

unattainable. Resistance to the accord has predictably surfaced among Bosnian Serbs because under terms of the agreement Sarajevo will be under Muslim control.

Why intervene in Bosnia, and why now? We must first understand that the U.S. is a nation guided by both humanitarian ideals and practical necessities. Our ideals misled us in Vietnam, where we learned the hard way that civil wars are not resolved by outside military force. From our intervention in Somalia we learned that our humanitarian zeal has to be tempered by practical wisdom. We can feed starving people, but we cannot force a political solution on them.

Since the end of the cold war the U.S. has been the only world power with the ability to secure a peace through whatever means are appropriate. We have the military might to enforce agreements. The question is: Do we have the will to get involved in conflicts far from American shores?

It was clearly the presence of oil in the Persian Gulf that led President Bush to claim that vital American interests were involved when Iraq invaded Kuwait. The former Yugoslavia contains no oil, and trade with the region is not critical to the U.S. economy. Nevertheless, instability in that region could easily spill over into surrounding countries. It was instability in this region that precipitated World War I, a fact which led Pope John Paul II, during his recent visit to the U.S., to plead with Clinton not to let the century conclude, as it started, with a war over Sarajevo.

In making his case to the American people and a skeptical Congress, Clinton argued that without U.S. participation the combatants would not have reached the Dayton accord, nor would the European nations in NATO have agreed to supply an additional 40,000 peacekeeping troops to the region. The more persuasive case for U.S. involvement, however, is the harsh reality of the situation: only the commitment of an outside force can keep the warring parties in Bosnia from continuing their mutual slaughter.

At one level, the U.S. and NATO assignment in Bosnia is to prevent a recurrence of the war that began in 1991. At another level, however, the U.S. and NATO are making themselves available as a peace broker for enemies who must slowly and painfully build a future together. We cannot arrange that future, but we can help stop those who want to determine the future through violence.

Reinhold Niebuhr pointed out that modern technology has increased our capacity for intimacy even as it provides us with the tools to fight wars that avoid intimacy. We need, as Niebuhr argued more than 50 years ago, to develop "political instruments which will make such new intimacy and interdependence sufferable." Our survival depends on finding a way to accept the "interpenetration of cultures" rather than turning to mutual destruction.

The peacekeeping force that goes to Bosnia will offer only a partial correction of past errors and blatant wrongdoing on the part of several nations and many individuals. We are sending troops to an area that has witnessed ethnic cleansing, torture, indiscriminate killing of civilians, and rape as an instrument of war. We go to the region not to solve problems but to permit Serbs, Muslims and Croats to struggle toward their own solutions. Sending U.S. forces into a region full of generations-old patterns of hatred and aggression is dangerous. But the alternative is worse. If we do not support the peace process, we invite the return of an unceasing war that breeds further hatred and aggression.

The U.S. is blessed with wealth and resources and the means to act on behalf of others. We may regard this peace mission as we might speak of any effort on behalf of a

people in need. We go to Bosnia not to control or dominate others, but to help others to do what they cannot do for themselves.●

COMMENDING CATHY MYERS

● Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I rise today to commend Cathy Myers, of my staff, who has completed 12 years of dedicated and exemplary service in the U.S. Senate. Since my election to the Senate in 1992, Cathy has worked in my office, unselfishly devoting her time, and effort in making the office run more efficiently and effectively. She is certainly someone you can count on and my staff and I appreciate everything she does for all of us. Cathy has been the consummate example of a devoted employee, and I wish her many more successful years of service.

It is with great joy that I rise today in honoring Cathy Myers on the occasion of her 12th anniversary as an employee in the U.S. Senate.●

WHAT MAKES HONG KONG TICK

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, one of the impressive leaders in our world is a legislator little known by most Americans. He is Martin C.M. Lee, who has led the forces for democracy in Hong Kong and has courageously stood up for freedom and democracy and human rights in Hong Kong.

He does that in the face of a Chinese takeover of Hong Kong that is slated in 1½ years from now.

Recently, he had an op-ed piece in the Washington Post that I hope the leaders of China will see.

On the possibility that more Chinese leaders will see it, I ask that it be printed in full in the RECORD. I hope that all the Members of the Senate and House and their staffs will read it also to help prepare them for what may happen come 1997.

The article follows:

WHAT MAKES HONG KONG TICK

(By Martin C.M. Lee)

HONG KONG.—On June 30, 1997, Hong Kong and its 6 million free citizens will become part of the People's Republic of China. As the countdown to 1997 advances, the people of Hong Kong should be hearing reassurances from China that we will be able to keep our freedoms and way of life. Instead, each day brings a new threat.

The latest has thrown Hong Kong into turmoil, both for the harm it will do to human rights and for the message it sends about China's plans for the future. In October China proposed scrapping key sections of Hong Kong's Bill of Rights and reinstating a number of repressive colonial laws that had been removed from the statute books because they violated the Bill of Rights.

On Nov. 15, Hong Kong's legislature fought back. The Legislative Council—elected in September with a surprise majority for democrats—passed, by a decisive 40-15 vote, a historic motion to condemn China's efforts to end human rights protection in Hong Kong.

That motion drew a line in the sand over human rights here—and even had the support of a large number of pro-Beijing legislators. Even before the motion was debated, Chinese officials had declared that Hong Kong's legis-

lature had no right to discuss the topic of the Bill of Rights. By defying Beijing, Hong Kong's people sent the message that our rights and freedoms will not be given up without a fight.

The Bill of Rights was enacted in 1991 as a confidence-building measure to allay fears raised by the Tiananmen Square massacre of 1989. Thus it is not surprising that China's pledge to emasculate the Bill of Rights is having a devastating effect on future confidence in the rule of law.

The Bill of Rights—known in Chinese as *Yan Kyun Faat*, the Human Rights Law—puts into domestic law the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, under which countries agree to a minimum standard of behavior toward their citizens. Britain and more than 80 countries worldwide have signed the covenant. China, however, has not. Beijing, in fact, sees the Bill of Rights as part of a conspiracy by "international anti-Chinese forces and the agents of the British side," according to its own New China News Agency.

The core problems is that China does not understand what makes Hong Kong tick. The People's Republic of China is an authoritarian Communist state. Hong Kong has always been a sanctuary from China, where the rule of law held sway and Hong Kong Chinese people were given economic and civil freedoms to make Hong Kong's the most successful economy in Southeast Asia.

In the past decade, the world has witnessed countless examples of authoritarian regimes changing into free societies—from Eastern Europe to Asia. Regionally, South Korea, Taiwan, Thailand and the Philippines have all progressed from authoritarian to representative governments, and other Asian countries are moving steadily in that direction. But the world has no recent experience of a vibrant, cosmopolitan and extremely free society losing basic freedoms.

Hong Kong today has all the attributes of a pluralistic civil society; a robust press, clean and accountable government and a rule of law superior to any legal system in Asia. The proposal to scrap Hong Kong's Bill of Rights is the clearest indication yet that Beijing is trying to remake Hong Kong in China's image. Because China has been successful in luring international investment without improving human rights, Beijing may now believe it can sustain Hong Kong's economic success while clamping down on civil rights and freedoms.

In 1997, China is set to control all three branches of Hong Kong's government. Beijing says elected legislators will be turned out of office and replaced with a rubber-stamp appointed legislature. Hong Kong's top official, the chief executive, and his cabinet will all be appointed by Beijing. And China has ensured control of the Court of Final Appeal, Hong Kong's highest court, which will not be set up until after the transfer of sovereignty in 1997. Thus all three branches of government are slated to be under China's control.

This is why the people of Hong Kong regard saving our Bill of Rights as our last-ditch battle. Just as the Bill of Rights is an important check on abuse of power by the British government today, so will it be an essential check on arbitrary use of power by China after 1997.

At least one senior Chinese leader clearly understands the value and fragility of Hong Kong's system. Last March the chairman of the powerful Chinese People's Political Consultative Committee, Li Ruihuan, admitted errors in China's hard-line policy toward Hong Kong and appealed to his fellow leaders to handle Hong Kong with greater care in the future.

In a public speech, he used the metaphor of an old woman selling a valuable antique