

Secretary Albright

Bosnian Refugees Return Home

August 30, 1998

Remarks to returning refugees, Stup, Bosnia.

Thank you Ambassador Kauzlarich. Friar Andelovic, Cardinal Puljic, Friar Vujica, thank you for your warm welcome to the Seminary. President Zubak, President Ganic, Vice President Soljic, elected officials.

[Spoken in Serbo-Croatian]

DRAGI PRIJATELJI, HVALA VAM STO STE MI DOPUSTILI PRIVILEGIJU DA VAS POSJETIM V VASEM DOMU I HVALA VAM ZA VJERU I HRABROST DA SE PONOVO VRATITE KUĆI.

[English translation]

Dear friends: Thank you for allowing me the privilege of visiting you in your home, and thank you for having the faith and courage to come back home again.

[End translation]

People who look at Bosnia from the outside often see it in a detached and abstract way. We make a list of goals and we check them off—a road built here, a meeting held there, an agreement signed somewhere else. We talk about a multiethnic society, a multisyllabic abstraction that cannot possibly capture the richness of the lives people led here.

Before the war, 1,000 people dwelt in Stup, earning a livelihood from industry, business, tourism, and farming. Among them were Croats, an equal number of Bosniaks, and a smaller number of Serbs. They lived and worked together. They raised their children together. They married whom they loved. There were families here with ties to every one of the religious, cultural, and ethnic communities that have long co-existed in Bosnia.

I imagine many saw themselves simply as Sarajevans. When they looked down the street they saw simply neighbors. When they looked up, they saw crosses, minarets, and orthodox church spires, and they knew they were home.

Then the war came, and Stup found itself on the front line between Bosnian Government and Bosnian Serb forces. A community that once welcomed every man and woman became a no-man's land. People were driven out; everyone ended up in the wrong house.

We can still see the ruins over which the armies fought. But today, Stup is on the front line of a different struggle. Assistance from the United States, from the EU, from the UN, and from NGOs, is helping to rebuild a welcoming community here. Houses, power lines, and roads are being fixed. Jobs are being created. People are coming home.

And what we need to remember today is that you are not coming home to invent something new; you are certainly not coming home to lead lives that have been designed for you by outsiders. You are coming to reclaim your lives and to assert your identity. You are coming to take back what you had before.

[Spoken in Serbo-Croatian]

DRAGI PRIJATELJI, ZELIMO DA, NA SVAKI NACIN KOJIJEMOGUCE, IMATE SVE ONO STO STE PRIJE IMALI.

[English translation]

Dear friends: In every way that is possible, we want you to have what you had before.

[End translation]

I do not want to suggest that any of this is easy. I know this is a community of proud, hard-working people who have been forced to live the lives of refugees for all or most of the last 6 years. I have no illusions that you can forget what you have suffered or regain all you have lost. I know you will be living here with the memories of loved ones the war took away. I will not pretend that a house built on rubble can replace the homes where your children and perhaps your parents were born and your memories stored. But it is precisely because what you are doing is hard that I wanted to come here to stand with you and to salute you.

I want to salute you for not letting the war destroy a way of life that belongs to you, for having the courage to build on what was once a battlefield, for having the faith to believe that the future can be made better than the past. And I want to explain why what you are doing is so important to us. For if you can come back here and give this community the identity it

"We must also acknowledge that we cannot return refugees to communities that are not yet ready to receive them. It is wrong to stop refugees from coming home. But I hope our European allies will recognize that it is also irresponsible to force them to return where there is no security, no housing, and no jobs."

once had, despite all you have seen and suffered, then so can all of Sarajevo. And if Sarajevo can become an open city and Canton again, if its people can forgive without forgetting the horrors they have witnessed, then the promise of Dayton can be fulfilled throughout this once-divided nation. And if Bosnia can be united by common interests and aims, if it can face its past and still move forward, then so can any nation struggling to overcome a painful legacy.

Slowly but surely, I believe the people of Bosnia are overcoming the legacy of the war. I have been here many times over the years.

Every time I fly over Sarajevo, as I did today, it looks better. Houses that were roofless shells now shelter families. There are cars, trucks, people—life—on the streets.

The signs of progress are certainly more evident today than when I visited here last summer. Then, hardly any refugees were returning home. Most Bosnian leaders were resisting integration. Hardliners did not worry about competition. Many Bosnians had no access to free media. Few indicted war criminals had been arrested. Many people had the impression that the international community was biding its time, settling for the status quo instead of striving to improve it.

The United States pledged then that the only aid we would support for Bosnia would be aid to help people who were helping Dayton to succeed. We also made a long-term commitment to see this process through; we made it clear that our mission would determine our timetable, not the other way around.

Now, a common license plate has made it possible for you to move freely throughout your country. The international community has shut

down biased media. We have diminished the power of police forces to intimidate you. War criminals are going to The Hague. From Sarajevo to Banja Luka to Mostar, the democratic process has produced new officials who are accountable, pragmatic, and focused on the issues that matter to their people.

And we are seeing a real popular movement on behalf of refugee returns. The displaced are exercising their rights—from the Serbs who wish to return to Drvar, to the Bosniaks who have pitched tents in Kotor Varos, to the Croats who are back in their homes in Travnik. Decent, brave people like you are showing it is not only possible to stop ethnic cleansing; it is possible to move beyond it.

Indeed, it is necessary to do this, because people like you have shown us they do not want to be separated from their homes by permanent lines of partition. It is necessary because displaced people are a natural base for extremists who would perpetuate conflict. It is necessary for the hard, practical reason that a forced division of Bosnia would reignite violence.

Unfortunately, a reversal of progress in Bosnia is still possible. We are working here with our eyes open, and much of what we see remains disturbing. Bosnia's peace is not yet self-sustaining.

The international community has much more work to do—to help train a multiethnic police force, to support reconstruction, to supervise the next round of free and fair elections. But perhaps our biggest challenge is to work with communities such as this one to create the conditions that allow displaced people to return home as equal partners in their municipalities.

We must also acknowledge that we cannot return refugees to communities that are not yet ready to receive them. It is wrong to stop refugees from coming home. But I hope our European allies will recognize that it is also irresponsible to force them to return where there is no security, no housing, and no jobs.

Bosnia's leaders and Bosnia's people also have work to do to meet their basic commitments under the Dayton Agreement. Bosnian Serb authorities, particularly in some municipalities in the east, are still resisting minority returns and still protecting indicted war criminals. Croatian authorities have also in many cases failed to protect returning families, some of whom are living like prisoners in their homes, sleeping in shifts to guard their property.

And in spite of the progress we see here in Stup, Bosniak authorities are not yet doing nearly enough to permit refugees to return to Sarajevo Canton. They are forgetting that the capital of a multiethnic Bosnia must set an example. It must be a symbol of tolerance, not the emblem of a sterile, separatist vision.

These are the problems for which I am urging that the leaders of each community take responsibility as I meet them today and tomorrow. But as we urge, there is a principle we

will keep in mind. Multiethnic institutions cannot be imposed from the outside, for this is your country, and we will not be here forever. Nor can they be imposed from the inside, as they were in Tito's time. Forced unity is false unity. True and lasting unity must be based on a consensus that can only emerge from democratic choice.

That is why our belief in democracy is at the heart of our strategy for implementing the Dayton Agreement. That is why Bosnia's coming elections will be so important.

It is not the place of outsiders to tell the Bosnian people how to vote in September. But we can point out that this election offers a real choice between two very different visions of Bosnia's future.

On the one hand, there are leaders campaigning for your vote who want to see Bosnia take its rightful place in a peaceful, united Europe. They may not agree with the international community or with each other on every point, but they do agree that the responsibility of the government in Bosnia is to provide you with the services you need to resume normal lives. They know that self-isolation is self-deception; that there is no way to bring investment and opportunity to the people they represent if Bosnians are cut off from each other and the world.

On the other hand, there are still leaders campaigning for your support who do not want peace, because they owe their own influence to success in war. There are still leaders who do not want a transparent market economy, because they owe their own fortunes to the black market. There are still leaders who want you to be angry, bitter, and afraid, because they know you will never vote for them unless you are angry, bitter, and afraid.

Fortunately, this will be a competitive election in a pluralistic society. For the first time in Bosnia, the candidates will debate each other on national television. Then you will have the chance to decide. I urge you to seize that chance by voting. Election day belongs to you. It is your chance to tell us what kind of country Bosnia should be, not the other way around.

At the same time, we have no interest in subsidizing intolerance. Whatever the outcome of the vote, we will provide support only to those communities that meet their responsibility to implement Dayton, by welcoming refugees, by making joint institutions work, by upholding justice and the rule of law.

Communities committed to reconciliation will continue to receive aid and investment; their economies will grow, and their people will prosper. Communities that choose to be isolated will be isolated.

I say with confidence that given a choice, most Bosnians will choose to live in a tolerant, united country. That is not just an expression of faith but a conviction based on experience.

I believe it because with each Bosnian election in the last 2 years, the forces of tolerance have gained support. I believe it because I have seen people like you vote with your feet for a better future—by coming home, by judging your neighbors not by their genealogy but by their character. I believe it because most people are pragmatic enough to realize that they have nothing to gain by fighting with their neighbors.

No one has expressed that conviction better than a police officer from my home town of Washington, DC, who came to Bosnia a couple of years ago to participate in the International Police Task Force. "This conflict is almost like sparring with a mirror," he said. "How are you going to knock out the guy in the mirror? You may bloody your hands; you may smash it; but you're still going to have to deal with your own reflection."

Here in Stup today, we can see that there is no reason why the lines which divided armies during the war should continue to divide communities today. And all around Bosnia, we can see that your courage and your tolerance are contagious.

I believe with all my heart that you will succeed. I am convinced that others will keep following your example. And I pledge to you the continued support of the United States. ■

Secretary Albright Bombings in Africa

August 18, 1998

Kenya

Remarks at the site of the bombing of the U.S. embassy in Nairobi.

Mr. Foreign Minister, friends, *pole sana*: Good afternoon, and thank you all for being here. I have come to Nairobi today—to this sorrowful and now sacred location—to deliver in person a message from the American people. That message begins with sadness and grief. As a result of the cowardly act committed here, more than 250 people are dead. Five thousand were injured. Almost every family in every part of Kenya has been touched by this tragedy. So many, so well loved, have been lost. Our pain is deep. In America, in Tanzania, and most of all here in Kenya.

To the people of Kenya, I express on behalf of my country our deepest sympathy. The bombing here 10 days ago was a terrible injustice. The dead were teenage girls, office workers, mothers, children. They were not the enemies of anyone; they were innocent—just as Kenya was innocent.

Why should this nation of good and proud people be singled out along with Tanzania? There is no reason. But terror is not about reason. It's about hate, and we reject hate. It's about destruction, and the people of Kenya and the United States reject destruction. We are builders. The terrorists would like nothing better than to drive us apart. We must not let them. We will not let them.

Together, we mourn the friends and loved ones we have lost. Together, we pray for the swift and complete recovery of those who have been injured. Together, we pledge to bring to justice the murderers of our loved ones, colleagues, and friends. And together, we must vow to maintain warm relations between our two countries. Our friendship extends back for decades. Even before independence, the Kennedy airlift brought hundreds of Kenyans to the United States to receive a higher education. We have long been partners in supporting peace, stability, and freedom in East Africa, and we have developed strong and enduring people-to-people ties.

I know there is anguish about what happened in the aftermath of the bombings. And I cannot say we acted perfectly, but I believe that allegations of callousness are wrong. In the circumstances, amidst the horror, the fears, and the different jobs that had to be done, it is not surprising that there were misunderstandings. The U.S. Marines limited access not out of indifference but because they were afraid that the weakened building would collapse and trap new victims, in order to keep people away from the burning fuel tanks, and because they were concerned about the possibility of a second terrorist attack.

Meanwhile, there were many heroes. The people of Kenya may be proud of the efforts made with nothing more than muscles, bare hands, and the urgency of desperate caring to retrieve people from the rubble and save their lives. A number of foreign countries, especially the Israelis, earned our admiration and gratitude for all they did to help.

The United States, too, contributed much. We provided massive quantities of search-and-rescue equipment such as generators, hydraulic machines, and listening devices. An urban disaster support team from Virginia helped in the effort to find survivors and recover bodies, both from the embassy and from Ufundi House. We provided large amounts of medical supplies, and our military surgeons and paramedics have been hard at work in Kenyan hospitals.

But our efforts to rebuild from this tragedy are far from complete. They must and will continue. When our Congress returns to Washington early next month, the Administration will request substantial emergency funds to help Kenya and Tanzania recover. We want to work with the representatives of the people of Kenya and with the NGO community to identify and meet specific needs, such as medical care, assistance for the victims and their families, repairs to public infrastructure, and security improvements. We also want to reaffirm our commitment to helping the people of Kenya build a more prosperous and fully democratic society.

I know that some have said that the Kenyans who were killed would not have been killed if America had not been here in Nairobi. And that is probably true. But why are we here? The Americans and Kenyans who worked in our embassy and who were among the victims wanted nothing more nor less than to improve the quality of life for both our peoples. And that's why we have worked—and will continue to work—to broaden economic opportunities, strengthen civil society, promote sustainable development, fight disease, and safeguard the environment. These efforts reflect values and aspirations that Kenyans and Americans share—and no bombing can change that.

We are also very proud that the efforts of the United States are being carried out here by a most amazing ambassador, Ambassador Prudence Bushnell, and we are all incredibly proud of her and everything that she has done to maintain solidarity and to hold America's head up high. Pru, thank you very much.

I was very moved last week to read a story about a man who was pulled from the Ufundi Cooperative Building 36 hours after the bombing. He said he had survived because "the courage of the mind is greater than the body. I never gave up hope," he said. Those brave words remind us that the strategy of terror is based almost entirely on replacing hope with fear. It is a strategy of intimidation. It is designed to make us forget our aspirations, to hunker down and become passive, and turn against one another. I say there is more real strength in a single tear among the millions shed for the loved ones killed here than there can be in any terrorist act. We grieve because we care for each other, and that is also why we build—and why we have faith that if we work together, we can create a future far better than the past.

Let us choose as those who died here would have had us choose: to honor their memory by comforting their families, caring for the injured, rebuilding their society, and holding the guilty accountable. And to honor their example by redoubling our efforts to forge a future of greater freedom, security, and prosperity not just for some, but for all people. Thank you very much.

Tanzania

Remarks at the Deputy Chief of Mission's residence, Dar es Salaam.

It is a great pleasure for me to be spending some time with you and hearing about your extraordinary last 10 days and what an extraordinary job you have done in keeping everybody together. We are all very grateful to you.

President Clinton and I have spoken about you, Mr. Chargé, and everybody here. America is very proud of you, all of you—Americans and Tanzanians—and I am truly in the presence of heroes. Your bravery and compassion and courage have been recognized around the world. And the terrorists who would like to drive us apart have, in fact, brought us all closer. I certainly feel that way from just having a few discussions with your colleagues as you have described the last few days.

Together, we mourn the loved ones and the colleagues we have lost. Together, we pray for those who have been injured. And together, we vow to rebuild and maintain our commitment to warm relations between the United States and Tanzania—and between the United States and all of Africa. Together, we promise to bring to justice the murderers of our friends.

My personal message to you is that we will support you with money and people as you work to re-establish embassy operations. We are going to be asking Congress for emergency funds so that our facilities here are secure, and we will expedite payments to the families who have suffered irreparable loss. We have launched an appeal to our colleagues worldwide to contribute to the Department's emergency relief fund for foreign nationals, and we will continue to help the Tanzanian people.

This embassy has made an emergency declaration making relief funds available, and we have brought in large quantities of emergency aid. I brought in additional medical supplies today, and we hope that Congress will approve supplemental assistance when it returns to Washington in September.

Finally, I pledge to do all I can as Secretary of State to remind the American people of the importance of the work that you do day in and day out on their behalf—and to remind them as well of the hardships and dangers. You are America's best, and you who are Foreign Service nationals work side by side with us for a world that is more peaceful, prosperous, lawful, and free.

No piece of paper could possibly compensate you for the heartbreak and gut-wrenching efforts of the past 10 days. But I count it an honor, nevertheless, to present the State Department's Award for Heroism to the U.S. Mission at Dar es Salaam.

The citation reads, "In recognition of the heroism displayed by the mission staff in the wake of the bombing in Dar es Salaam on August 7, 1998, and in honor of your unselfish dedication to duty, your colleagues, and the people of Tanzania." (NOTE: A similar award was presented by the Secretary to the U.S. Mission in Nairobi.) ■

Secretary Albright

U.S.-Asia Pacific Relations: An Overview

July 30, 1998

*Address to the Australasia Centre of the Asia Society,
Sydney Opera House, Sydney, Australia.*

Thank you very much Foreign Minister Downer, Mr. Morgan, Ambassador Peacock, Ambassador Woolcott, and good afternoon to you all. I am very glad to be here and to be joined by America's Ambassador to Australia, Genta Hawkins Holmes, as well as by our Consul General in Sydney, Rich Greene.

I am very, very glad to be here and have the opportunity to address this august group in this magnificent hall. Before, Mr. Downer mentioned my singing. I haven't had a chance to sing in a place with acoustics such as this. Maybe I wouldn't have been described as someone who had to save their singing for the shower.

It is, indeed, a pleasure to also be in the Olympic City. I have never been to Australia before, but I am having a wonderful visit already and looking forward to my return for AUSMIN in the Olympic year. It was very clever of us to plan to have it here that year, and the reason I'm here this year is to make sure that I get tickets.

As some of you may know, before I became a diplomat, I was a university professor. And from time to time, I would ask my students to put aside the map of the world Americans customarily use, which has the Western Hemisphere at its center and leaves chunks of Asia and Australia divided and at opposite ends.

Instead, I would take a globe and spin it around 180 degrees, and I would ask my students to consider the world anew, from the perspective of Japan or China or the people of Oceania. And what was remarkable was how rarely they had been asked to do that, to shed their normal skins and think from a different point of view.

I mention that this afternoon because this society encourages a similar brand of unconventional thinking among the diverse peoples of the Asia-Pacific. And as we prepare for the 21st century, there is no work more important.

From the Aleutians to Auckland and from Sumatra to Seoul, technology is bringing populations from vastly different worlds into daily contact with one another. But contact does not ensure clear communication, much less understanding. To achieve that, we must work hard to see that the differences that distinguish and define us do not obscure the common interests and values that bind us.

Fortunately, when it comes to the Asia-Pacific region, there is no better example of cooperation built on shared values and interests than the relationship between the United States and Australia. On the map, we could hardly be further apart. But as defenders of freedom and advocates of the rule of law, we cannot be separated. For decades, we have stood shoulder to shoulder both in time of peace and through five wars.

Today, our alliance is an anchor of regional stability. We are vigorous trading partners. Our people visit each other, attend each other's schools, do business with each other, learn from each other, and collaborate on everything from eradicating disease to fighting terror.

Obviously, we don't always see eye to eye. In some economic sectors we're competitors as well as partners. Globally, our roles are not the same. Regionally, Australia's perspective is sharpened by its proximity to the Asian mainland. But on the big things—on the central issues of democratic government, the pursuit of prosperity, and the desire for peace—we are true allies, valued partners, and, I hope, eternal friends.

I look forward to reaffirming our alliance tomorrow when Secretary of Defense Cohen and I meet with Foreign Minister Downer and Defense Minister McLachlan. The AUSMIN reflects the indispensable nature of our cooperation and gives me confidence that everything that can be done to maintain the security and peace of this region will be done.

Earlier this week, Foreign Minister Downer and I both attended meetings of the ASEAN Regional Forum and Post-Ministerial Conference. There, the convergence of U.S. and Australian interests in Asia was evident.

For example, in the aftermath of the South Asia nuclear tests, we agree that the nuclear non-proliferation regime must be buttressed and its value reemphasized. Every effort must be made to reduce tensions and prevent a nuclear arms race in the region. And every nation in the world should agree, as the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty provides, never again to conduct a nuclear explosive test.

We concur on the importance of maintaining stability on the Korean Peninsula. Both our nations support the Agreed Framework under which North Korea has pledged to freeze and dismantle its nuclear weapons program. Australia understands how critical this effort is. It has done more to support the Korean Energy Development Organization—KEDO—than any nation apart from Japan, Korea, and the United States. I applaud your government's decision to contribute additional funds to KEDO, and I thank you for that.

Our countries both understand the strategic significance of China and the key role it will play in determining whether the Asia-Pacific remains stable. And we agree that China should be encouraged to define its interests in ways compatible with the stability and prosperity of its neighbors and to observe international norms on proliferation and human rights.

President Clinton's recent trip to China reflected progress toward both these goals. He conveyed a message of freedom and friendship directly to the Chinese people. He drew the connection between individual liberty and competitiveness in the global economy. And he stressed the importance of halting the spread of dangerous weapons and technologies.

I was encouraged by the recent trend toward greater openness in China. At the same time, I have been disturbed by the recent detention of religious and political activists, and I said so to Chinese Foreign Minister Tang when we met in Manila.

Engagement with China brings benefits to both our nations. But engagement is not the same thing as endorsement, and we should continue to speak frankly about the problems that remain.

The United States and Australia are both strong supporters of democracy in Cambodia. As we have seen again this past weekend, the Cambodian people desperately want to make democracy work. We hope that the balloting will produce an outcome that genuinely reflects their wishes. But we don't yet know if that has happened.

It is clear that twice now in less than a decade the Cambodian people have gone to elections in record numbers that I would only wish were emulated in other countries. We must also remember that the purpose of the election was not to make it easier for us to declare success in Cambodia and walk away, it was to give the Cambodian people a chance to start anew a democratic process that was arrested when the coalition government disintegrated last year. To encourage that process to continue, we must stay engaged, keep the pressure on, and make our assistance to any government conditional on its respect for international norms.

Our nations also agree that it is past time for Burma to rejoin the family of democratic nations, and here your Foreign Minister and I had another chance to work together in Manila. Regrettably, the Burmese regime is pursuing a policy not of dialogue but of denial. Today, Aung San Suu Kyi, who was marking her sixth day in a standoff, was all of a sudden taken in her car by a military driver back to Rangoon and thereby forbidden from exercising a basic human right, which is the ability to travel freely in your own country.

We have just heard this news, and Foreign Minister Downer and I have spoken about it. We think that this is an unacceptable violation of her human rights, and it will only contribute to the further isolation of Burma, a country whose people are suffering because the government is not moving in a way to have the kind of dialogue and democratic discourse that is necessary. Aung San Suu Kyi is a remarkable person and has fought for the freedom of the Burmese people. She is entitled to be able to go on doing that in a way that strengthens democracy.

Australia and the United States worked in Manila to do what we could to break the impasse, and we will continue to work together throughout this episode. All my experience in life and diplomacy tells me that our engagement can make a difference and that change must eventually come to Burma. Concerted international pressure can make it harder for the regime to resist reform. Diplomacy can offer it face-saving ways to compromise. Our nations should pursue both tracks and deepen our cooperation on this issue.

Finally, and perhaps most important, both our nations have an interest in seeing that confidence is restored to the troubled economies of East Asia. With today's global market, problems in one place can and do affect people every place. Nations that export to Asia—and both our nations export a great deal—are being hurt.

"We have an opportunity to lead in negotiating a bio-safety regime for genetically altered products that will respond to scientific concerns, while ensuring that agricultural exports do not become ensnared in unjustified regulations."

But the potential costs are far greater than lost exports. Misery can give rise to mistrust among nations; poverty can push desperate people across borders; economic despair can lead to disillusionment with economic and political freedom. And I applaud Australia for its contributions to IMF funding arrangements for Thailand, South Korea, and Indonesia.

The United States is also doing its share through support for the IMF and World Bank and through the direct assistance we are providing to meet emergency humanitarian needs. We're stressing the importance of reforms that will attract investors and lead to

more open and accountable management of economies in the region. We're also encouraging Japan to stimulate its economy so that it may once again become an engine of growth.

No nation has been hit harder by the financial crisis than Indonesia, traditionally a source of stability and growth within the region. The United States is determined, and I know Australia is, to help Indonesia meet the humanitarian needs of its people. We both hope Indonesia will emerge from this crisis not only as strong and prosperous as ever, but with the commitment to democracy it needs to stay strong and prosperous for good.

As friends and allies, the United States and Australia work together to resolve amicably the differences that arise in our own relationship. And we cooperate in regional efforts to build security, prosperity, and peace.

But in our era, that's not enough. Every nation, no matter

its size, location, or state of development, is vulnerable to global threats such as trafficking in drugs and human beings, the spread of AIDS, and terrorism. On each of these issues, cooperation between our nations and people is solid. We believe in law. And as the recent tragedy in Papua New Guinea demonstrated, we will reach out and help those in need.

Yesterday, I visited Papua New Guinea. It was tremendously moving to see how that nation is coping with the tragedy of the tidal wave and tremendously gratifying to be able to bring with me tangible expressions of American support for its people. I did hear again this morning, however, that there has been another earthquake in the region, and I think this obviously will only complicate the issues there.

One area of cooperation I want to highlight this afternoon is the environment, which is a multifaceted challenge. The United States and Australia are both vast countries with abundant resources, diverse wildlife, and spectacular coasts. This gives us a shared stake and a shared opportunity to work together in every part of the environmental area, where we were partners in developing the International Coral Reef Initiative. The Great Barrier Reef may be the world's leading example of why coral preservation matters and what strong leadership on this issue can achieve.

We can be allies in the effort to protect endangered species and to ensure that trade in products derived from nature is effectively and fairly controlled. We have an opportunity to lead in negotiating a bio-safety regime for genetically altered products that will respond to scientific concerns, while ensuring that agricultural exports do not become ensnared in unjustified regulations. We can join forces with others to take on the problem of deforestation, which is caused by poor land management, population pressures, and out of control forest fires.

The problem of fires was particularly acute last spring, when they exacted an enormous toll on the economies of nations and the health of people in many parts of this region. In response, the United States has earmarked \$4 million to help improve forest management, fire fighting, and climate prediction in Southeast Asia. But we need to do more and mobilize more international support to change the conditions that spark such devastation.

Both our nations have the resources and the expertise to promote sustainable agriculture and forest management, to encourage an end to the most dangerous burning practices, and to contribute to the resolution of disputes over land tenure. But perhaps the most comprehensive long-term environmental challenge facing us all is global climate change.

Leading scientists agree that greenhouse gases are warming our planet. A warming planet is a changing planet—and not for the better. Unless we act, sea levels will continue to rise throughout the next century, swamping some areas and putting millions of people at greater risk to coastal storms.

We can expect significant and sudden changes in agricultural production and forest ecosystems, leading to changing patterns of wildlife migration and forcing more people to leave home and cross borders in search of productive land. We will also see more heat-related deaths; more serious air pollution; increased allergic disorders; and more widespread malaria, cholera, and other infectious diseases.

Like most of you, I am not a scientist. I am also something of a skeptic. We all know of times past when prophets of doom were proven wrong; when predictions that we would soon run out of food, water, or air did not come true. So I am no Chicken Little. But I note that the scientific backing behind the current warming projections is the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, representing the work of more than 2,000 scientists from more than 50 countries. Their report is carefully worded, factually based, and it recognizes the uncertainties as well as the risks. Yet in both our nations, we have those who insist that the scientific warnings are wrong; or that, even if they are right, we can't afford to take the steps required to slow the release of greenhouse gases.

But the one thing we truly cannot afford to do is wait and see. For if the warnings are right, the cost of reversing climate change and cleaning up the damage will be infinitely greater than the cost of preventing it.

Our choice is clear. We can keep pumping more gases into the atmosphere every year, invite more severe climate change, and let future generations deal with the consequences. Or we can act prudently to protect our planet—our children's home.

Not without controversy or difficulty, both our nations have chosen the latter course. We are working for a comprehensive climate change agreement in which all nations contribute to a global solution to this global problem.

We took an essential step toward that goal last December in Kyoto. There, for the first time, industrialized nations agreed to mandatory targets for limiting greenhouse gas emissions. These targets vary from country to country, with the United States pledging to meet a standard of 7% below 1990 levels within the next 10-14 years.

As we prepare for the next Conference of the Parties to the Climate Change Convention this November, we will be working closely through the so-called "Umbrella Group," which includes among others the United States, Australia, Russia, and Japan. Our goal is to solve this problem in ways that stimulate technological innovation and allow maximum flexibility in achieving the necessary emissions reductions.

I have to say having just recently traveled with President Clinton to China, where it is clear that while the United States is the greatest problem now, China will be the greatest problem; a message that he is delivering is one that I think is key: Countries that are so-called developing countries are concerned about how putting in environmentally sound technology

will affect their development. And the President argues that no one has the right to tell another country to limit its development. But those that have gone through industrialization can validate the fact that often the economic situation in a country can be actually improved once environmentally sound technology is put in.

I believe, ultimately, and I am confident, that we can make our environment healthier and keep our economies competitive or even post economic gains through greater efficiency and the use of clean technology.

Our cooperation is also essential to solve the other half of the climate change puzzle, which is to create a global action plan to which both developed and developing nations contribute. This is critical if we want to make not just short-term headlines, but long-term improvements. For it is expected that, within two decades, the largest emitter of greenhouse gases will not be the United States, but China. And that, by 10 years after that, the developing world will have become the source of the majority of such emissions.

Industrialized nations created the global warming problem and must take the lead in responding. But clearly, no solution will work unless developing countries play a part in it.

Global warming may look like an insurmountable problem, and its potential economic effects can seem too large to confront. But in contemplating the challenge, we should recall the many times when naysayers predicted that protecting the environment would be too hard, too costly, and too cumbersome.

From America's waterways cleanup in the 1970s, to Australia's stewardship of the Great Barrier Reef, to the global effort to close the ozone hole, environmental preservation is working, and it is working in ways that keep our economies growing.

In the 18 months that I have had the honor to serve as America's Secretary of State, I have been to the Asia-Pacific region six times, South Asia once and, last November, to Asia's front door for the APEC meetings in Vancouver. This schedule reflects a simple reality. No region of the world is more important to American security and prosperity, or to the values we share with others, or to our effort to meet new global challenges.

"Industrialized nations created the global warming problem and must take the lead in responding. But clearly, no solution will work unless developing countries play a part in it."

Because of the financial crisis, these are not the best of times for the people of this region. But friendship, like a sailing ship, cannot be truly tested when the skies are clear and the weather fair. It is during the hard weather and high winds that we learn whether what we have designed is sound, what we have built is sturdy.

America's commitment to the peace and stability of this region and to the freedom and welfare of its people is not a fair-weather commitment; nor is it short lived. It is unshakable now, and it will endure.

That commitment is grounded in our own interests. It is consistent with enduring principles of democracy and law. It is made secure by alliance with our closest partners, such as Australia. And it is animated by our hopes for a future far better than the past.

Thank you very much for your attention here this afternoon and for your very kind welcome to beautiful Sydney. ■

David Marchick

The Importance of Agriculture To the United States

July 15, 1998

Remarks by the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Trade Policy and Programs, Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs, at the Global Agricultural Attache Conference, Washington, DC.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to address you today. I would like to begin by reading from a statement by a senior U.S. official on agricultural trade.

Our farmers are by far the world's most productive. They help feed the world. But they do so despite tariffs on U.S. products that in some cases are as high as 100%. They also confront many non-tariff barriers. In gaining access to this \$500 billion a year market, we want a level playing field for American agriculture.

You might question who said this. Secretary Glickman? Ambassador Barshefsky? Actually, it was the Secretary of State. I wanted to share Secretary Albright's statement with you to make a central point: The State Department—from the Secretary through officials in the economic and regional bureaus in Washington to every embassy in the world—is fully aware of the importance of agriculture to the United States. We are also fully aware of the importance of trade, and of agricultural trade in particular, to the health of the U.S. economy and the global economy. The Secretary regularly raises agricultural issues, along with other key trade issues, in her meetings with foreign officials. And as you are all aware, supporting agricultural exports is a central component of any ambassador's portfolio.

Under Secretary Eizenstat frequently reminds us that his title is Under Secretary for Economic, Business and Agricultural Affairs. Agricultural is not just an extra word in his title, but a responsibility he, and all of us on his staff, take seriously. Under his leadership, the State Department has undertaken an active and comprehensive outreach effort to representatives of the agricultural community to assure them that we welcome their input, that we take their concerns seriously, and that we are prepared to advocate strongly on behalf of U.S. agriculture with our foreign counterparts. We

have arranged meetings with several regional bureaus at the Assistant Secretary level and hosted meetings with several of our ambassadors, including Ambassador Griffin. In one example of this outreach effort, our new ambassador to Chile, John O'Leary, held a roundtable discussion just this morning with agricultural trade association officials to hear from them directly how the embassy can help advance agricultural trade with Chile.

Why this increased emphasis and greater attention to agriculture? It is an extension of one of the core principles guiding our priorities at the State Department: Economics plays a central role in pursuing our foreign policy objectives, and agriculture plays a central role in our economy. This Administration has made a commitment to bring foreign policy closer to the American people and to ensure that it represents the interests of the nation as a whole. That commitment surely includes the agricultural community.

Let me review a few statistics with which you may be familiar. The United States is the world's leading exporter of agricultural products, with a 21% share of world farm trade. U.S. farm exports reached record levels in 1996, exceeding \$60 billion, or about 10% of total goods exports. With a \$27 billion surplus, agriculture was the largest positive contributor to the 1996 U.S. trade balance. As you know, exports are vitally important to the economic well-being of our farmers and to our standard of living. Last year, exports accounted for over 30% of farm cash receipts; nearly 1 million jobs in the agricultural sector depend on exports.

While overall farm exports fell slightly, to about \$58 billion in 1997 due to the decline in grain prices, exports of high-value agricultural exports such as poultry and vegetables remained high. Agriculture turned in a \$22 billion trade surplus last year. And despite the Asian

financial crisis, which some estimate may cut about \$2 billion from our 1998 agricultural exports, the long-term prospects for continued growth in agricultural exports are good.

Secretary Glickman has rightly said that “exports are the ultimate safety net for U.S. agriculture.” In fact, it is clear that the future of U.S. agriculture lies in trade. America’s farmers are twice as reliant on foreign trade as the U.S. economy as a whole. The United States, in passing the major reforms of the Freedom to Farm Act, made the right choice that markets, not governments, should determine agricultural production and trade flows. Our farmers are already competing and winning in global markets. They know that while globalization presents some challenges, it presents more opportunities. We don’t want any special treatment; we demand a level playing field.

To take full advantage of these opportunities, further liberalization of global agricultural markets and progress in bringing agriculture more fully into the mainstream of the global, rules-based, trading regime is needed. Our farmers can compete on price and quality. But as you know, they face a daunting array of tariff and non-tariff barriers. Breaking down those barriers, through multilateral, regional, and bilateral negotiations and enforcement of existing agreements, is at the core of the Administration’s trade—and overall economic—agenda.

The next round of agricultural trade negotiations in the WTO, scheduled to begin next year, will begin where the Uruguay Round left off. Among our objectives for those negotiations are further substantial reductions in tariffs, significant expansion of market access commitments, drastic reduction or elimination of export subsidies, and the imposition of rigorous disciplines on state trading enterprises.

As the U.S. prepares for these negotiations, we must work together with industry to clarify our objectives, define our strategies, and encourage our trading partners to support our initiatives. All of the trade agencies will have to work together as a team to ensure the successful outcome of the negotiations. We will need strong analytic work by economists and trade specialists in Washington, as well as detailed reporting from agricultural and economic sections in our embassies to inform our own negotiating strategy. We will also have to call on agriculture and economic sections to make our case abroad.

In addition to preparations for the next round, we need to continue to ensure implementation of existing multilateral and bilateral

agreements, and in particular, to address the increasing use of non-tariff barriers to agricultural trade. While we have made progress, we still have numerous problems around the world, including unjustified sanitary and phytosanitary restrictions to our agricultural exports, technical barriers such as labeling requirements, and slow approvals for genetically modified products. In this area also, close cooperation and coordination among the trade agencies is vital if we are to succeed. We must ensure that the U.S. Government obtains accurate information, develops the best possible policies, and communicates effectively with industry and foreign governments.

Let me also say a few words about a topic that hits close to home for all farmers and ranchers—sanctions. Throughout the past year, Under Secretary Eizenstat has led an effort in the State Department to ensure that our sanctions policy is a rational one. With the Secretary’s support, Ambassador Eizenstat started a task force which brings together all parts of the State Department to ensure that all equities, including economic, are considered before a sanction is put in place. Simultaneously, we have been working with the Congress to foster a dialogue which we hope will produce a sanctions policy that makes sense for American interests.

Let me mention a few principles which we believe should guide our sanctions policy. Sanctions can be an effective tool, intermediate between diplomacy and the use of force. To be most effective, however, they should be multilateral. Multilateral sanctions not only demonstrate a seriousness of purpose throughout the world, they also distribute the economic burden across a number of countries. There are times when we still should act alone when we are unable to gain multilateral consensus, but these should be carefully considered. We should carefully analyze whether the sanctions will be effective in pursuing our objective and evaluate the costs the sanctions will impose on U.S. economic interests. Finally, sanctions should always give the President flexibility; without it, our policy will be all sticks and no carrots. A perfect example of this is the important non-proliferation law we are now implementing with regard to India and Pakistan.

Rightfully, the Glenn Amendment seeks to use U.S. influence to stop the spread of nuclear weapons. But in doing so, it inadvertently put at risk up to \$250 million in wheat exports facilitated by USDA’s GSM credit guarantee program. That’s why we supported the efforts by Senator Murray and others to amend the law to ensure that U.S. wheat will continue to flow.

As the President stated:

We need to make sure our sanctions policy furthers our foreign policy goals without hurting our farmers. We will resist any action that would lead to a de facto grain embargo.

Agricultural groups have been very vocal on sanctions issues, and I would encourage them to continue to voice their concerns. They should be assured, however, that we understand the implications of sanctions on their livelihood. We must continue to work together to ensure that their interests are heard loud and clear.

I'd also like to mention an area where trade and foreign policy agencies have been working very effectively to remove barriers to U.S. agricultural exports. Gaining approval of genetically modified organisms, or GMO products, in the European Union has been a very long process—and one that is far from over. We have both short- and long-term goals. In the short-term, it is critical that the two remaining GMO corn products in the U.S. export stream awaiting final marketing approval gain approval from the EU before this year's shipping season ends. Because the EU's approval process has been slow and unpredictable, we run the real risk of being shut out of the EU corn market entirely for this year. Simply put, this would be unacceptable.

Over the past year, U.S. Government officials from the White House, State, USDA, and USTR at all levels have raised this issue repeatedly with their European counterparts. The President, Secretaries Albright and Glickman, and Trade Representative Barshefsky have all written letters and raised this issue in meetings with their counterparts to stress the importance the U.S. places on this issue, and to highlight the very real negative consequences failure to resolve it could bring to our trade relationship. This pressure has helped move the process forward, though unfortunately, we can not yet claim victory.

In the longer term, we need to continue working with the EU to encourage an approval process which is predictable, transparent, timely, and based on science. We are hopeful that the new Transatlantic Economic Partnership just initiated between the U.S. and the EU will help us accomplish our longer term objective of streamlining the EU approval process for future varieties, as well as help us to resolve other long-standing differences with the EU in the agriculture sector.

Ensuring fair market access for our biotech agricultural products is a challenge facing us in many regions, not just in the EU. Our challenge will become increasingly urgent as the variety and volume of genetically modified products increases and a greater percentage of U.S. agricultural production contains GMOs.

Agriculture is rapidly becoming one of the best developed high-technology sectors in the United States. We must develop creative strategies, in partnership with industry, to ensure that our farmers are not penalized for their innovation and success with modern biotech production methods. The U.S. is committed to a science-based and transparent regulatory regime while maintaining the highest possible standards of food safety and environmental protection. We must hold our trading partners to their obligations to base regulation of GMOs and other agricultural products on sound science.

If it ever was true that the State Department could focus exclusively on "foreign policy" while other agencies focused on "trade policy," that time is long past. To accomplish our objectives we must work together, in Washington and in our embassies. I urge you to call on ambassadors as well as other officials at post to assist in resolving specific barriers encountered by American agricultural exporters, and communicating our agricultural trade objectives to foreign audiences. In reporting back to Washington, keep us as well as USTR and USDA informed of your accomplishments and challenges. Let us know when we can provide information or reinforce your own efforts by communicating with our counterparts here or abroad.

Let me conclude by making a personal observation based on close to 10 years of experience in the international trade field. I don't think there has ever been as high a focus on agricultural trade throughout the government. Between Gene Sperling, Lael Brainard, and Sally Katzen at the White House; Ambassadors Barshefsky and Scher at USTR; Secretary Albright, Ambassadors Eizenstat and Larson at State; and the dynamic trio of Secretary Glickman, Gus Schumacher, and Paul Drazek at USDA—the stars are aligned in terms of ensuring that agricultural issues remain a top priority throughout the Administration.

Those of you in agricultural affairs and agricultural trade offices overseas are in the front lines of our continuing effort to ensure a level playing field for American agriculture. On behalf of the Secretary and Under Secretary Eizenstat, I applaud your efforts and wish you the best of luck. ■



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. 21 UST 2517; TIAS 6997.

Ratification: El Salvador, Feb. 26, 1998.

Accession: Nepal, Mar. 4, 1998.

Pollution—Ships

1996 amendments to the international code for the construction and equipment of ships carrying dangerous chemicals in bulk (IBC Code) of the international convention for the prevention of pollution from ships, 1973, as modified by the protocol of 1978. Adopted at London July 10, 1996. Entered into force July 1, 1998.

1996 amendments to the code for the construction and equipment of ships carrying dangerous chemicals in bulk (BCH Code) of the protocol of 1978 relating to the international convention for the prevention of pollution from ships, 1973. Adopted at London July 10, 1996. Entered into force July 1, 1998.

1996 amendments to the annex to the protocol relating to intervention on the high seas in cases of pollution by substances other than oil, 1973 (TIAS 10561). Adopted at London July 10, 1996. Entered into force Dec. 16, 1997.

Prisoner Transfer

Convention on the transfer of sentenced persons. Done at Strasbourg Mar. 21, 1983. Entered into force July 1, 1985.

Signature: Albania, May 19, 1998.

Safety at Sea

Amendments to the international code for the construction and equipment of ships carrying liquefied gases in bulk (IGC Code) of the international convention for the safety of life at sea, 1974, as amended. Adopted at London May 23, 1994. Entered into force July 1, 1998.

Amendments to the international convention for the safety of life at sea, 1974, as amended. Adopted at London May 23, 1994. Entered into force July 1, 1998.

Amendments to the international convention for the safety of life at sea, 1974, as amended. Adopted at London May 24, 1994. Entered into force July 1, 1998.

Amendments to the international code for the construction and equipment of ships carrying dangerous chemicals in bulk (IBC Code) of the international convention for the safety of life at sea, 1974, as amended. Adopted at London June 4, 1996. Entered into force July 1, 1998.

Amendments to the guidelines on the enhanced program of inspections during surveys of bulk carriers and oil tankers of the international convention for the safety of life at sea, 1974, as amended. Adopted at London June 4, 1996. Entered into force July 1, 1998.

Amendments to the international convention for the safety of life at sea, 1974, as amended. Adopted at London June 4, 1996. Entered into force July 1, 1998.

International Life-Saving Appliance (LSA) Code of the international convention for the safety of life at sea, 1974, as amended. Adopted at London June 4, 1996. Entered into force July 1, 1998.

Terrorism

International convention against the taking of hostages. Adopted by the UN General Assembly Dec. 17, 1979. Entered into force June 3, 1983; for the U.S. Jan. 6, 1985. TIAS 11081

Succession: Macedonia, Mar. 12, 1998.

Accession: Mauritania, Mar. 13, 1998.

BILATERAL

Belgium

Memorandum of agreement concerning assistance in developing and modernizing Belgium's civil aviation infrastructure. Signed at Washington and Brussels June 19 and July 30, 1998. Entered into force July 30, 1998.

Bulgaria

Agreement concerning economic, technical, and related assistance. Signed at Sofia July 27, 1998. Enters into force upon the first day of the first month after the exchange of diplomatic notes confirming that parties have completed their respective requirements.

Cameroon

Agreement regarding the consolidation, reduction, and rescheduling of certain debts owed to, guaranteed by, or insured by the United States Government and its agencies, with annexes. Signed at Yaounde July 29, 1998. Enters into force upon receipt by Cameroon of written notice from the U.S. that all necessary domestic legal requirements for entry into force have been fulfilled.

China

Agreement concerning the United States [Peace Corps] volunteer program in China. Signed at Beijing June 29, 1998. Entered into force June 29, 1998.

Agreement on cooperation concerning peaceful uses of nuclear technologies, with annex. Signed at Beijing June 29, 1998. Entered into force June 29, 1998.

Germany

Arrangement relating to the status of troop care enterprises and their employees under Art. 72, para. 4 of the Supplementary Agreement of Aug. 3, 1959 to the NATO Status of Forces Agreement, with related letters. Effected by exchange of notes at Bonn Mar. 27, 1998. Entered into force Mar. 27, 1998.

Arrangement regarding the application of Article 73 of the Supplementary Agreement of Aug. 3, 1959 to the NATO Status of Forces Agreement, with related letters. Effected by exchange of notes at Bonn Mar. 27, 1998. Entered into force Mar. 27, 1998.

Hungary

Agreement extending the annex to the air transport agreement of July 12, 1989, as extended. Effected by exchange of notes at Washington Apr. 27 and June 18, 1998. Entered into force June 18, 1998.

Japan

Agreement concerning cooperation on the Mars Exploration PLANET-B Program, with memorandum of understanding. Effected by exchange of notes at Washington June 29, 1998. Entered into force June 29, 1998.

Korea

Air transport agreement, with annexes. Signed at Washington June 9, 1998. Entered into force June 9, 1998.

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

Mexico

Memorandum of understanding on cooperation in the identification, conservation, management, and research in cultural heritage sites. Signed at Washington June 10, 1998. Entered into force June 10, 1998.

Memorandum of understanding concerning biodiversity conservation cooperation particularly in forest resources. Signed at Washington June 10, 1998. Entered into force June 10, 1998.

Mozambique

Agreement relating to the employment of dependents of official government employees. Effected by exchange of notes at Washington June 29 and July 14, 1998. Entered into force July 14, 1998.

Netherlands

Agreement relating to air transportation between the United States and Aruba, with annexes. Signed at Washington Sept. 19, 1997. Entered into force June 11, 1998.

Norway

Basic exchange and cooperative agreement concerning geospatial information and services cooperation. Signed at Oslo July 8, 1998. Entered into force July 8, 1998.

Slovenia

Agreement relating to the employment of dependents of official government employees. Effected by exchange of notes at Ljubljana Apr. 30 and May 8, 1998. Entered into force June 10, 1998.

Sri Lanka

Agreement amending the agreement of Aug. 29, 1964, for financing certain educational exchange programs. Effected by exchange of notes at Colombo June 23 and Aug. 13, 1998. Entered into force Aug. 13, 1998.

Switzerland

Agreement for cooperation concerning peaceful uses of atomic energy, with agreed minute and annexes. Signed at Bern Oct. 31, 1997. Entered into force June 23, 1998. [House Document 105-184, 105th Cong., 2nd Sess.]

United Kingdom

Memorandum of understanding concerning cooperation in the development, production, and follow-on support of an Armored Scout and Reconnaissance Vehicle (ASRV) system, with annexes. Signed at Washington and Bristol Feb. 26 and July 7, 1998. Entered into force July 7, 1998.

United Nations

Agreement extending the agreement of Oct. 18, 1994, as amended and extended, for the contribution of personnel to the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. Effected by exchange of letters at New York June 29, 1998. Entered into force June 29, 1998.

Venezuela

Memorandum of agreement concerning assistance in developing and modernizing Venezuela's civil aviation infrastructure. Signed at Washington June 29, 1998. Entered into force June 29, 1998.

Yemen

Agreement regarding consolidation and rescheduling of certain debts owed to, guaranteed by, or insured by the United States Government and its agency, with annexes. Signed at Sanaa May 19, 1998. Entered into force Aug. 10, 1998. ■