

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Rajiv Y. Mody (CN=Rajiv Y. Mody/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:21-APR-1999 16:25:00.00

SUBJECT: ABC Nightline, March 25, 1999

TO: Stephen A. Marquis (CN=Stephen A. Marquis/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Rajiv Y. Mody/WHO/EOP on 04/21/99
04:23 PM -----

Mark A. Kitchens
03/26/99 12:10:41 PM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc:

Subject: ABC Nightline, March 25, 1999

ABC NIGHTLINE
Aired on MARCH 25, 1998

ANNOUNCER: March 25, 1999.

TED KOPPEL, ABC News : (voice-over) When you listen to the top general, it's cut and dry, plain as day.

Gen. WESLEY CLARK, NATO Supreme Commander: We're going to systematically and progressively attack, disrupt, degrade, devastate and we're going to destroy these forces and their facilities and support.

TED KOPPEL : (voice-over) But when you start listening to the political leadership.

Pres. BILL CLINTON: Well, he has to choose peace or we have to try to limit his ability to make war.

TED KOPPEL : (voice-over) You come to realize that victory may end up being whatever the President says it is.

Pres. BILL CLINTON: The exit strategy is what it always is in a military operation, it's when the mission is completed.

TED KOPPEL : (voice-over) Tonight, the crisis in Kosovo, day two.

ANNOUNCER: From ABC News, this is Nightline. Reporting from Washington, Ted Koppel.

TED KOPPEL: On the military front, not much seems to have changed. NATO bombers pounded Serb installations for the second night in a row and Serbian soldiers in Kosovo continued, indeed, may even have cranked up their war against Albanian Kosovars. European and American reporters, photographers and camera people have been kicked out of Yugoslavia and Kosovo, so tonight even more than last night we are reporting on a war we

can barely see. But if you listen carefully, you can begin to hear the faint sounds of strain in the NATO alliance. Nothing major yet, just some grumbling from the Italians, some nervousness from the Greeks and a testy don't fly through our air space from the Austrians. Ever so slightly, the Clinton administration has begun adjusting, calibrating the terms under which the bombing would be halted. Where only a few days ago the United States was insisting that Yugoslav President Milosevic would have to sign and abide by the terms of the so-called Rambouillet agreement, today, Secretary of State Albright said he would only have to embrace the framework. In other words, there's now some room for negotiation.

Where General Wesley Clark is still talking about the destruction of Serbian forces and facilities, his political bosses back here in Washington are setting a more modest goal, degrading and diminishing the military capability of the Serbs. Again, a subtle difference, but destruction is a clear and measurable goal, degrading and diminishing the Serbs' military force, well, you could argue that that's already been accomplished. It's a judgment call.

Kevin Newman gives us a sense of what this day has been like.

KEVIN NEWMAN, ABC News : (voice-over) By first light, the only images of damage were available from Serbian television. Some of the 50 Tomahawk cruise missiles and NATO's laser guided bombs had hit homes and large factory sized buildings. That much is obvious. What was in the structures is not. Serbian TV said this was a plastics factory. NATO says weapons were made here.

ANTHONY CORDESMAN, ABC News Military Analyst: We took no losses. There was no real problem with any of the ground based air defense. The only air to air encounters resulted in NATO victories.

KEVIN NEWMAN : (voice-over) But there were indications not every aspect of the first night of attacks went as planned. Pictures of craters where missiles had missed their mark were played again and again on Serbian television. The pilots of these British jets returned to base without deploying their weapons.

UNIDENTIFIED BRITISH PILOT: We had some difficulties in the area with the amount of smoke in the area, the weather.

KEVIN NEWMAN : (voice-over) Still, NATO's supreme commander declared himself satisfied and pledged to hit Milosevic and his forces harder next time.

Gen. WESLEY CLARK: We're going to very systematically and progressively keep the pressure on. We're going to grind away at him until we accomplish the military objectives or until our political leaders tell us to halt.

KEVIN NEWMAN : (voice-over) In spite of the tough talk, Slobodan Milosevic appeared on television with his cabinet looking relaxed. He broke off diplomatic relations with the leading NATO nations involved in the attack but most importantly showed no sign of easing his army's oppression of ethnic Albanians in the southern Yugoslavian province of Kosovo. Western wire service photographers were able to transmit these images of the continuing flight of refugees away from fighting and murder NATO says has intensified since the attack. Now, the images of war came without sound or movement. As the day progressed, there were even fewer. Serbian authorities ordered all western journalists out of Yugoslavia. ABC Correspondent Sheila MacVicar and her camera crew drove north toward the Hungarian border village of Zwieged. (ph)

SHEILA MacVICAR, ABC News: It's really hard to say exactly why they're doing that. I think there can be a couple of reasons. One is that

historically the Serbs have felt that they've had a really bad deal from the foreign press over the course, particularly the coverage of the Bosnian war and the genocide and crimes against humanity which took place there. So they feel that the foreign media is biased against them. That's their point of view. On the other hand, this is a country which has never really made the transition into even struggling democracy the way every other country in Eastern Europe has. It is still very much under Slobodan Milosevic rooted in its communist past and as such its instincts when something like this happens, when the state is threatened, are to close in to see outsiders as spies and as traitors.

KEVIN NEWMAN : (voice-over) That antagonism against western journalists erupted into the open in the country immediately to the south of Yugoslavia, Macedonia. In the capital, student protesters sympathetic to the Serbs raced toward western media positions, pelting cars and forcing some reporters to flee. A larger group of protesters marched toward the nearby American embassy, setting cars there on fire but failing to breach the compound. There was a growing sense of unease among other countries bordering Yugoslavia. Albania and Romania sought assurances NATO would protect them, as did democratic elements in Montenegro, the Yugoslav province next to Kosovo. The secretary of state issued a warning.

MADELEINE ALBRIGHT, Secretary of State: I also want to stress that President Milosevic should not attempt to use this crisis to broaden the conflict or spread violence and instability elsewhere in the region.

KEVIN NEWMAN : (voice-over) Through the day, the diplomatic face of the alliance was, for the most part, firm. European leaders meeting in Berlin denounced Milosevic and the NATO Secretary-General declared no one was wavering.

JAVIER SOLANA, NATO Secretary-General: I can guarantee you that the solidarity, that the unanimity, the coherence of the alliance is total and absolute.

KEVIN NEWMAN: But that face isn't without nervous twitches. Sources say NATO ambassadors were unnerved by these pictures broadcast on Serbian television purporting to show battle damage to a Serbian hospital. So behind closed doors, NATO's generals played the video for the ambassadors, paused aspects of it and built a case that it had been faked using old footage. It wasn't the only indication that some NATO countries are anxious. Italy's prime minister suggested it was time to start diplomatic initiatives again, a plea echoed by Greece. To try to soothe Italian fears, General Wesley Clark had telephoned ahead of Yugoslavia's army, warning him any attempt to deploy in the Adriatic Sea between Yugoslavia and Italy would bring instant retaliation from NATO. So far, the Serbian fleet has remained in port.

RALPH PETERS: Now, I would certainly be worried about Italian discontent for many reasons.

KEVIN NEWMAN : (voice-over) Ralph Peters is a former army intelligence officer.

RALPH PETERS: One, because we don't want the alliance to fray. Secondly and importantly because the key air bases from which we are flying are in Italy.

KEVIN NEWMAN : (voice-over) That is where most of the aircraft for the second assault came from. The raids were launched at the same hour tonight as last night, planes taking off 15 seconds or less apart. There were also cruise missile launches from sea, as there were last night. ABC Reporter Bob Schmidt is aboard the USS Gonzalez.

BOB SCHMIDT, ABC News: You've just seen about 18 launches. All but two were successful. One failure gave sailors and media people on the deck and the bridge some anxious moments. An errant Tomahawk missile roared out of its tube then suddenly went out of control and plunged into the sea just after the ship.

KEVIN NEWMAN : (voice-over) NATO commanders called the second attack on Yugoslavia a more serious, tougher assault. But there was even less independent confirmation of the damage than on the first night. And what it will take to stop the attacks also became less clear as they progressed. The President, meeting with his national security team, said Milosevic must either surrender...

Pres. BILL CLINTON: Or we have to try to limit his ability to make war. That's what we're trying to do.

KEVIN NEWMAN : (voice-over) Until then, there will be fewer ways of knowing exactly what is happening in Yugoslavia. Tonight, as NATO bombs and missiles were hitting targets throughout the country, Serbian TV had stopped showing pictures of damage and instead broadcast patriotic military marches.

I'm Kevin Newman for Nightline.

TED KOPPEL: So what does constitute a NATO victory in Kosovo? Earlier this evening I spoke with Defense Secretary William Cohen. That interview, when we come back.

TED KOPPEL: And we're at the Pentagon with the secretary of defense, William Cohen.

Mr. Secretary, the President has analogized this situation to the conditions that existed before W.W.I, some of the conditions that existed in the Second World War. I mean those are big, big analogies. If, indeed, the stakes are that great, and let me begin by asking you, are they that great in your view?

WILLIAM COHEN, Secretary of Defense: Well, the stakes are high in terms of what the potential is for this conflict sending thousands, tens of thousands of refugees into neighboring countries and overwhelming them, causing greater instability in those countries and possibly involving other NATO members. And so the stakes are high. But I believe the President's correct in analyzing this to say there's a way to intervene at this point and do so with the use of air power to bring, hopefully, about a peace settlement on the part of Milosevic but if not to take down effectively his military capability to be able to wage that kind of war against the Kosovar Albanians.

TED KOPPEL: I guess my question is if the stakes are as high as you say they are, then one would assume that the United States and its NATO allies would do whatever was called for. I understand it's clearly easier if you can do it just with air power, but why rule out the introduction of ground troops should they become necessary?

WILLIAM COHEN: Well, because the NATO countries act by consensus and the consensus is at this point is that it's sufficient to carry out an air operation to do several things. Number one, to send a message to Milosevic that we're serious and determined. Number two, to try and deter him from carrying out the kind of slaughter he has carried out in the past and present and to, if that fails, to seriously degrade or diminish his military capability. The NATO countries have come to a consensus that that is sufficient at this time. Whether there's any recalculation another time, that remains to be seen. But at this time and all we have planned for is an air campaign, period.

TED KOPPEL: You said at this time three times now and you're careful enough with your language. Do you mean to imply that it is possible that you might be forced to recalculate at some other time and that you're not ruling out the possibility of ground troops?

WILLIAM COHEN: What I'm saying is that we are planning an air operation period. One cannot foretell the future nor should one seek to do so. But I believe that we are satisfied that we can carry out this mission effectively with an air campaign.

TED KOPPEL: Some military analysts have looked at the hard line generals around President Milosevic and said they believe, the hard line generals, that they can effectively wipe out the Albanian army in a week. They've already been at it for two days. You and others in the administration have indicated that if anything they've intensified their campaign. Is this all going to be academic in five days?

WILLIAM COHEN: What the Albanian Kosovars have demonstrated in the past is the ability to move out into the field or up into the hills and play a waiting game and then hit and run type of guerrilla tactic. We believe that the Serb army would not be able to wipe them out, certainly not in five days and we think it would be really quite difficult to do it over a long period of time. We intend from our perspective, NATO intends to prevent that from taking place if at all possible. So we're going to try to deter that activity from taking place and to then systematically go after those military targets that allow him to carry out this type of operation.

TED KOPPEL: Talk again about those military objectives. Are they, actually some of the goals, both military and diplomatic, seem, if I've been listening carefully enough to what you and your colleagues have been saying over the past couple of days, actually seem to be dropping a little bit in intensity.

WILLIAM COHEN: Well, the goals remain the same. The President indicated this, the secretary of state has indicated this, that Mr. Milosevic holds the keys to peace in his pocket. He can produce those keys at any time, when he pulls his forces back and he stops the assault upon the Kosovars who have signed up to the peace agreement and that he embraces the framework of Rambouillet. That is the diplomatic message that has gone out to Mr. Milosevic. The military mission --

TED KOPPEL: And it's precisely that, it's precisely that language, if I may interrupt you just for a second, that causes me to believe you've actually slipped back a little bit. A few days ago you were calling on him to sign the agreement. Now you're calling on him to accept the framework. You know as I do that that little change in language means something.

WILLIAM COHEN: Well, I think it's also been very clear that any changes whatsoever would have to be something that would be acceptable to the Kosovars. We're saying that you had a chance to sign up to Rambouillet. There may be some slight modifications that could take place but only if they were acceptable to the Kosovars as well. So basically he has to sign up to Rambouillet. What changes might be modified at that point is up to the negotiators.

TED KOPPEL: We're going to have to take a short break. When we come back, let's talk about the military conditions. Back again in a moment with Secretary of Defense William Cohen.

(Commercial Break)

TED KOPPEL: And we're back once again at the Pentagon with the secretary of defense, William Cohen.

Mr. Secretary, we were talking about the conditions that NATO and the United States are setting for the end of bombing. We talked about the diplomatic conditions. Spell out for me again what the military conditions are.

WILLIAM COHEN: We are seeking to, number one, show our resolve, a determination on the part of 19 countries, this is not the United States acting alone, it's 19 countries who feel very committed that Mr. Milosevic must cease and desist from the activity of the slaughtering innocent people and pull back his forces and sign up to this agreement. And so we seek to send a message. And then number two, we seek to deter him from continuing the type of activity that he has at present and in the past and if he fails to do that to then systematically start targeting his military infrastructure and start diminishing his capacity to wage this kind of warfare against the Kosovars.

TED KOPPEL: Let me focus on that language for a moment, the degradation, the diminishing of capacity. That's clearly something that you can determine at a moment's notice. In other words, it's your definition...

WILLIAM COHEN: That's correct.

TED KOPPEL: -- of when his capacity has been diminished.

WILLIAM COHEN: That's right.

TED KOPPEL: So this thing could end tomorrow, it could end next week. There is no clear objective standard by which the rest of us can say here's what the administration is setting out to do and we'll know when they've done it.

WILLIAM COHEN: We would make that determination in consultation with all of the 18 other countries who are participating in this operation and endorsing it and we would make that determination and then we could reserve any right to respond at a future time. So we will make the determination when we believe we have seriously diminished his capacity to wage this kind of effort against the Kosovars and much will be, the proof will be in the situation on the ground. To the extent that he is unable to wage effectively an onslaught against the Kosovars, we'll know that.

TED KOPPEL: Mr. Secretary, you keep speaking of the unanimity that exists among the 19 members of NATO. The Italians aren't happy. The Austrians haven't given you the right to over fly. The Greeks have already begun expressing some concern. Indeed, what we're hearing is that while the military leadership of NATO is prepared to keep on hammering away as long as it needs to, there are already some fractures in the political coalition, that it's not as solid as you suggest.

WILLIAM COHEN: Well, it's always been a very tough issue in dealing with NATO. No democracy wishes to go into this kind of a conflict as such to use military power to achieve a diplomatic objective. But based on the conversation that I've had with my counterparts, the secretary of state has had with her counterparts, we also understand that NATO can only operate by consensus. The President has talked to all the major leaders in the NATO countries and they are committed to seeing to it that Milosevic stop his activities. Yes, there are differences of opinion in terms of this action, but they are committed in terms of going forward with it. Some would like to see it settled perhaps sooner rather than later, but all see the need, once this action is started, to continue on.

TED KOPPEL: Given those two answers that you've just given me, the one that, in which you agreed that you can essentially define when Milosevic's military has been appropriately degraded and that there is, indeed, some

political tension that does exist within NATO with some members preferring to bring this thing to a conclusion sooner rather than later, it doesn't really sound as though there is the kind of commitment to do whatever is needed to prevent Milosevic from ever being able to do this kind of thing again.

WILLIAM COHEN: Let me indicate very clearly I have talked with all of the major NATO allies, in fact, all of my counterparts. There is no disagreement on the need to carry this mission out to its completion. And so from a military perspective, we have absolutely solid support. I believe that the President has talked to all of his counterparts, heads of state, and they also are committed to seeing this through. We made that very clear from the beginning. We don't take step one without being prepared to carry it all the way through. So while some, obviously many, all of us would like to see this come to an end sooner rather than later, that's up to Mr. Milosevic. He's the one who holds the keys here. And if he decides he's going to continue his onslaught then he's going to continue to face the kind of systematic degradation of his forces. We are satisfied that we have all of the support necessary to carry that out.

TED KOPPEL: Mr. Secretary, let me end where we began. If conditions are such that they are bad enough that they require us to go to war, is it not essential that the United States go into a war being prepared to do whatever is necessary to win it? In other words, do you begin by ruling out all kinds of options?

WILLIAM COHEN: First of all, we're taking action to prevent Mr. Milosevic's troops from slaughtering innocent civilians. That is our mission. We're going to deter that and we're going to diminish his capacity to do it.

TED KOPPEL: Although he's still doing it.

WILLIAM COHEN: He is doing it at this time and that will tell us that he's made a choice that he wants to witness the continuation of NATO forces taking out and taking down his military capability.

TED KOPPEL: But in answer to my question?

WILLIAM COHEN: In answer to your question, we will, we believe we have a satisfactory method of accomplishing an objective and we intend to carry out our mission. And so we're satisfied that we have a consensus to do that and that's what we're going to do.

TED KOPPEL: Would you be surprised if the military part of this was over in a week?

WILLIAM COHEN: I wouldn't put any time frame on it at all. We will do whatever we have to do to make sure that we satisfy ourselves that we have accomplished our mission.

TED KOPPEL: And that's going to be decided by NATO consensus not by the United States?

WILLIAM COHEN: It's going to be decided by a consensus, the consensus going in and we believe the consensus will hold till the end.

TED KOPPEL: Secretary Cohen, thank you very much.

WILLIAM COHEN: Thank you.

TED KOPPEL: I'll be back in a moment.

(Commercial Break)

TED KOPPEL: Tomorrow on Good Morning America, Diane Sawyer talks with Secretary of State Madeleine Albright about the latest developments in Kosovo.

That's our report for tonight. I'm Ted Koppel in Washington. For all of us here at ABC News, good night.

END

Message Sent

To:

Jennifer M. Palmieri/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anthony R. Bernal/OVP@OVP
Melissa G. Green/OPD/EOP@EOP
Leslie Bernstein/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robin M. Roland/WHO/EOP@EOP
Chandler G. Spaulding/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dominique L. Cano/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dag Vega/WHO/EOP@EOP
Brenda M. Anders/WHO/EOP@EOP
gamble-bennett@dol.gov @ inet
Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP@EOP
Richard L. Siewert/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jordan Tamagni/WHO/EOP@EOP
Beverly J. Barnes/WHO/EOP
Elizabeth R. Newman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julia M. Payne/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julianne B. Corbett/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey M. Smith/OSTP/EOP@EOP
Lowell A. Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan A. Kaplan/OPD/EOP@EOP
Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer Ferguson/OMB/EOP@EOP
Mark D. Neschis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Ruby Shamir/WHO/EOP@EOP
Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP@EOP
Amy Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lisa J. Levin/WHO/EOP@EOP
Peter A. Weissman/OPD/EOP@EOP
William A. Halter/OMB/EOP@EOP
Eli G. Attie/OVP@OVP
Patricia M. Ewing/OVP@OVP
Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa M. Murray/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan E. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP
Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anne M. Edwards/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael Waldman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gene B. Sperling/OPD/EOP@EOP
Paul K. Engskov/WHO/EOP@EOP
Laura D. Schwartz/WHO/EOP@EOP
Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julie E. Mason/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steven J. Naplan/NSC/EOP@EOP
Daniel J. Gunia/OA/EOP@EOP
Alison Muscatine/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gordon Li/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP

Mark A. Kitchens/WHO/EOP@EOP
June Shih/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey A. Shesol/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rochester M. Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rachael E. Sullivan/OVP@OVP
Julie B. Goldberg/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sarah E. Gegenheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Susanna B. McGuire/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steve Ricchetti/WHO/EOP@EOP
Edward F. Hughes/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa J. Prober/WHO/EOP@EOP
Justin Coleman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Clara J. Shin/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan M. Prince/WHO/EOP@EOP
Joshua S. Gottheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Heather M. Riley/WHO/EOP@EOP
Alejandro G. Cabrera/OVP@OVP
Rebecca L. Walldorff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jon P. Jennings/WHO/EOP@EOP
Katharine Button/WHO/EOP@EOP
Tracy Pakulniewicz/WHO/EOP@EOP
James T. Heimbach/WHO/EOP@EOP
Victoria L. Valentine/WHO/EOP@EOP
James E. Kennedy/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael A. Hammer/NSC/EOP@EOP
Laura J. Lewis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Toby C. Graff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sean P. O'Shea/WHO/EOP@EOP
Thomas D. Janenda/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rajiv Y. Mody/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robin J. Bachman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Saladbar 23 <saladbar23 @ hotmail.com> @ inet

----- Forwarded by Rajiv Y. Mody/WHO/EOP on 04/21/99
04:23 PM -----

Mark A. Kitchens
03/26/99 12:10:45 PM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: ABC GMA, March 25, 1999

ABC GOOD MORNING AMERICA
Aired on MARCH 25, 1999

SPEAKER: MADELEINE ALBRIGHT, U.S. SECRETARY OF STATE
DIANNE SAWYER, ANCHOR

SAWYER: Joining us from Washington, Secretary of State Madeleine Albright. Madam Secretary, so good to have you with us.

ALBRIGHT: Good morning, Diane.

SAWYER: There are reports that the ethnic Albanians are under fierce attack by the Serbs still. Is this air campaign working or is it making everything worse?

ALBRIGHT: I believe that the air campaign is working, and I have to say, Diane, in watching the films of our airplanes taking off and your interviews with various pilots and military, I have to say how incredibly proud I am of the American military, how grateful and how much we pray for them.

I do think that this is an essential campaign that what we have to do is deter Milosevic. And if he is not deterred, then seriously damage his capability, his military capability, to keep killing and harassing the Kosovars. And I think that reports of increased fighting are really dreadful because who is suffering here are the ordinary civilians. And this is Milosevic's trait is that he wants to keep himself in power while the Serbs as well as the Kosovars themselves are suffering deeply.

SAWYER: You've talked about seriously damaging his military. After watching two nights of the bombing, how long is that going to take?

ALBRIGHT: It's going to take -- I'm not going to comment on the time line of this. And it is very important that we continue until the job -- until our objectives here, that I've stated, are finished. And the military people say that they are satisfied with how the campaign is proceeding.

SAWYER: But how long are the NATO allies going to give this? Reports now that Greece and Italy are wavering, talking about negotiations?

ALBRIGHT: What is happening here, Diane, is all of us would like to end this peacefully and have diplomacy work. But the alliance is united in knowing we have to attain our objectives, those that I said, deter and damage seriously. We're all talking to each other. Yesterday Secretary-General Solana said the alliance was strong and united. And everyone would like to end this in a peaceful way, but we are all together.

SAWYER: You see no cracks forming or coming?

ALBRIGHT: I see -- no, I don't. Clearly, we are all discussing this. Everyone is assessing the situation. And this is a difficult assignment for an alliance of 19 people. It's an alliance that operates by consensus. But I think that as the Secretary-General of NATO says, this is a strong and united alliance.

SAWYER: You know Milosevic. You have negotiated with him, talked with him. You've said, too, he knows how to get in touch with us. Any word from him? Any word of any kind?

ALBRIGHT: No. I mean, he has not been in touch. I think that what is important here is that he knows how to get ahold of us. Basically, they are still putting out the message that they do not like what is going on and that they object to what we are doing. That is not the way to reverse course. And I think that he knows the diplomatic channels are open.

SAWYER: There is talk in Washington among diplomats that his responses are not rational. What does this mean? Is it just an intransigent politician or do you think he's unstable?

ALBRIGHT: I think all he cares about is his own power. He has based his power on jingoistic nationalist statements. And he is a man who does not care about his people. He has propagandized them. He keeps saying to his

people and to anybody that talks to him that nothing is going on, that the Serb forces are doing nothing in Kosovo. And you have just reported that fighting has intensified. He has only one concern, his personal power.

SAWYER: Is he smart?

ALBRIGHT: I think he is smart. I think he's smart and cagey and cares only about himself.

SAWYER: You have said that we will do whatever it takes to bring them back to the negotiating table. What does that mean, whatever it takes?

ALBRIGHT: Well, I think that what we need to do is to stay firm here. What -- I believe that it is important for us all to remain strong and united and make clear that this kind of treatment of Kosovar Albanians or anybody -- he has ethically cleansed other parts -- is unacceptable at the end of a 20th century, a century that has been marked by extremes in terms of killing people who are not of the same religion or ethnic background. And I think we cannot end the century this way. I think we must take steps in order to stop this humanitarian catastrophe. And we will use our military force and we are always prepared to engage with diplomacy.

SAWYER: Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, always great to have you with us. Thank you so much.

ALBRIGHT: Thanks, Diane.

END

Message Sent

To:

Jennifer M. Palmieri/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anthony R. Bernal/OVP@OVP
Melissa G. Green/OPD/EOP@EOP
Leslie Bernstein/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robin M. Roland/WHO/EOP@EOP
Chandler G. Spaulding/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dominique L. Cano/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dag Vega/WHO/EOP@EOP
Brenda M. Anders/WHO/EOP@EOP
gamble-bennett@dol.gov @ inet
Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP@EOP
Richard L. Siewert/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jordan Tamagni/WHO/EOP@EOP
Beverly J. Barnes/WHO/EOP
Elizabeth R. Newman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julia M. Payne/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julianne B. Corbett/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey M. Smith/OSTP/EOP@EOP
Lowell A. Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan A. Kaplan/OPD/EOP@EOP
Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer Ferguson/OMB/EOP@EOP
Mark D. Neschis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Ruby Shamir/WHO/EOP@EOP
Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP@EOP
Amy Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lisa J. Levin/WHO/EOP@EOP

Peter A. Weissman/OPD/EOP@EOP
William A. Halter/OMB/EOP@EOP
Eli G. Attie/OVP@OVP
Patricia M. Ewing/OVP@OVP
Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa M. Murray/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan E. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP
Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anne M. Edwards/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael Waldman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gene B. Sperling/OPD/EOP@EOP
Paul K. Engskov/WHO/EOP@EOP
Laura D. Schwartz/WHO/EOP@EOP
Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julie E. Mason/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steven J. Naplan/NSC/EOP@EOP
Daniel J. Gunia/OA/EOP@EOP
Alison Muscatine/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gordon Li/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mark A. Kitchens/WHO/EOP@EOP
June Shih/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey A. Shesol/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rochester M. Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rachael E. Sullivan/OVP@OVP
Julie B. Goldberg/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sarah E. Gegenheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Susanna B. McGuire/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steve Ricchetti/WHO/EOP@EOP
Edward F. Hughes/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa J. Prober/WHO/EOP@EOP
Justin Coleman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Clara J. Shin/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan M. Prince/WHO/EOP@EOP
Joshua S. Gottheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Heather M. Riley/WHO/EOP@EOP
Alejandro G. Cabrera/OVP@OVP
Rebecca L. Walldorff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jon P. Jennings/WHO/EOP@EOP
Katharine Button/WHO/EOP@EOP
Tracy Pakulniewicz/WHO/EOP@EOP
James T. Heimbach/WHO/EOP@EOP
Victoria L. Valentine/WHO/EOP@EOP
James E. Kennedy/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael A. Hammer/NSC/EOP@EOP
Laura J. Lewis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Toby C. Graff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sean P. O'Shea/WHO/EOP@EOP
Thomas D. Janenda/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rajiv Y. Mody/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robin J. Bachman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Saladbar 23 <saladbar23 @ hotmail.com> @ inet

----- Forwarded by Rajiv Y. Mody/WHO/EOP on 04/21/99

04:23 PM -----

Mark A. Kitchens
04/01/99 06:04:59 AM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: CNN Larry King, March 31, 1999

Larry King Live
Aired March 31, 1999 - 9:00 p.m. ET

U.S. Patrol Missing in Macedonia; NATO Expands Its
Targets in Yugoslavia; Amadou Diallo Shooting Sparks
Controversy About NYPD Tactics

LARRY KING, HOST: Tonight, NATO expands its targets in
Yugoslavia.

Will that force the Serbs to back off from attacking
civilians in Kosovo? If not,

is sending in ground troops next? In Washington,
presidential candidate Pat

Buchanan takes on Democratic Senator Mary Landrieu of
Louisiana. Plus

fighting breaks out on the floor of Russia's parliament
over the crisis in

Kosovo. We'll ask the Russian ambassador to the U.N.
about Russia's next
move.

And later, four New York City Police officers charged
today with

second-degree murder for firing dozens of bullets into
an unarmed African

immigrant. We'll speak to New York Police Commissioner
Howard Safir,

Johnnie Cochran, lead attorney for the victim's family;
from the police union,

we'll be joined by Bruce Robertson; actress Susan
Sarandon, who has joined
the protest against the police.

All next on LARRY KING LIVE.

Before we talk with Pat Buchanan and Senator Landrieu,
we have a breaking

story: an extensive search-and-rescue operation for
three American members

of a NATO force along the Yugoslav-Macedonia border
missing since coming

under fire earlier today. NATO officials confirm that.
Helicopters are out
searching, ground forces as well.

We'll start with Jane Arraf, our CNN international
correspondent at NATO
headquarters in Brussels. What can you tell us?

JANE ARRAF, CNN CORRESPONDENT: Well, Larry, NATO says it
has

extensive forces and helicopters out combing the
countryside along with
Macedonian police in an effort to find those three
missing servicemen. It says
that they were on a normal reconnaissance patrol on a
civilian road on the
border near Yugoslavia in northern Macedonia on
Wednesday afternoon when
they radioed that they were being shot at and they were
surrounded. The base
then lost contact with them. Those search and rescue
operations are being
hampered by the rugged territory in the region. A
military official here says
nothing is easy in that terrain. There are about 1200
NATO troops stationed in
Macedonia including about 300 Americans. NATO has not
sent ground troops
into Yugoslavia and says it has no plans to do so --
Larry.

L. KING: Jane, one other quick thing, since they
reported that they were
surrounded and there were shots, is the best hope that
they were captured?

ARRAF: That could be a possibility. NATO officials here
won't speculate at
all. They say it's not clear yet until they find some
evidence what happened to
them, that they -- they say there's no use in
speculating whether they were
captured. That certainly is one scenario they're dealing
with.

L. KING: Thank, Jane. We'll be covering this story. As
soon as more
information comes in we'll get back to you, and others
as well.

Let's now go to Washington. Pat Buchanan is a candidate
for the Republican
Party nomination for the presidency. Senator Mary
Landrieu is a Democrat of
Louisiana and a member of the Senate Armed Services

Committee. We're
going to discuss this action from both aspects.

Pat, from the other night, someone mentioned to me today
-- is your position
that we do not interfere in any action that's regarding
just one country? And if
that's true, does that mean, say, if a dictator started
killing off people, but it
was in his own country, we would never interfere?

PAT BUCHANAN (R), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: No, I don't say
you would never interfere, but my view is that United
States armed forces,
basically, should not go into action unless American
honor or American
citizens or American vital national interests are at
stake. I don't think there's
any vital national interests, Larry, that's at stake,
and whose flag should fly
over Pristina and Kosovo. But there's no doubt the
president has us committed
to this air war, and I think we're in a situation now
where we're going to have
to either escalate or negotiate.

L. KING: So just as an example, if Hitler were only
killing German Jews you
wouldn't have bothered with that?

BUCHANAN: No, but Hitler started...

L. KING: Supposing he had only killed German Jews.

BUCHANAN: Well, look let me give you an example. Stalin
killed five million
Ukrainians and FDR recognized him. Mao Tse-Tung killed
30 million Chinese,
we did nothing. Cambodians -- the Cambodians killed a
million people and not
a single American recommended we go back.

L. KING: But you favor doing something.

BUCHANAN: But no, I did not favor going to work against
Stalin or going to
war against China or going to war against Cambodia or
going to war against
the Sudan where two million people have died. Larry, we
have got to have a
criterion for intervention and that criterion has got to
be: are the vital national
interests of the United States at stake.

L. KING: Senator Landrieu, your thoughts?

SEN. MARY LANDRIEU (D), LOUISIANA: Well, obviously, I disagree

with Pat on one major point, and I would most certainly say that it is in

America's interests to have a free and Democratic and united, as much as possible, Europe and that is what NATO represents. It is the hope of Europe.

On the eve of the 50th anniversary of NATO, it's important to think about how

important it is for NATO to be successful. The more successful NATO is, the

more successful they can lead in this way of peace-keeping and bringing more

democracy and stability. It's clearly in our economic interests and our

long-term military interests, Larry, for this to happen.

L. KING: So your answer Senator to Pat it is...

LANDRIEU: It is in our vital interests for Europe to be free and Democratic,

in our economic and military analysts.

BUCHANAN: All right, we...

L. KING: We will be back --- hold on one second, pat. We'll be back with Pat

and the Senator, but right now let's go to the Pentagon, Jamie McIntyre, our

CNN military affairs correspondent. Do you have anything to add on what we

just heard from Jane Arraf about our -- the missing NATO people?

JAMIE MCINTYRE, CNN MILITARY AFFAIRS CORRESPONDENT:

Not a whole lot, Larry. Their search still continues for these three U.S.

soldiers. They're from the 1st Infantry Division. They were taking part in a

routine reconnaissance patrol in their Humvees when they split up to cover

more ground, in what we're told is part of an exercise. That's when the group

of Humvees lost contact with one of them. One of the vehicles with three

soldiers in it radioed that they were taking small arms fire, then they said they

were surrounded; then hadn't been heard from. This all happened about 2:30 in

the afternoon, local time in Macedonia. Since then a massive search has been

going on with allied troops looking for them. They have not been found. It's a pretty ominous situation this far after the incident not to have found either the troops or the vehicles.

But at this point, the Pentagon has no idea what happened to them. These were troops that were part of what used to be call task force able sentry. That was a U.N. monitoring mission on the border of Macedonia with Yugoslavia.

They were folded into the NATO forces when the U.N. ended the mandate for that -- for that mission along the border. So at this point, the Pentagon is quite concerned about the safety and whereabouts of these three missing soldiers.

L. KING: Do we know who they are?

MCINTYRE: The Pentagon knows who they are. They are in the process now of notifying the families, but they have not released their identities.

L. KING: We'll take a break and come back with more. We'll be joined by the Russian ambassador to the United Nations; Pat Buchanan and Senator Landrieu will remain with us. The commissioner of the New York City Police Department, Howard Safir will be with us at the bottom of the hour in a major discussion on the indictment today of four officers in New York City for second-degree murder.

Don't go away.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

L. KING: We'll get right back with Pat Buchanan and Senator Mary Landrieu, but let's check in with John King at the White House now for the observations there about these missing soldiers -- John.

JOHN KING, CNN WHITE HOUSE CORRESPONDENT: Larry, White House officials telling us the president was first informed by his national security adviser, Sandy Berger, about six hours ago, 3:00 in the afternoon here

Washington time, and the president, we're told, has been periodically updated since then on the search and rescue operation under way. White House officials referring all questions to the Pentagon about the substance, the details of that search.

They do say, however, that it's very disturbing, of course, that neither the vehicle nor these troops have been located several hours after this.

This report comes just a short time after the White House briefing in which the press secretary, Joe Lockhart, once again, said that the American people should be well aware of the risks of this operation, and on the eve of a visit by the president tomorrow to the Norfolk Naval Air Station in Virginia where he is to meet privately first with families of some military members overseas as part of this operation, and then give a public speech making his case for why the United States should be involved, and also thanking the military families -- those here in the United States and those overseas -- for participating in this.

Again, White House officials say the president is being kept up to speed, but they've very little information tonight, except that they say that this is obviously a very disturbing and a very distressing development.

L. KING: Thanks, John. As usual, CNN is on duty and will be throughout the night covering this.

Pat Buchanan, is it your position that there should be no American troops anywhere in this area?

BUCHANAN: Well, I would not...

L. KING: These three that are missing should not have been there?

BUCHANAN: Well, I don't think we should have put the troops earlier into Macedonia; there's no vital interest in the Balkans in my judgment. It's a European problem; the Europeans should have dealt with

it, Larry. And it
clearly appears that the bombing, which was designed to
end a humanitarian
disaster, has only exacerbated and increased that
disaster. The president is the
victim of some very bad advice, and I think he has had
some very bad
misjudgments here, and we're in a very serious problem
in the Balkans as a
consequence.

L. KING: Senator Landrieu? LANDRIEU: Well, I disagree. I
think the
president could do a better job of communicating. I
think perhaps we all could
do a better job of that. Maybe there's enough blame to
go around.

But the fact is, is that this particular leader has been
torturing, murdering and
killing innocent civilians, not armed soldiers, for many
months, and according to
our intelligence and our military generals, this
offensive was going to take
place whether we went in there, bombed, or not. The
attempts of bombing are
attempts to weaken him.

Now, we have a mission. I hope that we will be
successful. I think we need to
do whatever it takes to be successful and for NATO to
have its credibility
intact. I think it's very important. Now, we're in
there, and we need to do our
job. And it's dangerous, it's risky, no one said it
wouldn't be, it's very serious,
but I do believe we can be successful.

L. KING: Do...

BUCHANAN: Larry...

L. KING: Pat, do you regard President Milosevic as an
enemy?

BUCHANAN: I regard him as a thug. He's like a lot of
other thugs in this
world. I wouldn't want to have anything to do with him.
I understand why the
Kosovar-Albanians are trying to break away.

But Larry, you've got to look at this in perspective.
There are thuggish and
criminal Serb elements acting in Kosovo. The KLA has

been described by
Americans as itself a terrorist organization. Osama bin
Laden, the terrorist
that blew up our embassy, supports them. I don't care
which of those two
groups basically controls Kosovo, but I don't think a
lot of Americans ought to
die deciding whether it's one or the other.

If we can use our good offices to stop the killing,
fine. But thus far, American
bombing has only exacerbated the killing. So we got one
option left after the
bombing, if it doesn't work, that's send in a ground
army to put an end to this,
or basically negotiate. Now, the president of the United
States, as I understand
it, even agrees with me there. He will not cross that
line, and I think that's at
least the right decision.

L. KING: Senator, do you -- the president yesterday used
the word
"genocide." Is that a word you would use, and is that a
prime reason for
NATO being there?

LANDRIEU: I think so. I think it's going to be clear, as
these weeks unfold,
exactly the kinds of atrocities that are taking place.
This is a province --
90-percent Albanian -- that's been autonomous. We didn't
start out asking for
independence, but the international community -- NATO --
was asked for
autonomy, for peace. He has not given it. He has
continued his torture and his
rampage, and if he is allowed to get away with this, and
people continue this
kind of behavior, all of Europe, or a good part of it,
could become unstable.
That clearly, Pat and Larry, is not in our interests.
It's in our economic
interests and military interests for Europe to be strong
and united, and for it to
be democratic.

And I also think that we need to listen to our military
leaders, and if they
believe that they have got to accelerate or to move in
to be successful, then I
think we need to do that. Now, I hope that we don't, but
you don't start a fight
saying, "This is as far as we'll go." We have set our

goals and we need to
accomplish them.

L. KING: Pat, you've always been pro-military.

BUCHANAN: Well, I've been very strongly pro-military,
but I think the
president got some bad advice. But I will say this: he's
commander in chief,
and for heaven's sakes, the commander in chief of the
greatest nation on
Earth does not start an offensive without the will and
the capacity to see it
through to the end. And quite clearly Mr. Berger and the
president had no idea
what was going to happen. "Two days," they said,
"Milosevic will fold. They'll
stop the ethnic cleansing." We have seen it accelerate
and exacerbate to the
point where, all over the world, people are saying the
NATO offensive is
failing, Larry.

Now, we've got to look that in the eye. Someone gave the
president bad
advice. The American military is doing its job
magnificently --especially those
fellas that got that pilot out -- but the strategy was
flawed from the beginning,
and we got to speak the truth. And frankly, for heaven's
sakes, don't go
marching into the big muddy again on the basis of a lot
of reports we haven't
got verified.

L. KING: Let me get a break and we'll ask Senator
Landrieu if she believes
that the increased bombings into Yugoslavia themselves
are going to prove
pivotal. We'll be right back.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

WILLIAM J. CLINTON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: We
must not allow, if we have the ability to stop it,
ethnic cleansing or genocide
anywhere we can stop it, particularly at the edge of
Europe. So I ask you to
support our men and women in uniform, but to support the
proposition that the
21st century world will be a case of, yes, there will be
a lot more
decentralization, there'll be a lot more individual
empowerment, but it will not

be a time of chaos and madness.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

L. KING: We'll be back momentarily with Senator Mary Landrieu of Louisiana and Pat Buchanan, presidential candidate, discussing this crisis.

We now have joining us for some moments Ambassador Sergei Lavrov. He is the Russian ambassador to the United Nations.

Anything new you can report to us as a follow-up to the discussions between Mr. Kasparov and the folks in Yugoslavia?

SERGEI LAVROV, RUSSIAN AMBASSADOR TO U.N.: Well, since I have a few moments, as you said, Kasparov is the world chess champion.

L. KING: Oh, I said -- I meant Primakov. I'm sorry.

LAVROV: It's OK. I hope he understands.

Well, I've heard some suggestions what kind of criteria should be used, starting from national interests of the United States, down to NATO 50th anniversary celebration, and then to genocide. I haven't heard a criteria which I call international law. And I wonder why is that admitted altogether?

L. KING: Do you feel -- you don't feel at all that the people in Belgrade are breaking any international laws?

LAVROV: No, I am not saying this. I am saying that whatever criteria you use, there is international law for each case, including genocide. Genocide convention of 1948, which took the United States 40 years to sign, provides for the obligation of all participants to prevent genocide. But it also provides for mechanisms to do this, and the mechanism is, if you want to use force to prevent genocide, go to the Security Council.

L. KING: Mr. Ambassador, there was even arguments in your own

parliament today in Russia -- two men got pretty angry at each other -- I don't know if you saw this. What are your thoughts on this?

LAVROV: Well, this is -- are you still showing the picture?

L. KING: Yes, what was this? I mean...

LAVROV: Well, that was a fight there.

L. KING: I thought there was unanimous feeling in Russia against this war.

LAVROV: Well, it is, basically, a unanimous feeling. I don't know what was the exact argument about. They differ on how to proceed in specific terms, but they don't disagree on the need to stop the bombing.

L. KING: Is your country going to continue its efforts like the one Mr. Primakov made? Will there be other efforts on your behalf to bring these parties to cease-fire?

LAVROV: Well, we have to proceed because there is no other choice. We don't believe that this escalation is going to achieve any result. It certainly violates international law created with the full participation of the United States and other NATO members, and we try to convince our partners to come back to political solution.

We suggested the meeting of ministers of the Counter Group countries. We suggested what Primakov negotiated with Milosevic, and I really don't understand why NATO rejected it. The offer was very simple: stop the bombing, Milosevic withdraws his forces above the level agreed in October from Kosovo. He resumes negotiations, and he guarantees the humanitarian assistance and the return of refugees.

The argument from NATO that he first has to stop fighting and start withdrawing before they stop bombing -- I believe it's not practical. If he knows that his troops are now legitimate, quote/unquote, target for NATO

phase two, and he has asked to start withdrawing them before they stop bombing him, that means that he is invited to amass his troops in convoys on roads and to make them an easy target.

L. KING: Would you comment on a point of concern in many areas: Russia has apparently officially notified Turkey that it's going to send seven naval vessels through the Bosphorus Straits into the Mediterranean, into the region of conflict in Yugoslavia. James Rubin, of the State Department of the United States, said that, "This deployment does not send a helpful signal to Belgrade," Rubin referring to the statement by the Russian president that Russia didn't intend to get involved. What do these ship deployments mean?

LAVROV: Well, I hope that Belgrade itself would decide which kind of signal it sends to it, and Jamie Rubin would be taking his own signals -- he's a good friend.

But this is true: Russia asked Turkey for the permission for seven naval ships -- reconnaissance ships, to cross the straits and to go into the Mediterranean.

So far, one ship is scheduled to leave on the 2nd of April. It's a reconnaissance ship. Its task would be to use the means it has to assess the situation and to get the information. This is too close to our borders. This might touch upon our security, and we want to have first-hand information from ourselves.

L. KING: Why six others?

LAVROV: In addition to CNN, of course.

L. KING: Why six other ships?

LAVROV: For the same purposes.

L. KING: Reconnaissance?

LAVROV: Reconnaissance.

L. KING: Thank you, Mr. Ambassador. We'll be calling on

you again.

Ambassador Sergei Lavrov, the Russian ambassador to the United Nations.

Back with Pat Buchanan and Senator Mary Landrieu after this.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

L. KING: Now, our remaining moments with Pat Buchanan and Senator Mary

Landrieu. Did anything the Russian ambassador say, Mr. Buchanan, give you

cause for concern? BUCHANAN: No, not for concern. But I will say this,

Larry: NATO is a defensive alliance, and under Article Five, you have to

attack a NATO country and then all NATO countries respond. It is true that

Yugoslavia did not attack any NATO country and that Kosovo remains a part

of that country, so Serb troops are operating inside that country and under the

rubric of international law, I think he may have an argument, although my

belief is, if the vital interests of the United States are at risk -- I don't think

they are -- but if they were, I think that we act independently of any lawyers.

L. KING: Senator.

LANDRIEU: Yes, I'd like to say two things if I could. I don't think Pat meant

to say that the president declare that this could be taken care of in two days. I

think that's what you said before we got on this segment. And clearly, that

was never stated. I mean, the president was hopeful that these airstrikes

would be effective. They have been very effective in damaging a lot of his

military operations. They have not been able to stop this village burning, and so

perhaps another step needs to be taken.

For the Russian ambassador, I would just simply say that we hope -- many of

us in the Senate -- that Russia -- we know that Russia could be helpful. We

have made good progress with Russia. We hope that they could cooperate,

and they could be helpful in bringing peace, so we remain hopeful, But we

stand with our NATO allies in this, and it's very important for NATO to be successful.

And I would just say to Pat and others that the Security Council voted pretty much overwhelmingly to reject NATO's resolution last week -- I mean, to reject Russia's resolution last week. So with that said, it's still a very tough situation, but I don't think Russia should dictate our policy. We need to stand with our NATO allies.

BUCHANAN: But Mary, I did...

L. KING: Pat, the closing word is yours. Go ahead.

BUCHANAN: Mary, I do think you have to concede that the administration was caught completely flat-footed by what has happened here. They said, "Two days Milosevic will buckle and come to the table and sign something." In addition to that, we were told it would stop the humanitarian disaster. We've got a humanitarian Bay of Pigs on our hands. We don't know how it's going to end. We're escalating to a degree we thought we would never have to.

I hope it succeeds. I'm skeptical, and -- but the main concern we've got is those Americans who went into battle and we hope they get those three folks back as well.

L. KING: Thank you both very much, Pat Buchanan, presidential candidate for the Republican nomination of the presidency; and Senator Mary Landrieu, member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Democrat of Louisiana -- or Loosiana.

We're going to take a break, and when we come back and switch our attention to New York. Four police officers were indicted on second-degree murder charges today. They plead not guilty. We'll have a panel discussing it, beginning with Howard Safir, who is the police commissioner of New York. And then the panel will consist of Johnnie Cochran, who

will be representing
the family of the gentleman who was killed; Bruce
Robertson of the
Patrolmen's Benevolent Association; the activist actress
Susan Sarandon; Ron
Daniels of the Center for Constitutional Rights; and
Murray Weiss, the
criminal justice editor of "The New York Post" who
interviewed the
policeman. That's all next. Don't go away.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: We begin with the police chief of the city of New
York, Howard Safir.

Always a great pleasure to be in his company. The
officers have pled not
guilty to charges of second-degree murder.

Happy Passover, Chief Safir...

HOWARD SAFIR, POLICE COMMISSIONER, NEW YORK CITY:
Happy Passover to you.

L. KING: ... one. And two, is the police chief neutral
in this? Is he pro-the
officers? What?

SAFIR: I haven't taken a position yet, and the reason I
haven't taken a position
is because we don't know what the facts are. The police
officers have not
testified. They pled not guilty.

And in fact, until they testify at trial and tell their
side of the a story, it would
be inappropriate for me to take a position on it.

It's a tragedy. I mean, it's a tragedy. We know Mr.
Diallo was an unarmed
innocent man. But what was in the minds of the police
officers we'll have to
hear from them at trial.

L. KING: What is their standing? Are they being paid?
Are they suspended?
What?

SAFIR: As of the indictment today they have been
suspended. They'll be
suspended for 30 days.

The law in this city is that I can only suspend them for
30 days. After that,

they must come back on what's called modified assignment
with no gun and
no badge.

L. KING: It's obvious, though, Howard, and people would
say that Mr. Diallo
-- what could he have done to deserve that?

SAFIR: Well, nobody...

L. KING: I mean, even if he ran, as was reported in the
"New York Post,"
even if he looked suspicious?

SAFIR: Nobody deserves to be shot who is innocent. We
all acknowledge
that. We all agree that this a terrible tragedy. The
issue is what was in the
mind of the police officers when they fired the shots.
Did they fear for their
lives? Did they think that Mr. Diallo was going for a
gun? I don't know the
answer to that. So right now, it's all speculation. And
until the police officers
have a chance to tell their story, we really don't know
what happened.

L. KING: Now you have got the other police officers in
Brooklyn with the
torture of the Haitian immigrant. That's going to go on
trial. Is this, Chief, an
aberration?

SAFIR: It is an aberration. We have 6 million contacts
with the public a year.
Civilian complaints last year had the lowest number of
force allegation in the
last five years.

We fire our weapons less than any large-city police
department in the United
States. In fact, we fire our weapons six times less than
Washington, D.C.,
three times less than most other major cities.

L. KING: Now, the Justice Department -- is this true? --
is investigating the
police of New York for pattern and practice, is what
they call it?

SAFIR: They're doing an inquiry to see whether or not
there is a pattern and
practice. I think they will find at the end of their
investigations that this is the
most restrained large-city police department in the

United States. And to
broad-brush this department with one or two incidents is
the worst kind of
group prejudice.

L. KING: How do you know whether someone is going to be
a good cop?

SAFIR: Well, we do psychological testing. We do very
stringent training. We
do retraining.

But you know, in a force of 40,000 human beings, you're
going to be
somewhat reflective of the population. There are going
to be good cops and
there are going to be bad cops. The vast majority are
good cops who put their
lives on the line every day.

You know, we have had four street-crime unit cops killed
since the unit was
formed, and I don't see anybody, you know, paying much
attention to that.

But the important thing here is to get to the bottom of
this issue, to understand
that this is not representative of the NYPD, and that's
what these
investigations will find.

L. KING: That street-crime unit is plain clothesmen,
right?

SAFIR: They were plain-clothes. I put them back in
uniform last week
because I think it's important that the public
understand who they are and
what they're doing.

L. KING: Is there an inner investigation in addition to
the district attorney and
the charges and the like? Do you have an investigation
going independent of
that? SAFIR: There will be an investigation after the
criminal proceedings. But
I can't do the investigation at the request of the
district attorney, and properly
so, because I don't want to impact on the criminal
investigation.

L. KING: Mr. Wise will be with us in a while. He wrote
an article in the
"Post" yesterday talking to the officers. And apparently

there had been a
rapist loose in the area and the man started to run.

Have you read that and do you have a comment on that?

SAFIR: Well, I did read it. I can't comment on his speculation. What I can comment on is that in fact the street-crime unit was looking for a pattern rapist. Mr. Diallo in a general way fit the description of that rapist. But whether or not that was the motivation for them stopping him or not I won't know until I know the facts.

L. KING: The problem here is split-second decision-making, right?

SAFIR: This entire event took place in between seven and eight seconds. And what people have to understand is, you know, businessmen and people in other professions have advisers, they have minutes, they have hours to make decisions. Police officers have a split second to decide whether or not they're going to take a life or protect their own life.

It's a very difficult thing. I know; I have been there.

L. KING: What do you think about the citizen protests every day and the arrests of prominent people?

SAFIR: Well, I think, you know, it's -- it's become a thing where I believe some people are very sincere. A lot of people are looking for their moment of fame, looking for their 15 minutes in front of the camera.

The other side of this is I walk around New York every day. I am told by citizens over and over how grateful they are to the police department that this is now the safest large city in America. Crime has been reduced 50 percent, and the people who have been demonstrating and getting arrested I don't believe are representative of the majority of the people in the city.

I look on the Internet. I look at the letters I get. I look at what people tell me.

And most people say, sure, there are times when cops do inappropriate things.

I fired more cops than my two predecessors combined. I will not tolerate that.

But when you look at the majority of this police force they have made this a city in renaissance.

L. KING: Chief, is there a danger here of the pendulum going too far where you put a lot of pressure on officers for arrests, and the guy, you know, he jaywalks, let's take him off the street, that kind of thing?

SAFIR: I don't believe that's true. I think you have to have a balance to make sure that we don't violate anybody's civil rights, at the same time we do assertive policing. In fact, the Vera Institute, which is a very renowned criminal justice institute, just did a study of two of our precincts and showed you can do assertive policing without violating people's rights.

I believe that's what we do. That's what we will continue to do.

But on the other hand, there have been some valid criticisms. We can make improvements. I am willing to make improvements. I have been meeting with a lot of community groups to hear their concerns and will continue to do that.

L. KING: A couple of other quick things. You got a lot of criticism for coming out for the Academy Awards. I'll be back in your city next week.

How was -- what was your response to that during the middle of all this?

SAFIR: Well, my response was I went with a personal friend on my own personal time. I have asked the Corporation Council of the city to look into it to make sure it's appropriate. And he will make a determination. I believe it was appropriate.

I don't think -- you know, I work 24 hours a day seven days a week. If I want

to take my family on a trip on the weekend that doesn't impact my job, that should be my business. And that's what the overwhelming majority of people have told me.

But to make sure it's appropriate I have asked the Corporation Council to investigate.

L. KING: And finally, what is this doing or done to the morale of the department?

SAFIR: Well, it's devastated the morale of the department. If you have been putting your life on the line for five years, made this the safest city in America and all of a sudden all the media does is talk about the Diallo killing and broad brush the entire department with one incident, it has to be devastating to morale.

I have been working very hard to work with police officers and with the various units to let them know that most citizens do appreciate what they have done and do not associate them with this tragedy. But it has an effect on morale. We're going to have to rebuild that.

L. KING: By the way, Howard, I have been calling you chief. You are commissioner, right? That's the title in New York.

SAFIR: I am the New York City police commissioner.

L. KING: Is there a chief or are they one and the same.
SAFIR: We have a chief of department who reports to me.

L. KING: Again, happy holidays.

SAFIR: And you as well.

L. KING: Howard Safir, the commissioner of the New York City Police.
We'll be back with more on this topic right after this.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

L. KING: Welcome back.

Now joining us to discuss the Diallo shooting case, all in New York, Johnnie Cochran, lead attorney for the family of Amadou Diallo; Bruce Robertson first vice president of the police union, the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association; the brilliant actress Susan Sarandon, who has joined in the protests against police brutality; Ron Daniels, Executive director of the Center for Constitutional Rights; and Murray Weiss, the criminal justice editor for the "New York Post." He had an amazing story yesterday interviewing the officers. We'll have individual questions for each and then try to round-robin in the time available.

Johnnie, you're representing the family in what regard?

JOHNNIE COCHRAN, DIALLO FAMILY ATTORNEY: In a possible civil suit that will be happening. The Diallo family has retained myself, Barry Scheck, Peter Neufeld (ph), Kyle Waters (ph) and a lawyer named Michael Warren.

L. KING: A possible civil suit against the city.

COCHRAN: Against the city and the involved officers, yes, Larry.

L. KING: Bruce, can you have a stand even though you head the union and the policemen belong to your union, can you have a stand before you know the facts?

BRUCE ROBERTSON, PATROLMEN'S BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION: I don't think anybody should have a stand before all the facts are in. I mean, it's obvious that there was a terrible tragedy in that hallway on that night, and five people know what happened in there. And unfortunately, Mr. Diallo was killed in that incident, and God rest his soul. But, again, our contention is that it was a tragedy and not a crime.

L. KING: But you don't know that, do you?

ROBERTSON: No, we don't know that. Until -- until these

four police officers can tell their story in the court -- in a court of law, it remains -- they seem to be the only ones that know what happened in there.

L. KING: Your role is to stand up for them? Is that the role as the president?

ROBERTSON: We support them because we know the kind of work that they do. We know the split-second decisions they have to make. We know the aggressive-type policing that, that particular unit does.

L. KING: Susan, why did you take such a vocal stand against -- before all the facts are in?

SUSAN SARANDON, ACTRESS: I haven't taken a stand as to their

innocence or not. I think an indictment was necessary because otherwise, it

does a disservice to the group of good cops that I believe most of New York

City's finest are. And to pretend that nothing happened or that it wasn't worth

an indictment would have been just as a disservice to them as to the Diallo family.

I think that when the questions are asked, it's not just to find out what was

going on in their minds, though, it's also to find out what circumstances led to

the conditioning that puts these guys in this circumstance. To create a task

force that quickly; to increase its number that quickly really robbed them of

the training supervision and -- and the surveillance, everything that they

needed to put them on the street where they were in a position to do what

needed to be done. So I think that they're victims also.

And I think that the problem was -- the reason that we took to the street was

that it was being handled in a way not by the police, necessarily, but by the

powers that be, that made it seem as if it could be dismissed or it wasn't --

something hadn't happened. It was just not quick enough coming, and we

wanted to make sure that attention was still focused on

this, so the bigger
issues could be addressed.

L. KING: Ron, what is the Center for Constitutional
Rights?

RON DANIELS, CENTER FOR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS: Well, the
Center for Constitutional Rights is a public interest
legal institution which is
deeply involved in the issue of police brutality and
misconduct. When the
commissioner talks about the split-second decisions that
have to be made in
this unit, we're looking at aggressive unit that in 1997
and 1998 profiled,
stopped and frisked 45,000 people in the city of New
York. That's why you
have such outrage. The question of -- the matter is,
with Amadou Diallo, his
crime was being black or a person of color in America.
That today translates
to this...

L. KING: So they just came and shot him?

DANIELS: No, what I am saying is that if he were -- if
he were in a suburban
white neighborhood, he would have gotten the benefit of
the doubt. In an
urban inner city neighborhood with the profiling that's
going on, being black or
a person of color automatically means suspect, means
dangerous, means
threatening, and that's why the Center for
Constitutional Rights in this unit, this
street crimes unit that says we own the night, we have
filed a federal civil
rights lawsuit against them because we think that people
ought not to live in
communities where their Fourth Amendment rights are
suspended.

L. KING: I got to get a break and then I want Murray
Weiss to tell us what
the cops told him that he wrote about yesterday and then
we'll round-robin as
much as we can.

Don't go away.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

OFC. SEAN CARROLL, DEFENDANT: I would like to thank
everybody for

the support.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: In the middle please, I'm sorry.

CARROLL: I would like to thank the officers of New York City for their
undaunted support; the members of the street crime unit.

OFC. RICHARD MURPHY, DEFENDANT: I am very happy with the support that we got from the police department.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: You're blocking -- I'm sorry, officer.

MURPHY: I did nothing wrong, and this trial will show that I did nothing
wrong and I'm looking forward to it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I know that was a very emotional night for all
the officers in that unit.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

L. KING: As you might imagine with the events in the Balkans, we have
limited time. We're going to look at this subject a lot as this trial approaches
and have all of these guests back.

But Murray Weiss of the "New York Post," can you briefly tell us what you
learned, briefly, in that article you wrote yesterday, the police officers' side of
this.

MURRAY WEISS, "NEW YORK POST": Yes, basically their story is that
they came on down Wheeler Avenue in the Bronx and they see a figure of a
man in a doorway. It's midnight at night. He looks suspicious to them;
fidgeting, pacing looking in the window. The officers decide to get out of the
car. The two that are on the passenger's side by sheer fate are closest to Mr.
Diallo. They get out. They begin to approach him. They identify themselves as
police officers. They ask him to come to him. Rather than come to him, he
actually turns as though he's trying to go into the building, and they continue to

approach him. When they climb the stairs and they say --
they kind of order
him to come out and to show his hands, show his hands.

Unfortunately, Mr. Diallo, according to my sources, he
begins to turn to his left
and with his right hand, he reaches into his pocket. He
pulls out what later is
identified as his wallet, unfortunately. One of the
officers sees a black object;
yells "Gun! He's got a gun"; the other officer, they're
both on the top of the
steps. He pulls out his gun and he fires a few shots. He
falls literally off the
step backwards as though he has been shot. And that
pretty much prompts the
other officers to begin to fire. They think that the
officer has been shot.

He's actually in a prone position at one point on his
back. He's trying to wiggle
away. The other two officers come around the front and
the rear of the car.

They see what they think is a gunfight. It's midnight at
night. Perhaps the
gunfire is reflecting off a glass giving the impression
there's gunfire coming
from the vestibule.

When the smoke clears basically, you know, the sad truth
is that obviously Mr.

Diallo is shot numerous times and there's only a wallet
laying 18 inches from
his hand.

L. KING: As a journalist, Murray, is this an
understandable tragedy to you?

WEISS: I think the story that I reported goes a long way
to explaining to a
large degree some of the things that happened at the --
at the scene of the
shooting. I think there are a lot of questions left
unanswered, clearly, and you
know, the liability and culpability is going to rest in
some of the great nuances
of both the evidence gathering, the ballistics, and
obviously, ultimately, the
testimony of the officers.

L. KING: We'll get some thoughts from everybody again.
I've got to get
another break. We'll be right back.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

RUDOLPH GIULIANI, MAYOR OF NEW YORK CITY: The criminal justice system has, as it has been doing now for some time, although many people are trying to exploit this, is operating correctly. Charges have been brought. In fairness to the Diallo family and their need for a just and complete result, in fairness to the entire city and its need for a just and complete result, and in fairness to the four police officers and their need to have a fair trial, we should allow the criminal justice system now to operate.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

L. KING: Again, we apologize for the time limitations, and we promised a lot more on this with all of our guests.

Johnnie, does it, Murray Weiss' explanation, as he got it seem fairly logical?

COCHRAN: No, it doesn't, Larry, because, as I think Murray will agree, that's iteration No. 3.

The first version by a lawyer named Worth (ph) who represents these officers came out and said, look, what happened was that the officer was shot through his pants leg. They believed he was shot, and they were firing in response to that.

The second iteration had Mr. Diallo running down the street and the officers following him. This is the third iteration.

Let me tell you what's wrong with that. We have to wait for the facts. Here's the problem. We have a forensic pathologist, and I can tell you this, Mr. Diallo was hit with one of the first bullets that were fired at him, struck him in his -- and perforated his spinal cord, causing him to be instantly paralyzed. He fell to the ground, Larry, and thereafter he was struck in the bottom of the feet and the leg as these officers continued firing.

The reason they are charged with second-degree because
this is willful
disregard and a violation of this man's absolute rights.
They kept firing when
he was down. It was 41 shots. It never becomes logical.

He was incapacitated and paralyzed after a short time.
And the physical
evidence will prove that. And there are going to be
several more iterations
before this is over.

L. KING: Bruce, what do you make of the severity of
second- degree
murder?

ROBERTSON: I think the charge -- I think the charge
comes about to be only
because those police officers did not get a chance to
speak and tell their story
to the grand jury. They probably will tell their story
in the trial, and the truth
will come out here.

L. KING: When you say "probably," wouldn't they
definitely take the stand?

ROBERTSON: Yes. I think so, but that's not my decision
to make. That's
going to be their attorneys' decision to make.

I know the reason that they did not take the stand or
they did not go and make
statements before the grand jury was because of the
circus atmosphere that
was created in New York City with people taking to the
streets like a lynch
mob.

L. KING: Well said. Susan, has anything been said to
assuage your worries?

SARANDON: I just hope that we don't lose track of the
need to use this
incident as a springboard to examine, you know, ways
that we can be
protected without giving up our civil liberties, that we
can get rid of terms like
"racial profiling" in order to make ourselves safe, that
we use this as a chance
to take on some of the examples in other cities where
people aren't treated as
children that need to be disciplined, but that they work
within the community,

spotting community leaders, getting more people of
neighborhoods in their
neighborhoods as policemen...

L. KING: The police commissioner says, Susan, you have
the lowest crime
rate of any big city in America.

SARANDON: Well, I guess it depends on what neighborhood
you're in. And
if you're at a point where you're as afraid of policemen
as you are of being out
on the street and being shot by someone in your
neighborhood -- I don't have a
problem in my neighborhood. I am not talking about my
neighborhood.

I am talking about what's happening -- you know, the
trains run fast in Italy
too, you know. Fascism work. It's very efficient. But
it's not necessarily what
we want.

And it's not -- if it's systemic, it's not fair to the
policemen who want to
operate in a different fashion, which are the bulk of
the policemen. And to say
that starting from the top, this aggressive, you know,
anti-crime war, there has
to be a way to deal with all of the problems in every
neighborhood with more
respect that are clever and more imaginative and use the
people in those
neighborhoods to help solve crimes themselves.

L. KING: We -- I am going to have to cut you there,
because we are out of
time. We're going to have everybody back. We'll give a
lot of coverage to this.
We'll tell you what's coming up tomorrow night after
this.

Thanks, folks.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

L. KING: Again, a very happy Passover.

Tomorrow night on LARRY KING LIVE, our coverage of the
airstrikes
against Yugoslavia continues, and we'll also update that
case in New York
City of a police shooting of a West African immigrant,
all tomorrow night.

Up next, a special edition of "NEWSSTAND." "People"
magazine profiles the
late comedian Gilda Radner. Stay tuned.

END

Message Sent

To:

Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer M. Palmieri/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anthony R. Bernal/OVP@OVP
Melissa G. Green/OPD/EOP@EOP
Leslie Bernstein/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robin M. Roland/WHO/EOP@EOP
Chandler G. Spaulding/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dominique L. Cano/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dag Vega/WHO/EOP@EOP
Brenda M. Anders/WHO/EOP@EOP
gamble-bennett@dol.gov @ inet
Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP@EOP
Richard L. Siewert/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jordan Tamagni/WHO/EOP@EOP
Beverly J. Barnes/WHO/EOP
Elizabeth R. Newman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julia M. Payne/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julianne B. Corbett/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey M. Smith/OSTP/EOP@EOP
Lowell A. Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan A. Kaplan/OPD/EOP@EOP
Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer Ferguson/OMB/EOP@EOP
Mark D. Neschis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Ruby Shamir/WHO/EOP@EOP
Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP@EOP
Amy Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lisa J. Levin/WHO/EOP@EOP
Peter A. Weissman/OPD/EOP@EOP
William A. Halter/OMB/EOP@EOP
Eli G. Attie/OVP@OVP
Patricia M. Ewing/OVP@OVP
Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa M. Murray/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan E. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP
Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anne M. Edwards/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael Waldman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gene B. Sperling/OPD/EOP@EOP
Paul K. Engskov/WHO/EOP@EOP
Laura D. Schwartz/WHO/EOP@EOP
Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julie E. Mason/WHO/EOP@EOP

Steven J. Naplan/NSC/EOP@EOP
Alison Muscatine/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gordon Li/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mark A. Kitchens/WHO/EOP@EOP
June Shih/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey A. Shesol/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rochester M. Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rachael E. Sullivan/OVP@OVP
Julie B. Goldberg/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sarah E. Gegenheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Susanna B. McGuire/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steve Ricchetti/WHO/EOP@EOP
Edward F. Hughes/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa J. Prober/WHO/EOP@EOP
Justin Coleman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Clara J. Shin/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan M. Prince/WHO/EOP@EOP
Joshua S. Gottheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Heather M. Riley/WHO/EOP@EOP
Alejandro G. Cabrera/OVP@OVP
Rebecca L. Walldorff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jon P. Jennings/WHO/EOP@EOP
Katharine Button/WHO/EOP@EOP
Tracy Pakulniewicz/WHO/EOP@EOP
James T. Heimbach/WHO/EOP@EOP
Victoria L. Valentine/WHO/EOP@EOP
James E. Kennedy/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael A. Hammer/NSC/EOP@EOP
Laura J. Lewis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Toby C. Graff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sean P. O'Shea/WHO/EOP@EOP
Thomas D. Janenda/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rajiv Y. Mody/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robin J. Bachman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Saladbar 23 <saladbar23 @ hotmail.com> @ inet
Kimberly S. Anderson/OA/EOP@EOP

----- Forwarded by Rajiv Y. Mody/WHO/EOP on 04/21/99
04:24 PM -----

Mark A. Kitchens
04/01/99 06:05:03 AM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: CNN Crossfire, March 31, 1999

Crossfire

Aired March 31, 1999 - 7:30 p.m. ET

Should NATO Send Ground Troops Into Kosovo?

ROBERT NOVAK, CO-HOST: Tonight, NATO aims at more targets in

Yugoslavia, as Russian warships enter the Mediterranean.
Is Operation Allied

Force working, or is it time to send in ground troops?

ANNOUNCER: Live from Washington, CROSSFIRE. On the left, Bill Press.

On the right, Robert Novak. In the CROSSFIRE, former U.S. ambassador to

NATO Robert Hunter, and in Tulsa, Republican Senator James Inhofe, a member of the Armed Service Committee.

NOVAK: Good evening. Welcome to CROSSFIRE.

On day eight in the bombing of Yugoslavia, there was not yet a start of destruction visited on center city Belgrade as hinted in advance by NATO.

But in Washington, the Pentagon did report that allied aircraft had hit Serbian army tanks. Meanwhile, on the day after the Russian peace initiative was summarily rejected by NATO, the Kremlin said it is sending the first of seven warships into the Mediterranean to be close to the Yugoslav war area. News of such Russian intervention did not exactly thrill U.S. officials, who also have to deal with reports that the Pentagon is running out of million-dollar cruise missiles.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

KEN BACON, PENTAGON SPOKESMAN: We have a supply now, but it won't last forever, but we certainly have enough to continue striking important targets.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

NOVAK: But the big questions deal with the possibility of American combat troops being sent to fight their way into Kosovo.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

JOE LOCKHART, WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY: There is no plans, no intention to send in ground troops at this point.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

NOVAK: Not at this point, the White House says, but what about later?

Bill.

BILL PRESS, CO-HOST: Senator, good evening. Thanks for joining us. I

think we accept and admit that the one week of NATO airstrikes haven't done

the job in Serbia, so the question is, what course to take now? Senator, before

I get your answer to that question, I'd like you to listen to what one of your

Republican senatorial colleagues had to say today.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

SEN. JOHN MCCAIN (R), ARIZONA: I would intensify the bombing

campaign to a very significant degree, including destroying a lot of the

infrastructure, dropping the bridges, turning out the lights in Belgrade. And

then, I would tell Mr. Milosevic that -- then I would consider the option, if

necessary, of ground troops, which I would use as a last, absolute last resort

but not take it off the table.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

PRESS: Actually, that was last night on "LARRY KING LIVE," senator.

Do you think Senator McCain is just being too much of a hawk here, or isn't he on the right track?

SEN. JAMES INHOFE, (R-OK), ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE: No, I

don't think it's matter of being hawk. First of all, we shouldn't be over there.

And we -- I can remember six months ago, tonight, I was on CROSSFIRE

with Elliot Ingalls (ph), and at that time, I said, we're going to end up sending

troops in there; the president knows it; he's lying to

the American people, and
now, we're now to the point where it's going to happen
-- there still denying it
-- but it's going to happen.

Now, when you say: What would you do at this point? You
know, I wouldn't
be over there to start with, right now. We did our best
to keep from sending
our equipment, our assets over there -- we can't afford
to do it, and yet,
they're over there now.

PRESS: Well, senator, I'd like to debate -- and we will
-- the question of
whether or not we should be there, but we are there,
senator, and we can't
ignore that. Now that we're there, now that the United
States and NATO are
in, isn't it important to finish the job? Isn't it
important to win?

INHOFE: No, I don't think there's any finish to the job.
If you can tell me, Bill,
what the end game is, what is the exit strategy, what is
the finish, what's the
mission, then I would agree with you, but we don't know
that; and we've tried
to get it from this administration -- we haven't gotten
it. So I would say that
we ought to drop everything we've got and get out of
there.

Right now, we're running out of cruise missile, as you
well know. We said that
several days ago. My concern is, you know they've got
surface-to-air missiles
over there. They haven't been using them; they didn't
want to waste them on
cruise missiles; then, what's next? Our airplanes go in.

PRESS: Senator, what is...

INHOFE: I think it's a very, very dangerous situation
that he's got us in.

PRESS: Senator, I don't understand what's so
complicated. Isn't there an
obvious exit strategy, which is victory -- what's wrong
with that, senator?

INHOFE: They have never said that; this administration
has never said
victory...

PRESS: Why don't you say it?

INHOFE: ... nor have they said what victory is. What's victory? I mean, we go in there and take out and kill a bunch of Serbs?

You know, I was over there, Bill. I don't think there's anyone on this program that's been -- that you've had so far -- that's actually been over in Kosovo.

And I have to say this, and I say this in a real sincere way. When I was going through there about two months ago, I only saw two dead soldiers; they were both Serbs. And we paint the picture that there's only one bad guy in this fight, and I can't accept that.

PRESS: Bob.

NOVAK: Ambassador Robert Hunter, I'd like to play for you a little potpourri of the president, secretary of state and secretary of defense talking about ground troops in Kosovo. Let's take a look at it.

ROBERT HUNTER, Please do.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

WILLIAM J. CLINTON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: I do not intend to put our troops in Kosovo to fight a war.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

MADELINE ALBRIGHT, U.S. SECRETARY OF STATE: We have no plans to use ground troops in an aggressive way, only to implement a peace agreement.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

WILLIAM COHEN, U.S. SECRETARY OF DEFENSE: We do not foresee and don't have any plans to put ground forces in a hostile environment.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

NOVAK: Do you think the leaders of our country have put themselves --
painted themselves into a corner -- no matter what happens on the ground,
they cannot send ground troops in, after saying these things?

ROBERT HUNTER, FORMER U.S. AMBASSADOR TO NATO: It's the circumstances under which you send them in. There's already the agreement,
if there is peace, for a group of 28,000 soldiers, of whom only 4,000 would be
American, to go in and keep the peace. The question is whether they have to
fight there way in -- nobody wants to do that.

I agree with Senator McCain, just now; I think we should be using air power
to the maximum and see what that accomplishes.

NOVAK: Do you think that could work? Do you really think that could work?

HUNTER: I don't know whether that could work or not.

NOVAK: You're a student of history.

HUNTER: All I know is that Milosevic, for the first time, is feeling the full
impact, not just of the military power of the United States, but of the entire
NATO alliance, a unified NATO alliance, where he thought only a few week
ago, they were all going to run for shelter.

NOVAK: Do you know of any time in history where air power without
combat troops has affected major engagement, other than the nuclear bombing
of Japan -- do you know of any other?

HUNTER: Well, this is the question whether we can achieve what we need to
do by breaking the will of Milosevic to carry out ethnic cleansing, near
genocide and to try to prosecute something we haven't seen since World War
II. This is a matter of indicating to him that he is going to lose big time of
things he values.

INHOFE: Can I get in on this?

NOVAK: I just want to show one thing. I want to get a testimony from an ethnic cleanser, a fellow by the name of Arkan, who is very notorious. He was indicted, today, by the World Court as a war criminal in Hague -- in the Hague, and he also stopped by and had an exclusive interview with CNN, and this is how he ended the interview. Let's take a look at it.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

ZELJKO RAZNATOVIC, "ARKAN": If you come with the ground troops in Yugoslavia, then you will have the new Vietnam in the heart of Europe; that's for sure.

(END VIDEO CLIP) NOVAK: Whether it's for sure or not, isn't that a possibility that if you send ground troops, American ground troops, into Serbia you would have a Vietnam situation?

HUNTER: I don't think we'd have a Vietnam situation. For one thing, we have a united 19 countries trying to achieve a single result. You have a relatively small military that you're dealing against, and we're far better trained and far better to operate than we did in Vietnam, but that's not the point. Nobody is trying to send in ground troops. What we're trying to do...

NOVAK: But you may have to.

HUNTER: In the final analysis, it might become impossible to avoid it. But right now, there are a lot of instruments left to try other things.

PRESS: Go ahead, senator. I know you want to get in here.

INHOFE: Let me just say, Bob, you gave a lot of quotes from the administration about ground troops not going in, never their intention, and yet, Wesley Clark, General Wesley Clark said -- and I quote right now -- he said, "We never showed him -- we never thought air power alone could stop this

kind of paramilitary strategy." And I think that everyone believes that. And, I, again, go back to six months ago when we said, let's get ready because they're talking about sending in troops, even though they're denying it to the American people. Certainly General Wesley Clark knows what he's talking about.

PRESS: Senator, I want to come back to your point that we have no business being over there. I suggest a couple of reasons that have been given, I think, legitimately, for NATO's action over there. How about a stable Europe, Senator? Isn't that important to the United States?

INHOFE: Well, I think, first of all, that we could get a stable Europe, that we have a lot of people over there -- the Italians, the Germans and the rest of them, who have a lot at stake militarily, a lot of strategic interests here. We don't have them.

And your guest, Robert Hunter, was quoted four days ago as saying: "Strategically, Kosovo is not important." And I don't think it's all that important.

Here's the big problem that we failed to talk about, and that is, what is this doing to America and our ability to defend ourselves if something should happen in North Korea or something should happen in Iraq?

HUNTER: Can I add something on that?

PRESS: Sure.

HUNTER: Let me tell you, if, now that NATO's engaged -- all 19 countries have voted for it; 13 countries are there including the United States -- if we then back down, if we allow this two-bit dictator, Milosevic, to succeed, what we're going to find is that the North Koreans will come at us; Saddam Hussein will come at us again. We'll find that nobody believes our word. Nobody believes NATO's word, and, frankly, if we back down, we might as well cancel the NATO summit, because the thing that we've

worked at for 50

years -- we built to go into the 21st century -- won't
be worth very much. So...

INHOFE: Robert, do you think that they believe our word
now?

HUNTER: I think they do.

INHOFE: You do think they believe that?

HUNTER: I think there was a problem for a number of
months in which

NATO was making threats and not following them through.
But day by day
now I think the credibility of NATO is back, and I think
the credibility of the
United States is...

(CROSSTALK)

NOVAK: Ambassador Hunter...

PRESS: I want to follow through here with the senator,
just if I can, Bob, one
other point. Senator, back to some of the reasons in
terms of strategic
interests of the United States, not to mention the
threat of a wider war. But
how about simply, sir, the genocide, the ethnic
cleansing that's taking place?
Are we just supposed to look the other way or let the
Europeans handle it?

INHOFE: Now, Bill, you're talking about humanitarian,
aren't you?

PRESS: I am. And I am not ashamed to raise that issue.

INHOFE: All right. Let me ask you this question, Bill. I
just came back
yesterday from West Africa. I was just across the border
from Angola.

For every one person that they're killing in Kosovo,
they're killing 30 in Angola,
as we speak. What about 800,000 people in Rwanda as
opposed to 2,000 in
Kosovo? Where's your humanitarian...

PRESS: Your point, senator, is that since we can't be
everywhere we should
be nowhere, is that it?

INHOFE: I am saying we have a responsibility in this country, and that is to defend America. Right now, if we should have to put ground troops into either Iraq or actually go across into someplace else in that particular theater, we don't have the capacity.

If you doubt that, you talk to the commanding officer of the 21st (UNINTELLIGIBLE). He said if we have to go into the ground -- on the ground in Iraq, we would have to be 100 percent dependent upon Guard and Reserves.

PRESS: All right. Senator, Mr. Hunter, we're going to have to take a break. When we come back, will NATO bombs be falling next on downtown Belgrade?

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

PRESS: Welcome back to CROSSFIRE. There's breaking news on this issue.

We're going to go immediately to the Pentagon and CNN's Jamie McIntyre.

Jamie, what's the latest there?

JAMIE MCINTYRE, CNN CORRESPONDENT: Well, the Pentagon says that they have received a report from NATO headquarters that a three-man reconnaissance team of NATO soldiers in Macedonia along the border with -- with Kosovo have reported -- are reported missing and are being searched for at the moment.

The last report came from this three-man team as they were driving in a military vehicle along a civilian road in what's known as the Kumanovo area.

They radioed that they were coming under small- arms fire and were surrounded, and then, according to sources, the radio transmission broke off.

Ground and helicopter teams are searching for the missing reconnaissance team aided by local police that are sending patrols into that area in Macedonia.

Again, this occurred apparently today in the border area between Macedonia and Yugoslavia, where NATO troops were on a routine reconnaissance patrol when they radioed in that they were coming under small-arms fire. We don't know what's happened to those NATO troops.

Bill.

PRESS: Jamie, thank you very much. We'll resume our debate here in Tulsa, Oklahoma, joined by Senator James Inhofe; here in the studio, Robert Hunter, former ambassador to NATO.

Bob.

NOVAK: Ambassador Hunter, you're not a soldier but you have dealt with soldiers for years over at NATO and you know something about it. There seems to be two separate plans. One is at NATO -- you get from Brussels -- they talk about, if they have to go in to clean it up, that talk about 200,000 troops. It would take about a month to get them in place. And there's another proposal of taking the NATO troops in Macedonia, which I don't think include any American fighting forces and -- what is it? 18,000 troops or less -- and sending them in. Which of those plans is realistic or are either of them realistic?

HUNTER: I don't know. You'd have to ask a military person. The basic thing is to stay the course with the air power, and to get the message across to Milosevic that he is not going to be able to prevail with his ethnic cleansing and to prevail in taking on the mightiest alliance in history, and show that we don't have the moral or the political fortitude to carry on.

NOVAK: Let me ask you a couple of political questions. One political question is that we're getting film from Yugoslavia, from all over Yugoslavia of a lot -- a lot of support. There are not five or six people. There's big support for Milosevic, had another rock concert in -- in Belgrade today. They seem to really be

stepping up their --
their morale and their activity.

You can take a look at it right there.

Can we say that the bombing, while it certainly has not
impeded ethnic
cleansing, has stepped up Milosevic's support in his own
country, in Serbia?

HUNTER: Milosevic always had a lot of support. The worst
thing would be if
we now allowed him to consolidate that by showing that
he can get away with
what he's doing.

Fine, if he can manufacture some popularity and get a
little nationalism going,
but that's not really what's involved here. What's
involved here is the behavior
of this government and preserving lives and trying to
build peace, not just in
the former Yugoslavia, but across Europe.

NOVAK: One more political question, and that is that
Russia announced today
-- and they're very disturbed at the Pentagon that this
might encourage the
Serbians to be more resistant -- Russia announced that
they're sending
warships to the Mediterranean.

I wonder if this little country -- and the -- pretty
soon there's not going to be
anymore Kosovars in Kosovo anyway. I don't know how you
handle that.

But we are really deteriorating our relations with --
it's not a superpower
anymore, but it's the No. 2 nuclear power in the world.
We need good
relations with them. Isn't that short-sided on the U.S.
part?

HUNTER: Absolutely, we need good relations with the
Russians, but they
ought to be coming toward us.

NOVAK: But they're not.

HUNTER: It's time they got on the right side of
history...

PRESS: They do when they want the money.

HUNTER: It's time they got on the right side of history, recognize they're backing a loser with Milosevic, to understand, frankly, that they can have an honored place in European security if they will support the way forward in terms of -- of peace instead of getting on the wrong side.

PRESS: Senator Inhofe, we haven't forgotten you, honest. You want to make a point there.

INHOFE: Yes. I really do want to make a point there. You know, the two powers that have ICBMs that can reach the United States of America are Russia and China. Russia is right now from the Black Sea fleet sending ships -- maybe one, maybe more -- for aid. We also know that they have sent in a lot of their equipment, perhaps even nuclear equipment, for the border areas.

Here we go in. We're taking on not just Milosevic. We can't sit here and say, that little guy, we can whip him. We have got these two other powers that actually have missiles that can reach the United States of America, and we have zero defense -- thank you to this president.

So this is a very, very serious thing. I am very much concerned about the possibility of World War III.

HUNTER: Now, now, come on. Let's not exaggerate what's going on with the Russians.

INHOFE: I am not exaggerating what's going on with the Russians.

HUNTER: We have got -- we have got 1,500 Russian soldiers serving with NATO in Bosnia. The Russians were part of the contact group that put together the Rambouillet peace process. You have Primakov, the prime minister, going to Belgrade yesterday, trying to talk Milosevic into seeing some kind of sense.

The Russians are making some demonstration for domestic reasons, but even

Primakov has said we're not going to become isolated. We want this thing to work.

So...

INHOFE: Robert, there can be no stronger...

HUNTER: This is not the Cold War. This is not the Cold War.

INHOFE: There can be no stronger statement than Primakov and the rest of

them have said in -- for what we have done. They are very much concerned

about it. I am concerned about it. I mean, here we are getting involved in

something where we're so diluting our assets that we couldn't adequately

defend America in a conventional sense if something should erupt someplace

else like Iraq or North Korea.

This is serious, and I would just ask agree with the statement, Robert, that you

made four days ago in the "Baltimore Sun" when you said there are no -- let

me make sure I get this right -- "Strategically, Kosovo is not that important." I

agree with you.

HUNTER: That's right, in raw strategic term, but in terms of the morality of

the West, in terms of building NATO, in terms of our credibility, that is very

important.

INHOFE: If you want to put American lives on -- just for the morality of the

West, then...

(CROSSTALK)

HUNTER: I am not asking for American lives. I am asking to try to use the

air power of 19 countries to bring this thing to a halt.

PRESS: Senator, I want to jump in with a political question before we the

show here, because you just took a slap at Bill Clinton.

I mean, you know...

INHOFE: If you want to extend this for 30 minutes, I've

got a few more.

PRESS: I am sure you do.

My question is: How much of your position is dictated by your hatred for Bill

Clinton, and how much of it is dictated by what's best for the United States?

INHOFE: It's not hatred for Bill Clinton. I am chairman of the Readiness

Committee. I know the problems that we're having right now, and, Bill, it is

very, very serious -- somebody has to say it; I'm so tired of wimpy politicians

who act like this isn't going to deplete our resources, our ability to defend

America, when, in fact, it's true. And it's not hatred of Bill Clinton, but I don't

feel very kindly to a president who has stopped us from being able to defend

America against an incoming missile.

PRESS: Senator, this president is trying to defend America now, and you are sitting on your hands.

NOVAK: Well, that's a political statement from Mr. Press. Thank you very

much, Senator James Inhofe, Tulsa. Thank you, here in Washington, to ambassador Robert Hunter.

HUNTER: Thank you.

NOVAK: And Mr. Press will return to his other mode, and we'll have closing comments after a minute.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

PRESS: Tomorrow night on CROSSFIRE, Republican Senator and

presidential hopeful John McCain tells us what he would do about Kosovo if

he were in the White House, 7:30 p.m., Thursday, east coast time -- Bob.

NOVAK: Bill, the president at the time of one of his bombing raids on Iraq

said that he would hold off because of Ramadan. This is the holiest week in

the Christian religion. The Serbian orthodox priests in Serbia have suggested

that there be a bombing pause just for Easter. Are you
hard-hearted enough
that you think it's a bad idea for the president to
grant that?

PRESS: I would grant a bombing pause, not for the entire
holy week, but I
think there's got to be some action on the part of
Milosevic to -- not to get
back to the bombing. Here's what I'd...

NOVAK: You would grant a bombing pause?

PRESS: I would not, but not a whole week. NOVAK: I bet
you President
Clinton doesn't.

PRESS: But, I got to tell you, bombs in downtown
Belgrade -- big mistake.

From the left, I'm Bill Press. Good night for CROSSFIRE.

NOVAK: I agree. From the right, I am Robert Novak. Join
us again next time
for another edition of CROSSFIRE.

END

Message Sent

To:

Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer M. Palmieri/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anthony R. Bernal/OVP@OVP
Melissa G. Green/OPD/EOP@EOP
Leslie Bernstein/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robin M. Roland/WHO/EOP@EOP
Chandler G. Spaulding/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dominique L. Cano/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dag Vega/WHO/EOP@EOP
Brenda M. Anders/WHO/EOP@EOP
gamble-bennett@dol.gov @ inet
Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP@EOP
Richard L. Siewert/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jordan Tamagni/WHO/EOP@EOP
Beverly J. Barnes/WHO/EOP
Elizabeth R. Newman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julia M. Payne/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julianne B. Corbett/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey M. Smith/OSTP/EOP@EOP
Lowell A. Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan A. Kaplan/OPD/EOP@EOP
Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP@EOP

Jennifer Ferguson/OMB/EOP@EOP
Mark D. Neschis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Ruby Shamir/WHO/EOP@EOP
Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP@EOP
Amy Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lisa J. Levin/WHO/EOP@EOP
Peter A. Weissman/OPD/EOP@EOP
William A. Halter/OMB/EOP@EOP
Eli G. Attie/OVP@OVP
Patricia M. Ewing/OVP@OVP
Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa M. Murray/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan E. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP
Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anne M. Edwards/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael Waldman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gene B. Sperling/OPD/EOP@EOP
Paul K. Engskov/WHO/EOP@EOP
Laura D. Schwartz/WHO/EOP@EOP
Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julie E. Mason/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steven J. Naplan/NSC/EOP@EOP
Alison Muscatine/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gordon Li/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mark A. Kitchens/WHO/EOP@EOP
June Shih/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey A. Shesol/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rochester M. Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rachael E. Sullivan/OVP@OVP
Julie B. Goldberg/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sarah E. Gegenheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Susanna B. McGuire/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steve Ricchetti/WHO/EOP@EOP
Edward F. Hughes/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa J. Prober/WHO/EOP@EOP
Justin Coleman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Clara J. Shin/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan M. Prince/WHO/EOP@EOP
Joshua S. Gottheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Heather M. Riley/WHO/EOP@EOP
Alejandro G. Cabrera/OVP@OVP
Rebecca L. Walldorff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jon P. Jennings/WHO/EOP@EOP
Katharine Button/WHO/EOP@EOP
Tracy Pakulniewicz/WHO/EOP@EOP
James T. Heimbach/WHO/EOP@EOP
Victoria L. Valentine/WHO/EOP@EOP
James E. Kennedy/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael A. Hammer/NSC/EOP@EOP
Laura J. Lewis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Toby C. Graff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sean P. O'Shea/WHO/EOP@EOP
Thomas D. Janenda/WHO/EOP@EOP

Rajiv Y. Mody/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robin J. Bachman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Saladbar 23 <saladbar23 @ hotmail.com> @ inet
Kimberly S. Anderson/OA/EOP@EOP

----- Forwarded by Rajiv Y. Mody/WHO/EOP on 04/21/99
04:24 PM -----

Mark A. Kitchens
04/01/99 06:05:07 AM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: CNN Moneyline, March 31, 1999

Moneyline News Hour with Lou Dobbs
Aired March 31, 1999 - 7:20 p.m. ET

Signs From the U.S. Economy Indicate Stock Prices Will
Continue to Rise

JAN HOPKINS, CNN ANCHOR: The quarter's gains extend one
of the
longest-running bull markets ever, and my guest tonight
has presided over it.
He is one of Wall Street's most respected leaders,
Donald Marron. He's
chairman and CEO of PaineWebber, which controls \$352
billion in assets.
Welcome back to MONEYLINE.

DONALD MARRON, CHAIRMAN & CEO, PAINEWEBBER: Nice to be
here, Jan.

HOPKINS: So, the market has done very well, we topped
10,000 even today.
Where do we go after 10,000?

MARRON: Well, I think we're obviously in a pause here to
find out what's
going to happen, but I think where we go depends on the
continuation of the
trends over the last few years. That looks pretty
positive. Low inflation, good
economic growth in terms of the managing of America's
business, and cheap
money.

HOPKINS: It's interesting, though, we had a report today

that corporate
profits are -- that growth and corporate profits is
declining and also we see
interest rates rising. These things don't bode well for
stocks, do they?

MARRON: Well, you know what it's showing, though? When
you look at the
quarter or even last year you find the biggest spread
between the results of
money managers. Just take out the sheet on the mutual
fund results in the
paper or see hedge funds. You have managers have done
very well, managers
have done very badly; my experience, the widest spread
ever. That's partly
because all boats are not rising at the same time in
this tide.

HOPKINS: So that you have to pick the winners. That's
part of the
explanation for why the Dow has outperformed other index
-- well, it hasn't
performed -- outperformed the Nasdaq for the quarter,
but why some big chip
stocks, either technology or Dow stocks, have
outperformed the rest of the
market.

MARRON: Well, I think it's much more a case now of
picking individual
stocks, but I also think the fact is there's a reason
why the big companies are
doing better. In this new world of the Internet and
world commerce,
companies have less pricing power, it's tougher to do
well; a big company with
a great franchise has a better opportunity, probably,
than a smaller company.
And the second reason is there's more liquidity in big
companies. Investors
want to know they can get out quickly when they change
their minds.

HOPKINS: Let's talk about your company in all of those
respects. We'll talk
about the Internet, we'll also talk about bigger
companies.

Lots of consolidation in your industry and yet you're
staying as a niche player,
really a boutique. Have you looked for partners, have
people come sniffing
after you?

MARRON: Well, I haven't really thought of us as a boutique with \$350 billion in assets.

HOPKINS: But compared to Merrill Lynch and the CitiGroup, you know, all of the bigger and better ones...

MARRON: Well, we're growing at a very good rate. We want to accelerate our growth in the next couple of years. I think the fact is the new electronics -- online trading is the most exciting addition to our whole business. In our case, a full service where we can combine advice with technology, deliver it faster, deliver it more effectively, and do the trading online at the same time.

HOPKINS: And you're doing that?

MARRON: We have now a product called The Edge that's been introduced almost two years ago. We have 310,000 clients with \$60 billion in assets. You get your statement on the Internet, you get information, you get research, you get tracking sales.

HOPKINS: And you trade online as well?

MARRON: In the third quarter there'll be online trading as well.

HOPKINS: You've had to rethink the business, haven't you, as a result of the Internet?

MARRON: Yes. This is a business you have to rethink all the time, and the biggest thing you have to rethink now is there's a whole lot of new clients, there's a clear age difference or a generational difference here between those people who have never seen a bear market and are technology proficient, and older people that are in the business. And there are different needs now; more people have more assets to represent more of their future than they did 20 years ago.

HOPKINS: And you have a whole system of brokers that are

still useful with
Internet trading, or are not?

MARRON: Oh, absolutely, because our brokers have gone
from being
transactors to asset gatherers and asset advisers.

Internet trading's only one part of it. It's an
important part of it, but the real
thing is what do you do with your money? How do you get
advice? Where do
you invest it? That's timeless. That's not going to go
away. How you execute
that advice may change, why the technology's important,
but the need for it's
going up not down.

HOPKINS: Let's go back to where your company goes in
this environment.

Your stock went up quite a lot when it was a takeover
target or rumors that it
was a takeover target. Now you've lagged the rest of the
brokerage
companies. What's it say about where you are?

MARRON: Well, our stocks done well over the last three
years, five years
and 10 years, things just -- I don't, frankly -- I'm no
better predicting our stock
in the short term than any other CEO.

We're doing very well. Our assets are coming in very,
very rapidly. We've had
very good growth in our basic businesses, and our growth
is accelerating in
part because of the markets, and in part because of
technology. So we think
the outlook is very, very good for the firm.

HOPKINS: And it doesn't make sense to be connected with
a bank or a
larger company?

MARRON: Well, it would be great if we could take over a
bank but
unfortunately Glass-Steagall won't let us do it. What we
have to do is continue
to perform well. We must continue to provide innovation,
new advice, new
technology, keep growing fast. That's the most important
thing for us and our
stockholders.

HOPKINS: Thanks very much. Don Marron of PaineWebber.

NATO May Need Ground Troops to End Serbian
Aggression in Kosovo
Aired March 31, 1999 - 6:40 p.m. ET

JAN HOPKINS, CNN ANCHOR: To discuss the ground troop
option, I am
joined from Washington by the author of "Fighting For
The Future," former
Army Lieutenant Colonel Ralph Peters -- Welcome.

RETIRE LT. COL. RALPH PETERS, U.S. ARMY: Thank you,
Jan.

HOPKINS: So can ground troops be avoided?

PETERS: Jan, if we want to save anything that's left of
Kosovo I don't think it
can be avoided. However, behind the talking heads at the
White House and
State Department I guarantee you there is absolute
turmoil in the
administration and in Brussels in NATO, because frankly
this oversold air
campaign has failed to date. The pilots are doing their
very best, but they
haven't been allowed to do enough. We haven't hit hard
enough. It looks like
the future means ground troops and we're not prepared.

HOPKINS: Well, it's interesting because we heard from
Yugoslavia that in
fact if ground troops are involved this would become
Vietnam in Europe. Do
you agree with that?

PETERS: Absolutely not, that's nonsense. The Serb army,
while it's got some
power, they are half-trained butchers. They've got a lot
of equipment. We
could take them apart quickly, if we were able to
prepare the proper force and
get it in there. But that's much easier said than done.
It would take weeks.

We are not planning -- I can tell you the Pentagon is
not planning for this;
Brussels is not planning for it. If you want it bad, you
get it bad. Do it fast,
there will be friendly casualties and the very mess we
hope to avoid.

HOPKINS: But they've increased the bombing, is that
enough?

PETERS: We may hope, but hope is not a strategy or a policy. I don't believe so. Look at the faces; look at the numbers of the refugees. Jan, beyond all the spin it's common sense, if we meant to protect the Kosovar Albanians we are failing; we have failed.

HOPKINS: Jamie McIntyre was asking the question at the end of his report, even if ground troops go in to protect them how many will be left in the country? PETERS: That's a great question because we have -- not the military -- the military has been under great restrictions in this. They haven't been allowed to do much. It's been a political strategic operation. The equivalent to this operation would be a hospital administrator telling the surgeon what to do in the operating room. At a certain point you have to let the military use their expertise; we haven't. It has been micro-managed and it's the worse I've seen.

HOPKINS: Thanks very much for joining us. Former Army Lieutenant Colonel Ralph Peters joining us from Washington.

Flight of Ethnic Albanians From Kosovo Sparks Refugee Crisis in Neighboring Countries
Aired March 31, 1999 - 6:35 p.m. ET

JAN HOPKINS, CNN ANCHOR: The United States today pledged \$50 million in humanitarian aid for Kosovo's refugees, on top of the \$8.5 million already promised.

Joining us now by phone with the latest on the crisis is Kris Janowski, from the U.N. High Commission on refugees in Geneva. .

Kris, Welcome.

KRIS JANOWSKI, U.N. HIGH COMMISSION ON REFUGEES: Hello.

HOPKINS: How are you coping with the situation? And, in fact, are you coping with it?

JANOWSKI: The situation is, indeed, extremely difficult. Today we had a good over 30 percent more people crossing than, for example, yesterday. We had Macedonia eventually flooded with well over 10,000 people crossing, with the Serbs essentially sending 3 train loads of people over the past 24 hours into Macedonia, in what one would describe as a new phenomena of ethnic cleansing by train.

To Albania, we saw about 30,000 crossing, and there is also thousands of people crossing into Montenegro. So it's going by the hour and it's going by the day.

HOPKINS: How are you dealing with the situation?

JANOWSKI: We've put a lot of people on the ground, especially in northern Albania, which is taking the brunt of this refugee crisis. We started an airlift into Tirana, which we hope will be expanded in the next few days. The situation is complicated by bad weather, bad roads, weak infrastructure and so on, so forth.

But in the end, we will be able to feed these people, even though we have to reckon with tens of thousands more coming over -- perhaps hundreds of thousands -- if things continue to grow the way they are at the moment.

HOPKINS: So, the plan is to continue airlifts of refugees out of the area in order to provide more space, really?

JANOWSKI: We will not be airlifting refugees initially. They are already being moved from northern Albania further south, to areas which are less affected by the crisis. We are trying to house them locally with local families.

We'll have to probably resort to tented camps as well. And we have appealed to all governments to keep their borders open, since even though we are trying to help these people where they are at the moment, there may be a

need to move them further into more far-flung countries
if the crisis continues
at the current pace.

HOPKINS: Because I would assume that you'd be running
out of space.

JANOWSKI: Well, we are already running out of space in
many places -- not
really Macedonia, even though Macedonia is very
affected, the Macedonian
Albanian community is very happy and very generous to
house these people.

We are running out of space in Albania already and
certainly Montenegro,
where these people are essentially going into a fairly
small mountainous area.

So tented camps will be one solution; public buildings
will be a solution, and
international organizations, not just ours, but many
others will have to put a lot
of people on the ground to deal with it; and certainly
this is the worse crisis
and the quickest exodus that we've seen since the worse
days of the war in
Bosnia a few years ago.

HOPKINS: Thanks for joining us, Kris Janowski, from the
U.N. High
Commission on Refugees, talking to us from Geneva.

NATO Expands Strikes Against Yugoslavia; Ethnic
Albanians Flee Kosovo and Serb Brutality; Albanian
Refugees Strain Humanitarian Network
Aired March 31, 1999 - 6:30 p.m. ET

JAN HOPKINS, CNN ANCHOR: Good evening. Tonight on the
MONEYLINE NEWS HOUR, NATO bombs move closer to the heart
of
Belgrade. Operation Allied Force expands dramatically,
attacking the nerve
center of Serbia's military. Traumatized and terrorized,
20,000 refugees are
fleeing Kosovo every day, as Serbia's "scorched earth"
campaign accelerates.
We'll hear the latest from the U.N. High Commission on
Refugees. And the
most explosive question facing NATO and the White House:
Are ground
troops inevitable?

We begin tonight with our report on the eighth day of
combat in the strike

against Yugoslavia. U.S. missiles, today, U.S. missiles,
today, struck Belgrade
as Operation Allied Force entered a new, intensified
phase. The strategy:
target Serb leadership.

Allan Dodds Frank has our report.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

ALLAN DODDS FRANKS, CNN CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): Week
two of NATO's campaign started with escalating attacks,
closing in on the
Yugoslavian capital, including bombing the Serbs'
special forces headquarters
near downtown Belgrade.

NATO vowed to bomb any targets necessary to force
Yugoslavian President
Slobodan Milosevic to stop fighting in Kosovo.

JAMIE SHEA, NATO SPOKESMAN: No facility, no unit which
is currently
being used to plan, conceive, direct, or carry out the
Yugoslav campaign
against the Kosovars is going to be a sanctuary.

GEORGE ROBERTSON, BRITISH DEFENSE MINISTER: NATO's
aircraft will now increase the damage to his war
machine, including tank and
troop concentrations. We know where they're dispersed
to, and we know
where they are hiding.

FRANK: NATO briefers showed videos of bombs hitting fuel
storage areas,
heliports, police and military headquarters.

AIR COMMANDER DAVID WILBY, BRITISH ROYAL AIR FORCE:
We know that he is really running short of fuel. We are
now starting to hit him
very hard on the ground. We've hit him in his command
and control facilities.

FRANK: On Serb television, Milosevic gave no indication
of backing down. In
Yugoslavia, his supporters held large demonstrations,
rock concerts, and
picketed the U.S. Embassy.

And shortly after an international tribunal indicted the
Yugoslavian paramilitary
leader known as Arkan for war crimes in Bosnia and
Croatia, he was on
CNN, denying reports that his fighters are pillaging

Kosovo.

ZELIKO RAZNATOVIC, ARKAN: No, they are not engaged yet, but, as I said, they will be engaged if NATO is coming with the ground troops. If you come with the ground troops in Yugoslavia, then you will have a new Vietnam in the heart of Europe, that's for sure.

FRANK: U.S. authorities continue to say they will not commit ground troops to combat, even though air attacks are proving difficult against Serb tanks.

KEN BACON, PENTAGON SPOKESMAN: The targeting has been complicated by the fact that they are putting some of their equipment near schools, and mosques.

FRANK: The State Department said the Serbian offensive against Kosovo Albanians continues.

JAMES RUBIN, STATE DEPARTMENT SPOKESMAN: In addition to killings and forced expulsions, Serb forces are also engaged in identity elimination, destroying of birth certificates, property deeds and other documents.

FRANK: Russia's announcement that it is sending seven warships to the Mediterranean was not well received in Washington.

JOE LOCKHART, WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY: We are concerned about these statements, because of the signal that may be received in Belgrade.

FRANK (on camera): Weather over Kosovo is improving, and the allied forces made it clear there will be no pause in the bombing for religious holidays, whether its Passover, Easter, or Orthodox Easter.

Allan Dodds Frank, CNN Financial News, New York.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

HOPKINS: The NATO attack on Yugoslavia and the Serbian genocide have created a refugee crisis. It's a humanitarian disaster.

The numbers can hardly
be exact, but these are our best estimates of the
dimension of the crisis: Out of
1.8 million Kosovar Albanians, fully 1/3 are believed to
be out of their homes.
And estimated 134,000 have poured out of the region
since the NATO attack
began and into nations that can barely manage their own
economic and ethnic
problems. Twenty-seven thousand have fled to Montenegro;
85,000 to
Albania; 22,000 to Macedonia.

Matthew Chance is in Macedonia and filed this report.
(BEGIN
VIDEOTAPE)

MATTHEW CHANCE, CNN CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): Thousands
of Kosovars are now crossing the Macedonian frontier.
Eyewitnesses say
thousands more are hiding in the hills without shelter,
waiting for their chance
to leave Kosovo.

This woman says she walked, carrying her child, until
her feet were sore. She
says the Serbs told her to leave her home or they would
shoot her family. Like
so many others here, hers is a story of Serb
intimidation and forced exile.

With new arrivals by the minute, the ethnic Albanian
charities, who are the
front line of humanitarian aid here, are stretched to
the limit. Hundreds of
people are crammed into trucks and ferried to makeshift
reception centers.

At least here, amid the gravestones, they can eat a
decent meal -- for some,
the first in days.

The humanitarian organization, El Hilal, is at the
forefront of caring for these
Kosovars. It provides the food and tries to settle
families within Macedonia's
own ethnic Albanian community.

BEHIDJUN SHEHABI, EL HILAL (through translator): We are
doing our
best to provide whatever help we can in this
humanitarian crisis. But only
today, we have seen 3,000 refugees come across into
Macedonia, and the

situation is getting worse.

FRANK (on camera): With an increasing flow of refugees out of Kosovo, organizations like El Hilal are under increasing pressure to house and feed a burgeoning population. Although they're coping right now, there is concern about just how long they can keep on providing.

(voice-over): The suffering endured by these people in Kosovo has been immense. They've now escaped to safety, but they face life as refugees; the hardship may have only just begun.

Matthew Chance, CNN, Skopje, Macedonia.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

HOPKINS: The United States, today, pledged \$50 million in humanitarian aid for Kosovo's refugees, on top of the \$8.5 million already promised.

Joining us now by phone with the latest on the crisis is Kris Janowski, from the U.N. High Commission on refugees in Geneva. .

Kris, Welcome.

KRIS JANOWSKI, U.N. HIGH COMMISSION ON REFUGEES: Hello.

HOPKINS: How are you coping with the situation? And, in fact, are you

extremely coping with it? JANOWSKI: The situation is, indeed, difficult.

Today we had a good over 30 percent more people crossing than, for example, yesterday. We had Macedonia eventually flooded with well over 10,000

people crossing, with the Serbs essentially sending 3 train loads of people over the past 24 hours into Macedonia, in what one would describe as a new phenomena of ethnic cleansing by train.

To Albania, we saw about 30,000 crossing, and there is also thousands of people crossing into Montenegro. So it's going by the hour and it's going by the day.

HOPKINS: How are you dealing with the situation?

JANOWSKI: We've put a lot of people on the ground, especially in northern Albania, which is taking the brunt of this refugee crisis. We started an airlift into Tirana, which we hope will be expanded in the next few days. The situation is complicated by bad weather, bad roads, weak infrastructure and so on, so forth.

But in the end, we will be able to feed these people, even though we have to reckon with tens of thousands more coming over -- perhaps hundreds of thousands -- if things continue to grow the way they are at the moment.

HOPKINS: So, the plan is to continue airlifts of refugees out of the area in order to provide more space, really?

JANOWSKI: We will not be airlifting refugees initially. They are already being moved from northern Albania further south, to areas which are less affected by the crisis. We are trying to house them locally with local families.

We'll have to probably resort to tented camps as well. And we have appealed to all governments to keep their borders open, since even though we are trying to help these people where they are at the moment, there may be a need to move them further into more far-flung countries if the crisis continues at the current pace.

HOPKINS: Because I would assume that you'd be running out of space.

JANOWSKI: Well, we are already running out of space in many places -- not really Macedonia, even though Macedonia is very affected, the Macedonian Albanian community is very happy and very generous to house these people. We are running out of space in Albania already and certainly Montenegro, where these people are essentially going into a fairly small mountainous area.

So tented camps will be one solution; public buildings will be a solution, and international organizations, not just ours, but many others will have to put a lot of people on the ground to deal with it; and certainly this is the worse crisis and the quickest exodus that we've seen since the worse days of the war in Bosnia a few years ago.

HOPKINS: Thanks for joining us, Kris Janowski, from the U.N. High Commission on Refugees, talking to us from Geneva. When the MONEYLINE NEWS HOUR returns, Balkan tactics. Is NATO moving closer to the use of ground troops, that's next.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

HOPKINS: Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic has survived eight days of NATO air raids; cruise missiles, stealth planes and guided bombs have failed to stop the ethnic purge of Kosovo or bring Milosevic to the peace table. The United States and NATO have pledged not to send ground troops. Will they keep their word?

Jamie McIntyre has the story.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

JAMIE MCINTYRE, CNN MILITARY AFFAIRS CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): NATO's air war continues to expand. Targets now on the approved list include buildings in downtown Belgrade, to send a message to Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic that there is no sanctuary from allied smart- bombs and missiles. But despite eight days of bombing, and recent attacks on Yugoslav troops, there is no evidence that the killing of Ethnic-Albanians in Kosovo has stopped, or even slowed.

AIR COMMODORE DAVID WILBY, BRITISH ROYAL AIR FORCE: I think underlying all that a week of hard work, you will start to see the resolve starting to crack very quickly. I believe we've accomplished one hell of a lot in this week.

MCINTYRE: For now, Kosovar Albanians have little choice but to run for their lives to neighboring Albania and Macedonia. The pentagon says it will provide \$25 million in relief supplies to aid the refugees, including hundreds of tents that were used to house U.S. troops in the desert of Saudi Arabia. The hope is that by pounding Yugoslavia unrelentingly in the weeks to come, eventually its army will lose its will and ability to fight, and the refugees will be able to go back.

KEN BACON, DEFENSE DEPARTMENT SPOKESMAN: I have every reason to believe that once we stabilize the situation and provide a safe environment for these people, they will return home, and the international community will help them rebuild their houses and their lives.

MCINTYRE: Its a long-term strategy, and NATO's top commander has requested more firepower, including the U.S. aircraft carrier Roosevelt, which is scheduled to arrive in the Mediterranean Sea next week, as well as ground-based Apache attack helicopters. But the U.S. insists one thing is not under consideration: sending NATO ground troops to Kosovo to protect the Ethnic-Albanian majority.

JOE LOCKHART, WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY: Our position on ground troops remains the same -- no intention.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

MCINTYRE: The Pentagon dispute the perception that the NATO air campaign is failing in its key goal: to protect the Kosovar Albanians. It insists that military planners never promised a quick fix and that given enough time the aerial bombardment alone can fulfill its goal of weakening the Serb army to the point where it can no longer attack the Kosovar Albanians. The question is when that happens, how many Albanians will be left to save -- Jan.

HOPKINS: Jamie McIntyre, thanks.

To discuss the ground troop option, I am joined from Washington by the author of "Fighting For The Future," former Army Lieutenant Colonel Ralph Peters --
Welcome.

RETIRE LT. COL. RALPH PETERS, U.S. ARMY: Thank you, Jan.

HOPKINS: So can ground troops be avoided?

PETERS: Jan, if we want to save anything that's left of Kosovo I don't think it can be avoided. However, behind the talking heads at the White House and State Department I guarantee you there is absolute turmoil in the administration and in Brussels in NATO, because frankly this over-sold air campaign has failed to date. The pilots are doing their very best, but they haven't been allowed to do enough. We haven't hit hard enough. It looks like the future means ground troops and we're not prepared.

HOPKINS: Well, it's interesting because we heard from Yugoslavia that in fact if ground troops are involved this would become Vietnam in Europe. Do you agree with that?

PETERS: Absolutely not, that's nonsense. The Serb army while it's got some power, they are half trained butchers. They've got a lot of equipment. We could take them apart quickly, if we were able to prepare the proper force and get it in there, but that's much easier said than done. It would take weeks. We are not planning -- I can tell you the Pentagon is not planning for this; Brussels is not planning for it. If you want it bad you get it bad. Do it fast there will be friendly casualties and the very mess we hope to avoid.

HOPKINS: But they've increased the bombing, is that enough?

PETERS: We may hope, but hope is not a strategy or a policy. I don't believe so. Look at the faces; look at the numbers of the refugees. Jan, beyond all the spin it's common sense, if we meant to protect the

Kosovar Albanians we are
failing; we have failed.

HOPKINS: Jamie McIntyre was asking the question at the
end of his report,
even if ground troops go in to protect them how many
will be left in the
country?

PETERS: That's a great question because we have -- not
the military -- the
military has been under great restrictions in this. They
haven't been allowed to
do much. It's been a political strategic operation. The
equivalent to this
operation would be a hospital administrator telling the
surgeon what to do in
the operating room. At a certain point you have to let
the military use their
expertise; we haven't. It has been micro-managed and
it's the worse I've
seen. HOPKINS: Thanks very much for joining us. Former
Army Lieutenant
Colonel Ralph Peters joining us from Washington.

Every military conflict has been influenced by the
communications technology
of its day. Vietnam was the first television war. Desert
Storm considered the
first war broadcast live, and this war, the leading-edge
tool of mass
communications -- the Internet -- is also a weapon.

Greg Lefevre reports.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

GREG LEFEVRE, CNN CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): NATO says
its
Website is under attack from Belgrade. This is what the
site looked like earlier
Wednesday when hackers posted anti-Clinton and other
graffiti at Nato.int.

JAMIE SHEA, NATO SPOKESMAN: It seems that we have been
dealing
with some hackers in Belgrade, who have hacked into our
Website and
caused line saturation of the server by using ping (ph)
bombardment strategy.

LEFEVRE: In other words, the hackers have found a way to
inundate the
NATO Website with so many requests the system

overloaded. NATO says
none of its military communications were affected. It's
also been besieged by
thousands of e-mails, apparently sent to jam and corrupt
its Internet
communications.

ALEX FOWLER, ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION: This is very
early on in this crisis and Milosevic moved very quick
to try to silence those
independent sources of information. I think he is on to
what's happening online
and he knows it's out there.

LEFEVRE: Taking sides -- a Serbian group called the
Serbian Unity Congress
appears to promote the official Yugoslavian line. On the
other side: Kosovo
info with a plea for help. At Kosovo.net the writers
deny the international
media's depiction showing bomb damage as "NATO Crime."

Free Enterprise is in on the act. This Website is
sponsored by a company
specializing in industrial intelligence. It collects
data from public sources as
well as its own.

Meanwhile the e-mail from the region pours into message
boards. A woman in
Belgrade compares the atmosphere to a horror film.

"Last night they attacked some parts of Belgrade. I
heard the thunderbolts.
The doors and window were shaking. I can't explain the
feeling."

A man in Belgrade, in a plea for peace posts photos of
his children and a
child's drawing. Angry at the war, but not the warriors.
It shows a youngster
with a sling shot knocking out a NATO plane with the
pilot parachuting safely
to earth.

Greg Lefevre, CNN, San Francisco.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

HOPKINS: Coming up on the MONEYLINE NEWS HOUR, Y2K and
your
government. Washington has plenty to say about the
computer bug, but is it
following its own advice?

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

HOPKINS: Looking at other stories around the nation tonight: four New York police officers today pled not guilty to charges they murdered an unarmed African immigrant. The officers fired a total of 41 bullets at the victim, striking him 19 times. The four were released on \$100,000 bail.

At Susan McDougal's criminal contempt trial in Arkansas the jury today heard from one of McDougal's old friends. Claudia Riley (ph) testified that McDougal was pressured by both Ken Starr's office and her late husband to cooperate with Starr's investigation of President Clinton. But Riley says McDougal refused. And in Texas, Texas Governor George W. Bush today bolstered his front-runner standing in the polls by announcing he raised more than \$6 million this month for his possible run for the presidency. Bush's exploratory committee raised the money without holding a single fund-raising event.

The White House is putting a positive spin on the government's Y2K readiness. President Clinton's Y2K czar, John Koskinen, says more than 90 percent of the government's computers are fixed and tested for the millennium bug. But some critics question that success rate.

Ann Kellan reports from Washington.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

ANN KELLAN, CNN CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): This is the deadline for all federal agencies to have critical computer systems ready for the year 2000. Several agencies have missed the deadline. The watchdog General Accounting Office says it is most concerned about three key agencies: the health finance arm of Health and Human Services that processes Medicaid forms, the Federal Aviation Administration that monitors the skies, and the Department of Defense.

JOHN KOSKINEN, PRES. COUNCIL ON Y2K CONVERSION: So all of those smart weapons that are, you know, in our arsenal and in some cases being used even today have to be tested.

KELLAN: According to the president's Y2K chair, John Koskinen, 13 of the 24 major agencies are Y2K compliant -- at least their critical systems are. But 11 agencies say they need three or four more months to get critical systems ready for the new year.

KOSKINEN: We are confident that these systems will effectively operate.

KELLAN: Each agency will have contingency plans just in case, because, even though the federal government is confident it will be Y2K ready, some local and state agencies may not.

KOSKINEN: And our concern now is those organizations, including some small and medium-size cities and counties, that are taking an attitude of "We're going to wait and see what breaks, and then we're going to fix it."

KELLAN: While the federal government boasts that 92 percent of its most critical systems are Y2K ready, that number could create a false sense of security.

JOEL WILLIAMSON, GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTING OFFICE: There still are risk areas that need to be addressed, and so, the pressure still needs to be continued to be put on the federal government.

KELLAN: While this March 31st deadline was an arbitrary one set by the government, the deadline nine months from now, won't be arbitrary at all.

Ann Kellan, CNN, Washington.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

HOPKINS: The MONEYLINE NEWS HOUR will return in a moment.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

HOPKINS: Coming up on MONEYLINE: the economy is growing,

inflation is

low, consumers are confident, so what's wrong with corporate profits? A sell-off for bonds hits the stock market. A full report from Wall Street. And I'll talk with one of the most powerful men on Wall Street: PaineWebber chairman and CEO, Donald Marron is my guest.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

HOPKINS: Tonight on MONEYLENE, a second day of selling storms Wall

Street as the Dow industrials end the first quarter with a triple-digit loss. The biggest IPO of the year is a big flop. Pepsi spins off its bottling operation and the reception is ice cold. And facing tough times, American farmers find a guaranteed customer: the government.

But we begin tonight on Wall Street. The Dow Jones industrial average tumbled for the second-straight day after a near 100-point morning rally propelled the Dow over 10,000 again.

The Nasdaq composite did not fare much better on the day, losing nearly 19 points. The Nasdaq was in record territory at one point.

A disappointing end to an impressive quarter when more than \$400 billion was added to the stock market's capitalization.

Rhonda Schaffler has more. (BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

RHONDA SCHAFFLER, CNN CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): The quarter ended with another volatile session culminating in a late-day sell-off. At the closing bell the Dow Jones industrial average dropped 127 points to 9,786.

DOUGLAS CLIGGOTT, J.P. MORGAN: We clearly -- we came out of the gates strong, but then when we got the new information about a healthier manufacturing sector, really, than the consensus had expected, that started pushing interest rates up and started pushing stock prices down.

SCHAFFLER: Philip Morris was responsible for about 11

points of the Dow's
decline, as its shares plummeted. Technology stocks,
which rallied to new
highs early in the day, lost their footing, and the
Nasdaq composite index
closed with a loss of 18 points to 2,461.

Choppy trading days were a common denominator throughout
the entire first
quarter.

VINCE FARRELL, SPEARS, BENZAK, SALOMON & FARRELL: The
first quarter continued the same trends you saw in 1998.

Very few stocks
powered the S&P or the Dow Jones average to new highs,
and extreme
volatility, like you had last year, continued in the
first quarter, with a lot of days
showing 1 percent changes, which is really unusual.

SCHAFFLER: Even after all those wild swings, most of the
key markets
managed to post a gain for the quarter. Small-cap stocks
continued to lag the
overall market. Financial stocks dominated the Dow 30
top performers.

On the big board, LSI Logic topped the list of big
gains, along with Sprint and
America Online.

(on camera): And traders say there is little out there
to dampen their
enthusiasm for the outlook in the second quarter, as
long as inflation remains in
check and unemployment remains low.

Rhonda Schaffler, CNN Financial News, New York.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

HOPKINS: Again today, market breadth was negative.
Decliners on the big
board beat advancers by a four-to-three margin.
Fifty-three stocks hit new
52-week highs; 170 stocks hit new 52-week lows.

Late today, talk of another big tie-up in the Internet
business. Bruce Francis
joins us now with the latest.

Bruce.

BRUCE FRANCIS, CNN CORRESPONDENT: Jan, a tie-up that has

been

the subject of speculation for some time. A source tells me that Yahoo! and

Broadcast.com are in late-stage negotiations. Yahoo! is the Web's leading portal. Broadcast.com serves up audio and video over the Internet.

A deal expected to be announced as soon as tomorrow.

Neither company is

talking. But analysts said that Yahoo! has scheduled a conference call for

tomorrow morning. Broadcast.com's now has a market value of more than \$4

billion. Analysts say the purchase price could be as much \$130 a share,

valuing the company at \$5.7 billion, slightly more than 10 percent premium to

Broadcast.com's close.

Shares of Yahoo! also, though, have skyrocketed, giving Yahoo! a market cap

of \$33 1/2 billion. One analyst says that Yahoo! is looking to expand content.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

MARK MOORADIAN, JUPITER COMMUNICATIONS: Broadcast is certainly a leader in aggregation of audio and video.

They've got the content.

They've got an established audience there. And certainly, as these guys move

forward, as they are serving up content to a very different audience, Yahoo!

basically wants to make sure that they're going to control a lot of that content.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

FRANCIS: And in composite trading, Yahoo! fell almost \$4. It closed 168 3/8.

And Broadcast.com rose almost 5, to close at 118 3/16.

Interesting potential deal here, Jan.

HOPKINS: Why does Yahoo! need Broadcast.com in

FRANCIS: Yahoo! needs to get into the high-bandwidth area, an area that

Broadcast.com is specialized in really, delivering video and audio over the net.

They also have a more businessy audience and a businessy flavor to their

content, something that Yahoo! lacks.

Remember, that was one reason why AOL needed Netscape.

HOPKINS: Very interesting. Bruce Francis.

The entire tobacco sector today swooned along with Philip Morris, following yesterday's record verdict against Philip Morris. An Oregon jury ordered the cigarette maker to pay more than \$80 million to the family of a man who died of lung cancer. Philip Morris is appealing the verdict, the largest award ever against big tobacco.

Philip Morris slid 2 3/4, down nearly 15 percent in the past two days.

RJR Nabisco down to 2 3/4. Lowes fell nearly four. Brooke Group down nearly a half.

One analyst expects more volatility in the sector.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP) MARTIN FELDMAN, SALOMON SMITH BARNEY: Over the next two months or so, when we see another important individual case come to trial or reach a verdict, I would expect the stocks to be volatile and I would expect investors to remain nervous.

On a one-year point of view, I think that the stocks -- the stocks could still look relatively attractive, although we do need some more evidence as to how the industry is going to deal with these individual cases.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

HOPKINS: Investors have paid a price for Philip Morris' legal troubles. The stock is down nearly 40 percent from its 52-week high.

Late-day plunge in stocks benefited the bond market. Bond prices rebounded from a sharp sell-off, triggered by an unexpectedly strong report on manufacturing activity in the Midwest.

The Treasury's 30-year treasury ended the day down more than a half a point in price, and the yield tonight is at 5 2/3 percent.

Bonds reacted little to another phenomenal report on the economy. The nation's gross domestic product exploded in the final three months of last year.

GDP surged 6 percent, the strongest showing in 2 1/2 years. But the revised estimate was slightly lower than economists first thought.

And behind that stellar headline, a disturbing detail: the government says corporate profits declined last year for the first time in almost a decade.

Peter Viles has the report.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

PETER VILES, CNN CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): For corporate

America, it marks the end of a winning streak that powered history's greatest bull market. The government now says a decade of rising corporate profits has come to an end.

This is what the decade looked like: a burst of double-digit profit growth in the mid-'90s, but last year, profits fell by 2.2 percent.

ALLEN SINAI, PRIMARK DECISION ECONOMICS: For years, we've had corporate profits growth far, far in excess of growth in the economy. That really was a historical anomaly, as American corporations realized the benefits of restructuring, the new world economy and the new technology. We just won't see any of that again.

VILES: Economists blame the global slump that hurt demand for American goods and robbed American companies of pricing power at home. Also to blame, rising compensation costs.

Good times means promotions and higher salaries for millions of workers. And companies are so optimistic, they're borrowing again, which cuts into profits.

STEVE RICCHIUTO, CHIEF ECONOMIST, ABN AMRO: In 1998 -- and in fact, in the second half of 1997 -- corporations began to borrow again fairly

heavily. And as they began to borrow, even in a declining- interest rate environment, the net result was their interest costs began to rise.

VILES: It's important to note Wall Street watches a different set of profit numbers. It strips out one-time charges and gains. But even that measure slowed dramatically last year, rising just 3.7 percent.

CHUCK HILL, DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH, FIRST CALL: There's a greater degree of uncertainty about where earnings are headed as we go forward. I mean, it appears that earnings may be bottoming out here, but our confidence level is certainly not high at this point.

VILES: Economists say the earnings squeeze won't necessarily slow the overall economy, but Wall Street is another story. Profit growth drives bull markets.

Peter Viles, CNN Financial News, New York.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

HOPKINS: Solid earnings, however, were not enough to drum up strong demand today for Pepsi Bottling's initial public offering. Pepsi Bottling fell from its initial price of \$23 a share. It was the most active on the big board. The IPO is one of the largest ever, raising \$2 1/3 billion.

But as Fred Katayama reports, Pepsi Bottling's name lacked the midas touch:
.com.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

FRED KATAYAMA, CNN CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): Pepsi Bottling Group's market debut marked the fifth-biggest offering ever and featured a company selling one of America's best-known brands. But its stock didn't produce the big pop that investors demand on day one.

CRAIG WEATHERUP, CHAIRMAN & CEO, PEPSI BOTTLING GROUP: This company generates a tremendous amount of cash flow. That's

what makes it such a good investment.

KATAYAMA: Investors didn't drink to that and sent Pepsi Bottling stock down 1 5/16, a loss of 5.7 percent. Coca-cola's warning Monday that worldwide sales will slow this quarter put a damper on demand for Pepsi Bottling's stock. But also hurting the bottler, it's not an Internet stock.

STEPHEN LACEY, MANAGING EDITOR, IPO REPORTER: While there is some high growth in that business, it's not on the same caliber as expectations for a lot of the Internet companies.

KATAYAMA: Compare that with the debut Tuesday of online travel booker Priceline. The stock jumped more than 330 percent and added another 20 percent today: this despite the fact that Pepsi Bottling's \$7 billion in sales last year was 200 times greater than Priceline's 35 million. And Pepsi Bottling earned 55 million while Priceline lost 113 million.

Money-losing Internet companies, of course, are common. Even so, Internet stocks that hit the market this year gained on average 138 percent on their first day. Non-Internet stocks rose just 16 percent.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

Fair or unfair, after the first day of trading, the market valued Pepsi Bottling at just under \$3 1/2 billion, almost a third that of Priceline.com.

One IPO watcher said, "Anyone with a brain should realize this isn't the time to go public unless the company has .com after its name."

Jan.

HOPKINS: Thanks, Fred.

Another example of the gap between Internet and non-Internet IPOs: the stunning debut of ZDNet. The Internet spin-off of publisher Ziff-Davis began trading today as a tracking stock. ZDNet soared 16 3/4, nearly 90 percent

from its offering price of \$19 a share.

Meanwhile, parent company Ziff-Davis lost \$7.5; that stock has almost doubled in the months leading up to the IPO though.

Coming up on MONEYLINE: the man who's guided PaineWebber for almost 20 years; Donald Marron, the insider's view, next.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

HOPKINS: Topping tonight's MONEYLINE" movers: Seagram; the stock jumped nearly \$2 after Merrill Lynch upgraded Seagram, predicting strong earnings growth.

Bed, Bath & Beyond rallied \$2. Late yesterday, the home decorator reported better-than-expected earnings.

FDX, the parent company of Federal Express, slumped \$4.5. Goldman Sachs downgraded the stock, saying the air freight sector won't be the main beneficiary of the boom in electronic commerce.

And Etec Systems lost nearly a third of its value, diving more than \$13. The chip equipment-maker warned quarterly earnings would be disappointing.

The stock market is the subject of tonight's MONEYLINE Focus. Even with today's sell-off, the Dow Jones industrial average has had a stellar first quarter; up 6.5 percent for the quarter and year.

The quarter's gains extend one of the longest-running bull markets ever, and my guest tonight has presided over it. He is one of Wall Street's most respected leaders, Donald Marron. He's chairman and CEO of PaineWebber, which controls \$352 billion in assets. Welcome back to MONEYLINE.

DONALD MARRON, CHAIRMAN & CEO, PAINEWEBBER: Nice to be here, Jan.

HOPKINS: So, the market has done very well, we topped 10000 even today. Where do we go after 10000?

MARRON: Well, I think we're obviously in a pause here to find out what's going to happen, but I think where we go depends on the continuation of the trends over the last few years; that looks pretty positive. Low inflation, good economic growth in terms of the managing of America's business, and cheap money.

HOPKINS: It's interesting, though, we had a report today that corporate profits are -- that growth and corporate profits is declining and also we see interest rates rising. These things don't bode well for stocks, do they?

MARRON: Well, you know what it's showing though? When you look at the quarter or even last year you find the biggest spread between the results of money managers. Just take out the sheet on the mutual fund results in the paper or see hedge funds. You have managers have done very well, managers have done very badly; my experience, the widest spread ever. That's partly because all boats are not rising at the same time in this tide.

HOPKINS: So that you have to pick the winners. That's part of the explanation for why the Dow has outperformed other index -- well, it hasn't performed -- outperformed the Nasdaq for the quarter, but why some big chip stocks, either technology or Dow stocks, have outperformed the rest of the market.

MARRON: Well, I think it's much more a case now of picking individual stocks, but I also think the fact is there's a reason why the big companies are doing better. In this new world of the Internet and world commerce, companies have less pricing power, it's tougher to do well; a big company with a great franchise has a better opportunity, probably, than a smaller company.

And the second reason is there's more liquidity in big companies. Investors

want to know they can get out quickly when they change their minds.

HOPKINS: Let's talk about your company in all of those respects. We'll talk about the Internet, we'll also talk about bigger companies.

Lots of consolidation in your industry and yet you're staying as a niche player, really a boutique. Have you looked for partners, have people come sniffing after you?

MARRON: Well, I haven't really thought of us as a boutique with \$350 billion in assets.

HOPKINS: But compared to Merrill Lynch and the CitiGroup, you know, all of the bigger and better ones...

MARRON: Well, we're growing at a very good rate. We want to accelerate our growth in the next couple of years. I think the fact is the new electronics -- online trading is the most exciting addition to our whole business. In our case, a full service where we can combine advice with technology, deliver it faster, deliver it more effectively, and do the trading online at the same time.

HOPKINS: And you're doing that?

MARRON: We have now a product called The Edge that's been introduced almost two years ago. We have 310,000 clients with \$60 billion in assets. You get your statement on the Internet, you get information, you get research, you get tracking sales.

HOPKINS: And you trade online as well?

MARRON: In the third quarter there'll be online trading as well.

HOPKINS: You've had to rethink the business, haven't you, as a result of the Internet?

MARRON: Yes. This is a business you have to rethink all the time, and the

biggest thing you have to rethink now is there's a whole lot of new clients, there's a clear age difference or a generational difference here between those people who have never seen a bear market and are technology proficient, and older people that are in the business. And there are different needs now; more people have more assets to represent more of their future than they did 20 years ago.

HOPKINS: And you have a whole system of brokers that are still useful with Internet trading, or are not?

MARRON: Oh, absolutely, because our brokers have gone from being transactors to asset gatherers and asset advisers.

Internet trading's only one part of it. It's an important part of it, but the real thing is what do you do with your money? How do you get advice? Where do you invest it? That's timeless. That's not going to go away. How you execute that advice may change, why the technology's important, but the need for it's going up not down.

HOPKINS: Let's go back to where your company goes in this environment.

Your stock went up quite a lot when it was a takeover target or rumors that it was a takeover target. Now you've lagged the rest of the brokerage companies. What's it say about where you are?

MARRON: Well, our stocks done well over the last three years, five years and 10 years, things just -- I don't, frankly -- I'm no better predicting our stock in the short term than any other CEO.

We're doing very well. Our assets are coming in very, very rapidly. We've had very good growth in our basic businesses, and our growth is accelerating in part because of the markets, and in part because of technology. So we think the outlook is very, very good for the firm. HOPKINS: And it doesn't make sense to be connected with a bank or a larger company?

MARRON: Well, it would be great if we could take over a bank but unfortunately Glass-Steagall won't let us do it. What we have to do is continue to perform well. We must continue to provide innovation, new advice, new technology, keep growing fast. That's the most important thing for us and our stockholders.

HOPKINS: Thanks very much. Don Marron of PaineWebber.

And for more in-depth coverage of the markets, the economy, corporate America, and a lot more, visit cnnfn.com any time day or night.

But up next: seeds of worry; the worsening plight of the American farmer. That's when MONEYLINE continues.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

HOPKINS: The Microsoft antitrust trial appears far from settling and it's far from resuming in court. The judge today said the two sides will return to court, but not until May 10th, at the earliest. Attorneys for Microsoft and the government began settlement talks yesterday. They plan to meet again. Microsoft shares today lost more than \$3.

In other corporate news, Daimlerchrysler is playing down reports of a culture clash at the newly merged company. Daimler's German CEO, Yurgen Schrempp, said that the departure of seven American executives is typical following a merger. The comments come as the automaker reports a six percent sales gain in the first two months of the year. Schrempp's American counterpart, Robert Eaton, told CNN Financial News he's upbeat about the future.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

ROBERT EATON, CO-CHAIRMAN, DAIMLERCHRYSLER: We're just as focused on shareholder values as we ever were, and we're going to try to grow those margins. We've set some very stringent financial goals within the

new company. And at this point in time, 1999 looks like a good year.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

HOPKINS: In the five months since the merger, Daimlerchrysler shares have under-performed the market.

Another Japanese company is slashing jobs. Mitsubishi Electric is cutting 10 percent of its global work force, or more than 14,000 jobs, in order to boost profits.

Turning now to the U.S. economy, and a group that has not participated in this astonishing growth: American farmers. They're planning to sow a record soybean crop this spring, despite little hope for a turnaround in the farm economy. Ceci Rodgers reports from Chicago.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

CECI RODGERS, CNN CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): Farmers are suffering the worst slump and the lowest prices in 13 years, but eternally optimistic, they're gearing up to plant a record soybean crop and huge corn and wheat crops, that raises the prospect of more unneeded supplies down the road.

VICTOR LESPINASSE, CARR FUTURES: What we really want to see is an increase in demand. We're trying to do it through donations. We would like to see foreign economies recover, especially in Asia, that would then increase their demand.

RODGERS: Why are farmers planting so many acres when demand is so low? Cash-strapped farmers will receive a guaranteed price for their soybeans. The Clinton administration is also considering more aid for farmers, in addition to last fall's \$6 billion package.

Ag officials are also exploring more food aid to Russia, though analysts fear the conflict in eastern Europe could delay donations.

DICK LOEWY, PRESIDENT, AGRESOURCE CO.: With the continued problems in Kosovo, we may not ship the wheat to the Russians. Our export pace is going to also be disappointing there, too.

RODGERS: Grain prices spent much of the past few weeks on the rebound from 13-year lows, but grain markets all staged sharp declines on the latest news of huge prospective plantings.

(on camera): Analysts are skeptical grain prices will be able to recover much in the coming months, especially with exports still languishing and farmers getting ready to plant yet another bumper crop.

Ceci Rodgers, CNN Financial News, Chicago.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

HOPKINS: Crude oil's recovery is having a huge impact at the gas pump, after a year of rock-bottom prices. The American Automobile Association says gas prices surged more than 10 percent in the past two weeks. It's the biggest jump in nine years, since the Persian Gulf War.

Earlier this week, crude oil prices hit their highest level in a year, at \$17 a barrel; an increase of about 40 percent for the year.

MONEYLINE will be right back.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

HOPKINS: Tomorrow, look for three reports on the strength of the economy: personal income and spending, an important indicator, because consumer spending makes up two-thirds of the economy; construction spending; and the widely followed National Association of Purchasing Management index, that measures the strength of manufacturing. The news comes during a holiday-shortened session in the bond market. It closes at 2:00 p.m. Eastern time, tomorrow, and will be open until noon on Good Friday.

That's MONEYLINE for this Wednesday. I'm Jan Hopkins in for Lou Dobbs.

Thanks for joining us. Good-night from New York.
CROSSFIRE is next.

END

Message Sent

To:

Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer M. Palmieri/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anthony R. Bernal/OVP@OVP
Melissa G. Green/OPD/EOP@EOP
Leslie Bernstein/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robin M. Roland/WHO/EOP@EOP
Chandler G. Spaulding/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dominique L. Cano/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dag Vega/WHO/EOP@EOP
Brenda M. Anders/WHO/EOP@EOP
gamble-bennett@dol.gov @ inet
Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP@EOP
Richard L. Siewert/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jordan Tamagni/WHO/EOP@EOP
Beverly J. Barnes/WHO/EOP
Elizabeth R. Newman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julia M. Payne/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julianne B. Corbett/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey M. Smith/OSTP/EOP@EOP
Lowell A. Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan A. Kaplan/OPD/EOP@EOP
Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer Ferguson/OMB/EOP@EOP
Mark D. Neschis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Ruby Shamir/WHO/EOP@EOP
Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP@EOP
Amy Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lisa J. Levin/WHO/EOP@EOP
Peter A. Weissman/OPD/EOP@EOP
William A. Halter/OMB/EOP@EOP
Eli G. Attie/OVP@OVP
Patricia M. Ewing/OVP@OVP
Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa M. Murray/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan E. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP
Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anne M. Edwards/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael Waldman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gene B. Sperling/OPD/EOP@EOP
Paul K. Engskov/WHO/EOP@EOP
Laura D. Schwartz/WHO/EOP@EOP
Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julie E. Mason/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steven J. Naplan/NSC/EOP@EOP
Alison Muscatine/WHO/EOP@EOP

Gordon Li/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mark A. Kitchens/WHO/EOP@EOP
June Shih/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey A. Shesol/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rochester M. Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rachael E. Sullivan/OVP@OVP
Julie B. Goldberg/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sarah E. Gegenheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Susanna B. McGuire/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steve Ricchetti/WHO/EOP@EOP
Edward F. Hughes/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa J. Prober/WHO/EOP@EOP
Justin Coleman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Clara J. Shin/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan M. Prince/WHO/EOP@EOP
Joshua S. Gottheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Heather M. Riley/WHO/EOP@EOP
Alejandro G. Cabrera/OVP@OVP
Rebecca L. Walldorff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jon P. Jennings/WHO/EOP@EOP
Katharine Button/WHO/EOP@EOP
Tracy Pakulniewicz/WHO/EOP@EOP
James T. Heimbach/WHO/EOP@EOP
Victoria L. Valentine/WHO/EOP@EOP
James E. Kennedy/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael A. Hammer/NSC/EOP@EOP
Laura J. Lewis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Toby C. Graff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sean P. O'Shea/WHO/EOP@EOP
Thomas D. Janenda/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rajiv Y. Mody/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robin J. Bachman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Saladbar 23 <saladbar23 @ hotmail.com> @ inet
Kimberly S. Anderson/OA/EOP@EOP

----- Forwarded by Rajiv Y. Mody/WHO/EOP on 04/21/99
04:24 PM -----

Mark A. Kitchens
04/01/99 06:05:12 AM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: PBS NewsHour, March 31, 1999

PBS NewsHour
Aired On March 31, 1999

SENATE BRIEFING

Services
in Yugoslavia.

Sen. John Warner, chairman of the Senate Armed
Committee, provides an update on the NATO strikes

JIM LEHRER: The Senate Armed Services Committee has been receiving regular briefings on the war. We get ours now from the Committee's Chairman, Senator John Warner, Republican of Virginia. Senator, can you add -- those are terribly moving stories.

The Campaign of ethnic cleansing.

SEN. JOHN WARNER
(R-VA), Senate Armed Services
Committee: Indeed they are, Jim,
and about six months ago, I was
in Kosovo and saw the suffering
from the Milosevic butchery
campaign last summer. And we
had hoped, after the Holbrooke

mission, that we'd reached some accord, and then of course Rambouillet, and it fell apart. And whatever we discuss tonight and our panel to follow, I'm sure there's grounds

for
to

"what if" and criticism, but I would urge all at this time

focus on the risks being taken tonight by American fliers, and those of eight other allied NATO nations, as they continue to carry out this military campaign.

JIM LEHRER: Have you heard anything in any of your briefings, Senator, that would lead you not to believe the stories of these refugees as to what is going on and why they are leaving Kosovo?

SEN. JOHN WARNER: No, I think there's a mounting body of evidence to corroborate these tragic stories by individuals.

JIM LEHRER: In a general way, how do you feel about this mission, eight days after it began?

SEN. JOHN WARNER: Well, we had, I think, a basis to believe that Milosevic would not have subjected his own people in Belgrade and elsewhere to the type of very serious damage being inflicted by the air campaign. But he has not, for reasons, perhaps some day we will learn more fully. I think all the diplomatic efforts, including

perhaps the
to

futile one by Primakov have been made, and he only historically responds to military pressure. And we've got

stay the course. There are no other alternatives. I know

that

valued colleagues of mine have thought about let's arm the Kosovars. In my judgment, and this is just one person's judgment, I think within two weeks he will pretty well have fulfilled his objectives in Kosovo of ridding the Kosovar army of any ability to combat his takeover of that region.

JIM LEHRER: And so there's literally nothing NATO could do about it now even if they wanted to?

SEN. JOHN WARNER: Well, NATO has been doing everything they can. Weather has been a serious obstacle; terrain is like an enemy.

JIM LEHRER: Why is that?

pockets

SEN. JOHN WARNER: Well, because -- I've walked those hills and seen them, it's very mountainous and of fog hang in; bad weather can come up in a matter of minutes and obscure a target. But NATO has done everything it can within the frame work of the use of air power and is continuing. We're moving into -- I don't know, whether it's phase one, two or three, that's irrelevant.

What

we're doing now is concentrating on those assets that Milosevic personally needs to continue to conduct his campaign in Kosovo, and perhaps pose a greater threat across the borders.

JIM LEHRER: Now, that includes some military targets right in downtown Belgrade, does it not?

SEN. JOHN WARNER: Well, I should not -- nor should any of us -- discuss specific targets, but the NATO people -- mind you, this campaign is not just an American campaign, it was planned by 19 nations and presumably the best military staff that can be brought together and reach

a

consensus. That's why we should stick with it. But we shouldn't discuss targets. But we know we're going to bring it to his command and control and his ability to

communicate

with his field commanders, and at the same time, to the extent weather and other factors, like shoulder-held weapons, which they have in abundance down there with the tanks in Kosovo, to the extent we can, we're going to bring pressure on those military units, trying to clean

out the

pockets of the Kosovar resistance.

JIM LEHRER: Now you mention -

SEN. JOHN WARNER: The KLA.

The Kosovo Liberation Army.

JIM LEHRER: Yes, the KLA. Now, is the K LA effective, is the KLA resisting this?

SEN. JOHN WARNER: This is a legitimate question. And I think we should at some point in time examine the intelligence we once had, which indicated it was substantial and formidable. But I have not as yet seen they have put up the type of fight that I

thought they would in trying to resist this ethnic cleansing of tragic proportions.

JIM LEHRER: Well, should we arm them more?

SEN. JOHN WARNER: I think not because, remember, the US -- and that thought only originated in the United States -- the US has been one of a team player of 19 nations. And to inject that here in the closing days of

what I believe is Milosevic's ethnic cleansing campaign in Kosovo, he's created the problem he set out to do, in other words,

in the adjoining areas with the refugees; he's pretty well subdued whatever KLA opposition once existed, and now he feels he's going to consolidate those gains and then

face the world. But in the meantime, we're going to continue to bring very severe and hopefully unacceptable damage on his command and control and possibly targets in the central region that you mentioned.

JIM LEHRER: But Senator, if I'm understanding what you're saying, Milosevic has already accomplished what he set out to do. We're talking about reversing something, is that right?

SEN. JOHN WARNER: He hasn't fully accomplished that, because, in doing so, he's degraded his military, and

within the next 10 days, there will be, I think, much more than we've been able to deal thus far in the way of damage. But the ethnic cleansing part probably, and this is just my judgment, will be completed in a matter of weeks. That's why when people say let's bring to bear ground forces,

that requires a very considerable amount of time to transport

and

put in place elements, tanks, heavy equipment, artillery, helicopters that would be used to support those ground

units.

That option, practically speaking, is not there.

JIM LEHRER: And a lot of people misunderstand that, don't they, Senator? They think, oh, well, let's put in ground troops, somebody snaps their finger, and suddenly there are 200,000 ground troops. Forget it, right?

SEN. JOHN WARNER: The ones in Macedonia were designed and equipped primarily for quick extraction of the UN forces and the other humanitarian people who were in there.

JIM LEHRER: That's 28,000 altogether?

SEN. JOHN WARNER: General number.

JIM LEHRER: Six thousand of them are American.

SEN. JOHN WARNER: They could probably deal with isolated units of the Serb army, but if you had to go

through

and attack the central forces of the Serb army, you need heavy armor of greater proportion that they have because, remember, any offensive operation, has to be better equipped than a defense. And they would essentially be put on defense if we were to attack.

No contingency plans?

JIM LEHRER: Everyone who appears to be in a position of authority within NATO and within the U.S. government, within the Pentagon, keeps saying that there are not even contingency plans for putting troops in there, with the exception of peacekeeping troops. Does that jibe with you?

SEN. JOHN WARNER: That's correct, and that has been the plan all along. Now, there were studies made, and I reviewed them last September and October, and they were significant numbers of people and heavy equipment, which had to be transported from the Adriatic Sea up through Albania -- is one of the main routes - and that was a logistic

operation

that would require a number of weeks.

JIM LEHRER: Do you agree with -- in our film clip we had Former Defense Secretary Frank Carlucci saying it would take at least 200,000 troops; is that a figure that makes sense to you?

SEN. JOHN WARNER: Well, some of the planning in NATO had very high estimates, but, again, as we talk to those issues, and I respect Secretary Carlucci, former secretary of defense, but someone better look at where our assets, how quickly they could be brought to bare and the likelihood that Milosevic will not have completed what he set out to do by way of ethnic cleansing in the period of

time

within which you could bring those in.

JIM LEHRER: So then how do we win this thing? If in fact everybody is now saying no matter where they came down at the very beginning on this operation, Senator, most

people

are now saying that NATO must now win this; can NATO in fact win this without ground troops?

SEN. JOHN WARNER: Well, you have to go back and examine very carefully the President's statement, which did he obliquely hint at, all right, Mr. Milosevic , if you do

not

stop what you're doing, then there may be within the NATO structure some thought independence for this country, and there, Mr. Milosevic , you will have lost your battle,

because

that's holy ground, the old 1389 battlefield. I actually

went

and saw it one time. That's holy ground.

JIM LEHRER: That's really
holy ground for Serbs.

SEN. JOHN WARNER: That's
right, absolutely.

JIM LEHRER: We did a long
piece on it the other night on this program.

SEN. JOHN WARNER: The victory in terms of clear
winning to me is quite elusive in this situation. But I do

not

at this point in time think we should be criticizing what

has

taken place because all these military people have done what they were ordered to do as best they could, considering the weather and the terrain and other factors.

No-win situation?

JIM LEHRER: And one of those factors being told at the beginning, you can't use ground troops?

SEN. JOHN WARNER: Clearly the political structure, and it's not just within -- although our President made it

clear --

it was within the NATO framework of planning by this planning staff that that would not be an option. Otherwise, they could have pre-positioned the heavy tanks and military vehicles and artillery and the like and then had as an

option -

JIM LEHRER: Which is what happened in Desert Storm.

SEN. JOHN WARNER: It's clearly what happened. And, now, of course, hindsight may be that you should not have abandoned any option in the beginning, put all options in place, and then determine whether or not to use it. But again, I think at this point in time, we've got to think

about

the safety of those people flying those missions and not go back and perform a lot of "what if" and "what should have been done." Let's see it through, stick to it.

JIM LEHRER: But see it through with air power only.

SEN. JOHN WARNER: That's correct.

JIM LEHRER: And you believe -- and you know a lot more about this than anybody else -- you believe it can still happen with air power alone?

SEN. JOHN WARNER: To the extent we can be effective in containing Milosevic from going across his borders, destabilizing the other nations, and perhaps further

suffering

in the Kosovo region, air is the one option and we've got

to

pursue it. Now, again, I think probably in a matter of

weeks

he will have completed what he set out to do, because we do not have any indications that the KLA is going to give him that type of resistance that would delay his progress.

JIM LEHRER: So how do you feel about it yourself, Senator? You -

SEN. JOHN WARNER: Well, it's a human tragedy of great proportions. But you have to ask your question what if we had done nothing as a collection of 19 nations? Here in

this

most holy of weeks of Easter, and done nothing, and watched these same pictures -- how would you have reacted to that? So it seems to me that we had little

choice

but the 19 nations of mounting the actions they have taken today and to see them through to the finish.

JIM LEHRER: Senator, thank you very much.

SEN. JOHN WARNER: You bet, thank you.

END Segment One

THE NEXT STEP

Aired on March 31, 1999

Four retired military leaders discuss the performance of NATO forces thus far and the possibility of deploying ground troops to stop Serbian attacks on ethnic Albanians.

MARGARET WARNER: We get four perspectives now on NATO's mission and options from four retired military leaders: General George Joulwan was the top NATO commander when NATO sent troops to Bosnia in 1995; General Merrill McPeak

was Air Force Chief of Staff during the Persian Gulf War; Rear Admiral Eugene Carroll was an Assistant Deputy Chief of Naval Operations in the 1970's, and he is now Deputy Director of the Center for Defense Information here in Washington; and Lieutenant General William Odom was Director of the National Security Agency in the mid-1980's, and he is now the director of National Security Studies at the Hudson Institute. Welcome gentlemen. General McPeak, first of all, your reaction to the day's news, which is that NATO has at least given authority to General Wesley Clark to expand the list of targets,

included,

it is reported, government buildings in downtown Belgrade. Is that the right move?

Stepping up the attack.

GEN. MERRILL McPEAK

(RET.): Well, first of all, I'm not sure that move has been made.

Let me just say at a tactical level it appears to be me that this campaign, we're a week or so into it now, is going very well. A

whole list of targets have been
nominated and reduced by the air crews. Very
business-like, sort of school, textbook solution, and we

have

had no combat casualties no US combat casualties in this
week -- or so -- long campaign. So I think it's been going
pretty well. The NATO authorities may conclude that they
have to expand that target list in Belgrade. I don't know

that

they've done that. If they do so, I hope they're careful,
because we do want to avoid unnecessary civilian
casualties.

MARGARET WARNER: Admiral Carroll, would you say
this is going well?

REAR ADM. EUGENE CARROLL (RET.):Tactically,
certainly. We're doing tremendous damage, and Milosevic is
paying a terrible price for his defiance. But in terms of
objectives, we're not attaining the objective that we set

for

ourselves, which was to deter aggression against the
Kosovars. He, Milosevic , is running wild there, and as we
saw in the earlier scenes, the suffering is intense, the

area is

being cleared out, and from the air we can do absolutely
nothing about it. We can bomb indefinitely, and we still

will

not affect the situation on the ground in terms of
Milosevic
control.

Milosevic

MARGARET WARNER: General Joulwan, would you
agree that in terms of objectives it's not being met, and

what

would you add to what Senator Warner said about why so
far the ethnic cleansing is continuing and there doesn't

seem

to be much deterrence in that at all?

GEN. GEORGE JOULWAN
(RET.): Well, I think Senator
Warner also talked about in
hindsight perhaps we would have
considered several different
options to give to our political
leadership. In hindsight, I think he

was correct. What we have to realize now, and I don't want
to second-guess commanders doing a superb job. NATO is
deeply involved. But the political objective as announced

by

the Council, North Atlantic Counsel and our own President,
was to deter, to stop the killing. Forty-thousand Serb

troops

in Kosovo, and they're carrying out this genocide. So from

a
doesn't

strategic level, from a strategic-political level, it just
seem to have met those objectives.

MARGARET WARNER: Do you agree with Admiral
Carroll that really air power just can't do the job?

GEN. GEORGE JOULWAN (RET.): Well, that's what I
keep emphasizing, that you have to have flexibility and
alternatives -- so not just Plan A, but B, C, D, and E. I'm
sure somewhere in the bowels of NATO, as well as in our
own joint staff, people are looking at options. We do that.
That is our profession; that's what we get paid to do. The
political authorities may limit what you can do, but the
planning that needs to go on I think should include many
options. And I think by doing that, by even doing the
planning for a ground option, you will restrict Milosevic

's
ability to just have 40,000 troops go throughout Kosovo. He
will have to put some on the Macedonian border, for
example. So how do you take the initiative away from
Milosevic? In my opinion, he has that initiative now.

Changing Milosevic's mind.

MARGARET WARNER: Do you agree he has the
initiative now?

LT. GENERAL WILLIAM
ODOM (RET.): Of course he
has the initiative. I mean, he's
winning day by day. We heard
Senator Warner say, in effect, as
I understood it, if not explicitly,
certainly implicitly, the main
reason he wants to keep bombing

is to make us feel good so we will have done something.
But he hasn't made a case that would achieve those
objectives. Clearly, you've got to consider a ground
campaign. Now, I agree with him that we're already where
we are. And second-guessing -

MARGARET WARNER: We have to start from here, in
other words.

LT. GENERAL WILLIAM ODOM (RET.):
Second-guessing what has already happened, I think that's a
useful exercise, but there's also the problem we have to go
from where we are today. Where we are today, I think we
have to put ground troops in there, I don't care if it

takes

two weeks, four weeks or six weeks. And I think we have
to set the objective of occupying Belgrade and destroying

Milosevic 's regime. And when he knows that and he's been told in advance that we're going to detach Kosovo, he's lost it by doing this, then we will begin to change the incentive structures. Another thing we've got to do is to put no time limit on how long we're going to stay there because we may need to stay there until a generation changes and until we have a set of leaders who are civilized. Today we don't have those. Until we're

willing

to kill them we're going to have to hit here and watch them kill people like we're seeing on this film tonight.

MARGARET WARNER: All right. General McPeak, I think you've just heard three of your colleagues all say

they

don't think that air power alone can do it. How would you answer that, in terms of the political objectives here?

GEN. MERRILL McPEAK (RET.): I feel like I must have missed something here, Margaret. No one ever said that air power would stop Milosevic from being a nasty personality to deal with. This whole bombing campaign has been about introducing ground troops in Kosovo. There are 10,000 such troops waiting in Macedonia now. The Kosovars have agreed to let them in. Our bombing is not because we like

to

watch bits and pieces of buildings go floating by us, but because we want to convince Milosevic that he should let those ground troops in. That's the whole point. That would mean that we would be inserting peacekeeping troops in a permissive environment. I'll say one thing -- if Milosevic continues to resist, we're going to make that environment permissive for the introduction of ground troops one way

or

another. As I said, we have achieved good results so far against a whole laundry list of targets, air defenses,

logistics

supporting military infrastructure, and now I would expect

to

see our air forces turn their attention or emphasize to a greater degree attacks on the Serbian ground forces in Kosovo. Look, it's only been going on a week or so. It's not time to throw in the towel here. I said seven or eight days ago on this program that the biggest risk was that we'd run out of stomach, and it sounds as though some are willing to throw in the towel after only seven

days.

MARGARET WARNER: Do you think, Admiral, that if NATO just keeps bombing that ultimately Milosevic can be forced to change his mind?

REAR ADM. EUGENE CARROLL (RET.): No, I don't believe so. He is impregnable, our bombing has actually solidified the support for his regime. He had opposition,

and now it's all focused on NATO, resenting the application of our force. And in order to go to Belgrade to take him out physically -

MARGARET WARNER: As General Odom suggested.

REAR ADM. EUGENE CARROLL (RET.): -- as General Odom has suggested, you're talking about a military campaign involving more than 100,000 troops, perhaps 200,000, a matter of months, and of immense destruction that will mean no one is a winner. There will just be no victory in this. I think Senator Warner used the term "prevail;"

that's the best you can say, is we would prevail militarily in the ultimate game, but there would be no victor.

What should be done?

LT. GENERAL WILLIAM ODOM (RET.): Well, this figure of 200,000, I don't think anybody knows how many troops are going to be there. And I agree with General McPeak that the air campaign is having a degrading effect. If it is, then it ought not to take 200,000 troops to do

it. We ought to be able come in there pretty easily. It's my understanding that the tank forces are all T-55, 1950 --

MARGARET WARNER: The Serb tank forces.

LT. GENERAL WILLIAM ODOM (RET.): The Serb tank forces are 1950's vintage tanks. There's no hand-held weapon in that - in the Serb arsenal that would kill an M-1 tank today. Therefore, tank forces, say coming down out the Voyavadina of Hungary, they wouldn't be going through the mountains, and I think

it would be a very interesting kind of campaign. The Nazis went through there in about 14 days the whole country and into the Greece. And I don't think that this force today

is a

great deal more competent than the ones that the Germans ran.

MARGARET WARNER: All right. Well, let's ask General Joulwan, who has the most recent experience with this force and with that terrain. Tell us how, if combat ground force had to be introduced, how would it be done, do you think it could be done?

GEN. GEORGE JOULWAN (RET.): Well, first of all, our forces are trained to do this. We do combined arms, that's air, ground, sea. And you get a synergistic effect when you put those all together. In Bosnia we had tactical air

control

parties with the UN forces when we did the air campaign in August and September of '95. We had observed fire, and as General McPeak knows and others, that is your most effective fire.

MARGARET WARNER: I'm sorry, explain that kind of fire.

GEN. GEORGE JOULWAN
(RET.): Observed fire. In other words, you have people on the ground that can pinpoint what you need to shoot at, or bomb from the air. That is to me the best sort of eyes you can have on

target. We had those when we did the air campaign in Bosnia. So the synergistic effect, I think, is important

here.

You have 12,000 NATO troops in Macedonia now. Perhaps we should plan for, I don't say commit, but at least plan

for

a limited objective, something to take the initiative away from Milosevic. There's a damned good commander in Mike Jackson of the Ace Rapid Reaction Corps in Macedonia now. It's, to me, troublesome that we could have that many NATO forces two to three few miles from where atrocities are being committed and not at least come up with some planning.

MARGARET WARNER: Are you talking about, for instance, going at least into Kosovo a little bit and

suggesting

an enclave -- something?

GEN. GEORGE JOULWAN (RET.): A limited objective. And, with all the air power we have there, you combine that with some sort of limited objective, I think we could take some of the initiative away. But the wrestling of the pros and cons of that, that's up to the military planners at

NATO.

Let them do the pros and cons of what it would take, the risk involved, but at least do the planning of what you

can do

with the force there, and you may have to generate more forces. But I believe you must take the initiative away. We fully support the air operation now, but I think we could

do

more than that operationally to try to at least get inside

the

decision cycle of Slobodan Milosevic.

Return to diplomatic negotiations?

MARGARET WARNER: Do you agree, Admiral, that the NATO forces ought to do something to change this equation a little bit?

REAR ADM. EUGENE

CARROLL (RET.): I think we

ought to resort to diplomatic negotiating tactics. I know that's not a popular thing to say when you're talking

about a

man like Milosevic, but some place between his arbitrary cruel, inhumane position and NATO's demand that we put 28,000 troops onto Kosovo and take control away from him is room for some sort of a working agreement. There's also the problem of conducting military operations through Macedonia. There's a question of the Greek willingness to support combat operations against Serb forces.

MARGARET WARNER: Which you'd have to go through Greece into Macedonia. General McPeak, how do you react to General Joulwan's suggestion?

GEN. MERRILL McPEAK

(RET.): Well, I like it better than Bill's idea that we ought to occupy Belgrade, or Gene's idea that we can negotiate some more with Milosevic. Neither one of those options seem to make a lot of sense to me. What George has suggested is we ought to at least do the contingency planning to run a ground force in there or to make some

sort

of a demonstration on the ground, and I think that might stand Farmer Jones' logic test a little bit better. But,

look,

we're in our eighth day of air operations here. Even in Desert Storm we bombed -- we had an air campaign that lasted 39 days. We've had no US combat losses. We've inflicted heavy damage on the competition. What is the argument that we must abandon the course that we're on

here? It's unclear to me.

MARGARET WARNER: General Odom is dying to jump in here.

LT. GENERAL WILLIAM ODOM (RET.): Nobody is suggesting we abandon the air campaign, and I don't hear anybody condemning the air campaign, or even criticizing

it.

What I hear is the absence of anything in addition to that. And if -- General Joulwan's limited offensive out of Macedonia, I would sign up for that straight away. But what disturbs me is that we have an operation where we don't have contingencies if at the end of the air campaign we don't have what we consider as an acceptable objective. Now, that seems to me would bother you, General McPeak. Do you want to go to war with no aces in your hand when you're getting down and you're losing all your money? You spent all your money on an air campaign, and Milosevic is now in charge, he's killed so many thousands of people, and you look funny. I'm all for the bombing, but I want to go

in

with a combined arms force. I suggested a bigger campaign, because I don't care if it takes three or four, five

months to

plan it. If you start it, that clearly is going to affect

his mind

as much or more than what we're doing right now in the bombing.

MARGARET WARNER:

Let me ask General

Joulwan a very quick

question before we go. Do

you agree with General

Odom that the Serb military

may not be as formidable as

we think it is, if we ever got there on the ground?

GEN. GEORGE JOULWAN (RET.): I think we have to caution there. If you do, the order of battle, you will

see that

there are disparities. They're willing to fight, we have

should

have no illusions about that. The Serb military will

fight. We

have to go in there with that in mind. I think we do have

an

advantage if we put our forces together. But history will have to record whether we chose the right action or not.

I'm

worried about we may meet our objectives from the air campaign, but lose tens of thousands of Kosovars who have been ethnically cleansed, or the Serbs committed genocide,

and I'm not sure we will have gained much from the operation.

MARGARET WARNER: All right, thank you, General, thank you all four very much.

END

Message Sent

To:

Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer M. Palmieri/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anthony R. Bernal/OVP@OVP
Melissa G. Green/OPD/EOP@EOP
Leslie Bernstein/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robin M. Roland/WHO/EOP@EOP
Chandler G. Spaulding/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dominique L. Cano/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dag Vega/WHO/EOP@EOP
Brenda M. Anders/WHO/EOP@EOP
gamble-bennett@dol.gov @ inet
Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP@EOP
Richard L. Siewert/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jordan Tamagni/WHO/EOP@EOP
Beverly J. Barnes/WHO/EOP
Elizabeth R. Newman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julia M. Payne/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julianne B. Corbett/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey M. Smith/OSTP/EOP@EOP
Lowell A. Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan A. Kaplan/OPD/EOP@EOP
Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer Ferguson/OMB/EOP@EOP
Mark D. Neschis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Ruby Shamir/WHO/EOP@EOP
Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP@EOP
Amy Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lisa J. Levin/WHO/EOP@EOP
Peter A. Weissman/OPD/EOP@EOP
William A. Halter/OMB/EOP@EOP
Eli G. Attie/OVP@OVP
Patricia M. Ewing/OVP@OVP
Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa M. Murray/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan E. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP
Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anne M. Edwards/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael Waldman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gene B. Sperling/OPD/EOP@EOP
Paul K. Engskov/WHO/EOP@EOP

Laura D. Schwartz/WHO/EOP@EOP
Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julie E. Mason/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steven J. Naplan/NSC/EOP@EOP
Alison Muscatine/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gordon Li/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mark A. Kitchens/WHO/EOP@EOP
June Shih/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey A. Shesol/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rochester M. Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rachael E. Sullivan/OVP@OVP
Julie B. Goldberg/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sarah E. Gegenheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Susanna B. McGuire/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steve Ricchetti/WHO/EOP@EOP
Edward F. Hughes/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa J. Prober/WHO/EOP@EOP
Justin Coleman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Clara J. Shin/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan M. Prince/WHO/EOP@EOP
Joshua S. Gottheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Heather M. Riley/WHO/EOP@EOP
Alejandro G. Cabrera/OVP@OVP
Rebecca L. Walldorff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jon P. Jennings/WHO/EOP@EOP
Katharine Button/WHO/EOP@EOP
Tracy Pakulniewicz/WHO/EOP@EOP
James T. Heimbach/WHO/EOP@EOP
Victoria L. Valentine/WHO/EOP@EOP
James E. Kennedy/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael A. Hammer/NSC/EOP@EOP
Laura J. Lewis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Toby C. Graff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sean P. O'Shea/WHO/EOP@EOP
Thomas D. Janenda/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rajiv Y. Mody/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robin J. Bachman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Saladbar 23 <saladbar23 @ hotmail.com> @ inet
Kimberly S. Anderson/OA/EOP@EOP

----- Forwarded by Rajiv Y. Mody/WHO/EOP on 04/21/99
04:24 PM -----

Mark A. Kitchens
04/01/99 06:05:15 AM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: ABC World News Tonight, March 31, 1999

WORLD NEWS TONIGHT WITH PETER JENNINGS
Aired on MARCH 31, 1999

PETER JENNINGS, ABC News: (voice-over) On World News Tonight this Wednesday -- the NATO alliance tries to raise the stakes in its campaign against the Serbs. It says the capital city will now be a target. Millennium computer panic. The biggest thing to fear may be fear itself. And just days until opening day. Can money alone win or lose a season?

ANNOUNCER: From ABC News world headquarters in New York, this is World News Tonight with Peter Jennings.

PETER JENNINGS: Good evening. The policy for attacking the Serbs in Yugoslavia is firm for another day -- bombing, more bombing, nothing but bombing. And by tonight, the Serbian leader, Slobodan Milosevic, has undoubtedly heard that NATO has a new idea. It intends, so it says, to bomb the capital city, Belgrade. We're going to begin with that potential new dimension to the air campaign. At the Pentagon, ABC's John McWethy.

JOHN MCWETHY, ABC News: (voice-over) Taking the air campaign to downtown Belgrade is something that NATO had been avoiding because of the possibility of civilian casualties. Now among the targets being considered, the Ministry of Defense and Interior and the presidential palace.

JAMES RUBIN, State Department Spokesman: No place where attacks on Kosovo are conceived and planned will be immune from NATO air strikes.

Gen. MIKE DUGAN (Ret.), Former Air Force Chief of Staff: It means going places -- not where the tactical front is, not where you see the tanks and the artillery pieces -- but where you see the decision-makers.

JOHN MCWETHY: (voice-over) Military sources tell ABC News that some targets have been selected to send a very personal message to Milosevic and his top supporters. Their homes and offices will be considered potential targets. Even if buildings are empty -- which officials concede some are -- destroying them, they argue, still sends a powerful symbolic message.

Today, NATO released video of new strikes against ammunition and fuel storage areas, and the Pentagon claims Serb tanks in Kosovo were attacked for the first time. But more of the same may do little good.

(on camera) Intelligence sources say time is running out. They calculate in another several days, Milosevic will have won in Kosovo. He will have utterly destroyed what is left of the ethnic Albanians' insurgent army and will have forced hundreds of thousands of the people of Kosovo to leave the country, burning their homes as they go.

(voice-over) So the Clinton administration and America's NATO allies are left struggling with the question -- what do we do now? John McWethy, ABC News, the Pentagon.

The Serbian State Of Mind

PETER JENNINGS: If NATO actually does take its air campaign to the center of the Yugoslav capital, it surely knows that the Serbian leadership has more bomb shelters available than there are in most cities. As for breaking the Serbian spirit, where Kosovo is involved, that's a very tall order.

Kosovo is a national shrine, even for many Serbs who find Mr.

Milosevic's nationalism revolting. Sheila MacVicar tonight on the Serbian state of mind.

SHEILA MACVICAR, ABC News: (voice-over) According to Serbian TV, it is business as usual tonight. They showed pictures of President Slobodan Milosevic, but there was no mention that NATO now has downtown Belgrade in its sights. In the streets, the news did spread by Internet, foreign radio broadcasts and word of mouth.

And to make a point about potential casualties, journalists were taken to the city's largest hospital, only 300 yards from the defense ministry. Staff and patients said they were terrified.

But on the surface, life in Belgrade goes on very much as normal. Another government-organized rock concert in the city's center today. A Serbian journalist spoke to National Public Radio by telephone.

Voice of DEJAN ANASTASIJEVIC, Serbian Journalist: There's plenty of food. Serbia is largely an agricultural country, and now it's the middle of the spring. The price of meat went down, however. It's surprising. There's a general shortage of fuel and cigarettes. The government said that these will be rationed.

SHEILA MACVICAR: (voice-over) But as the bombing continues and now escalates, people are tiring of the shelters and looking outside the city for safety.

Voice of MARIA IVANOVIC, Freelance Journalist: There is fear setting in. It's beginning to feel more panic here, more aggressive.

SHEILA MACVICAR: (on camera) Still, there are no signs President Milosevic is pulling back. Here in Montenegro, there is growing concern tonight that Milosevic may be preparing to move against the Western-minded and neutral government of this republic, perhaps even preparing a military coup. Sheila MacVicar, ABC News, Podgorica, Montenegro.

Kosovo'S Ethnic Albanian Population Dwindling

PETER JENNINGS: The NATO alliance may not be doing much to stop the Serb forces in Kosovo, but the State Department does seem to know what's going on. Today, the department named 20 towns and villages in the province where it said there is credible evidence of war crimes -- mass executions, forced expulsion. And nearly all of it since the NATO campaign began.

Until recently, two million people lived in Kosovo. One way or another now, the ethnic Albanian population dwindles every day. We have two reports, beginning with ABC's Clay Scott, who's on the Kosovo border with Macedonia.

CLAY SCOTT, ABC News: (voice-over) They arrived at the border this morning -- nearly 2,000 ethnic Albanians. They said they had been forced onto trains by Serb soldiers who locked the doors shut. When the trains reached the border, the doors were opened, and the refugees made their way single file along the tracks for fear of buried land mines.

The Serbs took both their money and their passports, the refugees said, and there had been worse before they left. ``They shot the two sisters of my husband," she says. This woman was on one of those trains arriving this morning from Kosovo's capital, Pristina.

FEMALE REFUGEE FROM PRISTINA: We came without bread, without nothing. If they stayed there one day more, two days, they are going to die, some of them.

CLAY SCOTT: (voice-over) Aid officials are especially worried about

thousands of other refugees who are traveling by road on foot. They are stranded in the mountainous no-man's land along the Macedonian border, braving cold and hunger. They're still there because the Macedonian government has been extremely reluctant to take more Albanians because that would upset its own ethnic balance between Christians and Muslims.

This family arrived today from that no man's land after three days in the mountains. They described the last harrowing hours in their village. "They were killing people," she said. "I didn't even have time to put on my shoes." "We hid in the basement," he said. "We could hear the Serbs enter our building. When it was dark, we crawled out the window. There were dead people in the street."

His son and his grandchildren, he says, are still missing, lost somewhere in the mountains of Kosovo. Clay Scott, ABC News, on the Kosovo-Macedonia border.

The Flight From Kosovo

MIKE LEE, ABC News: (voice-over) This is Mike Lee at the Albanian border with Kosovo. Some 10,000 refugees crossed into Albania today. Buses were overflowing with frightened people. "There's nothing left of our homes but ashes," said this man.

A small convoy of tractors arrived today with all those who made it out of the village of Zym (ph). Some of them said they watched from a riverbank as the Serbs shot to death 22 of their men. They made it to the town of Kukes today, where thousands are scrambling for bread and other relief supplies.

(on camera) All of this has been extremely difficult for the children. Most of them don't even understand what a refugee is. All they know is that their lives have suddenly been turned upside down.

(voice-over) "My daughter asked me, 'Mommy, where are we going?'" said this woman. "I told her, 'Don't worry. We are going to grandma's house.' But when she looked back and saw our house on fire, she started screaming.

"The Serb police burned our house," she says. Her name is Calabria (ph). She is only 3 years old. "Yes, I saw the flames. Yes, I was scared, very scared."

Thousands of mothers are trying to comfort their children. They cry and say, "It's just like we see on TV. Are we going to die like people die in the movies?"

Late today, these people from one little village in Kosovo rode off to continue life in another place. They do not know where. Mike Lee, ABC News at the Albanian-Kosovo border.

PETER JENNINGS: Just one other note with -- based on what you see there. Faced with what we can all see is happening, President Clinton has ordered up \$50 million worth of food and other emergency supplies for the refugees.

When we come back, the debate about using ground troops in Kosovo. Not in the White House.

(Commercial Break)

A Closer Look

PETER JENNINGS: We are going to take "A Closer Look" tonight at the argument being waged, largely in the editorial pages, about sending ground

troops to Kosovo. Ever since the President said that he was trying to prevent a human disaster there, it has been clear to some people that ground troops would be needed and equally clear to others that it was not in the cards.

It is a debate made sharper by the fact that air power alone has not held the Serbs back. First, ABC's John Martin.

JOHN MARTIN, ABC News: (voice-over) As the air campaign continues, the bombs fall and refugees flee, five former government officials said today that ground troops may be needed to finish the job in Kosovo. Jeanne Kirkpatrick was U.S. ambassador to the United Nations under Ronald Reagan.

JEANNE KIRKPATRICK, Former U.S. Ambassador to U.N.: You cannot, from a remote location, stop troops on the ground from committing horrors, if they are inclined to do so.

JOHN MARTIN: (voice-over) Frank Carlucci was secretary of defense in the Reagan administration.

FRANK CARLUCCI, Former Secretary of Defense: If it does require ground troops in order to prevail, then I think we ought to send in ground troops.

JOHN MARTIN: (voice-over) William Howard Taft was ambassador to NATO in the Bush administration.

WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT IV, Former U.S. Ambassador to NATO: We have the political objectives. We should achieve them. If it takes ground troops, fine.

JOHN MARTIN: (voice-over) But what should the military objective be? Originally, it was autonomy for Kosovo.

MORTON ABRAMOWITZ, Former Assistant Secretary of State: I think that has now been forfeited. It has changed dramatically with this vast expulsion of people and this beating up on the Kosovars.

JOHN MARTIN: (voice-over) What's left -- safe havens or driving the Serbs out? Whatever the objective, said senator and Vietnam veteran John McCain, there must be an all-out effort.

Sen. JOHN MCCAIN, (R) Arizona: If that means at some point we may have to use ground troops, then we may have to use ground troops.

JOHN MARTIN: (voice-over) Retired General Colin Powell, Joint Chiefs chairman under George Bush, is reluctant to send troops.

Gen. COLIN POWELL (Ret.), Former Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff: I think it's a point we should try to avoid and see if air power can continue to work. At the end of the day, if you wish to seize the initiative, then you may have to do that.

JOHN MARTIN: (on camera) But Powell does concede that right now, without ground troops, NATO is at a disadvantage against the Serbs. John Martin, ABC News, Washington.

Nato At Disadvantage Without Ground Troops

PETER JENNINGS: It is pretty elementary what the former chairman of the Joint Chiefs says. NATO is clearly at a disadvantage without any ground forces. But as Colin Powell knows better than most, senior military men and the President are often haunted by what has gone before. Here's ABC's John Cochran.

JOHN COCHRAN, ABC News: (voice-over) In his first year as president, Bill Clinton learned the danger of using ground troops. Faced with another human tragedy, starvation in Somalia, an inexperienced Clinton turned a humanitarian mission into a futile and bloody hunt for a Somali war lord.

Thirty Americans were killed. A humiliated president withdrew.

TED GALEN CARPENTER, Cato Institute: Somalia should certainly be an object lesson for anyone who suggests sending ground troops to Kosovo. That was a very bitter experience. We went in with the best of intentions, and yet we went and ended up with a lot of dead Americans.

JOHN COCHRAN: (voice-over) But what about Operation Desert Storm which succeeded in driving Saddam Hussein from Kuwait? The difference there was that George Bush built a coalition with overwhelming force and had plenty of time not only to prepare for military action, but to convince the public that casualties would be justified to protect American access to Gulf oil. Also, the desert was perfect for allied troop operations.

But Kosovo is harder to explain to Americans, and the mountainous terrain would be ideal for Serb guerrilla operations against NATO forces. Some say sending in ground troops would be madness now that 40,000 armed Serbs are already in Kosovo.

RICHARD PERLE, American Enterprise Institute: So we have come in too late. I think this is negligence and incompetence on a grand scale, and I would be very reluctant to entrust the lives of American ground forces to the strategic thinkers who have gotten us into the situation we are now in.

JOHN COCHRAN: (on camera) On one thing everyone agrees. There can be no ground campaign unless the President convinces a skeptical public it is necessary. And so far, no one seems more skeptical than the President himself. John Cochran, ABC News, Washington.

PETER JENNINGS: Just time now to check in with our White House correspondent. Sam Donaldson is with us. Sam, there are some suggestions around today that, in spite of the failure to help the Kosovars or stop Mr. Milosevic, there's talk there in the White House that the President may, at some point fairly soon, say he's accomplished his goals, and NATO will stop the bombing.

SAM DONALDSON, ABC News: Well, Peter, he'd like to. From the beginning, the objective has been to accomplish limited goals -- to deter Milosevic's ability to kill people, to damage his war machine and, at that point, to get out.

As one senior official said the other day, "We never said we'd bomb him back to the negotiating table." So at the moment, if you look throughout the administration, you find all of the major players on the same page. Bomb, bomb, bomb. No ground troops. There's no talk of that here -- at least not today, Peter. And the guess is that there won't be any tomorrow either.

PETER JENNINGS: Sam, very briefly, if they had to point to a result up until now, what would it be?

SAM DONALDSON: They'd say that they wanted to demonstrate NATO's resolve. That is that NATO said it would bomb and it did. And they've done that. Milosevic must now understand that if NATO says we're going to bomb you, we're going to bomb you. The problem, of course, is what does the bombing accomplish because that, at the end of the day, is the way this page will be written in history.

PETER JENNINGS: Thanks very much, Sam. Sam Donaldson at the White House tonight.

We'll be back in a moment with some of the day's other news. There's another Y2K problem. The more they worry, the worse it appears to get.

(Commercial Break)

Millennium Computer Panic

PETER JENNINGS: Now, some of the other news today -- in Washington, the government announced that 92 percent of its critical computer systems are ready for the Year 2000. And it promises that the computers controlling air traffic and the ones that issue Medicare checks will be ready this summer. That is the good news. Now here's ABC's James Walker.

JAMES WALKER, ABC News: (voice-over) Two hundred and seventy-five days to go and the closer we get, the noisier, the more ominous the predictions become.

NARRATOR (Clip from "Y2K & You"): Twenty-five billion microchips -- if they fail, it's an electronic ice age.

JAMES WALKER: (voice-over) There's the noise on the Net -- from the publishers, from the sales people.

SALESMAN: Four cases lasts one family one year.

JAMES WALKER: (voice-over) The concern is that people may panic.

UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN: Whatever I have, I intend to take out of the bank. And if there's enough, I would probably buy gold.

PETER DE JAGER, Computer Consultant: When we panic, we lose everything. We are no longer a civilization when we panic. And that's my fear is that we will panic.

JAMES WALKER: (voice-over) Computer consultant Peter De Jager was one of the first to predict a Y2K disaster. This month, he changed his mind.

PETER DE JAGER: The number-one concern is no longer the technical issue. It is now the fear itself.

JAMES WALKER: (voice-over) There is a growing consensus that banks, insurance and phone companies will have their computers ready for the Year 2000.

(on camera) Federal officials hope today's report that the government is solving the Y2K problem will minimize the danger that people will overreact.

JOHN KOSKINEN, White House Y2K Council: The overreaction risks are that, you know, hundreds of millions of Americans decide that they're all going to, at the last minute, take money out of the bank, money out of the market, fill up their cars with gas and buy a lot of anything. The system won't tolerate that.

JAMES WALKER: (voice-over) In fact, computer experts say very few Y2K failures are likely to occur on January 1. Instead, they believe there will be small-scale disruptions spread out over the next year or so.

VENDOR: Take Visa, Mastercard, cash, check.

JAMES WALKER: (voice-over) That's why they urge people to stay away from those who are out to profit from doom. James Walker, ABC News, New York.

PETER JENNINGS: "On The Money" tonight -- prices on the rise.

(voice-over) In the past two weeks, gas prices have jumped about 12 cents a gallon in most places. In California, drivers are now paying up to 40 cents more following the decision by key oil-producing nations to cut production and since a fire shut down a major California refinery.

(on camera) In Washington today, a report from the government's official auditor, the General Accounting Office, says that major federal agencies could not account for a majority of the \$466 billion in assets that they hold.

(voice-over) On Wall Street today, the Dow Jones Industrial Average was

down more than 127 points to close at 9786. On the NASDAQ, stocks were down almost 19 points.

Graphics: Dow Jones 15-day Trend

Change: Down 127.10

Close: 9786.16

Volume: 922,062,400

NASDAQ 15-day Trend

Change: Down 18.89

Close: 2461.40

Volume: 1,074,988,205

(on camera) In a moment -- baseball, 1999. The season of the rich.

TERRY RYAN, General Manager, Minnesota Twins: It's not good for us to go into the season thinking that we may not stand a chance from April. That's not the way to play professional sports.

PETER JENNINGS: (voice-over) Poor teams out of the hunt before the game begins.

(Commercial Break)

Season Of The Rich

PETER JENNINGS: Finally tonight -- the money games. This Sunday is baseball's opening day. We learned today that the Major Leagues are considering selling patches of advertising on players' uniforms to boost team revenues. It's actually not such a ludicrous idea for some teams. ABC's Aaron Brown reports tonight that today in baseball, more than ever, winning depends on the wallet.

AARON BROWN, ABC News: (voice-over) For Major League Baseball, last year was close to perfect. There was McGwire and Sosa, the Yankees 125-win season.

BUD SELIG, Baseball Commissioner: I think George Will put it correctly near the end of the year, this is probably, in many ways, baseball's greatest year.

AARON BROWN: (voice-over) But if the summer was kind, winter was cruel. The big teams, the teams with the deep pockets, spent their cash wildly. The Yankees more than \$85 million for Bernie Williams, the Anaheim Angels spent more than \$80 million for Mo Vaughn.

And the Dodgers, a staggering \$105 million over seven years for pitcher Kevin Brown, \$15 million a year, which is about the entire Minnesota Twins payroll. The rich got better. The baseball poor got left behind.

RANDY SMITH, General Manager, Detroit Tigers: You have to spend to win, and if you don't spend, you're not going to win. I think you look at the top 12 payrolls last year, 11 of them had winning records. Look at the bottom 12 payrolls, they all had losing records.

AARON BROWN: (on camera) Baseball has always had its rich teams and its poor teams. The Yankees haven't won two dozen championships simply because they've had better scouts. But the disparity has never been this great, both off the field, the money the big teams make, and on the field, the talent they can buy.

(voice-over) While the Yankee payroll was growing -- it will exceed \$80 million this year -- the Twins payroll is shrinking. They are trying to cut salaries to between \$10 million and \$15 million, about half what they paid last year. The Yankees field stars at almost every position. The Twins will field a team so inexperienced, so devoid of stars, they not only won't be competitive within their division, they can barely be called

major league.

TERRY RYAN, General Manager, Minnesota Twins: It's not good for us to go into the season thinking that we may not stand a chance from April even to compete with Cleveland. That's not the way to play professional sports.

AARON BROWN: (voice-over) But that is how baseball is being played these days in a half dozen or more of baseball's 30 cities. And fans in those cities are denied the very best part of spring.

BUD SELIG: They have to have the hope that their team can be competitive and faith that they believe that. If you take that away from too many franchises, you've obviously hurt the game.

AARON BROWN: (voice-over) In too many places, the game is hurting, and the season is effectively over before the first pitch has been thrown.

Aaron Brown, ABC News, Lakeland, Florida.

PETER JENNINGS: Just a brief review of our top story tonight.

(voice-over) NATO now says it's going to take the air war to downtown Belgrade, the Yugoslav capital. The White House still has no plans to use U.S. ground troops. And as the massive flow of refugees continues, ABC's John McWethy says intelligence reports predict that within a few days, Slobodan Milosevic will have essentially won, driving the ethnic Albanians from their homes and defeating what there was of their military forces.

(on camera) That is our report on World News Tonight. Don't forget 20/20 and Nightline.

I'm Peter Jennings. Have a good evening. Good night.

END

Message Sent

To:

Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer M. Palmieri/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anthony R. Bernal/OVP@OVP
Melissa G. Green/OPD/EOP@EOP
Leslie Bernstein/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robin M. Roland/WHO/EOP@EOP
Chandler G. Spaulding/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dominique L. Cano/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dag Vega/WHO/EOP@EOP
Brenda M. Anders/WHO/EOP@EOP
gamble-bennett@dol.gov @ inet
Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP@EOP
Richard L. Siewert/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jordan Tamagni/WHO/EOP@EOP
Beverly J. Barnes/WHO/EOP
Elizabeth R. Newman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julia M. Payne/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julianne B. Corbett/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey M. Smith/OSTP/EOP@EOP
Lowell A. Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan A. Kaplan/OPD/EOP@EOP
Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer Ferguson/OMB/EOP@EOP
Mark D. Neschis/WHO/EOP@EOP

Ruby Shamir/WHO/EOP@EOP
Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP@EOP
Amy Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lisa J. Levin/WHO/EOP@EOP
Peter A. Weissman/OPD/EOP@EOP
William A. Halter/OMB/EOP@EOP
Eli G. Attie/OVP@OVP
Patricia M. Ewing/OVP@OVP
Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa M. Murray/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan E. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP
Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anne M. Edwards/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael Waldman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gene B. Sperling/OPD/EOP@EOP
Paul K. Engskov/WHO/EOP@EOP
Laura D. Schwartz/WHO/EOP@EOP
Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julie E. Mason/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steven J. Naplan/NSC/EOP@EOP
Alison Muscatine/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gordon Li/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mark A. Kitchens/WHO/EOP@EOP
June Shih/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey A. Shesol/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rochester M. Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rachael E. Sullivan/OVP@OVP
Julie B. Goldberg/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sarah E. Gegenheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Susanna B. McGuire/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steve Ricchetti/WHO/EOP@EOP
Edward F. Hughes/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa J. Prober/WHO/EOP@EOP
Justin Coleman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Clara J. Shin/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan M. Prince/WHO/EOP@EOP
Joshua S. Gottheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Heather M. Riley/WHO/EOP@EOP
Alejandro G. Cabrera/OVP@OVP
Rebecca L. Walldorff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jon P. Jennings/WHO/EOP@EOP
Katharine Button/WHO/EOP@EOP
Tracy Pakulniewicz/WHO/EOP@EOP
James T. Heimbach/WHO/EOP@EOP
Victoria L. Valentine/WHO/EOP@EOP
James E. Kennedy/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael A. Hammer/NSC/EOP@EOP
Laura J. Lewis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Toby C. Graff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sean P. O'Shea/WHO/EOP@EOP
Thomas D. Janenda/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rajiv Y. Mody/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robin J. Bachman/WHO/EOP@EOP

Saladbar 23 <saladbar23 @ hotmail.com> @ inet
Kimberly S. Anderson/OA/EOP@EOP

----- Forwarded by Rajiv Y. Mody/WHO/EOP on 04/21/99
04:24 PM -----

Mark A. Kitchens
04/01/99 06:05:19 AM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: CBS 60 Minutes II, March 31, 1999

CBS 60 MINUTES II
Aired on MARCH 31, 1999

SPEAKERS: WILLIAM J. CLINTON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES
DAN RATHER, CBS ANCHOR

RATHER: With the air war against Serbian forces entering its second intense week, we asked President Clinton to sit down and talk to us about Kosovo, about what to expect next there, and about his presidency. He agreed and this afternoon we met in the White House.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

RATHER (voice over): After walking and talking for a short while, we sat down for our interview in the cabinet room. The president talked passionately about the war tactics of Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic.

CLINTON: Look at what this guy did in Bosnia. Let's go back to Bosnia -- two million refugees, a quarter of a million people dead. And there is no question that this is his strategy. I think he wanted to clean them out. I think he wanted to ethnically cleanse the country as much as he could. I think he wanted to drastically alter the population balance. I think he wanted to eradicate all the records of the Albanians and the property they owned. I think he wanted to erase history and start all over again.

RATHER (on camera): Is genocide too strong a word Mr. President?

CLINTON: Well, as you know, I've tried to be hesitant in using it. There is no question that a few thousand people have been murdered because they were Kosovar Albanians. There's no question about that.

RATHER: But you hesitate to use the word genocide.

CLINTON: But I think -- because it's only a question of whether enough people have been killed yet. There's no question of what he was doing constitutes ethnic cleansing and that he was killing and uprooting people because of their ethnic heritage. There is no question about that.

And I think that not only he, but others who have been in decision-making positions have to be held accountable for what they've done. And of course, this whole war crimes tribunal that's been set up to review what happened in the Balkans, we will have to review those facts.

But the main thing I want to do, whatever the label belongs on it, is

to stop it if we can.

RATHER: Mr. President, there are reports that as we speak and through this evening that they will be-- there will be air attacks in Belgrade itself, that you've gotten NATO to organize. That is that correct, is that accurate?

CLINTON: It is accurate that we are attacking targets that we believe will achieve our stated objective, which is either to raise the price of aggression to an unacceptably high level so that we can get back to talking peace and security, or to substantially undermine the capacity of the Serbian government to wage war.

RATHER: In the vernacular of the military, have you authorized them to go downtown?

CLINTON: I have authorized them to attack targets that I believe are appropriate to achieve our objectives. We have worked very hard to minimize the risks of collateral damage, but I do not believe that we can rule out any set of targets that are reasonably related to our stated objectives.

RATHER: When you say that you don't rule out any targets that could help you accomplish the mission, would that -- declining to rule out targets -- include the defense ministry, the interior ministry?

CLINTON: I don't think I should discuss the specific targets, because I don't want to compromise our efforts to achieve them. But you can say that I didn't rule out any targets anywhere within Serbia or Kosovo that would be reasonably related to our objectives. You can say that.

RATHER (voice over): Since if bombing began, the president acknowledged that the humanitarian crisis in Kosovo has gotten much worse. But he says that would have happened anyway.

The forces of Serbian President Milosevic have continued to force tens of thousands of ethnic Albanians out of their homes and out of the country. Towns have been emptied, villages burned, and there have been reports of mass killings.

CLINTON: We believe we can do something about it there, and I think we have to try.

RATHER (on camera): You still believe you can do something about it there? The last few days have indicated well, it seemed from several points of view, Milosevic is winning and we're losing.

CLINTON: Well, we knew that would happen in the first few days. He had planned this a long time. Keep in mind, before the first NATO plane got in the air, he already had the 40,000 troops there.

Think how we would feel if this were going on and we were doing nothing. Now, there's no question that in -- we've run this air campaign for less than a week. We've been hampered by bad weather. We had to be cautious on the early nights to try to at least protect our planes as much as we possibly can against the air defenses, which are quite good.

And so it takes a while to get up and going, and against that, he had 40,000 troops and 300 tanks. It shouldn't surprise anybody that he's able to do a lot of what he intended to do, even though we've had some success in hitting his military targets in the last couple days.

But I would urge the American people, indeed the people of all the NATO nations, to have a little resolve here, to stay with your leaders, to give us a chance to really see this thing through.

We cannot view this as something that will be instantaneously successful. This is something that will require some time. So I would ask for the American people to be patient and to be resolved and to be firm

and give our plan a chance to take hold here.

RATHER: Mr. President, I want to read you what some fairly high-rank military people have said privately. You would understand they didn't want their names attached to it. "Dan, we're not employing the full power of our Air Force."

Another one, "We ran over 200 bombing missions the first day when we moved against Saddam Hussein. There hasn't been a single day in which we've run as many as 50 bombing missions, with the possible exception of today."

Why aren't we going all out? You've described a situation that you feel passionately about and you think is wrong. Everybody knows if you get in a street fight with a bully, you want to hit him the hardest right at first.

CLINTON: We have done this through and with NATO. It's an organization that operates by consensus. One of the things that has struck me is that in the last 48-hours, because of the actions taken by Mr. Milosevic, the will, the steel, the determination and the outright anger of our allies has been intensifying exponentially. So that we have now, I think, a stronger support than we have ever had for taking the most aggressive action we can.

I understand the frustration of some of our people in the Pentagon, but I think that the secretary of defense and the chairman of the joint chiefs will tell you that I have worked very hard with them to give them the maximum possible leeway, showing sensitivity only to targets that might have marginal benefits but cause a lot of collateral damage. I don't want a lot of innocent Serbian civilians to die because they have man running their country that's doing something atrocious.

But some of them are at risk because of that and must be because we have targets that we need to go after.

RATHER: With all respect, but also directly, everybody acknowledges you have a brilliant mind; you're an excellent speaker. But sometimes people, people who support you and like you say, well, he parses words too closely. What is "is" argument -- all of that.

I want to discuss ground troops in the context of speaking as a directly as you possibly can. When you say you have no intention to commit ground troops to accomplish the mission in Kosovo, does that mean we are not going to have ground troops in there, no way, no how, no time?

CLINTON: It means just what it says. You know, you -- I'll come back to the point, but you say people say I parse words too --that's what they said about President Roosevelt, too. He made a pretty good president.

And when people say you parse words too closely, it usually means they want to ask you a question and get you to give an answer which is inconsistent with the objective you're trying to pursue for the American people and say you don't do what they want you to do.

So normally they criticize you not for what you're doing but what they wish you would do.

Now, I have used those words carefully. I am very careful in the words I use.

Now, on the merits of it, the thing that bothers me about introducing ground troops into a hostile situation, and into Kosovo and into the Balkans, is the prospect of never being able to get them out.

If you have a peace agreement, even if it's difficult and even if you have to stay a little longer than you thought you would, like in Bosnia, at least there is an exit strategy and it's a manageable situation.

People are frustrated because we live in an age where everybody wants things to operate like an 30-second ad. This air campaign is not a 30-second ad. It's only been going on for a few days and it's been undermined to some extent, by bad weather.

RATHER: Let me follow up on something Mr. President. First of all, the pope has asked for an Easter suspension of the bombing. Are you prepared to do that?

CLINTON: I don't see how we can do that with what's going on on the ground there now. Mr. Milosevic is running those people to the Albanian borders, to the other borders by the thousands a day. He's killing people. No one would like more than I to properly observe Easter, which for Christians is the most important holiday of all, even more important than Christmas really because of what it symbolizes to the living.

But we can't observe Easter and honor the resurrection of Christ by allowing him another free day to kill more innocent civilians.

RATHER: And to those people who say, Mr. President, that this is the most important week in the whole Judeo-Christian calendar in many ways, because you have Passover, Monday, Thursday, Good Friday and Easter, that it is quote "obscene to be carrying on this kind of war during this period," you say what?

CLINTON: That we are acting in defense of the defenseless. We are not carrying on an aggressive war. We are acting at a time when he is going through the country, killing people, according to reports including moderate politicians, trying to destroy records of what their land holdings are, trying to eradicate any historical record of their claim to their own land.

I hate the idea of having to continue this campaign during this period, but I hate more the idea that we would walk away from this campaign while he continues to clean out house after house after house and village after village after village and kill a lot of innocent people. I think that is -- I think that that would not serve to honor the occasion.

RATHER: Mr. President, as you always try to do -- you are talking in measured tones -- as President of the United States, you have to be careful what you say. But I'm told by those who are close to you that you have a lot of pent up feelings about what's happening in the Balkans, what we're doing there. Can you share some of that with us?

CLINTON: Well, I guess I do have a lot of pent up feelings, and I think the president is supposed to keep a lot of his feelings pent up.

But let me say, I think throughout human history, one of the things that has most bedeviled human beings is their inability to get along with people that are different than they are. And their vulnerability to be led by demagogues who play on their fears of people who are different than they are.

And here we are at the end of the cold war, we're on the verge of the 21st century, and what is the dominant problem of our time, from the Middle East to Northern Ireland, to Bosnia, to Central Africa? People still wanting to kill each other because of their racial, their religious, their ethnic, their cultural differences. This is crazy.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

RATHER: When we come back, Mr. Clinton talks about his presidency and events of the past year.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

RATHER: There was a point in the interview in the cabinet room this afternoon when the interview broadened out and President Clinton talked

about what's happened the past year and his presidency.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

RATHER (on camera): Could you describe for me what you believe to be the responsibilities of a husband of a United States Senator?

(LAUGHTER)

CLINTON: I don't know, but I'm willing to fulfill them. You know, I would do whatever.

I would fill in at dinners, make speeches when she had to vote. I would be the main casework officer in the New York office. I'd do whatever I was asked to do.

Let me say seriously, though, I have no earthly idea what my wife will do. I can tell you that before some New York officials came to her, it had never crossed her mind. And I still think it's a highly unusual thing. And I can imagine that many voters in New York would wonder whether even though she and I intended to move to New York after we left the White House -- although I would also spend a lot of time at home in Arkansas -- they would wonder, well, you know, does this make sense for someone to be a United States Senator.

And that would be a burden she would have to carry in the campaign to explain that. Why she was doing, that she was asked to do it, and demonstrate her commitment to the state and its issues.

I think if she could win an election like that, she'd be magnificent.

But whatever the duties are, you know -- for 22 years now or more -- we've done what I wanted to do in terms of my political career. So the deal I made was she gets the next 22 years. And if I'm still around after that, we can argue about the third phase. And so I'd be happy to be the spouse of a senator.

RATHER: And you expect to do that together as man and wife?

CLINTON: Oh, absolutely. I would -- like I said, I don't know what the duties are, but I'm sure I could fulfill them.

(LAUGHTER)

RATHER: Mr. President, you know Americans like to know that first family is OK, that they're doing all right. Given the year plus, what you and our first family have been through, tell us what you can about how the three of you are doing.

CLINTON: Well, I think given what we've been through, we're doing reasonably well. And, you know, we're not a large family, but we do love each other very much. And we work hard to support one another.

And I think that this trip to North Africa has been a good thing, not only for our country, because I think Hillary's done a great job on it. I think it must have been good for Hillary and Chelsea too to have that time together to do some exciting things, to be in a different environment. And I think they've really enjoyed it.

But I think we're doing quite well considering what we've been through and God willing, we'll keep after it.

RATHER: Well, I asked you about the first family. How about yourself? We're here in a room with pictures of Lincoln, Washington, the Continental Congress. When you look back over this year plus, what's the moral of it? Does it have a moral?

CLINTON: Oh, yes. I think there's more than one lesson here. I think first of all, the moral is there's a personal moral, which is that every person must bear the consequences of his or her conduct. And when you make a mistake, you pay for it, no matter who you are.

And it's true, whether or not it's made public or whether or not what's

made public is exactly an accurate reflection of what, in fact, happened, that's not the important thing. The important thing is that there are consequences in people's personal lives no matter who they are.

The second lesson is that the Constitution works. The Founding Fathers were smart people. They understood that partisan passions would very often get carried away, and the temptation to seize on events of the moments would be too great and that's why they wrote the Constitution the way they did. And they were awfully smart.

The third thing that I think we learned this year is that the American people almost always get it right if you give them enough time, to think through things and really work on it.

And the fourth thing I think we learned is that people expect their elected officials to work for them and not to be focused on themselves or their adversaries in Washington. And that they will reward those who they believe get up every day and show up for work and work for them and their future and their children. And they will take account of those they believe do not.

Those are, I think, the lessons of the last year.

RATHER: You said the American people if given enough time -- did you ever consider resigning?

CLINTON: Never.

RATHER: Never for a second?

CLINTON: Never, not a second, never, never.

RATHER: Never entered your mind?

CLINTON: Never entered my mind.

RATHER: Did the first lady ever come to you and say, "listen, I think we ought to at least consider it?"

CLINTON: No. She felt at least as strongly as I did that it shouldn't have been done.

RATHER: That tells me she might have felt even stronger?

CLINTON: At least as strongly as I did. But it never crossed my mind. I wouldn't do that to the Constitution. I wouldn't do that to the presidency. I wouldn't do that to the history of this country.

I would never have legitimized what I believe is horribly wrong with what has occurred here over the last four or five years.

RATHER: Mr. President...

CLINTON: And so, it never crossed my mind. And I always had faith. I just prayed about it. I tried to work on maintaining my inner spiritual strength. I tried to come to grips with the work I had to do personally with my family and myself and the work I owed the American people.

And I just decided that, you know, that of all the options available, that wasn't one, and it never entered my mind.

RATHER: Mr. President, I get a lot of letters -- not as many as you do -- but I get a lot of letters from parents who say, some of them say, listen, I like President Clinton. I like what he's doing for the country. Some of them even say I'd vote for him again, but I don't know what to tell the children.

On the worst aspects of what's happened last year, let's try to give these parents some help. What can they tell their children?

CLINTON: It's interesting. I get a lot of letters from parents and from children, interesting letters from children. And sometimes pretty young children -- 11, 12, 13-year-old kids -- writing me.

Some of them on this very point are offended that they're being used in that way. And because what they say is, what I learned from this is what

my parents always told me, that nobody is so big or so important that they're not subject to the same rules of human conduct, and that when they do things they shouldn't, they have to bear the consequences. But that if they bear the consequences, say they're sorry, and go on, they should be able to go on with their lives because they also know that every person makes mistakes. No one is so big or so important that they are perfect.

And so that's what I would say to our children. That's what I think the lessons of all those Bible stories are, of the great figures in the Bible who did things they shouldn't have done. The reasons those stories are in the Bible is to say, everyone sins, but everyone is held accountable, and everyone has a chance to go on.

And all that all three of those points need to be made. And if you say that to our children, I think that's what needs to be said. Kids are pretty smart. And they -- this is a good lesson, not a bad lesson for them.

I'm sorry that I had to be the example, and it's painful, but the lessons -- the right lessons properly learned -- will be good for them and good for our country.

RATHER: The last question if you'll indulge me. You agree that whatever you do, however this situation in Kosovo turns out, whatever else you do, in the first paragraph of your obituary is going to be a reference to what you consider among the worst things that's ever happened to you, only president in the 20th century to be impeached, one of only two presidents to be impeached. Give me some sense of how you feel about that within yourself?

CLINTON: Well, first of all, I'm not at all sure that's right, that it will be the first paragraph of the obituary.

And secondly, if it is, if the history writers are honest, they'll tell it for exactly what it was.

And I am honored that something that was indefensible was pursued and that I had opportunity to defend the Constitution. That doesn't have anything to do with the fact that I did something I shouldn't have done, which I'm ashamed of and which I apologized for, but it had nothing to do with the impeachment process. And I think that's what the American people, -- two-thirds of them knew all along.

And I stood -- and I determined that I would defend the Constitution and the work of my administration and those that did not agree with what I had done and were furious that it had worked, and that the country was doing well, and attempted to use what should have been a constitutional and legal process for political ends, did not prevail.

And that's the way I saw it. I have no lingering animosity. I don't wake up every day mad at those people.

RATHER: You've got to be bitter about some of that.

CLINTON: I'm not. I, I have -- I'm not. I learned -- look, I'm not. And I'm not saying that for any reason other than I have -- part of the learning process that I went through in the last six years, but certainly in the last several years when I was dealing with this, when I saw, you know, all these other charges. They were always false. They never amounted to anything, and half the people that were propagating them knew they were false.

I realized that particularly in the last year, if I wanted people to give me forgiveness, I had to extend forgiveness. If I wanted to be free to be the best president and the best husband and father and the best

person I could be, I had to free myself of bitterness. And I have worked very hard at it.

And I have had very powerful examples. I look at a man like Nelson Mandela who suffered enormously. Yes, he was part of a political movement that was threatening to the people who were in, but he didn't deserve to go to jail for 27 years. And in the 27 years he was there, he purged himself of his hatred and also of whatever might have been wrong with himself, and his hatred of other people.

Now, if a person like that can rid himself of bitterness, what I went through was peanuts compared to that. It was nothing. And I think it was -- and any moment I spend full of anger and bitterness is a moment I am robbing from my wife or from my daughter or from my country or from my friends. So it's almost a selfish decision.

But I do not regard this impeachment vote as some great badge of shame. I do not because -- I do not believe it was warranted, and I don't think it was right.

And I believe frankly if you look back at President Andrew Johnson who unfortunately, because of the circumstances under which he came to office, didn't have the opportunity to achieve very much while he was president. I think most people believe that he was unjustly impeached and that the fact that he stood up to it and refused to give in and came much closer than I did -- he came within only a vote of actually being removed -- reflects well on him in the history of the country, not poorly.

And so I just don't have a bad feelings about that. That but neither do I have feelings of anger and bitterness against those who did what they did, whether they believed it or whether it was political or whatever. I just think it's past us and we need to put it behind us and we need to go on.

We owe that to the American people. Let it go. And all of us owe it to our families and our personal lives. All the great players here, they need to let it go and go on with the business of the country.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

END

Message Sent

To:

Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer M. Palmieri/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anthony R. Bernal/OVP@OVP
Melissa G. Green/OPD/EOP@EOP
Leslie Bernstein/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robin M. Roland/WHO/EOP@EOP
Chandler G. Spaulding/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dominique L. Cano/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dag Vega/WHO/EOP@EOP
Brenda M. Anders/WHO/EOP@EOP
gamble-bennett@dol.gov @ inet
Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP@EOP
Richard L. Siewert/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jordan Tamagni/WHO/EOP@EOP
Beverly J. Barnes/WHO/EOP

Elizabeth R. Newman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julia M. Payne/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julianne B. Corbett/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey M. Smith/OSTP/EOP@EOP
Lowell A. Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan A. Kaplan/OPD/EOP@EOP
Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer Ferguson/OMB/EOP@EOP
Mark D. Neschis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Ruby Shamir/WHO/EOP@EOP
Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP@EOP
Amy Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lisa J. Levin/WHO/EOP@EOP
Peter A. Weissman/OPD/EOP@EOP
William A. Halter/OMB/EOP@EOP
Eli G. Attie/OVP@OVP
Patricia M. Ewing/OVP@OVP
Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa M. Murray/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan E. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP
Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anne M. Edwards/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael Waldman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gene B. Sperling/OPD/EOP@EOP
Paul K. Engskov/WHO/EOP@EOP
Laura D. Schwartz/WHO/EOP@EOP
Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julie E. Mason/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steven J. Naplan/NSC/EOP@EOP
Alison Muscatine/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gordon Li/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mark A. Kitchens/WHO/EOP@EOP
June Shih/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey A. Shesol/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rochester M. Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rachael E. Sullivan/OVP@OVP
Julie B. Goldberg/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sarah E. Gegenheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Susanna B. McGuire/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steve Ricchetti/WHO/EOP@EOP
Edward F. Hughes/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa J. Prober/WHO/EOP@EOP
Justin Coleman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Clara J. Shin/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan M. Prince/WHO/EOP@EOP
Joshua S. Gottheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Heather M. Riley/WHO/EOP@EOP
Alejandro G. Cabrera/OVP@OVP
Rebecca L. Walldorff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jon P. Jennings/WHO/EOP@EOP
Katharine Button/WHO/EOP@EOP
Tracy Pakulniewicz/WHO/EOP@EOP
James T. Heimbach/WHO/EOP@EOP

Victoria L. Valentine/WHO/EOP@EOP
James E. Kennedy/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael A. Hammer/NSC/EOP@EOP
Laura J. Lewis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Toby C. Graff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sean P. O'Shea/WHO/EOP@EOP
Thomas D. Janenda/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rajiv Y. Mody/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robin J. Bachman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Saladbar 23 <saladbar23 @ hotmail.com> @ inet
Kimberly S. Anderson/OA/EOP@EOP

----- Forwarded by Rajiv Y. Mody/WHO/EOP on 04/21/99
04:24 PM -----

Mark A. Kitchens
04/01/99 06:05:23 AM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: FOX Special Report, March 31, 1999

FOX SPECIAL REPORT WITH BRIT HUME
Aired on March 31, 1999

BRIT HUME, HOST, SPECIAL REPORT: Welcome to Washington. I'm Brit Hume.

There are growing indications that not even the previously confident NATO commander Wesley Clark thinks the violence in Kosovo can be stopped by bombing alone. He has signalled he wants more tools at his disposal, and indications are he's meeting resistance to his request. More on that now from correspondent Greg Palkot at NATO headquarters in Brussels.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

GREG PALKOT, FOX NEWS (voice-over): The sun is now setting on the first week of Operation Allied Force. NATO planners are now frantically trying to avoid their worst-case scenario for the military campaign against Yugoslavia, that combat troops might have to be called in to deal with the situation on the ground in Kosovo, which can't be dealt with totally from the air.

GEN. WESLEY CLARK, NATO COMMANDER: But can we stop it on the ground? No. You can't stop paramilitary actions from the air. We all knew that.

PALKOT: But with the political cost of calling troops so high, NATO is trying to anyway, sending in low-flying tank-buster planes and other aircraft to try and stop Serb sweeps against ethnic Albanians, and then upping the ante today with a deeper campaign, hitting a larger number and broader scope of military targets.

JAMIE SHEA, NATO SPOKESMAN: No facility, no unit which is currently being used to plan, conceive, direct or carry out the Yugoslav campaign against the Kosovars is going to be a sanctuary.

PALKOT: But the man responsible for the carnage and running the show right now is Yugoslav president Slobodan Milosevic. That's why NATO military boss General Wesley Clark is pushing hard for approval to hit targets even closer to him, like the defense ministry in Belgrade. Until that approval is given, NATO officials are preparing the public for a long haul.

DAVID WILBY, AIR COMMODORE: Let me make it very clear that there is no instant solution. This will be an extended campaign.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

PALKOT: General Wesley Clark is a veteran of the Vietnam war. He knows the limits of an air campaign and the ugliness of ground fighting. Sources say while he does not rule out combat troops in Kosovo, he's hoping that tougher bombing raids can convince Slobodan Milosevic to call off his dogs of war.

Brit?

HUME: Within NATO, what does Clark have to do to get permission to expand his operations?

PALKOT: Sources close to Clark tell us that he is getting resistance from the very top -- that is, Javier Solana, NATO secretary general, saying, ``Wait. It's too politically sensitive to go in and start blowing up the defense ministry, the interior ministry in Belgrade." But Clark knows that the fall-out of not doing that, of having to get involved in something ugly in Kosovo, could be even worse.

Brit?

HUME: All right, Greg. Thanks very much.

The Defense Department has tried here in the U.S. to maintain an upbeat assessment of the progress of Operation Allied Force, and it kept that up in its daily briefing. But there was also confirmation that NATO commander Clark may want to hit targets and use weapons that have so far been off-limits to him. Here's correspondent Steve Centanni at the Pentagon.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

STEVE CENTANNI, FOX NEWS (voice-over): As NATO tries to zero in on Serbian troops and tanks, there's a political and military debate over whether to deploy the ultimate weapon for such an attack, the Apache helicopter. NATO commander Wesley Clark wants them, but his request so far has not been approved either by NATO or the Pentagon.

KEN BACON, PENTAGON SPOKESMAN: There are a number of issues. One is basing. One is the kind and tempo of fighting that we'd be taking on. Another is the risk.

CENTANNI: But even without the Apache, the Pentagon says there has been some progress in attacking Serbian troops in the field.

BACON: NATO forces have been striking tanks successfully, we believe, in Kosovo and other heavy armored or -- and military vehicles.

CENTANNI: The Pentagon also says a Yugoslavian special forces unit was struck by NATO warplanes Tuesday, a target very near the Yugoslav capital.

BACON: It was the closest to downtown Belgrade that has been struck to date.

CENTANNI: Even targets right in downtown Belgrade could be hit, including the interior and defense ministries. But a reporter who lived in Belgrade for five years says that could be a risky move.

JONATHAN LANDAY, ``CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR": ... emergency center and their main hospital literally 200 yards behind the rear of both

ministries. And so I think there is a serious risk of collateral damage.

CENTANNI: Meantime, there's word for the first time that the aircraft carrier Theodore Roosevelt may take part in Operation Allied Force. The Roosevelt left Norfolk, Virginia, last Friday bound for the Persian Gulf, but could stop instead in the Adriatic. It carries 50 warplanes and is accompanied by five ships capable of firing cruise missiles.

While the air campaign continues, a humanitarian relief effort is also getting under way. The Pentagon will take part in a \$50 million effort to airlift food and shelter to Kosovar refugees.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

As part of that relief campaign, the Pentagon will fly in food for hundreds of thousands of people, and they'll move the large tents that were being used for U.S. troops in Saudi Arabia and fly them into the Balkans to shelter the refugees.

Brit?

HUME: Steve, as far as the U.S. government is concerned, what does NATO commanding general Clark have to do to get permission to use something such as the Apache helicopter? Who has to approve it?

CENTANNI: Well, in this case, first the Pentagon has to approve it because it's going to be Pentagon aircraft that are involved. And secondly, the North Atlantic Council, which is the political arm of NATO, would have to give the go-ahead as well. It's the same process Clark had to go through to get all the ships and planes involved now, but they were all in place before the campaign began. This is a significant addition.

HUME: All right, Steve. Thanks very much.

Russia sends a warship to the Mediterranean, and we'll tell you how the White House is reacting to that in just a moment.

(18:09)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

HUME: The United States government took custody of the Yugoslav embassy and ambassador's residence here in Washington Tuesday night, standard practice after a break in diplomatic relations. Yugoslav embassy personnel were ordered to leave the U.S. after the Yugoslav government broke off relations.

Meanwhile, as our senior White House correspondent, Jim Angle, reports, the White House is telling those who are calling for ground troops to give the bombing campaign more time to succeed.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

JIM ANGLE, FOX NEWS (voice-over): Waving American and Albanian flags, Albanian-Americans rallied across the street from the White House in support of the NATO air strikes but also in support of ground troops...

DEMONSTRATORS: Send in the troops! Send in the troops!

ANGLE: ... a notion the U.S. continues to reject. Of course, Albanians are grateful for any help, but worry NATO hasn't been able to stop Milosevic, a view that was taken to a meeting with President Clinton, who tried to reassure them.

AVNI MUSTAFU, ALBANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL: The message that we've been getting is that if we stay the course, that at some -- in the very near future, it will not only slow them down, but it will stop them.

ANGLE: But NATO waited several days to target Serb troops in Kosovo so that it could soften up air defenses to avoid risk to pilots, not much consolation to people whose relatives are being murdered.

MUSTAFU: While we do understand that missile targets have to be

taken out, that ultimately, the success of this mission will be to protect the people on the ground.

ANGLE: But officials point to Bosnia, where it took 12 days of air strikes to get Milosevic to back down, and say people shouldn't rush to judgment.

JOE LOCKHART, WHITE HOUSE SPOKESMAN: This is going to take some time, but we will continue to, again, day by day and week by week, if necessary, take away his ability to impose his will.

ANGLE: In the meantime, the Russians caused a flurry of concern by announcing they were sending a warship to the waters of Yugoslav.

LOCKHART: There have been a series of mixed statements and messages about what they're doing, what they may be doing, what they're not doing.

ANGLE: What they're not doing, Lockhart said, is getting involved in the conflict, but the White House had another worry.

LOCKHART: Our concern is what messages might be read in Belgrade by this.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

ANGLE: The White House is afraid that Milosevic, who hardly needs any encouragement, would interpret this as a sign of support from the Russians for what he's doing in Kosovo. The Russians say it isn't. The Americans say it isn't helpful, but don't see it as confrontational.

Brit?

HUME: All right, Jim. Thanks very much. Is there any sign -- I mean, does the White House know what the Russians would be up to with this warship?

ANGLE: They've been told that it would be intelligence-gathering, that that is the only role. They acknowledge that there's a legitimate interest for the Russians to be there. They're not even sure the ships are going, though. They hear different stories from different officials.

HUME: All right, Jim. Thanks very much.

The possibility of NATO taking the bombing campaign to Milosevic's doorstep in Belgrade is not without military, political and public relations risks. Already the Serbs are taking reporters on tours of bomb damage to demonstrate what they claim are indiscriminate attacks on Serbian towns outside of Kosovo. Tim Marshall of our sister network Sky News reports.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

TIM MARSHALL, SKY NEWS (voice-over): The people of Krakivach (ph) came to see the damage and to protest against it. This was a military maintenance depot. On Monday night it received three direct hits from what we think were 2,000-pound bombs. The reason? To force the Yugoslav army to maintain their vehicles in the open.

For their view, the people walked up the hills from town to a spot where in 1941 thousands of Serbs were massacred by the Nazis. They're making parallels. Almost the entire town appears to have turned out for this demonstration. There's remarkably little hostility towards the foreign press. And here, as in other demonstrations, there's one clear message: Stop the bombing.

The mood and the damage 30 miles away, though, was very different. Picking your way through the shattered remains of the Sloboda (ph) factory complex is to walk through the end of a town's future. Five thousand people worked here, making hair dryers, vacuum cleaners and cookers. It was the biggest employer in central Serbia. No longer.

Sky News saw no evidence of a military target, but some areas were

cordoned off. We were told it was because of unexploded bombs. The Sloboda factory was a profit-sharing enterprise valued at around 400 million pounds. This is an area of high unemployment. The mood is one of deep anger.

"Can this vacuum cleaner kill?" said this man. The other staff are full of sorrow and fear for their future. It's the 50th anniversary of the factory. The director told us, "NATO sent us a congratulatory telegram." A few were clearing up, a futile exercise. The whole place could only be bulldozed. What is sure is that there is no money to rebuild it. The Serbs claim this is happening elsewhere.

Tim Marshall, Sky News, Cacak, in central Serbia.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

HUME: Coming up, former secretary of state Lawrence Eagleburger. Stay tuned.

(18:16)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

Interview with Former Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger

HUME: Who better to consult on war in the Balkans than a man who served as U.S. ambassador to Yugoslavia during the Carter administration and later as President Bush's secretary of state as the Soviet empire was crumbling, and so was Yugoslavia. He is, of course, Lawrence Eagleburger.

Welcome back, sir.

LAWRENCE EAGLEBURGER, FORMER SECRETARY OF STATE: Thank you, sir. Good to be here.

HUME: First of all, your take on whether, when it came down to it, we had -- NATO and the president had to do this or -- start the bombing or not, in your view.

EAGLEBURGER: Well, the answer to that is if you -- in the immediate past, no question, particularly after we'd threatened it for six months. Not to have done it would have been a terrible mistake. I can -- some other time, not tonight, but I can argue that there was a long time that we might have been able to do some other things to avoid it. I'm not sure they would have worked. But in the current circumstances, yes, we had to bomb.

HUME: Now...

EAGLEBURGER: My only concern is if we're not careful, it's the Vietnam sort of approach, which is in incremental steps, and that worries me a lot.

HUME: Well, now, we hear now that General Clark, the American who's the NATO commander, would like to hit targets in Belgrade, would like to use Apache attack helicopters, which I think is far to say is as close to ground troops as you're going to get from the air...

EAGLEBURGER: Yeah.

HUME: ... and that is meeting resistance, and he's having to run through a whole set of traps that he has to go through in order to get permission, and so on. Is that what you mean when you sense Vietnam syndrome here?

EAGLEBURGER: That's part of it. I'd have to start off by saying you better think very hard before you tell a general that if he says this is what must be done if we're going to be successful that you tell him no. I can only tell you, watching George Bush during the Kuwait-Iraqi think -- God bless him, the one thing he did was say "We're going to win this."

Now, you guys tell me how to do it." And he would argue with them, but in the end, the generals, who are the experts, were -- he would concede to them that this is what should be done. And if the political issues got in the way, he'd back them off.

Now, you know, my only concern -- well, my second concern, the categorizing -- this moving it up inch by inch is a concern. The other thing I would ask is if there was any question about whether the bombing was going to drive Milosevic to an agreement or not -- and from the beginning, we should have known that it was going to be very tough to do that -- then why don't we do it all at once? Why did we wait and begin to do this sort of ratcheting up the way we have? And if this doesn't work, where do we go next?

HUME: Well...

EAGLEBURGER: So I'm worried about that kind of an approach.

HUME: Let me ask you a question, then, in political terms, and that is, given the difficulty of persuading the American people, who are always hesitant on something like this, that we -- that this was something that needed doing, and given the fact that in the past Milosevic, although it took some many days -- 12 days, I guess -- had responded to merely being bombed, wasn't it a reasonable calculation to the administration to make that you don't want to throw everything at him at once, perhaps? They hadn't had to before.

EAGLEBURGER: Well, my first point would be that you'd better throw all or a lot at whomever the first time around, as we did in the Kuwait issue, if you -- in order to make it clear that you're going to be serious, for one thing.

HUME: But we did go in with air, and then later with ground, did we not?

EAGLEBURGER: Yeah, but let me -- yeah, well, let me go back to what you're pointing out which is, yes, we moved him then. How much success, in the long run, we have gotten out of that I'm not sure. But here's another point which you simply have to understand if you're going to understand Serbia and Milosevic. And that is that the Kosovo is different from Bosnia. In their mind, in their gut, Kosovo is old Serbia. It is -- it is quite different emotionally to Serbs.

And I have not believed from the beginning that Milosevic was easily going to give that up, and I will also say that I believed from the beginning that if, in the end, he has to back off, he's going to have to be able to go to the Serb people and say to them, "I was forced to do this. It is not something I wanted to do."

HUME: Now, when you say "give it up" -- he's not really being asked to give it up, is he?

EAGLEBURGER: He thinks he is. I think he is.

HUME: Because of the NATO...

EAGLEBURGER: Because I...

HUME: Because of the NATO...

EAGLEBURGER: ... think the dynamic -- I...

HUME: ... peacekeeping troops on the ground and...

EAGLEBURGER: Well, I think the dynamic is such is that if you get the NATO peacekeeping troops in there, I will bet you \$5 to a hole in a donut that 9 out of every 10 Kosovars -- the Albanian Kosovars -- already, in the end, believe that independence not only is what they want, but what this process will bring them. I think Milosevic knows that.

I think if you analyze the situation, and you put these NATO

peacekeepers in, assuming there's an agreement, it is only a matter of time before the Kosovo is in a position to declare its independence. And if the Kosovars see NATO standing in the way of that, we could well become the target of their affections, too, in terms of they might decide they're going to have to take a crack at us.

But there's no doubt in my mind that the Kosovars, by and large, see independence at the end of that road. And whether they're right or not, it is also in my mind clear that Milosevic sees that if you get into this process, the ultimate end is the independence of the Kosovo.

HUME: You seem to be saying, Mr. Secretary, that at Rambouillet, NATO and the allies offered Milosevic a deal that in political terms he couldn't accept.

EAGLEBURGER: Couldn't accept if he believes, as I think he does, that this dynamic leads him down the path. And the second thing is you have to understand Milosevic has lived politically from crisis to crisis, and if he had to create one in order to strengthen himself at home, he'd do it. And I think he saw this not only in terms of the emotional attachment of the Serbs to the Kosovo, but also he saw this as a crisis which in the end would strengthen him at home. And clearly, so far, it's done that.

So I think his political analysis and, in fact, his geo-strategic analysis (INAUDIBLE) get one -- get one through his head, was that in every sense he has to resist this. I personally believe that it's going to -- I think the odds are close to 50-50, if not beyond that, that we are not going to succeed in driving him to the table with the bombing, even with Apaches and whatever else. But even if he agrees to do it, he would be able to go back and say, "I was forced to it."

And by the way, if we get that agreement and, in fact, he pulls his troops out, that is only the beginning of another drama that's going to go on for some time that we ought to be worried about.

HUME: So at this juncture now, what's the proper course?

EAGLEBURGER: (laughs) You got me in the middle of something I can't answer. No, that's not -- I can tell you what the proper course is with great -- I mean, I think it's the proper course, but with great reluctance. The issue becomes, in the end, is the United States prepared to be seen to have lost? In quotes. We'll get some sort of a cover to it, I suppose, but we and NATO, have we lost to this pipsqueak Balkan dictator? Has he called our trump and called our -- that -- and trumped it? And right now, that's the one alternative.

If we -- if we some way or another stop the bombing in return for some sort of compromise on his part, supposedly, he's won, not us. And it will be seen that way in Serbia and around the rest of the world. So you've got that on one side, and you've got -- clearly, the only way you can be sure that we win is to put ground troops in there and fight a battle with lots of people killed, including a lot of ours, I think. And those are the two alternatives.

I guess I would have to say to you with the utmost reluctance, I cannot see the U.S. and NATO being in the "lose" position, so I guess I would say -- and I hate it -- is ground troops.

HUME: Secretary Eagleburger, thank you very much. No good choices.

We have to take a break to do the news. We'll be right back. Stay tuned.

(18:28)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

Political Headlines

HUME: A huge crowd of refugees is gathered on the border between Kosovo and Macedonia. Macedonian troops and border guards have attempted to stem the flow of Kosovar Albanians into Macedonia, but without results. FOX NEWS correspondent David Lee Miller is there and brings us the latest.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

DAVID LEE MILLER, FOX NEWS (voice-over): A human train of more than 1,000 refugees crossed the border from Kosovo into Macedonia. Their journey began with the Serbs locking them in railway cars without food and water for the trip to the border. All passports and ID papers were confiscated, making it impossible for them to prove their lives in Kosovo ever existed. They entered Macedonia on foot, walking along the train tracks, afraid to step outside the rails, which the Serbs said had been mined. Young and old made the exodus. Anyone left behind risked the wrath of the Serbs.

REFUGEE: Look! My father is invalid!

MILLER (on camera): Your father is an invalid?

REFUGEE: Yes. Don't have one leg.

MILLER (voice-over): Macedonian troops herded the refugees to a border checkpoint, where they were given food and processed by authorities. Others, meanwhile, are in the mountains surrounding the border, afraid to come down. Humanitarian workers say as many as 20 Kosovar Albanians have died from exposure. They fear the number will increase because Macedonian troops will not permit them to offer assistance.

PHILIPPE CHABOT, HUMANITARIAN AID WORKER: We can't get to them.

MILLER (on camera): So they stay up here in the Mountains, you're here to help, and you can't?

CHABOT: Basically, yeah. There's a political problem with the Macedonian government.

MILLER (voice-over): The military also tried to prevent journalists from meeting with the refugees. As we trekked the hilltops, they fired a warning shot. When we got too close, we were physically restrained.

MACEDONIAN SOLDIER: No! No!

MILLER (on camera): Here in the mountains of Macedonia, it is difficult to determine exactly how many refugees are hiding out. But of this we are certain. They are cold, hungry and desperate for help, help that is apparently not forthcoming.

(voice-over): Macedonia is rapidly reaching the breaking point. If the crisis continues, it may be forced to close its borders.

At the Kosovo-Macedonia border, David Lee Miller, FOX NEWS.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

HUME: NATO leaders say the Kosovo conflict has turned into the biggest humanitarian crisis in Europe since World War II, and it looks as if it will only get worse. Now the Clinton administration wants to make very clear there's only one person responsible for the crisis, and that's Yugoslav president Slobodan Milosevic. State Department reporter Kelly Wallace has the story.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

KELLY WALLACE, FOX NEWS (voice-over): Since NATO's air assault on Yugoslavia began, more than 100,000 Kosovars have fled to Albania, Montenegro and Macedonia. Many thousands more are expected to depart, and

the allies now have a refugee crisis on their hands. But the State Department bristles at any notion the air strikes, started in part to prevent a humanitarian disaster, actually caused one.

JAMES RUBIN, STATE DEPARTMENT SPOKESMAN: And people should stop looking for scapegoats, start listening to the Kosovar Albanians, who are very clear that "If NATO did not bomb, the Serbs would destroy us anyway," and put the blame where it belongs, on president Milosevic, for orchestrating this horrible policy.

WALLACE: It's a policy that hits home with these Albanian-Americans in Washington.

UNIDENTIFIED BOY: They killed one of my uncles. And half of my family's in Kosovo, and half of them are in Montenegro.

WALLACE: The U.S. stepped up assistance to Montenegro and the other countries in the region that are now starting to feel the strain of taking in so many refugees every day.

KAREN ABUZAYB, UN HIGH COMMISSION ON REFUGEES: All of these countries already had refugees over the last year from Kosovo, and others had other refugees from other parts of the former Yugoslavia. So the -- I think their capacity is fast being used up.

WALLACE (on camera): The State Department doesn't know if Milosevic is forcing the Albanians out to destabilize his neighbors or simply to get rid of them. But either way, the U.S. may find itself facing not only a military operation but a massive humanitarian relief effort.

At the State Department, Kelly Wallace, FOX NEWS.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

HUME: Is the Republican Party splintered on its foreign policy?

A full report in just a moment.

(BEGIN ON SCREEN)

The word "Balkan" comes from Turkish. It means mountain and has been used to describe the area since the early 19th century.

(END ON SCREEN)

(18:36)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

(BEGIN ON SCREEN)

Kosovo facts

In February, 1998, Slobodan Milosevic launched an offensive to crush the separatist Kosovo Liberation Army. Since then, more than 2,000 people are believed to have been killed; 443,000 have been driven from their homes.

Source: NATO

(END ON SCREEN)

HUME: The crisis in Kosovo has sparked an international debate over NATO's role in Yugoslavia. Domestically, a similar debate exists within the Republican Party, whose members are not unified behind any particular policy. FOX NEWS correspondent Carl Cameron takes a look at the divisions within the GOP.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

RONALD REAGAN, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (June 12, 1987): Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall!

GEORGE BUSH, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (January 16, 1991): Five months ago, Saddam Hussein started this cruel war against Kuwait. Tonight the battle has been joined.

CARL CAMERON, FOX NEWS (voice-over): Once galvanized and decisive on foreign policy, the Republican Party has splintered on international

affairs. In the crowded presidential field, Texas governor George Bush, first in the polls, was last to comment on Kosovo -- not with his own views, but on President Clinton's policy.

GEORGE W. BUSH, TEXAS GOVERNOR: Now that the president's committed to use force, I hope he will do so decisively and, of course, successfully.

CAMERON: Elizabeth Dole supports U.S. involvement, but does not say how. Lamar Alexander backs air strikes, along with Steve Forbes and John McCain, who's unenthusiastic.

U.S. SENATOR JOHN MCCAIN (R-AZ): I will, with reluctance, support this action.

CAMERON: But others are adamantly opposed.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE JOHN KASICH (R-OH): But I don't support getting involved in ethnic strife and civil wars.

CAMERON: Former vice president Dan Quayle says stay out, along with Pat Buchanan and other would-be Republican presidents Gary Bauer and Bob Smith. Divisions are just as pronounced in Congress.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TOM DELAY (R-TX): Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my complete opposition to sending American troops to Kosovo.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE HENRY HYDE (R-IL): We do have a national interest in halting the killing.

CAMERON: Beyond rhetorically safe support for U.S. troops, congressional leaders, who hope to make Clinton foreign policy mistakes a political issue, offer little else.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE DENNIS HASTERT (R-IL), HOUSE SPEAKER: But I have not made up my mind, and I will listen intently and closely to this debate.

U.S. SENATOR TRENT LOTT (R-MS), SENATE MAJORITY LEADER: Any time our military men and women are ordered into action by the president of the United States, certainly, the Congress supports them, and would not want to do anything to undermine what they are doing.

U.S. SENATOR DON NICKLES (R-OK): I don't think you can bomb a country into submitting into a peace agreement.

U.S. SENATOR JOHN WARNER (R-VA): We're doing what's in the best interests of mankind.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

CAMERON: ... now seems destined to be a major issue in the campaign of 2000. Republicans had hoped it would be so, noting polls that indicate the American people trust the GOP more than Democrats on it. But with the crisis Kosovo, concerns over China and numerous other countries, a number of Republicans have been found to have deep disagreements, and in some cases indecision, if not, at least, a reluctance to take a position now on some very tough problems.

Brit?

HUME: Carl, we're at that stage of the political season where among those presidential candidates it's really a race -- the race is on to see who can raise the most dough. I know you've been following that. Where's that stand now?

CAMERON: Tomorrow is the end of the first quarter, in which the Republican candidates, the Democratic candidates, as well, have to file their first financial disclosures. So they are in some cases boasting, and in other cases sort of low-balling how much money they've raised. George W. Bush, the governor of Texas, on the Republican side, will announce that he has raised more than \$6 million in the first three months of this year,

a substantial amount. In fact, it is on a pace to break the records set by both his father and Bob Dole in previous presidential campaigns for the amount of money raised. Elizabeth Dole, by contrast, will have less than \$1 million raised, and her organization points out that she got a late start and that they have asked many of their contributors to hold off a lot of their giving until the next quarter, so they can create the appearance of big momentum for them in the next three months.

On the Democratic side, no word specifically as to how much Vice President Al Gore will declare yet, but Bill Bradley, the challenger, will have over \$5 million, as well. And for him, that is considered a strong showing, but it should be pointed out, Brit, that Mr. Bradley does have the benefit of being the only opponent to Mr. Gore, so he will enjoy a lot of default money and a lot of default support as the only person in the race who is not Al Gore.

Back to the Republicans -- some people who have yet to raise as much as might have been expected, folks like Lamar Alexander, who will come in at under \$1 million, and having run in '96, a lot of folks thought that perhaps he would post a larger gain.

So this is the point where they're talking about raising money. They have been aggressively out around the country going to fund-raisers, and it's just the first measure of how successful they could be.

HUME: Very quickly, Carol -- is President -- Governor Bush on a pace where it looks as if he could go ahead and raise all his own money and not take any federal matching money and get out from under those regulations?

CAMERON: That's a decision he says he will not make until next fall. Twenty million dollars is the record, again, held by his dad and Bob Dole. He could do that.

HUME: All right. Very good. Our panel of journalists is coming up next.

(18:44)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

Special Report Roundtable

HUME: Some perspective now from Bill Sammon, White House correspondent of the "Washington Times," from freelance journalist Linda Killian, author of "The Freshmen: What Happened to the Republican Revolution?" and from the White House, our own senior White House correspondent, Jim Angle.

I want to start with you, Bill, but not perhaps in the way you think. I'm going to start with something that we heard you say earlier.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

BILL SAMMON, "WASHINGTON TIMES": Is it fair to ask the question this way? One week into this military operation, are we so far winning or losing?

LOCKHART: I think it's impossible to answer that question, and I don't see that there's a utility. What I can tell you is we got into this for the right reason, because, as the president said at his press conference, the price of inaction here is much higher than any price we pay for action.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

HUME: All right, Bill, you get to translate Lockhart for us.

SAMMON: Well, let's deconstruct that. I think -- it is telling you some information when the White House press spokesman says that he can't

tell you whether we're losing, and he also can't tell you whether we're winning. So you're giving him a lot of options there. You're not asking him whether we've won or -- in fact, I specifically phrased it in such a way -- "So far, are we winning?" I mean, we're a week into this thing. And I think it is telling that they can't even say that we're winning, at this point.

I think that means the other possibility is what we're looking at. We are losing.

HUME: Jim Angle, do you agree with that assessment?

ANGLE: Well, I think it's a difficult question for them, and that, of course, is our job, is to ask difficult questions. The problem is that -- they are making some progress, and you started to hear a little optimism today from NATO, saying that Milosevic is beginning to run out of fuel, they're beginning to cause him some pain on the ground. The problem is that no matter what they do militarily at this point, it is too late for the Kosovars. So no one here is ever going to say that it's a victory or that they are winning, that they have won this because the damage on the ground to the Kosovar Albanians is devastating. And no matter what they eventually do to Milosevic, it's not going to matter that much to those people.

HUME: Jim, it is interesting, though, that we now -- it's now clear, based on what Ken Bacon said at the Pentagon today, and what Greg Palkot reported from Brussels tonight, that Wesley Clark, the NATO commander, wants to do things that he is not -- yet, at least -- being permitted to do here, that this is a case where the general is really not running this war. And I wonder what -- I wonder what that tells us.

ANGLE: Well, the White House says it -- one of the things he had asked for -- and in fact, there was some delay in his effort to expand the targeting to some things that involve higher levels of the Yugoslavian government or the Serbian government.

But one of the things we're told is that his request for attack helicopters, for Apache helicopters, which would be somewhat reminiscent of Vietnam, of course, is that that decision has not yet come to the White House. Now, we do know that he's asking for them, but we don't know what levels of the political bureaucracy at NATO have not yet passed on it.

And that's one of the problems. Everything he wants to do, of course, they have to get the political OK not only from President Clinton, but also from all the rest of the 19 NATO allies.

HUME: Linda, let me ask you this question about -- about the political implications of the use of Apache helicopters, for example, which would certainly raise the prospect of casualties. It's the closest thing I guess you can get to ground troops without putting people physically on the ground. How -- would that -- how would that go down on Capitol Hill? Would that be a loss of support for the president, what?

LINDA KILLIAN, FREELANCE JOURNALIST: I don't think there's any stomach for that on the Hill. The buzz on the Hill today -- reporters calling congressmen and saying "This is -- is it" -- whether you call it "ineffective" or whether you call it an unmitigated disaster, it's not good. And that is what members of Congress are hearing. And they're nervous, and I don't think -- there's absolutely no support for troops on the ground. And there really is no support for anything that could cause any American casualties, I don't think.

HUME: None at all?

ANGLE: Brit, could I add one thing on that?

HUME: Yeah. Go ahead.

ANGLE: I mean, one of the problems here is that once you send in helicopters, even once you send in the A-10 Warthogs, is that they can easily be shot down by shoulder-fired missiles. This is something that anyone can step out of a building or a barn and shoot. And the whole problem so far has been -- they could have attacked his forces in Kosovo days ago. They waited because they wanted to reduce the risk to pilots. Now, that's not much comfort to the people on the ground, but that is, in fact, what they did. The president simply wants to have a war that is without casualties, and that makes it very difficult to do to Milosevic what you need to do to stop him in Kosovo.

HUME: Does this raise the question, Bill, that -- that the president -- I mean, we thought in the aftermath of Vietnam, with the way Ronald Reagan mounted military operations, leaving things pretty much to the generals -- and the same for Bush, as Larry Eagleburger was pointing out earlier, in the Gulf, that he basically let the generals run the war -- this is the kind of thing that went on during Vietnam. You know, there were tales of Lyndon Johnson with his shirttail hanging out at the White House, poring over target lists.

SAMMON: Yeah. Right. I think the analogy goes only so far in that, yes, it is frustrating to military commanders to have to, you know, run everything up to the White House in terms of whether they can get helicopters or not...

HUME: Well, not only the White -- we know Javier Solana has to sign off. The Pentagon has to...

SAMMON: But it's even worse, in this way. In Vietnam, and in these other conflicts, they were long enough where you could change that policy. You could say, "Look, we've got to give the generals the freedom here." You know, "This is obviously not working. Let's let them do it the way they want to do it." You don't even have that option here because the window of opportunity is so narrow and is slamming shut so quickly that it's a moot point. I mean, even if Clinton said today, "We're going to let the generals do it the way they want," the generals couldn't get ground troops in there. And they're not quite ready for the attack helicopters yet, until these A-10 or whatever they're called...

HUME: Warthogs, yeah.

SAMMON: ... Warthogs -- those need to do the -- those are the next step, OK? Then you bring in the tank-killer Apache helicopter gunships to go -- you know, you're getting closer and closer to the ground each time. And like you said, that's as close as you can get without actually putting...

HUME: Yeah, the...

SAMMON: ... troops on the ground.

HUME: Yeah, the Warthogs attack tanks, and the helicopters can attack units. But Linda, is Congress now prepared for a military failure here, and a policy failure? How would that go down?

KILLIAN: Well, the one thing -- a Democratic office that I spoke with today said it's too soon to know -- the Defense Department doesn't yet know what -- how -- what they've done on the ground, there are no really good assessments at this point -- and that it's a rush to judgment. It's only been a week.

HUME: Well, it clearly hasn't stopped the refugees.

KILLIAN: That's right.

HUME: It hasn't stopped the slaughter in Kosovo.

KILLIAN: That's right. And...

HUME: So that's -- that's manifest.

KILLIAN: And the Democrat -- the White House argument may be, "OK, we didn't get that, so what we'll go after is trying to destroy the Serbian army. And that may be their next -- their next argument.

HUME: Well, yeah. One sensed that when he talked about "if necessary, we're going to do that" -- and Wesley Clark has been quite confident about the ability to do that -- is that the fallback position, Bill, you think, that...

SAMMON: I don't know, but I just want to pick up on a point you made, and that is preparing for a failure. I think, as we get into April now, you're going to hear more and more talk about this NATO summit that's coming up at the end of the month.

HUME: That's here.

SAMMON: Here in Washington.

HUME: Right.

SAMMON: We're hosting the 50th anniversary of NATO. It's part summit, part celebration, more world leaders than have ever been assembled before in the history of Washington. And Slobodan Milosevic and this little obscure -- once obscure province of Kosovo stands to spoil the party, to completely turn out to be a debacle, ruining this whole summit for NATO. And so I think we're going to hear a lot more about that.

ANGLE: Yeah, Brit, I -- this is a tremendous challenge for NATO. One of the problems here, of course, is that the speed with which NATO is moving is completely mismatched with the speed that Milosevic is moving. And the White House has said repeatedly it took 12 days to bomb Milosevic into submission in Bosnia in 1995, and that is reasonable to wait for that long. The problem is that he is moving much faster than that on the ground in Kosovo. So I don't -- I have no doubt that over time, NATO will be able to punish him and seriously degrade his military abilities and make him pay for this. But as I said, that doesn't help the people in Kosovo, and that makes it very difficult to declare victory here.

HUME: Yeah. Can that -- that's a good question Jim raises. He says it's difficult, but can the administration cite that -- very quickly -- as a victory?

SAMMON: I believe the Clinton administration is capable of spinning almost anything. I don't think they'll be able to spin this one.

HUME: Will that fly on the Hill?

KILLIAN: No. When you have a defense spokesman saying "We haven't prevented a single brutality," no. I don't think so.

HUME: All right. Thanks to all three of you.

Next up: Members of the Russian parliament hot under the collar.
Stay tuned.

(18:56)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

HUME: Finally, Russia may be new to democracy, but the TV coverage the Russians permit of their legislature, the Duma, could teach the lords of Congress a thing or two about openness. Watch what happened and what the Russian people saw on television when the debate over Kosovo got heated in the Duma.

(CLIP FROM RUSSIAN DUMA FISTFIGHT)

HUME: On second thought, maybe our Congress already learned that lesson, and that's why the cameras here are so tightly controlled.

And that's it for SPECIAL REPORT this time. Please come again next

time, and in the meantime, stay tuned. More news is next.

END

Message Sent

To:

Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer M. Palmieri/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anthony R. Bernal/OVP@OVP
Melissa G. Green/OPD/EOP@EOP
Leslie Bernstein/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robin M. Roland/WHO/EOP@EOP
Chandler G. Spaulding/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dominique L. Cano/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dag Vega/WHO/EOP@EOP
Brenda M. Anders/WHO/EOP@EOP
gamble-bennett@dol.gov @ inet
Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP@EOP
Richard L. Siewert/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jordan Tamagni/WHO/EOP@EOP
Beverly J. Barnes/WHO/EOP
Elizabeth R. Newman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julia M. Payne/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julianne B. Corbett/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey M. Smith/OSTP/EOP@EOP
Lowell A. Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan A. Kaplan/OPD/EOP@EOP
Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer Ferguson/OMB/EOP@EOP
Mark D. Neschis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Ruby Shamir/WHO/EOP@EOP
Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP@EOP
Amy Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lisa J. Levin/WHO/EOP@EOP
Peter A. Weissman/OPD/EOP@EOP
William A. Halter/OMB/EOP@EOP
Eli G. Attie/OVP@OVP
Patricia M. Ewing/OVP@OVP
Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa M. Murray/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan E. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP
Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anne M. Edwards/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael Waldman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gene B. Sperling/OPD/EOP@EOP
Paul K. Engskov/WHO/EOP@EOP
Laura D. Schwartz/WHO/EOP@EOP
Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julie E. Mason/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steven J. Naplan/NSC/EOP@EOP
Alison Muscatine/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gordon Li/WHO/EOP@EOP

Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mark A. Kitchens/WHO/EOP@EOP
June Shih/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey A. Shesol/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rochester M. Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rachael E. Sullivan/OVP@OVP
Julie B. Goldberg/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sarah E. Gegenheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Susanna B. McGuire/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steve Ricchetti/WHO/EOP@EOP
Edward F. Hughes/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa J. Prober/WHO/EOP@EOP
Justin Coleman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Clara J. Shin/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan M. Prince/WHO/EOP@EOP
Joshua S. Gottheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Heather M. Riley/WHO/EOP@EOP
Alejandro G. Cabrera/OVP@OVP
Rebecca L. Walldorff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jon P. Jennings/WHO/EOP@EOP
Katharine Button/WHO/EOP@EOP
Tracy Pakulniewicz/WHO/EOP@EOP
James T. Heimbach/WHO/EOP@EOP
Victoria L. Valentine/WHO/EOP@EOP
James E. Kennedy/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael A. Hammer/NSC/EOP@EOP
Laura J. Lewis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Toby C. Graff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sean P. O'Shea/WHO/EOP@EOP
Thomas D. Janenda/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rajiv Y. Mody/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robin J. Bachman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Saladbar 23 <saladbar23 @ hotmail.com> @ inet
Kimberly S. Anderson/OA/EOP@EOP

----- Forwarded by Rajiv Y. Mody/WHO/EOP on 04/21/99
04:24 PM -----

Mark A. Kitchens
04/06/99 04:58:15 PM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: CNN Larry King, April 5, 1999

Larry King Live
Aired April 5, 1999 - 9:00 p.m. ET

Is It Too Late to Stop Ethnic Cleansing in Kosovo?

KING: Tonight, NATO vows to keep pounding Yugoslavia, and help is on the way for the refugees. Is it all too late to stop ethnic cleansing of Kosovo?

Tonight, the president of Albania will join us from Tirana to discuss the refugee crisis. We'll speak with Yugoslavia's charge d'affaires at the U.N., plus a debate on sending in ground troops.

Republican Senator Rick Santorum of Pennsylvania, Democrat Dick Durbin of Illinois will join us from Springfield.

Then from Phoenix, Arizona Republican John McCain will be with us.

From New York, CNN's senior analyst, Jeff Greenfield.

They're all next on LARRY KING LIVE.

Our first guest tonight is the president of Albania, a return visit for president Rexhep Meidani. He is on tap in Tirana, Albania.

Is it true that Greece is now helping Albanian refugees?

REXHEP MEIDANI, PRESIDENT OF ALBANIA: Yes, by humanitarian hats (ph). Some hats (ph) are entering Albania now.

KING: Are you surprised at that?

MEIDANI: No. Because our neighbors are friendly countries and are supporting each other, and we're cooperating quite well these last years.

KING: Do you know how many Albanians have fled your -- have come to your country? Do you know the numbers?

MEIDANI: Now -- now you mean?

KING: Yes.

MEIDANI: It's more than 220,000 deported people.

KING: How are they being fed, housed, clothed?

MEIDANI: I can say that the situation is still critical, and their health also.

Some of them are quite sick. Some have been beaten and are telling us some horrific stories.

So a lot of people have been massacred inside Kosovo, also (UNINTELLIGIBLE). It's a kind of genocide and more deportation, not known since the Hitler and Stalin time.

KING: What do you think of Germany and the United States and Turkey and Sweden taking in many, many refugees? The United States, 20,000; Germany, 40,000. What do you think of that?

MEIDANI: I think (UNINTELLIGIBLE) these people left to stay in the region and to put pressure also to this machinery of war by different ways, airstrikes, and also other options to stop the bloodshed and this deportation, this ethnic cleansing and physical elimination, and to create possibly this -- for these people to go back: to return to their houses and to their land. This is important for the moment.

KING: So you're glad they're doing it, but eventually -- I don't want to put words in your mouth. Eventually you're saying those people will go back to where they come from?

MEIDANI: Yes, indeed. For the reason, the most part of them, they have to stay in the region near Kosovo.

KING: Do you favor NATO's bombing of Belgrade and the possibility of ground troops?

MEIDANI: I can say that the airstrikes have to continue by different means and ways, also inside Kosovo, because it's a real humanitarian catastrophe inside Kosovo. Thousands and thousands of Albanians are living outside. They're hungry. They're suffering. And a lot of people died and have been killed.

So it's a problem how to help them. And this is a problem of time: how to

accelerate the time, because I am quite sure that the last step will be the presence of the international troops, of ground troops on the land like a protection of these people and like -- the possibility of these people to be back.

KING: Tell me how the people of your country are handling the people coming in.

MEIDANI: Yes. It's solidarity of Albanian people, of Albanian families to support this people and also to help them. Most Albanian families are helping them, are lodging and accommodating them -- are, in fact, distributing their bread, which is quite limited also.

KING: How do we end this, Mr. President? If the refugees eventually go back, how do we not know whether President Milosevic does it again?

MEIDANI: This is the problem. The problem is to destroy this machinery of war and also to reduce this military potential, and to save Balkans, to give the possibility of Balkans for real democratic development, economic development, a kind of Marshall Plan for Balkan countries, so to create a new area in this region: because since 10 years in the Balkans, when you only war, bloodshed and the genocide, and there was the same machinery which has exercised this massacre and this ethnic cleansing.

KING: Do you see an end in sight?

MEIDANI: I am quite sure -- I am optimistic about -- because always there is an end for barbarism and for dictatorships.

KING: Thank you very much, Mr. President. Thank you for joining us.

President Rexhep Meidani of the president of Albania, the poorest country in the region. Average Albanian makes \$850 a year. They're accepting all these people in. He hopes the refugee situation, coming

to other countries, is
temporary, and thanks Greece for their support.

Greece and Albania have not always had the greatest of
relationships.

We'll be back with more of LARRY KING LIVE right after
this.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: Welcome back to LARRY KING LIVE. We're east this
week, in
New York.

Finally get a chance to meet him in person. He has been
with us so many
times by satellite. Vladislav Jovanovic. He is the
Yugoslavian charge
d'affaires of the Yugoslav mission to the U.N.

Can you bring us up to date, Mr. Ambassador, on the
bombings? There
were more airstrikes tonight. What can you tell us about
damage in your
country?

VLADISLAV JOVANOVIC, YUGOSLAV CHARGE D'AFFAIRES,
UNITED NATIONS: The targets are more and more civilians,
and there is
not any attempt to consider this fact. One of the
objectives of that expansion
of bombing is, which is openly said, to -- to pressure
the population to start
cracking its morale and to start abandoning the policy
of defending the
country.

But unfortunate -- contrary to what some planners in --
in NATO do
expect, the resolve of the population to keep going, to
defend the country at
all costs is...

KING: Are you saying civilians are being killed?

JOVANOVIC: Yes.

KING: Do we have any numbers?

JOVANOVIC: More than a couple hundred.

KING: More than a couple hundred?

JOVANOVIC: Not today, but altogether. KING: Yes.
Citizens.

JOVANOVIC: Citizens, civilians. I don't count soldiers
among that, and
even more wounded people, including the refugees in a
few camps.

KING: How do you react to President Clinton saying that
if he -- if Mr.
Milosevic does not agree to sit down, does not agree to
the accords and to
have someone monitor this, he's going to pound them more
and more? I
mean, how much more can your country take?

JOVANOVIC: Our history was not very gentle with us. We
have been
hardened for -- through history because our state has
been built up on the
roads, and for that reason, we have to defend ourselves
against many
invaders. So our determination to resist, to fight is
unlimited, even if we
remain without any mode of weapon. And to the question
you mentioned --
to your first question, Larry -- what about the targets
that shall hit. Let me
remind you that the bridge near Novi Sad which was hit a
couple of days
ago had special place in our memory, in the memory of
our people because
on that bridge, the Nazi had killed in 1942 a few
thousands of Jews and
Serbs and thrown them into the Danube. And there is a
memorial complex
very near with plates, with description of names. All
that is now destroyed.
So it is the second insult to the victims.

KING: How do you feel, Mr. Ambassador, when you see all
of these
refugees leave? I mean, other countries starting to take
them in? Do you at
all feel that your country is at all part to blame?

JOVANOVIC: The pictures are certainly very disturbing.

KING: And they don't lie.

JOVANOVIC: There is -- there is something which missed.
This is the
situation of other refugees, internal refugees,
population of Yugoslavia. They

are all victims and sufferers of the airstrike campaign.
Those people are out
of their home in the shelters or even without shelters.
They're not regularly
supplied; they don't have normal, regular medical and
other aid and
assistance. So, that part of picture missed. And this is
the reason why the
population in this country and the West in general
risked to be one-sided
informed. But all of them, 11 million Yugoslavs,
including Albanians in
Kosovo are victims primarily of the aggression of the
bombing campaign.

KING: There was no aggression prior to the bombing?
There was reason
for them to be happy prior to the bombing?

JOVANOVIĆ: There were not any mass exodus or any reason
for them to
leave Kosovo unless they were incited by the terrorist
KLA in order to
make some show for media and TV.

KING: Terrorism may be terrible, but also in history,
terrorism sometimes is
on the right side. The Ergund (ph) were terrorist,
American revolutionaries --
lots of people have done damage for liberty. There may
have been
Yugoslavian terrorists who did damage to the Nazis for
liberty. Why single
them out? JOVANOVIĆ: Because they are victims. They are
targets. We're
not only policemen and soldiers and clerks working for
the state, but many,
many defenseless Albanians and other civilians.
Three-hundred Albanian
civilians were killed by those (UNINTELLIGIBLE) in order
to intimidate the
silent majority of Albania, and to force them to follow
the policy of
extremists, separatist, and terrorists.

KING: Since your president does not want to see -- I
would assume his
own people die, why doesn't he come to the table?

JOVANOVIĆ: He's always sitting around the table, but the
other side, the
countries responsible for launching that aggression
against Yugoslavia had
left the table in Paris and opted for the war.

KING: Because they wanted to allow troops in to keep peace in Kosovo.

What was wrong with that?

JOVANOVIC: Because they formulated impossible condition for one

self-respecting country to accept foreign military presence which is a form of occupation of one part of the territory and to accept the loss of that territory if not immediately, then certainly after three years of the interim period.

There is no case which is recorded in the modern history that one sovereign state accepted to -- to give -- make a gift of its territory to one national minority or to one foreign state wishing to -- to -- that kind of gift to be done.

KING: A couple of other things. You have not been home in how long?

JOVANOVIC: More than two and a half years.

KING: Your brother is there.

JOVANOVIC: Yes.

KING: Are you able to communicate with family?

JOVANOVIC: It's not easy to -- to get connection because of many

pressure, many demands, and probably that it is the result of the bombing --

not only civilian, other objects were targeted, but especially the

communication and other centers for civilian use, not for military and others.

So this is more and more a form of total war which NATO countries have --

are deciding to apply against...

KING: Do you expect ground troops to come in?

JOVANOVIC: I still believe that the people who are responsible for major

-- major countries are reasonable people and that -- that they would avoid

to -- to jump -- to leap into dark. Whoever tries to -- to start ground

operation in the Balkan in general risks never to get out from.

KING: I want to understand what you said earlier. There are no circumstances under which President Milosevic or your people will give up?

JOVANOVIC: We are not going to give up our territory and our sovereignty.

KING: No matter how much they bomb?

JOVANOVIC: Doesn't matter. But what we already -- and we have been ready up to now is to grant to our Albanian citizens and other people living there very impressive, substantial autonomy and Democratic self-government.

KING: And a safe return?

JOVANOVIC: Of course, a safe return. And I would like to tell you that after the meeting between President Milosevic and Dr. Rugova, today there was the second meeting between Dr. Rugova and the Federal Deputy Prime Minister Sainovic. They continued talking about political settlement and the safe return of all refugees who had to leave Kosovo Metohija (ph).

KING: Will Mr. Rugova be available for an interview?

JOVANOVIC: Why not? He has already addressed press people in those couple of days. Yesterday he received the Russian ambassador to Baghdad, and he -- he will talk with some generals. He's a free man. He can go whenever he wish. Only his security can be put into danger if he -- he is not advised to take some precaution.

KING: Thank you, Mr. Ambassador, as always.

The guest has been the ambassador, charge d'affaires, Yugoslav mission to the U.N., Vladislav Jovanovic. When we break, we'll come back with Senator Dick Durbin of Illinois, who supports the airstrikes, Senator Rick Santorum of Pennsylvania, who does not and Lieutenant

General Thomas

McInerney, United States Air Force, retired, to get us up to date; and lots more guests coming. And Walter Cronkite tomorrow.

Don't go away.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: Welcome back to LARRY KING LIVE. What you're seeing now is

something we just received at CNN headquarters from Serbian television

now. This is in Aleksinac in Yugoslavia. This is damage from a bombing.

And this is just in to CNN again from, as we mentioned there, Serbian television.

We now welcome to LARRY KING LIVE -- I am in New York. In Washington is Senator Rick Santorum, Republican of Pennsylvania, member of the Senate Armed Services Committee; in Springfield, Illinois, Dick

Durbin, Democrat of Illinois; and in Washington, Lieutenant General Thomas

McInerney, United States Air Force, retired, who has been kind enough to be with us on many occasions.

First, let's get an update from the general. We had some criticism the last

time you were with us. The first three days went well.

The rest have been

weak. How is it picking up now? RETIRED LIEUTENANT GENERAL

THOMAS MCINERNEY, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE: Well, it's picking up now, Larry. The weather broke for them, and

they were able to

get a lot more sorties in today. And tonight, as you

see, they're going to hit

around Belgrade and that area pretty hard.

They have added the Teddy Roosevelt, the battle group.

They have got, as

you know, 13 more F-117s came in over the weekend. And secretary of

defense announced the Apaches coming in. Of course, they won't have an

impact for quite some time. But that is an addition and

they are stepping up

the tempo.

KING: Something you're in accord with.

MCINERNEY: Absolutely.

KING: Senator Santorum, you are not.

SENATOR RICK SANTORUM (R), PENNSYLVANIA: Well...

KING: I don't want to put words in your mouth. I know you voted against it.

SANTORUM: I did vote against it, and I failed to see at that time -- and I think it has been borne born out -- how we could accomplish the political objective, the policy objective of getting the Serbs to agree to a peace that is fundamentally counter to everything they believe in. I fail to see how any kind of military action of what the president contemplated, which is airstrikes, would move them to do that. And I think that we're seeing that, particularly as the general pointed out, with the limited number of strikes that we have engaged in.

We have not aggressively gone after these targets and we have not aggressively prosecuted this war to the point that we should have if we were going to proceed down that course. And while I had hesitancy, and still do, that we were able to accomplish a mission, we have made it much tougher by not aggressively going after these targets.

KING: You would not change your vote in hindsight?

SANTORUM: No, I wouldn't change my vote in hindsight. But now that we're in the current situation, we have got to prosecute this war to win, and we aren't doing that.

KING: Senator Durbin, you are -- as I understand it, you favor the airstrikes but no ground troops? In other words, just keep pounding?

SENATOR RICHARD DURBIN (D), ILLINOIS: Yes, I think the strategy we're currently using is the best for the moment, and I would have some

serious misgivings about using ground troops. That should be subject to a full congressional debate. The Constitution requires it.

But make no mistake: We know what Mr. Milosevic believes in. He believes in ethnic cleansing. He announced it as his policy. And now we have seen the genocide and suffering of hundreds of thousands of people.

KING: But the ambassador just says they'll never give up.

DURBIN: Well, of course, they don't want to give up. And that's why the president, along with 18 other countries and NATO, are trying to pound them so that they don't have the military capability to take advantage of more helpless people.

What are we going to do? A lady in Chicago that I spoke to who had been a victim of the Holocaust said, we always wondered why they never tried -- the allies never tried to stop what was going on in the concentration camps. For all the criticism of this policy by NATO, we're at least trying our very best to stop Milosevic's ethnic cleansing.

KING: We'll be back with some more moments with our guests and then more guests. This is LARRY KING LIVE. Don't go away.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

WILLIAM J. CLINTON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: The ethnic cleansing of Kosovo cannot stand as a permanent event. We cannot say, well, we'll just take all of these folks and forget about their rights to go home. I don't believe anyone wants to do that. That's not what we're about. But we have to help deal with the practical, immediate human problems these families face and that these front-line nations face.

The refugees belong in their own homes on their own land. Our immediate goal is to provide relief. Our long-term goal is to give them their right to

return.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: General McInerney, do you still believe ground troops are going to have play a part in this?

MCINERNEY: I think in the final analysis there's going to have to be a role for ground troops, and clearly, it is probably going to be the thing that will finally get him to the negotiating table. And I think the introduction of the Apaches and what that entails is a good start.

KING: Senator Santorum, do you support all of these refugees coming in?

SANTORUM: Well, yes. I think we have to do our humanitarian best, and that is, obviously, support the surrounding countries and our other European allies who are trying to deal with that. And obviously, we're airlifting some people to Guam and Guantanamo Bay. And we have to do our part to stem the human suffering.

KING: Do you share Senator Durbin's view that if there are ground troops, you should vote on it?

SANTORUM: I do. But I'll tell you another mistake, in my mind, was the administration coming out right at the start and saying there won't be any ground troops. That's like, you know, playing in a football game and saying, we're not going to run to the right side.

You have to have all your -- all your weapons at your disposal if you're going to be a credible threat. And while I don't support ground troops, I think that's something, as Senator Durbin said, we need to discuss in Congress.

Taking it off the table, I think, gave the wrong signal to Milosevic at the wrong time.

KING: Senator Durbin?

DURBIN: Frankly, I think we have got to be very honest about what we get into with ground troops. This is not the Persian Gulf, flat as a table. It's mountainous terrain and terrible weather and people defending their homeland as they see it.

I think, frankly, we ought to debate that long and hard before we make that choice. I think the president was right. I think using air power at this point to try to tell Milosevic that we are serious is the way to go, and then, of course, meeting with our NATO allies decide what the appropriate step is beyond this.

KING: At this point, General, are you optimistic? Or is that too strong a word?

MCINERNEY: That's too strong right now, Larry. I think we're really in a gray area, and we have got a lot of work to do.

KING: Senator Santorum?

SANTORUM: Well, I am optimistic that our military will carry out the orders in the best possible way. I just have concerns about who is issuing those orders, and to the extent that we're engaging in this conflict, that we're engaging it to win.

KING: Senator Durbin?

DURBIN: This has been going on a long time. Those who thought we'd wrap it up in 10 days after 10 years of ethnic cleansing I think ought to wake up to reality. This will take some time.

KING: Thank you all very much. We'll take a break and come back, and meet Senator John McCain, Senator Joe Biden, Mike Boettcher, who will come for us right from Macedonia. We'll also have our own Jeff Greenfield aboard as well. Panel of five, your phone calls too.

Don't go away.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

CLINTON: If Mr. Milosevic does not do what is necessary, NATO will continue an air campaign. It will be undiminished, unceasing and unrelenting.

It will inflict such damage that either he will change his calculations or we will seriously diminish his capacity to maintain his grip and impose his control on Kosovo. We are prepared to sustain this effort for the long haul.

Our plan is to persist until we prevail.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: Welcome back to LARRY KING LIVE.

Joining us now on our panel the rest of the way in Phoenix, Arizona Senator John McCain, member of the Senate Armed Services Committee; in Wilmington, Delaware Senator Joseph Biden, Democrat and ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; in Washington, D.C., our senior White House correspondent Wolf Blitzer is aboard; in Skopje, Macedonia is Mike Boettcher, our CNN correspondent on the scene; and here in New York, CNN's senior news analyst, Jeff Greenfield.

Let's go first to Mike Boettcher. Anything up to date you can report on events where you are tonight?

MIKE BOETTCHER, CNN CORRESPONDENT: Well, at the present time, there's the transfer under way of refugees from this transit camp on the border of Macedonia and Yugoslavia to various camps around and the air transfer tomorrow of refugees to other countries around the world. I spoke to many refugees today, though, who said that they do not want to go to other countries around the world. And in the meantime, they're sitting out

there, Larry, in the cold, freezing -- thousands of them tonight.

KING: Senator McCain, if they don't want to go, what do you do?

SEN. JOHN MCCAIN (R), ARIZONA: We act as quickly as possible using all means at our disposal to destroying Mr. Milosevic and his military so we can move them back to their homes and rebuild their homes and their communities as quickly as possible.

KING: Is this action, in your opinion, going well?

MCCAIN: No, it's not going according to plan, obviously. But the fact -- that's what happens in wars, and terrible things happen in wars, and that's why they're the last resort. We have to adjust our means to obtain the ends that we sought at the beginning, and that is to move these people back or prevent the ethnic cleansing of them which would be hard to do now, but at least move them back; break Mr. Milosevic so that he and his thugs can never do this again.

KING: Senator Biden, can that work with bombing alone?

SEN. JOSEPH BIDEN (D), DELAWARE: Maybe not. But I don't think we have given it nearly as much time. We talk about the number of sorties, the number of bombs dropped, the number of cruise missiles. We really have only had probably -- John would know better than me -- but we only probably only had four to six days of any serious ability to inflict that damage. But I agree with John completely. I think that we have to use whatever means available to us. There has to be a sense of resolve here. There has to be a sense of purpose and there has to also be an open mind as to whatever means are necessary to get rid of Milosevic in terms of his ability to be able to engage in this ethnic cleansing. This guy is a thug. He should be tried as a war criminal.

KING: Wolf, you have observed this president for a long time, you ever seen him more resolute?

WOLF BLITZER, CNN SENIOR WHITE HOUSE CORRESPONDENT: Well, he is described by all of his advisers who are in those very small meetings, his national security team as the one who has to cheer everybody else up. He gives them pep talks. He tells them to go out there, and they're on the right course; don't give up. He's almost like the coach.

The problem right now is that there isn't a whole lot of time left. What they're really worried about in the White House, Larry, is that there's a Defense Department intelligence analysis right now that suggests that Slobodan Milosevic will have achieved his objectives within, perhaps, only five days. At that point, he's probably going to call for a -- even a unilateral cease-fire. He may even announce a partial troop withdrawal, all of which is designed to split the NATO alliance to show that this is over with. But that's not going to cause the NATO allies to stop bombing. It's going to complicate the matter when all is said and done.

KING: Jeff, would that mean the statement, where did we go right, prevails?

JEFF GREENFIELD, CNN SENIOR ANALYST: I am wondering, actually, whether or not Senators Biden or McCain are following up on the notion that Senator Biden just said, that Milosevic should be tried as a war criminal. Senator Biden, if he's tried as a war criminal, that presupposes he's in the hands of the NATO forces.

BIDEN: Sure does.

GREENFIELD: Does that mean we have to go to Belgrade?

BIDEN: Well, it means that we should not rule that out, Jeff. It seems to me that there's two things we should be doing now. The first and foremost is to cleanse Kosovo of his forces, and if -- in order to be

able to have a
practically permissive environment to go back in,
practically meaning that
there's not an ability to -- for his forces to threaten
NATO troops or the
people going back in. If it means we got to go into
Belgrade or toward
Belgrade, I would not take that off the table.

But again, it's premature to make these judgments. Here
we're 13 days into
what is planned to be somewhere on the order of a 30-day
bombing
campaign, half of which has been able to be executed so
far. So, I don't
think we have to make those judgments at this moment.

KING: Jeff has another question for...

GREENFIELD: For Senator McCain, though, do we -- General
Odom, the
former national security agency director, made such a
proposal. Is the logical
consequence of what you're saying, absolute
resoluteness; this has to be
won. Does that mean going to Belgrade as the general
suggest, maybe a
NATO occupying force for several decades? Is that where
we may be
headed?

KING: Take Yugoslavia.

MCCAIN: No, I don't believe that's absolutely necessary.
If you break the
Yugoslav military, Milosevic will go. That's the only
thing that's keeping him
in power, as you know. But the president -- look, the
president cannot win a
war without waging war. You have to say everything's on
the table;
everything can be used. And to preclude the use of
ground forces if
necessary is only be a source of encouragement to Mr.
Milosevic. And time,
as the Pentagon study indicated, is not on our side, and
we have to lead.
And we are a superior force. We can and will prevail.

KING: We're going to take a break. When we come back,
we're going to
ask Mike Boettcher -- he got into a roped-off,
not-allow- media in refugee
camp. He'll tell us about it. Then our panel will

discuss this issue at greater length.

Don't go away.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: We're back.

We'll go to Mike Boettcher. We've lost the line for a moment. As soon as he returns we'll come back for that refugee story.

Senator McCain, handling all of these refugees, is this a major logistic problem for Germany, Turkey, the United States?

MCCAIN: Yes, I think it's a big problem, and the quicker we can defeat Milosevic and get them back to their homes and communities, the less of a problem it will be.

And let me just make one additional point, if I could. There's not only this humanitarian tragedy that's taking place, but it's also the credibility of the United States and the future of NATO. They're paying attention to what we're doing, in Pyongyang and in Baghdad and Tehran and Tripoli. And if we fail here, they're going to be on the march, and I think a lot of Americans may be sacrificed in a lot of other places if we don't prevail.

KING: We have got Mike Boettcher back. He's in Skopje, Macedonia.

Tell us that story of what you did. You risked it a little. But you went into a refugee camp you weren't supposed to go to? BOETTCHER: That's right.

The transit camp on the frontier where you're seeing all of these pictures of upwards of 50,000 refugees living in squalid conditions -- and it's cordoned all. There are army troops all the way around to keep them from getting out and to keep us from getting in. And not to give too much away, we basically snuck between two of these soldiers, army sentries, who are posted all along the way for about three miles, and then walked into the

camp along the
Kosovo-Macedonia border.

KING: What did you see?

BOETTCHER: And when we got there, the conditions were --
I'll tell you
what, Larry. It -- it -- it looks horrible. It smells
horrible. But the thing that
really gets you when you walk in there, all you hear is
this coughing from
everybody. Thousands of people sick, Larry.

It's -- it's -- you know, it's a place where these
little paths are basically open
sewers, where people are living under pieces of plastic,
where there are
newborn babies and very old people who are incredibly
ill and who are
dying, where people have enough food right now, just
barely, but have to
stand in line for hours to get it, who are fighting to
try to get clean water.

I saw a little girl with a plastic bottle filling it up
in the river, and just up the
river is basically the toilet facility.

KING: How do you handle something like that emotionally?

BOETTCHER: Well, you know, Larry, I'd experienced
something similar
when the Kurds were run out of northern Iraq by Saddam
Hussein, and at
that point, I guess in 1991, basically, I adopted one
family and took care of
them, because the problem was so massive, you can't --
you can't -- you
can report on everybody, but you can't take care of
everybody.

So in that instance, I did that, and today, I kind of
joined one family and kind
of stuck with them and talked to them. And I didn't have
anything to give
them, but I told them that pretty soon they were going
to be moving, it
looked like. And I didn't know where. And that's when
they told me they
didn't want to go out of this area. They wanted to stay
close. They felt that
they were going to go back. They wanted to go back, that
if they were going
to die, they wanted to die in their homeland.

KING: Senator Biden, can you understand that, that many don't want to go to the safety of Germany or the United States?

BIDEN: Sure, I can, Larry. I don't think any of them want to go anywhere else.

You know, a point that Jeff made earlier -- I mean, Milosevic's goal here is very clear from the beginning, and some of us have been saying it for the last month and a half. His goal is, first of all, to cleanse, then to divide -- divide Kosovo, in my view -- and then to divide the alliance into agreeing to his new split and his new operation.

And you know, what would have happened -- people are calling this a civil war. You know, that's a little bit like calling the Nazi cleansing of Germany, of Jews a civil war. What the hell are we talking about here?

We're talking about a guy who has had a -- he is engaged in genocide. And I hope to God that he doesn't know Europe as well as he thinks he knows it, because I believe that he believes, as Jeff implied, that at the end -- or somebody implied -- Wolf maybe it was -- that at the end of the day, he's going to split the alliance by engaging in a unilateral cease-fire.

And to say that he has won and that he has already cleansed presupposes that we are going to allow him to do that and we are not going to continue to stay the course and move them back.

KING: I want to get a word from -- word from Wolf. First, Jeff.

GREENFIELD: Then that implies that what the president has said, that there is a way for Milosevic to get back to the peace table is, in your view, Senator Biden, completely irrelevant. You don't want him back to the peace table.

BIDEN: I think it is irrelevant now. I think we're beyond the point where he comes to the peace table. I think this is a point -- the only way it works at this point on is if we, the West, dictate -- NATO dictates to him an outcome. And I don't think he can be part of the outcome in the end of the day, because I think if -- I think absolutely the -- the statement made by John McCain is we're assuming Milosevic is synonymous with the Serbian people.

The only thing that keeps him alive and in play is the military. And that's why we cannot allow the military to remain a viable force no matter what happens.

KING: We'll take a break, pick up with Wolf and John and more talk. Don't go away.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: Welcome back. What you're seeing now is the first pictures of the first wave of refugees landing in Turkey. Other countries that will be taking them include the United States and Germany and Greece and others. But these are the ones arriving in Turkey.

Mike Boettcher has to leave us because our satellite is going to go down in about a minute. How many are going out tomorrow, Mike, from where you are?

BOETTCHER: It's hard to say. The process is either speeding up or slowing down no matter who you're talking to here. I -- I think you're going to see probably around 10,000 or so out tomorrow. And I -- I talked to this other family there and talked to them about Guam and Guantanamo Bay. And here are people who live in an Alpine country who are kind of incredulous that they were going to kind of a tropical atmosphere. They just had a hard time understanding that, frankly.

KING: Thanks, Mike, great job.

Wolf Blitzer, does the -- is the White House aware that these people are going reluctantly?

BLITZER: Yes, they're fully aware of that. They're fully aware these people want to go back home, and the White House is making a commitment that they will be allowed to go home. They're saying that they haven't yet completely shut the door to Slobodan Milosevic. A lot of senior policy-makers with whom I have discussed this issue in the past few days privately fully agree with Senator Biden and Senator McCain: You have to write off Slobodan Milosevic and assume he's not going to be part of any solution.

But the official White House position as enunciated today by Press Secretary Joe Lockhart and by the president himself is that there still is an opportunity for Slobodan Milosevic to accept these four conditions that President Clinton laid out. If he accepts those conditions, including allowing the Kosovar refugees to go back to their homes, an international peacekeeping force, the framework of the Rambouillet agreement and a withdrawal of Serb forces from Kosovo, then you could possibly make a deal.

The problem with writing Slobodan Milosevic completely out of it right now is then, assuming the military in Yugoslavia stays with him, he could be around for a long time, meaning this Kosovo crisis isn't going to be a problem for only a few more weeks or even months but maybe for years.

KING: Senator McCain, having the benefit of hindsight, what would you have done differently?

MCCAIN: I -- I'm hesitant to do that, because it could be criticism of the president. But I would have started a bombing campaign

along the lines that
we did at start of Desert Storm rather than this very
incremental beginnings. I
would have taken out the infrastructure immediately. I
would have had
troops massed and armored capabilities on borders of
Macedonia and into
Macedonia and Albania, if necessary, and other places to
move quickly into
Kosovo, never discounting the probability that we might
have to use ground
troops, since air has never really decided any major
battles. And made clear
our resolve to win this war and do whatever it takes.

KING: We'll take break, come back with our remaining
moments, and Mr.
Greenfield has that look of another question.

Don't go away.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: Mr. Greenfield with a question for the senators.

GREENFIELD: Well, I am just wondering if this notion
that I have been
playing with rings a bell with you gentlemen, that over
the last few years,
politics has in a lot of ways been diminished. We don't
have a cold war. The
economy is going good. People don't vote as much as they
used to. The
impeachment process was as much a farce as it was a
serious piece of
business. The late night comics will joke about the
president in ways we
couldn't have imagined 25 years ago. Suddenly we're
faced with a situation
where literally the most serious life and death
questions are on table. Is the
political community, is the journalistic community ready
to grapple with so
serious a matter given what we have been through over
these past few
years?

BIDEN: No. It has demonstrated, Jeff, it's not. Let me
give you an example.

John just said what he would have done. Were John
president and I were
secretary of state, I would say, yes, Mr. President, go
ahead and do that.
The difference is there are 16 other, 17 other NATO

nations that have to
sign on and plus there's a political community. Let me
give you one example.

The so-called Biden resolution is the resolution that
passed the Senate

authorizing the use of air power, and the Republican
leadership insists that

there be a provision in it saying no ground troops. I
was about to pass

because they told me that I didn't have the votes to
pass it without it. John

McCain came to the floor, faced down the Republican
leadership and a few

Democrats and said, this is outrageous to put this
prohibition in front end;

take it out. It got taken out. But it shows the
environment in which this whole
thing started.

KING: John.

BIDEN: So, the idea now that we're going to be able to
separate politics out

and the press is not going to want instant response and
instant analysis and

instant victory, I think is not realistic but time we
will -- there will be a little
maturation going on here.

KING: John.

MCCAIN: I think there's maturation because of what the
American people

and the journalists and we politicians are seeing.

BIDEN; Right.

MCCAIN: But let me -- let me also quickly add that I
believe that you have

to calculate what your chances of success are, and if
you don't -- if you

aren't sure that you can bring according to the Powell
doctrine overwhelming

force in a minimum amount of time and make the most
amount of

effectiveness out of it, then you shouldn't go in
because the worst of all

worlds, as we know is, the kind of standoff that we have
experienced in
previous conflicts.

KING: Wolf, is the White House going to keep prominent
people in the

administration available to the media on regular

interview basis?

BLITZER: Yes, and we're also being told the president himself will do more interviews. He did one, as you know, with Dan Rather last week. He's going to be coming out almost on a daily basis making statements about the situation in Kosovo.

A lot of people, though, inside the White House, Larry, a lot of my journalistic colleagues have come to the very, very sad conclusion, though, that this Kosovo crisis which seemingly sprung out of nowhere should not have come as that great a surprise. The problem that those of us in the news media over the past year -- we were so engrossed with the Monica Lewinsky investigation, the Ken Starr investigation, the impeachment process; we didn't pay attention that much to what was happening in Kosovo. The same is true of the top political leaders at the White House. They were so engrossed in trying to make sure the president stayed in office, they didn't educate the American public the way they probably should have. This problem should not have come as a surprise. The tragedy is that it has.

KING: Thanks, Wolf. We have about 30 seconds, Jeff, for the closing comment. We were Monica-ized.

GREENFIELD: We all know this -- in journalism, in politics, that the half life is about eight days. And it is absolutely astonishing that -- what was it, 10 weeks ago, as Wolf said, the only game in town was Monica and impeachment. If somebody had come to a -- to a journalism group and said, we got to do a big story on Kosovo, we all would have looked and said -- get with the program; it's impeachment. And here we are facing the most serious use of force in Europe I think since the end of World War II and we're on a "dark lean plain," to quote a poet.

KING: Thank you all very much. We're out of time. Tell

you about

tomorrow night right after this.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: Tomorrow night on LARRY KING LIVE, the president of Macedonia will be one of the guests; as will Morley Safer of "60 minutes" and the legendary Walter Cronkite.

Up next, the latest on the crisis in Kosovo. And then "NEWSSTAND: CNN & TIME." The plight of refugees from one Kosovar village and the story behind the mass exodus across the border. It's next. Stay tuned.

END

Message Sent

To:

Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer M. Palmieri/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anthony R. Bernal/OVP@OVP
Melissa G. Green/OPD/EOP@EOP
Leslie Bernstein/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robin M. Roland/WHO/EOP@EOP
Chandler G. Spaulding/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dominique L. Cano/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dag Vega/WHO/EOP@EOP
Brenda M. Anders/WHO/EOP@EOP
gamble-bennett@dol.gov @ inet
Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP@EOP
Richard L. Siewert/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jordan Tamagni/WHO/EOP@EOP
Beverly J. Barnes/WHO/EOP
Elizabeth R. Newman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julia M. Payne/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julianne B. Corbett/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey M. Smith/OSTP/EOP@EOP
Lowell A. Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan A. Kaplan/OPD/EOP@EOP
Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer Ferguson/OMB/EOP@EOP
Mark D. Neschis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Ruby Shamir/WHO/EOP@EOP
Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP@EOP
Amy Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lisa J. Levin/WHO/EOP@EOP
Peter A. Weissman/OPD/EOP@EOP
William A. Halter/OMB/EOP@EOP
Eli G. Attie/OVP@OVP

Patricia M. Ewing/OVP@OVP
Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa M. Murray/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan E. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP
Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anne M. Edwards/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael Waldman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gene B. Sperling/OPD/EOP@EOP
Paul K. Engskov/WHO/EOP@EOP
Laura D. Schwartz/WHO/EOP@EOP
Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julie E. Mason/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steven J. Naplan/NSC/EOP@EOP
Alison Muscatine/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gordon Li/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mark A. Kitchens/WHO/EOP@EOP
June Shih/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey A. Shesol/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rochester M. Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rachael E. Sullivan/OVP@OVP
Julie B. Goldberg/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sarah E. Gegenheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Susanna B. McGuire/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steve Ricchetti/WHO/EOP@EOP
Edward F. Hughes/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa J. Prober/WHO/EOP@EOP
Justin Coleman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Clara J. Shin/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan M. Prince/WHO/EOP@EOP
Joshua S. Gottheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Heather M. Riley/WHO/EOP@EOP
Alejandro G. Cabrera/OVP@OVP
Rebecca L. Walldorff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jon P. Jennings/WHO/EOP@EOP
Katharine Button/WHO/EOP@EOP
Tracy Pakulniewicz/WHO/EOP@EOP
James T. Heimbach/WHO/EOP@EOP
Victoria L. Valentine/WHO/EOP@EOP
James E. Kennedy/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael A. Hammer/NSC/EOP@EOP
Laura J. Lewis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Toby C. Graff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sean P. O'Shea/WHO/EOP@EOP
Thomas D. Janenda/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rajiv Y. Mody/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robin J. Bachman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Saladbar 23 <saladbar23 @ hotmail.com> @ inet
Kimberly S. Anderson/OA/EOP@EOP
Erica S. Lepping/WHO/EOP@EOP

----- Forwarded by Rajiv Y. Mody/WHO/EOP on 04/21/99
04:24 PM -----

Mark A. Kitchens
04/06/99 04:58:18 PM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: CNN Crossfire, April 6, 1999

Crossfire
Aired April 6, 1999 - 7:30 p.m. ET

Are Ground Troops the Only Way to Accomplish the
Clinton Administration's Political Objectives?

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

WILLIAM J. CLINTON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: If
Mr. Milosevic does not do what is necessary, NATO will
continue an air
campaign. It will be undiminished, unceasing and
unrelenting.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

MIKE KINSLEY, GUEST HOST: Tonight, the strike against
Yugoslavia
intensifies. As more bombs fall, the U.S. prepares to
send in helicopters.
Will this be enough to stop Slobodan Milosevic, or is it
time for ground
troops?

ANNOUNCER: Live, from Washington, CROSSFIRE. On the
left, Bill
Press. On the right, Robert Novak. In the crossfire, in
New York, former
NATO Supreme Allied Commander General George Joulwan.

KINSLEY: Good evening. Welcome to CROSSFIRE. I am Mike
Kinsley
of Slate.com on the Internet sitting in all this week
for Bill Press.

What is the exit strategy for Kosovo? How will it all
end?

President Clinton put it very simply today.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

CLINTON: We're prepared to sustain this effort for the long haul. Our plan is to persist until we prevail.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

KINSLEY: But what will it take to persist and prevail?

Today NATO officially approved the use of attack helicopters and 2,000 troops to go with them, all based next door in Albania. Is this a first step from air war to ground war?

In other developments, the first 90 Kosovar refugees were airlifted to safety in Norway: 90 down, 400,000 to go.

The United States has offered to take 20,000 but plans to keep them in Guam and Guantanamo, not the U.S. itself. And the air war continues. With better weather, NATO planes have begun to hit Yugoslav-Serbian ground troops who are driving the Kosovar Albanians out of their homes. But some experts believe the only answer to ground troops is ground troops.

Across the table is the youngest person ever to wear a bow tie on television, Tucker Carlson of "The Weekly Standard," a magazine printed on paper.

Tucker.

TUCKER CARLSON, GUEST HOST: Thanks, Mike.

General, Let's enter the world of make believe for a moment. Pretend you are General Wesley Clark and the president has asked you to rid Kosovo of Serb forces and make it safe for the refugees to return. How do you do it? Do you use ground forces? If so, how many divisions, how many planes, how do you enter the province? What do you do?

RETIRED GENERAL GEORGE JOULWAN, FORMER NATO SUPREME ALLIED COMMANDER: Well, this was a very similar question we faced in Bosnia. And I would hope that the supreme commander at this time said, "What is your political objective?" If it is as you

stated to deter or to stop the 40,000 Serbs from doing what they're doing, killing Kosovars and doing ethnic cleansing, then I think you have to come up with a realistic option to say, how do you do that.

And if air strikes alone will not accomplish that, you better have a plan B, C and D, which may include ground forces.

CARLSON: I am assuming, right, that those three plans would. But what, then, about NATO? Other NATO countries -- even our closest ally, England -- Tony Blair today essentially ruled out his support for ground troops. Would that jeopardize the alliance if the United States were to go ahead and support ground troops?

JOULWAN: Well, I think that it is again a question of leadership. If this is what it's going to take to realize the political objective of both the United States and NATO, then I think we in the military have the obligation to lay out what it's going to take to do that. And then the United States, as we have done in the past, needs to provide that leadership within the council to get consensus to meet the political objective.

KINSLEY: General, you keep saying if the air war -- air power is not sufficient. How long, in your opinion, is a fair test of that "if"? It's only been a week and a half. Most -- most of that time, the weather has been very bad, and NATO airstrikes have been limited for that reason. And there are people saying it will never work. Do you agree with them?

JOULWAN: Again, I would go back to the political clarity that's needed here. What do you want to accomplish? If you want to degrade his capability, if you want to degrade his infrastructure, then I think you could go on for weeks and weeks of airstrikes. If you want to prevent the genocide that's occurring now...

KINSLEY: Yes.

JOULWAN: ... that we knew 40,000 Serb troops were in Kosovo in violation of the October agreement, then you need to take, I think, more than just air action. And that is up to the political leadership and to the military, professionals to say, "What would that take?"

And I would tell you that I am surprised if the friends that I know in the joint chiefs of staff and within the alliance would rely solely on air.

KINSLEY: Well, we -- you haven't used it, but many people who say we have to go to ground troops use this word "quagmire," which, of course, comes from the Vietnam War, which lasted for eight years.

Is it fair to say we're in a quagmire after a week and a half?

JOULWAN: As one who spent two combat tours in Vietnam, much of that scar tissue I tried to use later on in my professional career, that is why you need to have clarity. We really weren't clear, I don't think, in the political objectives in Vietnam. We had some micromanagement at the top by our political leadership.

And NATO is better than that. The U.S. is better than that.

In Bosnia, we had clear political objectives. And the air campaign we conducted there were for clear political reasons.

I find that difficult now in trying to ascertain what those political objectives are in Kosovo.

CARLSON: Well, fair enough. Then perhaps you could fill in the blanks.

What should the objectives be? Clearly it's too late to stop ethnic cleansing.

Should we target -- specifically target Milosevic for removal?

JOULWAN: Why is it too late to stop?

CARLSON: Well, because people are continuing to be killed. And the fact is, as you know, the killing increased in ferocity since the airstrikes.

JOULWAN: Every more reason why we should have options. I know this

president. I briefed him on the plan to commit ground forces in Bosnia.

There was a groundswell of opposition against it at that time. There was not

support either in the press or in the Congress for it.

But this president made

a tough decision to commit ground forces in Bosnia. And

I think we need to

have that -- that same clarity right now.

I think it's -- it's really sad that we're now in 1999

watching the same

atrocities by the same person with the same troops that

we saw in

Srebrenica in 1995.

CARLSON: Yes, that is sad. But in one sentence, can you clarify for us, for

viewers what precisely our goals should be?

JOULWAN: I think the goal of preventing the genocide that we're seeing

today in Kosovo, the uprooting of people, the loading of train cars with

people on them, that should be our political objective.

But we should match

it with the means to accomplish it.

KINSLEY: Well, General, I've got to say, it seems to me, pretty clear, just

as someone sitting, reading the paper out in Seattle

that that is our political

objective.

JOULWAN: But where are the means to achieve it? That's the point I am

trying to get at. You need to marry up the political

objective with the means

to achieve it. And if you're not achieving it, you

better change your tactics.

KINSLEY: Can you talk a little bit about the differences and similarities

between the situation in Kosovo, both political and

military, and the situation

in Bosnia, which, I guess, you would maintain was a

successful use of

military power?

JOULWAN: In Bosnia, it -- after Srebrenica, the NATO alliance and the world community at the London conference in July of '95 passed some -- some very clear resolutions and guidance to me with triggers attached. And I say "triggers" -- when we could act if we saw a concentration of forces against a safe area.

It wasn't just for Dick Holbrooke's mission at Dayton. It was to stop an attack on safe areas. It was -- it was reduce the siege of Sarajevo. And it was to prevent the maneuver of Mladic in doing just what we see in Kosovo.

We accomplished all those objectives, to include later Dick Holbrooke's mission at Dayton.

CARLSON: Yes, but now NATO is not, by everyone's admission, achieving the single objective of stopping the killing. If at some point the killing continues and NATO refuses to either step up with ground troops or to halt it completely, what is the point of NATO? Isn't that utter failure in its sort of core mission to keep order in Europe?

JOULWAN: I hope not. As I said, NATO is better than that. I know the leadership. I know the military side of it. But you must get political clarity. You must have clarity of mission and purpose.

CARLSON: Yes, you keep saying that, that NATO is better than that, but the fact is it hasn't been better than that so far. Why not? And if there's a lack of clarity politically, where is that lack of clarity coming from? Is it President Clinton?

JOULWAN: I think part of that has to do with U.S. leadership. We are the leader of the alliance. And I think we need to provide that leadership. If we rule out a ground option here at home, I could assure you the alliance will

not support it.

KINSLEY: Well, as I -- as I was saying, General -- and I thought you

agreed. It seems to me that what you started ought to be the purpose is quite

clearly the purpose. And then the question becomes the means, which is to stop the ethnic cleansing in a nutshell.

I -- I -- I -- I think that's what motivates most of the people out -- in the outside world who are appalled by what's going on there.

The original idea two weeks ago, as was -- was that we would achieve that

by getting Milosevic to sign this peace accord, which created an autonomy, a semi-autonomous region in Kosovo.

But is that practical now, I mean, now that he's driven -- can people really

go back to their homes side by side with their Serbian neighbors and -- and

-- and be essentially ruled by Milosevic once again after what he's done in the past couple of weeks?

JOULWAN: I think it's going to be very difficult, but I think we now need to

come up with a plan to carry out our political objectives. And I think that's

going to include -- if you rule out ground options, what you do is Milosevic

only has to face one dimension of our power, which is air.

We talk in the military about combined arms, where you put air, ground and

sea together. That's what's missing in -- in -- in Kosovo. And so we're not

utilizing the full capability the alliance has and that -- and that the United

States has in Kosovo today.

KINSLEY: OK. Thanks, general. We're going to take a break. And when

we come back, we'll ask the general about these stories leaking out of the

Pentagon about how the president ignored their advice. Is that how a good

soldier behaves?

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KINSLEY: Welcome back to CROSSFIRE. I'm Mike Kinsley of Slate, the Internet magazine, sitting in for Bill Press. We're talking with the former supreme allied commander in Europe, General George Joulwan. General Joulwan ran NATO during the 1995 military operations in Bosnia. So he's an authority on dealing with Slobodan Milosevic. He's now a professor at West Point.

The fellow at this table who looks like a professor is actually Tucker Carlson, a writer for "The Weekly Standard" magazine.

Tucker.

CARLSON: Thanks, mike. General, there has been a great deal of off-the-record criticism of the president from his own military advisers. Last week, one unnamed high-level Air Force officer described the Kosovo campaign as a disgrace. This morning in The Washington Post members of the joint chiefs of staff were quoted anonymously saying that they knew from the outset that an air campaign would not be effective against the Serbs.

It sounds to me like a lot of high-level military officers have very little confidence in the president's ability to lead. Now, you know him. Should they have confidence in his ability to be commander in chief?

JOULWAN: I think so. What we need, though, is from those same military leaders the moral courage to stand up and say, if this is your political objective, Mr. President, this is what you need, regardless of whether we think -- what impact this will have on readiness, what impact this will have on the budget, this is what it will take to achieve it. And -- and I -- I hope that was done. If it wasn't done, then I believe that's a mistake by our military.

KINSLEY: But irrespective of what they think, is -- is

it proper for them to
be undermining the president, really undermining the war
effort in this way by
leaking their doubts to the newspapers?

JOULWAN: No, I don't think so. I think they should not
do that. It's time to
pull the team together. We're in this. We are where we
are. And we have to
get on with it.

I truly, though, think that the planning at least -- and
even planning was ruled
out for a ground option, which I think is inexcusable.

KINSLEY: But if -- if you were a general who really
believed this was
disastrous and believed it beforehand and not after the
fact when it's a little
bit easy, shouldn't you, if you decided it was so
important you were going to
speak out (a) speak out publicly and not anonymously and
(b) do it
beforehand when it might have prevented this thing that
you think is so
terrible?

JOULWAN: Absolutely, and that's why we have the
Goldwater-Nickles
Act. That's what CINCs do, forward-deployed commanders,
and that's
what our military leadership should do as well.

KINSLEY: You better explain the Goldwater-Nickles Act.

JOULWAN: That was passed to ensure that the military had
a voice,
particularly to the Congress, and they would give their
personal opinions,
and in this case, beforehand, on actions that were to be
taken.

CARLSON: But you can understand why individual officers
would be
hesitant to criticize the policies of the president. I
wonder why there has
been so much criticism of his leadership. Are these
people insane? Are they
making this up?

JOULWAN: I really don't think it's -- the criticism
comes after the fact. The
moral courage by our leadership comes before the fact.
This should have

been done during the debate on the decision, not afterwards.

CARLSON: Well, let's talk about -- quickly about another gripe that many in the military have, and that is this idea that the president has helped gut the armed forces, that when he assumed office, I think there were 18 divisions in the U.S. Army. I think there are about 10 now. There's this widely-reported-on shortage of cruise missiles. I think the question now is, if a conflict were to break out somewhere else in the world, say in North Korea or Iraq, would the United States have the forces to conduct a war in two theaters, or two different wars. Would it?

JOULWAN: That's a fair question. I don't think so. I think we have problems with our force structure and with our strategy. And so, no, I don't think -- I think we would have great difficulty in trying to carry out not only a major war contingency, but also the lesser regional contingencies that we're faced with throughout the world today.

KINSLEY: General, when you get together with your fellow generals and retired generals and talk about the things that we are talking about in society at large -- specifically, do we want the United States to play a role in the world beyond just protecting our own national security interests, narrowly defined? Should the military power of the United States be used to protect people from ethnic cleansing and other humanitarian things, which don't strictly affect our national security? -- is there a view in the military about whether that's a proper use?

JOULWAN: Let me just give you my view, which I...

KINSLEY: All right, that's fair enough.

JOULWAN: ... I have spent 36 years in service to my country, 18 of those in Europe. I was a second lieutenant when the Berlin wall went up. I was a lieutenant general when it came down. And I was a

supreme commander of
NATO in this new NATO we're building.

Never in my wildest dreams did I think we would see the
horrors that we
have seen in Bosnia and Kosovo, a repeat of what we saw
in World War II.
My whole life was devoted to preventing that.

That is the professionalism of our armed forces today.
That's what we need
to oppose. And whether that's a major regional war or a
lesser regional war,
that is not the issue here.

The president said, here is an our political objective.
NATO said this is our
political objective. We in the military said how do we
get the conditions for
success -- not carping about what it's going to cost,
but what do we need
for success. That is what we should be doing.

KINSLEY: But -- go ahead.

CARLSON: Well, there's obviously a great deal of
conversation about what
we need to do. And you must be privy to some of it after
36 years in the
military. You must hear things. The question obviously
before the country
now is, will we send in ground troops? The
administration has been very
cagey on this question. What do you think is going to
happen? What do you
hear?

JOULWAN: I think in order to get Milosevic just from
looking at one
dimension of our power, if you put at least the planning
for a ground
operation, he has to divert troops from the killing
fields of Kosovo to take
that into account. Whether you come in from Albania,
Macedonia or
elsewhere, he has to take that into account.

So I think the planning for that by NATO and by the
United States is
essential here. And I would urge that at least the
planning go on and let the
political decision be made later.

CARLSON: Is it going on?

JOULWAN: I -- again, if one could -- could listen to our political leadership, they have not even said they have authorized the planning for that. And that, I think, is a mistake.

KINSLEY: And is -- is -- let me ask you the same question about -- I asked about the generals about the people who would be the ground troops. We have an all-volunteer Army. Do people -- do people sign up for the Army hoping never to use the skills that they're developing or -- or -- or only using them in extreme emergencies for our national security? Or -- or do you think from talking to them that -- to the extent that you can generalize, that the -- that the man who would be -- and women -- who would be the ground troops could do this with a whole heart?

JOULWAN: Look, I have committed this force, this magnificent armed forces we have in Rwanda to stop the dying there; in Liberia, to help liberate our force -- our embassy there; in Macedonia, in northern Iraq. These are magnificent soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines. If the clarity is there, if the political guidance is correct, these men and women will do the job.

Whether that's in Kosovo or whenever you send them, they are well-trained.

KINSLEY: OK. Thank you very much, General Joulwan. Tucker and I will be back in a little bit.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KINSLEY: Tucker, there is an acronym I believe they use in the Army and elsewhere called CYA, which is "Cover Your Rear End." And it seems to me that that's what these generals are doing in a pretty flagrant way, or these -- I assume they're generals at the Pentagon...

CARLSON: Well, they are.

KINSLEY: ... leaking -- leaking oh, we told President Clinton not to do that.

CARLSON: But you have got to -- look, these are people who take war seriously, who understand its costs. They're being led by a man who wants a war where no one gets hurt, a free-lunch war. That's enough to make anyone nervous. And you feel for them.

KINSLEY: Well, the country wants a free-lunch war, and you have got Republicans, on the one hand, saying don't do it at all, and on the other hand, saying, as you are, do it with ground troops, and Clinton has typically compromised.

CARLSON: But the Republicans aren't the president, are they? So they're not responsible for that. And he is...

KINSLEY: They're not responsible at all.

CARLSON: Well, that's true too.

KINSLEY: And what about these generals? I mean, they're actually undermining the war effort by -- it seems to me. But that's just my view.

From the left, sitting in for Bill Press, I am Mike Kinsley.

CARLSON: Sitting in on the right, I am Tucker Carlson, sitting in for Bob Novak.

Join us again tomorrow night for another edition of CROSSFIRE.

END

Message Sent

To:

Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer M. Palmieri/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anthony R. Bernal/OVP@OVP
Melissa G. Green/OPD/EOP@EOP
Leslie Bernstein/WHO/EOP@EOP

Robin M. Roland/WHO/EOP@EOP
Chandler G. Spaulding/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dominique L. Cano/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dag Vega/WHO/EOP@EOP
Brenda M. Anders/WHO/EOP@EOP
gamble-bennett@dol.gov @ inet
Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP@EOP
Richard L. Siewert/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jordan Tamagni/WHO/EOP@EOP
Beverly J. Barnes/WHO/EOP
Elizabeth R. Newman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julia M. Payne/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julianne B. Corbett/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey M. Smith/OSTP/EOP@EOP
Lowell A. Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan A. Kaplan/OPD/EOP@EOP
Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer Ferguson/OMB/EOP@EOP
Mark D. Neschis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Ruby Shamir/WHO/EOP@EOP
Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP@EOP
Amy Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lisa J. Levin/WHO/EOP@EOP
Peter A. Weissman/OPD/EOP@EOP
William A. Halter/OMB/EOP@EOP
Eli G. Attie/OVP@OVP
Patricia M. Ewing/OVP@OVP
Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa M. Murray/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan E. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP
Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anne M. Edwards/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael Waldman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gene B. Sperling/OPD/EOP@EOP
Paul K. Engskov/WHO/EOP@EOP
Laura D. Schwartz/WHO/EOP@EOP
Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julie E. Mason/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steven J. Naplan/NSC/EOP@EOP
Alison Muscatine/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gordon Li/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mark A. Kitchens/WHO/EOP@EOP
June Shih/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey A. Shesol/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rochester M. Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rachael E. Sullivan/OVP@OVP
Julie B. Goldberg/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sarah E. Gegenheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Susanna B. McGuire/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steve Ricchetti/WHO/EOP@EOP
Edward F. Hughes/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa J. Prober/WHO/EOP@EOP
Justin Coleman/WHO/EOP@EOP

Clara J. Shin/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan M. Prince/WHO/EOP@EOP
Joshua S. Gottheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Heather M. Riley/WHO/EOP@EOP
Alejandro G. Cabrera/OVP@OVP
Rebecca L. Walldorff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jon P. Jennings/WHO/EOP@EOP
Katharine Button/WHO/EOP@EOP
Tracy Pakulniewicz/WHO/EOP@EOP
James T. Heimbach/WHO/EOP@EOP
Victoria L. Valentine/WHO/EOP@EOP
James E. Kennedy/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael A. Hammer/NSC/EOP@EOP
Laura J. Lewis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Toby C. Graff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sean P. O'Shea/WHO/EOP@EOP
Thomas D. Janenda/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rajiv Y. Mody/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robin J. Bachman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Saladbar 23 <saladbar23 @ hotmail.com> @ inet
Kimberly S. Anderson/OA/EOP@EOP
Erica S. Lepping/WHO/EOP@EOP

----- Forwarded by Rajiv Y. Mody/WHO/EOP on 04/21/99
04:24 PM -----

Mark A. Kitchens
04/06/99 04:58:21 PM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: CNN Inside Politics, April 5, 1999

Inside Politics
Aired April 5, 1999 - 5:12 p.m. ET

GOP Presidential Candidate Lamar Alexander Expresses
his Opinion About NATO's Mission in the Balkans

WOODRUFF: Throughout the NATO mission in the Balkans, we
have
heard presidential hopefuls express their opinions about
the airstrikes, about
the president's performance and the possibility of
ground troops.

Joining us now with his views, GOP presidential
candidate Lamar
Alexander.

It turns out Governor Alexander, there is a broad spectrum of views among the candidates in your party, or presumed candidates in your party. Where do you fit in on this spectrum?

LAMAR ALEXANDER (R), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: I think there is talk about methods, not enough about objectives. We're all trying to be armchair generals saying no ground troops, ground troops.

The president go to Congress, make a speech to them, to the American people and define our objectives. He ought to say, when we started, we threatened to bomb this thug unless he would sign this agreement -- he didn't sign it. Then kept bombing to stop the atrocities. He kept going, so our objectives have now changed. Now we have to win, and by winning, I mean put the Kosovars back so they can live safely, and I'm asking Congress to let me have all of the authority I need in order to reach those objectives. In other words, make his objectives clear, be vague about his means -- not rule them in, not rule them out.

WOODRUFF: But if you're saying that the president should ask Congress for the authority to do whatever it takes, that by necessity is going to include ground troops -- is it not?

ALEXANDER: That's true. That is true. It could include ground troops. But we're least likely to use ground troops if Milosevic thinks we're most likely to do it. So while -- you know, this is much easier said than done; it will take two or three months. It's not easy in Albania and the other countries right there to have a staging area for that. In the meantime, we could continue with our airstrikes; we could train Kosovar insurgents, and perhaps we wouldn't have to use ground troops.

But we've got to fit our means to our ends, and the president has been vague on his objectives and clear on his means, and it should

have been the

reverse. WOODRUFF: Are you suggesting that in the middle of the all of this, the president should go to Congress? It seems the war is now under way, the NATO mission is now under way and you're saying it's almost as if the president should double back and talk to Congress.

ALEXANDER: I am indeed saying that, Judy, because otherwise we'll be sliding into a ground war without knowing what we're doing.

Look back at Somalia, 1992 and '93. There we went from a peace-keeping mission to a nation-building mission. We sent in an elite group of Americans to -- because our peace keepers were getting killed -- they were being ambushed -- they were stepping on land mines -- and our men and women got slaughtered and drug through the streets. We do not want to slide into a ground war, so the president should go before Congress and do just what you said. The objectives have changed -- I'm here to tell you that -- and to define what we're doing.

WOODRUFF: How is what you're saying different, for example, from what John McCain is saying, when he says "we need to do everything possible to win." It sounds to me as if that is about what you are saying.

ALEXANDER: We need to do everything -- I'm not sure what Senator McCain has said. I respect him for speaking out forcefully on the issue. What I'm saying is the president should admit that two weeks ago, our objectives were one thing, and today, they're another. And when you have different objectives, you have different methods, and the Congress would welcome that. I think Senator Lugar, Senator McCain and others would give the president the authority he needed to reach whatever the appropriate objectives are.

WOODRUFF: Some days ago, you were calling on the

president to
announce his exit strategy. Now the question about doing
that was: Do you
telegraph to the enemy to the other side during a
conflict like this what your
exit strategy is -- are you still arguing that, that
should be out there as well?

ALEXANDER: Yes he should. He should say -- for example,
Tony Blair
has been very specific -- more so than the president --
in saying to the
Kosovars, our promise to you is that we'll take you
home, and you can live
their peacefully. Now our exit strategy would be when
you are home, and
when you're living there peacefully, we get out. Now
that could be our exit
strategy -- the president should telegraph that.

What he should not telegraph is -- are the means that we
need to get there;
That's a matter between him and the joint chiefs; it's a
matter of tactics and
surprise. We don't need 400 armchair quarterbacks in
Washington D.C. and
around the country on television and off television
second-guessing this.

We ought to all agree on what the objectives are; the
Congress approves it;
and the military men and women tell him how to do it and
help him get it
done.

WOODRUFF: Lamar Alexander, thank you very much for
joining us.

ALEXANDER: Thank you, Judy.

WOODRUFF: I appreciate it.

END

Message Sent

To: _____

Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer M. Palmieri/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anthony R. Bernal/OVP@OVP
Melissa G. Green/OPD/EOP@EOP
Leslie Bernstein/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robin M. Roland/WHO/EOP@EOP
Chandler G. Spaulding/WHO/EOP@EOP

Dominique L. Cano/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dag Vega/WHO/EOP@EOP
Brenda M. Anders/WHO/EOP@EOP
gamble-bennett@dol.gov @ inet
Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP@EOP
Richard L. Siewert/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jordan Tamagni/WHO/EOP@EOP
Beverly J. Barnes/WHO/EOP
Elizabeth R. Newman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julia M. Payne/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julianne B. Corbett/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey M. Smith/OSTP/EOP@EOP
Lowell A. Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan A. Kaplan/OPD/EOP@EOP
Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer Ferguson/OMB/EOP@EOP
Mark D. Neschis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Ruby Shamir/WHO/EOP@EOP
Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP@EOP
Amy Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lisa J. Levin/WHO/EOP@EOP
Peter A. Weissman/OPD/EOP@EOP
William A. Halter/OMB/EOP@EOP
Eli G. Attie/OVP@OVP
Patricia M. Ewing/OVP@OVP
Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa M. Murray/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan E. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP
Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anne M. Edwards/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael Waldman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gene B. Sperling/OPD/EOP@EOP
Paul K. Engskov/WHO/EOP@EOP
Laura D. Schwartz/WHO/EOP@EOP
Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julie E. Mason/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steven J. Naplan/NSC/EOP@EOP
Alison Muscatine/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gordon Li/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mark A. Kitchens/WHO/EOP@EOP
June Shih/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey A. Shesol/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rochester M. Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rachael E. Sullivan/OVP@OVP
Julie B. Goldberg/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sarah E. Gegenheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Susanna B. McGuire/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steve Ricchetti/WHO/EOP@EOP
Edward F. Hughes/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa J. Prober/WHO/EOP@EOP
Justin Coleman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Clara J. Shin/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan M. Prince/WHO/EOP@EOP

Joshua S. Gottheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Heather M. Riley/WHO/EOP@EOP
Alejandro G. Cabrera/OVP@OVP
Rebecca L. Walldorff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jon P. Jennings/WHO/EOP@EOP
Katharine Button/WHO/EOP@EOP
Tracy Pakulniewicz/WHO/EOP@EOP
James T. Heimbach/WHO/EOP@EOP
Victoria L. Valentine/WHO/EOP@EOP
James E. Kennedy/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael A. Hammer/NSC/EOP@EOP
Laura J. Lewis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Toby C. Graff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sean P. O'Shea/WHO/EOP@EOP
Thomas D. Janenda/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rajiv Y. Mody/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robin J. Bachman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Saladbar 23 <saladbar23 @ hotmail.com> @ inet
Kimberly S. Anderson/OA/EOP@EOP
Erica S. Lepping/WHO/EOP@EOP

----- Forwarded by Rajiv Y. Mody/WHO/EOP on 04/21/99
04:24 PM -----

Mark A. Kitchens
04/06/99 04:58:24 PM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: PBS NewsHour, April 5, 1999

PBS NewsHour
Aired on April 5, 1999

NEWSMAKER: JAVIER SOLANA

NATO's Secretary General Javier Solana speaks with
Jim Lehrer
about air strikes in Yugoslavia.

JIM LEHRER: A newsmaker
interview with NATO
Secretary General Javier
Solana. I talked with him late
this morning, Eastern daylight
time.

JIM LEHRER: Mr. Secretary-General, welcome.

JAVIER SOLANA: Good morning. How are you?

JIM LEHRER: Fine, sir. Sir, in general terms, what has the NATO air campaign accomplished thus far?

JAVIER SOLANA: The NATO campaign is going according to plans. We have had some days of bad weather that has prevented to achieve all the objectives.

In

general terms, the campaign is going as was defined and as planned.

JIM LEHRER: What has it accomplished?

JAVIER SOLANA: Well, it has accomplished -- is in the first phase, as you know, it was basically to damage the

air

defenses of the country. And the second phase started a few days ago to try to damage as much as possible the war machine of Milosevic, the war machine of the Serbian army and the Serbian police.

JIM LEHRER: Now, when you say it's gone has planned, the large-scale exodus by the ethnic Albanians was not part of the plan, was it?

JAVIER SOLANA: Our responsibility was to try to stop the criminal activity of Milosevic. As you know, this criminal activity was planned way before our first air strike.

In fact, the air strike was a response to the behavior President Milosevic has been planning for months and this criminal behavior. The question of the exodus of refugees is nothing which is dramatically new, unfortunately. It has been taking place for months. It is true that the last few days the behavior

of

Milosevic has achieved levels of criminality that no

rational

man could have believed. And that is why the exodus has increased in numbers, and that is why the alliance and all the allied countries are doing its utmost to stop this massacre first and then to help the consequences of the massacre of Milosevic; therefore, we have at this point two objectives: first, to do as much damage as possible to the war machinery; and second, to help as much as possible the consequences of massacres which are the refugees.

What is NATO doing about refugees?

JIM LEHRER: All right, now, the refugee camp now, there are some figures

out today, 44,000, another
44,000 left yesterday, is
that correct?

JAVIER SOLANA: Well,
the figures that are produced by the Organization of the
UN are more or less like that. I would not be prepared at
this point to be precise on the figures. The figures are

being

given by the UNHCR, the agents of refugees, but,
unfortunately, more or less, are like the ones you have

just

given.

JIM LEHRER: Yes. But your spokesman, the NATO
Spokesman, Jamie Shea, said this morning that 360,000,
an estimated 360,000 ethnic Albanians have left Kosovo in
the last two weeks since the bombing began, is that, that's
a correct figure?

JAVIER SOLANA: It, more or less - more or less, that is
the figure we have on this point, although it's very

difficult

to be absolutely precise. The basic counting and the basic
figures are provided by the agents of refugees of the UN,
but, more or less, are the same that we have at this point,
yes.

JIM LEHRER: Now, NATO is stepping in, as you said, to
try to assist these refugees. Specifically, what is NATO
going to do about it?

JAVIER SOLANA: What NATO is now going to do it is
already doing. As you know, we have troops deployed
already in Macedonia; we are going to deploy troops in
this very moment in Albania to do whatever we can; we
are not going to spare any effort to put all the military
capabilities that we have to the service of the

humanitarian

relief. NATO and NATO countries are doing the utmost
with no spare effort to help the humanitarian catastrophe
that we cannot forget had been created by Milosevic's
behavior.

JIM LEHRER: And that includes, does it not, taking some
of those refugees from Macedonia and Albania to other
countries nearby, is that correct?

JAVIER SOLANA: Well, as you know, many, many
countries, not only countries that belong to NATO, but
also partner countries, are offering their possibility of
receiving in their countries some refugees. Now, we would
like to have as much as possible to help - in particular

the

Macedonian government - to handle the humanitarian crisis, and, therefore, some of these refugees will be good to take into other countries, but the principle that we'd

like

to defend as much as possible is that these refugees do have the right to return to their homes, to return to their country, and, therefore, we would not like to see these refugees going very far away from the region where they should return. So this is the violence we want to strike,

to

relax the situation in Macedonia and Albania, but at the same time have the commitment, the guarantee that these people had the right in the international community obligation to allow them to return to his country.

JIM LEHRER: You use the word "guarantee." NATO will guarantee that these folks will be allowed or will be able

to

return to Kosovo?

JAVIER SOLANA: It is my point that the international community, of course, including NATO, should guarantee that these people that have been forced out of their country by the criminal

atrocities of Milosevic to have the guarantee that they can return as they so wish to their country. Yes.

JIM LEHRER: And that is now one of the priority goals of the NATO operation?

JAVIER SOLANA: Well, at this point, the priority goal is double - as far as the consequences of the Milosevic actions, they are for the refugees to help them as much as possible, with all our capabilities, capabilities of NATO, the capabilities of the NATO countries, and capabilities, also, of the organization of the United Nations, UNHCR, the European Union, the OSCE, all the international communities together in a very well coordinated manner that had started two days ago here in Brussels. And, of course, here at the same time we are going to continue striking to damage the machinery of criminal - the criminal machinery that Milosevic has put forward to really kill and expel the thousands and thousands of people from Kosovo.

Air strikes alone?

JIM LEHRER: And you believe that can - you still believe that can be done by air strikes alone?

JAVIER SOLANA: I think that is absolutely necessary to continue with the air campaign, and the air campaign is what can really damage at this point in a more important manner the capabilities that the Serb army and the paramilitary forces do have. That is our opinion. That is

the

opinion of all the countries that belong to NATO, and we have to succeed with the air campaign to stop - and I would like to say a behavior that nobody could have even thought in the most difficult nights of nightmare - the behavior of somebody like President Milosevic at the end of the 20th century.

JIM LEHRER: As you know, Mr. Secretary-General, here in the United States, at least, the debate has gone beyond that, that former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, among others, said on this program Friday night, for instance, that victory is the only alternative for NATO and whatever it takes. Ground forces, in addition to air strikes, victory must be attained by NATO. Do you agree with that as a general premise?

JAVIER SOLANA: I agree. I agree completely that victory is the only outcome, and victory not only for NATO, victory for the values that we want to defend, the countries that belong to NATO, the people of the countries that belong to NATO, and many other citizens of the world that cannot live with this behavior of somebody in the European territory at the end of the 20th century; therefore, victory is the only thing, the only exit of this conflict, and victory means to uphold the values that civilized people in the world want to have as we enter into the 21st century. Yes, I agree with that.

JIM LEHRER: Now, Winston Churchill, who is the grandson of "the" Winston Churchill, the prime minister of Great Britain in World War II, the grandson was a member of the parliament in Britain, wrote a piece that appeared in the "Wall Street Journal" here in the United States, and let me read you how it ends: "The sooner that the alliance's" - he's talking about NATO - "The sooner the alliance's political leadership recognizes that the operations in Yugoslavia must now enter the phase of ground warfare and that Kosovo will ultimately become a free, independent nation the sooner the bloodshed and suffering will be ended." Is he right?

JAVIER SOLANA: Well, I have great respect for what he represents and his thinking, but at this point the countries that belong to NATO, they have a slight different approach. And

the approach is that at this point we are not in the position to deploy troops at this point to the ground; we want first to have all the air campaign finished, to try to have a cease-fire, and, therefore, after that to deploy the troops, which are already prepared, already prepared to guarantee that, among other things, that the refugees return to their country, if they so wish. As far as the final stages of Kosovo, the only position, the common position of the international community on this point is what was agreed in the Rambouillet Agreement, or in the measures in the Rambouillet Agreement, and it goes through in the direction of a very profound self-government for Kosovo, and not any other - any other position has been taken by the international community. But it's true that the

evolution

of the situation on the ground, the behavior of President Milosevic is so dramatic that there may be an event that we will have to think about some other alternative. At this point, the agreement that was signed by the Kosovars in Rambouillet should be the basis of the discussions for a final solution to the crisis.

Are you surprised?

JIM LEHRER: You were, of course, involved in all of the discussions that led up to the decision to launch this air strike campaign. Are you personally surprised or whatever word you would want to use here about the fact that Milosevic continues to do what he's been doing in spite of the NATO air attacks after almost two weeks now?

JAVIER SOLANA: Well, I'm not surprised at what Milosevic is doing. I've been involved in the crisis in the Balkans since 1992. I know fairly well what has been the war in Bosnia, the behavior of President Milosevic, and in the war against Croatia and the war against Bosnia - we cannot forget that Milosevic is not a new personality in

this

crisis in the Balkans. What he is doing now is something that goes beyond anybody could have imagined, the behavior, the cruelty, the manner in which he is deporting people, that is what it is - it's a deportation of people,

of

people of his country - it's something that to me probably is the only small surprise that I've had. How much cruelty could be in somebody at the turn of the century?

JIM LEHRER: Mr. Secretary-General, one

decision-making question, the United States has offered to send 25 Apache helicopters to the NATO force to assist in attacks on Serb ground forces, tanks, et cetera, that there seems to be some confusion about whether NATO wants to use these helicopters or the ambassadors, having made a political decision yet. Can you clarify where matters stand on the helicopters?

JAVIER SOLANA: Yes. I would like to, with pleasure. Of course, we welcome very much the commitment of the American people, the administration, President Clinton, to continue to providing the help through new assets, assets that will be very, very important to do what we want to do, to damage as much as possible the war machinery of President Milosevic; therefore, we welcome very much all the NATO countries, we welcome very much the decision of the American administration, and President Clinton. Yes, we welcome very much.

JIM LEHRER: Has the decision been made whether or not to use these 25 helicopters? Has NATO accepted the offer, in other words?

JAVIER SOLANA: The decision has been made - a decision has been made. We are at this moment in consultations with the government as to whether the helicopters will be deployed, and in a question of minutes I would say the answer will be given, but I can tell you that everybody, it looks - this decision of President Clinton with great satisfaction.

JIM LEHRER: But the Albanian government you're referring to specifically, that's where they'd be used, correct?

JAVIER SOLANA: Yes.

JIM LEHRER: All right. But, in other words, there's no problem -

JAVIER SOLANA: Yes.

JIM LEHRER: There's no problem here, right? In other words, those helicopters aren't going to be used -

JAVIER SOLANA: No. On the contrary. Right. On the contrary, there's very, very profound gratitude for the contribution and assets of your government.

JIM LEHRER: Okay. Because the question has been raised

about why were ambassadors
and political people making
decisions that were basically
military decisions, but that's not
a problem?

JAVIER SOLANA: No, not at all. The only political
decision that has to be taken and has already been taken is
a decision about allowing military assets to belong to the
NATO countries - in this particular case to your country -
to be deployed in countries which are not NATO
members. That is the only decision that has to be taken; it
has already been taken.

introduction
JIM LEHRER: Now, should that be read as - some
people are reading it here as a step toward the
of ground forces - should that be read that way?

your
JAVIER SOLANA: Well, I don't think that this is
interpretation - the correct interpretation. I think that
administration, the American administration explained very
clearly yesterday that this is a new asset to be provided
in
order to achieve the same objective, the objective of
damaging and destroying, if possible, the military machine.
At the level we are now after several days of air
campaign,
it could be of great help to have these new assets, Apache
helicopters, to continue in the same mission - destroying
and damaging as much as possible the machinery of
Milosevic.

and
JIM LEHRER: Back to the general and finally, Mr.
Secretary-General, is there any question in your mind that
the 19 members of the NATO alliance have the
wherewithal and the will to see this thing through to a
conclusion that will, in fact, do all the things that you
others have outlined?

JAVIER SOLANA: I can tell
you that I chair the North
Atlantic Council every day,
and some days I share two
meetings, and I can tell you
that all the countries, the 19
allies at this point, are
absolutely together, behind the decision that we had taken
several days ago, and they are absolutely determined to
see this through to the victory.

JIM LEHRER: Mr. Secretary-General, thank you very

much.

JAVIER SOLANA: Thank you very much.

JIM LEHRER: And since that interview this morning, Solana did receive preliminary approval from Albania to deploy those Apache helicopters, NATO officials told the NewsHour. And the first airlift of Kosovo refugees took place. Hundreds were flown to Turkey.

END Segment One

SEEKING REFUGE
Aired on April 5, 1999

As refugees continue to flow across the borders, NATO decided to relocate 100,000 of them. Margaret Warner talks with Brian Atwood of AID, Karen Abuzayd of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and Bill Frelick from the U.S. Committee for Refugees.

JIM LEHRER: And more now on that Kosovo refugee story. Tim Ewart of Independent Television News begins.

TIM EWART: This is the border between Kosovo and Macedonia, a vision more hellish with every passing day. The Macedonian government now estimates that 115,000 people are trying to cross, people they don't want,

refugees who they say should be NATO's problem. The first group of refugees were at last allowed to move to a camp run by NATO forces. As British soldiers handed out food, there was anger at what many see as Macedonian indifference. Four thousand people are in the care of NATO tonight, their suffering alleviated, although far from over. This camp is at last offering shelter to some of the refugees. It's a start, albeit a small one. But across

those

hills on the border with Kosovo, there remain scenes of almost unimaginable misery. The days ahead here are awful to contemplate. NATO countries are talking of airlifts on the clogged roads out of Kosovo; that seems

like

a distant dream.

The relocation effort.

JIM LEHRER: And Margaret Warner takes it from there.

MARGARET WARNER: Three perspectives now on NATO's decision to relocate some 100,000 ethnic Albanian refugees. Brian Atwood is head of the Agency for International Development or AID. President Clinton just named him to coordinate the US refugee rescue effort. Karen AbuZayd is head of the US regional office for the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, which will help coordinate the relocation program. And Bill Frelick, senior policy analyst at the U.S. Committee for Refugees, a private, non-profit group.

MARGARET WARNER:
Brian Atwood, starting with
you, give us a sense of how
this program is going to
work. How soon will we see
it on a really massive scale?
How long will it take to
move 100,000 refugees?

BRIAN ATWOOD: Well, it started today. And let me say
at the outset that this is not the kind of a program that

we

like to run. The relocation effort is a temporary one, and these people will be temporarily relocated. They all want to go home. And we expect that they will be going home. The problem is, as you just saw on your show, this is a very serious tragedy on the border of Macedonia. We want to get access to those refugees. The Macedonian government is obviously very sensitive about all of these people coming into their country. Clearly their infrastructure is overwhelmed but there are political ramifications as well. So, we have been negotiating with the Macedonian government. Yesterday, Strobe Talbot and Julia Taft were there, and I believe we're beginning to see some relief.

MARGARET WARNER: Explain Strobe Talbot and Julia Taft, both senior -

BRIAN ATWOOD: That's the Deputy Secretary of State
and Julia Taft is the head of the refugee office at the

State

Department. Today we saw approximately 10,000 people leave this no man's land, as we come to call it, and we're beginning to see some relief there.

MARGARET WARNER: You're talking about now just
leaving this sort of, as you said, no man's land that's on

the

border, and they actually were moved into Macedonia.