

Aristide said that "If Jesus was so angry when he entered the temple that he took up a whip, turned over the tables and talked harshly to the hypocrites, all the more reason for us to do so who are Jesus' servants." For this man to compare himself to Jesus is disgustingly blasphemous.

Aristide opposes every principle for which our country stands. For the United States to spend over \$2 billion in taxpayer dollars to prop up this man is unconscionable.

Mr. President, Aristide threatened to send a flood of refugees to the United States if additional millions of the American citizens' dollars are denied him. And the Clinton administration has capitulated to this blackmail. But this Senator, for one, cannot stomach using U.S. tax money to sponsor a tyrant who has demonstrated no concern for justice or democracy.

If the December 17 elections proceed, Aristide's hand-picked successor, Rene Preval, will almost certainly win, inasmuch as 10 of the 12 largest political parties are boycotting the election. Aristide declares that he and Preval are twins—an allusion to their ideological similarity. It is, to be sure, an indication of what a Preval president will be.

The deteriorating situation in Haiti is clear: Unless Aristide and his successor fulfill their promises to the Haitian people, to the United States Government, and to the international community, neither United States troops nor additional billions of United States taxpayers' dollars can ever bring democracy to Haiti.

BOSNIA

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have spoken several times on the Senate floor about the situation in Bosnia. Just last night, the Senate voted in support of our troops.

Time and again, I have listened to Senators cite the amount of phone calls and letters they have received from their constituents both for and against sending American ground troops to Bosnia.

I, too, have heard from a number of Vermonters about this issue. Over the past several weeks, opponents of President Clinton's Bosnia policy have outnumbered supporters by a 3 to 1 margin.

I think it is appropriate, however, that on the day the Bosnian peace agreement is signed in Paris, I share with the Senate a letter I received from my friend, Colonel R.W. van de Velde USA (Ret.).

I ask unanimous consent to insert his letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD after my statement and yield the floor.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 15, 1995. R.W. van de Velde Ridge Road, RR 2 Cornwall Middlebury, Vermont 05753

TO THE EDITOR: It is unfortunate, but foreign policy is paid attention to by other nations only when it has economic or military clout. It would be a nicer world if some other reason, such as logic or kindness, had similar clout, but in a world of humans rather than of angels, that is very rarely the case.

So when the President of the United States says the military must be used, he is backing up policy with muscle. Sometimes the mere threat of that kind of muscle is enough. The situation in the Balkans surely has gone beyond that possibility.

It is also a fact of life that a leader, or a nation that will not lead is bound to lose his or its ability to lead.

It is another truth that whether we like it or not, the world looks on the United States for leadership. We are the richest and strongest in the world in peace as well as war. We are a peaceful people, but we maintain a well trained and well equipped military force; and it is all volunteer. There is no draft—no unfairness—everyone in the military service of this Nation is a person who chose that service presumably with his/her eyes open and mindful that there might someday be some dangers, some risks, to life and limb. How we, a nation, got the notion that military force can be exerted without risk, I don't understand.

Let us not be "skeptical" or fearful of using our military strength when we can't do otherwise. Anyone who says "let Europeans clean up their own mess" simply does not understand the condition of Europe or the Balkans. Both need American leadership and strength, and so do we if we are to continue as the ideal of what a big nation should be.

R.W. VAN DE VELDE
Colonel, U.S. Army (Ret.).

NOTE

(In the RECORD of December 12, 1995, beginning on page S18387, an improper version of the statement by Senator COHEN was reflected. The permanent RECORD will be changed to reflect the following correct statement.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I have lamented on a number of occasions the erosion of civility in our public discourse. This is a trend that has had a negative impact on our politics and on the relationship between the government and the citizenry. The heightened level of rhetoric, the slash-and-burn tactics, and the accusations of bad faith, have made it more difficult for politicians to communicate with each other and to communicate with those we represent. It has made it more difficult for reasonable people to reach agreement and far too easy for unreasonable voices to dominate the debate.

The breakdown in the tone of our discourse is symptomatic of a wider problem which many have described as a deterioration of civil society. Our civil society is the collection of public and private institutions, and accepted moral principles, that bind us together as a community of citizens. Civil society is what makes us a nation of community, rather than merely a group with common voting rights.

There is abundant evidence that our civil society is fraying around the edges. People lack faith in the capacity

of government to act in the interest of the people. There is a growing lack of confidence in our public schools—one of the great unifying forces in our country. Americans are less engaged in fewer communal activities than we once were. We are much more apt to stay at home to rent a video, communicate on the faceless Internet, or channel-surf on cable TV, than we are to attend a PTA meeting, march in a parade—or even join a bowling league, as one Harvard professor's study revealed.

It is against this background that today we consider the constitutional amendment to prohibit desecration of the U.S. flag. The argument for protecting the flag is a weighty one: The U.S. flag is a unique symbol of our nationhood. When our troops go to battle to fight for our Nation, they march under the banner of the flag; each day when our children go to school, they pledge allegiance to the flag; when a national leader or world dignitary dies, the flag is flown at half mast; when one of our athletes wins a gold medal at the Olympic Games, the flag of the United States is raised; when a soldier or police officer dies, his or her coffin is draped with the flag; when immigrants are naturalized, they salute to the flag.

In this diverse Nation, respect for the flag is a common bond that brings us together as a nation. Our common reverence for the flag is part of what makes us citizens of a country, not just individuals that happen to live in the same geographic area.

There is also no denying that when the flag is burned, desecrated, despoiled, or trampled upon, the potency of the flag as a symbol is denigrated. When the flag is burned, whether by Iranian fundamentalists during the hostage crisis or by American protestors here at home, we are rightly outraged because these acts represent a direct affront to our Nation. By tolerating flag desecration, we are condoning actions that undermine the fabric of our national life.

Critics of the flag amendment have reminded us that because flags owned by the Government are still protected under current law, this amendment will only restrict what individuals can do with flags that they own personally. But the flag is not a mere piece of property like a car or television, it is more than the fabric and dye and stitching that make it up. The design of the American flag and the values it represents belong to all of us; in a sense, it is community property. We the people maintain part ownership of that flag and should be able to control how our property may be treated.

This is not a very radical principle. Federal law already controls what we can or cannot do with our own money. Anyone that mutilates, cuts, defaces, disfigures, or perforates a dollar bill can be fined or put in jail for 6 months. Similarly, in O'Brien versus United States the Supreme Court upheld the