International Affairs Budget, FY 2000

Testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Washington, DC, April 15, 1999.

Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee. I am pleased to be here, although I must say that if I had my choice of dates to come and ask you for money, I'm not sure I would have picked April 15. You have my written statement, which I urge you to review. It covers important subjects and parts of the world that I will not be able to discuss orally and still honor your time for questions.

Mr. Chairman, events of the past year, especially in the Balkans, the Gulf, A sia, and A frica, illustrate the range of perils that exist as we approach the new century. I come before this subcommittee in search of the resources and tools we need to respond to those perils and to seize opportunities for ensuring our security, promoting our prosperity and upholding our values.

This subcommittee has generally supported adequate funding for international programs, and for that, I salute you. However, this year the proposed Congressional Budget Resolution would require a reduction of 15% in the amount requested by the President for international affairs. This is tantamount to the surrender of A merican leadership around the world. Anyone who says we should do more to counter terror, or fight drugs, or halt proliferation, or promote A merican exports, or prevent the abuse of human rights should agree that it is not possible to accomplish any of these goals without resources.

This is not a partisan issue. The call for a strong U.S. foreign policy comes from leaders in both parties. So I hope that we can work together, Mr. Chairman, not only on our overall FY 2000 request for international affairs, but also on our supplemental request for Jordan and to aid the recovery of hurricane victims in Central America and the Caribbean. And we need to find a way to do this without raiding other priority programs. In addition, the President will submit shortly an emergency supplemental request to cover costs related to the crisis in Kosovo.

This request will include funds for lifesaving humanitarian relief, assistance to the embattled front-line states, and other urgent requirements. If ever there were an emergency, Mr. Chairman, this is one. We are not in this alone, for we have friends in Europe and elsewhere who are providing large quantities of help. But we must do our part. So I will be urging the subcommittee's support for prompt action on the portions of the request that will fall within your jurisdiction. I also ask your support for our policy on Kosovo, for we are confronting an outrage we cannot accept and only we and our allies have the muscle to oppose.

President Milosevic has unleashed a rampage of ethnic cleansing and genocide directed at the expulsion or total submission of the Kosovo A lbanian community.

We have all seen the images of families uprooted and put on trains, children crying for parents they cannot find, refugees recounting how their loved ones were led away, and ominous photos from the sky of freshly upturned earth.

Behind these images is a reality grimmer than any seen in Europe in more than half a century. And make no mistake, this campaign of terror was not the result of NATO action; it is a Milosevic production.

The regionwide killing, raping, shelling, burning, and deporting were as meticulously planned as they are being ruthlessly carried out. That is why force became NATO's only option after the diplomatic solution we offered and reoffered at Rambouillet was rejected over and over again by Belgrade.

Today, our values and principles, our perseverance and our strength, are being tested. We must be united at home and with our allies overseas. We must do all we can to ease the suffering of refugees and other victims. We must and will persist in gathering evidence and documenting the truth to help the war crimes tribunal hold perpetrators accountable. And while continuing to strive to minimize civilian casualties, we must strike and strike again until an outcome that meets the demands of the international community is achieved.

These demands are as simple as they are just. There must be a verifiable stop to Serb military action against the people of Kosovo. Belgrade's military, police, and paramilitary forces must leave so that refugees can return safely. An international military presence must be permitted. And the people of Kosovo must be given the democratic self-

government they have long deserved. In addition, as President Clinton has made clear, we insist that the three A merican soldiers now in the custody of Belgrade be released immedi-

ately and without conditions.

The current crisis highlights the need to integrate the Balkans more fully into the Euro-A tlantic community of democracies. We have made a start in this direction, but one outcome of the current fighting must be a comprehensive, multiyear, multinational approach. We do not want this conflict to serve as a prelude to others. In the weeks ahead, we will be consulting with you and working with regional leaders, our allies, and international financial institutions to develop a strategy for bringing Europe's southeast corner into the continent's mainstream.

As we look ahead, we know that the prospects for long-term peace in Europe also depend on the success of democracy in the Baltics, Ukraine, Russia, the Caucasus, and Central Asia. For this reason, I strongly urge your backing for the SEED and Freedom Support A ct programs.

These democracy-building initiatives are good investments. A lready, a number of countries have graduated and no longer need our aid. But the region is vast and the dangers posed by corruption, criminals, and communist backsliders are great. We need your help in funding these initiatives fully and flexibly so that the forces of freedom may be bolstered and their enemies held at bay.

Our efforts to promote lasting stability across Europe are mirrored in our own hemisphere through the Summit of the Americas process. Here our challenge is to translate the promise of reform into the reality of

"These democracy-building initiatives are good investments. . . We need your help in funding these initiatives fully and flexibly so that the forces of freedom may be bolstered and their enemies held at bay."

> prosperity that is broadly shared, and to strengthen fragile democratic institutions. One major test is in Colombia, where we are committed to helping President Pastrana re-establish the rule of law and secure a future of peace for his people.

Similarly, in A sia, we are working with allies and partners to improve security cooperation, restore economic momentum, and build democracy. In this region, there is no greater threat to peace and stability than the situation on the Korean Peninsula. With our Korean and Japanese allies, and China, we are seeking ways to reduce tensions.

To this end, we have vigorously pressed our concerns about North Korea's long-range missile program. We have reached an agreement that will allow U.S. inspection of suspicious underground construction at Kumchang-ni. And we continue to insist that North Korea meet its obligations under the Agreed Framework. That Framework succeeded in freezing North Korea's plutonium production and separation facilities at Yongbyon and in bringing those facilities under rigorous IA EA monitoring. Pursuant to the Framework, those facilities will eventually be dismantled and the nuclear fuel shipped out of North Korea.

As long as North Korea is abiding by its terms, our support for the Framework is vital. I urge members to provide that support by approving the President's request for \$55 million for the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization.

Meanwhile, former Secretary of Defense William Perry is conducting a comprehensive review of the U.S. approach to North Korea. He is seeking

> extensive input from the Congress and is working closely with our allies. He will complete his recommendations later this spring. A lso in East A sia, we have continued our strategic dialogue with China. Since that

dialogue began, China

has taken positive steps on proliferation, moved ahead on economic reform, and played a responsible role during the A sia financial crisis. We need to recognize this progress, even as we press for more.

During Premier Zhu Rongji's visit to Washington last week, President Clinton raised matters where the U.S. and China disagree. These include our decision this year to pursue vigorously a China-specific resolution at the UN Human Rights Commission. This reflects our condemnation of widespread human rights violations, including the arrests of Chinese who sought peacefully to establish an opposition political party.

Before and during Premier Zhu's visit, significant progress was made toward an agreement that would allow China's accession to the World Trade Organization on commercially viable terms. Because such an agreement would clearly benefit U.S. interests, we will resume negotiations later this month in an effort to resolve remaining issues.

As I have said before, in our relations with China, engagement is not endorsement. We continue to have sharp differences with Beijing. But we also believe that the way to narrow those differences, and to take advantage of the many areas where U.S. and Chinese interests coincide, is through debate and dialogue.

In the Middle East, we continue to work with regional leaders on behalf of peace. We are in regular contact with Israeli and Palestinian officials, encouraging them to carry out the Wye River Memorandum. We have expressed our support and friendship to Jordan's new King A bdullah, and we consult frequently with leaders in Egypt.

As we pursue our diplomatic efforts, I hope we can count on the subcommittee's backing for those programs that help our partners and support the peace process.

In the Gulf, we have responded to flagrant Iraqi violations with forceful measures to reduce the aggressive potential of the Baghdad regime. We continue to defend pilots patrolling the no-fly zones and to work with the Security Council to develop a basis for resuming inspection and monitoring of Iraq's remaining WMD capabilities. Our policy is to counter the threat Saddam Hussein poses to Iraq's neighbors, our allies, and our interests—and to support the Iraqi people's desire to reintegrate themselves internationally and free themselves from a leader they do not want, do not deserve, and never chose.

Mr. Chairman, the new century will demand from us a fresh approach to the dangers and opportunities of Africa. Today, with regional leaders, we are searching for ways to end bloody conflicts from the Sudan and Horn of Africa to the Congo and Sierra Leone. However, these immediate crises must not cause us to neglect long-term goals. I urge your backing for our efforts to assist the fragile transition to democracy in Nigeria, to help extend the rule of law throughout the continent, and to advance the essential human goal of sustainable development.

Mr. Chairman, many of the measures we take to protect American security and prosperity are directed at particular countries or parts of the world. But others can best be considered in global terms. These include our international economic leadership; the war against terror, drugs, and crime; and initiatives to promote democracy and human rights. They also include our strategy for safeguarding American security by preventing weapons of mass destruction and the missiles that deliver them from falling into the wrong hands. The economic crisis in Russia and elsewhere in the New Independent States adds urgency to the need for effective action. Thousands of scientists with WMD expertise are facing increased temptations to sell their know-how to the highest bidder.

This year, we are requesting \$250 million for State Department programs under the President's Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative. These programs seek to enhance our security by engaging weapons scientists to prevent proliferation, halt smuggling, and tighten export controls.

Fifty years ago, only a short distance from where we are now, President Harry Truman delivered his first and only inaugural address. In what came to be known as the Four Point speech, he challenged Democrats and Republicans alike to lend a hand to those struggling for freedom and human rights; to continue programs for world economic recovery; to strengthen international organizations; and to draw on our country's expertise to help people help themselves in the fight against ignorance, illness, and despair.

Today, we are summoned to meet similar responsibilities in a far different time—and to honor principles that will endure for all time. To that mission, I pledge my own best efforts and respectfully solicit both your wise counsel and support.

Thank you very much. n

American Political and Economic Leadership: The Challenges of the Global Economy Secretary Albright

Remarks to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Washington, DC, April 14, 1999.

Thank you very much, Tom; I needed that. I will be very happy, in our Q & A session, to talk a little bit more about my activities of the last 48 hours.

I also have to say that in my various meetings with Tom Donahue, we have talked a lot about the verv natural partnership we have in pursuing U.S. national interests. We are working very hard together on behalf of those interests. I think that often, people have not understood that the business community and those who dedicate their lives to economics are the natural constituency for the State Department as we move into the 21st century. So it's a great pleasure to be with you, Tom, Klaus Schwab, distinguished guests, colleagues, and friends. I'm very, very pleased to welcome you to the Department of State.

I know it's not Davos, but it is still quite fitting to have representatives from the Chamber of Commerce and the World Economic Forum here under this roof at this time. For we live in an era when the connections between the business community, the global economy, and the ways and means of U.S. foreign policy are intimately related.

That's why I want to thank the leadership and members of the Chamber for working with us so closely and also to recognize the help our business people have provided in reconstruction efforts in Central America. To those of you who are from outside the U.S., I want to commend you, as well, for the cooperative efforts being undertaken through organizations such as A PEC and the Trans-A tlantic Business Dialogue.

These initiatives are critical because as the new century approaches, the great challenge and opportunity we face is to help bring nations closer together around the basic principles of democracy and open markets, the rule of law, and a commitment to peace. To succeed in this effort, economic leadership must play a central role.

For example, as the financial crisis has shown in Indonesia and elsewhere, economic disruptions can have profound political consequences. At the same time, nations that have built truly representative governments seem better able to ride out even severe financial storms.

More broadly, in this decade, the movement toward more open economic systems has been a powerful contributor to the democratic trend. We see this everywhere from central Europe to Central A merica and from the strongest reforming economies in Africa to the robust democracies of the Southern Cone. This affects our prosperity because reform leads to greater efficiency, more opportunity, and higher levels of investment and trade. This contributes, in turn, to our security because nations that are growing have a deeper stake in finding a peaceful solution to disputes and are less likely to become breeding grounds for terror, narcotics trafficking, and international crime.

We know also that free markets bring enormous benefits, but we also know that there are accompanying problems that markets alone cannot solve. That's why we're committed to adapting our international financial institutions in the World Trade Organization to make them more transparent, open, and accountable—and why we're working through these institutions to improve financial sector governance, address environmental and labor concerns, and help people around the world adjust to change.

Later this year, the largest gathering ever of trade ministers will meet in Seattle to set the trade agenda for the next decade. We will strive to use those talks to chart a course that will result in stronger protections for intellectual property and lower barriers to our agricultural, industrial, and service exports.

We would like to have China participate in that gathering as well as a full member of the WTO. Last week's visit of Chinese Premier Zhu resulted in significant progress, and we've agreed to resume negotiations later this month. The two countries said they will pursue intensively an agreement that would enable China to accede to the WTO this year.

It is clearly in the interest of the United States that China be bound by the same set of rules as other countries and that it be obliged to reduce or eliminate its many barriers to trade. The rise of economic interdependence has contributed to the increased use of sanctions as an instrument of international policy to punish and persuade. It's vital, however, that this tool be used wisely—not indiscriminately or simply out of frustration.

We're working with leaders in Congress to develop a sanctions policy that carefully weighs U.S. interests and that recognizes that multilateral sanctions are more effective than unilateral ones. We're also striving to ensure that sanctions are carefully designed and targeted to avoid unnecessary harm to innocent people. We're consulting with governors because on sanctions, it's important that the United States speaks with one voice so that a coherent message is sent to those who are the target of our sanctions. We need to avoid measures that impede our ability to build multilateral coalitions in support of sanctions, as we are attempting to do toward Burma.

International economic leadership is critical to the future we want to build. But it must be combined also with effective political leadership and muscle. That's why the United States is working hard with allies and partners to build peace in Northern Ireland, to advance the process of reconciliation in the Middle East, to resolve tensions on the Korean Peninsula, and to encourage stability in other strategic areas, such as the A egean and South A sia.

Unfortunately, in some cases, diplomacy alone is not enough. Today in Kosovo, NATO is responding forcefully to the assault on fundamental human values that is being waged by the regime in Belgrade. As Tom said, late yesterday I returned from meetings in Europe with NATO foreign ministers. Our alliance has made it clear that we will persist relentlessly and with determination until the crisis ends on acceptable terms: Serb security forces must leave so that the refugees can reenter; an international security presence must be permitted; and the people of Kosovo must be given the democratic self-government they have long deserved.

The current crisis highlights the need to integrate the Balkans more fully into the Euro-Atlantic community of democracies. We have made a start in this direction, but one outcome of the current fighting must be a comprehensive, multiyear, multinational approach. We do not want this conflict to serve as a prelude to others.

Working with the regional leaders, our allies, international financial institutions, and you, the private sector, we need to transform the southeast corner of Europe from a source of unrest into an anchor of stability. To those who say we don't have the funds for such a project, I can only point to the current situation—to the loss of life, to the flood of refugees, and the destruction—and say that what we can't afford is a repeat of this.

The Clinton A dministration will work closely with Congress to gain the resources we need both to cope with the present emergency and to contribute our share to long-term solutions. We do so, however, at a time when the majority in Congress is insisting that funds to help Central A merica recover from Hurricane Mitch must come from other high-priority international programs. We are not only just robbing Peter to pay Paul, we're robbing Paul also.

We do so in the wake of recent House and Senate budget votes that would cut the President's funding request for international affairs by a disastrous 15% to 21%. In raising these matters, I do not engage in special pleading. These are serious issues. Our nation cannot afford—and I do not believe the free world can afford—to see America's foreign policy budget treated like a political football.

We're talking about only 1% of federal spending. And I repeat that because I think many people think that it's 25%; it's 1% of federal spending. Yet that 1% pays for everything from export assistance to American firms to the protection from terrorists for American diplomats. It helps us put food into the hands of hungry children and keep weapons of mass destruction out of the hands of rogue regimes. It enables us to train others in the rule of law, including the sanctity of contracts. And it would enable us, at long last, to meet our own obligations to the United Nations.

A mericans are justly proud of the Marshall Plan and the other measures undertaken half a century ago to aid European recovery and reinforce freedom in an unsettled world. In that era, A merica devoted more than a dozen times the share of its wealth to international programs, compared to what we allocate today.

We are not proposing anything that costly now. But I do hope that we will have your continued help in spreading the word that there is nothing foreign about foreign policy anymore. When we make innovative investments in peace, prosperity, and democracy overseas, as we now propose, we help to secure those blessings for our own citizens here at home. And when we fail to make the needed investments, we place our own future in jeopardy.

Whenever I speak in the Benjamin Franklin room here, I'm reminded of his saying that the greatest talkers are the least doers. So I will close and do my best in the allotted time to answer your questions.

Thank you very much. n

A New NATO for a New Century Secretary Albright

Remarks at the Brookings Institution, National Issues Forum: A New NATO for a New Century, Washington, DC, April 6, 1999.

Thank you very much. Thank you. The reason that Mike was so tall is that I'm so short. So we had to build me up here. I thank you very, very much for that introduction, and good morning to you all. Excellencies of the diplomatic corps; officials of the Brookings Institution; distinguished officials, scholars, and colleagues; and members of the media: I am pleased to be here to participate in this National Issues Forum.

I wanted especially to greet your learned panelists Michael Brown, Ivo Daalder, James Goldgeier, and Charles Kupchan. Their wisdom will be welcome. For although this is, without doubt, the right time and place for a discussion of the new NATO and the 21st century, we still have urgent 20th century business to conduct.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was forged in the aftermath of Holocaust and war, by the survivors of war, to prevent war. It reflected our predecessors' determination to defend hard-won freedoms—and their understanding that while weakness invites aggression, strength is a parent to peace.

During its first four decades, NATO's might deterred conflict in the heart of Europe, the scene of so much past horror. But NATO was more than a peacekeeper. The shield it provided allowed post-war economies to rebuild, World War II adversaries to reconcile, and Europe's integration to begin.

In part because of NATO, the Cold War ended as this decade began. Alliance leaders confronted a new set of questions. How would the alliance hold together now that the adversary that had brought it together was gone? If it remained united, what would it do? How should it change? How might the new NATO relate to the new Europe? And what role would Russia play?

President Clinton and his counterparts, with the help of outside experts, including those here at Brookings, have moved steadily but surely to answer these questions. A cting openly and methodically, they have taken steps to modernize and strengthen the alliance, prepare it for new missions, invite new members, establish partnerships with Europe's new democracies, and develop strategies for the future.

My plan this morning had been to discuss these and related issues with which we have been wrestling in recent years, and which were to be highlighted at the Washington Summit later this month. My intentions have not changed, but the context for my remarks has. For some of the key policies and principles to be affirmed at the Washington Summit are already in practice. As we speak, NATO is responding to a real post-Cold War threat to its interests and values. We are doing so in a political and security environment that differs dramatically from the past. We are seeing, every day, the importance of military forces that are mobile, flexible, precise, and capable of operating together well. By acting on behalf of justice and peace in Kosovo, we are reaffirming NATO's core purpose as a defender of democracy, stability, and basic human decency on European soil.

Certainly, we are saddened and outraged by the terrible human suffering we see: the long lines of refugees; the cries for loved ones missing or lost; the cold-blooded butchery. But let us be clear about what is at stake and where the responsibility for this agony resides. As President Clinton has repeatedly urged, we need to consider the map. Kosovo is a small part of a region with large historic importance and a vital role to play in Europe's future.

This region is a major artery between Europe and Asia and the Middle East. Its stability directly affects the security of our Greek and Turkish allies to the south and our new allies Hungary, Poland, and the Czech Republic to the north. Kosovo, itself, is surrounded by small and struggling democracies that can be overwhelmed by the flood of refugees Milosevic is creating.

Kosovo is part of an area, the southeast corner of Europe, where World War I began, major battles in World War II were fought, the worst fighting in Europe since Hitler's surrender occurred in this decade. Today, this region is the critical missing piece in the puzzle of a Europe whole and free. That vision of a united and democratic Europe is critical to our own security. It cannot be fulfilled if this part of the continent remains divided and wracked by conflict.

Of course, there is more than one source of division in the Balkans, but throughout the 1990s, the most damaging has been the ruthless incitement of ethnic hatred by the authorities in Belgrade: not once, not twice, not three times, but over and over again. President Milosevic has seized every opportunity to advance his own power. by attacking first Slovenia, then Croatia, then Bosnia, and now the people of Kosovo. The result has been a nightmarish cycle of murder and mayhem that has caused chaos in the region and directly threatened NATO's interests and values.

Make no mistake: The atrocities committed by Serb forces in Kosovo were not the result of NATO bombing; they were the reason NATO had to act. It was Milosevic a decade ago who stripped the Kosovo Albanians of the autonomy to which they were entitled; who launched last Spring a campaign of brutal repression; who violated the cease-fire negotiated last October; whose security forces committed acts of barbarism such as the massacre at Racak earlier this year; and who refused to join the leaders of Kosovo in signing the balanced and just settlement negotiated at Rambouillet.

Milosevic poses as the great defender of Serb sovereignty, but it is because of his brutality that an international presence first became necessary to monitor human rights in Kosovo. It is because of his duplicity that the need for an armed international presence to implement any potential peace agreement became obvious. It is because of his cruelty that NATO action became the only option as he prepared to unleash yet another rampage of terror. It is because of his arrogance that NATO attacks have broadened and intensified, as that terror continues.

As a result of all this, the NATO of the 21st century is being tested now before the new century even begins. We are determined to pass that test. Using aircraft and facilities from more than a dozen countries, we are striking back hard. We are resolute, because it is in our interests and because it is right to stop the ethnic cleansing, war crimes, crimes against humanity, and the other indicators of genocide that we see.

George Kennan famously described democracies as slow to anger, but fiercely determined when roused. Today, our alliance of democracies is roused, as is our collective conscience, by the brutal crimes we witness and cannot accept and will not allow to pass with impunity.

Militarily, our immediate objective is to continue relentlessly to degrade and diminish Belgrade's capacity to impose its will on others. After less than 2 weeks, and despite adverse weather, we are beginning to see the evidence that our strikes are having an effect, hindering transportation and communications, sowing uncertainty, demonstrating allied resolve. As hard as it is, we must be patient and persist. We must be prepared for an extended conflict. But day by day, the damage inflicted by NATO power on the sources of Milosevic's power will grow.

As the fighting continues, so do United States and NATO efforts to assist the front-line states in caring for refugees and preventing a spillover of violence. It's impossible, in words, to do justice to the magnitude of the refugee crisis. It is a daunting challenge to governments in the region, the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, the OSCE, the State Department's refugees bureau, USA ID, and a wide range of non-governmental institutions. There had been a tremendous outpouring of effort, including by millions of average citizens who have donated money and supplies.

Last week, President Clinton committed \$50 million in humanitarian assistance over and above the \$100 million we had allocated prior to the current offensive. During the weekend, the United States and other NATO allies agreed to temporarily host 100,000 refugees. Yesterday, the President announced the formation of a high-level team, headed by USA ID Director A twood, to coordinate our overall humanitarian response.

In the days ahead, we know we will have to do more for those in and outside Kosovo, both short-term and long. The need is enormous and will continue to grow. We will be consulting regularly with Congress and presenting the facts to the American people. There should be no doubt that the United States will continue to do its share.

We have also issued a clear warning to Milosevic not to widen the conflict with NATO by seeking to undermine or topple the democratically elected Government of Montenegro. Politically, we are working hard to ensure allied unity and explain NATO's case to the world, and to convey the truth to the people of Serbia, who have been surrounded for too long by Milosevic's lies.

Legally, we are cooperating fully with the international tribunal at The Hague. We want those now directing and committing crimes in Kosovo to pay for them the rest of their lives. We are also insisting that Belgrade treat humanely and release immediately the three A merican servicemen abducted last week.

Diplomatically, we are in regular contact with Russia, which has expressed strong opposition to NATO actions in Kosovo. We've not been surprised by this, but neither have we given up on trying to work with Russia to bring this crisis to an end. Clearly, this would be in Russia's interests, because no nation in this century has paid a higher price for instability and aggression in Europe.

Russia's hopes for the future lie in a continent that is secure and stable, where those who would exploit ethnic passions are stopped and countries work together to build prosperity and maintain peace. In the days ahead, we will strive with Russian leaders to make real progress on issues where we have a common interest in moving forward.

We will also continue our search for a way to resolve the Kosovo crisis on acceptable terms. And from day one, those terms have not changed. As President Clinton warned President Milosevic yesterday, "more empty promises and token half-promises won't do." NATO insists that Milosevic halt his offensive and

withdraw his security forces and that the people of Kosovo be allowed to return to their homes under the protection of an international security force, and to enjoy democratic self-government.

Even as we respond to the crisis in Kosovo, we in NATO and NATO's partners must concern ourselves more broadly with the

future of the region. The peaceful integration of Europe's north, west, and center is well-advanced or on track. But, as I said earlier, the continent cannot be whole and free until its southeast corner is also stable.

In recent years, the international community has done much to assist countries in the region. Our own Southeast European Cooperative Initiative has facilitated a great deal of the efforts in joint and cooperative planning. We know, because we have seen that the leaders and citizens of this region want to work and build together. Once the Kosovo fighting is resolved, we should move forward with new steps. Working with leaders in the region, our explicit goal should be to transform the Balkans, from the continent's primary source of instability, into an important part of the European mainstream. We do not want the current conflict to be the prelude to another. We want to build a solid foundation for a new generation of peace, so that future wars are prevented, economies grow, democratic institutions are strengthened, and the rights of all are preserved.

Some say violence is endemic to this region and that its people have never and will never get along. That is, I believe, a false and self-fulfilling prophecy that we categorically reject. The people of Southeast Europe, including the Serbs, have experienced

"Some say violence is endemic to this region and that its people have never and will never get along. . . . If you look at the region today, you will see Greeks and Turks operating side by side as NATO allies; you will see Macedonians and Albanians and Montenegrins answering the humanitarian call; you will see Christians and Muslims and Jews united in their condemnation of the atrocities being committed."

> long periods of living and working together without conflict. If you look at the region today, you will see Greeks and Turks operating side by side as NATO allies; you will see Macedonians and Albanians and Montenegrins answering the humanitarian call; you will see Christians and Muslims and Jews united in their condemnation of the atrocities being committed.

In Bosnia, you will see NATO and its partners working with ethnic Serbs, Croats, and Bosniaks to complete implementation of the Dayton accords. Success here would remove a major threat to European security and establish a model of interethnic collaboration that is needed throughout the Balkans and around the world.

Since the peace accords were signed more than 3 years ago, enormous strides have been made. It is essential, however, that we not allow events in Kosovo to distract us, or simply assume that the future of peace in Bosnia is assured. The nation's bitter divisions are only partially healed. The job of enabling refugees to return safely is ongoing and difficult. Local authorities have not yet assumed the responsibilities for democracy and peace that they must.

The Dayton accords remain a linchpin of hope for integrating Southeast Europe into a democratic continent. If those accords are to be

> implemented, NATO must continue to help the people of Bosnia to realize the benefits of peace. At the Washington Summit, our leaders will focus simultaneously on what has been, what is, and what will be. Drawing inspiration from the past, they will pay tribute to alliance founders and salute those who have sacrificed through the years to keep our region

secure, prosperous, and free.

They will focus on the present, including every aspect of the situation in Kosovo and the surrounding region. They will focus on the future, drawing up a blueprint—as the title of today's forum reflects—for the new nation in the new century.

In so doing, they will be guided by the great lesson of the past century, which is that neither North America nor Europe can be secure if the other is not. Our destinies are linked. That is as true now as it was when NATO was founded 50 years ago. A cross the A tlantic, we must stand together and act together as allies when allied action is called for—and as friends in helping to shape a more stable, prosperous, and lawful world. Some suggest that Europe should take care of Europe, freeing A merica to concentrate on responsibilities elsewhere. But this makes no sense. It would create the twin false impression that A merica does not care about Europe and Europe does not care about the world.

Moreover, it would weaken us both in and beyond Europe, by depriving the continent of A merica's valuable role, while leaving A merica to assume broader burdens that Europe has the resources and responsibility to share. Such a division of labor would also lead to a division of attention and gradually weaken the indispensable transatlantic bond. We had a taste of divided labor in the early years of this decade in Bosnia.

As our unity in Kosovo now reflects, we will not go down that road again. At the summit, our leaders will unveil a revised strategic concept for the alliance that will take into account the variety of future dangers the alliance may confront. They will commit NATO to developing military forces that can perform the full spectrum of alliance missions.

These include NATO's core mission: the ability to deal with aggression committed directly against one or more NATO members. They include other potential operations, such as those now ongoing in Bosnia and Kosovo. These differ, day to night, from the kind of all-out defense of Europe for which the alliance prepared for so long.

Such operations will likely differ in size and length than missions undertaken in collective self-defense. Hopefully, they will be rare. But as is now the case, there may be more than one ongoing at any given time. They may be conducted jointly with partners or other non-allied nations. By definition, they will involve operations outside alliance territory, with all the logistical complications that entails.

We have already made progress in developing the capabilities required, but gaps remain. Many allies have only a limited ability to deploy forces rapidly outside their country and to sustain them once they arrive. The need is not so much that allies invest more in defense but that we all invest wisely. For example, we need to ensure that command, control, and information systems are well-matched. We need to have forces—not just among a few countries but throughout NATO-that are versatile, flexible, and mobile. Our benchmark is clear. We must also be as good in dealing with new threats as we are in dealing with old.

To these ends, we expect the summit to produce a Defense Capabilities Initiative that will prepare the alliance to field forces designed and equipped for 21st-century missions. We expect, as well, a related initiative that responds to the grave threat posed by weapons of mass destruction—or WMD—and their means of delivery. For we cannot prepare for the future if we do not prepare for the greatest danger of the present and the future.

We also support the strengthening of the European pillar of our alliance. It is in A merica's interest to see a more integrated Europe, able to act effectively and cohesively, willing to assume a greater share of our common responsibilities. So we welcome and support efforts to improve European capabilities. We have made the point, however, that to be constructive, such initiatives should be linked to NATO, complement existing activities, and be open to all European members of the alliance, whether or not they are in the EU.

Last month, at the Truman Library in Missouri, I was witness to history as NATO gained three new members and America three new allies. For the people of Hungary, Poland, and the Czech Republic, it was a homecoming —an irreversible affirmation of their belonging within the democratic community of the West. For the alliance, it was a strengthening, an enhancement of NATO's muscle and reach.

These three new members are NATO's first since the end of the Cold *War, but they will not be the last. We* are building a future that erases, not replaces, the division of the past. In today's Europe, destiny is no longer determined by geography; nations are deciding their own fates. Around the continent, they have been coming together in support of more open political and economic systems. It is natural and inevitable that, as this occurs, other non-NATO countries will achieve the threshold required for serious consideration as new members. A number have already ascended far along this uphill road.

At the Washington Summit, NATO leaders will welcome this progress and affirm that the door to the alliance remains open. They will announce a concrete and practical plan to help prepare potential new members to meet NATO's high standards. They will assure aspiring members that they will be judged by what they can contribute to the alliance, not by where they sit on Europe's map.

Half a century ago, A merican leadership helped lift Western Europe to prosperity and democracy. In this decade, the entire transatlantic community is helping Europe's newly free nations to integrate themselves into the economic and security structures of the continent. This is evident in the direct assistance that has been provided by the European Union and our own SEED program and Freedom Support Act. It is evident in the EU's plan to expand and in the new roles and missions of the OSCE. It is evident in the partnerships NATO has forged with Europe's emerging democracies.

At the summit, our leaders will have the opportunity to take these partnerships to a new level. They will consider a framework to guide partner participation in planning, deciding, and implementing certain alliance missions. They will announce a plan to upgrade the forces that partners will have available for future NATO-led operations. The result will be a NATO with wider military options, partner countries with enhanced military capabilities, and a Europe practiced in multiplying NATO strengths by partner strengths to arrive at the product of peace.

The Washington Summit will show how much NATO values its relationships with all of Europe's democracies, including Russia. The inclusion and full participation of each in the transatlantic community is essential to the future we seek. This is true not only from a security standpoint. For in the 21st century, a nation need not be in NATO to work closely with NATO, to share responsibility for Europe's security, to be integrated into Europe's economy, and to reap the benefits of a Europe that is stable and prosperous.

In 1916, when the forerunner of the Brookings Institution was founded, Europe was engaged in a war that had begun in the Balkans and that would soon draw hundreds of thousands of Americans across the Atlantic, many never to return. In 1999, as we meet, the United States and NATO are engaged in another Balkan conflict, determined to halt atrocities and prevent wider war.

Some might conclude that, in the intervening years, we learned nothing, or else that nothing we can ever do will bring stability to this troubled corner of the globe. There is much in recent headlines and broadcasts to support both of these grim conclusions. But I am heartened by other—and I believe stronger—currents. Historically, Balkan conflicts have torn Europe apart. Today, most of Europe is united in opposing tyranny, and all of it, except the leaders in Belgrade, supported a negotiated peace.

Historically, acts of violent repression have occurred off-camera, hidden from public view. Today, despite Milosevic's best efforts, global media coverage leaves no doubt about the savagery taking place, and there can be no question about the world's need to respond.

Historically, violence in Southeast Europe has been contagious, spreading like wildfire amidst the tinder of ethnic grievances and fear. Today we are wary but encouraged by progress in Bosnia—and by the vigorous efforts of leaders in other parts of the region to prevent violent outbreaks.

Historically, atrocities have been committed by the strong against the weak, with no stronger force standing guard. Today, NATO is determined to use its strength to halt the abuses, restore stability, and return to the people of this region what President Clinton has called, in another context, the "quiet miracle of a normal life."

In our era, the great divide is not between East and West, North and South, or right and left. It is between those ensnared by the thinking and habits of the past, and those inspired by the possibilities of the future, between those who are prisoners of history and those determined to shape it.

From our vantage point at the threshold of a new century, we must vow together to free ourselves from the recurring nightmares of the old. We must dedicate our power to the service of even more powerful ideals. We must affirm our faith in the ability of men and women working together, across national and ethnic lines, to forge a future better than the past.

It is that faith which inspired NATO's founders when they first gathered in Washington 50 years ago; it is that faith which guides NATO in its actions today; it is that faith which will unite NATO's leaders when they assemble again in Washington later this month.

Let us never forget that NATO's preparations and operations are not directed against any particular people but against aggression, terror, and chaos. Nor should we ever fail to remember NATO's intent, which is to develop with our partners a security system that will embrace all of Europe—and enable children on both sides of the Atlantic to grow up and grow old in freedom, security, and peace.

To that mission, I pledge my own best efforts and respectfully solicit both your wise counsel and support.

Thank you very much. n

A Blueprint for U.S.-Africa Relations In the 21st Century

Secretary Albright

Remarks at Opening Plenary Session of U.S.-Africa Ministerial on Partnership in the 21st Century, Washington, DC, March 16, 1999.

Thank you very much, Assistant Secretary Rice. Mr. Secretary General of the UN, Mr. Secretary General of the OAU, excellencies and colleagues: Good morning, and welcome once again to the Department of State.

I want to begin by thanking you all for coming, for together, we have an extraordinary opportunity during the next 2¹/2 days to draw up a blueprint for U.S.-Africa relations in the 21st century. My job this morning will be to set the stage for President Clinton's remarks by describing briefly U.S. economic priorities in Africa and outlining our hopes for the ministerial.

The United States has two overarching goals in its relationship with the continent: One is to combat transnational threats to our common security; the second is to work with you on a basis of mutual respect to accelerate A frica's full integration into the global economy. This will be the focus of our efforts here in Washington this week.

Since President Clinton took office, he has worked hard to promote world economic growth, based on fair and open rules of investment and trade. We've made the case to our own citizens and to others that openness will lead to more commerce, better jobs, and greater opportunities in the developed and developing worlds alike. Many nations in Africa have begun moving in this direction, and the possibilities for future growth are huge.

During his historic visit to the continent last March, President Clinton took the lead in focusing world attention on Africa's promise as a trade and investment partner. Many other A dministration officials—myself included—have visited and sought to encourage long-term beneficial investments there.

This week's conference provides a chance for us to move forward in the direction of enhanced integration and broader prosperity. After this plenary session, we will break out into a series of panel discussions and roundtable meetings. A number of my Cabinet colleagues and I will participate on the U.S. side.

Our goal will be to analyze the status of current initiatives and consider how great a progress can be achieved. In the process, I hope we can develop a common understanding of some of the terms we often use but do not always define. For example, we need to discuss the elements of good governance in concrete and practical terms so that we can lay the groundwork for real progress and not just list lofty goals.

In the same vein, we need to look systematically at the obstacles to greater democracy in A frica and see if we can agree on specific steps to remove those obstacles. We should examine the full range of development issues from microenterprise to the construction of modern infrastructure for trade. We need to focus urgently on the devastating impact of HIV/A IDS and make a commitment to address the disease as a national and international priority. Coincidentally, I am today issuing a report entitled, "The 1999 U.S. International Response to HIV/ AIDS."

We should also discuss specific issues, such as the current negotiations in Cartagena aimed at the adoption of a biosafety protocol. And we should consider the relationship of economic matters to other major concerns on the continent, such as instability, injustice, and strife.

Before closing, I want to say personally that I'm deeply committed to making the U.S.-Africa partnership work. I have said that the United States needs to pay greater attention and the right kind of attention—to Africa, and I mean it. I believe that the promise of Africa in the new century is breathtaking. I say that without any attempt to minimize the array of armed conflicts that A fricans now face.

Although not the focus of this conference, these tragedies command our continuous attention, and they reflect serious failures of leadership both on the part of Africans and the larger international community.

The point I want to make today, however, is that even as we strive to deal with these conflicts, we should keep the larger picture and the longer view in mind. We have to keep building for the future step by step, year by year, assembling the nuts and bolts of stability and prosperity. The problems that have generated strife in Africa today are hardly unique to that continent. Certainly, Africa possesses the qualities and the human resources necessary to create a future far better than the present or the past.

This conference reflects that longterm, systematic view. It reflects America's understanding that there is growing interdependence across the Atlantic; that we have a strong interest in an Africa where democracy has put down deep roots and where the benefits of growth are broadly shared.

Together this week and in the months to come, we must move forward driven not by crisis but by our confidence in each other to take advantage of opportunities, confront hard problems, achieve concrete results, and steadily improve the lives of all the people.

Now I have the pleasure of introducing our next speaker, Ambassador Salim Salim, who is serving an unprecedented third term as Secretary General of the Organization of African Unity. Under his leadership, the OAU has been playing an active and dynamic role in efforts to resolve conflicts and create the conditions for greater progress on the continent. It's not an easy job. But the United States is pleased to support the OAU in its endeavors, and I'm honored to introduce to you now Ambassador Salim Salim. n

U.S. Efforts To Assist Kosovo Refugees Julia V. Taft

Testimony by the Assistant Secretary for the Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration before the Subcommittee on Immigration, Senate Judiciary Committee, Washington, DC, April 14, 1999.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. During the past 3 weeks the world has witnessed one of the most sustained and cruel crimes against humanity during this century. The calculated dislocation of hundreds of thousands of Kosovars during this past year by Serb forces reached devastating proportions in recent weeks. Since March 24, almost a half million refugees have been forced from Kosovo, and many thousands more may yet flee.

I am honored to have the opportunity of testifying before you today on the U.S. Government's efforts to assist and care for the refugees. I would like to give you an update on the situation of the refugees in Macedonia and Albania, our efforts and those of other countries to provide protection and assistance, and what we see ahead. I will then be happy to answer any questions you might have.

The U.S. and its NATO allies are working with humanitarian organizations to alleviate the humanitarian crisis. We will do whatever is necessary to ensure that Milosevic's current campaign of ethnic cleansing does not stand and that refugees can return to their homes, villages, and towns and rebuild their lives in Kosovo.

What we have watched ever since the Rambouillet process is the systematic expulsion of Kosovo Albanians. I want to emphasize here that this expulsion was well underway before the NATO bombing commenced. While over 680,000 KosovoAlbanians have been forced to flee Kosovo in the past year, the majority during the last 3 weeks, hundreds of thousands more are believed to be displaced within Kosovo. After a short lull, when borders with Albania and Macedonia were closed by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and after a large number of refugees on the FRY side disappeared, we saw this weekend the resumption of small movements of refugees out of Kosovo.

The refugees tell of extreme violence: people forced to leave their homes at gunpoint, women and children forcibly separated from their husbands, fathers, and sons; homes and villages torched; passports and other identity documents confiscated. Even more serious are the reports of arbitrary and summary executions, of mass graves, and most recently of the mass rape of young women and girls.

We are extremely concerned about the fate of between 700,000 and 800,000 ethnic Albanians who remain in Kosovo, many of whom are displaced. We are exploring ways to reach these people with the humanitarian assistance they so clearly need, but, as you can imagine, there are many security constraints. The FRY Government has not provided the security assurances needed nor the authorization for ICRC or other international agencies and NGOs to operate in Kosovo.

Deputy Secretary Strobe Talbott and I visited A lbania and Macedonia and other countries in the region from A pril 3 to 5 to thank them for supporting NATO operations and for receiving the refugees and to underscore our commitment to providing the assistance needed to address the impact of the unfolding humanitarian, economic, and security crises. We stressed to the Government of Macedonia the importance of keeping its borders open to the refugees who are fleeing.

Witnessing the masses of people who have been stripped of their dignity, identity cards, and worldly possessions was a profoundly moving experience. In spite of their forced expulsion by the Serbs, many herded into boxcars and transported to borders, all the refugees expressed support for NATO and the effort of the allies to stop Milosevic's aggression. On my way back, I joined with my counterparts from other major donors and countries in the region at a conference hosted by UNHCR to map a coordinated multilateral strategy for the humanitarian response. Operation "Sustain Hope" was announced by the President on A pril 5 to coordinate our own humanitarian response to the refugee crisis in the region. The U.S. has committed over \$150 million in financial and material assistance since the crisis began just over a year ago. This includes the \$50 million recently authorized by the President to help address the urgent needs of the refugees. We are sending over 1 million humanitarian daily rations to the region, as well as tents and other relief supplies. Other countries are also mobilizing large relief efforts.

The limited capacity of Albania and Macedonia to cope with these enormous numbers of refugees was completely overwhelmed. I would, however, like to pay tribute to the enormous generosity of the people of these two countries who have so generously opened their countries and their homes to the refugees. In Albania, approximately 80,000 refugees are being housed in private homes. Macedonian families are hosting about 60,000. I would also like to commend Turkey for stepping forward immediately to take 20,000 refugees and help alleviate the pressure on Macedonia—a gesture which the U.S. Government has volunteered to help finance.

Because of the enormity of the effort required and despite the best efforts of UNHCR and the other relief organizations on the ground, NATO was asked to take a role in undergirding the humanitarian assistance infrastructure. NATO, with its logistical and operational expertise, is working closely with UNHCR and other aid agencies to build refugee camps, distribute aid, and assist with transportation and the organization of relief efforts. In Albania, 30 camps are being built throughout the country. While UNHCR remains the lead humanitarian organization, this cooperation is an example of the excellent coordination between NATO and UNHCR. We are now beginning to see the situation for the refugees improve, although much still needs to be done to ensure that all receive the full range of assistance they need.

The President has also directed that additional U.S. forces be deployed in A lbania and Macedonia to support the relief effort. We anticipate the deployment of at least 1,000 airlift, medical, engineering, logistics, and security personnel. A bout 600 U.S. military personnel are already in the region to support the humanitarian operation.

ICRC has begun efforts to trace and locate missing persons to help reunite families. It has established a hotline in Geneva to receive calls from around the world and has sent tracing personnel to Macedonia and Albania. Many other relief organizations from around the world are assisting in this mammoth effort. We are supporting our U.S. NGOs with funding and supplies.

As part of a multination effort to relieve the strain on A lbania and particularly Macedonia, we have stated that we are prepared to accept up to 20,000 refugees, and preparations are underway to make that possible. We are prepared to implement this commitment, and DoD is ready right now to accept 500 refugees in Guantanamo tomorrow—and that number can be quickly augmented. We are discussing with UNHCR and others the modalities of such an operation should large numbers of new refugees flood into Macedonia and Albania.

Our preference, however, has always been and remains to ensure a safe and humane refuge in the region, as close to Kosovo as possible so that people can return home when it is safe to do. The nature of our effort will be determined by the requirements on the ground. Given that the situation remains fluid, we believe that we—as well as other governments—must remain prepared to take refugees if the situation requires that kind of assistance to the front-line states. First groups of refugees—some 4,000 have left Macedonia for Turkey, Germany, and Norway.

I know that many of your constituents, particularly those with relatives among the refugees, are asking why we do not bring refugees to the United States. Our first priority is to ensure the safety and the care of over half a million people. This is an emergency situation and, we hope, a temporary one. Therefore, we do not anticipate a general U.S. refugee resettlement program at this time. The aim of our military and political action is to enable the Kosovo Albanians to return to their homes when conditions permit. In the meantime, we are committed to doing everything possible to work with other countries to ensure that the refugees are provided with temporary asylum and with care and assistance. I must underscore that everything we are doing and planning for is geared to the safe return of the refugees to Kosovo, which, we hope, will be possible in the near future. n



MULTILATERAL

Antarctica

The Antarctic Treaty. Signed at Washington December 1, 1959. Entered into force June 23, 1961. TIAS 4780; 402 UNTS 71. Accession: Venezuela, March 24, 1999.

North Atlantic Treaty North Atlantic Treaty. Done at Washington April 4, 1949. Entered into force August 24, 1949. TIAS 1964; 34 UNTS 243. Accessions: Czech Republic, March 12, 1999. Hungary, March 12, 1999. Poland, March 12, 1999.

Pollution

1997 Amendments to Annex I of the Protocol of 1978 relating to the international convention for the prevention of pollution from ships, 1973. Adopted at London September 25, 1997. Entered into force February 1, 1999.

BILATERAL

Antigua and Barbuda A greement amending and extending the agreement of December 14, 1977, as amended and extended, regarding United States defense areas and facilities in Antigua, with attachment. Signed at St. John's January 19, 1999. Entered into force January 19, 1999; effective January 1, 1999.

Argentina

A greement concerning security measures for the protection of classified information. Signed at Washington January 12, 1999. Entered into force January 12, 1999.

A cquisition and cross-servicing agreement, with annex. Signed at Miami and Buenos A ires January 11 and 15, 1999. Entered into force January 15,1999.

European Community A greement on mutual recognition, with annexes. Signed at London May 18, 1998. Entered into force December 1, 1998.

Germany

Supplementary agreement to the agreement of September 19, 1995 concerning final benefits to certain victims of National Socialist measures of persecution. Exchange of notes at Bonn January 25, 1999. Entered into force January 25, 1999.

A greement for participation in the German Geoscience Space Mission CHAMP. Signed at Washington and Bonn January 28 and February 12, 1999. Entered into force February 12, 1999.

Italy

A greement supplementing the air transport agreement of June 22, 1970, as amended. Effected by exchange of notes at Rome December 30, 1998 and February 2, 1999. Entered into force February 2, 1999; effective A pril 1, 1999.

Korea, Republic of

A greement extending the agreement of January 6, 1992, as extended, relating to scientific and technical cooperation. Exchange of notes at Washington January 22 and 28, 1999. Entered into force January 28, 1999; effective January 29, 1999.

Latvia

A greement for cooperation in the Global Learning and Observations to Benefit the Environment (GLOBE) Program, with appendices. Signed at Riga January 27, 1999. Entered into force January 27, 1999.

Nicaragua

A greement regarding the consolidation, reduction and rescheduling of certain debts owed to, guaranteed by, or insured by the United States Government and its agencies, with annexes. Signed at Managua October 20, 1998. Entered into force December 21, 1998.

Russian Federation

A greement amending the agreement of July 30, 1992, as amended, concerning the safe, secure, and ecologically sound destruction of chemical weapons. Signed at Washington and Moscow November 6, 1998 and January 14, 1999. Entered into force January 14, 1999.

A greement extending the agreement of April 3, 1995, as amended, concerning cooperation in nuclear weapons transportation security through provision of material, services, and related training. Signed at Moscow and Washington December 14, 1998 and January 14, 1999. Entered into force January 14, 1999.

A greement amending the agreement of A pril 3, 1995, as amended concerning cooperation in nuclear weapons storage security through provision of material, services and related training. Signed at Moscow and Washington December 14, 1998 and January 14, 1999. Entered into force January 14, 1999.

A greement amending the agreement of April 3, 1995, as amended, concerning cooperation in nuclear weapons storage security through provision of material, services and related training. Signed at Moscow and Washington December 14, 1998 and January 14, 1999. Entered into force January 14, 1999.

Senegal

A greement relating to employment of dependents of staff members of diplomatic and consular missions. Signed at Dakar A pril 28, 1998. Entered into force A pril 28, 1998.

Ukraine

A greement extending the Protocol of May 10, 1995 to the air transport agreement of 1990, as extended. Effected by exchange of notes at Kiev December 29, 1998 and January 20, 1999. Entered into force January 20, 1999. ■