

U.S. Foreign Operations Budget

Secretary Albright

1

Statement before the Senate Appropriations Committee on Foreign Operations, Washington, DC, May 20, 1999.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee: Good morning. I am pleased to be here to seek your support for the Administration's request for funds for the foreign operations programs of the United States.

At the outset, let me thank this subcommittee and its members for their leadership in supporting a principled and purposeful U.S. foreign policy. We have not always agreed on all subjects, but the disagreements have almost always been on tactics, not goals.

For we all know America's purpose: it is freedom. We Americans are dedicated to the rights of all people. We promote government with the consent of the governed. We believe in law. We cherish peace. We seek prosperity.

Having said this, we have not said very much, for it is easy to list goals. Our task, together—you and me, America and our friends overseas—is to achieve them.

About a decade ago, we began a journey into a new era. We set out free from Cold War bonds but soon were plagued by other perils. Along the way, we have not always put our foot right, but overall we have made great progress.

Because the signposts of the past have fallen, history demands that we be innovators and trailblazers, builders of new institutions and adapters of old.

So in virtually every part of every continent, we work with others to bring nations closer together around basic principles of democracy and law, open markets, and a commitment to peace.

We do this because it is right, but also because it is essential to protect the best interests of our nation and people. In this era, our security, prosperity, and freedom hinge on whether others, too, have access to these blessings. And the future depends on whether we can help shape a world in which disputes are settled, prosperity is shared, criminals are caught, aggressors are deterred, and basic human rights are respected.

Mr. Chairman, we need the full measure of American influence and leadership at this critical time. The scope of our national interests and the connections between our global role and our prosperity require it. The range of threats to our security demands it. And, as recent events in the Balkans, the Gulf, Asia, and Africa remind us, the world will not wait. That is why I come before you in search of the resources and tools we need to respond to perils and seize opportunities for ensuring our security, promoting our prosperity, and upholding our values.

This subcommittee has generally supported funding for international programs and for that, I thank you. In particular, I salute your support for a supplemental to meet urgent needs in Kosovo and southeast Europe as well as Central America and Jordan.

I was gratified to see so many Senators, including several of you, travel to southeast Europe or Central America earlier this year. You gained firsthand knowledge of the human tragedies and foreign policy challenges we face. You returned committed to seeing that the State Department has the resources to get our part of the job of relief and reconstruction done right. And your efforts are paying off.

I hope that we can work together in that same spirit to maintaining next year, and in the years to come, the quality of diplomatic leadership that can prevent crises from ever occurring—and respond to them quickly when they do happen.

Unfortunately, this year the budget allocations being contemplated would require drastic reductions in the funding requested by the President for foreign operations—cuts in the range of 14-29%. This appears to be the outcome of a process shut off from the realities of the world in which we live. It is arithmetic, not statecraft, and it presents us with a shared problem.

Cuts of this magnitude would gravely imperil immediate and long-term American interests. Let me explain how.

The low funding levels would be bad enough, but they are complicated by limits on spending. Because foreign aid spends out over several years, aid commitments made in previous years account for half of the spending, our outlays, in the President's budget request. A lower FY 2000 spending ceiling means that prior year commitments will account for an even greater proportion of the total, leaving very little room for new spending. To meet our prior commitments, we might well be required to make other cuts, as much as one-half to two-thirds, in programs that are essential to American interests. This is tantamount to the surrender of American leadership around the world.

Anyone who says we should do more to counter terror, or fight drugs, or halt proliferation, or promote American exports, or prevent the abuse of human rights should agree that it is not possible to accomplish any of these goals without resources.

This is not a partisan issue. The call for a strong U.S. foreign policy comes from leaders in both parties. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that we can answer it together—and work to assure funding levels that provide our citizens with the diplomatic leadership they deserve.

AMERICAN LEADERSHIP AROUND THE WORLD

Europe and the New Independent States

Mr. Chairman, this year we mark the 10th anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall and the 50th anniversary of the founding of NATO. It is an appropriate time to rededicate ourselves to the goal of a new Europe—undivided, democratic, and at peace. But the continent cannot be whole and free as long as its southeast corner is wracked by ethnic tensions and

threatened with conflict. And throughout this decade, the primary source of rancor and violence in this region has been the ruthless incitement of ethnic hatred by authorities in Belgrade.

The current campaign of ethnic cleansing in Kosovo is an assault on universal values of respect for human rights and dignity. The resulting outflow of refugees is both horrifying and profoundly destabilizing. And Milosevic's repeated use of violence and terror poses a profound threat to the security and character of Europe.

NATO was right to respond. And despite the difficulties we face, we will prevail. NATO, the European Union, and our G-8 partners including Russia have united around terms for an acceptable end to the crisis. Serb security forces must leave so that refugees can safely re-enter. An international security presence must be allowed, with NATO at its core. And the people of Kosovo must be given the democratic self-government they have long deserved.

We are continuing to work, through military and diplomatic means, to make Belgrade understand that these terms offer the only prospect for peace. And we continue to support the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia in its effort to ensure that those who commit or order atrocities in Kosovo will be held accountable.

The current crisis highlights the need to integrate the Balkans more fully into the Euro-Atlantic Community of democracies. We do not want this conflict to serve as a prelude to others. In the weeks ahead, we will be consulting with you, and working with regional leaders, our allies, and international financial institutions to develop a strategy for bringing Europe's southeast corner into the continent's mainstream.

The President's budget proposal, as you know, was presented before Belgrade turned away from negotiations and chose the course of war and mayhem. It foresees an extensive

international presence in Kosovo but not the military force that will now be required. I hope we can work closely together, Mr. Chairman, to revise our request to take account of the situation in the region, and to ensure that we and our European partners do our part to build a solid foundation for a new generation of peace.

That is what we are doing—with NATO, the European Union (EU), Russia, and others—in Bosnia. Completing the implementation of the Dayton accords would remove a major threat to European security and establish a model for inter-ethnic cooperation that is needed throughout the Balkans and around the world.

Since the Accords were signed 3 years ago, enormous progress has been made. And as peace has returned, we have steadily reduced our troop presence, and worked to return decision-making to Bosnian hands.

But the nation's bitter divisions are only partially healed. If the promise of Dayton is to be fulfilled, we must stand firm in our support for Bosnia. I ask your support for our request of \$175 million to help refugees return home, buttress democracy and human rights, foster foreign investment and a free-market economy, professionalize Bosnia's police, and reinforce regional stability. And to serve our interests throughout this corner of Europe, I ask your support for the President's SEED request encompassing all of southeast Europe, which totals \$393 million.

Beyond the Balkans, Mr. Chairman, we are working with our friends, allies, and partners to create new institutions and adapt old ones to meet the challenges of the new era. And with every step forward, we draw closer to our vision of a Europe whole and free.

With the President's personal leadership and crucial help from former Senator George Mitchell, we have supported the people of Ireland in their desire to end terror and live in peace through implementation of the historic "Good Friday" agreement.

I want to thank this subcommittee once more for its support for the annual U.S. contribution to the International Fund for Ireland. This is a valuable expression of our support for peace in Northern Ireland.

With Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, we have signed the U.S.-Baltic Charter, to show support for the freedom and security of those nations and for their efforts to join Western institutions. And we are pursuing our Northeast Europe Initiative to build bridges among the nations of the Nordic and Baltic region.

Under the New Transatlantic Agenda, we are working with the EU to meet the challenges we both face around the world, such as humanitarian disasters, proliferation threats, international crime, and differences over trade. We strongly support the expansion of the European Union into central and eastern Europe and Turkey's desire to be part of that process. We are working hard to ease tensions in the Aegean and continue to explore every opportunity for progress toward a settlement on Cyprus.

We are among those striving to help the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) meet its potential as a catalyst for democratic change, tolerance, and respect for human rights.

With our allies, we last month set the course for NATO's second 50 years. At the Washington Summit, we welcomed NATO's three new members, with strong Congressional support. We recognized collective defense as the core mission of the alliance, but resolved to prepare to respond to the full range of threats the alliance may face. And we resolved to further develop our partnerships with other European democracies.

Further to the east, democratic change remains very much a work in progress. In many countries, respect for human rights and the rule of law is weak and economic reforms have been slowed by financial turmoil.

We will continue to help countries in the region find the right road. We do this for reasons of principle, but also because this part of the world is critical to our own long-term security and prosperity.

We are determined to maintain our pragmatic partnership with Russia in the many areas where our interests coincide. The fact is, on a variety of security, financial, and global matters, Russia has continued to do serious business with the United States and

*“With our allies,
we last month set
the course for
NATO’s second
50 years.
At the Washington
Summit, we
welcomed NATO’s
three new members,
with strong
congressional
support . . . And
we resolved to
further develop
our partnerships
with other
European
democracies.”*

with Western institutions, notwithstanding our differences over Kosovo. We have moved forward on important issues such as the HEU agreement, the Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty, and the Civil Aviation agreement.

We have made noteworthy progress toward the goal of completing CFE negotiations by the time of the OSCE summit later this year. And we have maintained frequent contacts, from President Yeltsin on down, in an effort to bring Russia on board over Kosovo. I will also mention that we have not seen that cooperation change since the departure of Prime Minister Primakov last week.

Obviously, it remains to be seen how Russian politics will evolve. But one thing is constant—America's interest in encouraging a peaceful and democratic Russia to tackle its economic problems and play a constructive international role. It should not be surprising that the Russian transition from communism to a more open system is proving difficult. Our own democracy took many decades to mature and remains unfinished. We have an enormous stake in Russian success and will continue to help as long as Russia is committed to the path of reform.

We are sustaining our strategic partnership with Ukraine—knowing that an independent, democratic, prosperous, and stable Ukraine remains a key to building a secure and undivided Europe. This year we will continue to support Ukraine's economic and political reforms, press for a free and fair presidential election, enhance cooperation under the NATO-Ukraine Charter, and strengthen joint non-proliferation efforts. As Ukraine prepares for elections this year, it is essential that President Kuchma demonstrate the leadership, and the Rada the wisdom, to press ahead with overdue reforms.

In February, after the most searching consideration, I was able to certify that the requirements of U.S. law with respect to Ukraine's business climate were met—albeit just barely. But I would urge Congress to reconsider the wisdom of the certification requirement, as it has become an impediment to our credibility and steady engagement in Ukraine. I look

forward to working with Congress and the U.S. business community to ensure a level playing field for American economic interests in Ukraine.

Throughout the NIS, a great deal of work remains to be done to build stable democratic governments and functioning, transparent market economies. And the United States has a continuing interest in fostering regional cooperation in Caspian energy development and transportation infrastructure. I welcome the great Congressional interest and support for these issues.

In the coming year, we hope to see progress on resolving the conflicts in Nagorno-Karabakh and Abkhazia, and are engaged with all parties toward that end.

We renew our request this year for legislation to repeal Section 907 of the Freedom Support Act. This provision hinders our ability to advance America's national interests in Azerbaijan and the Caucasus. Eliminating it would restore balance to our policy toward Azerbaijan and Armenia, and reinforce our role as an honest broker in the peace process.

We are monitoring with concern the rise of repression in Belarus, and supporting NGOs and media outlets to help opposition views reach the public. And we are preparing to facilitate withdrawal of Russian troops from Moldova by requesting funding under the Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative for disposal of munitions and force relocation. And, as every country in the region holds elections this year or next, I ask your support for our efforts to ensure that they be free and fair.

Our support for democratic and market reform will not remake the region overnight. But it can help those in the region who are helping themselves to move in the right direction.

For example, our support fosters economic development by encouraging investment in small businesses, helps to build accountable democratic institutions, and fights the crime and corruption that have shadowed emerging markets. It helps sustain and

expand our non-proliferation programs, which I will discuss shortly. Our assistance is focused on exchanges, civil society, and the private sector, and it is increasingly directed toward the regions, not concentrated in capitals.

We fund these NIS programs neither as a favor to governments in the region nor as a stamp of approval of all their policies, but because they serve American interests. And frankly, we need to do more. So I urge you to back our full request of \$1.032 billion this year. And I ask that you ensure that we have the flexibility we need to support democratic and market reforms in accordance with America's interests.

The Western Hemisphere

Here in our own hemisphere, we have important interests dictated not only by proximity of geography, but by proximity of values.

The nations of Latin America and the Caribbean have made great progress over the past two decades, but serious problems remain. These include poverty, inequality, and corruption; there are still recurring crises, including natural disasters, political turmoil, and financial instability. But there is now a broad and deepening consensus across the region on how to deal with these challenges, and a willingness to work cooperatively on them. I ask you to ensure that we have the resources we need to help make the most of this historic opportunity.

Five years ago, at the summit in Miami, President Clinton and the other 33 democratic leaders of our hemisphere affirmed a commitment to democracy and market economics, and developed an action plan to help make a difference in people's daily lives.

At the heart of the summit process is a commitment to free and fair trade and economic integration. In recent years, every major economy in the region has liberalized its system for investment and trade, and we have begun negotiations to achieve a Free Trade Area of the Americas by 2005.

As a result of its continuing market-based reforms, Latin America has been relatively successful in weathering the global financial crisis; our exports to this region have continued to rise steadily even during the recent periods of turbulence. To complete this transformation, we must follow through on our free trade agenda and give the President the same authority to negotiate trade agreements as his recent predecessors have had.

As they pursue a shared trade agenda, the leaders of our hemisphere are also working together to ensure that the promise of economic reform translates into steadily improved standards of living for ordinary citizens. At last year's summit in Santiago, they approved initiatives to promote small business development, increase investments in education, and address wide and increasing inequalities between the rich and poor.

The focus on broad-based economic development is central to our strategy for helping our neighbors in the Caribbean and Central America recover from Hurricane Georges and Hurricane Mitch—among the worst natural disasters ever to strike the Western Hemisphere.

I welcome your support for our supplemental request in this area. The hurricane season is upon Central America and the Caribbean again, and we will be able to put this money to immediate use in repairing last year's damage and helping prepare against the ravages of future storms. It is particularly timely, as the international donor community will hold a consultative group meeting in Stockholm May 24-28 to discuss Central American reconstruction.

Approving the supplemental was a vital step in aiding the recovery of Central America, but sustained recovery also requires expanding trade and creating jobs. Ultimately, job creation and economic development in Central America and the Caribbean are the keys to long-term stability and

to stemming the flow of illegal immigration. These are the goals of the Caribbean Basin Trade Enhancement legislation which the Administration submitted in March. I urge Congress to adopt this legislation promptly.

As the recent disasters so starkly demonstrate, economic development is often a series of two steps forward, one step back. What is required is long-term commitment.

Support for democracy requires the same kind of determination and steadiness. Every democracy, including our own, remains a work in progress. We should not let the occasional discouraging headline distract us from the remarkable gains made over the past two decades, as nation after nation in our hemisphere has embraced the principles of representative and constitutional government.

Consider, for example, some of the crises of the last few months: serious political conflicts over economic policy in Ecuador, an assassination in Paraguay that triggered a presidential resignation, and a political stalemate in Haiti which may be lessening but is still unresolved. In each of these countries, democracy is not yet deeply-rooted. Ten years ago, how would we have expected these crises to be resolved?

None of these stories is yet complete. But despite the turmoil, the leaders and citizens of these countries have **not** pushed aside democracy and the rule of law, the militaries have **not** stepped in as alleged national saviors, political differences have **not** degenerated into widespread violence, even when there were thousands marching in the streets. Instead, from Asuncion to Quito to Port-au-Prince, we have seen negotiations within a constitutional framework, and efforts to forge broad-based, multiparty coalitions.

Let me also say a few words about Colombia, a country that is a major priority of our current democracy efforts.

Colombia is not a new democracy, but its political institutions are under terrible strain, as the government tries

to cope with a bloody civil conflict, massive drug trafficking, and economic stagnation. The January 25th earthquake was also a huge blow.

Since taking office last summer, President Pastrana has worked hard to re-establish the rule of law, restore fiscal responsibility, and secure peace. He offers the best chance in years to put Colombia back on the right course and deserves our support.

President Pastrana and other elected leaders around the hemisphere are valuable partners in the effort to strengthen democratic institutions and improve standards of living. Unfortunately, Fidel Castro continues to justify his pariah status by throwing

“In January, President Clinton announced a series of steps, building on measures the Administration took the previous March, which expand our efforts to reach out to the Cuban people and help prepare for a peaceful transition to democracy.”

dissidents and human rights advocates in prison and refusing to hold free and fair elections. Our response is guided by one simple principle: the Cuban people deserve the same rights and liberties as their counterparts from Argentina to Alaska.

In January, President Clinton announced a series of steps, building on measures the Administration took the previous March, which expand our efforts to reach out to the Cuban people and help prepare for a

peaceful transition to democracy. In particular, we have made it easier for Cubans to be in touch with family and friends in the United States and easier for the Cuban-American community to help those on the island. As the President made clear, our goal is to strengthen people-to-people ties and encourage the development in Cuba of peaceful activities independent of the government.

The Asia-Pacific

In the Asia-Pacific, we are working with allies and partners to improve security cooperation, restore economic momentum, and build democracy.

As President Clinton and Prime Minister Obuchi reaffirmed in their summit earlier this month, the U.S.-Japan alliance remains the cornerstone of regional security and we are reinvigorating that alliance through the implementation of new guidelines for defense cooperation. With the world's second-largest economy, Japan is also an economic key. We are encouraging Tokyo to continue and expand its program of deregulation, market-opening, and other measures to restore growth.

There is no greater threat to peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific than the situation on the Korean Peninsula. With our Korean and Japanese allies and China, we are seeking ways to reduce tensions with North Korea and make progress toward a permanent settlement. To this end, we have vigorously pressed our concerns about North Korea's development, deployment, testing, and export of long-range missiles. We have reached an agreement that will allow U.S. inspection of underground construction at Kumchang-ni, thereby assuring—at a minimum—the suspension of any destabilizing activities that may have been occurring at that site. And we continue to insist that North Korea meet its obligation under the Agreed Framework to freeze and dismantle its ability to produce fissile material which can be used in nuclear weapons.

As members of the subcommittee know, former Defense Secretary Perry is currently conducting a comprehensive review of U.S. policy toward North Korea. He has sought extensive Congressional input and consulted closely with the South Korean and Japanese governments. We expect Dr. Perry to present his findings and recommendations to the President very soon.

Also in East Asia, we have continued our principled and purposeful engagement with China. The tragic and mistaken bombing by NATO of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade, for which President Clinton and other alliance leaders have apologized, should not alter the fundamental relationship between our two countries. Cooperation between the United States and China is vital to regional security, prosperity, and peace. Neither country can benefit from a policy of confrontation or isolation.

Since the U.S.-China Strategic Dialogue began a half-decade ago, we have seen China move from being part of the nuclear proliferation problem to becoming part of the solution. It has endorsed extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), become party to the Chemical Weapons Convention, promised not to assist unsafeguarded nuclear facilities, supported peace talks on Korea, and played a responsible role during the Asian financial crisis. We need to recognize these gains, even as we press for further progress.

On economic issues, we are continuing our effort to negotiate an agreement that would enable China to join the World Trade Organization on commercially viable terms.

On proliferation, we are urging China to take the necessary steps to become party to the Missile Technology Control Regime.

And on human rights, we are pressing Beijing to live up to the standards of the UN covenants it has signed, including the International

Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. We have also urged China to resume dialogue with the Dalai Lama.

As I have said before, in our relations with China, engagement is not endorsement. We continue to have disagreements with Beijing. But we also believe that the way to narrow those differences and to take advantage of the many areas where U.S. and Chinese interests coincide, is through regular contacts and dialogue. Elsewhere in the region, we are strongly supporting those committed to political and economic reform.

While visiting Indonesia this spring, I spoke both publicly and privately about the importance of holding free, fair, and credible elections on June 7, and about the need for the Indonesian military to do more to stop violence without abusing human rights. I also discussed with Indonesian leaders the ongoing effort to reach a just and peaceful resolution of the status of East Timor. My emphasis was on the need to disarm paramilitary forces, promote stability, and respect the will of East Timor's people as the transition to a new status takes place.

In Cambodia, we are continuing to work with ASEAN, Japan, Australia, and others to strengthen democracy. We are encouraged by the progress that has been made toward political reconciliation and are urging authorities to bring senior Khmer Rouge leaders from the 1975-79 period to justice under credible, internationally sanctioned procedures.

In Burma, we continue to advocate a meaningful dialogue between the authorities there and the democratic opposition, led by the National League for Democracy (NLD). We are deeply concerned by the attempts made throughout the past year to harass and intimidate NLD leaders. Officials in Rangoon must understand that the path to international acceptance and economic progress lies in movement toward a legitimate and popularly supported government.

South Asia

Mr. Chairman, South Asia receives a relatively small amount of American assistance, but the region has a significant impact on our national interests.

Last year's nuclear tests by India and Pakistan posed a threat to international security and dealt a blow to the nuclear non-proliferation regime. In our diplomacy, we strive to move both governments toward the mainstream of international proliferation policy. We are encouraging the parties to resolve the long-standing tensions between them, and we work in the process to broaden and revitalize our relations with both countries.

We have made some important headway. Both India and Pakistan have made qualified commitments to adhere to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty by September and they have pledged to join negotiations for a fissile material production cutoff, and to tighten export controls.

Indian voters will not choose a new parliament until this fall, but we are determined to maintain our arms control dialogue during the interim period. More broadly, throughout the region we will be working hard to advance our core foreign policy objectives of enhancing economic ties, countering terrorism, extending the rule of law, and promoting respect for human rights—including religious freedom, worker rights and women's rights.

The Middle East

American policy in the Middle East is designed to strengthen the forces of peace, encourage regional economic integration and growth, spur democratic progress, marginalize extremists and defeat terror.

To these ends, we maintain our unshakable commitment to the security of our ally, Israel. And we continue to work with regional leaders in support of a just, lasting, and comprehensive Middle East peace. This year, as we mark the 20th anniversary of the

signing of the Israeli-Egyptian peace treaty, we remember how far we have come and how far we have yet to travel.

We welcome the election of Ehud Barak as the next Prime Minister of Israel. Once he has formed a government and taken office, we hope to move forward vigorously on all aspects of the Middle East peace process. We hope for rapid implementation of all outstanding Wye obligations by both sides and the start of permanent status negotiations with the goal of completing them within 1 year. We will also be prepared to undertake a new effort to make progress on the Syrian and Lebanese tracks.

We were extremely pleased this week to receive in Washington His Majesty, King Abdullah of Jordan, who has pledged to maintain Jordan's constructive role in the peace process. With the passing of Jordan's King Hussein, the region lost a courageous and eloquent champion of peace. We have expressed our full support and friendship to the new King and—with the support of Congress, for which I thank you—will help him work to strengthen the Jordanian economy.

Mr. Chairman, as we pursue our diplomacy, I hope we can count on the subcommittee's support to fund those programs that help support the peace process. These include our requests for economic support funds and foreign military financing that benefit our partners in peace—Israelis, Egyptians, Jordanians, and Palestinians—as well as regional programs that bring those parties together.

In the Gulf, we will continue to work with our allies and friends, and within the United Nations Security Council, to confront the threats posed by the Iraqi regime.

Last December, we joined our British allies in a military operation that degraded Iraq's weapons of mass destruction (WMD) capacity and its ability to threaten its neighbors. We have since continued to enforce the southern and northern no-fly zones

and have repeatedly acted against Iraqi military assets in the zones that threaten our pilots and aircraft.

At the United Nations, we are working within the Security Council to develop a basis for resuming inspection and monitoring of Iraq's remaining WMD capabilities. We will insist that sanctions against the regime continue until Iraq meets its obligations, although we support easing the burdens on the Iraqi people through an enhanced oil-for-food program.

Our policy toward Iraq is to counter the threat Saddam Hussein poses to his people, his neighbors, our allies, and our interests in the region until there is a change in regime in Baghdad. We must and will persist in thwarting Iraq's potential for aggression. And we will support the Iraqi people's desire to reintegrate themselves into the international community and free themselves from a leader they do not want, do not deserve, and never chose.

Across the border from Iraq in Iran, parliamentary elections have reinforced clear signs of popular support for a society based on the rule of law and a more open approach to the world. We welcome that, though we are concerned that Iran continues to pursue policies—on proliferation, terrorism, and human rights—that violate international norms.

Iran's President Khatami has called for a dialogue between our two people. Last summer, I endorsed that call and expressed a willingness to work with authorities in Tehran, when the time is right, to develop a roadmap for more normal relations. The official Iranian response thus far has not been encouraging, but we stand ready for a dialogue in which both sides would be free to discuss all issues of concern.

Last month, two Libyans accused in the 1988 bombing of Pan Am flight 103 were delivered into the custody of Scottish authorities for trial in the Netherlands by a Scottish court under Scottish law. This development is a milestone in the decade-long effort to

hold accountable those responsible for the murders of 270 people, including 189 Americans. The United States looks forward to the legal resolution of this case and to the partial alleviation of anguish that may bring to those whose loved ones were lost on Pan Am 103.

Africa

In Africa, our challenge is to address pressing security and humanitarian concerns, while maintaining our focus on helping to realize the continent's great human and economic potential.

From the Red Sea to the Atlantic Ocean, African states are embroiled in civil and regional wars that are taking a horrifying toll on innocent civilians. It would be difficult to overestimate the destructiveness of these conflicts; and we are engaged in intensive efforts to resolve each of them.

Just 2 days ago, with strong U.S. support, Sierra Leone's President Kabbah and rebel leader Sankoh signed a cease-fire agreement, a step toward ending the brutal fighting there. But at the same time, we are mindful of the fact that conflict is not the only force shaping the future of the 700 million people in the region.

An increasing number of Africa's leaders now understand that the continent's future prosperity depends on trade and foreign investment. They are working to create a better environment for doing business by privatizing state-run enterprises, revamping commercial codes, and adopting sound fiscal policies. As a result, overall economic growth in Africa has averaged nearly 4% over the past 4 years, and our exports to the region have risen by an average of more than 11% per year over the same period.

The United States has a direct stake in seeing this economic progress continue. It means better business opportunities for American companies. And it means that African nations could

be stronger allies, and less dependent on international assistance, in the decades to come.

So, once again, I urge Congress to pass the African Growth and Opportunity Act. This trade measure would provide essential support for the process of economic reform across the continent and expand our trade with one of the largest untapped markets in the world.

Mr. Chairman, I want to draw your attention to our efforts in Sudan, a country that remains one of our diplomatic and humanitarian priorities.

“ . . . to protect the security and prosperity of our citizens, we are engaged in every region on every continent. Many of our initiatives and concerns are directed . . . at particular countries or parts of the world. Others are more encompassing and can best be considered in global terms.”

With your support, the United States provided more than \$150 million to Sudanese relief last year, and has already committed over \$130 million for FY 1999. Operation Lifeline Sudan is now the largest food delivery program in history, having surpassed the Berlin Airlift. Thanks to this remarkable effort, the immediate crisis which endangered the lives of over 2 million people in the southern part of that country has largely abated.

But long-term food security in Sudan depends on ending that country's civil war. The international donor community, with our active participation and support, is working to revitalize the negotiating process. Kenya has appointed a special envoy to focus full-time on the process. And with American assistance, a secretariat will be set up for the talks in Nairobi, under the auspices of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development.

In Africa, as elsewhere, we can have the greatest impact where we have partners. For that reason, it is essential for us to continue our strong support for the positive developments in Africa's two anchor states, South Africa and Nigeria.

Five years ago, Nelson Mandela was elected as the first president of a free South Africa. Next month, he will step down, the voters will select a new parliament, and that parliament will choose Mandela's successor.

Mandela's wisdom will, of course, be missed—there are few leaders in

world history as beloved, but the fact that this transfer of power is taking place so smoothly marks yet another step forward in South Africa's transition to normal democratic governance.

One of the great accomplishments of the Mandela Administration has been to reduce the government's role in the economy and promote private sector investment and competition. But in many ways the job of building South Africa's democratic institutions is just beginning. And while political violence has receded, violent crime of a more prosaic nature—including organized crime—has become a major problem.

The task of building true democracy in Nigeria is even more daunting, but that country's political situation has improved dramatically over the past year. In February, Nigeria chose its first elected president in over 15 years. The elections were far from perfect, but the people's choice was clear.

President Clinton, Treasury Secretary Rubin, and I met with President-elect Obasanjo on March 30th, and assured him that we will provide strong support for Nigeria's transition to democracy.

For the future of the continent, the stakes could not be higher. Nigeria has the largest population in sub-Saharan Africa and is a dominant cultural, economic, and military power. A successful democracy, coupled with a revived economy, could be an engine for positive change throughout the region.

Nigeria, South Africa, and most other African nations have long and difficult journeys ahead. They will need to persevere in spite of the setbacks and discouragements that are bound to come along the way. The United States needs to stay the course as well. We should continue to provide essential assistance to those who are working to open markets and strengthen civil society, representative democracy, and the rule of law. This is the strategic approach that drives our policy and for which I ask the support of this subcommittee and the Congress.

GLOBAL OPPORTUNITIES AND THREATS

Mr. Chairman, to protect the security and prosperity of our citizens, we are engaged in every region on every continent. Many of our initiatives and concerns are directed, as I have discussed, at particular countries or parts of the world. Others are more encompassing and can best be considered in global terms.

Protecting American Security

The first of these is our strategy for ensuring the fundamental security of our citizens and territory—a challenge that differs substantially from the past.

The risks of east-west confrontation have been sharply reduced, and for that we remain grateful. But we face a variety of other dangers, some fueled by technology's advance; some by

regional rivalry; some by naked ambition; and some by envy, resentment, or outright hate.

During the past year alone, we have witnessed terrorist attacks against two of our embassies in Africa, the testing of longer-range missiles by North Korea and Iran, periodic threats from Saddam Hussein, and nuclear explosions in South Asia that fueled regional tensions and challenged the global non-proliferation regime.

The future promises scant relief from such perils. In response, President Clinton has outlined plans for strengthening our military, revitalizing our alliances, and preparing American communities for possible terrorist strikes.

Defending America requires both the capacity and the will to use force when necessary. But we must also use diplomacy vigorously, to bolster the forces of law and prevent weapons of mass destruction and the missiles that deliver them from falling into the wrong hands.

The economic crisis in Russia and elsewhere in the New Independent States (NIS) adds urgency to the need for effective action. Thousands of scientists with WMD expertise are facing increased temptations to sell their know-how to terrorists or rogue states. And the risks of illicit weapons trafficking are likewise on the rise.

To address these growing proliferation risks, the President is seeking a total of \$250 million in foreign operations funds this year for the State Department programs under the multi-agency Expanded Threat Reduction (ETR) Initiative. Building upon the far-sighted Nunn-Lugar program, we seek to engage weapons scientists to prevent proliferation, halt smuggling, and enhance export controls.

These programs are carefully targeted at the highest areas of proliferation risk in a time of unprecedented transition and continued uncertainty. The State Department administers them with the highest

possible standards of care and oversight. We do this with direct input and participation from a broad range of agencies to ensure that relevant policy, technical, and intelligence assessments are all taken into consideration.

We ask your support in order to sustain these high standards, for we must do everything we can to keep Russian nuclear, chemical, and biological expertise out of the wrong hands.

This year we are requesting \$20 million to fund the CTBT Preparatory Commission, which will continue to lay the human and technical foundation for the treaty's entry into force. Even before the test ban is in place, these funds will help build up the international verification system that will help us deter, detect, and closely monitor nuclear explosive testing around the globe. We should not lag behind in realizing the benefits of a treaty we led in negotiating and signing. I strongly urge the Senate to approve the CTBT this summer, so that we can participate fully in the first meeting of treaty parties that will take place this fall.

I also ask your support for our proposed \$43 million voluntary contribution to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). These funds will help the agency continue enhancing the safeguards that permit it to verify compliance, worldwide, with the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Our request this year includes \$55 million for the Korean Energy Development Organization (KEDO). This increase of \$20 million will significantly reduce KEDO's standing debt and allow us to meet a critical national security obligation.

The Agreed Framework succeeded in freezing North Korea's dangerous plutonium production and separation facilities at Yongbyon. Thanks to the Framework, those facilities are now under rigorous IAEA monitoring, and their spent fuel—which could contain several bombs' worth of weapons-grade plutonium—is now in safe storage. If the Framework is fulfilled,

those nuclear facilities will eventually be dismantled and this nuclear fuel shipped out of North Korea.

Meanwhile, as long as North Korea is abiding by the terms of the Framework, our support for KEDO remains a vital investment in our national security. I appeal to the members of this subcommittee not to let a lack of funding cause the Framework's demise. All told, we are requesting \$231 million for our Non-proliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining and Related Programs Account (NADR) in FY 2000. These funds support our global export control assistance efforts; and in the New Independent States, \$10 million in NADR funds supports non-proliferation activities under the Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative.

The NADR account includes \$40 million—a proposed increase of \$5 million—for America's commitment to global humanitarian demining. Especially in light of our inability at present to join the Ottawa Convention, maintaining U.S. leadership through the Demining 2010 initiative is a practical, political, and moral imperative.

NADR funding also enables us to work with friendly countries in a multi-year, multi-faceted global campaign to deter and defend against terrorist attacks; and to pursue, prosecute, and punish the criminals who commit them. This is a paramount national interest for which we are requesting \$43 million to fund specific programs.

Our programs against terrorism protect Americans working and traveling abroad. Our Anti-Terrorism Assistance (ATA) program enhances the skills of security officials in selected countries so that they may be more effective partners in preventing and punishing terrorist acts. We have launched new training initiatives to counter terrorist fund-raising and the potential use of weapons of mass destruction.

The increased funds we are seeking this year will also help fund new initiatives to interdict terrorists and

detect explosives at the borders of developing countries. And our request will help expand the ATA training beyond the traditional areas of the Middle East and Latin America into Africa and the New Independent States.

Mr. Chairman, our diplomacy and our programs play a key role in the unrelenting campaign to combat terrorism. I am convinced that this effort saves American lives. And I know that it merits the full support of this subcommittee.

Finally, I also urge this subcommittee to approve the President's budget request of \$3.43 billion in Foreign Military Financing (FMF). This program enables key friends and allies to meet their defense needs by financing acquisition of U.S. military articles, services, and training. FMF also promotes our interests by binding our coalitions, cementing our military relationships, and enhancing interoperability with U.S. forces.

Sustaining American Prosperity

A second overarching goal of our foreign policy is to promote a healthy world economy in which American genius and productivity receive their due.

The American economy is strong today because of the energy, innovation, and skills of the American people. We have the most competitive economy on earth. Our foreign policy cannot take credit for that, but we can and do support it.

Since President Clinton took office, we have negotiated more than 240 trade agreements, including the Uruguay Round and agreements on information technology, basic telecommunications, and financial services. This matters because trade has been a significant contributor to the sustained economic growth we have enjoyed these past 6 years. Currently, more than 12 million U.S. jobs are supported by exports, and these are good jobs, paying—on the average—13-16% more than non-trade related positions.

This subcommittee can help us to build on this record by supporting the President's funding request for agencies such as the Export-Import Bank, the Trade Development Agency, and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, which help our business people find new markets abroad.

During the past decade, the trend toward more open rules of investment and trade has helped to spur record economic expansion and raise living

“The American economy is strong today because of the energy, innovation, and skills of the American people. We have the most competitive economy on earth. Our foreign policy cannot take credit for that, but we can and do support it.”

standards in much of the world. Over the past 2 years, however, the financial crisis applied the brakes to many national economies and plunged a number, particularly in East Asia, into reverse. Although the U.S. economy has remained healthy, important sectors such as agriculture, aircraft, and steel have been adversely affected by shrinking export markets and increased pressure from low-priced imports.

We have responded on two levels. We have rigorously enforced our laws against unfair trade. And more broadly, President Clinton has come forward with proposals designed to restore world economic growth, reform international financial institutions, ensure fair treatment for U.S. workers

and firms, and assist our trading partners in improving the management of their financial sectors.

For example, we have encouraged Japan to implement reforms that would help make that country once again an engine of economic expansion. We have joined forces with the World Bank and the IMF to prevent the financial contagion from spreading further and to meet urgent humanitarian needs. And we have made it clear, in promoting trade and supporting the role of international financial institutions, that serious consideration must be given to environmental and worker standards.

Unfortunately, there are no quick or simple solutions to the problems many countries now face. Success in the global economy requires sound fiscal and monetary policies, transparent financial systems, good governance and the rule of law. It is no accident that nations with these attributes have fared best during the crisis.

Nations with deeper problems must take the tough steps required to develop broad-based and accountable democratic institutions that will earn investor confidence and engender public support. It is in our interest to help nations that are prepared to undertake these reforms and we ask your support in doing so.

Accordingly, I urge you to approve the President's request for \$1.395 billion in FY 2000 for multilateral development banks, which include the World Bank and five regional development banks. And I ask you to endorse our request for \$143 million for the U.S. annual contribution and arrears payment to the Global Environmental Facility (GEF).

The multilateral banks lend and invest in developing economies where risks are too high for private financing alone and where leverage is needed to spur such financing. Bank policies reflect U.S. priorities by stressing the need for borrowing countries to implement financial sector reforms, fight corruption, observe sound environmental and labor standards, and create a favorable climate for investment.

In recent years, trade and private sector development have played increasing roles in efforts to foster development and raise living standards around the world. But this does not diminish the critical role played by professional development organizations such as USAID.

The heart of our bilateral development assistance is contained in three USAID accounts, for which we are requesting a total of \$1.848 billion, up slightly from last year's appropriation.

The Development Assistance account supports basic economic growth, agricultural progress, environmental stewardship, family planning, democracy, and good governance.

USAID's Child Survival and Disease Programs Fund is designed to save and enrich people's lives through improved maternal and child health and nutrition, lower HIV transmission, wider access to health services, and basic educational opportunities.

Finally, the Development Fund for Africa covers a broad range of urgently needed services, and includes this year an expanded Africa Food Security Initiative and a \$30 million request for the Africa Education for Development and Democracy Initiative.

When we contribute to multi-lateral efforts to promote sustainable development, we leverage as much as eight or 10 times our national contribution to support goals we share.

This year, we have requested \$80 million in contributions to the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). For years, UNDP has been at the forefront of helping developing countries establish democratic institutions, market economies, and basic human rights.

The need for UNDP's work remains especially strong among African countries struggling against the plagues of conflict, poverty, and disease, and among Asia's poorer nations. It also plays a major role in supporting women worldwide as they strive to gain more equal access to the levers of political and economic power.

Like UNDP, UNICEF plays an important role in countries suffering or recovering from the devastation caused by civil or international conflict. Around the world, UNICEF helps protect children, a society's most vulnerable members and its hope for the future. We are requesting \$101 million for UNICEF for FY 2000.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most inspiring ways this account helps make a difference in the lives of men and women in this country and around the world is through its support for the Peace Corps. The Peace Corps has been one of this country's most successful programs overseas—both in bringing skills and knowledge to those who desperately need them, and in gaining goodwill for our country. President Clinton's request for \$270 million in funding will put us well along the path to our goal of having 10,000 volunteers serving overseas early in the next century.

Fighting International Crime And Narcotics

A third global objective of our foreign policy is to fight and win the struggle against the hydra-headed evil of international crime.

Drug cartels and other international crime gangs threaten us every day, whether we are pursuing business opportunities overseas or going about our daily business here at home. Crime and corruption also pose major threats to democracy and economic reform in Latin America, Africa, and the former Soviet Union.

President Clinton spoke to these dangers last year when he unveiled a comprehensive strategy to integrate all facets of the federal response to international crime. Led by our Bureau for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, the State Department is a key partner in this effort, which is designed to extend the first line of defense against crime far beyond U.S. borders.

To this end, we are working with other nations around the globe to train police, prosecutors and judges, seize drug assets, help farmers find alternatives to illicit crops, expose and close front companies, halt money laundering, track criminals, and bring smugglers of contraband to justice.

In our own hemisphere, these comprehensive efforts have paid clear dividends. In 1998, coca cultivation in South America declined to its lowest level in a decade. Peru has cut cultivation by more than 55% in 3 years, and Bolivia has made impressive progress as well. Colombia remains a major challenge, but we are working to step up our efforts there.

In Africa, Nigeria is the key, and for the first time in years, the prospects are encouraging. It is essential, however, that we have the flexibility in administering our anti-narcotics and crime programs to devote sufficient resources to the continent. A significant portion of the heroin interdicted in the U.S. is traceable to African smuggling organizations.

In Asia, we are handicapped by the repressive nature of the authorities in Burma and Afghanistan—the world's two leading producers of heroin. We are doing our best to address the problem by working through neighboring states, regional organizations, and the United Nations.

In Russia, Ukraine, and the other New Independent States, we continue to focus our efforts on helping legislators to draft fundamental anti-crime and corruption laws and on law enforcement training. We are also negotiating agreements that will allow our own law enforcement officers to cooperate more effectively with their counterparts in these countries.

There are no final victories in the fight against international crime, but—as our increased budget request of \$295 million for this year reflects—we are pushing ahead hard. Our purpose, ultimately, is to create a tightly woven web of agreements, laws, inspectors, police, and judicial power

that will deny drug kingpins and other criminals the space they need to operate.

Promoting Democracy, Human Rights, and Rule of Law

American policy is to promote democracy, the rule of law, religious tolerance, and human rights.

We believe, and the Universal Declaration on Human Rights affirms, that “the will of the people . . . expressed in periodic elections” should be the basis of government everywhere. We are working actively to promote the observation of this principle around the world.

Earlier in this statement, I mentioned some of the specific programs we use to aid democratic transitions, support free and fair elections, and help democratic forces build civil society. These include our Freedom Support Act and SEED programs and the assistance provided by USAID’s Democracy and Governance Center. These programs reflect our ideals and serve our interests.

When we support democratic forces, we are aiding our natural partners and helping to forge an ever-expanding community of democratic nations that can work together to strengthen democracy where it exists and lend support to those who seek it where it does not.

We know from experience that democratic governments tend to be more successful at preventing conflicts and coping with the turbulence of the global market than regimes that do not answer to the people.

Our support for the right to democracy is part of our broader effort to elevate global standards of human

rights and respect for the rule of law. Our goal is to enter the 21st century moving ahead in these areas, not just settling for the status quo.

Accordingly, the United States will continue to support democratic ideals and institutions however and wherever we can effectively do so.

We will continue to advocate increased respect for human rights, vigorously promote religious freedom, and firmly back the international criminal tribunals for Rwanda and the Former Yugoslavia.

We will support efforts to help women gain fair access to the levers of economic and political power, work with others to end the pernicious trafficking in women and girls, and renew our request for Senate approval of the Convention to Eliminate All Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

And as the President has pledged, we will continue working through the International Labor Organization to raise core labor standards, and to conclude a treaty that would ban abusive child labor.

PROVIDING HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE

This year, we have requested \$660 million for Migration and Refugee Assistance and \$30 million to replenish the U.S. Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund. The total is a \$20 million increase from FY 1999 appropriated levels. We have also requested \$220 million for international disaster assistance.

CONCLUSION

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

Today, we are summoned to meet similar responsibilities in a far different time and to honor principles that will endure for all time. In so doing, we must heed the central lesson of this century, which is that problems abroad, if left unattended, will all too often come home to America.

We Americans draw immense strength from the fact that we know who we are and what we believe. We have a purpose. And like the farmer’s faith that seeds and rain will cause crops to grow, it is our faith that if we are true to our principles, we will succeed.

Let us, then, do honor to that faith. In this final year of this turbulent century, let us assume—not with complaint but welcome—the leader’s role established by our forebears. And by living up to the heritage of our past, let us fulfill the promise of our future and enter the new century free and united, prosperous, and at peace.

To that mission, I pledge my own best efforts, and respectfully solicit both your wise counsel and support. Thank you very much. ■

For more information and related topics, visit the Department’s website at: <http://www.state.gov/www/budget/index.html>

Class of 1999: Shaping the Course Of History

Secretary Albright

Commencement address at Georgetown University, School of Foreign Service, Washington, DC, May 29, 1999.

Father O'Donovan, Dean Gallucci, Doctor Brown,—(inaudible)—Ambassador Don McHenry, Class of '99, of which I am a proud member, and your families and faculty and other members of this distinguished university community and guests, and all friends: Good morning. I have to tell you that I am deeply moved by having this honorary degree. I have collected a few—(inaudible)—but I have to say that—(inaudible)—the one thing missing in my life was a Georgetown honorary degree. So thank you very much.

As I look out on this audience, lots of thoughts run through my mind. I've lived in the neighborhood a long time and through my endless Ph.D. studies, I really—(inaudible)—try to find books.

I have sat in this audience as a parent twice. I have sat up here as a faculty member for 10 years because I love graduations and I used to come to all of them. I never imagined that I would be standing in front of you as Secretary of State of the United States. Nor did I imagine, actually, that I'd have an honorary degree from Georgetown. So this is a pretty good day.

To the Class of 1999, I say congratulations. Today is a day to celebrate. It is the payoff for all the exams, the late nights in the Lauinger Library, and the carpal tunnel syndrome caused by so many hours at a computer. Now, graduation is one of the five great milestones in life—the others being birth, death, marriage, and the day you finally pay off your student loan.

Now, I really do, as I said, love graduations, and I have attended a lot of them. I love the academic surrounding and the caps and gowns and the solemn traditions. Recently, I was at the University of Arizona, and there, the solemn tradition is to throw tortillas around like frisbees during the commencement speech. It's a little unusual, but it does keep you alert. This is important because, if Father O'Donovan will forgive me, a commencement speech can be a little like a sermon, except you don't have the fear of God to keep you awake.

This morning, I promise not to bore you—at least intentionally—and I will suppress the habit I developed as a professor of speaking in 50-minute sound bites.

I begin by saying that the Georgetown School of Foreign Service has a tradition of excellence to which the President of the United States—among other distinguished alumni—can attest and which Dean Gallucci and his faculty continue to uphold. This school is renowned for producing people who are doers. It yields an annual harvest of diplomats, educators, business people, and professionals who are not afraid to run necessary risks.

If I have any advice for you who graduate today, it is to embrace this Georgetown spirit. Yours is the last graduating class of the 20th century. And the character of the new century will be determined not by the complacent but by the courageous, not by the critics, but by those willing to put their lives and careers on the line to make the future better than the past.

When I was a professor, I often would ask my students to role play and pretend they were diplomats or generals confronted by a crisis. Of course, I would always give the role of Secretary of State to a woman student. And I would ask the students to formulate recommendations based on U.S. interests and values. At the time, our most vital interests were defined solely

in Cold War terms: to defend our people, territory, and allies from communist aggression.

Our task today is more complex. I remember delivering a lecture here years ago after the Berlin Wall fell, celebrating that event but also warning that the world might become more, rather than less, dangerous.

In recent years, that fear has been validated by the revival of ethnic strife, the increased destructiveness of international terror, and the spread of advanced weapons technologies.

“The great lesson of this century is that when aggression and brutality go unopposed, like cancer, they spread. And what begins as a treatable sickness in one part of the body can rapidly endanger the whole.”

Meanwhile, the information revolution has created a new linkage among events that is both instantaneous and global. [Sound of airplanes overhead.] Oh, yes, I remember the airplanes, too. As a result, what happens anywhere can matter everywhere, and will likely matter soon.

In such an environment, there is always the danger that we will talk ourselves into paralysis. For the geopolitical chessboard is now multi-dimensional, and anyone seeking a reason not to act will always be able to find one. But if our choice is always to wait until everything is perfect and all the downsides have turned rightsides up, waiting is all we would ever do.

We have long since passed the time in our history when we could count on the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans to guarantee our security; when we could protect our interests by maintaining a few key relationships, principally in Europe; and when we could safely take a reactive approach to most events in most places most of the time.

Our era demands a dynamic approach that recognizes the global nature of our interests, the rapidity with which new threats may emerge, and the extent to which progress in one area can lead to a breakthrough in another. That’s why, as I speak, the United States is preparing for a new push on all tracks of the Middle East peace process.

In consultation with our allies, we are actively exploring possibilities for enhancing stability on the Korean Peninsula.

- We are working hard to help democracy take a firmer hold in capitals such as Jakarta, Lagos, Bogota, and Kiev.
- Around Africa, we are supporting African efforts to end conflicts and to promote new opportunities for growth.
- Around the world, we are working to prevent weapons of mass destruction from falling into the wrong hands.
- And in Kosovo, we are striving with our NATO allies to oppose terror and promote a just peace.

There are those who say it is not smart to stand up to ethnic cleansing in Kosovo because by so doing, we upset powerful countries. Others say it is not consistent because NATO does not intervene in every place where outrages are committed. Still others say it is not prudent because Kosovo is small and distant and the fate of its people shouldn’t matter to us very much. To all this, I can only reply with a revered term of American diplomacy: Nuts.

The great lesson of this century is that when aggression and brutality go unopposed, like a cancer, they

spread. And what begins as a treatable sickness in one part of the body can rapidly endanger the whole.

The risk is especially high in the Balkans, where World War I began, bitter fighting in World War II occurred and the worst violence in a half-century took place earlier in this decade.

Many of you, like me, are students of history. And we know that America will never be fully secure if Europe is not stable, that Europe will never be fully stable until its south-east corner is at peace, and that southeast Europe will never be at peace until Slobodan Milosevic—who has now started four wars—is stopped.

Over the past 2 months, this truth has been seared into our hearts. We don’t know for sure how many innocent people in Kosovo have been victimized by Milosevic’s troops. But the evidence is that the vast majority of the ethnic Albanians have been driven from their homes.

We have reports of 500 villages burned or largely destroyed, 60 villages where executions have occurred and women and girls being systematically raped, of men being taken from their families and never seen again, of mass grave sites in, among other places, Pusto Selo and Izbica, Maliseo, and Drenica.

These names may sound strange to our ears, but they represent real communities where people came together to conduct business, educate their children, and worship God.

Perhaps we should substitute for Pusto Selo and Izbica, more familiar names such as Rosslyn and Georgetown and Adams Morgan and Cleveland Park, and imagine them torched and plundered and our neighbors and family members murdered, abused and expelled. Perhaps we should imagine that the hand we outstretch, asking for help, is that of the person sitting next to us right now.

Those who say we should substitute reason for force in dealing with Milosevic have very short memories, for we have tried that repeatedly. For more than a year, we tried to

negotiate a settlement. Last October, we brokered a cease-fire and deployed international monitors to verify it. Milosevic used the time to mass 40,000 troops on Kosovo's border and to plan his current campaign of terror.

That is why we insist that the crisis must end on NATO's terms, not because we are being macho, but because there is no way the refugees will or should return without a credible military force to protect them. And to be credible, that force must have NATO at its core.

As for those who appear to see moral equivalence between Milosevic's actions and those of NATO, they're not seeing very well. Milosevic's brutality made NATO's response necessary, and in responding, NATO has taken great pains to prevent and limit civilian casualties. On the whole, alliance operations have been more precise than any comparable campaign in history and we have expressed deep regret for the few mistakes made.

The best that can be said for Milosevic is that he doesn't kill people by accident. On the contrary, the death and destruction of Kosovo's Albanian community is the whole point of Milosevic's war.

Certainly, there are no easy answers in Kosovo. But I, for one, would rather respond to questions about why NATO has acted, than try to explain why NATO did not act in the face of ethnic cleansing in its own front yard.

This commencement ceremony is about the future, and so is NATO's strategy in Kosovo. If we are to accept what Milosevic is doing, we would invite further atrocities from him and encourage others to follow his example. That's why NATO must not and

will not back down. And it's why we strongly support the International War Crimes Tribunal, which earlier this week indicted Milosevic and four of his henchmen for crimes against humanity.

These historic indictments matter because they demonstrate to Milosevic's victims that the world cares. They demonstrate to Milosevic's minions that the world is watching. And they demonstrate to Milosevic's people that the world understands who is responsible for this conflict and who is prolonging it.

The future is also why we are launching an initiative with our European partners that will help countries throughout the Balkans to become full members of the Euro-Atlantic community, including Serbia should it become democratic. Our purpose is to do for southeast Europe what we did for the west after World War II and for central Europe after the Cold War. And by succeeding, put the last piece in place of a Europe without walls, wholly free and fully at peace.

During World War II, America didn't just fight Hitler; we responded against Fascism. During the Cold War, we didn't just fight Stalin; we were standing up against communism. Today, we are not just fighting Milosevic, we are standing against the sick idea that the way to settle differences is not through debate, democracy, and negotiation but through murder.

As I said earlier, yours is the last graduating class of the 20th century. It has been a bloody century. We owe it to you and to the children you will raise to do everything we can now to see that the new century is not cursed with the plagues of the old.

At key moments throughout the history of our nation, Americans have been asked to rise to a challenge: In Washington's time, to pledge their sacred honor; in Lincoln's, to ensure that government of the people did not perish; in Roosevelt's, to overcome fear itself; and under John Kennedy, to bear any burden in defense of freedom.

Today, we face new dangers in a world of great turbulence and complexity. And under President Clinton, we are responding to those dangers by backing our principles with strength, and by acting with vision and spine.

We recognize, as we look ahead, that there is no certain road map to success, either for individuals or for nations. Ultimately, it's a matter of judgment, a question of choice.

In making our choice, let us remember that there is not a page of American history of which we are proud that was authored by a chronic complainer or a prophet of despair. In the tradition of Georgetown, we must be doers.

Class of '99, you and I and all of us have a responsibility in our time, as our predecessors did in theirs, not to be prisoners of history but to shape it, a responsibility to oppose evil and uphold justice, and to build with others a global network of purpose and law that will protect our citizens, preserve our values, and safeguard our future.

To that mission, I have pledged my own best efforts, and I summon yours.

Congratulations once again, and to all of you, the best of luck and come to the Foreign Service and join the Georgetown Mafia. ■

For more information and related topics, visit the Secretary's website at: <http://secretary.state.gov/index.html>

The Effects on U.S.-China Relations Of the Accidental Bombing of the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade

Stanley O. Roth

Testimony by the Assistant Secretary for East Asian and Pacific Affairs before the Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Washington, DC, May 27, 1999.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to address the subject of U.S.-China relations.

When this subcommittee initiated its series of hearings to examine U.S. policy toward China, no one could have imagined that barely 2 months later we would be addressing the tragic accidental bombing of the P.R.C. embassy in Belgrade and its effect on U.S.-China relations.

But that is where we are: confronted by our own sad but irreversible mistake, recovering from mob damage to our diplomatic facilities in China, but committed to working through this difficult period in our relationship with China.

As we all know, the bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade by U.S. planes acting on behalf of NATO—which caused the death of three Chinese journalists and injury to more than 20 other personnel—was a terrible accident and a tragic mistake that no one in NATO or our government intended.

Since the accident, the U.S. Government has acted promptly and properly to express our regret, apologies, and condolences. On Saturday night following the bombing, Secretary Albright personally went to the Chinese embassy in Washington to express the deep sorrow and regret of the United States and to explain that the bombing was a terrible mistake. President Clinton personally signed the official Chinese condolence book in the presence of Ambassador Li in the Oval Office.

President Clinton spoke personally with President Jiang to express our nation's sincere sympathies, to assure him that the U.S. is investigating the incident, and to promise that we will convey the results of that investigation once concluded. In short, though we cannot change what happened, the U.S. has responded appropriately by expressing our deep regret and by undertaking an investigation.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, in the aftermath of the bombing, the U.S. embassy in Beijing was besieged by Chinese protestors. Embassy facilities were significantly damaged. Other U.S. posts in China also were targets of demonstrators. Guangzhou and Shanghai suffered disruptions to their work and minor damage but in Chengdu protestors burned the residence of the Consul General. We can be thankful that our people in China suffered no loss of life or serious injury.

Mr. Chairman, I have testified on many occasions, but never in the aftermath of such events. Here in Washington, how often have we almost unthinkingly concurred in the notion that “diplomacy is our first line of defense?” Today, I ask us all to reflect for a moment on just what that phrase actually meant for our diplomats in China during the past few weeks. Their lives, the lives of their families, and their possessions, were in harm's way, but they uniformly responded with dignity, courage, and resilience.

This government cannot ask more of its diplomatic corps than the service it received in China over the last few weeks. I wish to commend Ambassador Sasser and all of his staff.

In acknowledging the valor of the American diplomatic staff in China, I would be less than candid if I did not also touch on the role that the Chinese Government played, or failed to play, in handling the anti-American reaction that took place throughout China. The state-run media delayed by several crucial days publishing reports of U.S. official apologies and explanations. There was an inexplicable delay in President Jiang's willingness to accept the phone call from President Clinton that I referenced earlier. China failed for several days to carry out its obligation to provide for the security of U.S. diplomatic personnel.

I understand that the Chinese word for "crisis" is a combination of the characters for "danger" and "opportunity." There are those who undoubtedly speculate, both in China and the United States, that perhaps the crisis of the last few weeks, this trough in the U.S.-China relationship, represents an opportunity for China to press for concessions from the U.S. on issues such as the terms for China's WTO accession, human rights, Tibet, and non-proliferation. These speculators are dangerously mistaken. U.S. policy in these areas is determined by clear and long-standing assessments of U.S. self-interest and fundamental values.

Our standards will not change in reaction to either the bombing error in Belgrade or the Chinese reaction to it.

Specifically with respect to the World Trade Organization, our discussions with China on the terms of its accession have been on hold at China's insistence since the bombing in Belgrade. I need not state the obvious: It is in China's economic interest to accede to the WTO and Chinese leaders are cognizant of how near we are to concluding an agreement on accession. We, for our part, continue to believe that closing a commercially sound deal and achieving China's accession is strongly in our interest.

Ambassador Barshefsky recently noted the necessity of a negotiating schedule that resumes "in the not too distant future" and her optimism that China wishes to move forward with respect to WTO entry. We believe it would be in the interest of both countries to do so.

As we work to answer Chinese concerns about Belgrade and put the relationship back on track, we ourselves should keep in mind the interests that in the recent past have motivated our engagement with China.

Despite our current bilateral differences, the U.S. and China continue to have compelling mutual interests in promoting peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula, working to minimize nuclear tensions on the Indian subcontinent, and advancing the economic well being of Asia. We need to continue serious discussions with the Chinese

about the importance of reducing tensions across the Taiwan Strait, as well as potential areas of friction in the region, such as the South China Sea. We and China should continue to cooperate on economic issues in APEC and other regional fora.

China's cooperation is essential to keep under control technologies used in the production of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems. We want to be able to continue to discuss with China steps it can take toward membership in the Missile Technology Control Regime. We have an ongoing interest in promoting the observance of human rights in China. Our principled and purposeful engagement with China includes pressing Beijing to live up to internationally recognized human rights standards, including the provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. We will continue to urge the Chinese authorities to follow up on President Jiang's overture to the Dalai Lama at the June 1998 summit by establishing a meaningful and productive dialogue with the Dalai Lama or his representatives.

The U.S.-China relationship has seen difficult times in the past and overcome them. The United States is committed to doing so once again. In the end, if China is equally committed to making the relationship work, I am hopeful we will overcome the effects of this tragic accident.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to speak. ■

For more information and related topics, visit the Department's website at: <http://www.state.gov/www/regions/eap/index.html>

Urgent Issues in Transatlantic Trade Relations

Alan P. Larson

Remarks by the Assistant Secretary for Economic and Trade Policy at Iowa Governor's Conference on International Trade, Des Moines, Iowa, May 20, 1999.

Good afternoon, and greetings from Secretary Albright. First off, I'd like to thank Governor Vilsack and Secretary Judge for inviting me to speak today. As a native Iowan, I didn't need much convincing to come back to my home state. But even if the location had been a less desirable one—like Paris—I still would have jumped at the chance to discuss the vitally important issues on your agenda today.

When I come to an event such as this, the most important information is not what I bring but rather what I carry back. That is why the State Department has been increasing its outreach at the State and local level. We want to better represent you and more effectively advocate on behalf of your interests as we conduct foreign policy.

Two Important Issues: China WTO and Sanctions Reform

Before I turn to the theme of the conference, I would like to comment briefly on two other issues that have important implications for Iowa. These are China's entry into the WTO and the ongoing effort to reform U.S. sanctions policy.

First, on China's WTO accession, the Administration has given high priority to agricultural market access. The results announced during Premier Zhu's visit represent a dramatic breakthrough. They include a strong market access agreement on agriculture and requirements for opening up the State trading enterprises that now control grain distribution in China. We are seeking to schedule further talks with the Chinese as soon as feasible. The President's Trade Representative, Ambassador Barshefsky, recently met with her Japanese, European, and Canadian counterparts in Tokyo and they all reaffirmed the desire to see China enter the WTO, on appropriate terms, before the November WTO ministerial in Seattle. The President and the Secretary of State have apologized for the mistake that led to the tragic bombing of China's embassy in Belgrade.

At the same time, we believe that both countries share an overriding interest in keeping the bilateral relationship on track and on achieving the goal of China's accession to the WTO on commercially viable terms.

Second, I also wanted to say a few words about policy changes announced by the President on April 28

that generally exempted food, medicine, and medical equipment from trade embargoes. Here is what was decided.

- The Administration will exempt commercial sales of food, medicines, and medical equipment from unilateral sanctions regimes, unless the President determines that our national interest requires otherwise;

- Such sales will be permitted only to non-government entities or to governmental procurement bodies not affiliated with the coercive organs of state; and

- No U.S. Government funding, financing, or guarantees in support of sales to terrorist countries is allowed.

The April 28 policy change was not aimed at any particular country. It should be seen as one step in an ongoing process of rationalizing U.S. sanctions policy.

Changes in Europe

The theme of today's conference is timely. Important changes are taking place in Europe—changes that have significant implications for the United States.

The introduction of the new currency, the euro, is perhaps the most dramatic change. The United States has long supported European integration as a means to build stability and prosperity on the continent. A stronger and more united Europe provides a better market for our products.

At the same time, a united Europe is a stronger partner for the U.S. in tackling a host of global challenges, such as drugs, terrorism, organized crime, and infectious diseases. Under the umbrella of NATO, European nations are standing shoulder-to-shoulder with us to stop and reverse so-called ethnic cleansing in Kosovo. And we will also work hand-in-hand with the EU to build a new peaceful, democratic, and prosperous Southeast Europe when the conflict is over.

A single European currency will reduce transaction costs for American companies exporting to and doing business in Europe. More profoundly, it is likely to create pressures for European governments to tackle some of the long-term structural problems in their economies, such as overly rigid labor markets.

Institutional change is a second important process now underway in Europe. Under the new Treaty of Amsterdam, the powers of the EU's main institutional bodies have been redefined. The role of the European Parliament in decision-making has been strengthened. The attitude which the European Parliament adopts toward international trade and investment issues will be something to watch very closely.

The European Commission, too, is undergoing an evolution. The Amsterdam Treaty has increased the powers of the Commission's president. The recent scandals and mass resignation of commissioners could also affect the manner in which a new Commission, expected to be seated in the fall, will handle its duties. A strengthened Commission could play a more effective role in working with the U.S. to head off problems before they become full-blown disputes.

A third major change relates to the process of enlarging the European Union to include countries in eastern Europe, the Baltics, and Cyprus. The United States has supported enlargement as a means to improve European stability and anchor these countries firmly within the orbit of democratic societies. We will work with the EU to ensure that the process of accession does not lead to unfair discrimination against U.S. products and is achieved in a manner consistent with Europe's international obligations.

“We will work toward eliminating once and for all export subsidies, reducing the market-distorting effects of agricultural support payments, and reigning in discriminatory practices of state trading enterprises.”

A fourth major transformation is the reform of the EU's common agricultural policy, or CAP. In fact, this is closely related to enlargement. If the current CAP benefits were to be extended to new, farm-dependent east European countries, the strain on the EU's budget would be too large to bear. EU leaders agreed on a package of CAP reforms in Berlin on March 26. In general, they made only modest cuts in support prices for grains and beef and put some overall limits on CAP spending.

To speak frankly, we were disappointed by the absence of more meaningful steps toward removing the

distortions caused by EU CAP policies. The weakness of the reforms virtually guarantees that the EU will continue to rely upon trade-distorting domestic support payments and will need to use export subsidies to dispose of large domestic surpluses.

Our disappointment has strengthened our resolve to make real progress in the next round of WTO trade negotiations. We will work toward eliminating once and for all export subsidies, reducing the market-distorting effects of agricultural support payments, and reigning in discriminatory practices of state trading enterprises. In this context, we simply cannot accept assertions that the CAP reforms agreed to so far are not Europe's opening position for the next round but rather the bottom line which all other WTO members must accept. The rest of the world, including farmers here in Iowa as well as those in many developing countries, are trying to build market-based agricultural export sectors. It is not fair that we should continue indefinitely bearing the cost of the EU's inefficient farm programs. If the EU wants to maintain large farm employment and preserve its cultural landscape, let it do so with direct payments and not with production subsidies or subsidized exports that distort trade and hurt farmers in the rest of the world.

The Challenge to Rules and Science

My remarks so far have dwelt on traditional topics. Now I must move into new territory to discuss a disturbing trend. I am speaking of the increasing efforts from within the EU that could weaken the scientific basis for regulatory decisions that affect trade. This trend poses a challenge not only to U.S. interests but also to the rules-based, global trading system that we have spent the past 50 years in building. We have seen a number of such efforts in recent months. For example:

• On beef hormones, the EU refused to acknowledge what the rest of the world, including an impartial WTO dispute settlement panel, sees clearly. There is no scientific evidence to justify the EU's ban on beef grown with growth promotant hormones. Decades of studies by our own Food and Drug Administration, as well as respected international food safety bodies, confirm the safety of these products. While our beef is consumed by satisfied customers in over 138 countries, the EU still insists on keeping this beef out of its market;

• Second, at the recent meeting of the Codex Alimentarius, the international food safety regulatory body, the EU pressed unsuccessfully to ban the use of BST in dairy cows despite the fact that the scientific body that advises Codex concluded that such use of BST is safe;

• Third, in the Biosafety Negotiations in Cartagena, Colombia, EU negotiations tried to impose onerous restrictions on trade in products from biotechnology. The EU approach was not based on scientifically demonstrated risk and went beyond the mandate of the negotiations, which was protection of environmental diversity, not regulating food safety;

• Fourth, EU countries have erected daunting obstacles to companies seeking EU approval for biotechnology products. The EU, of course, has a right to insist that any such products undergo an appropriate approval process. We have analogous procedures in the U.S. The real problem in Europe is the lack of transparency and predictability in the approval process and the scope of non-scientific factors to influence regulatory decisions. This was starkly highlighted last summer, when for domestic political reasons France held up the marketing of two U.S. corn products already deemed to be safe by EU scientific bodies;

• Fifth, the EU is pushing for international acceptance of an overly broad "precautionary principle"

regarding risk assessment in various international fora. Now everyone favors reasonable precaution especially when it comes to food safety; that is why all existing risk assessment procedures are designed to embody an appropriate degree of precaution. But for some in Europe "the precautionary principle" appears to mean that, when it suits European authorities, they may withhold approval until the risk assessment process has convinced even the most irrational consumer of the absence of even the most hypothetical risk or the most remote theoretical uncertainty. Such an interpretation would give countries free rein to ban any product no matter how beneficial, with no real evidence it is harmful. If elevated to a principle of international law, it could serve to validate the use of non-tariff trade barriers to unjustifiably restrict trade.

These issues are not unique to the agricultural sector. In fact, one of the most contentious disputes we've had in recent months concerns airport noise standards and how they would affect certain U.S. aircraft engines fitted out with noise reduction equipment known as "hush-kits." Here is a case where the EU sought to impose on the rest of the world a certain regulatory standard that was not based on objective, scientific factors, that ignored standards set by the International Civil Aviation Organization—ICAO—and that discriminated against U.S. companies.

There are, of course, explanations as to what is driving this process in the EU. Some say that much of this is a reaction among European publics to the mishandling of the mad cow scare, when European authorities first told consumers there was no risk from European beef and later had to acknowledge that there was. European publics may place less trust in science, or at least in European scientific bodies, than in the U.S. There is also less public trust in EU regulation, in part because of the division of responsibility between the EU Commission and the

member states. But no matter what the reasons are, the EU's actions, if not moderated, could put the world trading system on a dangerous and slippery slope. So let me outline what the Administration is doing.

First, we are standing fast in our support of the scientific basis for rules making. We are alert to efforts to undermine this principle and respond quickly and in concert with others to protect our interests in international organizations such as the Codex, the Biosafety talks and the WTO. More strategically, we are entering the next round of WTO trade negotiations firmly committed to preserving the sound, objective principles underpinning trade such as are found in the Agreements on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures—SPS—and on Technical Barriers to Trade—TBT.

Second, we are working with the EU to improve our cooperation in many of these areas so that we head off trade disputes before they become crises. For example, we have negotiated a package of Mutual Recognition Agreements that reduce the regulatory costs of doing business in each other's market. We are working to establish a full range of regulatory dialogues, including on biotechnology and on food safety, that should help to increase cooperation and lessen conflicts. We are also working with the EU to establish an effective early warning system that would allow us to identify regulatory or legislative proposals that could have a negative impact on transatlantic trade or bilateral relations.

Third, we are becoming more active on the public diplomacy front. This includes equipping our embassies to rebut false claims about U.S. regulatory or trade practices and to be more proactive in informing publics about the issues. For example, seemingly lost in the European debate about biotechnology products is the fact that these new products offer the promise of meeting the world's food needs while lowering costs, protecting the environment, and improving nutrition.

We are ensuring that this side of the story is told. As an Iowan who grew up surrounded by fields of hybrid plants, I understand the point that all current food products are genetically modified. Considered rationally, what some Europeans appear to be objecting to is not the fact that a product is genetically modified so much as the process by which the genetic modification was accomplished.

Similarly, we are working to ensure that the facts regarding the use of growth promotant hormones in cattle are made available. For example, the EU's latest study takes particular aim at the hormone estradiol as a threat to human health. I wonder how many European consumers know that the average adult would need to eat over 13 pounds of American beef in order to equal the amount of estradiol found in one egg. Do you imagine European authorities will soon ban French omelets? These are facts, and we want them to be heard.

Responsibilities of the U.S.

For fairness, I should add that obviously the U.S. shares important duties and obligations to protect the

trading system. Everything I've said about the need to respect the rules and base decisions on science applies to us as well. As a strong economy, the U.S. has a special responsibility to resist the pull of protectionism as the world struggles to emerge from the financial shocks of the last 2 years. And one immediate step we can take is to reject the steel import quota bill now being considered by Congress.

Americans also need to recognize the depth of consumer concerns in Europe about many of the issues I've discussed today. Some of these concerns may seem to us irrational, but they nevertheless are putting enormous pressure on governments and are affecting market decisions. These factors need to be taken into account, for example, when making planting decisions that involve new products not yet approved by the EU. Farmers need to assess the risks of not being able to ship to Europe. At the end of the day, no one can force consumers to buy food products they won't eat.

It could be useful to establish an international dialogue—with active participation from university scientists, seed companies, consumer groups, farm groups, food processors, and

retailers—to talk through these issues in a dispassionate manner. The objective should be to tone down the rhetoric and step up the availability of scientific information; to examine benefits as well as any risks of new technologies; to point, where needed, toward regulatory changes that could improve public confidence; and, ultimately, to enable consumers to make intelligent, reasoned choices.

I do want to leave some time for discussion. In closing, I'll simply stress the commitment we have at the Department of State to improving our links with business and farm groups. I encourage any of you that visit Washington to come in to the Department and discuss your concerns. Our doors will be open. ■

For more information and related topics, visit the Department's website at: <http://www.state.gov/www/issues/economic/index.html>



TREATY ACTIONS

MULTILATERAL

Fisheries

Agreement on the International Dolphin Conservation Program, with annexes. Done at Washington May 21, 1998. Entered into force February 15, 1999. *Signature:* European Community, May 12, 1999.

BILATERAL

Canada

Agreement for the sale of Canada's entitlement to downstream power benefits within the United States, with attachment. Effected by exchange of notes at Washington March 31, 1999. Entered into force March 31, 1999.

Ecuador

Interim agreement concerning the use of facilities in Ecuador to increase aerial detection and control of illegal narcotics trafficking operations. Effected by

exchange of notes at Quito March 31 and April 1, 1999. Entered into force April 1, 1999.

European Community

Agreement on mutual recognition, with annexes. Signed at London May 18, 1998. Entered into force December 1, 1998.

Japan

Agreement amending the agreement of March 31, 1989, as amended, concerning acquisition and production in Japan of the SH-60J, UH-60J, and UH-60JA aircraft. Effected by exchange of notes at Tokyo March 23, 1999. Entered into force March 23, 1999.

Russian Federation

Agreement concerning cooperation in the promotion and development of civil aviation. Signed at Washington and Moscow February 19 and March 22, 1999. Entered into force March 22, 1999.

Memorandum of understanding on cooperation in seismology and geodynamics, with appendix. Signed at Washington March 24, 1999. Entered into force March 24, 1999.

Protocol to amend the January 14, 1994 air transport agreement, with annexes. Signed at Moscow April 5, 1999. Entered into force April 5, 1999.

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 December 17, 1998. Entered into force March 17, 1999. ■

For more information and related topics, visit the Department's website at: http://www.state.gov/www/global/legal_affairs/legal_adviser.html