

The American Community

Secretary Albright

1

Remarks at the Miami Herald Symposium,
Miami, Florida, February 5, 1999.

Thank you, Mr. Ibarguen, for that introduction and for hosting this symposium. Archbishop Favolora, General Wilhelm, Congresswoman Meek, Mayor Kasdin, members of the Florida Legislature, very distinguished business and academic leaders, members of the press, guests, and friends. I live most of my life in a place called Foggy Bottom; so it is, indeed, a pleasure to visit the Sunshine State.

I want to begin by saying that the Miami Herald is one of our nation's truly great newspapers. I say that because it is true—and because I hope it will put you in the mood, after I have finished my remarks, to ask easy questions.

Seriously, I am always delighted to be in Miami. And I was pleased to have the opportunity earlier today to participate in opening the new headquarters of Radio and TV Marti and to join Representative Meek in teaching a class at Miami Northwest High School. As many of you know, I am a former professor, which means that even my soundbites are 50 minutes long. This afternoon, however, I am resolved to be brief so that we may have time for discussion.

Half a century ago, right here in this city, President Harry Truman spoke about America's goals in the postwar world. He was a plainspoken man, so his words were not complicated. He said simply that America's hope was to "create a political and economic framework in which lasting peace may be constructed." Today, as we prepare to enter a new century, we face a much different world but the same overarching challenge.

From Key West to Prudhoe Bay, we Americans compete in a global workplace and do business in a global market. We travel further and more often than any prior generation. We see advanced technology creating new wonders, but also spawning new dangers, as the threats posed by terror, crime, drugs, pollution, and disease spread across national borders.

We want to live—and we want our children to live—in peace, prosperity, and freedom. But the plain truth is that we will not be able to guarantee these blessings for ourselves if others do not have them as well. So our strategic goal is to

bring the nations of the world closer together around fundamental principles of democracy and law, open markets, and a commitment to peace.

During the next few minutes, I would like to discuss this goal in the context of our own hemisphere. This is appropriate given Miami's role as an air and water bridge within the Americas. And it is timely, because events in the region are very much on our minds.

Later this month, the President will visit Mexico, with whom we share a 2,000-mile long border and a host of common interests. In March, he will travel to El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua to discuss a full range of economic and political issues. Foremost on his agenda will be efforts to help our neighbors—the victims of Hurricane Mitch.

Their plight reminds me of the words of the 69th Psalm: "Save me . . . for I sink in deep mire, where there is no standing; I am come into deep waters, where the floods overflow me." The author of those words was addressing a much higher power than us. But the words still speak to us because so many in Central America now find themselves in a place "where there is no standing"—and in desperate need of help.

The fury of Mitch washed houses into raging rivers and the unforgiving sea. It destroyed whole villages, disrupted power lines, demolished businesses, and inundated croplands. Most painfully, over the course of a few devastating days, it separated families into grieving survivors and the dead. More than 9,000 people perished, and hundreds of thousands lost their homes.

The President's trip will remind the world and our own citizens that, though the rains have stopped, the hard work of rebuilding and recovery has just begun. That work matters to us on a human level, and on the level of our national interest, as well. Over the past decades, we have invested billions of dollars in helping Central America recover from war, build democracy, and create economic

opportunity. We did so because we have a large stake in a region that can provide a healthy and rewarding life for its people at home.

Destruction yields desperation, which can contribute to crime, conflict, and a renewed rush of illegal immigrants. The immigration issue has been one of the most difficult and mutually painful problems with which we and our neighbors have had to wrestle. It harms our communities, while exposing would-be migrants to exploitation by smugglers and con artists. We should do all we can to see that the problem does not become worse.

Fortunately, the United States is responding to the need on many levels. Churches, non-governmental organizations, and individuals have donated tens of millions of dollars in urgently needed supplies. From North American families to Central American "familias," the hand of help has been extended. Nowhere have relief efforts been more generous and sustained than here in Dade County, where Operation Helping Hands and the Miami-Dade Search and Rescue Operation have done much not only in Central America, but also in the Caribbean, and now in earthquake-ravaged Colombia.

When I leave here, I will meet with some of the participants in those efforts. But I take the opportunity now to congratulate the Miami Herald for its own leadership role. Through your caring and commitment, you have served your broader community very, very well.

The United States has also responded as a country. I will not go through the entire list, but a host of agencies from USAID to the Department of Defense to our State Department embassies have contributed in accordance with their capabilities and expertise. All told, we have dedicated approximately \$300 million to relief and recovery efforts. And that is only the beginning. We are currently consulting

with Congress about a substantial commitment of additional funds.

We will also ask Congress to enhance and expand the Caribbean Basin Trade Initiative to help spur business activity throughout the region, especially in the storm-damaged areas where opportunity and hope are desperately needed and in very short supply.

The response to the recent disasters has been gratifying, but it should not be surprising, for it reflects the blossoming partnership that has grown out of the Summit of the Americas process. That process began here in Miami in 1994 and continued in Santiago last year. Its purpose is to

"The response to the recent disasters has been gratifying. . .it reflects the blossoming partnership that has grown out of the Summit of the Americas process."

build a true hemispheric community that reflects not only our proximity of geography but also our closeness of interests and values. Over the years, we have worked hard to build such a community and have made remarkable progress.

On the economic front, we have forged a commitment to integration and growth based on open markets, open books, better schools, and broader participation. These policies have paid off for our neighbors and for us. We export more to the Americas than to any other part of the world. And while our overall exports went down last year, exports to this hemisphere increased by more than 6%. For Miami, that means jobs in the port, at Miami International, and for the sellers of everything from light bulbs to life insurance.

As the President made clear in his State of the Union address, the United States is firmly committed to achieving a Free Trade Area of the Americas by 2005. Through negotiations based here in Miami, we are laying the groundwork for such an agreement. We are

also working closely with Brazil and other countries in the region to prevent the further spread of financial instability. The key to this is what we refer to as second-generation economic reforms that extend accountability and the rule of law to the financial world, thereby promoting prosperity that is more widely shared and less vulnerable to the kinds of disruptions we saw in East Asia.

In the area of security, our hemispheric community has also made great strides. With our help, and that of others, the troubling border dispute between Ecuador and Peru has been resolved. In Central America, after decades of fighting, differences are being settled by ballots, not bullets. And counter-narcotics cooperation is stronger than ever, because the understanding is broader than ever that the drug

plague threatens us all, and that we must all do our part in the struggle against it.

As our hemisphere builds peace at home, we also promote freedom. For at the heart of the Summit of the Americas process is a commitment to democracy. Two decades ago, a map of the Americas that showed blue for democracy and red for dictatorships would have been mostly red. Today, with a single exception, it would be as blue as the waters of Biscayne Bay.

We realize, however, that many democracies are fragile and their growth threatened by weak political and judicial institutions, wide disparities of income, corruption, and crime. We are working with our partners to change that.

In nations such as Venezuela and Peru, Paraguay and the Dominican Republic, we are helping democratic forces to assemble the nuts and bolts of lasting freedom. In Colombia, we see an opportunity to strengthen democracy because a promising new president has made possible a new spirit of cooperation and partnership.

President Pastrana is committed to the rule of law and a future of peace for his country. He is being opposed by guerrillas on one hand and paramilitary groups on the other. Both are violent, and both are complicit in the drug trade that is flooding our shores with cocaine and has undermined the very fiber of Colombian society.

In his new budget, President Clinton is requesting almost \$300 million, including \$230 million in emergency funds, to help President Pastrana end the civil conflict, fight drug traffickers, support alternative development, and create a climate in which the rights of all Colombians may be respected.

In Haiti, the long-unresolved conflict between President Preval and majority legislators has stalled economic reforms and led to the de facto dissolution of Parliament. The Haitian people deserve better. We want to continue assisting them as they struggle to build better lives.

And in Cuba, we have taken a series of measures designed to help the Cuban people without strengthening their repressive and backward-looking rulers.

Our goal is to do what we can to help Cubans prepare for a peaceful transition to democratic rule. To this end, we have sought to make it easier for Cubans to be in touch with family and friends here in the United States and easier for the Cuban-American community to help those who stayed

behind. We recognize that, as one Cuban-American leader told us, "In building civil society, the strongest NGO is the family."

Although the specifics of our approach to promoting democracy vary from country to country, the fundamental goals are the same. We seek to foster where we can the development of free institutions and practices.

One example is our Vital Voices Initiative, which was launched by First Lady Hillary Clinton in Uruguay last October. This initiative seeks to increase the role of women as decision-makers and opinion shapers. We can expect that much of the energy and drive of the next phase of democratic development in the Americas will be provided by the entry of women into politics, business, and private life. This is a historic and irreversible change, and the United States should be proud to champion it.

In closing, I want to say just a couple of words about resources. As you know, the President's budget was released this week. It includes funds for everything we do in the Americas and around the world to protect our security, prosperity, and freedom. And by everything, I mean initiatives that range from supporting the Middle East peace process to countering terror to promoting U.S. exports to preventing the spread of nuclear weapons.

The total cost equals only about 1% of the federal budget. But that 1% may determine 50% of the history that will be written about our era. And it will

affect the lives of 100% of the American people.

In the days ahead, I will be asking Congress to approve the President's request, in full. This choice between funding and short-changing U.S. leadership is among the most critical the new Congress will make. When it acts, I hope it will bear in mind both the challenges of the future and the bipartisan traditions of the past.

Many years ago, the man known as the Great Liberator, Simon Bolivar, expressed the hope that the Americas would be best known throughout the world, not for vast territory or material wealth, but for "freedom and glory." Today, that honorable vision is closer to reality than it has ever been. But it remains a work in progress.

As we approach the year 2000, the United States is committed to forging with its neighbors a new American century—in the broadest sense of that term. We want a century in which every nation in our hemisphere will be able to live in peace; every society will be ruled by law; every individual will be able to pursue happiness to the fullest extent of his or her abilities; and every government—without blemish or exception—will be accountable to its people. That is a lofty vision but a worthy one—and one that is attainable. Toward its fulfillment, I pledge my own best efforts and respectfully solicit both your wise counsel and support.

Thank you very much. ■

The Importance of Kosovo

Secretary Albright

Remarks at the U.S. Institute for Peace, Washington, DC, February 4, 1999.

Thank you very much for that introduction. Also, it's so nice to see so many friends in the audience. I thank you all for gathering on such short notice to talk about the changing situation in Kosovo.

Some of what I have to say will be very familiar to many of you who have spent much of your professional lives working on the Balkans. I thank you for your dedication and your indulgence this morning, for where American interests and values are at stake, the American people deserve a full explanation of our policy. And, as we prepare to open a diplomatic conference in Rambouillet, France, and discuss at home America's possible role in implementing a peace settlement, we need to answer as many times as necessary some very logical questions, such as where is this place Kosovo, and why does it matter?

Twice before in this century, American soldiers in huge numbers have been drawn to Europe to fight wars that either began in the Balkans or that sparked bitter fighting there. After World War I, America withdrew from Europe and ignored the storm that was gathering. An entire generation of brave Europeans and Americans paid the price.

After World War II, we had learned our lesson. We stayed and helped Western Europe build peace, prosperity, and freedom beyond anything its people had known before. As a result, our own nation prospered as well and stood secure in liberty.

Now that the Cold War is over, we have the opportunity to extend those blessings to the rest of Europe, including the Balkans. We have learned that we cannot hope to guarantee these benefits for ourselves if others do not have them as well. That is why we work to bring the nations of the world closer together around fundamental principles of democracy and law, open markets, and a commitment to peace. And that is why it matters when a place like Kosovo falls victim to turbulence and bloodshed.

Kosovo is a region of Yugoslavia, about the size of Connecticut. Most of its people are ethnic Albanians, and most are Muslim. But Serbs view this region—poor, even by Balkan standards—as the cradle of their national heritage.

Yugoslavia's collapse and descent into violence and brutality began in Kosovo. It was by proclaiming Serbia's right to supreme authority there that Slobodan Milosevic burnished his ultra-nationalist credentials and began his rise to power. And one of his first acts as President of Serbia, in 1989, was to strip Kosovo of the autonomy it had enjoyed under the Yugoslav Constitution. His policies of ethnic polarization and hate-mongering in Kosovo ushered in a decade of police repression and human rights abuses throughout Yugoslavia. Those policies led to the breakup of Yugoslavia and to the devastating conflict in Bosnia.

For 10 years, Kosovo's Albanian population fought a courageous, nonviolent campaign to regain the rights they had lost. They earned the admiration of the world and the attention of successive U.S. administrations. In 1992, recognizing the stakes involved, President Bush issued what has become known as the "Christmas warning"—a private but forceful message to President Milosevic not to use force against the civilian population of Kosovo.

But about one year ago, President Milosevic upped the ante by launching a brutal crackdown. Police and military forces were sent in to terrorize civilians, killing hundreds and driving hundreds of thousands from their homes. Under these conditions, many Kosovars abandoned nonviolence and threw their support to the Kosovo Liberation Army, although its tactics too were sometimes brutal and indiscriminate.

*The KLA, as it is known, offers a deceptively simple answer to the tragedy of Kosovo—*independence from the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. But there is no guarantee that independence would lead to peace in Kosovo and ample reason to fear that it could undermine stability elsewhere in the region. The best answer is for Kosovo, and all of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, to adhere to international standards of human rights for everyone, regardless of ethnicity.**

Last fall the region reached crisis, with hundreds of thousands of civilians stranded in the hills and a steady succession of battles and killings. With diplomacy backed by the threat of NATO air strikes, we reached an agreement that averted a humanitarian crisis, slowed the violence, and removed some Serb forces from the region. And we put a 1,000-person OSCE mission on the ground.

Unfortunately, neither the Serbs nor the Kosovo Albanians have ever fully met their obligations. Today the region is again on the verge of massive violence and a human tragedy of immense proportions.

It may not be immediately apparent that the brutal policies of one local leader, and the tragedy of one small people, matter so much that they affect fundamental American interests. But they do. America has a fundamental interest in peace and stability in Southern Europe and in seeing that the institutions which keep the peace across that continent are strengthened. America has a fundamental interest in preserving Bosnia's progress toward peace for which our soldiers, diplomats, and humanitarian workers have given so much—and which would be seriously jeopardized by renewed violence in nearby Kosovo. America has a fundamental interest in strengthening democratic principles and practices in the Balkans and throughout Europe. Developing a real democracy in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is crucial. And America has a fundamental interest in seeing the rule of law upheld, human rights protected, and justice done.

We must never forget that there is no natural boundary to violence in Southern Europe. Spreading conflict could reignite fighting in neighboring Albania and destabilize fragile Macedonia. It could affect our NATO allies, Greece and Turkey. And it could flood the region with refugees and create a haven for international terrorists, drug traffickers, and criminals. Regional conflict would undermine NATO's credibility as the guarantor of

peace and stability in Europe. This would pose a threat that America could not ignore.

A great deal has been written and said about Kosovo as another Bosnia. But Kosovo is not Bosnia—for a host of political, geographic, and historical reasons. Most importantly, Kosovo is not Bosnia because we have learned the lessons of Bosnia—and we are determined to apply them here and now. We know—and we are seeing again—that the only reward for tolerating atrocities is more of the same. The killings of 45 people in Racak last month provide more fuel to the fires of violence, which have caused 45,000 people to flee their villages in the past 6 weeks.

We know that the longer we delay in exercising our leadership, the dearer it will eventually be—in dollars lost, in lost credibility, and in human lives. Simply put, we learned in Bosnia that

“America has a fundamental interest in peace and stability in Southern Europe and in seeing that the institutions which keep the peace across that continent are strengthened.”

we can pay early, or we can pay much more later.

Finally, we learned in Bosnia, and we have seen in Kosovo, that President Milosevic understands only the language of force. Nothing less than strong engagement from NATO will focus the attention of both sides, and nothing less than firm American leadership will ensure decisive action.

That is why the United States has led the way in NATO and in the Contact Group to build momentum for a political settlement. In London last Friday, my Contact Group colleagues

and I put forward a comprehensive plan to end the fighting and to move on to the difficult business of building a future. We told both sides that we expect full compliance with the relevant Security Council resolutions.

Belgrade must put an end to offensive operations and give its full support to the Kosovo Verification Mission and the International Criminal Tribunal for Yugoslavia. Belgrade must ensure that those responsible for the Racak massacre are brought to justice or turned over to the International Criminal Tribunal for Yugoslavia if that body so requests. The Kosovo Liberation Army must refrain from provocations. And both sides were told in no uncertain terms that they must protect civilian populations and facilitate the work of humanitarian organizations.

The Contact Group also set out a timetable for concluding an interim political agreement. Representatives from Belgrade and Kosovo will open talks this Saturday in Rambouillet, France, under the chairmanship of British Foreign Secretary Robin Cook and French Foreign Minister Hubert Vedrine. Leaders of all Kosovo Albanian factions have already accepted. We have had positive indications from Belgrade this morning. President Milosevic knows we expect full participation, and I believe we will get it.

These will not be conventional negotiations, and they will not be easy. We will offer the parties the chance to meet together. But we expect that this will be a week of intense diplomacy by our negotiators—American Ambassador Chris Hill, European Union envoy Wolfgang Petritsch, and a Russian representative, whom we understand will be Boris Mayorskiy.

And we expect that the parties will accept the draft interim agreement to be put forward by the Contact Group. Our approach is based on months of painstaking shuttle diplomacy by Ambassadors Hill and Petritsch. Many of you are familiar with the thrust of our ideas, so let me touch only briefly on the principles behind it.

The core of what we are proposing has not changed and will not. We aim to put in place a durable and fair interim agreement that will create a peaceful political framework for Kosovo while deferring the question of Kosovo's status for several years. The people of Kosovo must be able to govern themselves democratically without interference from Belgrade while the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia's territorial integrity and sovereignty are maintained. And they must possess all the institutions a democratic government requires, from a legislature and an independent judiciary to a locally controlled police force.

All the ethnic groups of Kosovo, of which there are several in addition to Albanians and Serbs, must be treated fairly. They must be able to control,

they have been denied and in which Belgrade has a chance to show that Kosovo can prosper within its borders over a 3-year interim period.

We expect the parties to finish the talks within 7 days or satisfy the Contact Group that significant progress is being made to warrant an extension. At the end of that time, three outcomes are possible. If President Milosevic refuses to accept the Contact Group proposals or has allowed repression in Kosovo to continue, he can expect NATO air strikes. If the Kosovo Albanians obstruct progress at Rambouillet or on the ground, they cannot expect NATO and the international community to bail them out. Decisions on air strikes and international support will be affected, and we will find additional ways of bringing pressure to

the Contact Group are not met. United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan, too, has lent his full support.

This reflects a general recognition that we have reached the stage where diplomacy, to succeed, requires the backing of military force. And it reflects wide agreement that NATO successfully acted beyond its borders in Bosnia to bring a deadly conflict to an end and that it can do this again in Kosovo. No one believes NATO should fight a war but rather that under the right circumstances, deployment of a NATO-led peacekeeping force may give lasting peace a chance to develop. And as in Bosnia, American leadership is needed to set progress in motion and make peace a real possibility.

During the last few days, Administration officials, including myself, have been consulting with leaders in Congress on the dangers of allowing the situation in Kosovo to fester and on our indispensable role in helping to resolve it. This morning, President Clinton announced that we are seriously considering the possibility of American participation in a NATO-led peace implementation force for Kosovo.

America has clear national interests at stake in a peaceful resolution of this conflict, which create compelling reasons for us to consider seriously American participation. However, our willingness to participate will depend on achieving a strong and effective agreement to which the parties show that they are genuinely committed. The force must be able to operate in a permissive environment, including the withdrawal of a sufficient number of Serb security forces and an agreement restricting paramilitary weapons and operations.

We must agree with our NATO allies on a clearly defined and achievable mission—one where our contribution would be no more than several thousand troops, while our European allies provide the lion's share. At the same time, we must recognize that some U.S. participation is desired and expected by our allies and may be essential to securing the confidence of the parties.

“We do not expect to resolve all the long-standing and deeply held grievances of both sides. Rather, we seek to build a climate in which the people of Kosovo receive the rights and security they have been denied and in which Belgrade has a chance to show that Kosovo can prosper within its borders over a 3-year interim period.”

without government interference, their identities and cultural life. And the rights of individuals of all ethnicities must be fully protected. The right to nourish and promote culture and identity is at the heart of many of the problems in the Balkans.

Finally, to ensure that these principles take effect, authority should devolve as much as possible to local communities so that they have the authority to resolve problems themselves.

We do not expect to resolve all the long-standing and deeply held grievances of both sides. Rather, we seek to build a climate in which the people of Kosovo receive the rights and security

bear. If the two sides do reach agreement, we will need to concentrate our efforts on making sure that it is successfully implemented.

There should be no doubt on either side that the consequences of failure to reach agreement or to show restraint on the ground will be swift and severe. Last Saturday, NATO gave its full support to this approach by warning that Secretary General Solana, after consulting with the United States and other NATO allies, can and will authorize strikes on the territory of the FRY if the demands laid out by NATO and

I am pleased to say that Europe has already shown willingness to take on a great deal of the burden in Kosovo. Britain, France, and other allies have already pledged to provide the bulk of a post-settlement force. Thirty-seven countries have sent verifiers to the OSCE mission. Russia has pledged its partnership in ending the war and securing the peace and is providing, as I said, a senior negotiator for the talks at Rambouillet.

One of the best outcomes of our experience in Bosnia has been the understanding, trust, and partnership that developed between Russia and its colleagues in the field, at the negotiating table and even at NATO. Each partici-

pating country has gained from Bosnia a broader sense of its own national interests and a shared stake in achieving a common sense of security in Europe. And, certainly, we would welcome any decision by Russia to participate in a Kosovo peace implementation force.

Often, I like to end my speeches on an optimistic note. Those who know me know that is my nature, and it usually makes for better rhetoric. In contemplating the current situation in Kosovo, however, I believe it may be more fitting to quote the self-assessment of Vaclav Havel:

I am not the optimist because I am not sure that everything ends well. Nor am I a pessimist, because I am not sure everything ends badly. Instead, I am a realist who carries hope, and hope is the belief that freedom and justice have meaning.

There is a great deal at stake in Kosovo today for the people of that region, for the future of security cooperation in Europe and for all who believe in the principles of tolerance, respect for human rights, and adherence to the rule of law. We do not underestimate the difficulties or the risks of achieving a settlement that is lasting and fair. We cannot succeed if the parties refuse to live up to their own responsibilities. But we would not be meeting our own responsibility to them or to ourselves if we do not do what we can to lead the way.

Thank you very much. ■

U.S. Efforts To Counter the Forces of International Terror

Secretary Albright

Statement before the Subcommittee on Commerce, State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Washington, DC, February 4, 1999.

Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee. I welcome this opportunity to testify concerning U.S. efforts to counter the forces of international terror. As you know, the President has designated the Department of State as the lead agency for coordination of our counter-terrorism policy and operations abroad, while the FBI is the lead agency for countering terrorism in the United States.

So I am delighted to be here with my colleagues, Attorney General Janet Reno and FBI Director Louis Freeh. Their presence reflects the fact that the battle against terror requires effective coordination within our own government and between our government and law-abiding nations around the globe.

It also requires a partnership between the executive and legislative branches of the United States. And here I want to commend the Chairman and members of this subcommittee—for no one has been more aware of the dangers to our diplomatic personnel, more supportive of our efforts to improve security, or more helpful in providing resources to respond to the terrorist threat, than this panel.

I look forward to the opportunity today to build on our partnership and to explore with you the many dimensions

to our strategy. In my statement, I will provide an overview of the international threat and discuss our diplomatic actions, policies, plans, and resource needs. The Attorney General and the Director will then bring you up to date on the wide range of law enforcement, technology, crisis management, and other initiatives that are underway.

We will each discuss the Five-Year Interagency Counter-terrorism and Technology Crime Plan. This plan serves as a base-line strategy for coordinating our response to terrorism in the United States and against American targets overseas. The subcommittee has received copies of the plan, which was crafted under the leadership of the Attorney General. You also have the written statements we prepared for this morning. We have agreed to keep our oral presentations brief in order to honor your time for questions.

The Threat

I will begin by discussing the threat posed to the United States and the world by the forces of international terror. If you look at the statistics, you will see that the number of terrorist incidents worldwide is declining. This

reflects the diplomatic and law enforcement progress we have made in discrediting terrorist groups and making it harder for them to operate. It reflects, as well, the improved political climate that has diminished terrorist activity in places such as Northern Ireland and Central America.

But you would not be conducting this hearing, Mr. Chairman, if the dangers posed by international terrorism had declined. Tragically, they have not.

Last August, I had the sad honor of bringing back to U.S. soil the bodies of Americans who perished in the embassy bombing in Kenya. Like the members of our armed forces who died in foreign conflicts, these Americans went in harm's way for our country. But there is a difference—for they were not combatants in a war as we have long understood that term. They were casualties, instead, of a new kind of confrontation that looms as a new century is about to begin.

In this struggle, our adversaries are likely to avoid traditional battlefield situations, because, there, American dominance is well established. They may resort, instead, to weapons of mass destruction and the cowardly

instruments of sabotage and hidden bombs. As we know from explosions over the past decade in Africa, the Khobar apartment complex, the World Trade Center, and Pan Am 103, these unconventional threats endanger both Americans and others around the world.

Accordingly, we must be vigilant in protecting against the terrorist triple threat posed: first, by the handful of countries that actively sponsor terrorism; second, by long-active terrorist organizations; and third, by loosely affiliated extremists such as, among others, Osama bin Laden, who has urged his followers to kill Americans when and wherever they can.

Our strategy must be long-term. The Five-Year Plan is only the beginning. Certainly, no single arrest or shutdown of a terrorist operation will be sufficient. The advance of technology has given us new means to counter terrorists. But it has also enabled terrorists to develop more powerful weapons and to travel, communicate, recruit, and raise funds on a global basis.

It is essential, therefore, that we work closely with others. The perpetrators of terror include persons from a wide variety of creeds, cultures, and countries. And their criminality has claimed victims almost everywhere—from Jerusalem to Japan, Tanzania to Turkey, and Oklahoma City to Sri Lanka.

To counter this plague, law-abiding peoples everywhere must close ranks to detect, deter, prevent, and punish terrorist acts. It is not enough for Americans to be concerned only about attacks against Americans; we must reach out to all those victimized or threatened by terror. The victims of the attacks orchestrated in Africa by Osama bin Laden, after all, were predominately African, including many practitioners of Islam. Terrorism is a highly indiscriminate form of violence. It must be opposed not simply as a matter of national interest but as a fundamental question of right and wrong.

Fighting Back

Following the embassy attacks last August, President Clinton ordered military strikes to disrupt terrorist operations and deter new bombings. The message he conveyed is that, in this battle, we will not simply sit back and wait. We will take the offensive. We will do all we can to limit terrorist movements, block terrorist funds, and prevent terrorist acts.

As the President's decision demonstrated, we will not hesitate, where necessary, to use force to respond to or defend against acts of terrorism. But force is only one element in our strategy. Every day, in every part of the world, we use a full array of foreign policy tools in our zero tolerance campaign against international terror.

- For example, we place the highest priority on measures to prevent weapons of mass destruction from falling into the wrong hands. This imperative is on our agenda with

“The advance of technology has given us new means to counter terrorists. But it has also enabled terrorists to develop more powerful weapons and to travel, communicate, recruit, and raise funds on a global basis.”

virtually every nation and figures in almost every major meeting I have.

- We constantly exchange information with friendly governments concerning terrorist activities and movements, thereby preventing attacks and facilitating arrests.

- We work with other agencies and other countries to strengthen screening procedures and increase intelligence sharing on visa applications.

- We are expanding our Anti-terrorism Training Assistance Program, which has already instructed more than 20,000 law enforcement officers from more than 90 countries, in subjects such as airport security, bomb detection, maritime security, VIP protection, hostage rescue, and crisis management.

- We are engaged, through the State Department-chaired Technical Support Working Group, in a vigorous research and development program to improve our ability to detect explosives, counter weapons of mass destruction, protect against cyber sabotage, and provide physical security. In the technological race with terror, we are determined to gain and maintain a decisive strategic edge.

- We are making use of the Terrorism Information Rewards program to encourage persons to come forward with information to prevent acts of terrorism and apprehend those who commit them.

- We impose economic sanctions against state sponsors of terror. Currently, the seven governments on this list are Cuba, Iran, Iraq, Libya, North Korea, Sudan, and Syria.

- And both domestically and internationally, we are working to strengthen the rule of law.

The Rule of Law

At home, we have changed our statutes to block the financial assets of terrorist groups, prevent them from raising funds in the United States, and allow us to bar foreigners who support such groups.

Around the world, we couple law enforcement with diplomacy in order to bring suspected terrorists before the bar of justice. As the subcommittee knows, we have done this successfully in the World Trade Center case, the CIA killings, and to a very considerable extent, in the Africa embassy bombings—which triggered a worldwide manhunt for bin Laden and his associates in murder. The Attorney General

and Director Freeh will provide more detail on these efforts, but let me stress two points.

The first is that law enforcement success often depends upon international cooperation. That cooperation has been extraordinary in some recent cases. We cannot discuss these in public, but I did want the record of this hearing to reflect our deep appreciation for the timely and lifesaving help we have received. Second, I believe every American should be proud of the work the FBI, the Justice Department, the CIA, and the State Department's Diplomatic Security Service—or DS—have been doing.

When I was in Nairobi last August, I had a chance to meet some of the FBI personnel who were literally sifting the wreckage of the embassy for clues. I was deeply impressed by their dedication, and I have been even more deeply impressed by the progress made in gaining custody of suspects. I am gratified, moreover, that the partnerships in the field among the FBI, Department of Justice, DS, and our embassies and other agencies are excellent. Our people are working together closely and well to investigate past crimes and prevent new ones. They are doing a great job for America.

I cannot leave the subject of bringing terrorists to justice without highlighting the tragic case of justice delayed with respect to the bombing more than a decade ago of Pan Am flight 103. As Senators know, we have challenged the Government of Libya to meet its pledge to deliver the two suspects in that case for trial in the Netherlands under Scottish law. This approach has been approved by the Security Council and is supported by Arab and African regional organizations. It is an approach that is reasonable and fair and that has been on the table now for more than 6 months.

I would like to take this opportunity once again to urge Libya to deliver the suspects for trial and thereby gain suspension of the UN sanctions. If this does not occur by the time those sanctions come up for Security Council

review later this month, we will seek additional measures against the Qadhafi regime.

Our effort to strengthen the rule of law against terrorism is global. At its heart is the message that every nation has a responsibility to arrest or expel terrorists, shut down their finances, and deny them safe haven.

Attached to my testimony is a chart showing the extent to which countries have ratified 11 international anti-terrorism conventions. Our goal is to obtain universal adherence to these treaties. Our purpose is to weave a web of law, power, intelligence, and political will that will entrap terrorists and deny them the mobility and sustenance they need to operate.

As we stressed in the aftermath of the murders in Kenya and Tanzania, terror is not a legitimate form of political expression, and it is certainly not a manifestation of religious faith. It is homicide—plain and simple.

It is right for nations to bring terrorists to justice, and those who do so should be recognized and rewarded appropriately. It is wrong to finance terrorist groups, whether or not specific contributions are for terrorist purposes. It is cowardly to give terrorist groups money in return for not being targeted. It is irresponsible simply to look the other way when terrorists come within one's jurisdiction. And it fools no one to pretend that terrorist groups are something they are not.

Consider the words of Hezbollah's Sheik Hassan Nasrallah shortly after the Wye accords were signed: "I call on any Palestinian who has a knife, a hand grenade, a gun, a machine gun or a small bomb to go out during these few weeks and kill the Israelis and the Accord." He also called for the assassination of Chairman Arafat.

Some say Hezbollah is not terrorist, because it has a political agenda. But that is sophistry. As long as it advocates indiscriminate violence and assassination, it is terrorist. The same is true of other groups, such as Hamas, the PKK, and Sri Lanka's Tamil Tigers.

For each, the decision to use terror was a choice it did not have to make. Law-abiding nations must unite in helping them realize that the choice they have made is wrong.

In this connection, I was very disappointed that Germany failed to make good on the recent opportunity to prosecute Abdullah Ocalan, leader of the terrorist PKK—and that Italy and Turkey were unable to find an alternative way to ensure he was brought to justice. Instead of determination, this opportunity was greeted with handwringing and vacillation. Ocalan has left Italy, and his current whereabouts are unknown. We call upon any nation into whose jurisdiction Ocalan comes to cooperate in ensuring that he stands trial for his alleged crimes.

Diplomatic Force Protection

The measures we take to provide physical protection for our diplomatic personnel overseas play a major role in our strategy for countering terror. I know this subject is a matter of great interest to the subcommittee. And, certainly, nothing is of more urgent concern to me.

In the aftermath of the embassy bombings last August, I established Accountability Review Boards, chaired by Adm. William Crowe, to investigate and recommend improved security systems and procedures. I received their report last month and will be submitting a formal response this spring.

As you probably know, Mr. Chairman, the Boards found that the security systems and procedures followed by the two embassies involved were in accord with State Department policy. In both cases, the terrorists were prevented from penetrating the perimeter of the post. In neither case did U.S. employees or members of the military breach their duty.

The Boards did, however, identify what they termed "a collective failure" by the executive and legislative branches of our government over the

past decade "to provide adequate resources to reduce the vulnerability of U.S. diplomatic missions."

The report suggests that responsibility for this failure must be shared broadly, including by the Secretary of State, and I accept that. It reminds us all that no matter how much we care, no matter how much we do, we can always do more when the lives of our people are on the line.

The report cites some of the steps we have taken, particularly since August, to strengthen perimeter defense, increase security personnel, and speed necessary construction and repairs. It notes, as well, congressional approval of the security-related

supplemental appropriation late last year. We were, and are, very grateful for your swift action on that measure. It has helped us to resume, albeit in a

makeshift way, our diplomatic activities in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam. And it is enabling us to upgrade physical security levels worldwide through the hiring of additional diplomatic security agents and support personnel.

The Accountability Review Boards concluded, however, and I agree, that these measures must be viewed as just an initial deposit toward what is required to provide for the security of our posts overseas.

According to the report,

We must undertake a comprehensive and long-term strategy. . . including sustained funding for enhanced security measures, for long-term costs for increased security personnel and for a capital building program based on an assessment of requirements to meet the new range of global terrorist threats.

The Boards stress, and again I concur, that "additional funds for security must be obtained without diverting funds from our major foreign affairs programs." This is a key point. For it would make no sense to enhance the security of our people overseas while, at the same time, depriving them of the resources they need to effectively represent American interests.

The State Department is determined to go forward with an extensive, multi-year program for upgrading security at all our posts. The President's budget for Fiscal Year 2000, released earlier this week, proposes the minimum amount required

“. . . in today's world, there is nothing automatic about security. It is every person's responsibility. No detail should be overlooked. . . No assumptions should be made about when, where, why, how, or by whom a terrorist strike might be perpetrated. Literally, nothing should be taken for granted."

to move ahead with such a program.

First, it includes \$268 million to fund what we call the "tail" of the supplemental. This includes the recurring costs required by additional personnel and security improvements not addressed in emergency supplemental approved last fall. We expect such costs to run about \$300 million annually in subsequent years.

We recognize the need to continue an aggressive program of locating suitable sites and building secure facilities overseas. The President's budget includes an additional \$36 million for site acquisition and the design of new facilities; augmenting FY 1999 emergency funds available for site, design, and construction. It also proposes \$3 billion in advance appropriations for new construction in the years 2001 through 2005.

I feel strongly that in order to have a viable security construction program, we need a long-term commitment of

resources. The President's request proposes that this be done by advanced appropriations. We have been able to work together on such arrangements in the past, and I hope very much that we will be able to do so in this case.

I wish to stress, Mr. Chairman, that our request for support is not special pleading. American embassies include a broad range of U.S. Government employees and their families. They host a constant flow of U.S. citizens who turn to our people for help on everything from business advice to travel tips to emergency medical aid. They are open to foreign nationals who

wish to come to our country as tourists or students or for commercial reasons. And as the casualty list for the Africa bombings illustrates so starkly, many of our embassy

employees are locally hired.

Under international law, the host country is responsible for protecting diplomatic missions. We hold every nation to that standard and will assist, where we can, those who need and want help in fulfilling that duty. In an age of advanced technology and suicide bombers, no one can guarantee perfect security. But our embassies represent America. They should not be easy targets for anyone. We owe our people and all who use or visit our facilities the best security possible.

As I noted at the time I received Admiral Crowe's report, the Department is already implementing, or studying the best way to implement, a significant number of its recommendations. I cannot detail in public everything that we are doing, often in partnership with others, to prevent and prepare for potential terrorist strikes. I am able to say, however, that we will

continue to implement additional physical protection measures as rapidly as we can.

- We are improving our programs for dealing with vehicle-bomb attacks, such as those experienced in Africa.
- We see the need for additional crisis management training and have begun such a project at the Foreign Service Institute.
- We are engaged, with other agencies, in a review of equipment and procedural needs related to the possibility of a terrorist incident involving the use of chemical or biological weapons.

We are striving to improve our emergency response capabilities. As the Crowe report indicates, and our Five-Year Plan reflects, we need a modern plane to replace the specially configured aircraft used to deploy the Foreign Emergency Support Team that we dispatch overseas when there is a major terrorist incident. The current aircraft is 36 years old and was delayed while en route to Nairobi last August by the need to make repairs. This is not acceptable. The Department is currently engaged with the National Security Council and the Defense Department in discussions on the best way to replace the old aircraft, and the Administration intends to resolve the matter as soon as possible.

Security and Diplomacy

Finally, we agree fully with the Accountability Review Boards on the need to demonstrate the high priority we attach to security issues. This is one reason why I recommended to the President that he depart from past practice and appoint an outstanding career law enforcement professional, David Carpenter, as our Assistant Secretary of State for Diplomatic Security.

Assistant Secretary Carpenter is helping us to get out the message to all our posts that, in today's world, there is nothing automatic about security. It

is every person's responsibility. No detail should be overlooked. No precaution should be shrugged off. No post should be considered safe. No assumptions should be made about when, where, why, how, or by whom, a terrorist strike might be perpetrated. Literally nothing should be taken for granted.

We all recognize that the price tag for needed measures to improve security is and may remain, at least for the foreseeable future, higher than the resources we have available for that purpose. The result is that we will continually have to make difficult and inherently subjective decisions about how best to use the resources we have and about how to reconcile security imperatives with our need to do business overseas.

Overseas Presence Advisory Panel

In making these judgments, I am pleased to announce that we will be aided by a new Overseas Presence Advisory Panel, to be chaired by Mr. Lewis Kaden. The panel is charged with preparing recommendations for criteria to be used in making decisions on the size and composition of our overseas posts. It will also design a proposed multi-year funding program for the Department to restructure the U.S. presence abroad.

In its deliberations, the Advisory Group will take into account the heightened security situation, advances in technology, the transformation of the world's political lineup, and the emergence of new foreign policy priorities. The panel is being asked to complete its work by the end of this fiscal year.

Conclusion

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me say a word about coordination. This subcommittee has stressed the need for U.S. agencies to work together in responding to the terrorist threat, and

you are absolutely right. The Five-Year Plan will help. So has the President's designation of a National Coordinator for Infrastructure Protection and Counterterrorism. And I have the highest confidence in the State Department's own new coordinator for counterterrorism, Lt. Col. (ret.) Mike Sheehan.

Personally, I am in frequent contact with my colleagues here at the table, Attorney General Reno and FBI Director Freeh, and with the Secretary of Defense, the Director of Central Intelligence, and other key officials regarding the full range of anti-terrorism issues. I think we work together well and are getting better at it every day.

One reason is that the President has made it clear through both his policies and statements that this issue is the Administration's highest priority, internationally and domestically. That is true for a host of compelling substantive reasons. But I suspect it is true for another reason as well.

Over the past 6 years, on too many occasions, the President has had the job of comforting the loved ones of those murdered and maimed by terrorists. I know from my own experience; it is an impossible task. After the last hand has been held and the last words of condolence offered, all you can really do is vow that everything within your power will be done to prevent similar tragedies.

That is the vow of this Administration this morning. And I suspect it is fully embraced by the members of this subcommittee and by the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I have quoted New Hampshire's Daniel Webster to you before. I do so again in closing my testimony this morning. "God grants liberty," said Webster, "only to those who love it, and are always ready to guard and defend it."

To that, I say "Amen," and thank you again for the opportunity to testify before you today. ■

The President's International Affairs Budget: A Small Price For Strong Leadership

Secretary Albright

Remarks on the International Affairs Budget, Washington, DC, February 1, 1999.

Good afternoon. Today around the country, the American people are gearing up to celebrate Groundhog's Day Eve. But here in Washington it's budget day. Accordingly, I'm pleased to present the highlights of the President's request for what we fondly refer to as Function 150 or the International Affairs portion of the federal budget. I will then be even more pleased to yield the floor to Ambassador Craig Johnstone, who will take your questions.

Ambassador Johnstone is the Director of our Office of Resources, Plans, and Policy, and he has just returned from a similar briefing or a budget rollout on Capitol Hill. I note that he survived. He is still breathing and even smiling—probably because this is the last time that he'll have to do this. Next week, he will re-enter the private sector. Ambassador Johnstone will leave with my profoundest thanks for the outstanding service he has rendered to the Department and, thus, to the American people. Craig, thank you very, very much for everything that you've done.

Over the next few weeks, I will have a number of opportunities myself to present this budget on

Capitol Hill. It's a good budget, and I hope that every legislator who has urged stronger American leadership in one place or another or to address one problem or another will support it. Leadership requires resources. That's true whether we are trying to stabilize a financial crisis, prevent the spread of weapons of mass destruction; ease regional tensions, strengthen democratic institutions, or recruit top people to the diplomatic service.

We use Function 150 for these purposes and many, many others. Yet, the total of what we spend for international affairs is equal to only about 1% of the whole federal budget. That 1% makes a huge difference in the day-to-day lives of all the American people. For our country, it can spell the difference between a future of stability, rising prosperity and law, and a more uncertain future in which our economy and security are always at risk, our peace of mind is always under assault, and American leadership is increasingly in doubt.

Rather than go through a lot of numbers, let me highlight for you more generally some of the themes to be found in this year's funding request.

First, this is a security budget—a budget to make our citizens safer. It would increase the amount we invest to control the export of advanced weapons technologies and to ensure that no nukes become loose nukes. It will fund programs to maintain stability on the Korean Peninsula, keep the plague of drugs from our neighborhoods, and protect our citizens from the forces of international terror.

I want to highlight, in particular, our request for \$3 billion in advance appropriations for enhanced security at our diplomatic missions. This reflects our determination to see that the tragic lessons of this past August in Kenya and Tanzania are not forgotten over time. The advance appropriation is a multi-year, multi-billion-dollar commitment to improve security. It sends a message that no terrorist can prevent America from meeting its responsibilities around the globe.

Second, this is a peace budget. There are funds here to support peace processes in Bosnia, Northern Ireland, Guatemala, Peru, Ecuador, Africa—Great Lakes—and the Middle East, including implementation of the Wye River Memorandum. It also includes \$50 million to support peace and rehabilitation in Kosovo.

Third, this is a prosperity budget. It's designed to promote American exports through the President's export initiative; contribute to sustainable development; and help our neighbors in Central America, the Caribbean, and Colombia recover from a series of devastating natural disasters.

Fourth, this is a freedom budget. It includes funds to solidify democratic transitions in critical areas of Central Europe and the New Independent States, and to support the building of democratic institutions in Africa, Asia, and the Americas.

Fifth, this is a human rights budget, reflecting values that our citizens cherish. It includes funds for a new child labor initiative, to support the rule of law, to help victims of torture, and to assist women in gaining fair access to the leverage of economic and political power.

Finally, this is a put-our-money-where-our-mouth-is budget. It asks that Congress provide funds to pay our arrears to the United Nations and other international organizations. These organizations serve our interests. By meeting our obligations to them, we do both the right thing and the smart thing for America.

I want to close simply by reemphasizing how important resources are to the success of American foreign policy and to the well-being of the American people. Since the Cold War's end, there has been a tendency to short-change our international programs, and there is grave danger in this. For we live in a time when, perhaps more than ever before in history, America is counted on to help resolve conflicts; cope with emergencies; and overcome obstacles on the road to security, prosperity, and freedom.

We can't respond ourselves to every flood, famine, or fight. We must insist that others do their share. But do

not doubt that the forces of evil, ambition, and desperation that have roiled our globe in the past are still in evidence today. If we are but penny-wise and yield to the temptation of complacency, we will invite the dangers—both overt and latent—in the world to grow and spread. But if we're farsighted enough to move along the path set out by the President's budget, we will give momentum to the positive forces of democracy and openness, hope, and respect for human dignity.

These are forces that have been embattled throughout the current century but which we would like to see define the next. It is with this stark choice in mind that I will be making the case for the President's budget to Congress and the American people in the weeks and months ahead.

Thank you very much. ■

Challenges Facing U.S. National Interests at Home and Abroad

Secretary Albright

Remarks at the Center for National Policy, Washington, DC, January 21, 1999.

Thank you very much. Mo (Steinbruner), that's great. I'm very pleased to be here with the members of the diplomatic corps, friends from Capitol Hill, journalists, colleagues, and guests. It's a pleasure to always be back at the Center for National Policy.

When I get introductions, it isn't usually as Xena but as the former president of the Center for National Policy. But I must say that the Xena introduction issue all started when I actually was in New Zealand, where somebody asked me a question about whether I knew about Xena the Warrior Princess. I said I did, though I didn't. But I have since learned a lot.

What I also have found is when I speak to huge student audiences—and all of us are practiced public speakers so we know—there's a moment where you're losing your audience, and you think: What am I going to do now? This I did out in the State of Washington at some point, where I had a huge high school audience. I said, "you know, they call me Xena the Warrior Princess," and I went like that, and I got my audience back and was able to go on.

I really would like to thank Mo for what she is doing and for directing the Center for National Policy. Mo has been the heart and spirit of the Center for National Policy ever since its founding. She remains a really undaunted leader. The Center remains a

bastion of seriousness and sanity in this city at a time when both are needed and neither is abundant. So I congratulate you. This organization has never been more necessary nor, I must say, have you ever been better led. So I'd really like to pay tribute to my successor, Mo Steinbruner, who is magnificent and really works with all the issues very hard. Mo, thank you very much.

It's kind of amazing to me, actually, that as of 2 days from now, I will have been Secretary of State for 2 years. It's a job I recommend highly to anyone willing to wait until I am finished. On a personal level, I enjoy every day, and foreign policy in this era is an endlessly fascinating and terrifically fast-paced operation. This is fortunate because there's something to be said for not slowing down.

Shortly before Christmas, I took a few days off. That first morning, I sat down, put my feet up, and had a nice leisurely read of the newspapers. This was a big mistake; no wonder so many people are depressed. It is inherent in the job of Secretary of State—and, I think, partly inherent simply in being an American—that you begin to feel responsible even for events you cannot control. It is particularly frustrating to me when areas or problems that seem to be going in the right direction stall or slip backwards.

Like most Americans, I am goal-oriented, and I want to start a task and finish it and move on to the next one. But diplomacy today does not lend itself to that. Instead, it's like trying to fold one of those cardboard boxes. You get three corners in place, but they all start to come undone when you try to fold in the fourth one. The danger is that we will grow frustrated and simply walk away from hard problems in strategic regions such as the Balkans and the Gulf, or that we will become impatient and act rashly without sufficient preparation or careful weighing of the risks. If we are to protect our nation's interests, we must avoid either extreme. We must be tortoises, not hares, and we must be persistent in our policies, realistic in our expectations, true to our principles, and firm in our actions.

It is with these disciplines in mind that I intend to focus this morning not on the long list of specific goals, but rather on three fundamental questions; each timely as we begin this century's final year and each related directly to the prosperity, security, and freedom of the American people.

*The **first** is whether the dominant economic trend of the next decade will be continued movement toward expanded trade, free markets, and liberal rules of investment or—as some*

predict—a retreat into protectionism. A couple of years ago, the question would have barely come up. From Beijing to Brasilia, the world economy was booming. The Uruguay Round had been completed, the World Trade Organization created and NAFTA signed, and commitments secured to establish free trade areas throughout our hemisphere and in the Asian Pacific. On every continent, governments were coming to equate economic openness with progress.

The consensus today is less solid. During the past 18 months, the financial shocks that began in Asia pulled tens of millions of people back into poverty. The result has been political turmoil, controversy about the prescriptions of the International Monetary Fund, and doubts in some quarters about the wisdom of economic liberalization. These doubts are ill-founded but real. They extend to Europe, where our efforts to negotiate a multilateral agreement on investment was torpedoed, and to Congress, which has refused, thus far, to grant fast-track trade negotiating authority to the President.

So it's little wonder that the headline on the cover of the current foreign policy magazine asks whether globalization has fizzled out. To understand what is happening, we must acknowledge, first, that despite recent setbacks, globalization has helped to spur record economic expansion and rising living standards in Asia, Latin America, and elsewhere. Moreover, because of the productivity of our work force, the United States is the country best prepared to take advantage of economic integration.

But globalization in itself is no guarantor of prosperity. If growth is to be sustained and broadly shared, the forces of change must be harnessed. Developing countries must be helped to build the institutional capacity they need to manage transparent capital flow and to assist their populations in coping with change. I see here a particular role for the State Department.

This year with the U.S. Agency for International Development—USAID—we will launch a social safety

net initiative to help countries help their people survive and recover from the dislocations inherent in the new era. We will drive home the message that democratic institutions and practices, including the rule of law, are the best insurance against financial storms. We will proceed with plans to reform international financial institutions so that we may have more confidence that when the current financial crisis ends, new ones will be averted.

Finally, as we prepare for the summit of the World Trade Organization this fall, we will emphasize the roles of free trade and liberal investment as the twin engines of world economic growth.

But as President Clinton said in his State of the Union address:

We must also ensure that ordinary citizens in all countries benefit from trade. Trade promotes the dignity of work, the rights of workers, the protection of the environment. We must insist that international trade organizations be open to public scrutiny.

The bottom line is that if we are truly to guide globalization rather than allow it to drive us, we must act openly, not behind closed doors. We must take into account the needs not only of the privileged few but of all the rich, poor, and in-between, as those terms apply both to nations and to human beings.

*A **second** key question we face concerns the fundamental security of our citizens and territory—a question we consider today in a far different context than in the past. The dangers of Cold War confrontation have long since ended and for that, we remain grateful. But as Shakespeare's Brutus observed, "It is the bright day that brings forth the adder." As this century draws to a close, we face a serpent's den of perils—some fueled by technology's advance, some by regional rivalry, some by naked ambition, and some by outright hate.*

During the past year, we were witness to terrorist attacks against two of our embassies in Africa, the testing of longer range missiles by North

Korea and Iran, periodic challenges from Saddam Hussein, and nuclear explosions in South Asia that threatened the global non-proliferation regime. The new year promises little relief from such perils. On Tuesday, President Clinton outlined plans for further strengthening our military, developing national and theater missile defenses, and preparing down to the community level for the possibility of a terrorist strike.

The defense of our country requires both the capacity and the will to use force when necessary. As the President made clear, we have both. But force can be a blunt instrument and nearly always entails grave risks. So our security also requires the vigorous use of diplomatic tools.

In the Balkans, the world is confronted by new and unacceptable violence in Kosovo. The massacre in Racak this past weekend has brought tensions to a razor's edge. President Milosevic has invited world condemnation by trying to expel the director of the Kosovo Verification Mission, Ambassador Bill Walker, for doing his job with frankness and courage. And he's blocking efforts by the international war crimes tribunal to investigate the latest atrocity. There is no simple answer to the problems of Kosovo: The ethnic Albanians are fragmented; the Kosovo Liberation Army has committed deliberately provocative acts of kidnaping and murder; and the outlook for a negotiated solution is cloudy.

What is clear is that the status quo is neither acceptable nor sustainable. President Milosevic must meet his obligations by complying with UN resolutions: reducing the Serb's security presence; cooperating with the War Crimes Tribunal; and permitting the verification mission, including Ambassador Walker, to operate unhindered.

We're consulting with our allies and partners about how to achieve this outcome. Success will not guarantee peace in Kosovo, but failure would almost surely lead to a full rupturing of the cease-fire and a return to massive violence. It's essential, therefore, that

we be persuasive in dealing with Milosevic, and that requires that we be prepared, if necessary, to use force because force is the only language he appears to understand.

Meanwhile in the Gulf, we are working on several levels to contain Saddam Hussein and develop steps for hastening his departure from power. At the United Nations, we're insisting that sanctions against the regime continue until Iraq meets its obligations. At the same time, we support lifting restrictions on the amount of oil that may be sold to meet humanitarian needs. We're consulting with Security Council members concerning future weapons inspections and monitoring arrangements. We're enforcing the no-fly zones, and we stand ready to respond if Saddam again threatens his neighbors, reconstitutes his weapons of mass destruction, or moves north against the Iraqi Kurds.

This week, we gave preliminary notification to Congress of the seven Iraqi opposition groups that will be eligible for U.S. assistance under the Iraq Liberation Act. This morning, I'm announcing the appointment of an experienced American diplomat, Frank Ricciardone, a Special Representative for Transition in Iraq. He will be assisted by a team that will include both the military and a political adviser with extensive on-the-ground experience in the region.

Our policy toward Iraq is based on hard experience and sound principle. We seek compliance, not confrontation. But we cannot accept a consensus reflecting weakness or impatience that would give Saddam the opportunity to rebuild his military and reconstitute his weapons of mass destruction, a chance he would surely seize.

We must and will persist in thwarting Iraq's potential for aggression. With the aid of Frank Ricciardone and his team, we will persist in helping the Iraqi people reintegrate themselves into the world community by freeing themselves from a leader they do not want, do not deserve, and never chose.

Further to the East, we're conducting a broad review of our approach to maintain stability on the

Korean Peninsula. We're engaged in discussions with both Koreas on ways to resolve concerns regarding the North's nuclear and long-range missile capabilities. I will not sugarcoat the potential dangers here. The Agreed Framework to freeze and dismantle North Korea's ability to produce nuclear materials must be implemented in good faith and by all sides. Restraint on missiles is essential if North Korea is to enjoy good relations with the nations in its region and improve its standing in the world. In the year ahead, the government in Pyongyang will face a critical choice between two futures: one, of better relations based

“We begin with the principle that democratic governance is not an experiment; it is a right accorded to all people under the Universal Declaration on Human Rights.”

on mutual respect and a commitment to peace; the other, of deepening isolation. We strongly urge the former, but we are prepared for either.

More broadly, we will be using our diplomacy throughout 1999 to enhance our security by means of arms control and non-proliferation. Next week in Russia, I will once more urge the Duma to ratify the Start II treaty and, thereby, clear the way for talks aimed at deep reductions in our nuclear arsenals. I will also discuss steps to prevent the destabilizing transfer of arms and sensitive technologies. This is a problem we addressed not only with Moscow but worldwide.

We provide materials or technical assistance to more than two dozen countries to enhance the effectiveness of their export controls. We also share information. These efforts, although rarely publicized, have prevented numerous transactions that would have

threatened our allies, our friends, or ourselves. While working with others to halt proliferation, we also strive to ensure that our own technology is not compromised. Last year, President Clinton directed the Energy Department to strengthen security at U.S. laboratories. American export control requirements are the world's most stringent.

Today, I'm sending a report to Congress on State Department plans for implementing the authority that Congress returned to us for licensing commercial communications satellites. As the report indicates, such decisions will be based strictly on foreign policy and national security interests as determined by the Departments of State and Defense.

The **third** question I want to discuss today concerns the future of democracy.

Over the past decade, we have witnessed the most extensive expansion of human freedom in history. From Johannesburg to Riga and from East Berlin to Ulaanbaatar, walls fell, statues of dictators toppled, political prisons emptied, and long-silenced voters marched to the polls. For the first time ever, electoral democracy is the world's predominant form of government. Yet some say that democratic momentum has slowed.

Certainly, many democracies are fragile and their people only partly free. In too many countries, there are leaders who talk the talk of democracy, but then turn around and rig elections, repress dissent, and shackle the press. As our own history reflects, building democracy is hard. Far more than elections are required. Free and responsive institutions must be established, a culture of law and tolerance must be created, habits of cronyism and privilege must be challenged, and public expectations about improvements in the quality of life must be addressed. I spoke earlier about the need for persistence, and that's fully evident in the global struggle for democracy.

We begin with the principle that democratic governance is not an experiment; it is a right accorded to all people under the Universal Declaration

on Human Rights. We know, however, that each country must come to democracy at its own speed and by its own path. Government "of the people" cannot be imposed from the outside. But countries, such as ours, that have established such systems can assist by sharing our knowledge and by helping nations in transition to develop durable democratic institutions. That's why today, from Asia to Africa to the Andes, U.S. agencies and non-governmental organizations are training judges, drafting commercial codes, aiding civil society, and otherwise helping to assemble the nuts and bolts of freedom. In the months ahead, we can expect several important tests of democracy.

In Ukraine, the world is watching to see whether scheduled presidential elections are free, and whether leaders deal seriously with the need for economic reform and a commitment to the rule of law.

In Nigeria, a promising and potentially historic transformation may be underway. After years of tyranny, free local elections have been held. Independent political parties have been allowed to register. Political prisoners have been released, and noted exiles have returned home. The United States strongly supports these developments and will do all it can to assist those striving for a Nigerian political system in which all may participate and the rights of all are protected.

In our own hemisphere, Colombia's promising new president is determined to overcome threats posed by drug cartels, guerrillas, paramilitary forces, and poverty. We are determined to help.

And in Indonesia, leaders must prevent further violations of human rights, heal ethnic divisions, deal fairly with the aspirations of those in East Timor, and heed their people's desire for far-reaching political reform.

Although the specifics of our approach to promoting democracy vary from country to country, the fundamental goals are the same. We seek to encourage where we can the development of free institutions and practices. Some fault these efforts as

unrealistic for presuming that democracy is possible in less developed nations. Others suggest that we are being "hegemonic" by trying to impose democratic values.

In truth, we understand well that democracy must emerge from the desire of individuals to participate in the decisions that shape their lives. But we see this desire in all countries. There is no better way for us to show respect for others than to support their right to shape their own futures and select their own leaders. Unlike dictatorship, democracy is never an imposition; it is always a choice.

The answers to the three questions I have discussed this morning will do much to shape the new century. American foreign policy will do much to shape those answers. And the adequacy of resources we devote to foreign policy will do much to determine whether our policy succeeds. Unfortunately, over the past decade, the level of our resources has not kept pace with our responsibilities. While the quantity of our embassies has increased and our workload has gone up, the number of our full-time employees has dropped, and we have experienced a significant reduction in purchasing power.

Today, only about 1% of the federal budget is devoted to international operations and programs. This finances everything from supporting peace to promoting American exports; from fighting drugs to inspecting for weapons of mass destruction; from combating AIDS to protecting our embassy personnel, who are on the front lines in the battle against international terror.

This year, I will be asking Congress to approve in full the President's request for funds to counter and protect against terror, and to carry out programs that will promote U.S. interests and preserve American leadership. This choice between funding and short-changing U.S. leadership is among the most critical the new Congress will make. When it

acts, I hope it will bear in mind both the challenges of the future and the bipartisan traditions of the past.

Fifty years ago this week, 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 their full support to international organizations, to continue programs for world economic recovery; to join with free people everywhere in the defense of democracy; and to draw on our country's vast storehouse of technical expertise to help people help themselves in the fight against ignorance, illness, and despair.

President Truman urged Americans not to shun the cloak of leadership but rather to wear it in the knowledge and with the faith that the power behind us will always be greater than the obstacles before us, because as long as we are true to our principles, America will never stand alone. This was true in 1949. It is true, as well, in 1999. For if we are generous, determined, and persistent in our efforts to build prosperity, assure security, and promote democracy, we will have allies not only among governments but among people everywhere.

Our allies will be all those who yearn to walk in freedom whether or not they are free today; all who believe in tolerance and respect for the rights of others; all who wish to pursue happiness in a climate that gives full rein to their imaginations and skills; and all who want to raise their children in a world where the defenders of peace and the proponents of law are far-sighted and vigilant, strong, and unafraid. With such allies, we cannot fail, nor will we.

In his address on Tuesday, President Clinton challenged us to meet our generation's historic responsibility to build "a stronger 21st century America in a freer, more peaceful world." To that great mission, this morning, I pledge my own best efforts and respectfully solicit both your wise counsel and support.

Thank you very much. ■

International Cooperation In Landmine Action

Donald K. Steinberg

Remarks by the Special Representative of the President and Secretary of State for Global Humanitarian Demining to the Mexico City Conference on Landmine Action: "Reaffirming Our Commitment," Mexico City, New Mexico, January 12, 1999.

Thank you, Mr. Ambassador. I am grateful for the opportunity to address this important conference on the topic, "International Cooperation in Landmine Action." I want to begin by saluting the organizers of the conference—the Governments of Mexico and Canada—for their initiative in bringing together so many officials from OAS governments, international agencies, and non-governmental organizations who have played such a fundamental role in changing the global political landscape on this issue. On behalf of my government, I wish to recognize all of your courageous efforts to achieve the entry into force of the Ottawa Convention and reiterate my government's strongest support for the goal of a world which is mine-safe within the next decade—a goal which the United States is facilitating within its Demining 2010 initiative.

Landmines have been an everyday part of my life for the better part of this decade. I remember traveling with National Security Adviser Anthony Lake to Ethiopia, Rwanda, Burundi, Mozambique, and Angola—five of the world's most heavily mined countries—in 1994 when I was serving as President Clinton's Special Assistant for Africa. In Angola, a country in

which a dozen separate armies have laid millions of mines, we visited Kuito, a city that had been destroyed by three decades of civil war:

In a small clinic, we saw a young woman who was giving birth and having part of her leg amputated at the same time. The doctor later told us that this woman was pregnant and had been starving. She went into a grove of mangos to get some fruit and detonated a landmine that had been planted purposely in the field. The loss of blood had stimulated premature labor, and the doctor told us that it was unlikely that either the mother or the child would survive.

No one who sees such a sight can be immune to the terror of these weapons. Later, when I was named U.S. Ambassador to Angola, I witnessed for more than 3 years the daily tragedy of landmines, including more than 80,000 amputees; hundreds of thousands of displaced persons driven from their homes and fertile fields; and literally millions suffering economic, environmental, and psychological degradation. It was for this reason that I was so honored to be named by President Clinton to my current role, giving me the opportunity to build on the outstanding work of my predecessor, Ambassador Rick Inderfurth.

As we discuss international cooperation in mine action, we have much to learn from the success of the movement which came together to bring us to where we are today—a coalition of like-minded governments, NGOs, and international agencies. As Canadian Foreign Minister Axworthy stated yesterday, the challenge ahead—which he defined as eliminating the threat of landmines to civilians in the Western Hemisphere as soon as possible and to civilians around the world within the next decade—may be even more daunting than the remarkable challenges overcome in bringing the Ottawa Treaty into force.

My government has dedicated more than \$250 million to humanitarian mine action over the past 5 years, and we will be expanding our efforts to well over \$100 million in 1999. I will describe the elements of this assistance later, but I want to stress at the outset that no government, no international agency, and no NGO on its own has the capacity to make more than a small dent on the problem. We must work together.

Coming from conferences held over the past year, including the Washington conference in May 1998,

are a variety of cooperative efforts to which my government is committed. These include:

- Joint mine awareness programs;
- Comprehensive level-one surveys in mine-affected countries;
- Creating and maintaining a database of landmines, demining programs, and survivor assistance efforts around the world, especially through the Geneva International Center and James Madison University;
- Supporting the UN Mine Action Service, the UNDP country projects, and the Norwegian-inspired Mine Action Support Group;
- Promoting Mine Action Centers in mine-affected countries, which empower local governments and peoples to address their own problems;
- Working with our European Commission colleagues and others to identify a global network of test and evaluation facilities to assess promising demining technology and develop international technology demonstration projects;
- Working with our NATO and Partnership for Peace friends to encourage joint mine action projects; indeed, Deputy Special Representative Priscilla Clapp is now in Brussels to encourage these joint efforts;
- Supporting survivor assistance efforts, including both the supply of prosthetics and orthotics as well as addressing the psychosocial and other impediments to rehabilitation and reintegration;
- Encouraging unilateral steps by nonsignatories of the Ottawa Convention that help achieve the goals of that treaty; and
- Reviewing types of assistance we can provide to help destroy existing stockpiles of mines in countries requesting this help, thereby eliminating the threat of these mines before they ever enter the ground.

On this last point, I salute the commitment of the Nicaraguan Government, announced last week, to destroy its existing stocks.

As we work to achieve these objectives, barriers between nations and among governments, international agencies, and NGOs must fade away. In Angola, I was proud that the U.S. Embassy was able to fund the demining efforts of the Norwegian People's Aid, the British HALO Trust, and the German MGM; mines awareness programs of UNICEF, ICRC, Christian Children's Fund, CARE, and the Angolan Government; and survivors' assistance programs of the German Medicos, the French Handicap International, and VVAF. The child whose quality of life is restored by a prosthetic device never asks the nationality of his or her doctor.

Developing new ways around the world to engage the private sector in mine action is a critical part of our effort. We have been working with a number of private partners to pool our creative talents and resources to develop imaginative approaches. I would like to highlight a few of these noteworthy projects as a means of inspiring other governments to consider similar efforts.

First my government is supporting the United Nations Association and HDI in their "Adopt a Minefield" program, which is working with the United Nations to fund demining efforts in Afghanistan, Bosnia, Cambodia, Croatia, and Mozambique. Already, 100 separate community-based organizations in the United States have begun to raise \$25,000 or more each to support UN and host-country efforts to destroy mine fields in these countries.

Second, late last year, DC Comics, the U.S. Defense Department, and UNICEF came together to produce a mine awareness comic book in Spanish, in which Superman and Wonder Woman help teach the children of Central America to identify and avoid contact with these weapons. This is a follow-up to the successful comic book produced for the children of Bosnia. The next project in line is a Portuguese-language version for Mozambique and Angola.

Third, the Marshall Legacy Institute has initiated a "Canine Corps" project in collaboration with the Humane Society of the United States, UNDP, DC Comics, and the State Department. The Humane Society's engagement is due, in part, to the fact that whereas landmines harm about 26,000 human beings each year, they also kill as many as 10 times that number of animals. This project is designed to expand use of dogs in mine detection efforts in mine-affected countries.

Fourth, our Department of Education is supporting groundbreaking research by the Physicians Against Landmines in research aimed at developing low-cost prosthetics with appropriate technology, especially for children.

Fifth, we are supporting, along with Ted Turner's United Nations Foundation and the Canadian Government, the rapid production by the VVAF of standardized, high-quality level-one surveys in 10 mine-affected countries. This program will provide the framework for planning new strategies, minimizing the impact of landmines, and giving us criteria for measuring the success of mines action projects. This program will also help those countries that have ratified the Ottawa Treaty to meet their reporting obligations under Article 7 of the Treaty.

Another exciting initiative is a series of consultations we have launched with major U.S. corporations to encourage them to use portions of their social responsibility funds to address the problems of mines, such as the outstanding rehabilitation efforts of groups like the Landmine Survivors Network.

We are also encouraging these corporations—as well as government entities, NGOs, and other employers—to institute programs to recruit, train, and mentor survivors of landmine accidents, especially for efforts addressed specifically at mine actions.

These projects are some of the ways in which the United States, working with foreign governments, international agencies, and NGOs, is working to create a synergy among our mutual efforts. In sum, the U.S. Government intends to provide this year more than \$100 million for mine actions, including:

- \$35 million for mine awareness, mine mapping, and demining assistance to 25 countries under the State Department program;
- \$34 million for the training of foreign deminers and for mine-awareness projects under the Defense Department program;
- \$18 million for research and development in demining technology;
- \$10 million in assistance to landmine survivors under the USAID Patrick J. Leahy War Victims Fund; and
- Substantial additional funding from the Department of State and USAID for projects associated with the repatriation of refugees and displaced persons.

I would be remiss if I did not pay tribute here to the leadership of Senator Patrick Leahy and his legislative assistant, Tim Rieser, who have done so much to raise public awareness in the United States and generate this level of financial support.

In the Western Hemisphere, U.S. efforts have concentrated on Central America, where we have provided about \$8 million in assistance over the past years, working through the OAS Mission for Mine Clearance in Central America and the Inter-American Defense Board and the World Rehabilitation Fund in El Salvador.

Today, I am pleased to outline my government's intention to fund additional projects in the Western Hemisphere in fiscal year 1999, pending consultations with the U.S. Congress. In Central America, we intend to provide another \$4 million to assist the effort to make this a "mine-safe" region as soon as possible, especially in the wake of the devastation created by Hurricane Mitch. This assistance comes on the top of the \$300 million provided by my government in emergency relief over the past 3 months. Working with MARMINCA and the IADB, we will provide additional training, technical assistance, logistical support, medical and communications assistance, and mine-awareness programs in Guatemala, Nicaragua, Honduras, and Costa Rica.

In Peru and Ecuador, my government intends—as a guarantor nation of the peace accords—to allocate substantial resources to begin demarcation and demining work along the border. Pending the results of an assessment team that will travel to the region within the next few weeks, we are prepared to provide both short-term assistance associated with the start-up of this operation and long-term training assistance.

Throughout this hemisphere—from Central America to the Peru-Ecuador border—men and women of good will and great courage are putting behind them years and even decades of civil strife. The United States will stand shoulder to shoulder with these brave people as they stand up for peace and national reconciliation. We urge all our fellow OAS partners here today to

make a similar commitment of direct assistance for those mine action efforts.

I want to conclude with a few words about our anti-personnel landmine (APL) policy. You are all familiar with the compelling reasons identified by my government for not signing the Ottawa Convention. I hope you are equally familiar with the efforts we are taking to eliminate anti-personnel landmines and find alternatives.

- Since 1996, the United States has destroyed 3.3 million non-self-destructing APL—all of our long-lived APL except those needed for defense in Korea and training.
- We have pledged to end the use of all APL outside Korea by 2003.
- We are aggressively pursuing the objective of having APL alternatives ready for Korea by 2006.
- We are also aggressively pursuing alternatives to our mixed anti-tank systems, which are covered by the Ottawa Convention.
- We are expanding our research not only to seek alternatives but to redefine military strategies to eliminate the need for APLs.
- We are committed to transparency on landmine issues and are proud to be among the only countries meeting their reporting obligations under the OAS resolutions and other international organs.

Let me assure you that the United States will remain in the forefront of the struggle to eliminate the threat to civilians from anti-personnel landmines. When it comes to reaffirming our commitment to an anti-personnel landmine safe world, as we used to say in Angola: "Estamos Juntos." Muito obrigado, gracias, and thank you. ■



TREATY ACTIONS

JANUARY

BILATERAL

Armenia

Memorandum of understanding concerning scientific and technical cooperation in the earth sciences, with annex. Signed at Reston and Yerevan Sept. 25 and Nov. 2, 1998. Entered into force Nov. 2, 1998.

Benin

Agreement relating to the employment of dependents of official government employees. Effected by exchange of notes at Washington Sept. 22 and Dec. 3, 1998. Entered into force Dec. 3, 1998.

Bolivia

Agreement concerning security assistance matters and the provision of articles, services, and associated military education and training by the United States Government for anti-narcotics purposes. Effected by exchange of notes at La Paz Oct. 27 and Nov. 5, 1998. Entered into force Nov. 5, 1998.

Chile

Agreement for educational cooperation. Signed at Washington Feb. 26, 1997. Entered into force Nov. 9, 1998.

Colombia

Supplemental memorandum related to the July 24, 1998 memorandum of understanding concerning the transfer of forfeited assets. Signed at Washington Oct. 28, 1998. Entered into force Oct. 28, 1998.

Denmark

Agreement for promotion of aviation safety. Signed at Copenhagen Nov. 6, 1998. Entered into force Nov. 6, 1998.

Estonia

Acquisition and cross-servicing agreement, with annex. Signed at Tallinn and Stuttgart Sept. 9 and Oct. 21, 1998. Entered into force Oct. 21, 1998.

Ethiopia

Agreement to exempt from income tax, on a reciprocal basis, income derived from the international operation of aircraft and ships. Effected by exchange of notes at Addis Ababa Oct. 30 and Nov. 12, 1998. Entered into force Nov. 12, 1998; effective Jan. 1, 1998.

Finland

Agreement relating to participation in the USNRC Program of severe accident research, with addendum. Signed at Rockville and Espoo Oct. 29 and Nov. 12, 1998. Entered into force Nov. 12, 1998.

Germany

Protocol amending the convention of Dec. 3, 1980 for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to taxes on estates, inheritances, and gifts. Signed at Washington Dec. 14, 1998. Enters into force upon the exchange of instruments of ratification.

Honduras

Agreement concerning security assistance matters and the provision of articles, services, and associated

military education and training by the United States Government for anti-narcotics purposes. Effected by exchange of notes at Tegucigalpa Oct. 16 and 22, 1998. Entered into force Oct. 22, 1998.

Israel

Memorandum of agreement concerning ballistic missile threats. Signed at Washington and Jerusalem Oct. 31, 1998. Entered into force Oct. 31, 1998.

South Africa

Agreement concerning security measures for the protection of classified military information. Signed at Pretoria Nov. 20, 1998. Entered into force Nov. 28, 1998.

Uganda

Agreement for cooperation in the Global Learning and Observations to Benefit the Environment (GLOBE) Program, with appendices. Signed at Kampala Nov. 26, 1998. Entered into force Nov. 26, 1998.

FEBRUARY

MULTILATERAL

Aviation, Civil

Montreal protocol No. 4 to amend the convention for the unification of certain rules relating to international carriage by air signed at Warsaw on Oct. 12, 1929 as amended by the protocol done at The Hague on Sept. 28, 1955. Done at Montreal Sept. 25, 1975. [Senate]

Executive B, 95th Cong., 1st Sess. Enters into force for the U.S. Mar. 4, 1999.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization Protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty on the accession of the Czech Republic. Signed at Brussels Dec. 16, 1997. [Senate] Treaty Doc. 105-36, 105th Cong., 1st Sess.

Protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty on the accession of Hungary. Signed at Brussels Dec. 16, 1997. [Senate] Treaty Doc. 105-36, 105th Cong., 1st Sess.

Protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty on the accession of Poland. Signed at Brussels Dec. 16, 1997. [Senate] Treaty Doc. 105-36, 105th Cong., 1st Sess.
Acceptances: Netherlands, Dec. 4, 1998; Portugal, Dec. 3, 1998; Turkey, Dec. 3, 1998.
Entered into force: Dec. 4, 1998.

BILATERAL

Benin
Investment incentive agreement. Signed at Washington Nov. 30, 1998. Entered into force Nov. 30, 1998.

Cyprus
Agreement for cooperation in the Global Learning and Observations to Benefit the Environment (GLOBE) Program, with appendices. Signed at Nicosia Nov. 24, 1998. Entered into force Nov. 24, 1998.

Centro Regional de Sismologia Para America del Sur (CERESIS)
Memorandum of understanding concerning scientific and technical coop-

eration in the earth sciences, with annexes. Signed at Reston, Santiago, and Lima Oct. 6, Nov. 17, and Dec. 3, 1998. Entered into force Dec. 3, 1998.

Kenya
Investment incentive agreement. Signed at Nairobi Dec. 3, 1998. Enters into force on date on which Kenya notifies the U.S. that all legal requirements have been fulfilled.

Macedonia
Agreement concerning the reciprocal employment of dependents of official government employees, with attachment. Effected by exchange of notes at Washington Dec. 10, 1998. Entered into force Dec. 10, 1998.

Mozambique
Agreement amending the agreement of Aug. 13, 1997 regarding the consolidation, reduction, and rescheduling of certain debts owed to, guaranteed by, or insured by the United States Government and its agency. Effected by exchange of notes at Maputo Sept. 30 and Oct. 27, 1998. Entered into force Oct. 27, 1998.

Senegal
Agreement regarding the reduction and reorganization of certain debts owed to, guaranteed by, or insured by the United States Government and its agencies, with annexes. Signed at Dakar Dec. 17, 1998. Enters into force following receipt by Senegal of written notice from the U.S. that all necessary domestic legal requirements have been fulfilled.

Slovenia
Memorandum of understanding concerning the exchange of graduate students, post-doctoral researchers,

and lecturers under the auspices of the Fulbright Program. Signed at Ljubljana Dec. 8, 1993. Entered into force Jan. 20, 1999.

Sweden
Basic exchange and cooperative agreement for global geospatial information and services, with annexes. Signed at Stockholm and Bethesda Nov. 26 and Dec. 14, 1998. Entered into force Dec. 14, 1998.

Venezuela
Convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income and capital, with protocol. Signed at Caracas Jan. 25, 1999. Enters into force upon the date of the later of the notifications through the diplomatic channel, accompanied by an instrument of ratification.

Vietnam
Agreement on the establishment of copyright relations. Signed at Hanoi June 27, 1997. Entered into force Dec. 23, 1998.

Agreement amending the agreement of June 27, 1997 on the establishment of copyright relations. Effected by exchange of notes at Washington Dec. 23, 1998. Entered into force Dec. 23, 1998.

Zimbabwe
Investment incentive agreement. Signed at Harare Jan. 20, 1999. Enters into force on the date on which Zimbabwe notifies the U.S. that all legal requirements have been fulfilled. ■