

Richard Brookhiser is senior editor of National Review.

3. Mr. Quayle knows it's a big, and of cop-show violence on his kids, every aging rock critic who credits El-

# Over a Barrel in Yugoslavia

By David C. Hendrickson

**A** COLORADO SPRINGS, Colo. America faces a dilemma in its policy toward Yugoslavia. The Administration is committed to aims that can be achieved only through the use of large-scale force. Yet it draws back in horror from sending in American combat troops. The Bush Administration finds itself at the same impasse for which it ridiculed the Europeans — feeble and ineffective attempts to end the slaughter — yet with no apparent way out. The use of American military force, implied by Administration threats last month, will not resolve the dilemma. The Administration's subsequent rejection of force was sound.

The evil we pose no threat to our security interests. The main argument of advocates of intervention — that it would prevent ethnic violence from spiraling out of control in Eurasia — is an excellent reason for not intervening. Intervention would tie the use of our military power to goals that are more grandiose than those proclaimed in the new world order and that are far beyond our capacity to attain.

We have trouble enough reconciling majority claims and minority rights at home. It is an illusion to believe we have a duty or right to resolve by force such conflicting claims throughout the world. The case for intervention — if there is one — must rest on humanitarian grounds. But it is doubtful that such involvement could remain limited or, if limited, be effective. Instead of stopping the war, intervention may escalate it. It may even compound injustice by driving the Serbs who live in Bosnia from their homes.

It would be wiser for the administration to reconsider the objectives it has embraced. They require that Belgrade "promote an immediate ceasefire, disarm and disarm elements of the Yugoslavian Army inert, and force the displacement of ethnic groups, disarm all irregular forces and grant free access for United Nations and other humanitarian agencies."

These objectives assume that the conflict is a simple case of aggression. David C. Hendrickson is author (with Robert W. Tucker) of "The Imperial Temptation."



sion by Serbia against Bosnia and Herzegovina. The reality is more complex. What Raymond Aron said of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict may be said of the conflict among Serbs, Croats and Muslims: They "cannot form a

## U.S. goals require force. But force could backfire.

single collectivity and cannot occupy the same territory: One or the other is doomed to injustice." The unpalatable truth is that each party has reason to fear the others. Haunted by memories of atrocities, each has plausible claims to the disputed territories. Under these circumstances, the Serbs' insistence that they have a right to carve out autonomous republics in Croatia, and Bosnia and Herzegovina is difficult to rebut. The counter-argument that it is

dangerous to change borders to defend the rights of ethnic minorities is no doubt true. But the legitimacy of doing so was conceded when we recognized the secessionist claims of Slovenia, Croatia and Bosnia.

Characterization of the conflict as pure Serbian aggression is not only misleading but also creates an obstacle to effective outside mediation. Such mediation should be based on the principle that the most feasible resolution to the conflict is the partitioning of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Rather than attempt to reverse the "ethnic purifications" conducted by all sides, we should acknowledge that the old pattern of living side by side is no longer a plausible basis for a settlement. The goal should be not to deny due to the autonomous objectives they want or a Greater Serbia but to contract Serb borders so that Croats and Bosnian Muslims also have the basis of viable states. Though the difficulty of drawing new borders minimally acceptable to all sides should not be underestimated, such an approach offers the best chance of stopping the fighting and bringing the parties to a settlement. □

all. Not surprisingly, since politicians and commentators are typically middle class or richer, and can only talk about the poor from hearsay. Still, let's listen to him and see if we recognize ourselves. "The responsibility of having families," said the Vice President, "has helped many [baby boomers] recover traditional values. And, of course, the great majority of those in the middle class survived the turbulent legacy of the 60's and 70's. But many of the poor, with less to fall back on, did not."

For decades now, young suburbanites have been projecting their own desires onto the poor, who are supposed to be more "authentic," and romanticize the images they have created. When the middle-class kid decides his vocation in an alternative life style is over, he or she can usually arrange re-entry to the bourgeois world. But for the poor, the slippery slope from respectability can plunge rather rapidly to welfare dependency, gangs, death. No one needs bourgeois values more than project dwellers, because they are the only ticket out.

Values are everyone's problem. As a professional politician, the Vice President lives by identifying enemies and rallying supporters, and so it wasn't surprising — particularly in an election year — that his discussion of values quickly became an attack on "the cultural elite." This is an old theme in American politics: elite — slave owners, bankers, pointy-headed intellectuals — are bad, while the people are virtuous.

When Mr. Quayle spoke this week in New York, though, he was asked why large audiences watch sitcoms mocking their values. How can pop culture be attacked as elitist? He gave a surprisingly honest answer: "I'd like to think about it." We all ought to think about it, including those of us who may say we support "traditional values." Millions have told us different story. Thank you, Mr. Vice President, for reminding us. □

simultaneously pressing for dramatic arms reduction and withdrawal of imperial forces. The new softliners say: Don't help the Russians until we have helped ourselves.

In his dramatic descent on Washington this week, the bold and ebullient Boss Yeltsin put the heat on the new softliners.

First he proved he had the political muscle to cross the arms-control fubicon and put an end to the fear of a first strike. Soviet SS-18

## Help Yeltsin now; no 'second try.'

land-based MIRV's kept the world on edge for decades. In return, we gave up bargaining-chip land missiles and only half our submarine MIRV's.

Mr. Yeltsin was aware that this agreement, measured by the old callipers, gave the U.S. a strategic advantage. But his new callipers are more realistic: the U.S., which could have ruled the world when it had a nuclear monopoly, proved that it has no such designs. In reality, by giving up his ability to launch a devastating first blow, Yeltsin gave up no Russian security at all.

Second, he showed an ability to improvise under unexpected pressure, which is the mark of the master statesman.

He had concentrated on making the arms deal and lobbying for the Freedom Support Act, which would give him economic breathing room. But he had not foreseen the impact of an afterthought: his revelation that he had discovered evidence of missing Americans in the K.G.B. archives. (They cannot be, as speculated, U-2 pilots, for C.I.A. insists that only Francis Gary Powers was downed.) To Yeltsin's dismay, this became a

hire back to his family." Brought the house down. Then he out in the embarrassing zinger: "So now you are telling me, first do the job, and then we shall support you if passing that act. I don't quite understand you."

That changed the political mood. Afterward, Senator McCain went to him, was personally reassured, and withdrew his opposition. Yeltsin's improvisation worked.

Now remains the opposition of the softliners led by House Speaker Tom Foley. He is fearful of the selfish, isolationist sentiment of many voters about foreign aid. Nor is he alone; it took Richard Nixon (now touring Russia to escape Watergate anniversary orgies) to pressure George Bush to propose to join the Western salvator package.

Are Democrats to be the new softliners? Or will Bill Clinton exercise party leadership and persuade Congressional Democrats to invest a few billions now — to avert the need for trillions in armaments tomorrow if democracy in Russia fails?

Let's hope so; we won't get much help from controversy-averse Ross Perot (who just canceled his date with Congress to discuss M.I.A.'s, fearful of being asked under oath about his business expedition to the Vietnamese). This is the time for a prattle in courage from Mr. Clinton: not just a pious statement, but some responsible arm-twisting.

Give Mr. Bush and James Baker good marks on the arms deal, preserving the timetable can be speeded and that S.D.I. cooperation was not neglected. The new hard-liners hope Bush also pressed the need to get Russian troops out of the Baltics and K.C.B. agents out of Washington.

And give more than a grudging salute to Boris Yeltsin. He left us with a profound thought to chew over: "Today, the freedom of America is being upheld in Russia." By helping freedom there, we advance it here. □

# A net gain

As an oil company, we get lots of letters from environmentalists—some of them are even complimentary. Recently, we got a whole slew of letters from some relatively young environmentalists—second-graders to be exact.

and wildlife and the earth we all share. After all, Mobil is made up of people, tens of thousands of them and their families, who breathe the same air, drink the same water, and share the same concern for the overall quality of life. If our people didn't feel this way, they would be shortchanging their own children.

They were forwarded to Mobil's chair-