

# Americans Must Unite to Reduce the Dangers Posed by Nuclear Weapons

Secretary Albright

1

*Remarks before the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, Chicago, Illinois, November 12, 1999 (introductory remarks deleted).*

I am delighted to be here in Chicago, a city that Richard Wright once called the pivot of the eastern, western, northern and southern poles of our nation but which now increasingly serves that purpose for our globe. Chicago is the capital of America's heartland but also a dynamo of international travel and trade, blessed by the busiest airport, largest mercantile exchange, most dramatic skyline, and best rightfielder in the world.

It has also been blessed for more than three-quarters of a century by this very venerable institution—the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations. In 1922—the year the Council was founded—our country was walking away from the League of Nations, our cities were coping with Prohibition, and our Secretary of State had a beard.

Much has changed since then, but this Council has remained one of our nation's most influential platforms for discussing America's rightful place in the world. The Council has also been a leader in assessing American attitudes toward international relations.

I was heartened that your latest survey shows strong, albeit guarded, support for an active U.S. role. I was delighted to see that most Americans agree with me that President Clinton deserves high marks for his foreign policy leadership. But your survey also reveals that a majority of our citizens are afraid, as the new century is about to dawn, that the next 100 years will prove even bloodier than the last. And given our experience of Holocaust and global war, that is a daunting prospect. And we have no higher responsibility than to do all we can to prevent that prospect from becoming a reality.

This evening, I would like to discuss with you a major part of that responsibility. Because even though the Cold War has ended, the dangers posed to us by nuclear weapons have not. We must carry out a comprehensive strategy to limit

those dangers both by keeping such weapons out of the wrong hands and by deterring and defending against their possible use. These goals received a setback last month when the U.S. Senate voted not to ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, or CTBT.

America's allies and friends responded to this vote with universal shock and disappointment. I have personally been besieged by calls from my counterparts around the globe. All express concern. Some even fear that America is on the verge of deciding simply to go it alone, to abandon efforts at

## MESSAGE TO OUR READERS

The United States Department of State Dispatch has provided key speeches and testimony by senior State Department officials as well as current U.S. treaty actions since 1990. However, since all speeches, briefings, and testimony from State Department officials and the current U.S. treaty actions are available on the Department's web site at [www.state.gov](http://www.state.gov) upon release, hard copy distribution of this publication will end with the December 1999 issue.

Back issues from January 1993 through December 1996 are available on the Department's archive through the federal depository library of the University of Illinois at Chicago at <http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/>. For issues beginning with January 1997 and ending with December 1999, Dispatch continues to be available on the Department's main web site at <http://www.state.gov/www/publications/dispatch/index.html>. □

nuclear nonproliferation, and to rely solely on military might in what could become a new, wider, and even more dangerous nuclear arms race. My reply to those who harbor such fears is not to overreact. The United States has not gone crazy.

If you remember 1991, Saddam Hussein invaded another country. He pillaged it; he set fire; and he decided that he could control the region. Before that, he had gassed his own people. He had been acquiring weapons of mass destruction.

We carried out, with the help of an alliance, a war in which we put Saddam Hussein back in his box. The United Nations voted a set of resolutions which demanded that Saddam Hussein live up to his obligations and get rid of the weapons of mass destruction. The United Nations Security Council imposed a set of sanctions on Saddam Hussein until he did that. It also established an organization.

So there was an organization that was set up to monitor whether Saddam Hussein had gotten rid of his weapons of mass destruction. That organization, UNSCOM, has made clear he has not. The United States, in the person of me, in fact, authored a resolution—because I was concerned about the children of Iraq—to make sure that Saddam Hussein would be able to sell his oil for food and medicine.

There has never been an embargo against food and medicine. It is just that Saddam Hussein has not chosen to spend his money on that. Instead, he has chosen to spend his money on building weapons of mass destruction and palaces for his cronies; in fact, I think he has built 54 palaces at more than \$2 billion since the war ended.

We have established a regime which would make sure that the food and medicine is distributed to the children of Iraq. And where the UN is active in northern Iraq, child mortality has gone down. It is Saddam Hussein who is keeping his people in bondage. It is Saddam Hussein who gassed his own people. It is not the United States or the United Nations.

Okay. My reply to those who harbor the fear that we might overreact and pull out of the world is that the United States has not gone crazy. A clear majority in the Senate wanted to delay voting to allow more time to deliberate on the treaty. President Clinton and Vice President Gore have reaffirmed America's commitment to nonproliferation. And, as Winston

*“Never before have the clearly expressed views of our closest allies been so lightly dismissed; never before has the Senate rejected so abruptly a treaty of this importance; and never before has the tradition of a bipartisan foreign policy . . . seemed so distant.”*

Churchill once reportedly declared, “Americans can always be counted upon to do the right thing in the end, after all the other possibilities have been exhausted.”

That said, the Senate debate was a highly sobering experience. Never before have the clearly expressed views of our closest allies been so lightly dismissed; never before has the Senate rejected so abruptly a treaty of this importance; and never before has the tradition of a bipartisan foreign policy—once championed by such giants of this state as Everett Dirksen and Paul Douglas—seemed so distant.

Much has been said about how the Administration and Senate leadership handled this issue. It is fair to assign blame to both sides: to the Senate for giving the treaty short shrift; to the Administration for not doing enough to lay the groundwork for a successful debate.

But our focus now must be not on where we have been but on where we are headed. That is why I have chosen to address this subject here, tonight. Those of us in public life have a duty—when circumstances warrant—to raise a flag of warning. And I do so now,

because I believe it is dangerous when the world's leading nation is as sharply divided as we appear to be on how to confront the world's greatest threat.

Our challenge is to overcome the scars left by past arguments, put aside partisan distractions, and come together around concrete measures that will keep Americans secure. To succeed, we must go beyond slogans to

the reality of a world in which U.S. actions and attitudes have real consequence. Because if we do not accept the rules we insist that others follow, others will not accept them either. The result will be a steady weakening of nuclear controls. If efforts at control fail, within a couple of decades or less, a host of nations from the Middle East through South Asia to the Korean Peninsula could possess nuclear weapons and the ability to deliver them at long range.

One can imagine then a world imperiled by bitter regional rivalries in which governments are able to threaten and destroy each other without ever having to mass troops at a border, send an aircraft aloft, or launch a ship of war.

This is where the issues of nuclear testing and missile defense are linked, for those of us concerned about defending against missiles armed with weapons of mass destruction should be the first to value halting nuclear tests as an initial line of defense.

More than four decades ago, President Eisenhower warned that the knowledge of how to build nuclear weapons would spread and that not

even a massive arsenal would be enough to keep America safe. He strived, therefore, to achieve agreements, including a comprehensive test ban, that would reduce the risk of war.

His successor, President John Kennedy, took up that same banner. In 1963, he said that

the conclusion of a treaty to outlaw nuclear tests . . . would check the nuclear arms race in one of its most dangerous areas . . . Surely, this goal is sufficiently important to require our steady pursuit, yielding to the temptation neither to give up the effort, nor . . . our insistence on vital and responsible safeguards.

These, then, are the core principles that guided America in years past and should guide us still.

**First**, America must lead in the effort to assure stability and peace in a nuclear world.

**Second**, we should strive for sound agreements to reduce the dangers posed by nuclear weapons.

**Third**, we should view such agreements not as ends, but as means; they must contribute to our overall security.

Obviously, agreements do not erase the need for a powerful nuclear and conventional military deterrent, but they establish rules that increase the chance that our deterrent will succeed in preventing war; they complicate efforts by potential adversaries to develop and build nuclear weapons; and they make it more likely that others will join us in a common response against those who break the rules.

By outlawing nuclear tests, the CTBT will impede the development of more advanced weapons by nuclear weapons states and constrain the nuclear capabilities of countries that do not now have such weapons. For example, in Asia, the CTBT would make it harder for North Korea to advance its nuclear weapons program or for China to develop the technology required to place multiple warheads atop a single small missile.

In the Persian Gulf, the treaty would create another important yardstick to measure the intentions of Iran, where a historic debate between the forces of openness and isolation is underway. In South Asia, the treaty would be a valuable tool for constraining a potentially catastrophic arms race along a disputed border.

In Russia, there is support among some for building a new generation of tactical nuclear arms, because Russia's conventional military capabilities have degraded, and money is lacking to rebuild them. The CTBT would reinforce momentum toward nuclear restraint around the world.

Despite these benefits, critics say the treaty is too risky because some countries might cheat. But improvements in our own national means of verification, together with the International Monitoring System established by the treaty, would enhance our ability to detect nuclear explosions. Also, the treaty's provisions for on-site inspections should help deter violations and assist in finding the smoking gun should a violation occur. Moreover, the military value of very low-yield tests is limited. They are of little use in developing more advanced strategic weapons.

The bottom line is that, under the CTBT, it is less likely that nations will test because the risks of detection will be higher. But if they do test in ways that might threaten our security, they will be detected. And if that were to happen, the world, not just the United States, would object with the full force of international law on its side.

Of course, some among you may ask, so what? Aren't international law and world opinion merely abstractions? Won't governments, and especially those we worry about most, pursue their own interests regardless of treaty obligations?

There is a good deal of merit in these questions. But there is no merit to the conclusion that some draw—which is that if we cannot assure 100% compliance with the rules we establish,

we are better off not establishing any rules at all. Consider the facts.

During the first 25 years of the nuclear age, five countries tested nuclear weapons. In the 29 years since, two—India and Pakistan—have joined the list. During this period, knowledge about how to build nuclear arms has spread, but far fewer nations than we once predicted are acting on that knowledge.

The question is “Why?” The answer, I think, is that global standards matter. Over the years, more and more nations have embraced the view that it is unnecessary and dangerous to develop and test nuclear weapons. This view has given birth to an extensive, although not yet complete, framework of legally binding agreements. These include nearly universal participation in the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, or NPT.

Of course, neither law nor opinion will prevent nations from acting in their own best interests. But most countries are influenced in how they define their interests by what the law is, and most find it in their interests to operate within the law or, at least, be perceived as doing so.

Why else, for example, did South Africa, Brazil, and Argentina abandon their nuclear weapons programs? Why else did China agree to halt its own nuclear tests and sign the CTBT? Why else have India and Pakistan agreed, in principle, to do the same? And why else have the nations that contribute to the proliferation problem made such vigorous efforts at concealment?

Some treaty opponents have pointed out, accurately, that North Korea joined the NPT and then evaded its obligations under it. But why did North Korea take on these obligations in the first place? And why should we conclude that because that pact was violated, we would have been safer without it? After all, North Korea's secret activities first came to light as a result of inspections under that agreement.

Further, we can only imagine what kind of world we would have today if

the NPT had not entered into force three decades ago, or what kind of world we will have three decades from now if we decide that the job of stopping proliferation is either not worth doing or already done.

To me, it is an open and shut case that outlawing nuclear tests by others will result in a more favorable security climate for America than would otherwise exist. But the second question we must consider is whether accepting a legal ban on our own tests will undermine our nuclear deterrent.

That deterrent includes our ability to put a nuclear weapon on a bomber or missile and deliver that weapon with a high degree of accuracy. The knowledge that we can do this will stop any rational government from attacking us, and the CTBT would not affect that. Because the treaty does not cover delivery systems, we can continue to test and modernize them.

There can be no doubt that our deterrent is effective. After all, we have already conducted more than 1,000 tests—hundreds more than anyone else. Our knowledge base and technology are superb. However, many Senators opposed the CTBT because of their concern that, without testing, weapons in our arsenal might become either unsafe or unreliable.

Obviously, this is a very serious concern, which we have taken seriously. Our nation's most experienced nuclear weapons scientists have examined very carefully the possibility that our weapons will degrade without testing. They have recommended steps that will enable us to retain confidence in the safety and reliability of our arsenal under CTBT, including a robust program of stockpile stewardship. These steps were incorporated in a package of understandings that accompanied the treaty when it was submitted to the Senate.

We simply do not need to test nuclear weapons to protect our security. On the other hand, would-be pro-

liferators and modernizers must test if they are to develop the kind of advanced nuclear designs that are most threatening. Thus, the CTBT would go far to lock in a technological status quo that is highly favorable to us.

There is, moreover, even another

*“The case for ratifying the CTBT is strong. It asks nothing of us that we cannot safely do; it requires of others a standard we very much want the world to meet. Those tempted to cheat will face a higher risk of being caught and will pay a higher price when they are.”*

layer of protection for American security. If the day should come when our experts are not able to certify the safety or reliability of our nuclear arsenal—or if the treaty is not working and new threats are arising that require us to resume nuclear tests—we will have the right to withdraw from the treaty.

The case for ratifying the CTBT is strong. It asks nothing of us that we cannot safely do; it requires of others a standard we very much want the world to meet. Those tempted to cheat will face a higher risk of being caught and will pay a higher price when they are. And if the worst case unfolds and we must withdraw, we can and will.

The burden on treaty supporters is to persuade skeptics that ratifying the CTBT will reduce the dangers posed to our security by nuclear weapons, without endangering our security by preventing us from taking steps necessary to national defense.

But there is also a burden on treaty opponents, for it is not sufficient simply to say the treaty is imperfect, opponents must offer an alternative that is better. And they must explain why America will be safer in a world where nuclear tests are not outlawed and may again become commonplace, where

there is no guarantee of an international monitoring system to detect such tests, where we have no right to request on-site inspections, and where America is held responsible by allies and friends everywhere for the absence of these protections.

To those Senators who want the Administration to bury the CTBT, we say, no, our national interests will not allow us to do that. But to those who are willing to take a further look at the treaty, we say, how can we help? For despite the Senate vote, the treaty lives.

It is essential that the dialogue on CTBT continue and bear fruit. After all, the Administration and Congress have worked together on difficult national security issues before. A number of leading Senators from both parties have expressed interest in a bipartisan effort to move forward on CTBT now.

In that spirit, I am announcing today that we will establish a high-level Administration task force to work closely with the Senate on addressing the issues raised during the test ban debate. As we did with NATO enlargement, this team will also carry the dialogue to Americans from all walks of life to explain and analyze the treaty.

In our discussions with the Senate, we will be open to a variety of possible approaches for bridging differences, including at an appropriate point the potential need for additional conditions and understandings, as was the case with the Chemical Weapons Convention.

Meanwhile, President Clinton has made clear that the United States will continue to observe a moratorium on nuclear explosive tests and has urged all others to do the same. And we will continue to work with Congress to provide our share of support for preparatory work, including construction of the International Monitoring System.

Finding the way forward on CTBT is necessary, but not sufficient, to crafting a bipartisan strategy for reducing the nuclear danger. It is equally important that we establish common ground on the question of national missile defense and the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

Here, agreement must be found between the extremes. On one side, there are those demanding that we scrap the ABM Treaty, despite objections from Russia, China, and our closest allies. On the other are people who oppose any adjustments to the treaty and are against developing even a limited system of national missile defense.

The Administration believes that both extreme views are dangerous. The first risks reviving old threats to our security; the second fails to respond to new ones.

For more than a quarter-century, the ABM Treaty has contributed to strategic nuclear stability. It is based on the understanding that an all-out competition in ABM systems would create destabilizing uncertainties about intentions and destroy our ability to reduce strategic offensive arms. Preserving this understanding is vital to us. It is also essential to Russia.

If we were simply to abandon the ABM Treaty, we would generate fears in Moscow that we are also abandoning the goal of stability; we would squander a historic opportunity for negotiating further mutual reductions in our nuclear arsenals; and we would run the unnecessary risk of transforming Russia into once again our most powerfully armed adversary.

On the other hand, our partners must recognize that the strategic environment has changed greatly in the 27 years since the ABM Treaty was signed. The Gulf war showed what a real threat theater-range missiles in hostile hands can be. And tests of longer range missiles by Iran and North Korea raise concerns about vulnerability that must be addressed.

Our military serves as an effective deterrent to any rational adversary. The problem is how to deal with threats from sources that are neither rational nor interested in complying with global norms.

It is against this danger that the Administration is developing and testing a limited National Missile Defense System, with a decision on deployment possible as early as next summer. For deployment to occur, certain changes to the ABM Treaty would be necessary, and we have begun discussing these with Congress, our allies, and Moscow.

To date, Russian leaders have expressed strong opposition to any treaty modifications and accused us of undermining the entire system of international arms control simply by raising the subject. A Russian defense official recently proclaimed that his nation has the ability to overwhelm the missile defense system we are planning. That is true—and part of our point. The system we are planning is not designed to defend against Russia and could not do so. And that will remain true even if we are able to negotiate further deep reductions in our arsenals.

The changes we are contemplating in the ABM Treaty are limited. They would not permit us to undermine Russia's deterrent. And because Russia and the U.S. are vulnerable to the same threats, we are prepared to cooperate with Moscow on missile defense.

In response, Russia must do more than just say *nyet*. It is in our mutual interest to develop an arrangement that preserves the essential aims of the ABM Treaty, while responding to the new dangers we both face.

Domestically, the Administration recognizes that if we are to have support for any agreement we might reach with Russia, we must consult closely with the Legislative Branch. The Administration and Congress have the same boss—and that is you, the American people. We have an obligation to work shoulder to shoulder in support of policies that will keep our citizens secure.

In defending against nuclear dangers, we rely on a combination of force and diplomacy. That is why our military must remain second to none, but also why we need resources to back our international diplomatic leadership. Earlier this year, Congress voted to cut the President's request for international programs by more than \$2 billion. By standing firm in our negotiations, we won much of that back.

Now we are engaged in a final effort to persuade Congress to pay what we owe to the United Nations. This is not just a matter of honoring our word, although that in itself should be enough.

The UN serves important American interests. These include peacekeeping, safeguarding nuclear materials, prosecuting war criminals, enforcing sanctions against rogue states, protecting intellectual property rights, fighting disease, and saving children's lives.

A half-century ago, our predecessors created the United Nations. Thirty-eight years ago, our nation was proudly represented there by Illinois' favorite son—Adlai Stevenson. Today, we are the organization's number one debtor. We are even in danger of losing our vote in the UN General Assembly. America can do better than that. I hope you agree. Congress should vote this year—at long last—to pay our UN bills.

The issues I have discussed today of nuclear risks and national defense, of resources and American interests affect us all. And I hope the dialogue

concerning them will broaden far beyond the narrow corridors of Washington, DC.

These are matters that warrant the attention of our universities and scientists, our professionals, and our vast network of nongovernmental organizations. We need a truly national debate.

We Americans are the inheritors of a tradition of leadership that has brought our country to the threshold of the new century strong and respected, prosperous, and at peace. The question our children will ask is whether we were good stewards of that inheritance.

A decade or two from now, we will be known as the bitter partisans who allowed their differences to immobilize America or as the generation that marked the path to a safer world. We will be known as the unthinking unilateralists who allowed America's international standing to erode or as the generation that renewed our nation's capacity to lead.

There is no certain roadmap to success, either for individuals or for nations. Ultimately, it is a matter of judgment, a question of choice.

In making that choice, let us remember that there is not a page of American history of which we are proud that was authored by a peddler of complacency or a prophet of despair. We are a nation of doers.

We have a responsibility in our time, as others have had in theirs, not to be prisoners of history but to shape history; a responsibility to act—with others when we can, alone when we must—to protect our citizens, defend our interests, preserve our values, and bequeath to future generations a legacy as proud as the one we received from those who came before. To that mission, this evening, I pledge my own best efforts and summon both your support and the wise counsel of this esteemed Council.

Thank you very much for your attention. ■

# The U.S. and Africa: Building A True Partnership

*Secretary Albright*

---

*Remarks before the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and the Nigerian Community, Abuja, Nigeria, October 20, 1999.*

Secretary General Kouyate, ECOWAS resident representatives, Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen: Thank you for your warm welcome on this, my first visit to Nigeria.

Although I am new here, I do not feel like a stranger, for I have watched Nigeria's progress over the past year with the same mix of solemnity and joy that I felt a decade ago to see tyranny overthrown and nations reborn across central Europe. I had never given up the belief that I would one day hear freedom ring again in the streets of Prague, my native city. And I had never stopped hoping that I would be able, during my time as Secretary of State, to visit a Nigeria whole and free.

Today, it is possible to envision Nigeria becoming, at long last, what Wole Soyinka has called

an unstoppable nation, rich in human and material resources; a nation endowed with a seeming gift of leadership; one whose citizens anywhere in the world would be revered . . . simply by the very possession of a Nigerian passport.

When the history of this decade is written, Nigeria's transformation has every chance of standing beside the Czechoslovak Velvet Revolution and

South Africa's long walk to freedom as a shining example of the strength of human dignity and the depth of the desire for freedom.

Two days ago, I saw that same dignity and desire written across the faces of the people of Sierra Leone. I saw people who had suffered unspeakable horror, yet who sought not revenge but renewal.

I met African children eagerly learning to use prosthetics from an American veteran, himself a double amputee. I watched the most bitter enemies slowly learning to talk to each other. And I had the pleasure of reviewing ECOMOG troops—Nigerians and other West Africans—who are providing the stability Sierra Leone needs to begin again.

There is no message of easy optimism in the camps of Sierra Leone or on the long path Nigeria has still to travel. But there is an opportunity to build a true partnership between the United States and Africa—to leave behind the attitudes and habits of the past and seize opportunities to work together to achieve shared goals.

I am proud of what we have achieved thus far. President Clinton and his Cabinet, myself included, have made an unprecedented investment of time and energy to develop our ties

with Africa across a broad new range of subjects—from agriculture and transportation policy to promoting trade and fighting corruption.

Our nations are working together to end conflicts and build peace, combat the crime and terror that know no borders, promote economic reform and integration, and support democratic institutions and accountable government. It matters profoundly whether we succeed, and it matters nowhere more than here in Nigeria.

Nigeria is important to the United States and the world because you have the potential to be an economic powerhouse for Africa and global markets, because you are already a leader for peace, and because, ever since your struggle for independence, you have been a signpost for others in search of freedom.

President Obasanjo has already done much to restore Nigeria's democratic institutions. The steps still to come include the repeal of the last repressive laws, the return of Nigeria's judiciary to its former renown, and the consolidation of civilian control of the military. These are the long-term changes which will ensure that this time, democracy has come to Nigeria to stay.

Nigerians are also showing great determination to come to terms with the abuses of the past. I applaud recent progress toward bringing to justice the killers of KudiratAbiola, Shehu ar’Adua, and others. And I welcome President Obasanjo’s courage and farsightedness in appointing a panel to investigate human rights abuses committed since 1984, as well as establishing a committee to review dubious government contracts signed since by previous regimes.

These investigations, if they are fully and honestly carried out, are an opportunity to break—for good—the cycle of impunity that has claimed so many lives and done so much to discredit legitimate authority.

We also want to do all we can to help establish justice and permanent peace among Nigerians of every ethnicity and creed. Later today, I will visit Kano to gain a better understanding of that part of Nigeria’s rich mosaic.

And I follow with concern the extraordinary challenges that Nigeria faces in the Niger Delta region. Communal tensions there have been fed by past government neglect, police and military brutality, and extreme poverty and despair—even as tremendous oil wealth is pumped from the Delta every day.

I want to commend President Obasanjo for his efforts to defuse the crisis and to hear the concerns of the Delta people. I stress America’s desire to do what we can to help find solutions that are based on the rule of law, not the law of force—solutions that give the Delta people a voice in their own future and a stake in the future of Nigeria. I believe we can help find ways to work with American oil companies on these issues. They, too, have a stake in seeing Nigeria’s transformation succeed. And they can be partners in developing the Delta and bettering the lives of its people.

Nigeria’s success in meeting the challenges of democracy will be a welcome inspiration across Africa. For

our part, the United States will continue to be a strong supporter of democratic forces across the continent. We work with governments seeking to make the transition, and we support the elements of civil society such as the journalists, labor unions, women’s groups, and other activists that have kept Nigeria’s democratic vocation alive.

*“I stress America’s desire to do what we can to help find solutions that are based on the rule of law, not the law of force—solutions that give the Delta people a voice in their own future and a stake in the future of Nigeria.”*

President Clinton has pledged to work to return American assistance to Africa to its past high levels. We will be making the case to the American people that Africa’s peace and well-being are closely bound with our national interests—whether fighting crime and terrorism or promoting exports and trade. We will be explaining that our assistance programs for Africa are an investment in our common future, and we will be working with Congress to achieve a substantial addition to our funding, including a three- or fourfold increase in our assistance to Nigeria.

As President Clinton stressed at the UN General Assembly last month, the fight against poverty and underdevelopment is a critical part of our struggle for democracy and stability in Africa. We cannot hope to combat poverty without winning the war on HIV/AIDS.

The imperative in Africa now, as in my own country a decade ago, is to face squarely the reality of this disease. It has killed more people than all the wars of this century combined, and it will leave 40 million children homeless and orphaned by the end of the next decade.

The way to beat AIDS is not to ignore or deny it, but to prevent it. Countries such as Uganda and Senegal that have faced the threat squarely are beginning to see reductions in their infection rates. We know it can be done. We are ready to help. And we are working with Congress to put in place a \$100 million program for 14 African countries and India.

Spending on health, education, and social welfare is not just important to democratic stability. It is fundamental to economic growth, along with economic reform and improved investment climates. The United States will continue to support Africa’s modernizing economies and encourage American investors to take a closer look at the opportunities Africa has to offer.

For almost 2 years, we have sought to obtain passage of the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act—one of the most important pieces of legislation on Africa that I can remember. Its purpose is to build trade and investment links between the United States and Africa that will benefit us both. The Senate vote on this legislation may come as soon as this week.

This is a job-creating, trade-expanding, growth-producing measure for both sides of the Atlantic. It deserves the strong support of Congress and the American people. It is time to treat Africa just as we do our other trading partners, and this bill will accomplish that.

In this and other ways, the United States will keep working to provide new incentives for investment and trade with Africa. We will continue to encourage spending for micro-enterprise and economic opportunities for women. We will continue to seek



out and initiate continent-wide projects such as our Safe Skies Initiative, which is making African commerce easier by making air travel safer and more secure. And we will continue to be a leader in reducing the crushing burden of international debt which African nations face.

The international financial institutions and the G-7 have approved President Clinton's plan to make it easier for countries to qualify for debt relief, to provide relief more rapidly, and to ensure that savings are used to meet social needs. Ultimately, private sector investment will be the engine of long-term growth across Africa. And if domestic investment is to be profitable and foreign investment attractive, the battle against crime and corruption must be won.

Too many of Africa's resources are being squandered and its peace shattered by the criminal and corrupt, by diamond runners, drug peddlers, and those who consider public office a license to steal. Those complicit come in all colors and nationalities. They include leaders and generals who sell off their countries' resources to pad their bank accounts and use child soldiers to fight their senseless wars. They include international and local criminal organizations that use Africa as a convenient base of operations. They include mercenaries who would sell drugs and guns to a kindergarten if the markup were high enough.

This is a fight between those with faith in the rule of law and those who believe in no rules at all. Its ill effects touch every nation, and we must combat it together.

That is why the United States supports the West African Small Arms Moratorium, which bans shipments to 16 countries for 3 years. We hope this West African innovation will spread to other regions as part of a global offensive against illicit arms transfers.

That is why we have tightened our own regulations governing arms sales, making it illegal for traffickers subject

to American law to broker illicit deals anywhere. And that is why it is time to choke off the underground economy that fuels conflict with illicit sales of gemstones, precious metals, and narcotics.

As we work to fight transnational threats, we must find ways to end the conflicts that block African development and threaten regional peace.

I have said repeatedly that our involvement in peacemaking in Kosovo, East Timor, and elsewhere around the

*“Too many of Africa’s resources are being squandered and its peace shattered by the criminal and corrupt, by diamond runners, drug peddlers, and those who consider public office a license to steal.”*

world is not an excuse for inaction in Africa; it is a challenge to do better. One of the areas where the international community must improve is in developing the resources of our African partners so that we can move together, quickly and effectively, to prevent and respond to crises.

That is why the United States is the largest contributor to the Organization of African Unity's—OAU—Conflict Management Center. That is why President Clinton's Africa Crisis Response Initiative has already trained and equipped battalion-sized contingents from six countries for peacekeeping.

Yesterday, I reviewed a battalion of Malian troops on its way to Sierra Leone. They are trained by Americans, supported by the Dutch, and will serve with soldiers from Nigeria, Guinea, Ghana, and elsewhere. Such partnerships are an important step—and ECOWAS is a vital partner—toward ensuring that the nightmares of Sierra Leone, and Rwanda before it, will not be repeated.

For much of this decade, ECOWAS has been on the front line of the struggle for peace in Africa. Too often, in fact, you have been the only line separating innocent civilians from utter chaos. Much has been asked of you in Sierra Leone, Guinea-Bissau, and Liberia. You have stretched limited resources farther than the international community had any right to expect, and you have achieved more than anyone dared hope.

The United States has been ECOMOG's largest supporter, providing well over \$100 million this decade. We have allocated an additional \$11 million in logistical support for your mission in Sierra Leone. This week, we will vote in the UN Security Council to send a peacekeeping mission to Sierra Leone to help relieve the burden you have carried so long. We are also ready to help strengthen ECOWAS itself, both in its security architecture and in its efforts to promote regional economic integration and trade.

Elsewhere on the continent, the United States has taken a lead role in reenergizing a regional peace process in Sudan. We are working with the OAU to help end the conflict between our friends—Ethiopia and Eritrea. We are working to defuse the escalating tensions in Burundi, and we will help implement the peace agreement in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Each of these conflicts is a serious roadblock in the way of Africa's development, but they are not the sum of Africa's present—or its future.

Since becoming a diplomat, I have come to Africa a half-dozen times and have seen both the continent's problems and its promise. From Addis to

Luanda and from Gulu to Cape Town, some of what I have witnessed has saddened me. But I have also been inspired. Nowhere in the world are there stronger or braver people than those working now to secure justice, prosperity, and lasting peace across Africa.

In recent days, I have been reminded of the immense debt that the world owes to President Nyerere and millions of Africans like him who, in our lifetime, have shown us how to be champions of peace and forces of liberty.

Mwalimu was unique, capable of soaring vision and deep humility. He believed, profoundly, in what Africa could be. And he lived his beliefs as best he knew how.

Sixteen years ago, the writer Chinua Achebe wrote that

One shining act of bold, selfless leadership from the top, such as unambiguous refusal to be corrupt or to tolerate corruption at the fountain of authority, will radiate powerful sensations of well-being and pride through every nerve and artery of national life.

I expect that I will see that pride on the faces of thousands of Tanzanians tomorrow, as I join them in paying Mwalimu homage. I see that pride here today, in the faces of Nigerians who struggled for so long, performing countless acts of bravery while refusing to see their democratic will denied.

I believe that Nigeria's new hope and pride will radiate beyond your borders, just as the courage of Nyerere, Mandela, and their million less-known colleagues illuminated not just a continent but the world. I believe

they will spark more acts of leadership toward a better, freer tomorrow.

When I think about the future in Africa, I am reminded of another great force for freedom, Vaclav Havel. He has said that

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

I am a realist—or, as a Malian newspaper called me yesterday, an Afro-realist. In Africa, as across the time zones and from pole to pole, liberty is always worth the trouble. And I hope you will join me in striving to give freedom and justice one true meaning for us all.

Thank you very much. ■

# American Support for Freedom Of The Press and International Exchange Programs

*Secretary Albright*

---

*Remarks to the Institute for International Education, New York City, October 14, 1999.*

Thanks, Allan. When Allan was Associate Dean of the Georgetown School of Foreign Service in the early 1980s, he helped recruit me to teach there. Over the years, he's been a wonderful colleague and friend. So when he invites me to dinner, I show up.

But given this institution and this audience, it was an easy sell. Henry Kaufman, Garrick Utley, our distinguished cochairs, honorees, guests and friends: I am delighted to be here.

I am a fan of the IIE for many job-related reasons, but I have a personal one, as well. When my family first came to America, my father, who had been a Czech diplomat, needed to find a new line of work. Ben Charrington—a patron saint of IIE—helped him obtain a teaching position at the University of Denver. There, my father thrived, and so did our family. For us, IIE has always been a synonym for opportunity.

Of course, there are many other families around the world who have equally good cause to thank this institution. For eight decades, the IIE has been the world's leader in promoting the exchange of people and the sharing of ideas.

Founded in the aftermath of war, to help prevent war, it is dedicated to the premise that people who under-

stand and know each other better are less likely to hate and attack each other. That requires a certain faith in human character—a faith without which no human progress could be achieved.

Speaking of faith, I just want to say to those who may have followed the recent, all too brief, debate on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty that we will not give up. The treaty is in our interests. As President Clinton said last night, "the fight is far from over." And as Winston Churchill said years ago, "Americans can always be counted upon to do the right thing—after all other possibilities have been exhausted." In the meantime, we will continue to refrain from nuclear explosive tests and encourage others to do so as well.

The nuclear treaty aside, tonight's dinner comes at an exciting time for me as Secretary of State. That is because at the beginning of this month, the Department merged with the United States Information Agency.

This was no mere bureaucratic reshuffling. It reflects our understanding that, in today's world, public diplomacy must be an integral part of our foreign policy from the moment initiatives are conceived to the day they are fully

executed. I am pleased that tonight we are joined by our newly sworn-in Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs, Evelyn Lieberman. I call your attention, as well, to the presence of Alice Ilchman, now Chairman of the Board of the Rockefeller Foundation and formerly Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs.

As these leaders can attest, public diplomacy matters because in this day and age, we cannot simply assume that America's policies and intentions will be understood. Public diplomacy helps us to tell our side of the story, to clarify intentions, provide explanations, and rebut lies. It also enables us to spread more broadly the good news of democracy.

About the time the IIE was founded, British author H.G. Wells wrote that "history [is] a race between education and catastrophe." Helping people to value democratic principles of tolerance and openness is a good way to aid us all in winning that race.

That is why our international scholarship, exchange, and visitor programs are such a vital component of our public diplomacy. And for decades, the IIE has successfully administered the best of these programs, including the Fulbright and

Humphrey fellowships.

I have a deep commitment to these programs because I have seen them work. When I was at Georgetown, I participated in seminars that included future prime ministers and presidents from Europe, Asia, and Latin America.

This year, Allan tells me that the IIE is training lawyers from Russia, economists from South Africa, public administrators from eastern Europe, and environmental professionals from India. That is an impressive amount of history in the making.

While these initiatives focus on specific areas of expertise, they also improve the climate for respecting basic human rights. In relatively closed societies, IIE programs provide a rare chance to establish outside contacts and explore wonderfully dangerous ideas, such as freedom. In transitional countries, they provide a means of educating future leaders about the nuts and bolts of democratic institutions. And in every nation they touch, they help open the door of opportunity to minorities and women.

The benefits to the United States are clear as well. These ventures improve our understanding of other cultures and make friends for us worldwide.

In consequence, I am absolutely committed to preserving the integrity of these programs. They are by law and by right nonpolitical. They are not pork; they are pure gold—and we must manage them as the precious assets to American interests and values they are.

The Institute for International Education is dedicated to the exchange of knowledge and the pursuit of truth. Tonight, I want to say a few words—in the context of American foreign policy—about the closely related subjects of free press and free expression.

It is especially appropriate to do so here in New York, the free speech capital of the world—where, to paraphrase Shakespeare, some are born with opinions, some develop opinions, and all have opinions thrust upon

them. It is also appropriate because the IIE is a champion of free expression, training journalists in many key countries.

But even more important, freedom of speech and expression are fundamental to the principles and values that America promotes around the world. The Universal Declaration on Human

Numerous correspondents, including Raul Rivero and Manuel Gonzalez Castellanos, have been arrested or detained for directly or indirectly criticizing Fidel Castro.

In Belarus, the government closed down newspapers 2 weeks ago after one published a story about a cabinet minister's construction of a luxurious

*“The Universal Declaration on Human Rights provides that everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and to impart and receive ideas through the media. The very importance of this right is what causes dictators to want to suppress it. For to dictators, the truth is often inconvenient—and sometimes a mortal threat.”*

Rights provides that everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and to impart and receive ideas through the media. The very importance of this right is what causes dictators to want to suppress it, for to dictators, the truth is often inconvenient—and sometimes a mortal threat.

That is why so often they try to grab the truth and leash it like a dog, ration it like bread, or mold it like clay. Their goal is to create their own myths, conceal their own blunders, direct resentments elsewhere, and instill in their people a dread of change.

Consider, for example, Serbia. For years Slobodan Milosevic, now an indicted war criminal, has fed his people lies while repressing and terrorizing those who sought the truth. Slavko Curuvija, a newspaper owner and critic of Milosevic, was murdered this spring after being harassed repeatedly by Serb authorities. Other independent voices, such as the opposition newspaper Glas Javnosti, have also been fined or temporarily shut down.

In Cuba, it is hard for an honest person to get on a soapbox without having it yanked out from beneath.

summer home. In Syria, the government arrested human rights journalist Nizar Nayyuf back in 1992. He is now near death after years of solitary confinement, torture, and neglect.

Even in somewhat more open societies, criticizing the powers that be can be hazardous to your health and livelihood. For instance, in Zimbabwe, two journalists, Mark Chavunduka and Ray Choto, were arrested, tortured, and are now on trial for reporting on an alleged army plot to remove President Mugabe.

In Croatia, journalist Orlanda Obad is being prosecuted for writing about the financial holdings of President Tudjman's family. More than 900 other Croat journalists currently face civil or criminal charges. In Peru, television station owner Baruch Ivcher was stripped of his citizenship and forced into exile for reporting on allegations of government abuses, including illegal wiretapping and torture.

Governments that respond to hostile or investigative reporting with threats and prosecutions betray their

own insecurity and misuse power. No society can advance very far unless its government is accountable, and governments are not accountable unless journalists are able to do their jobs.

It is true that reporters and independent broadcasters are capable of abusing their rights; of poisoning the airwaves by inciting hate, spreading fear, and telling lies. We have seen that happen this decade in, among other places, Rwanda.

Press codes that establish standards of professionalism and accountability can be a vital safeguard. And authorities should have the right to rebut, correct, and argue with their critics. But they do not have the right simply to silence them. This is a point we make to all countries, including friends and allies.

In Ukraine, for example, we are concerned by apparent efforts to hinder news coverage of opposition candidates in the current presidential campaign. Federal authorities have frozen the bank accounts of the television station STB, which has a reputation for unbiased reporting, thereby forcing the station to curtail political and other programming.

And earlier this year, in Turkey, a journalist named Nadire Mater published a book of interviews with soldiers that was banned for allegedly insulting the military. The author faces a possible 6-year prison sentence.

It must be emphasized, however, that there has been noteworthy progress on human rights in Turkey since Prime Minister Ecevit, with whom I met recently in Washington, came to power. For example, in August, the Turkish Parliament suspended the sentences of some journalists convicted for speech-related offenses. This is a step in the right direction, and we will continue to encourage further progress.

Around the world, Americans may be proud that our diplomats regularly stress the importance of free speech and a free press. Both publicly and privately, we urge that the rights of journalists and other reporters be respected.

One place where we have made a special effort is Kosovo. This is a region where past efforts to control and misuse information contributed to a terrible harvest in suffering and blood. That is why creating a climate in which a free and independent media could

Unfortunately, over the past 5 years, the funds we annually invest in international affairs have declined by roughly 20% from the prior 5-year period. And what has been a very bad situation is now at risk of becoming much worse.

*“Around the world, Americans may be proud that our diplomats regularly stress the importance of free speech and a free press. Both publicly and privately, we urge that the rights of journalists and other reporters be respected.”*

operate was a priority for NATO and the UN in the aftermath of the conflict earlier this year.

Today, thanks in part to American assistance, Kosovo has six daily newspapers and more than 20 radio stations, reflecting a wide range of editorial viewpoints. One influential publisher, Veton Surroi, has been particularly courageous in championing the cause of better relations between ethnic Albanians and Serbs.

As we scan the horizon, we see the ongoing problems of intolerance in the Balkans and the obstacles to a free press created by organized crime in Russia. We see the clashes in Iran and China between those who favor greater openness and those who fear it and the tendency in so many countries still to censor ideas, rather than debate them.

We are reminded daily that the quest for free expression must confront many hurdles and remains a long-distance race. But with H.G. Wells' aphorism in mind, we must, and will, continue to educate, advocate, and insist that global norms be respected.

Before closing, I want to say just a word about resources. Public diplomacy, international exchanges, and support for human rights all cost money.

Last week, Congress voted to slash President Clinton's Fiscal Year 2000 budget request for foreign affairs by \$2 billion. This does not include another \$2.6 billion in emergency needs that we have identified since the President's budget was prepared. The result is a clear and present danger to American interests and a potential shortfall so large that it could become nearly impossible for me to do my job.

The message we are sending back to Congress is that this is simply not acceptable. The President has vowed to veto the inadequate appropriations bill. And we will insist that our international affairs programs, including public diplomacy, be treated fairly in the final budget negotiations this fall.

Many Americans are surprised when I tell them that the amount we allocate for foreign affairs is equal only to about one penny of every dollar the federal government spends. But in many situations, diplomacy is our first line of defense in preventing war, defusing crises, and building peace.

And foreign policy is one of our government's most basic responsibilities. So I hope we will have your support in assuring that America has the resources required to lead.

Finally, let me emphasize how strongly I feel about the issues I have discussed tonight. When I was in

graduate school, I wrote my thesis on the role of the media in Czechoslovakia before and during what came to be called Prague Spring.

In the 1980s, as a professor, I watched the freedoms promised by the Helsinki Accords inspire writers such as Andrei Sakharov and Vaclav Havel and help erode the foundations of communism in central Europe and the Soviet Union.

And as UN Ambassador and Secretary of State, I have come into contact with courageous men and women throughout the world who still strive at great cost and risk to report and broadcast the facts. These heroes remind me of the old story about the

wavering dissident in a repressive regime who tells his friend: "It is because I have children, I dare not speak out." To which his friend replies, "it is because I have children, I dare not remain silent."

I am proud that throughout this century, America has been the world's leading defender of every person's right, everywhere, to speak, write, publish, and broadcast freely and without fear. I am proud that America pioneered the notion that public diplomacy should be based not on self-serving fictions, but rather on openness and truth.

Finally, I am proud to count myself among the friends and admirers of the Institute for International Education. In the year you were founded,

Woodrow Wilson was President, the reigning World Series champions were the Boston Red Sox, and the Secretary of State had a moustache.

Since then, over eight decades, the Institute for International Education has been a mighty instrument of information and an agent of understanding, fostering peace and reminding us all that what counts most are not the distinctions of culture, nationality, and language that divide us, but rather the common humanity that binds us.

For all you have done, I congratulate you. For all you are doing and will do, I salute you. And for your attention and welcome here tonight, I thank you all very much. ■

# The William Cohen Lecture: Combining Force and Diplomacy To Secure America's Future

*Secretary Albright*

---

*Remarks at the William Cohen Lecture, University of Maine, Bangor, Maine, October 13, 1999.*

Mr. Secretary, thank you very much for that introduction and for welcoming me to your home. President Hoff, Chancellor MacTaggart, Dean Brucker, former President Hutchinson, President Miller, faculty and students of the University of Maine, guests and friends: Good morning.

I have long felt a kinship for Maine because of the years I spent working for Senator Ed Muskie, my first boss. He was a plain speaker, who accomplished much and understood deeply the connections between American strength at home and our leadership overseas. Aside from my parents, he remains my greatest hero, and I look forward to going with Secretary Cohen later in the day to visit the Muskie archives.

I am also delighted to be invited to deliver the William Cohen lecture. It is named for someone I deeply admire. For a quarter of a century, Bill Cohen has been one of America's most outstanding and respected public servants.

While others have given their first allegiance to party or to some narrow ideology or even to some special interest, Bill Cohen has devoted himself to Maine and to America. You must be very proud of him, as I am to serve with him.

Another reason I am pleased to be here is that I am a former professor. I love academic surroundings. And on the flight up—or I guess down—to Maine, I was thinking about my own days in school. Even then, I was very interested in foreign policy. Every time I went to a new town or school, I would start an international affairs club—and name myself president.

But it is not only because of my insatiable appetite for power that I became interested in foreign policy. The truth is I couldn't help it. When I was growing up, events overseas shaped almost everything about my life.

I was still a toddler when the Nazis overran my native Czechoslovakia and plunged the world into global conflict. Later, the Holocaust shook our faith in humanity itself. The dawn of the nuclear era called into question the very survival of our race. The Cold War divided the world into two well-armed camps. And periodic crises in Korea, Hungary, Berlin, Cuba, Prague, and Vietnam made us keenly aware of the dangers that existed and the responsibilities that we as Americans had.

Today, all this may seem as relevant as a manual typewriter or a long-playing record. The Soviet Union no longer exists. We are the world's lone superpower.

As a result, it may be tempting to look upon international affairs as just another academic subject, something to read about and debate, but not a determining factor in our lives. And that temptation exists not just for students, but for all of us.

There is grave danger in this, for it may be that we Americans have come to feel safer than we truly are. And it is certainly true that if we were to become complacent, and to take our security, prosperity, and freedom for granted, we would endanger them all.

We cannot simply assume that because the Cold War has ended, the dangers posed by weapons of mass destruction have disappeared; or that because free markets are ascendant, global prosperity is assured; or that because nations communicate more, they will fight less; or that because totalitarianism has been defeated in many places, it is gone everywhere and will not rise again.

The world is shaped not by those who merely inherit but by those who act. And if we discard the cloak of leadership, others who may not share our interests or values will surely pick it up.

Earlier generations of Americans turned the tide in the first global war, defeated the greatest evil the world has known, and defended freedom through decades of Cold War.

Our task is different and seemingly less dramatic but no less important. It is to forge a steadily growing consensus, based on steadily rising standards, that will help bring nations on every continent closer together around basic principles of democracy and open markets, the rule of law, and a commitment to peace.

As a goal, that is as easy to say as it is difficult to achieve. Like freedom itself, it is something we will never fully achieve but can only pursue. And if America is to lead the world in the right direction, as we must, we will have to make good use of every available foreign policy tool.

That means our armed forces must remain the best led, best trained, best equipped, and most respected in the world. And as President Clinton has pledged and Secretary Cohen and our military leaders assure, they will.

But we will also need first-class diplomacy. Because on many occasions, we will rely on diplomacy as our first line of defense—to cement alliances, build coalitions, and find ways to protect our interests without putting our fighting men and women at risk.

At the same time, our diplomacy is stronger because we have the threat of force behind it. In this way, force and diplomacy complement each other. It's like having Pedro Martinez to do your pitching and Mark McGwire or Sammy Sosa to bat cleanup. It is by combining force and diplomacy, for example, that we protect Americans from the threat posed by nuclear weapons.

Here, the military deterrent provided by our armed forces and the technological edge they enjoy are indispensable. But we will all sleep better if our deterrent is never used. The diplomatic challenge is to create a

political environment in which serious military threats to our country are less likely to arise.

That is why, since 1992, our support has helped deactivate almost 5,000 nuclear warheads in the former Soviet Union; eliminated nuclear weapons from three former Soviet Republics; and purchased more than 60 tons of highly enriched uranium that could have been used by terrorists or outlaw states to build such arms.

We are also helping 30,000 former Soviet weapons scientists find employment in peaceful commercial ventures,

dangerous nuclear weapons. The treaty has been widely endorsed by our military and scientific leaders because it would make our nation more secure and our world safer.

The United States today has no plans and no need to conduct nuclear explosive tests. It is plainly in our interests to discourage others from doing so, as well. The treaty would do that by banning tests and establishing a global monitoring system to detect cheaters.

However the Senate votes, the world should not doubt America's

*“We are taking steps . . . to protect ourselves from the new threats posed by ballistic missiles. Here, the military job is to maintain our deterrent and develop the best defensive technology possible. The diplomatic job is to ensure that in responding to new dangers, we do not act rashly and aggravate or revive old ones.”*

so they are not tempted to sell their expertise to those who might do us harm.

We are taking steps, as well, to protect ourselves from the new threats posed by ballistic missiles. Here, the military job is to maintain our deterrent and develop the best defensive technology possible. The diplomatic job is to ensure that in responding to new dangers, we do not act rashly and aggravate or revive old ones.

Finally, we have called upon the Senate to approve a treaty that would ban nuclear explosive tests of any size, for any reason, in any place—for all time. As we speak, the outcome of debate is uncertain. The Senate could vote to delay consideration or not to approve American participation.

The comprehensive test ban has been a goal of U.S. Presidents since Dwight Eisenhower and John Kennedy. It promises to slow both the development and spread of new and more

commitment to reducing the dangers posed by nuclear weapons. We will continue both to advance our program for assuring the reliability of our nuclear deterrent and to observe a moratorium on nuclear explosive tests. We will continue to support the international monitoring system the treaty would establish.

We will persist in urging others to join the agreement and to refrain from tests prohibited by it. And surely there will be further discussion of the merits of the treaty here at home, because there is no question that this landmark pact would serve both our national interests and the cause of world peace.

A second example of where we use force and diplomacy to safeguard American security is by striving to reduce the risks posed by regional conflicts. Because the United States has unique capabilities and standing, it is natural that others will turn to us in



time of emergency. In one sense, that is gratifying, but it also leads to difficult, damned-if-you-do, damned-if-you-don't, choices.

American actions must reflect American interests. Neither our armed forces nor our prestige should be committed lightly. And when we decide on a course of action, we should not rest until our goals are achieved.

The question, of course, is when, where, and how America should engage. There is no mathematical formula for arriving at such judgments. Before launching a diplomatic initiative, or considering the use of troops, a President must weigh our interests against a matrix of past commitments, present capabilities, future hopes, and enduring values.

He, or she, must marry principle to pragmatism, so that we are not only able to do the right thing but also to do the thing right. The risks of action must be balanced against the risks of not acting. And America's stake must be reflected in the nature and extent of America's commitment.

Taking all this into account, I believe Americans can be proud of the part we have played in supporting peacemakers over bomb throwers in key regions of the world. For example, President Clinton and another of Maine's extraordinary former Senators, George Mitchell, have been deeply involved in efforts to end the century-long strife in Northern Ireland.

In the Middle East, we have entered a new and more hopeful stage in the peace process. For the first time in years, Israelis and Palestinians are talking directly to each other, negotiating directly, and looking for creative ways to address each other's concerns.

America will do all it can to support the parties in their pursuit of peace. This is true not only between the Israelis and Palestinians, but also for the entire region. Daunting obstacles remain, but a just, lasting, and comprehensive Middle East peace is within our grasp. This is an opportunity

leaders in the region must seize, for there could be no greater gift to the future.

In East Timor, we are participating in a UN-authorized force, led by Australia and Thailand, to shield civilians from violence and allow them to shape their own destiny in accordance with the popular will. Secretary Cohen was in Indonesia last month, where he conveyed our message which is firm, but fair.

*“Obviously, we neither can nor should try to right every wrong or fight every fight. But the history of this century warns us that problems abroad, if left unattended, will all too often come home to America.”*

We fully back Indonesia's efforts to strengthen its democracy. But we also expect the Indonesian armed forces to disarm militias in West Timor and prevent them from threatening the East. Too often, during the past few months, those charged with preserving order have conspired with the enemies of order. That is a crime against the people of East Timor and unacceptable to the world.

We are also working with leaders in Africa to end the numerous conflicts that have generated suffering and slowed progress on that continent. Next week, I will travel to Africa for the third time in my current job. I will make clear America's commitment to assist, not by trying to impose solutions, but by supporting the implementation of African solutions and ideas.

Finally, in Kosovo, we continue to meld force and diplomacy in a manner that serves U.S. interests while upholding values that we cherish.

Southeast Europe has been a source of dangerous instability through much of this century. It is where World War I began, battles in World War II were fought, and Europe's worst violence in 50 years occurred this

decade. It would have been irresponsible—and unconscionable—if America and NATO had simply stood by when Slobodan Milosevic launched his ruthless campaign of ethnic cleansing.

At the outset, we used diplomacy backed by the threat of force to deter Milosevic and achieve a peaceful settlement. When Belgrade chose instead to attack, we responded with force while working diplomatically to maintain allied unity and explain

NATO's intentions.

Later, we used diplomacy to isolate Milosevic, enlist Russia on the side of peace, and gain Security Council support for an international peacekeeping force in Kosovo. Now we are working jointly—through military and civilian institutions—to build peace, aid economic recovery, and lay the groundwork for democratic self-government.

In recent weeks, we have heard some suggest that America need not concern itself when aggression or atrocities are committed overseas, unless they are committed directly against us. Obviously, we neither can nor should try to right every wrong or fight every fight. But the history of this century warns us that problems abroad, if left unattended, will all too often come home to America. We have a strong interest in acting where we can to prevent disagreements in key regions from becoming conflicts and in containing conflicts before they become all-out wars.

At the same time, except in extreme cases, America cannot go it alone. More often than not, the American role should be that of energizer or coalition builder. Or, perhaps, we will

provide limited amounts of specialized assistance. But if global standards are to be enforced and international stability maintained, many nations—not just the United States—have indispensable parts to fill.

A third area in which we use force and diplomacy to protect American interests is in response to what Secretary Cohen has called the “grave new world” of terror. Because we are the world’s strongest democracy, potential enemies may try to attack us by unconventional means, including terrorist strikes and the possible use of chemical or biological weapons.

In countering these threats, we must be prepared at home and overseas. That is why we are taking strong security measures and—at President Clinton’s direction—improving our planning for emergency response.

Through our diplomacy, we help train friendly governments in counter-terrorism, offer rewards for terrorist suspects, and gather information to advise and warn Americans.

We strive to forge international agreements that will leave terrorists with no place to run, no place to hide, no place to operate, and no place to keep their assets.

And we do all we can to bring suspected terrorists to the bar of justice, as we have in several major cases, including the sabotage of Pan Am 103 and the bombing last summer of two American embassies in Africa.

Above all, we make it clear to terrorists that their efforts to make America abandon its responsibilities will never succeed. The nation whose finest raised the flag at Iwo Jima and plunged into hell on Omaha Beach will not be intimidated.

Old Glory will continue to fly wherever we have interests to defend. We will meet our commitments. We will do all we can to protect our people. And we will wage the struggle against terrorism on every front, on every continent, with every tool, every day.

Before closing, I want to say just a few words about the need to back up our national security leadership with resources. Over the past 5 years, the funds we annually invest in international affairs have declined by roughly 20% from the prior 5-year period. Unfortunately, the world is not 20% smaller or less dangerous. And what has been a very bad situation is now at risk of becoming much worse.

Last week, Congress voted to slash President Clinton’s Fiscal Year 2000 budget request by \$2 billion. The result, if this bill were to become law, would be to cut foreign affairs resources below even their currently inadequate levels. This would create a clear and present danger to American interests, which is why President Clinton has vowed to veto the bill.

The proposed reductions do not even include another \$2.6 billion in emergency needs that we have identified since the President’s budget was prepared. The result is a potential shortfall of such size that it would be nearly impossible for me to do my job, and I think Secretary Cohen agrees—much harder for him to do his.

Let us be clear what we are talking about. Most of the funds we spend on international affairs cannot fairly be called foreign aid; they aid America.

When we provide resources to safeguard nuclear materials in the former Soviet Union or help South American farmers find alternatives to growing coca or train foreign police in counter-terrorism, we are aiding America. When we take steps to keep regional disputes from exploding into conflicts that could require the presence of U.S. troops, we aid America.

When we negotiate trade agreements that open overseas markets to Maine seafood, paper products, or high technology, we are helping America. When our visa offices enable six million foreign tourists and other travelers to visit the United States annually, while keeping known criminals out, we help and protect Americans.

Even when we assist other countries in meeting such needs as clearing land mines, caring for refugees, and fighting HIV/AIDS, we are serving America’s long-term interests and staying true to America’s permanent values. Taken together, our international programs help make our citizens safer, our economy stronger, our world more stable, and our freedoms more secure.

Many Americans are surprised when I tell them that the amount we allocate for foreign affairs is equal not to a quarter, or dime, or even a nickel, but only to about one penny of every dollar the federal government spends. But that penny can spell the difference between hard times and good times for our people, war and peace for our country, less and more freedom for our world.

The budget debate in Washington revolves around real issues that relate to the role of the federal government in such matters as education and health care. But the protection of national security is one of our government’s most basic tasks.

It is a centerpiece of our Constitution and why our country first came together. It cannot be delegated, subcontracted, privatized, or left for others to do. It is the solemn responsibility of the executive and legislative branches in Washington, each according to its role.

The best leaders of both parties in Congress understand this. They know that American diplomacy belongs on the short list of budget priorities. This was the case President Clinton recently made in Missouri—to the applause of the American Veterans of Foreign Wars. And it should be a starting point in negotiations on the final shape of the FY 2000 budget. I hope we will have your support in assuring that America has the resources it requires to lead in a way our citizens expect and our interests demand.

Members of the University of Maine community: We live in a world of astonishing and ever-accelerating change where technological breakthroughs occur daily, trends may disappear in a week, and events of just

a few years ago can seem like ancient history. But some things have not changed—the wonderful taste of a Maine lobster, the beauty of a New England autumn, the excellence of this University, the legacy of Ed Muskie, the integrity of Bill Cohen, and the purpose of America.

Some decades ago, when Cold War tensions were at their highest, Walter Lippman wrote about the realities of his time in words that may serve as a warning to ours.

With all the danger and worry it causes . . . the Soviet challenge may yet prove . . . a blessing. For . . . if our influence . . . were undisputed, we would, I feel sure, slowly deteriorate. Having lost our great energies [and] daring because everything was . . . so comfortable. We would . . . enter into

the decline which has marked . . . so many societies . . . when they have come to think there is no great work to be done . . . and that the purpose of life is to hold on and stay put. For then the night has come and they doze off and they begin to die.

Our challenge is to prove Lippman wrong; to employ our energy, retain our daring, and understand that our responsibilities are similar in magnitude, if not so obviously in drama, as those fulfilled by our predecessors.

It is true we face no Hitler or Stalin. But it is as great a mission to create the conditions under which such evil does not again threaten us, as it would be to oppose such evil if and when it did.

The novelist Herman Melville wrote that we Americans

are the pioneers of the world; the advance guard set on through the wilderness of untried things, to make a path in the New World, that is ours.

The era of covered wagons and the blazing of trails through the wilderness is long past. But for America, there are no final frontiers. We are not and have never been a status quo country. We have always believed that the future can be made better than the past. We are doers.

And if we are to build for our children the future they deserve, we must be more than spectators, more even than actors. We must be the authors of the history of our age.

To that mission this morning, I pledge my own best efforts, and respectfully solicit yours.

Thank you very much. ■



# TREATY ACTIONS

## MULTILATERAL

---

### Aviation

Protocol for the suppression of unlawful acts of violence at airports serving international civil aviation, supplementary to the convention of Sept. 23, 1971, for the suppression of unlawful acts against the safety of civil aviation. Done at Montreal Feb. 24, 1988. Entered into force Aug. 6, 1989; for the U.S. Nov. 18, 1994. [Senate] Treaty Doc. 100-19, 100th Cong., 2nd Sess. *Accession:* Mongolia, Sept. 22, 1999.

## BILATERAL

---

### Brazil

Agreement for cooperation concerning peaceful uses of nuclear energy, with annex and agreed minute. Signed at Brasilia Oct. 14, 1997. Entered into force Sept. 15, 1999.

Agreement extending the agreement of July 8, 1987, as extended, relating to the employment of dependents of official government employees. Effected by exchange of notes at Brasilia June 21 and 25, 1999. Entered into force June 25, 1999; effective July 8, 1999.

### China

Protocol to the agreement of September 17, 1980, as amended, [TIAS 10326, TIAS 12448] relating to civil air transport. Signed at Washington Apr. 8, 1999. Entered into force Aug. 25, 1999.

### Iceland

Agreement amending and extending the memorandum of understanding of Jan. 28 and Apr. 9, 1982, as amended and extended, for scientific and technical cooperation in earth sciences. Signed at Reston and Reykjavik June 9 and July 8, 1999. Entered into force July 8, 1999; effective Apr. 9, 1998.

### Japan

Agreement concerning a program for the cooperative research on ballistic missile defense technologies. Effected by exchange of notes at Tokyo Aug. 16, 1999. Entered into force Aug. 16, 1999.

Agreement amending the agreement of Apr. 15, 1996, concerning reciprocal provision of logistic support, supplies and services between the Armed Forces of the United States of America and the Self-Defense Forces of Japan, with annex. Signed at Tokyo Apr. 28, 1998. Entered into force Sept. 25, 1999.

### NATO AEW&C Programme Management Organization (NAPMO)

Memorandum of agreement concerning cooperative projects for the E-3 Aircraft, with annex. Signed at Washington and Brunssum Aug. 10 and 30, 1999. Entered into force Aug. 30, 1999.

### Nicaragua

Memorandum of agreement for the provision of assistance in developing and modernizing Nicaragua's civil

aviation infrastructure. Signed at Washington and Managua Apr. 29 and Aug. 30, 1999. Entered into force Aug. 30, 1999.

### Paraguay

Memorandum of understanding concerning the operation of a seismic monitoring station in Paraguay. Signed at Asuncion Sept. 13, 1999. Entered into force Sept. 13, 1999.

### Romania

Air transport agreement, with annexes. Signed at Washington July 15, 1998. Entered into force Aug. 19, 1999.

### Spain

Agreement for the promotion of aviation safety. Signed at Washington Sept. 23, 1999. Entered into force Sept. 23, 1999.

### Suriname

Agreement concerning cooperation in maritime law enforcement. Signed at Paramaribo Dec. 31, 1998. Entered into force Aug. 26, 1999.

### Uganda

Agreement regarding the reduction and reorganization of certain debts owed to, guaranteed by, or insured by the United States Government and its Agency, with annexes. Signed at Kampala June 22, 1999. Entered into force Aug. 19, 1999. ■