

Secretary Albright

George Marshall and the Legacy Of American Global Leadership

October 30, 1998

Address to the 10th annual George C. Marshall Lecture, Vancouver, Washington.

Good afternoon, and hello Vancouver! Mayor Pollard, thank you for that introduction. Governor Locke, I deeply appreciate your being able to join us today. My friend Senator Murray, Senator and Mrs. Hatfield, General Smith, Dr. Erickson, Mr. Eccleston, President Sweet, Elizabeth Rainey, Jeff Raun, teachers, students, guests and friends: I am delighted to be here, and thank you all for coming.

It is a great honor to participate in what I consider to be one of the foremost lecture series in the United States. And I want to begin by thanking the Hudson Bay's volleyball team for giving up your practice so we could use your gym. I would also like to extend a special greeting to the thousands of students around the region who, I am told, are watching this event on television.

Earlier this year, in New Zealand, I said that one of my role models was Xena, the Warrior Princess. Tomorrow being Halloween, I thought I would offer that image to help you stay awake while I speak.

Seven years ago, this lecture was delivered by Colin Powell, who said that of all the military leaders in American history, Gen. George Marshall stood head and shoulders above the rest. It is an astonishing truth about the person we honor in this lecture series that the first thing I did when I became Secretary of State was hang in my office a portrait of the greatest diplomatic leader in American history, former Secretary of State George Marshall.

Winston Churchill called Marshall "a great American, but more than that." For by his vision and capacity for decision, Marshall helped lift an entire continent from its knees.

In recent years, we seem to have observed the 50th anniversary of everything from the end of World War II to the founding of the United Nations to the breaking of the color line in baseball.

Today brings to mind another such anniversary, for it was in 1948 that Congress approved the famous plan that bears George

Marshall's name. That plan extended a lifeline of billions of dollars in aid and technical help to a Europe devastated by war. By offering that lifeline, America helped unify Europe's west around democratic principles, curbed communist inroads, and planted the seeds of a transatlantic partnership the fruits of which we are still harvesting.

Just as important was the expression of American leadership that the Marshall Plan conveyed. After World War I, America had withdrawn from the world, shunning responsibility and avoiding risk. Others did the same. The result was unchecked aggression in Asia and the rise of great evil in the heart of Europe.

After the trauma of World War II and the soul-withering horror of the Holocaust, it was not enough to say that the enemy had been vanquished—that what we were against had failed. Marshall's generation was determined to build a lasting peace. And the message that generation conveyed from the White House, from both parties on Capitol Hill, and from the millions of average Americans who donated to the relief effort, was that this time America would not turn inward; this time, America would lead.

Today, almost a decade after the Cold War's end, it is not enough for us to say that communism has failed. We, too, must heed the lessons of the past, accept responsibility for the future, and lead.

Because we face no superpower rival, our task is different than that faced in Marshall's day. But although it may seem less dramatic, it is no less important. For the choices we make will determine whether the world begins the new century falling apart in crisis and conflict or coming together around basic principles of political and economic freedom, the rule of law, and a commitment to peace.

If we are wise and strong enough, our citizens will benefit from a world economy that has regained its footing and resumed

broad-based growth. We will find it safer and more rewarding to study, trade, travel, and invest abroad. And our armed forces will be called upon less often to respond to urgent and deadly threats.

In such a world, more people in more nations will recognize their stake in abiding by the international rules of the road and in seeing that others do so as well. Nations will be more likely to work together to respond to new dangers, prevent conflicts, and solve global problems. There will be a growing and principled consensus about what is fair and unfair on trade and what is right and wrong on human rights.

The most we can hope, in our time, is to build a solid foundation for such a world. It is, nevertheless, a tall order. And fulfilling it will require that we pass some rigorous tests, both as a government and as a people.

First, and most generally, we must fortify the relationships that comprise the heart of the international system, while helping nations that are weak, troubled, or in transition to participate more fully.

This is the job that dominates the day-to-day diplomacy of the United States. For example, in Europe, we are striving to fulfill the vision Secretary Marshall pro-

claimed but the Cold War prevented: the vision of a Europe whole and free, united as President Clinton has said, "not by the force of arms but by the possibilities of peace."

Last year, NATO invited the Czech Republic, Poland, and Hungary to join in reality the alliance for freedom that their peoples have always embraced in spirit. And across the continent, militaries whose guns were once pointed at each other are now deployed beside each other building peace in Bosnia and planning for the security of Europe's future.

In Asia and the Pacific, we see a region of immense dynamism and optimism despite the current financial problems. To build security, we have broadened our military cooperation with our close ally Japan. We have urged North Korea to end its dangerous and self-imposed isolation. And we are engaged in a strategic dialogue with China aimed at expanding cooperation in areas where we agree and making progress on others, such as human rights and trade, where we do not yet see eye to eye.

In Africa, poverty, disease, and disorder have cut off millions from the international system. But Africa is a continent rich both in human and natural resources. Its best leaders understand the need to end the devastating civil and cross-border conflicts that slow economic and social progress. They understand, as well, the need to pursue reforms that help private enterprise and democratic institutions gain a foothold. As President Clinton's visit to the region earlier this year reflects, we are committed to helping all those in Africa who believe in human freedom and are prepared to do what is necessary to help themselves.

Closer to home, through the Summit of the Americas process, we have forged a hemispheric commitment to defend democracy, expand commercial ties, fight the war against drugs, and maintain peace from Patagonia to Prudhoe Bay. It is encouraging that Colombia's new President Pastrana, with whom President Clinton and I met earlier this week, seems determined to lead his long-troubled country into a new era of stability and law.

Strengthening the bonds that hold the international system together is an ongoing challenge. A second challenge, new and urgent, is responding to the global financial crisis. Over the past quarter century, the vision of expanded trade and free markets that was embodied in the Marshall Plan has helped prosperity to spread, not only in Europe, but around the world. Hundreds of millions of people have lifted themselves out of poverty. Even with the current crisis, per capita incomes in Korea and Thailand are 60% higher than a decade ago.

These policies have paid especially high dividends here in the American Northwest, where the economy is an export powerhouse, and the boom in trade with Asia has provided good jobs in everything from computers to shipping to agriculture. Now, however, these policies are being tested. The crisis of financial confidence which began in Southeast Asia has spread to East Asia and Russia and now endangers economies in our own hemisphere. There remains a risk that leaders in some nations will panic and turn to the false god of protectionism or the impossible goal of isolation in today's global economy.

The Administration is determined to get the prosperity train back on track. To this end, President Clinton has outlined a bold plan for restoring growth and preventing the further spread of the crisis in financial confidence.

We are doing all we can to help American firms remain competitive in Asia. Congress has approved our share of resources for the International Monetary Fund. The independent Federal

"First, and most generally, we must fortify the relationships that comprise the heart of the international system, while helping nations that are weak, troubled, or in transition to participate more fully."

Reserve Board has cut interest rates—twice. And Japan has finally begun to take the steps needed to get its huge economy moving in the right direction.

The best news, however, would be if the shock of this crisis results in a commitment to sounder and more transparent financial practices around the globe. It is encouraging that some of the countries hit hardest, especially Thailand, Korea, and Brazil, have responded by deepening their commitment to democracy, fighting corruption, and undertaking difficult economic reforms.

As we look ahead, we know that the health of the global economy will depend on maintaining and expanding the commitment to open trade, open markets, and open books. But we also know that there are problems that markets alone cannot solve. This is a lesson we learned in our own country when we adopted laws to ensure the integrity of our financial system and created programs to help our citizens cope with economic dislocations.

The changes needed to put the global economy back on track will not occur overnight. The economies most directly affected must continue to take the medicine that will help them get well. Our allies in Europe and Asia must do their part in restoring growth. And our international financial institutions must do more to help countries cope with the social hardships created by the current crisis and develop better strategies for preventing future ones.

A third major challenge to the international system is posed by the competition among different nations and peoples for land, resources, and power. This challenge is as old as history itself, but as the years go by and technology continues to advance, it is ever more urgent. Today, sophisticated weapons are more available, more deadly, more mobile, and less expensive than ever before.

Our task is to do all we can to restrain and channel such competitions, so that differences are resolved peacefully and with respect for the legitimate rights of all. To do this, we must help people in trouble-plagued regions to place their hopes for the future above bitter memories of the past, to put reconciliation above revenge, and to transform old battlegrounds into the common ground of mutual security and the search for a better life.

Americans may be proud that around the world our country is standing shoulder to shoulder with the peacemakers against the bombthrowers, supporting the Good Friday agreement in Northern Ireland, trying to end conflict in Central Africa, working with our partners to implement the Dayton Accords in Bosnia, and—as we have seen so dramatically

these past two weeks—striving to overcome obstacles to a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

The memorandum signed by Israeli and Palestinian leaders in Washington last week reaffirms that negotiations work. It demonstrates that, regardless of their differences, Israelis and Palestinians want to find an alternative to protracted conflict and that they recognize that a viable negotiating process can get them there.

The agreement brings tangible benefits to both sides. Palestinian jurisdiction over lands on the West Bank will increase substantially, and new economic opportunities have been created. Israel will benefit from the Palestinian commitment to wage an unprecedented, systematic, and structured effort to fight and defeat terror. Enormous obstacles remain, but by creating circumstances for launching permanent status negotiations, both sides will now have a chance to talk about the issues that will define and resolve a real Israeli-Palestinian peace.

The understandings reached at the Wye Plantation provide further evidence that the peace process is resilient and can overcome severe setbacks. But it still has a long way to go. Last week, Israeli and Palestinian leaders made the hard choices required to reach an agreement. Now they must make the hard choices necessary to implement that agreement and to set the stage for further progress.

Our effort to build peace in the Middle East and elsewhere is not international social work, as some suggest. It is smart for America, because we are better off when regional conflicts do not arise, threatening friends, creating economic disruptions, and generating refugees. And it is also right for America to help others avoid unnecessary bloodshed and enable people to enjoy what President Clinton has called the quiet miracle of a normal life.

A fourth challenge we face is the need to repel threats posed by governments and factions that have contempt for international standards of law and human rights. Our foremost effort here is to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and poison gas.

Some point to the South Asia nuclear tests earlier this year and to the spread of missile technologies and say that arms control is futile. They say that because non-proliferation rules are sometimes broken, we should accept a world with no such rules at all. That is dangerous nonsense. Certainly, it will take more than treaties to keep Americans secure.

We need the best defense we can devise, the best intelligence we can develop, and the best emergency planning we can prepare. But we also need the best legal framework we can

establish to detect and diminish these threats and discredit those who brandish them. By so doing, we can cut the number of weapons we might one day face and reduce the chance that the deadliest arms will fall into the wrong hands.

For example, we will be safer if we keep working with Russia to reduce nuclear arsenals and prevent nuclear smuggling. We are determined that no nukes should become "loose nukes."

We will be safer if, through our diplomacy, North Korea's dangerous nuclear program can be forever put to rest, and we are able to

persuade that country to end its reckless development and sale of missile technologies. We will be safer if we can give enforcement teeth to the Biological Weapons Convention and if we can develop a sound bipartisan approach to the issue of ballistic missile defense.

And we will be safer if we can bring the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty into force. Its purpose is to ban nuclear explosive tests of any size, for any purpose, in any place, for all time. There could be no greater gift to the future.

To protect our security, we must also wage and win the battle against international terror. As the U.S. embassy bombings in Africa so tragically demonstrated, well-financed

terrorist leaders such as Osama bin Laden have vowed to kill Americans worldwide. Their goal is to cause our country to abandon its friends, allies, and responsibilities. To that, I can only say that the nation whose finest planted the flag at Iwo Jima and plunged into hell at Omaha Beach will not be intimidated.

Our flag will continue to fly wherever we have interests to defend. The President has requested, and Congress has approved, funds to help us better protect our people. And we will fight the struggle against terror on every front, on every continent with every tool, every day.

In Kosovo, another threat to international stability has arisen as a result of the repression perpetrated by Serbian President Milosevic. In recent days, NATO's threat to use force if

necessary to end Serb atrocities has led to the withdrawal of troops and allowed civilians displaced by violence to begin returning home.

International monitors, backed by NATO overflights, will seek to ensure that President Milosevic lives up to the promises he has made. Meanwhile, we are urging the parties to find a political solution that would end the crisis and bring democratic self-government to the people of Kosovo.

Fifth and finally, we face the challenge of sustaining progress around the world toward democracy and respect for human rights. Now there are those who cling to the false sense of order that comes when political dissent is stifled and everyone knows his or her place. They haul out the old stereotypes and say that, "Well, freedom may work in some places, but the people in such and such a country are not ready; they do not really want it; they do not really need it."

To use a diplomatic term of art: That is balderdash! No society can reach its potential unless its people are free to choose their leaders, publish their thoughts, worship their God, and pursue their dreams.

This is a lesson we have learned time and again this century—from South Africa to South Korea and from central Europe to Central America. It is a lesson we hope will be applied now in Cambodia, Indonesia, and Nigeria. In each country, new leaders have a historic opportunity to bring their nation into the democratic fold. If that is their choice, the United States will do all it can to help.

We must also be willing to speak out for human rights and for religious and political freedoms whether they are under assault in a small country such as Burma or a big country such as China. And if we are told to mind our own business, we must respond that human rights are our business because, as Martin Luther King once said, "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere."

We must strive, as well, to improve working conditions around the world, because I suspect you are like me. When we buy a blouse or a shirt, we want to know that it was not produced by people who were underage, under coercion, in prison, or denied their basic right to organize. We Americans cannot and will not accept a global economy that rewards the lowest bidder without regard to standards. We want a future where profits come from perspiration and inspiration, not exploitation.

We must also do all we can to advance the status of women, because no country can grow strong and free when denied the talents of half its people. In years past, we have made

"Our flag will continue to fly wherever we have interests to defend. The President has requested, and Congress has approved, funds to help us better protect our people. And we will fight the struggle against terror on every front, on every continent, with every tool, every day."

enormous progress. But today, around the world, terrible abuses are still being committed against women. These include domestic violence, dowry murders, mutilation, and forced prostitution. Some say all this is cultural, and there's nothing we can do about it. I say it's criminal, and we each have an obligation to stop it.

Last but not least, the United States must continue to lead the world in its support for the international war crimes tribunals, because we believe that the perpetrators of genocide and ethnic cleansing should be held accountable, and those who see rape as just another tactic of war must pay for their crimes.

Some decades ago, in the depth of Cold War tensions, 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

[wrote Lippman].

For . . . if our influence . . . were undisputed, we would, I feel sure, slowly deteriorate. Having lost our great energies because we did not exercise them, having lost our 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. For then the night has come and they doze off and they begin to die.

Although Mr. Lippman was often right during his career, I am convinced that on this point he was wrong.

For almost as long as I have been alive, America has played the leading role within the international system. And today, from the streets of Sarajevo to villages in the Middle East, from classrooms in Central America to courtrooms at The Hague, the influence of American leadership is as deeply felt as it has ever been.

This is not the result of some foreign policy theory; it is a reflection of American character. We Americans have an enormous advantage over many other countries because 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. As we seek to find our way through an era of great turbulence and new dangers, let us reject the temptation of complacency and follow instead the example set for us by Secretary of State and Gen. George C. Marshall.

Let us be doers. And by living up to the heritage of our past, let us together fulfill the promise of our future and enter the new century free and respected, prosperous, and at peace.

To that mission, this afternoon, I pledge to you my own best efforts and respectfully summon your support. I thank you once again for the opportunity to be here with you this afternoon. ■

Secretary Albright
**U.S. Efforts To Promote
The Rule of Law**

October 29, 1998

Remarks at the Condon-Falknor Distinguished Lecture, University of Washington School of Law, Seattle, Washington.

Thank you, Dr. McCormick, for that introduction. Officials of the university, members of the faculty, students of the law school and the Jackson School of International Studies, guests, and friends: I am delighted to be here and honored to participate in the Condon-Falknor Lecture Series.

I happen not to be an attorney, but I am known around my household as the mother of all lawyers. I have not one, but two daughters who are lawyers, not to mention two sons-in-law. So I feel right at home.

I also love academic surroundings because, in my former life, I was a professor. And after spending the last week with Israeli and Palestinian leaders, I have concluded that when it comes to lectures, it is, indeed, more blessed to give than to receive.

This afternoon, while speaking to community leaders in the port of Seattle, I thought to myself that I have always associated this part of the country and especially the State of Washington with the future. As the career of your great Senator, Henry Jackson, attests, the Evergreen State has always been a little bit ahead in understanding the importance of American leadership abroad. Since before we were a country, Americans have looked west. Here in Washington, when you look west, you see the East. And you know that, in our era, the vast Pacific that once separated America from the outside world has become little more than a pond.

With this reality in mind, I want to discuss with you some of the choices that we as a nation face. For nations are like people. Each must choose whether to live selfishly and complacently or to act with courage and faith.

We are privileged to reside in a country that, through most of this century, has chosen the latter course—to lead. So that today, we are helping to shape events in every region on every continent in every corner of the world.

We exercise this leadership not out of sentiment but out of necessity. For we Americans want to live, and we want our children to live, in peace, prosperity, and freedom. But as the new century draws near, we cannot guarantee these blessings for ourselves if others do not have them as well. One way to make progress toward that goal is to promote the rule of law. And this evening, I would like to discuss our efforts to do precisely that.

Law is a theme that ties together the broad goals of our foreign policy. It is at the heart of virtually everything we do at the Department of State—from the negotiation of arms control treaties to seeking a fair deal for our salmon fishermen to guaranteeing that the intellectual property rights of our software companies are protected. And one of the great lessons we have learned is that the rule of law and global prosperity go hand in hand.

Five years ago, in this city, President Clinton brought together for the first time the leaders of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Council. Those leaders agreed to pursue economic rules of the game that would bring down barriers to trade, increase investment, promote growth, and open new opportunities from Seattle to Singapore and from Santiago to Seoul. There followed, in our country, a period of sustained growth that has created record numbers of jobs, boosted wages, and enabled our people to look forward with confidence and hope.

The Clinton Administration has worked hard to spur this growth. Since the President took office, we have negotiated more than 250 agreements to increase beneficial trade. These efforts have paid off, especially here in Washington, where the value of exports per person is the nation's highest and one out of every four jobs depends on trade.

Our goal is to create a legal framework for fair trade and sound investment that will open markets and lead to long-term economic health

in America and around the world. These efforts will continue at the APEC summit in Malaysia next month.

At the same time, the global financial crisis requires that we focus not only on the rules governing international trade but also on the rules governing the regulation and management of economies within nations. For it is clear that an insufficient commitment to the rule of law in key countries was a major contributor to the current crisis.

In this context, the rule of law means having governments that answer to voters. It means having financial institutions that are accountable to customers, stockholders, and regulators. It means having contracts that are enforceable in courts that are impartial. It means having a system for collecting taxes that is effective and fair.

Above all, it means recognizing corruption as the insatiable parasite that it is. In the movie *Wall Street*, Gordon Gekko declares that "greed is good." But the greed that spawns crony capitalism and vast disparities of wealth within a society is not good. Nor is it sustainable. For if a country wants to attract long-term investment, it must create a climate in which the rule of law is respected and enforced.

As residents of this State well know, America has an immense stake in all this. When investors withdraw their money from abroad, we have a harder time finding customers for Washington computers and aircraft, apples, and wheat. Our trade deficit rises as our exports slow, and other nations flood the world market with cut-rate goods.

That is why the Administration is determined to get the prosperity train back on track. Last month, President Clinton outlined a bold plan for restoring growth worldwide. Congress came through at the very last minute with our share of resources for the International Monetary Fund. The Fed has cut interest rates—twice. And Japan has finally begun taking steps to get its critical economy moving in the right direction. The best news, however, would be if the shock of this crisis results in a commitment to sounder and more transparent financial practices around the globe.

It is encouraging that some of the countries hit hardest, especially Thailand, Korea, and Brazil, have responded by deepening their commitment to democracy and by facing up to the need for wrenching economic reforms. Others, such as Russia and Indonesia, must do the same. If they are willing to do their part, we must—and we will—do all we can to help.

The rule of law is a cornerstone of American prosperity. It is also an essential contributor to American security. The old cartoon character

Pogo, whom you may never have heard of but who was very cool when I was your age, said that while it is important to have faith, it is also wise to keep a pet alligator by your side.

The United States relies on the rule of law to help build a world that is safer and more secure. But we are also prepared, through our armed forces, to protect our citizens and our vital interests should the rule of law break down. A case in point is the battle against international terror.

As the U.S. embassy bombings in Africa so recently and tragically reminded us, well-financed terrorist leaders such as Osama bin Laden have vowed to kill Americans worldwide. Their goal is to cause our country to abandon its friends, allies, and responsibilities. To that, I can only say that the nation whose finest planted the flag at Iwo Jima and plunged into hell at Omaha Beach will not be intimidated.

Our flag will continue to fly wherever we have interests to defend. The President has requested, and Congress has approved, funds to help us better protect our people. And we will fight the struggle against terror on every front, on every continent with every tool, every day. Although we do not publicize it, we often use law enforcement and other assets to disrupt and prevent planned terrorist attacks. We use the courts to bring suspected terrorists before the bar of justice, as we have moved to do in the case of Pan Am 103 and as we have done in the Nairobi bombing. And around the world, we are pressing other nations to arrest or expel terrorists, shut down their businesses, and deny them safe haven. Two key examples are Afghanistan, where we are seeking the expulsion of bin Laden, and Libya, where we are demanding that those indicted in the terror bombing of Pan Am 103 be turned over for trial.

America has been targeted by terror because we are the world's strongest force for peace, freedom, and law. But no threat, no bomb, no terrorist, can diminish America's determination to lead. We also use the rule of law to reinforce our support for international norms of human rights and freedom. Because I am in my professor mode, I will begin with some historical context.

"The United States relies on the rule of law to help build a world that is safer and more secure. But we are also prepared, through our armed forces, to protect our citizens and our vital interests should the rule of law break down."

*"I am proud that,
in this decade,
no nation has worked
harder diplomatically,
contributed more
financially, assisted
more legally,
or made a greater
commitment militarily
to bring suspected
perpetrators to
justice."*

Almost exactly 50 years ago, representatives from nations around the world came together to draft and sign the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Since its unveiling, the Declaration has been incorporated or referred to in dozens of national constitutions, and its principles have been reaffirmed many times. It is a centerpiece of the argument we make today that respect for human rights is the obligation not just of some but of every government.

Now there are those who point to the gap between the ideals set out in the Universal Declaration and the violations that persist today, a half-century after it was signed. They

conclude that we might as well give up, that no matter what people say or do, there will continue to be torture and repression. In this view, the violation of human rights is just another sad reflection on the limits of human nature.

To that, I would reply as Katharine Hepburn did to Humphrey Bogart in the movie *African Queen*: "Nature, Mr. Allnut, is what we were put into this world to rise above."

It is true that there will often be limits on what we can do, but there is no excuse or rationalization that justifies indifference to gross violations of human rights. The most basic of

the rights referred to in the Universal Declaration is the "right to life, liberty, and the security of person."

As Eleanor Roosevelt's writings indicate, the drafters were deeply conscious of the Holocaust and of the many other outrages committed against conscience and law during the Second World War. Unfortunately, acts of genocide and other crimes against humanity remain, in our era, a major source of human rights abuse. I am proud that, in this decade, no nation has worked harder diplomatically, contributed more financially, assisted more legally, or made a greater commitment militarily to bring suspected perpetrators to justice.

A centerpiece of our efforts has been our strong backing for the international war crimes tribunals for Rwanda and the Balkans. As America's Ambassador to the United Nations from 1993 to 1996, I visited mass graves in both these regions. I spoke to women whose

husbands or sons disappeared after the massacre at Srebrenica and who clung to the hope that their loved ones would be found alive. I saw in Rwanda a virtual generation of widows—many the mothers of babies conceived through rape by the murderers of their husbands. These are women afraid to recall the past and unable even to think of what the future may bring.

We must not forget. The killings in Bosnia and Rwanda were not the inevitable result of ethnic grievances. They were not the products of drunken excess or battlefield passions. On the contrary, they were carefully planned and ruthlessly orchestrated by ambitious men seeking expanded power.

We all have a stake in seeing that these individuals are brought to justice. We all have a stake in establishing a precedent that will deter future atrocities. And we all have an interest in seeing that those who consider rape just another tactic of war are held accountable for their crimes.

The work of the tribunals is ongoing. Much remains to be done. But the scoffers who said they would never succeed are being proven wrong. Both panels are now operating at full speed. Last month, the tribunal for Rwanda handed down the first conviction in international legal history for the crime of genocide. And the United States strongly supports the efforts by the tribunal in The Hague to investigate crimes committed during the recent round of brutal violence in Kosovo.

Among the most basic rights spelled out in the Universal Declaration is the right to take part in government either directly or through freely chosen representatives. Article 21 provides that "the will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government."

The promotion of this right is a top priority of our foreign policy. We know that democracy is not an import; it must find its roots internally. But outsiders can help to nourish those roots by backing efforts to build democratic institutions.

And, increasingly, our help to emerging democracies has centered on the rule of law. The trend began a decade ago with police and judicial aid programs in Central America. It continues now in Haiti, Bosnia, central Europe, and the New Independent States. And one of the most interesting parts of our strategic dialogue with China has centered on this subject.

The point we stress in all our work is that, to be effective, laws must not only be on the books; they must be enforced fairly and independently. I don't know how many times I have expressed concern about violations of

human rights and been told by a foreign leader not to worry, those rights are all protected by the country's constitution. It is true that words matter, but deeds matter more. A good law is the beginning of justice not its end.

Moreover, when we speak about the rule of law, we mean laws that are designed to protect liberty not to deny freedom. As Aung San Suu Kyi, the Nobel prize-winning leader of the democratic forces in Burma has said:

those who believe in . . . human rights . . . wish to ensure that the law is not just the will of the dominant faction, and that order is not simply the reflex of an all-pervading fear. The claim that human rights . . . have to be balanced against respect for the law (is) valid only if the law ensures that justice is done.

Although the specifics of our approach to the promotion of democracy and law will vary with the country, the fundamental goals are the same. We seek to encourage where we can the development of democratic institutions and practices. Some fault these efforts as unrealistic in their premise that democracy can take hold in less developed nations, or "hegemonic" in trying to impose democratic values.

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

And, as we in the State Department press for human rights and democracy, our efforts will be strengthened by the arrival of our newest Assistant Secretary for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, a law professor, well known to all of you—Harold Koh.

You, who graduate from this university, and your counterparts across our country, will spend your careers in a world of accelerating and astonishing 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 dynamism of Seattle and the people of Washington; the beauty of the Olympic Mountains, the Cascades, and Puget Sound; the excellence of this university; the importance of law; and the purpose of America.

Fifty years ago, in a speech just down the coast, President Harry Truman spoke of that purpose in his time in words that would apply equally well in our time.

We seek no territorial expansion or selfish advantage

[said President Truman].

We have no plans for aggression against any state, large or small . . . The only expansion we are interested in is the expansion of human freedom . . . The only prize we covet is the respect and goodwill of . . . the family of nations . . . The only realm in which we aspire to eminence exists in the minds of men [and women], where authority is exercised through the qualities of . . . compassion and right conduct.

For almost as long as I have been alive, America has played the leading role within the international system. And today, from the streets of Sarajevo to villages in the Middle East, from classrooms in Central America to courtrooms at The Hague, the influence of American leadership is as deeply felt as it has ever been.

That is not the result of some foreign policy theory; it is a reflection of American character and of our faith that if we are true to our principles, we will succeed. Let us, then, do honor to that faith. Let us be doers, not doubters. Let us be confident that the values of freedom and law that have sustained Americans from the days of Thomas Jefferson to the days of William Jefferson Clinton are the right ones. And that by living up to the heritage of our past, we will fulfill the promise of our future—and enter the new century free and respected, prosperous and at peace.

To that end, I pledge my own best efforts, and respectfully solicit yours. Thank you very much. ■

Secretary Albright

Progress Toward American Foreign Policy Goals

October 29, 1998

Address to the Silicon Valley Forum, San Jose, California.

Thank you, Mayor Hammer, for that introduction. And thank you, Dr. Duffy and the Commonwealth Club, for making it possible for me to speak here today.

Representative Lofgren, friends, distinguished guests: I am very glad to be back in Silicon Valley, which I visited last in 1995. Since then, a number of interesting things have happened to both of us. San Jose has continued its astonishing ascent, emerging as an engine of economic growth and a center of science and learning. It is the kind of town whose astronomers discover new planets, as happened this summer, and whose entrepreneurs develop cutting-edge software for 9-month-olds, which also happened this summer.

Now I couldn't tell you whether this last is a good thing or not, so I consulted an expert—my newest grandson Daniel, who was born in January. He promised to get back to me as soon as he finishes teething.

Meanwhile, I have been having a wonderful time in my new job. *Time* magazine named me one of our country's 25 most intriguing people, alongside a cloned sheep. Because I am a diplomat, I have had my partisan instincts surgically removed. And as a former professor, I have pledged to stop speaking in soundbites that are 50 minutes long.

And now, after almost 2 years of non-stop travel and nearly non-stop workdays, including last week's round-the-clock marathon for Middle East peace, I think I can say that I have what it takes to be a software designer. I check my schedule every day, and sleep is not on it.

When I became Secretary of State, I said that I would do my best to discuss the who, what, how, and especially the whys of American foreign policy with people across our country. It is an essential part of my job to make the connection between Americans' daily lives and nuclear tests in South Asia, violence in Kosovo, or the rest of the foreign news that fills the back pages of the newspaper—and just about all of my days.

But today I know that my job is easy in this respect. The world has come home to Silicon Valley with a vengeance, in the form of the Asian economic crisis. And I have come to Silicon Valley to talk about what we can do to end that crisis and, more broadly, what we must do to keep Silicon Valley—and all of America—prosperous, secure, and free. For it is a central lesson of this century that problems abroad, if left unattended, will all too often come home to America.

If we are to shape events rather than be shaped by them, if we are to come out on top of the market rather than be left behind by it, we cannot sit home and hope that trouble will somehow pass us by. And if we are going to build the kind of world we want for ourselves and our children, we must take the lead in designing it, not wait for others to set the parameters for us.

This is why American foreign policy is aimed squarely at keeping our nation secure, our people free, and our economy healthy and growing. To make progress toward those goals, we are striving to bring nations closer together around basic principles of democracy, open markets, the rule of law, and a commitment to peace. For example, we work to protect American lives from threats like terrorism, drug trafficking, and weapons of mass destruction—by doing all we can to eliminate those threats at their source. We promote American security by striving to prevent or end regional conflicts, for we know that small wars and unresolved disputes can spread, endangering allies, creating economic havoc, and pulling in our own forces.

Today, Americans may be proud that, around the world, the United States is standing with the peacemakers against the bomb-throwers: supporting the Good Friday agreement in Northern Ireland; keeping the diplomatic heat on Saddam Hussein; working with our partners to open the door to peace in

Kosovo; and—as we have seen so dramatically these past 2 weeks—striving to overcome obstacles to a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

The memorandum signed by Israeli and Palestinian leaders in Washington last week—it demonstrates that, regardless of their differences, Israelis and Palestinians want to find an alternative to protracted conflict and that they recognize that a viable negotiating process can get them there. The agreement brings tangible benefits to both sides. Palestinian jurisdiction over lands on the West Bank will increase substantially, and new economic opportunities have been created, as well. Israel will benefit from the Palestinian commitment to wage an unprecedented, systematic, and structured effort to fight and defeat terror.

The arduous negotiations of the past 2 weeks provide further evidence that the peace process is resilient and can overcome severe setbacks. But it still has a long way to go. Last week, Israeli and Palestinian leaders made the hard choices required to reach an agreement. Now they must make the hard choices necessary to implement that agreement and to set the stage for further progress.

For the peoples of the Middle East as surely as for Americans, peace must mean, in the words of President Kennedy, “not a mere interlude between wars, but an incentive to the creative energies of humanity.” At home and around the world, we want to build a future that reflects the values we cherish. And we want to support others who aspire to the same rights and freedoms that we enjoy. That is why we are using our diplomacy to give democracy a hand in central Europe, feed starving children in Africa, help stop global climate change, and fight the spread of AIDS around the world.

These policies are not some kind of international social work; they respond to the reality that pollution, disease, and despair respect no national borders. They recognize that the ingredients for success in the global economy are also those that deepen individual liberties—the rule of law, the free flow of ideas and information, open borders, and open minds. And they reflect America’s faith in a simple proposition—that societies in which human rights and freedoms are respected will be more likely to succeed in every sense of the word.

Just as our diplomacy helps preserve our security and promote our values, we mobilize every foreign policy tool to sustain our prosperity—and to see that American genius and productivity receive their due. In this, we have a running start, because American workers are the world’s most productive, and California

workers, in particular, just may be the world’s most creative. But competition for the world’s markets is fierce.

As long as I am Secretary of State, our diplomats will provide all appropriate help to American firms. And I will personally make the point—as I do every time I travel overseas—that if other countries want to sell in our backyard, they had better allow America to do business in theirs.

The Clinton Administration will continue to pursue international economic policies designed to build a strong world economy that creates good opportunities for Americans. Since President Clinton took office, we have negotiated more than 250 agreements that help American exports grow and American jobs multiply. We have created the World Trade Organization and NAFTA; seen the tariffs of our Asian trading partners slashed; and forged landmark agreements on telecommunications, information technology, and financial services. And the Administration has been working to build a sound global framework for electronic commerce and other high-tech trade—to keep anyone from building a silicon wall between the products of American ingenuity and potential markets worldwide.

But nowhere is our leadership more crucial than in facing the international financial crisis. President Clinton has called this the biggest challenge to the world financial system since recovery from World War II.

And as Secretary of State, I see it as far more than an economic problem. In Asia, the crisis has plunged more than 100 million people back into poverty. It has generated significant political and social instability. It has created the potential for a backlash against a more open economic system. And its effects on key nations such as Russia have added to the diplomatic and security challenges we face in Europe and around the world.

In response, the President has outlined a bold plan for restoring confidence while laying the groundwork for sustained long-term growth. We are doing all we can, including supporting the use of IMF funds, to halt the financial contagion from spreading further. And as a result of last-minute action by Congress, in response to the President’s request, we

“Since President Clinton took office, we have negotiated more than 250 agreements that help American exports grow and American jobs multiply.”

are providing America's fair share of resources for the IMF and multilateral development banks.

We are encouraging Japan as it moves to implement reforms that would help make it once again an engine of economic expansion. We are tapping the resources of Exim and OPIC to help American firms remain competitive in Asia. We are pressing for reforms that will make the international financial institutions more open, more transparent, and more accountable to the people they serve. And we are working to improve the international community's ability to respond to—and where possible to prevent—major financial emergencies.

Of the greatest interest to you, perhaps, is the trip I will take with President Clinton in 2 weeks, to the annual leaders' meeting on Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation—or APEC. Last year's APEC meetings helped build pressure for market reforms and for aid to get Asia back on the track to prosperity. And it was at APEC that the proposal for a "Group of 22," whose finance ministers are now exploring ways to prevent future crises, was first made.

This year, we are looking to give commerce a much-needed boost by sparking immediate progress on trade liberalization in a region that accounts for 65% of American trade. We will ask regional governments and institutions to join us in expanding support for social safety nets, job creation, and small enterprises to help keep societies stable and put people back to work. And we will be looking beyond government to the needs of business in Asia—pressing for corporate restructuring, considering ways to deal with the burden of corporate debt, and improving corporate governance.

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

Nations with deeper problems must take the tough steps required to develop broad-based and accountable democratic institutions that will curb corruption, earn investor confidence, and engender public support. It is in our

interest to help nations that are prepared to undertake these reforms, and we are committed to doing so.

Working to make the global economy increasingly fair and transparent, and to spur global cooperation on issues important to us, is the smart thing for America. It is also the right thing for Americans—and for people all over the world.

And as President Clinton has said, "we know what to do. [For] the World War II generation did it for us 50 years ago." After that war, nations came together to create international economic institutions that would rebuild prosperity and sustain peace. They did this amid great uncertainty, skepticism, and even fear of what the future might bring.

But with the United States in the forefront, they recognized that the reckless and short-sighted policies in use before World War II were more than a threat to prosperity. In a speech 51 years ago, President Harry Truman listed as a key prerequisite to peace

that nations devise their economic and financial policies to support a world economy, rather than separate nationalistic economies . . . Surely after two world wars, nations have learned the folly of a nationalism so extreme as to block cooperative economic planning among nations.

That understanding helped carry postwar America to unprecedented prosperity and global preeminence. And it remains a fundamental principle guiding our nation's role in the global economy.

Today we have an opportunity to draw the international community together around the standards of democracy and opportunity that have served our nation so well. We must not let the difficulties we now face cause us to lose that chance.

Let us be confident that the principles that have sustained Americans for more than 200 years are the right ones; that by living up to the heritage of our past, we will fulfill the promise of our future and enter the new century free and respected, prosperous, and at peace.

To that end, I pledge my own best efforts and respectfully summon your counsel and support. Thank you very much. ■

Thomas R. Pickering

U.S. Policies in the Middle East

October 16, 1998

*Remarks by the Under Secretary for Political Affairs
at the Middle East Institute, Washington, DC.*

It's a pleasure to be here, among old colleagues and friends who share a common experience and appreciation for the Middle East. In this regard, allow me to pay special tribute to the work of the Middle East Institute and its supporters. Allow me to pay tribute, too, to your prescience. Who but you would have known that October 16, 1998 would land smack in the middle of the most important period for the Middle East peace negotiations in several years—and, thus, the most important Middle East weekend of the year, and more.

Current events in the region are testimony to the foresight of Amb. Christian Herter and the institute's founders, who recognized the importance of the Middle East to American interests and appreciated the need for greater mutual understanding. Since its establishment over 50 years ago, the institute's programs, publications, and library have served us well by educating the public and opinion leaders on the region's complexities and their relevance to the United States.

I have been asked tonight to speak about those complexities and to examine some of the problems and opportunities for U.S. policy in the region.

In some ways, the problems of the Middle East are not distinct from those that we face throughout the world. With an average population growth rate of 3%, the region is beset by the same demographic explosion which is putting dangerous resource demands and social and political pressures on countries throughout Africa and Asia. The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems is a global threat, which concerns not only the Middle East but Europe, South Asia, and East Asia as well. As the embassy bombings in Nairobi and Dar-es-Salaam so horrifically demonstrated, terrorism represents an international scourge, which is not confined to a single geographic area. The accelerating evolution of an interdependent global economy makes Middle Eastern markets vulnerable to the fiscal and trade upheavals now affecting Russia and several of the Asian tigers.

The Middle East is no longer the isolated, exotic enclave romanticized by the likes of Doughty, Lawrence, Thesiger, Philby, and Bell. Rather, it is a modern, vital member of the complex web of international institutions, information linkages, and transnational relationships euphemistically referred to as "the global village." But it is also a modern region with a venerable and vital history which touches all Americans.

The Middle East thus presents unique challenges. Many of its more intractable problems have their roots in the region's long history and require special consideration. Foremost among these, of course, is the Arab-Israeli dispute. Its antecedents date back thousands of years. The common traditions of the Gulf states have allowed for decades of interdependence and a close and cordial security relationship with the United States. Saddam Hussein uses history by invoking the legacy of the Babylonians to legitimize his aggressions and Iraq's persistent refusal to rejoin the family of nations. Across the Middle East, radical movements exploit religion for political ends, positing a false dichotomy between Islam and the West. Even moderates in the region speak of a "clash of cultures," when discussing relations with the U.S., and chastise us for what they perceive as double standards and an anti-Islamic bias. Huntington is perhaps more in vogue in the Middle East than the Middle West.

The truth is that Islam is one of America's newest, but fastest-growing religious faiths. In mosques across the country, millions worship as part of the complex web of American life, respected by friends and admired by neighbors. Americans are beginning to understand that Islam, Christianity, and Judaism share much in common and honor a single god. Indeed, each was born and found favor in the Middle East, the common crucible of our religious heritage.

The history of the Middle East has also given the region's political institutions a distinctive character, which influences how we deal with them. The Free Officer and Ba'athi

movements, the creation of the modern Gulf sheikdoms, Hashemite and Saudi rule in Jordan and Central Arabia, respectively, and the political structures in North Africa were all in a direct and material way influenced by the outside and by colonial experience, whether Ottoman or European.

One of the more distinctive characteristics of the region, in this regard, is the unusual longevity of its regimes. Most of its leaders have been in power for over 20 years. King Hussein has led Jordan since 1952. King Hassan ascended to the throne of Morocco in 1960. The UAE has had only one leader since indepen-

dence. In 1970, Sultan Qaboos came to the throne of Oman, and Hafez al Assad seized control of Syria. Colonel Qadhafi took power in Libya in 1971. Next year will mark the 20th anniversary of Yemen's Ali Abdullah Saleh and Iraq's Saddam Hussein as heads of state. With only 17 years as Egypt's President, Hosni Mubarak is one of the Middle East's more junior leaders in time of service but certainly not in terms of Egypt's enormous prestige and his leadership role in the peace process.

This continuity in leadership has resulted in a remarkable degree of internal stability. Alternatively, you could argue that it graphically illustrates the degree to which the region's political institutions are underdeveloped. Either way, it poses a particular challenge in planning for the future. In some cases, such as that of Jordan and Saudi Arabia, the path for succession, when it comes, is clear. In others, such as Syria and Iraq, the politics of regime transition are anything but obvious or certain.

We must manage these myriad issues with due regard to both their global character and special regional consider-

ations. Our policies combine continuity and innovation, multilateralism and American leadership. I should also point out, especially to a group such as you, that these issues require of us policies which are not only consistent with American interests but also take into consideration the views of our allies in the region and the social and political forces which influence

their decision-making. Virtually, every issue of common concern with the countries of the Middle East has a cultural dimension to it. To be effective in the region, we must understand and take these dimensions into account, not necessarily to the point where they determine our actions, but at least so that our decisions are not made in an intellectual vacuum or dispensed to a misunderstood public or leadership. If you examine our policies in any number of areas, I think you will find that we are making a special effort to accommodate these sensitivities and political realities.

Some parties, for example, have argued in a fit of oversimplicity that our war against terrorism is a war against Islam. Nothing could be further from the truth. We view terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction as transnational threats which require a multilateral approach. While America must lead, we cannot adequately protect ourselves by acting alone. Only by working together with our international partners and through international organizations can we hope successfully to contain the spread of missile technology, nuclear and chemical weapons, or acts of terror.

That being said, if and when American interests are under direct and imminent threat of attack, we will not, and should not, hesitate to act. Such was the case last August, when we had compelling information about operations planned by Osama bin Laden and his associates directed against American embassies abroad. Despite Sudanese claims to the contrary, the evidence implicating the al Shifa factory in the manufacture of chemicals for use in weapons of mass destruction was clear and convincing. But for political reasons, Sudan continues to argue for an international mission.

May I say that there is more than a little cynicism in Sudan's request, now that the rains have begun to wash the soil. However, let me be clear: We would welcome Sudan's return to the international community. I have spoken with the Sudanese foreign minister and made clear that Sudan should demonstrate its seriousness of purpose by signing the Chemical Weapons Convention. At that point, its sites would be open to investigation in the same manner as other signatories. Signing CWC would be a step toward more responsible behavior. Our strikes against the factory and bin Laden's camps in Afghanistan were a firm but measured response to this threat—one that had to balance our respect for the Arab people and Islam with our concern to protect our own citizens from exposure to attack and the possible use of chemical weapons. The strikes were not directed against the people of Sudan

"While America must lead, we cannot adequately protect ourselves by acting alone. Only by working together with our international partners and through international organizations can we hope successfully to contain the spread of missile technology, nuclear and chemical weapons, or acts of terror."

or Afghanistan, and they were confined to specific, limited sites. It is important now that we look to the future and work with renewed vigor to strengthen the bilateral and multilateral cooperation necessary to contain the threats of international terrorism and chemical weapons.

Multilateral diplomacy is our preferred means for dealing with Iraq, as well. The United States remains as determined as ever to ensure that Iraq never again presents a threat to its neighbors and the international community. This is a commitment made by the Bush administration to which we continue to adhere. Our goal is full Iraqi compliance with its obligations under all UNSC resolutions. To that end, ensuring the effectiveness of UNSCOM and the IAEA and maintaining Security Council unity and the broader international coalition in support of sanctions, are the focal points of our efforts.

Saddam's aims are twofold: to end the sanctions regime and to retain his weapons of mass destruction capability. In the face of this challenge, the international community must remain steadfast and resolute. We are working through the UN Security Council to ensure that the full extent of Iraq's WMD program is accounted for and disarmed. Until that is the case, sanctions will remain in place. The periodic controversies over UNSCOM access to inspection sites and Iraq's refusal to cooperate with UNSCOM and IAEA do nothing to alter this fact. We will not be drawn into playing his game, to responding to his every provocation. For all its bluster, Iraq remains contained within the limits imposed as a result of Saddam Hussein's folly 7 years ago. As we look ahead, we will decide how and when to respond to Iraq's actions based on the threat they pose to Iraq's neighbors, to regional security, to vital U.S. interests, and to the Iraqi people, including those in the north.

Rest assured that while we continue to give every preference to a diplomatic solution, through the work of the Security Council, the Secretary General, and other members of the international community, we retain in the region the force necessary to back our diplomacy. As he has shown in the past, Saddam underestimates that threat, because he doubts that we are ready to use the force deployed to protect our interests. The lesson now, as it was in the past, is that it is high time to come into compliance with UN resolutions. The bottom line is that if Iraq tries to break out of its strategic box, our response will be swift and strong. We will act, but on our own timetable, not Saddam Hussein's.

Our friends in the Gulf have been steadfast and reliable partners in this endeavor. Security cooperation with the Gulf states, much of which goes back for many decades, has been instrumental in successfully confronting Iraq's aggression and containing its regional ambitions. Beyond the question of security, however, the Gulf states have been at the forefront of economic liberalization, protection of intellectual property rights, and regional integration, which makes them among the most progressive and modern in these areas in the Middle East.

Special mention must be made of our efforts to help the Iraqi people. The intent of economic sanctions against Iraq is to deny Saddam Hussein the means to threaten his neighbors and the region. They are not directed against the innocent citizens who are victims of their government's misguided policies. Saddam Hussein has cruelly and cynically exploited the suffering of his people to raise international support for the lifting of sanctions. Many countries, including most in the Arab world, have been vociferous in their criticism of sanctions as unjustly punishing the Iraqi people for the decisions of its leadership. We believe that such criticism is not well-founded. In point of fact, the international community is doing more to care for the people of Iraq than their own government is or has. After 5 years of Iraq's refusal to accept UN programs to assist its people based on permitted oil exports, Iraq negotiated for 2 years and then accepted the UN's proposal. The United Nations, led by the United States, has undertaken the largest humanitarian effort in its history to minimize the negative impact of sanctions on the people of Iraq. Under the oil-for-food program and upon the recommendation of UNSYG Annan, we have now authorized Iraq to sell up to \$5.2 billion worth of oil every 6 months. A portion of the revenue from these sales will ensure that the people of Iraq are provided with the food, medicine, and other humanitarian supplies which its government has been deliberately denying them in order to exploit their suffering for propaganda purposes.

The Washington talks at Wye River are another example of our continuing commitment both to long-standing American policies in the region and to the needs of the people in the region. Building on what was begun in Madrid and shepherded through Oslo, these talks are the culmination of a long period of hard work. The President, Vice President, and Secretary of State are deeply engaged in completing a process built on American proposals and opening the door to final status negotiations, where more difficult tasks lie ahead: resolving

"... the Secretary of State has made it clear that there should be no doubting the Clinton Administration's commitment to Israel's security and its people."

the divisive questions of Palestinian statehood, resettlement of refugees, and the status of Jerusalem. However hard we may work to advance this process, we cannot want peace more than the parties themselves, and it is they who must make the tough decisions.

The atmosphere at Wye has been constructive and pragmatic. The purpose of these discussions is to make as much progress as possible on the interim issues. It is not designed to address permanent status issues. The setting brings together experts and political leaders. Their proximity to each other over the course of a long weekend is

facilitating interaction.

Throughout this process, the Secretary of State has made it clear that there should be no doubting the Clinton Administration's commitment to Israel's security and its people. That commitment has been unshakable and has been demonstrated repeatedly—in our joint struggle against terrorism, in the assistance to Israel that the American people have so long and so generously provided, and in the steps we have taken to ensure Israel's qualitative military edge. At the same time, we have agreed with Israeli

leaders from Prime Ministers Ben Gurion to Begin to Rabin to Netanyahu that the key to long-term security for the Israeli people lies in lasting peace. That is why we have been working so hard to resolve the present impasse. We cannot assert for ourselves the right to determine Israel's security needs. But we can continue to assert our belief that peace is the best guarantor of security.

Parallel to our diplomatic efforts to bring peace to the region, the number of Palestinian and Israeli victims of violence continues to mount. Last week's demonstrations in Hebron, the recurring random attacks against individuals, and the ever-present threat of a large-scale terrorist incident remind us of the fragility of this process and the urgent need to address the pressing demands of the people on the ground. The real measure of peace is the stability and prosperity it brings to people's lives. Israelis—and especially Palestinians—who suffer more economic, political, and social disadvantages, must be

free to realize and actually see concrete, material gains from peace—increased trade, free markets, improved standards of living, security.

The interim agreement expires May 4, 1999. It would be in the interests of all involved—and especially of the people in this region—for the parties to make the most of this period. It is a matter of history that when there is no progress toward peace, a political vacuum develops, which can give rise to political extremism or violence. The parties must move quickly to stay one step ahead of events and bring into fruition the long-awaited final status talks. The present talks have narrowed the issues and brought the sides together. They alone, with our help, can determine the outcome. The results will make a large difference to the area and its people.

Let us not forget that the peace process is more than just talks between the Israelis and Palestinians. It consists also of the Syrian and Lebanese tracks. Although we have been concentrating our energy on the Israeli-Palestinian relationship, we recognize that the Syrian and Lebanese negotiations are also crucial to the achievement of a comprehensive peace, and we are eager to re-energize them. We are exploring with the parties how to close the gaps between Syrian insistence on picking up talks from the point they left off in 1996 and Israel's position that all issues should be open. The Israeli Government has indicated its willingness to implement UN Security Council Resolution 425 on withdrawal of its forces from southern Lebanon, if it has appropriate security guarantees. The U.S. supports the implementation of UNSC Resolution 425. We want to see Lebanon free of all foreign forces and its sovereignty and territorial integrity preserved.

The ever-present potential for conflict in this region has been dramatically demonstrated over the past several weeks in the dispute between Turkey and Syria over the latter's support for the PKK. Turkey's threat to use of force should Syria continue its support of the PKK set off alarm bells in capitals throughout the region and beyond. We are relieved that for the moment, thanks to the skillful efforts of leaders such as President Mubarak of Egypt, diplomacy has prevailed and conflict has been averted or dampened. This incident is a reminder, however, that dangerous flash points in the region can erupt on short notice and that we and others must be prepared to contain them quickly through responsive and forceful diplomacy.

The outcome of the efforts in the peace process will affect our policy on a wide range of other regional issues, giving Arab governments more space for dealing with other pending issues. The political map of the region is clearly changing. Secretary Albright's Asia Society speech this

June was one initiative designed to respond to some of the opportunities these changes present. Since the election of President Khatami, we have noted a shift in Iranian thinking about its relationship with other countries, including the U.S., and we have made an effort to respond in a similarly positive way. After two decades of hostility and estrangement, it is time to work toward better relations. In addition to more cultural and academic exchanges as a means of building greater confidence between our peoples, we are ready to explore other ways to build mutual confidence and avoid misunderstandings, and we are prepared to do so as soon as Iran is ready.

As we work toward that goal, it is important that our two nations communicate directly, openly, and frankly with one another. In his September speech to the Asia Society, Foreign Minister Kharazi said that Iran would adopt policies based on the "guiding principle of replacing confrontation and tension with dialogue and understanding." While we agree with the foreign minister on the need for international cooperation on Afghanistan and narcotics, we believe his criticism of American policies reflects misunderstanding and the long divide that separates our two peoples and cultures, especially over the last 20 years. At this point, the United States would like to go beyond the exchange of rhetoric to address the substance of our relationship. We have proposed a process of parallel steps to build a new relationship, and we are ready to engage in such a process.

In our relationships with the countries of the region on the full range of issues which I have discussed this evening, the United States is very sensitive to the charge that it is hostile toward Islam or harbors cultural biases toward the Arab and Islamic world. Our critics in the region are often quick to characterize our actions as the reflection of a clash of cultures. This was the refrain heard in the aftermath of the strikes in Sudan and Afghanistan, echoed by Hamas militants opposed to the peace process or apologists for Saddam Hussein, and taken up by radical political movements throughout the region. During the Bosnian

conflict, we often heard the criticism that our response was too slow because of our indifference to the suffering of Muslims at the hands of Christian aggressors. This theme is being taken up again in the context of the fighting in Kosovo. Our firm and determined response to Serbian aggression there should serve to refute the charge of indifference and to reassure our friends in the Middle East that we are not insensitive to the suffering of innocent victims, whatever their religion may be, at the hands of a harsh and predatory regime.

President Clinton and Secretary of State Albright have spoken forcefully and frequently of our country's respect for Islam and the people who practice this faith. Islam has now established firm roots in America and is a religion whose moral teachings we admire and recognize as a source of inspiration and instruction for hundreds of millions of people around the world.

As I hope my remarks have made clear, the perceptions of bias by Muslims both abroad and at home is something we can neither belittle nor ignore. We must recognize that these perceptions can adversely affect our objectives in the region. For this reason, the issue of mutual understanding is an important element of our policy, as exemplified in our attempt to build a new relationship with Iran and to increase the level of people-to-people exchanges as part of an interim agreement between Israelis and Palestinians. If we are to overcome decades of mistrust and suspicion, we must do a better job of understanding one another. This is not for academic or altruistic reasons but for reasons of national interest.

This brings me full circle. I began by noting that your organization contributes greatly to building this mutual understanding. Long may it be so. It is in the best interests of all in the region, whatever their nationality or religion. It is truly in the best interests and best traditions of this country. All of us engaged in the foreign policy of this country thank you for it and wish you a good year ahead, and many others to follow. It has been an honor to speak here tonight. Thank you very much. ■

Susan E. Rice

U.S. Interests in Africa: Today's Perspective

October 21, 1998

Address by the Assistant Secretary for African Affairs at the School of International and Public Affairs, Institute of African Studies, Columbia University, New York City.

Thank you, Professor Bond, for the kind introduction. Dean Anderson, members of the faculty and Columbia community, students, Your Excellencies: It is a pleasure to be with you this afternoon. I thank Columbia's School of International and Public Affairs and especially the Institute of African Studies for the invitation to be with you today.

I understand Columbia's Institute—with its distinguished faculty—has been designated a National Resource Center in African studies by the Department of Education. Moreover, Columbia students come from over 30 African countries. I hope we can have a lively exchange on a range of important issues.

I'm sure many of you would agree that this has been a momentous year in U.S.-African relations. It is the year we heralded Africa's substantial progress during the first-ever comprehensive visit to the continent by a sitting American president. But, more recently, it has also been a year tinged with skepticism, regression, and even by mourning.

The bombings of our East African embassies just 2 months ago were a sobering reminder of the real and continuous threat Americans and Africans face from international terror. The blasts in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam left over 200 dead, 51 of whom—Africans and Americans—were working on behalf of American interests in the region.

Some may point to these cowardly terrorist attacks as evidence of Africa's fragility. When viewed in light of recent conflict in the Horn of Africa, Congo, and Angola, cynics argue that the U.S. ought to give up on Africa or, rather, never give it a chance. Recurrent instability has led a number of commentators to conclude rather hastily that the so-called "African Renaissance" has been a hallucination. Others maintain we are witnessing the "birth-pains" of a new Africa.

Time will tell, but it may be relevant to recall that the European Renaissance lasted over two centuries. Bloody, protracted war—and often plague—dominated at least half that period.

But, analogies aside, Africa's future is, in fact, uncertain. Still, our stake in Africa's success has never been clearer. I believe the logic of the defeatists—the so-called Afro-pessimists—is both flawed and shortsighted. Dismissing Africa's promise as well as its problems is detrimental not only to Africa but to fundamental U.S. national interests.

Today, Africa stands at a crossroads—a decisive time when its future hangs in the balance. The challenges and opportunities facing the African people stand in stark relief. Africa can overcome its troubled past or lunge back into self-destructive conflict. The United States can stand on the sidelines, or we can recognize and act upon our growing interest in a thriving Africa that can take its rightful place on the world stage.

Despite today's headlines, there is considerable reason for optimism about Africa's future. Economies that were growing at less than 2% at the beginning of the decade are registering growth at more than twice that level. Some countries are recording double-digit growth rates. The citizens of over half of all Sub-Saharan African nations are choosing their own governments freely and holding their leaders accountable. Indeed, the number of democracies has more than quadrupled in less than a decade.

Regional organizations such as ECOWAS and the Organization of African Unity are intensifying their efforts to prevent and resolve conflicts. Others, such as the Southern African Development Community and the revitalized East African Community, are moving toward the establishment of regional common markets that can become economic engines for the future. From the resurgence of war-torn

Mozambique to the demise of apartheid in South Africa; from the budding democracies in Benin, Mali, and Namibia to a fresh start for the great people of Nigeria—there is reason for real hope for the people of Africa.

Indeed, a politically reconciled, economically strong Nigeria would pay huge dividends for the entire African Continent. We thus hope Nigerians will stay the course. Let 1999 mark not only new South Africa's second democratic election but the true beginning of a lasting democracy in Nigeria.

Yet, clearly, in Nigeria as elsewhere, Africa's progress has been neither linear nor universal. In recent months, we have witnessed significant setbacks in several regions. Some countries which were beginning to recover from conflict have picked up arms again; some societies which were rebuilding are tearing down; and some governments which had taken fragile steps toward democracy and reconciliation are drifting back toward tyranny and repression.

At least eight African nations are involved in a bitter war in the Congo—potentially one of the most serious conflicts in the world today. Humanitarian crises in Sierra Leone, Somalia, and Sudan; resumed fighting in Guinea-Bissau; the face-off in the Horn of Africa; and the faltering Angolan peace process all must be of significant concern to the United States.

Indeed, whether the challenge is adversity or opportunity, the reality is that the end of the Cold War calls for a new paradigm for U.S. policymakers in Africa. We must resist the temptation to dissipate our energies in responding solely to the crisis of the day. Our horizons must be longer term.

First, as one of our two major policy goals, we must work in concert with Africans to combat the many transnational security threats that emanate from Africa just as they do from the rest of the world. These include not only terrorism but weapons proliferation, narcotics flows, the growing influence of rogue states, international crime, environmental degradation, and disease. Continued and closer collaboration with Africans to counter these threats to our mutual security should be an important priority for U.S. policymakers. Therefore, we must invest in new strategies in partnership with African countries, the G-8, and others to combat global threats effectively before they become more pernicious and pervasive.

We have made a start along this path but, in truth, we have a long way to go. Two years ago, the U.S. signed the Africa Nuclear Weapons-Free Zone Treaty to eliminate nuclear weapons now and forever in Africa, but too few African countries have ratified the agreement.

We have cleared thousands of acres of land-mines in Africa, but thousands more acres remain. We have provided modest amounts of anti-terrorism training to African countries as well as information on the activities of terrorist groups, but we need congressional support to do much more.

We have been working with law enforcement authorities from Nigeria to South Africa to interdict illicit drugs before they hit American streets. But the U.S. must go further to craft, fund, and implement a continent-wide counter-narcotics strategy. We have urged concerted international action to stem the flow of arms, ammunition, and explosives into Africa's conflict zones. But weapons sales, including from the United States, continue unabated.

Finally, the Administration has recognized the risk to U.S. citizens and soil from inadequate aviation safety and security systems in Africa. Thus, we are launching an innovative "Safe Skies for Africa" initiative to increase the number of Sub-Saharan nations that meet international aviation standards. The initiative seeks to make air travel safer for Africans and Americans and to strengthen airport security to help interdict would-be criminals and their contraband. The United States also is sharing our medical expertise through our Centers for Disease Control (CDC) to combat deadly diseases, like malaria and AIDS, that know no borders. For the protection of people everywhere, we cannot allow Africa to remain the world's soft and most accessible underbelly for terrorists and others determined to do evil.

At the same time, we must press ahead to achieve our second principal policy goal in Africa; that is, accelerating Africa's full integration into the global economy. Increasingly, the U.S. economy is fueled by exports. As we grapple with the consequences of turmoil in both our traditional and emerging markets from Asia to Brazil to Russia, the United States cannot afford to write off any potential new export market. A vast and growing market of 700 million potential consumers, Africa is in many ways the last frontier for U.S. exporters and investors.

For, despite areas of instability, Africa's economic trends remain positive. Two-thirds of African nations—roughly 3 dozen countries—

"... the United States cannot afford to write off any potential new export market. A vast and growing market of 700 million potential consumers, Africa is in many ways the last frontier for U.S. exporters and investors."

have implemented economic reforms to open markets, stabilize currencies, and reduce inflation. African governments have privatized over 2,000 state enterprises in the past few years, raising over \$2.3 billion in government revenue to invest in infrastructure, education, and health care. The U.S. relies heavily on the African Continent for petroleum and strategic minerals. In volume terms, nearly 14% of U.S. crude oil imports come from the continent, as compared to almost 18% from the Middle East. Within a decade, Africa is projected to be the source of well over 20% of our imported oil.

America's commercial interests in Africa will deepen as U.S. companies continue to tap this nascent market. American businesses exported over \$6 billion worth of goods last year to Africa and imported more than \$16 billion. The U.S. is now Africa's second-largest industrial supplier. U.S. companies have edged out European and Asian competition to complete major deals in the region. Examples abound: Coca-Cola recently made a \$35 million investment in a production and distribution facility in Angola; a consortium comprised of Enron and the Industrial Development Corporation signed a \$2 billion agreement to construct a steel plant in Mozambique; and, in West Africa, Ghana's stock exchange—although tiny—is one of the top performers in the world.

A visionary economic policy toward Africa is in our own long-term interest. Thus, we must continue and intensify our efforts to pass the African Growth and Opportunity Act. This landmark legislation remains key to establishing a mature trade and investment relationship with Africa just as we have with trading partners in other emerging markets.

At the same time, we are implementing the President's own Partnership for Economic Growth and Opportunity in Africa. We are providing technical assistance to help liberalize trade and investment regimes, launching an anti-corruption initiative, extinguishing bilateral concessional debt, and organizing the first-ever U.S.-Africa Economic Cooperation Forum. This ministerial level consultative group is scheduled to meet for the first time late this year. These various steps are important because sustained economic growth is key to eradicating Africa's endemic poverty—and the civil unrest which often accompanies it—and thus key to moving Africa toward lasting peace and prosperity.

Democratic governance and respect for human rights are also crucial to the goal of integrating Africa into the global economy. Recent history has taught us that governments which safeguard human rights as well as

political and economic freedoms can more effectively establish the conditions for sustainable economic growth.

Therefore, the Administration is actively supporting emergent democracies in Africa. We do so in full recognition that elections—although necessary—are not sufficient to sustain democratic change. As a result, we are investing also in the institutional foundations upon which lasting democracy thrives. We are helping to train legislators, foster independent judiciaries, encourage constitutional reforms, and establish genuine respect for human rights. We are active in newsrooms, universities, churches, community centers, and even army barracks to bolster press freedom, build strong civil societies, and teach African militaries the virtues of subordination to civilian leadership.

Equally important, the United States continues to play an active role—diplomatically and operationally—to help prevent and resolve African conflicts. Peace and stability are essential to nurturing a civil society that protects democracy and human rights and fosters an enabling environment for economic growth and investment. Today, too many of Sub-Saharan Africa's 48 countries are involved in regional or civil wars, causing serious humanitarian suffering and destroying the daily lives of millions of innocent civilians.

U.S. leadership and resources were instrumental in bringing to an end the protracted conflicts in Mozambique and Liberia. We continue to work to encourage a peaceful solution to the standoff between Ethiopia and Eritrea and to avert the resumption of widespread conflict in Angola and Burundi. We are also pursuing an immediate cease-fire and a lasting solution to both the internal and external causes of the widening conflict in the Congo.

As we work to address the crises of the day, we remain committed to helping Africans over the long-term to build their own capacity for peacekeeping and conflict resolution. President Clinton's African Crisis Response Initiative is designed specifically to train rapidly deployable, interoperable peacekeeping battalions across the continent.

Indeed, African nations have already made important progress in safeguarding their own citizens and maintaining peace in their own backyards. West African ECOMOG peacekeepers, for example, helped restore the legitimate government in Sierra Leone in March and supported democratic elections in Liberia last summer. Peacekeeping units from West and Central Africa helped to secure the fragile peace in the Central African Republic. These are important efforts that we must help to continue.

For in Africa, as elsewhere, there can be no progress where conflict is pervasive. There can be no freedom and respect for human rights where neighbor is pitted against neighbor. There can be no honest trade nor honest day's work where government budgets are diverted from development to destruction and no serious investment in the future where children are torn from schoolyards and forced to march in armies.

Ultimately, Africans themselves must determine if their dreams for a better future will become a reality. We cannot make that choice for them. Africa is not—and has never been—the United States' own to "win" or to "lose." But the United States must continue to work in concert with Africans to help secure the continent's future if we are to be smart about securing our own. If Africa succeeds, we all—Africans and Americans—stand to benefit. If Africa fails, we will all pay the price.

Still, we would be foolish to measure Africa's progress in months or even a few short years. It would be naive to assume that deep-rooted problems that have plagued parts of Africa for decades will disappear with the quick wave of a diplomatic wand. Future progress, as in the present and the past, will be uneven and fitful. There will be rough patches and occasional reverses. In this regard, Africa's experience will be no different than that of Europe, Latin America, or Asia. The difference is: America has never debated whether our interests lie in remaining actively engaged, even in difficult times, in these other regions of the world.

The dangers of taking a short-term approach to Africa policy—crisis by crisis, leader by leader, election by election—are akin to trying to make a fast buck in today's troubled stock market. If we seek quick returns over long-term gain, we will never be well-positioned to advance important U.S. economic and political interests in Africa.

We cannot stand idly by waiting for Africa to achieve perfection before we engage actively in helping to shape its future. If we temper our engagement or hold back until the whole of Africa is on even footing, we will concede important opportunities to our competitors and worse still, leave doors open to our adversaries.

Let me conclude with a short story about the problems of taking a passive approach. A good and faithful man fell upon financially

hard times. Every time he turned around, it seemed another demand was placed upon him until finally, he owed more and more to his creditors. One night in his distress, he dropped to his knees, lifted his eyes to heaven, and prayed, "Dear God, I am in trouble. Please let me win the lottery—and soon."

The next week he was optimistic his condition would change. After three months, his faith began to waver, and by the end of the year, he became angry. "Are you there God?" He pleaded, "I believed you would help me yet another year has passed and you refuse to answer my prayer." Suddenly, a dark cloud appeared in the sky, lightning flashed, and a voice boomed, "I hear you . . . I hear you. In fact, I've heard your every prayer, but give me a break. The least you could do is buy a lottery ticket."

The United States and each of you must do your part. We must invest the United States' commitment, talent, resources, and energy in Africa in order to promote lasting peace, security, and prosperity here at home.

We all—especially students of African studies—have a role to play. You are the next generation of U.S. policymakers, business leaders, journalists, development experts, and international lawyers. U.S. interests in Africa will grow deeper still in the next decade—your decade.

Thus, I hope you will remember the words of President Nelson Mandela spoken just a month ago during his last visit to the United States as President of the new South Africa. He said:

Though the challenges of the present time for our country, our continent, and the world are greater than those we have already overcome, we face the future with confidence. We do so because despite the difficulties and the tensions that confront us, there is in all of us the capacity to touch one another's hearts across oceans and continents.

Working with our African partners, we must continue to support democracy, economic reform, and political stability. Together, we can and must achieve the great promise of our common future and fashion a brighter next century for all our peoples. Thank you. ■

Peter F. Romero

The U.S.-Canada Relationship And the Western Hemisphere

October 7, 1998

Remarks by the Acting Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs before the Canadian-American Business Council, Washington, DC.

Thank you Stan [Stanley Krejci] for your kind introduction. I am absolutely delighted to have the opportunity to co-host today's reception and luncheon with the Canadian-American Business Council. I would like to thank personally Mr. Krejci, the Council's President, and Mr. Paul Weller, the Council's Executive Director, for their invaluable assistance in making this event possible.

One theme I will touch upon today is the growing ties of Canada and the United States with other countries in the Western Hemisphere. To further this positive trend on a person-to-person level, the Canadian-American Business Council graciously agreed that we would also invite today members of other prominent business organizations with ties to Latin America.

I am sure that serious "hemispheric networking" is going on at this, the first public event sponsored by the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs since the Secretary's announcement of her desire to create a new Bureau of Western Hemispheric Affairs—merging the Office of Canadian Affairs—currently of our Bureau of European and Canadian Affairs—with the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs. Before I talk more about our plans, however, I would like to sketch out with some figures the extraordinary breadth and depth of the U.S.-Canada economic relationship.

Trade between us has more than doubled since the signing of the Canada-U.S. free trade agreement barely 10 years ago. A mind-boggling total of \$1 billion in trade crosses our border each and every day. Ninety-five percent of our trade with Canada is trouble free; it's just the other 5% of the trade that grabs all the headlines, be it bilateral disputes over "spuds and suds" or, more recently, "hogs and logs." The value of this trade to both countries is

enormous. Exports to the United States account for one-fourth of Canada's gross domestic product.

U.S. merchandise exports to Canada exceed every other trading relationship, including our trade with the European Community. Just the two-way trade that crosses the Ambassador Bridge between Michigan and Ontario equals all U.S. exports to Japan, which is currently slightly ahead of Mexico as our second-largest trade partner.

Much of this trade is in the auto sector. General Motors' Detroit Cadillac plant, for example, receives seats on a just-in-time basis from a plant in Windsor, Ontario, as well as other parts from plants in Canada and Mexico. Overall, autos and auto parts account for about one-third of bilateral trade.

Energy is an excellent example of an economic sector that was once deeply affected by domestic regulations and policies that once bedeviled our relationship but is now an area of close cooperation and enormous mutual benefit. I don't have to tell you how well Canada does in exporting oil and natural gas to the United States. Canada is now our second-largest oil supplier, not far behind Venezuela, our number one supplier.

The future is even brighter. Private economists say the U.S. and Canada have only "scratched the surface" on the potential of jobs and higher incomes that economic integration through trade and investment can bring both our people.

Since we eliminated virtually all tariffs on trade between the U.S. and Canada as of the beginning of this year, much of our current focus is on facilitating lawful trade through removing non-tariff barriers, including more efficient customs and immigration processing of cargo and people. This has been the central theme of the U.S.-Canada Shared Border Accord, which was announced by President

Clinton and Prime Minister Chretien in 1995. The accord incorporates a series of practical projects that mix bilateral cooperation and pragmatism with intelligent transportation technology, to speed goods and people across the border.

Let me add here that the Administration is deeply concerned about the potential of the exit-control requirements of Section 110 of the 1996 Immigration Reform to create massive bottlenecks on our land border crossings with Canada and Mexico. Although Section 110 came into effect on October 1, the Immigration and Naturalization Service has indicated to us that it will not change its inspection procedures at this time. INS has informed Congress that it is testing new technologies to capture the required information with minimal disruptions through normal inspection procedures. Let me assure you that the State Department will continue to work with Congress for passage of the Senate-amended version of HR 2920, which would indefinitely delay implementation of Section 110 pending a feasibility study.

Building public support for NAFTA was one of the top issues discussed by Secretary Albright, Mexican Foreign Secretary Rosario Green, and Canadian Foreign Minister Lloyd Axworthy on September 22, 1998, in New York during the annual United Nations General Assembly. Secretary Albright, Secretary Green, and Minister Axworthy believe that the critical issues facing our three countries today, and the commonalities that have been created by our integration, necessitate in-depth discussions on a regular basis. Beside discussing free trade and NAFTA, the ministers talked about ways to increase educational and government exchange programs; coordinate for disaster preparedness; and hold separate meetings of their policy planning and public affairs staffs, and of officials concerned with the Y2K problem.

NAFTA is a resounding success, but the three governments need to do more to bring this message to their respective publics. From 1993 to 1997, trade among the three partners boomed: Canada-U.S. trade increased over 50%; Canada-Mexico trade was up over 80%; and U.S.-Mexico trade climbed over 92%.

The Administration's last comprehensive review of NAFTA in July 1997 estimated that exports to Canada and Mexico supported 2.3 million jobs in 1996—an increase of 189,000 jobs because of exports to Canada, and of 122,000 jobs in the United States because of exports to Mexico.

Since our 1997 trade with Canada and Mexico increased by over 13% and 25%, respectively, over 1996, any revised numbers on job creation in the United States from NAFTA would undoubtedly be even more impressive

than those figures. As we attempt to broaden our NAFTA relationships with Canada and Mexico, we are also entering a “new age” in our relationships within the hemisphere. For the first time ever, there is wide-ranging consensus in the whole hemisphere on basic political and economic values, on democracy, and the value of free markets.

The 1994 Miami Summit of the Americas established the common vision of a community of nations in the hemisphere dedicated to democracy and economic prosperity and ensuring that the fruits of those things get to all of the people. Leaders renewed their commitment to this goal at the Santiago Summit this past April and will again in Canada in the year 2000 or 2001.

Reflecting its increasingly important role in the Western Hemisphere, Canada will host the next Summit of the Americas. Canada is currently the chair of the Free Trade of the Americas talks and will host a critical FTAA trade ministers meeting next year. Canada will host the Organization of American States General Assembly in 2000.

The Canadian Government actively participates in international counter-narcotics fora, including the OAS's Inter-American Drug Abuse Control Commission (CICAD). Canada has been particularly instrumental in advancing the new hemispheric alliance against drugs.

The U.S. and Canada gained approval for this alliance at the April Santiago Summit. I met again with the recently elected Chairman of the working group of the alliance, Canadian Deputy Solicitor General Jean Fournier, and continue to be impressed with his drive, his creativity, and his dynamism.

The alliance represents a fundamental move by the United States to create a hemispheric framework by which to determine progress made by individual countries against the scourge of narcotics trafficking—this toward a regional, multilateral mechanism to monitor and evaluate national counter-drug performance.

Consistent with Canada's growing orientation and new role in the region, Secretary Albright decided this summer to establish a new Bureau of Western Hemispheric Affairs. This follows the Canadian Government's decision to reorganize along the same lines several years ago. The new bureau will broaden and deepen our common Western Hemispheric

“For the first time ever, there is wide-ranging consensus in the whole hemisphere on basic political and economic values, on democracy, and the value of free markets.”

agenda and preserve and strengthen our long-standing and vital partnership with Canada in transatlantic, transpacific, and global affairs.

The U.S. and Canada will remain close partners in NATO, the most successful security arrangement in history. We together constitute the Western side of the Atlantic Alliance, and our common efforts in support of Western security will not diminish.

Canada continues its partnership with us in contributing to European stability as a member of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and as a participant in peace-keeping operations around the world.

We remain partners in the G-8, in the Quad, with the European Union, and Japan, to tackle trade issues; and in the OECD, which is shaping the economic policies of the next millennium. We remain partners in the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation forum, the organization that is undertaking to expand open market principles throughout the Pacific Rim.

The United States and Canada will continue to work together on global issues of concern to both, such as arms control, nuclear non-proliferation efforts, and counter-terrorism. In that regard, we will all be attending a meeting in Buenos Aires in November in an effort to make the Western Hemisphere a hemispheric free zone as it relates to external terrorism.

In sum, we are at an exciting time in U.S. relations with Canada and the rest of the Western Hemisphere. We have come a long

way with our FTA with Canada, which is now 10 years old. We amplified this by NAFTA and added Mexico as a full and dynamic partner. These agreements are success stories that have brought jobs and prosperity to all of our people. We have recently initiated trilateral meetings with Canada and Mexico to see if an emerging "North American identity" will allow us to deepen the level of intergovernmental and person-to-person exchanges between our three nations.

The financial crises that have rocked Asia and Russia and shaken many other emerging markets pose a challenge to hemispheric cooperation. It is incumbent upon us to prevent a dynamic where we move back to protectionism, instead of forward to liberalization; to take negative, unilateral actions, instead of positive, multilateral actions. History will show that our closest cooperation took place during this period.

On Fast Track, we hope to build the necessary public support so that our Congress passes Fast Track as early as possible next year. In short, we are at a critical juncture at which we need to look outward to cooperate and compete with each other, instead of retreating into ourselves.

How well the U.S., Canada, and other nations of the hemisphere weather the current economic storms and emerge stronger in the future will depend on what we do together right now. ■

David J. Scheffer

Human Rights and International Justice

October 23, 1998

Address by the Ambassador-at-Large for War Crimes Issues at Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire.

I am deeply honored to speak on United Nations Day here at Dartmouth College. I particularly want to thank my host, the Dartmouth United Nations Club and its co-president, Michelle Chui, for her kind invitation. I had little difficulty accepting her invitation when I knew that it would afford me the opportunity not only to speak to a New England audience about some important issues but to take in the fall foliage. I also struck up a friendship years ago with your esteemed Professor Emeritus Laurence Radway and wanted to visit him on his home turf. This is my first visit to Dartmouth—a college where I know excellence in education and the beauty of your campus are powerful magnets for the nation's best students.

The United Nations today faces so many challenges worldwide that any recognition of its work necessarily can convey only a partial story. One of the most visible achievements of the United Nations throughout its history has been the promotion and protection of human rights. Beginning with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and continuing with the numerous human rights conventions, the work of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights and the UN Human Rights Center in Geneva, the reporting of Special Rapporteurs deployed to countries across the globe, the responses to human rights catastrophes throughout the world, and the creation of international criminal tribunals for the former Yugoslavia and for Rwanda, the United Nations has been a dominant champion of human rights in our time.

Secretary Albright, now and during her years as the U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations, has been a tireless advocate and protector of human rights. She has never shrunk from the challenge of human rights in a violent and complex world where so many political, economic, social, and security considerations must be considered in shaping policy

choices. I have worked for her for almost 6 years now, and I know her personal commitment to this issue. For example, she has pressed hard for women's rights and for the protection of children. One of her highest priorities is to obtain ratification of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, which has been delayed far too long. Secretary Albright has deplored the plight of women and girls in Afghanistan. She is the architect of the two United Nations' international criminal tribunals and has sought to ensure that peacekeeping operations respond to human rights violations. And she has pushed hard for freedom of religion and for the building of democracy, both of which give human rights the best chance to flourish.

If the United Nations is to continue its essential support for the protection and advancement of human rights worldwide, it needs to be a well-managed and well-financed international institution. Secretary Albright has worked hard to streamline UN management and administration. Enormous progress has been made in recent years. Meantime, however, this nation's arrears to the UN system of more than \$700 million continue to cause us severe difficulties. This situation ill serves the cause of human rights and the many other missions entrusted to the United Nations, particularly by this nation. Our foreign policy is being crippled by the loss of U.S. credibility in the face of such staggering debts to the United Nations.

Despite the Clinton Administration's sustained efforts to obtain the requisite funding, this could not be resolved with Congress in the omnibus funding bill adopted this week. Nonetheless, the President and Secretary Albright remain firmly committed to paying our debts to the United Nations. It is a top U.S. foreign policy priority, and we will continue to work with Congress toward this end.

I hold a position in the United States Government that has a very short history, as there has never before been an Ambassador-at-Large for War Crimes Issues, either in this country or any other nation. President Clinton and Secretary of State Madeleine Albright appointed me to bring a sharp focus to accountability for and prevention of atrocities wherever they may occur in the world. No one can survey the events of this decade without profound concern about worldwide respect for internationally recognized human rights. We live in a world where entire populations can still be terrorized and slaughtered by nationalist butchers and undisciplined armies. We have witnessed this in Iraq, in the Balkans, and in Central Africa.

Internal conflicts dominate the landscape of armed struggle today, and impunity too often shields the perpetrators of the most heinous crimes against their own people and others. As the most powerful nation committed to the rule of law, we have a responsibility to confront these assaults on humankind. One response mechanism is accountability; namely, to help bring the perpetrators of genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes to justice. If we allow them to act with impunity, then we will only be inviting a perpetuation of these crimes far into the next millennium. Our legacy must demonstrate an unyielding commitment to the pursuit of justice.

The touchstone of our work today are two documents framed 50 years ago at the United Nations. At the conclusion of World War II, the global collective conscience was devastated by reports of hitherto unthinkable atrocities committed during the war. It is from this dark period in history that both the international human rights system and international humanitarian law gained prominence on the world scene. In the space of 2 days in December of 1948, the UN General Assembly adopted both the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. These two instruments are the backbone of all that has followed in the fields of human rights and international humanitarian law.

The Office of War Crimes Issues, which I head at the State Department, has supported—since its creation in August 1997—efforts to bring to justice war criminals or, more precisely, those suspected of committing genocide, crimes against humanity, and serious war crimes. The challenge is so enormous we can never do enough; we can never respond to all of the needs. I sometimes liken war crimes to a growth industry, sadly enough. Every day we awaken to another report of a mass killing or a mass grave or an emerging conflict that holds

the potential of another atrocity. It is grim business. But we are determined to do all we can to achieve justice and prevent further atrocities. I want to share with you some of the contributions the Clinton Administration has made to this issue and what comprises the work of my office.

Yugoslav War Crimes Tribunal

One of Madeleine Albright's first achievements at the United Nations in February of 1993 was her leadership in the creation of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. Our support for the Yugoslav War Crimes Tribunal has been second to none ever since. Through the efforts of our government and the Stabilization Force in Bosnia, we have helped increase the number of indictees taken into custody from one when NATO entered Bosnia in January 1996 to 34 today. Twenty-nine public indictees remain at large. Two prominent figures in the Bosnian conflict, Radovan Karadzic and Ratko Mladic, remain at large. This is a reality that is certainly frustrating to us and to the victims of their alleged crimes. But their day will come, and they will face justice in The Hague. U.S. policy remains constant. Neither of these indictees should assume anything else. We would have hoped that they had shown the courage to voluntarily defend themselves before the tribunal rather than cower from the international community. In the meantime, we are confident of the tribunal's continuing progress. Six judicial proceedings covering a large number of indictees currently are underway in The Hague in three courtrooms, one of which was recently built with voluntary contributions from the United States and the Netherlands.

We are working to increase the number of indictees brought into custody in The Hague. Last week, Congress adopted new legislation that we sought to provide a rewards program for information leading to the arrest of suspects indicted by the Yugoslav Tribunal. Our diplomatic pressure one year ago led to the voluntary surrender of 10 Bosnian Croat indictees as well as other voluntary surrenders.

The United States is the largest financial supporter for the Yugoslav Tribunal. International justice is no less expensive than domestic justice. In fact, because of the investigative requirements of an international criminal tribunal and other factors, the costs of international litigation can be high. Since 1993, the United States Government seconded more than 30 lawyers, investigators, and analysts to the Yugoslav Tribunal. It can fairly be said that without that expert assistance, the tribunal

would be nowhere near its stage of development. The United States also continues to make, in addition to its assessed contributions through the United Nations, critical voluntary contributions of computer equipment and software and support for mass grave exhumations, the review of case files submitted by the parties to the conflict, and investigations in such places as Kosovo. The total U.S. funding for the Yugoslav Tribunal since its creation now totals more than \$64 million. We also use our diplomatic clout to strongly support the tribunal's annual budget at the United Nations, which for next year should be about \$90 million.

Another vital contribution is information, which we provide to the tribunal through special procedures that have been worked out under Rule 70 of the tribunal's Rules of Procedure and Evidence. This information is used by the prosecutor for background and investigative leads.

Since last March, we have been deeply engaged with responses to the conflict in Kosovo. We have provided the prosecutor with financial, diplomatic, and information support. We also have pressed hard and successfully to support the prosecutor's stated declaration that the tribunal has jurisdiction to investigate and prosecute serious violations of international humanitarian law in Kosovo.

I believe we have turned the corner with the Yugoslav War Crimes Tribunal. An enormous amount of work remains to be done—more investigations, more indictees, more trials. But progress has been made, and the tribunal's professionalism and credibility are well established.

Rwanda War Crimes Tribunal

The 1994 genocide in Rwanda was a horrific event from which we have learned many lessons. One is that we have to do a much better job responding to genocide as it unfolds and, even more importantly, to incipient genocide as its warning signals are recognized. Last March, in Kigali, President Clinton said:

We did not act quickly enough after the killing began. We should not have allowed the refugee camp to become safe haven for the killers. We did not immediately call these crimes by their rightful name—genocide. We cannot change the past but we can and must do everything in our power to help you build a future without fear, and full of hope.

By July 1994, 4 months after the genocide began, we were moving swiftly to create an international criminal tribunal to hold responsible the leaders of the genocide in Rwanda.

The Rwanda War Crimes Tribunal was established by November and is now entering its 5th year of operations. Despite severe management and staffing problems in its early years, and despite the fact that some of these problems persist, the wheels of justice are beginning to churn in the tribunal's courtrooms in Arusha, Tanzania. Last month, a three-judge panel handed down the first judgment in history on the crime of genocide and other crimes. Jean-Paul Akayesu, a former mayor of a town in Rwanda, was found guilty of genocide. Jean Kambanda, Rwandan Prime Minister during the genocide, pled guilty to genocide and other crimes and received the tribunal's maximum sentence—life imprisonment. Other indicted officials of the Rwandan Government are being tried on charges of genocide and other serious violations of international humanitarian law.

In fact, the number of publicly indicted individuals in custody in Arusha is 31, while only 8 public indictees remain at large. Most of those in custody come from the leadership ranks of the former Rwandan Government and society. The United States can take some credit not only for the establishment of the Rwanda War Crimes Tribunal but also for getting it back on track. At our encouragement, the UN's Office of the Inspector General launched investigations of the tribunal's operations that resulted in significant staff changes and reformed operations.

As with the Yugoslav Tribunal, our financial contributions, both assessed and voluntary, have underpinned the Rwanda Tribunal's operations. We have also seconded investigators and facilitated the hiring of seasoned U.S. prosecutors to work in the Office of the Prosecutor. Their performance has been exemplary. For example, it was a prosecutor on a leave of absence from the Department of Justice who led the prosecution which resulted in the first conviction for genocide by an international tribunal.

Let me also say that one indictee of the Rwanda War Crimes Tribunal is currently in detention here in the United States, in the State of Texas. His name is Elizaphan Ntakirutimana. He is charged with genocide and other crimes. Before being indicted, he entered the United States to join members of his family in Texas. Since September 1996, we have waged a long battle in federal courts to achieve his transfer to the tribunal in Arusha. This has been a historic case that will confirm our authority to cooperate with an international criminal tribunal. In early 1996, the Clinton Administration successfully obtained legislation to underpin our ability to cooperate in the transfer of

indicted individuals from the United States to either the Yugoslav or Rwanda Tribunal. The Ntakirutimana case tests that proposition. A federal district court recently ruled that he could be extradited. We hope that Mr. Ntakirutimana will be transferred to Arusha to stand trial without unreasonable further delay.

Cambodia

Let me say a brief word about Cambodia. The Clinton Administration has not forgotten the Pol Pot era of the late 1970s. We had hoped to bring Pol Pot to justice this year, but fate intervened to deprive Pol Pot of his life and us of our opportunity to bring him into custody. Nonetheless, senior Khmer Rouge leaders continue to remain at large. They must be brought to justice. We are hard at work to achieve that objective and are pleased to see renewed activity at the United Nations on this as well.

Iraqi War Crimes

We are also looking at Iraqi war crimes. For example, we are focusing renewed attention on Saddam Hussein and the senior members of his regime. His record is a long one. As Secretary Albright has often said, he is a repeat offender. It is extremely important that the pattern of Saddam Hussein's conduct be well known by the international community. That pattern of conduct has been criminal in character. It involves the actions of Saddam Hussein's regime during the Anfal campaign of the late 1980s against the Iraqi Kurdish people. It includes what he did to the Iranians during the Iran-Iraq war. It includes the invasion and occupation of Kuwait and the torture and killing of Kuwaiti civilians, and it involves actions that Saddam Hussein's regime has taken against the Marsh Arabs in southern Iraq following the Gulf war.

Our government is working with others to pull together the record of Saddam's regime in a way that can be useful to a prosecutor. For example, some years ago, Human Rights Watch and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee helped collect 5.5 million pages of Iraqi documents captured in northern Iraq. The U.S. Government has now scanned and indexed these 5.5 million pages into computer-readable form on 176 CD-ROM disks. Our goal now is to make this information accessible to investigators and prosecutors looking into Saddam's activities. The Clinton Administration recognizes that the record of Saddam Hussein's conduct under international law is deplorable. We are taking measures to insure that this record becomes better known to the world at large.

World War II

Another development in the past year brings us back to echoes of the Holocaust. We learned in April of the case of Dinko Sakic, who admitted on Argentine television on April 6 that he was the commander of the Jasenovac death camp in World War II Croatia. Some consider Sakic to be the most notorious World War II era war criminal still at large today. At least tens of thousands, and perhaps hundreds of thousands, were killed at Jasenovac. According to a captured German document, in December 1943, Nazis in the Balkans were reporting to Berlin midway through the war that 120,000 people had already been killed at Jasenovac. The camp obviously continued to operate almost through the end of the war. By any account, whoever commanded the camp must be put on trial.

We have commended the Government of Argentina for extraditing Sakic to face justice. The United States Government is committed to seeing that Dinko Sakic is vigorously prosecuted in Croatia and that he receives a fair trial. In order to assist the Croatian Government's prosecution, I personally delivered documents compiled by the U.S. Government on the Sakic case to senior Croatian officials in Zagreb. The Sakic case shows, as Secretary Albright has said, that there is no statute of limitations for genocide. The American people and their government will be paying close attention to this case to see that, in the end, justice is done in Croatia for crimes committed during the Second World War, just as it has been done elsewhere in Europe.

International Criminal Court

An event of major importance in the evolution of international humanitarian law occurred this past summer in Rome, where more than 160 nations met to craft a treaty that would result in the creation of a permanent international criminal court. The international community sought a noble and worthy objective whose time has clearly arrived. That objective is to hold accountable and bring to justice the perpetrators of the most egregious crimes against humankind: genocide, crimes against humanity, and serious war crimes.

At the diplomatic conference in Rome we deliberated as to how that objective could be accomplished in a world comprised of sovereign governments, each with its own penal system but each bound together with the cords of customary international law, reflected both in international treaties and in common practice.

The treaty that emerged from the Rome Conference has many provisions that we support, and the United States can be proud of the many significant contributions by the U.S. delegation to the treaty text. We in the U.S. Government, however, have reluctantly concluded that the treaty, in its present form, contains flaws that render it unacceptable. Most problematic is the extraordinary way the court's jurisdiction was framed at the last moment. A country whose forces commit war crimes could join the treaty but escape prosecution of its nationals by "opting out" of the court's jurisdiction over war crimes for 7 years. By contrast, a country that does not join the treaty but deploys its soldiers abroad to restore international peace and security could be vulnerable to assertions that the court has jurisdiction over acts of those soldiers.

Consider this scenario:

A state not a party to the treaty launches a campaign of terror against a dissident minority inside its territory. Thousands of innocent civilians are killed. International peace and security is imperiled. The United States participates in a coalition to use military force to intervene and stop the killing. Unfortunately, in so doing, bombs intended for military targets go astray. A hospital is hit. An apartment building is demolished. Some civilians being used as human shields are mistakenly shot by U.S. troops.

The state responsible for the atrocities demands that U.S. officials and commanders be prosecuted by the international criminal court. The demand is supported by a small group of other states. Under the terms of the Rome Treaty, absent a Security Council referral, the court could not investigate those responsible for killing thousands, yet our senior officials, commanders, and soldiers could face an international investigation and even prosecution.

Clearly, such a scenario is not acceptable to a country such as ours with its unique responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security. Having considered the

matter with great care, the United States will not sign the treaty in its present form. Nor is there any prospect of our signing the present treaty text in the future.

Just yesterday, I was in New York discussing the international criminal court and the treaty text in a meeting of the UN General Assembly's Sixth Committee. As I said there in New York, it is our view that governments must be afforded the opportunity to address their more fundamental concerns. The advantages that would derive from strong United States support for the international criminal court should not be sacrificed for a concept of jurisdiction that may not be effective and even runs the risk of dividing the international community on an issue—international justice—that will be difficult enough to achieve if the international community is together. The international community's willingness and ability to prevent and, where necessary, respond effectively to atrocities is of fundamental importance. The opportunity remains for the international criminal court to achieve its full potential. The U.S. holds the stakes for international peace, security, and justice to be too great to accept anything else.

Conclusion

I have not touched upon other atrocities we are focusing on, including those in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Sierra Leone, Burundi, Afghanistan, and elsewhere. It is a very large agenda but one that we cannot walk away from. I have not spoken of our emerging efforts to build a better system of early warning and prevention of genocide—a goal President Clinton is determined to see addressed. But I hope I have given you some idea of the challenges that confront us. I hope that some of you, in the future, will have the opportunity to help the international community address these challenges. We must make every effort to ensure that the worst crimes of the 20th century are not repeated in the 21st century. Thank you. ■



TREATY ACTIONS

MULTILATERAL

Arbitration

Convention on the recognition and enforcement of foreign arbitral awards. Done at New York June 10, 1958. Entered into force June 7, 1959; for the U.S., Dec. 29, 1970.

Accessions: Lao People's Democratic Republic, June 17, 1998; Mozambique, June 11, 1998.¹

Chemical Weapons

Convention on the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling, and use of chemical weapons and on their destruction, with annexes. Done at Paris Jan. 13, 1993. Entered into force Apr. 29, 1997. [Senate] Treaty Doc. 103-21, 103rd Cong., 1st Sess. *Ratifications:* Malawi, June 11, 1998; Senegal, July 20, 1998.

Environment—Climate Change

Amendments to Annex I of the Framework Convention on Climate Change of May 9, 1992. Adopted at Kyoto Dec. 11, 1997. Entered into force Aug. 13, 1998.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization

Agreement between the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty for the security of information, with annexes. Done at Brussels Mar. 6, 1997. Entered into force Aug. 16, 1998.

Ratification: Canada, July 17, 1998.

Agreement to implement paragraph 1 of article 45 of the agreement of August 3, 1959, as amended, to supplement the agreement between the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty regarding the status of their forces with respect to foreign forces stationed in the Federal Republic of Germany. Done at Bonn Mar. 18, 1993.²

Acceptance: Germany, June 23, 1998.

Agreement among the states parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and other states participating in the Partnership for Peace regarding the status of their forces. Done at Brussels June 19, 1995. Entered into force Jan. 13, 1996.

Additional protocol to the agreement among the states parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the other states participating in the Partner-

ship for Peace regarding the status of their forces. Done at Brussels June 19, 1995. Entered into force June 1, 1996.³

Ratification: Germany, Sept. 24, 1998.⁴

Further additional protocol to the agreement among the states parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the other states participating in the Partnership for Peace regarding the status of their forces. Done at Brussels Dec. 19, 1997.²

Signature: Latvia, Aug. 18, 1998.

BILATERAL

Bangladesh

Agreement regarding the status of United States armed forces visiting Bangladesh. Effected by exchange of notes at Dhaka Aug. 10 and 24, 1998. Entered into force Aug. 24, 1998.

Barbados

Agreement concerning cooperation in suppressing illicit maritime drug trafficking. Signed at Bridgetown June 25, 1997. Entered into force Oct. 11, 1998.

Bulgaria

Agreement for cooperation in the Global Learning and Observations to Benefit the Environment (GLOBE) Program, with appendices. Signed at Sofia Sept. 8, 1998. Entered into force Sept. 8, 1998.

Egypt

Results package grant agreement for the Private Sector Commodity Import Program (PRCIP). Signed at Cairo Sept. 3, 1998. Entered into force Sept. 3, 1998.

Agreement amending the results package grant agreement of Sept. 30, 1996 for Sector Policy Reform III. Signed at Cairo Sept. 23, 1998. Entered into force Sept. 23, 1998.

Agreement amending the grant agreement of Sept. 29, 1994, as amended for the Secondary Cities Project. Signed at Cairo Sept. 23, 1998. Entered into force Sept. 23, 1998.

European Community

Agreement for scientific and technological cooperation, with annex. Signed at Washington Dec. 5, 1997. Entered into force Oct. 14, 1998.

Japan

Agreement amending the 1986 agreement on maritime search and rescue (TIAS 11413). Effected by exchange of notes at Washington Sept. 30, 1998. Entered into force Sept. 30, 1998.

Kuwait

Basic exchange and cooperative agreement for geospatial information and services. Signed at Washington and Kuwait Aug. 7, 1998. Entered into force Aug. 7, 1998.

Oman

Agreement amending and extending the agreement of Dec. 13, 1993 and Jan. 15, 1994, as amended and extended, relating to trade in textiles and textile products, with attachment. Effected by exchange of notes at Muscat June 13 and Aug. 3, 1998. Entered into force Aug. 3, 1998; effective Jan. 1, 1998.

Russia

Agreement for promotion of aviation safety. Signed at Moscow Sept. 2, 1998. Entered into force Sept. 2, 1998.

Memorandum of understanding on cooperation in the field of civil aircraft accident/incident investigation and prevention. Signed at Moscow Sept. 2, 1998. Entered into force Sept. 2, 1998.

Sao Tome and Principe

Investment incentive agreement. Signed at Washington Sept. 10, 1998. Entered into force Sept. 10, 1998.

Sri Lanka

Agreement regarding grants under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and the furnishing of defense services from the United States of America to the Government of Sri Lanka. Effected by exchange of notes at Colombo July 23 and Aug. 4, 1998. Entered into force Aug. 4, 1998.

¹ With declaration(s).

² Not in force.

³ Not in force for the U.S.

⁴ With understanding(s). ■