one issue that I should begin with, because no one else seems to be speaking out, although I know that it is close to the hearts of both Republicans and Democrats here in the House of Representatives.

When we have our disagreements here in the House, one thing that we learn is that although we disagree, we do have some fundamental agreements that keep us together as Americans and that bind us to all of the American people. That is, we do believe in democracy. We do believe in freedom of speech. We do believe in these fundamentals that were fought for by George Washington, whose picture is on our wall here in the Chamber of the House.

We believe that we have a commitment to the world, a commitment to the world to stand for freedom because our forefathers were aided by people whose picture is also here on the wall in our Chamber, Lafayette, who came here to help us struggle for our freedom and independence over 200 years ago.

Basically he did so because he wanted to express a solidarity with the people of the United States, knowing that we would be the champions of freedom. By our very nature, our country is composed of people who come here from all corners of the world, all parts of the world, every race, every religion, every ethnic group is represented here, and we live together in freedom and democracy. By that very nature, we owe the world something. That is the stay true to those principles of freedom and democracy that our forefathers proclaimed, not just the rights of Americans but the rights of all people.

In the last 48 hours, there has been a vicious attack on the cause of democracy in the country of Burma. Burma is a country you do not hear much about. Most Americans in fact probably think that Burma, the only thing they relate to is BurmaShave, they think of BurmaShave. It must be some sort of shaving cream or something.

In fact, Burma is a country with 48 million people in Southeast Asia. A

country that now is suffering under the heel of one of the world's most vicious dictatorships. And over these last few years, many of us who have been active in the human rights movement have tried to work and do our best to see that perhaps Burma could evolve out of this dictatorship. The military dictatorship in Burma is called SLORC. It is a name that basically fits the regime because it sounds like it is right out of "Star Wars," out of the monstrous regimes that the freedom fighters in the film series "Star Wars," where the freedom fighters are fighting against the evil empire.

This evil empire in Burma is repressing the people. But there is, you might say, a champion of freedom, a hero to the world who lives in Burma and has tried to bring democracy to that country. It is Aung San Suu Kyi. Aung San Suu Kyi was of course of Nobel prize winner 2 years ago. She has suffered 5 years of confinement. She was arrested by the SLORC regime. Then last year she was set free and many of us hoped that there would be lessening of the repression in Burma. But what has happened in the last 48 hours is that the military dictatorship in Burma, SLORC, has rounded up almost 200 members of the democratic opposition in Burma and arrested them.

Anyone who is meeting with Aung San Suu Kyi, anyone who is involved in the democratic movement is being arrested. Dr. Sein Win, the Prime Minister of the democratic government in exile, testified in the Senate yesterday that the situation in Burma is one of despair and despotism. Today his brother, who is not even a member of the democratic movement, was arrested in retaliation for what Prime Minister Sein Win testified about here in Washington.

□ 1700

So I have introduced a piece of legislation hopefully that will discourage Americans from doing business in Burma. It is H.R. 2892, and we would hope that the American people and American businessmen recognize that here is a country that if anywhere we should take a stand for freedom. If anywhere in the world we could take a stand and it will not hurt us and we just show that we believe in freedom, it could be Burma. And there is no excuse for us not to do so. There is no strategic interest there, there is no huge commercial interest, but what is there are 48 million people suffering under the heel of despotism, crying out to the United States for us to take a stand.

Take your stand, America. What side are you on?

When that cry goes out from people who are being oppressed, never should we say we are on the side of the dictators, we are on the side of the oppressors.

This country, this dictatorship in Burma, has financed its war on its own people by selling off its teak forests, which have been decimated, by basically selling its natural resources, its