

Secretary Albright

Building a Framework for American Leadership in the 21st Century

February 11, 1997

Statement before the House International Relations Committee, Washington, DC.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: It is an honor and a pleasure to testify before you for the first time as Secretary of State. As Ambassador to the UN, I benefited greatly from our constructive dialogue over the past four years. I look forward now to continuing our relationship with the same candor and commitment—and to working with you on an even broader array of challenges facing our nation and the world.

Mr. Chairman, more than seven years have passed since the fall of the Berlin Wall and five years since the demise of the Soviet Union. Today, America is secure, our economy vibrant, and our ideals ascendant. Across the globe, the movement toward open societies and open markets is wider and deeper than ever before. Democracy's triumph is neither accidental nor irreversible; it is the result of sustained American leadership. It would not have been possible without the power of our example, the strength of our military, or the constancy and creativity of our diplomacy. That is the central lesson of the 20th century, and this lesson must continue to guide us if we are to safeguard our interests as we enter the 21st.

Make no mistake: The interests served by American foreign policy are not the abstract inventions of State Department planners; they are the concrete realities of our daily lives. Think about it. Would the American people be as secure if weapons of mass destruction, instead of being controlled, fell into the wrong hands? That is precisely what would have happened if the Administration and Congress had not acted to ensure the dismantling of Iraq's nuclear weapons program, the freezing of North Korea's, and the securing of Russia's.

Would we be as safe if small conflicts, instead of being contained early, spread across entire regions? That is what would have happened had we not devised a formula for ending the war in Bosnia and had we not persisted in our search for a comprehensive Middle East peace.

Or would we be as prosperous if the global economy, instead of becoming more open to our trade and investment, had caved in and closed up behind protectionist walls? That is what would have happened had we not pushed hard to achieve NAFTA and the GATT Uruguay Round agreements—and to expand trade through our hemisphere and across the Pacific.

The great divide in the world today is not between East and West or North and South; it is between those who are the prisoners of history and those determined to shape history. That is not only a statement of fact; it is a stark choice for us to make. Mr. Chairman, that is the same choice America faced 50 years ago in the aftermath of World War II. It was not self-evident then that we would make the right choice. We were tired of war, and we were just a few years removed from the Great Depression. But fortunately for our generation, President Truman, Secretary Marshall, and Senator Vandenberg and other leading Members of Congress from both parties were determined that America should lead rather than withdraw. In a bipartisan manner and together with our allies, they forged a set of institutions that have for a half-century successfully defended freedom, rebuilt economies, upheld law, and prevented war.

Since the end of the Cold War, we have chosen a similar course. We have begun to build a new framework of American leadership appropriate to the challenges of a new century. In so doing, we are required to address not a single overriding threat such as Soviet communism but rather a variety of perils—some as old as ethnic strife, some as deadly as terrorist bombs, some as pervasive as illegal drugs, and some as new as global warming.

To respond effectively to diverse threats, we require a full range of foreign policy tools. That is why we need to retain a military that is versatile, mobile, ready, and strong—and as President Clinton has pledged, we will. But force, being a blunt instrument and one with

sometimes extreme consequences, cannot solve all our problems. There will be many occasions, in many places, where we will rely on diplomacy to protect our interests, and we will expect our diplomats to defend those interests with skill, knowledge, and spine.

Mr. Chairman, while our military is the ultimate guarantor of our freedom, our diplomats are our first line of defense. One of my most important tasks as Secretary of State will be to work with you and your colleagues in Congress to maintain the superb diplomatic representation that our people deserve and our interests demand. As I said in my confirmation hearing, we cannot have world-class diplomacy on the cheap. We must invest the resources

required for American leadership.

In recent years, these resources have dwindled. During the last four years, the State Department has cut more than 2,000 employees, closed more than 30 embassies and consulates, and deferred the badly needed modernization of infrastructure and communications. We have deeply reduced our foreign assistance programs, and we now contribute a smaller percentage of our national income to growth and democracy in the developing world than any other industrialized nation. We are the largest debtor to the United Nations and the international financial institutions.

Our spending on international affairs constitutes barely 1% of the federal budget. If this small amount were to be cut further, it is our influence in the world, not the deficit, that would decline. In his State of the Union address last week, President Clinton said, "If America is to continue to lead the world, we here who lead America simply must find the will to pay our way."

The FY 1998 budget that the President has submitted to Congress seeks to restore our diplomatic readiness, including a modest increase in the funding of State Department operations. In my view, the entire \$19.45 billion requested for international affairs is required to sustain American leadership. I ask your support for this budget. In so doing, I pledge my own best efforts, and I am determined to work closely with you to guarantee that the American people receive full value for every dollar spent on our diplomacy.

"Our spending on international affairs constitutes barely 1% of the federal budget. If this small amount were to be cut further, it is our influence in the world, not the deficit, that would decline."

Mr. Chairman, I want to review with you today our developing framework for continued American leadership in the world and to highlight parts of our budget that will support it. This framework includes measures to control weapons of mass destruction, to prevent or settle dangerous regional conflicts, to maintain the United States as the hub of an expanding global economy, and to promote fundamental principles of democracy and respect for the rule of law. But we will not achieve these goals unless we are also able to reinforce our alliances and manage well our key bilateral relationships.

Leadership With Key Partners

Our relations with the world's major powers help bind together not only American diplomacy but the entire international system. By acting together, the leading nations are able to elevate overall standards of international behavior, spur economic and social progress, and strengthen the rule of law.

On Saturday, I will begin a visit to a number of key capitals in Europe and Asia. My purpose will be to establish or renew my personal acquaintance with leaders there and to discuss the range of pressing issues before us. My goal is not to reach new agreements but to exchange views and to lay a strong foundation for enhanced cooperation, especially in the year just ahead.

If the fundamental lesson of this century is, indeed, that America must lead, one of its major corollaries is that we must remain a European power. We have an interest in Europe's security, because since the founding of our Republic we have known that the Atlantic Ocean is not an impregnable barrier for our defense. We have an interest in Europe's prosperity, because our own prosperity has always depended greatly on our transatlantic trade and investment. And we have an interest in Europe's freedom, because it was the triumph of democracy there that ended the Cold War.

Today, American leadership in Europe is on solid ground. America led the way in revitalizing NATO, ending the carnage in Bosnia, mobilizing support for Russian democracy, and upholding the independence of Europe's new democratic nations. Now we are on the verge of realizing one of the most elusive dreams of this century—an integrated, stable, and democratic Europe. To fully reach our goal, we have three challenges to meet:

- We must create a new and larger NATO, while promoting the integration of all of the continent's new democracies;

- We must build close and constructive partnerships with Russia and Ukraine; and
- We must promote democracy, maintain stability, and defuse tensions throughout southeastern Europe—and particularly in the former Yugoslavia.

In 1994, President Clinton proposed and our allies embraced a program to adapt NATO to meet new challenges. These efforts will reach a new milestone at this July's NATO summit in Madrid. At the summit, the alliance will invite several nations to begin negotiations to join NATO and will approve important changes in NATO's internal structure. The negotiations leading to the NATO summit will be among the most ambitious and complex in the history of the alliance. In the coming months, Mr. Chairman, Administration officials will be making the case to the Congress and the American people why the new, larger NATO will advance our vital interests.

At its core, that case is this: Fifty years ago, the birth of NATO united new democracies, vanquished old hatreds, boosted economic reconstruction, and prevented future conflicts. What NATO did then for Europe's west, it can do now for Europe's east—the region where this century's two global hot wars and the Cold War began. The process of enlargement has already encouraged the settlement of historic disputes between Hungary and Romania, Germany and the Czech Republic, and Poland and Ukraine. In the future, it can increase our confidence that there will be no more Bosnias, that the democratic revolutions of 1989 will endure, and that the Cold War-style division of Europe will not reopen in some new and dangerous form.

That is what we are trying to achieve. Just as important is what we are trying to avoid. For there are only two real alternatives to enlargement. We could replace the alliance with a lowest-common-denominator NATO that includes everyone and imposes obligations on no one. That would devalue and degrade NATO. Or we could delay enlargement indefinitely, freezing NATO's membership along its Cold War frontier. That would create not only a permanent injustice but also a permanent source of tension and insecurity in the heart of Europe.

Of course, as we move forward, we must make sure no new lines are drawn across Europe. That is why we are strengthening NATO's Partnership for Peace and why our financial support for the Partnership is vital. It is why we support the expansion of the EU and the courageous work the OSCE has done from Chechnya to Bosnia. It is also why funding under the SEED Act remains critical. Our

assistance has helped nations from Estonia to the Czech Republic establish thriving democracies and thereby graduate from our program. But aid is still desperately needed in struggling democracies like Bulgaria and Romania.

One of the President's top budget priorities is the Partnership for Freedom initiative, which will open a new phase in our assistance to Russia and the other New Independent States. The first phase was devoted to establishing the basic institutions of democracy and a market economy. On the whole, this assistance has been enormously successful—especially in promoting private ownership, free elections, and civil society. Our efforts will now focus on boosting trade and investment, thereby unleashing the potential for long-term growth that is central to the transformation of these societies.

Mr. Chairman, Russia and many of its neighbors are making choices today that will have monumental consequences for our security and the cause of human freedom. At stake is this: Will they emerge as normal democracies with growing market economies that are fully part of the European mainstream? Or will they become poor and isolated nations, plagued by instability, corruption, and crime? These are not choices we can make. But we can choose to help those in each society who are determined to make the right choice.

Certainly, our interests are clear: A strong and permanent democratic process in Russia and the other New Independent States will enhance our security, aid in the fight against proliferation, help combat international crime, provide new economic opportunities, and create a climate of lasting stability in a region as vital to our future as it has been central to our past.

We understand that Russia opposes the enlargement of NATO, and we do not expect that to change. We must address Russia's legitimate concerns, but it is not in our interest to delay or derail a process that is helping to build a reunited Europe. In any case, the decisions NATO makes in Brussels and in our allied capitals are not going to determine the fate of Russia's democracy. That will depend on the ability of Russia's leaders to meet the real needs of their people and to speed Russia's economic recovery and revival.

What NATO can do and what it wants to do is to make Russia our full partner in building a united and peaceful Europe. NATO has proposed a formal charter to Russia that will

“What NATO did then [50 years ago] for Europe's west, it can do now for Europe's east—the region where this century's two global hot wars and the Cold War began.”

allow us to cooperate, consult, train, and respond to crises together. We have made steady progress toward this goal, which will be a major subject of my discussions in Europe.

The success of Ukraine's new democracy is also fundamental to Europe's future. Of the New Independent States, Ukraine was the first to experience a transfer of power between two democratically elected governments. More recently, President Kuchma has launched a bold program of reform that has reduced inflation and prevented an economic collapse. Our relations with Ukraine are based on a solid foundation of shared interests, including the achievement of a more secure and integrated Europe. As with Russia, we have established a binational commission, chaired on our side by Vice President Gore, to set the agenda for cooperation on a wide range of important issues.

Today, the greatest test of Europe's capacity to act together on behalf of European security is in Bosnia, where NATO and non-NATO nations alike are implementing the Dayton accords. IFOR carried out its military mission in Bosnia brilliantly, but more time is needed for political reconciliation and economic reconstruction. SFOR will give Bosnia the opportunity to make its new peace self-sustaining. Our strategy is to continue diminishing the need for an international military presence by establishing a stable military balance, improving judicial and legal institutions, helping more people return safely to their homes, and seeing that more of those indicted as war criminals are arrested and prosecuted.

In Bosnia, the immediate task is to determine the status of Brcko and the date of municipal elections—both of which are critical milestones in completing the implementation of the Dayton accords. Beyond Bosnia, we will continue to make clear that the nations of the former Yugoslavia can rejoin Europe only as free and open societies.

For the past 13 months, almost every nation in Europe has worked together to bring hope to the continent's most fragile region. Our challenge is to extend this spirit of cooperation to all the ties that bind our New Atlantic Community.

Mr. Chairman, while this century has taught us that America's vital interests are intertwined with those of Europe, it has also shown that our security and prosperity hinge equally on events in Asia. Indeed, since the turn of the century, the United States has been a Pacific power. Three times in the last six decades, we have fought wars in Asia. Since World War II, we have been actively engaged in the Asia-Pacific, and in recent years our leadership has contributed to the emergence of

many of the world's most dynamic economies. Moreover, from South Korea to the Philippines, and from Mongolia to Thailand and Taiwan, there has been a steady advance of democracy, human rights, and the rule of law—developments that highlight the universal aspiration for freedom.

President Clinton has given new prominence to Asia in our foreign policy. Together with our partners, we have begun building an Asia-Pacific community:

- We are opening markets for American goods, services, and capital—both bilaterally and through APEC;
- We are strengthening our core alliances and maintaining our forward deployment of 100,000 troops in the western Pacific;
- We are supporting new multilateral security dialogues such as the ASEAN Regional Forum; and
- We are continuing to support new democracies and to stress the importance of respect for human rights.

Our alliance with a democratic and prosperous Japan is one of the great successes of the post-war era. Today, our two nations cooperate on a host of bilateral, regional, and global issues. We have fortified our military ties through last year's Security Declaration, and we have brought greater balance to our economic relationship through an unprecedented 22 trade agreements negotiated since 1993. By means of our ambitious Common Agenda, we are addressing complex global issues such as AIDS, pollution, and unsustainable population growth. And together we are supporting democracy in Haiti and Russia and peace in Bosnia and the Middle East.

We are cooperating with Japan and another valued ally, the Republic of Korea, to implement the Agreed Framework freezing North Korea's development of nuclear arms. In recent weeks, we have worked closely with the South Korean Government to reduce tensions with the North and to regain momentum in the peace process. I ask for your support of our FY 1998 funding of KEDO, which will be critical to sustaining this renewed momentum. The United States is currently the largest contributor to KEDO. But in the future, Japan and the Republic of Korea will eclipse us by far as they pay for the construction of two light-water reactors in North Korea. We will also continue to press the proposal made by Presidents Clinton and Kim for Four-Party talks on achieving permanent peace on the peninsula.

China's emergence as a world power and the evolution of its relations with other nations will do much to determine the history of our era. That is why we must continue to expand our ties and why we are encouraging China's active and responsible participation in the international community. Our two nations share many common interests and have already cooperated on many issues, including the Korean Peninsula, international crime, nuclear testing, and the global environment. At the same time, we have had significant differences on trade, arms transfers, and human rights.

We have important interests in Hong Kong, our 13th-largest trading partner. China will soon regain sovereignty over Hong Kong, but Hong Kong will not cut its ties to our nation and the world. We look to China to live up to the letter and spirit of its accord with the United Kingdom on the reversion of Hong Kong. In that agreement, China pledged to maintain Hong Kong's open economy, democratic government, distinct legal system, and civil liberties. By honoring its pledge, China will not only help assure Hong Kong's future, it will also enhance the P.R.C.'s standing and contribute to its own growing prosperity. I look forward to discussing this issue during my upcoming visit to Beijing and other capitals.

While our interests demand that we maintain strong relations with Europe and Asia, we are first and foremost a nation of the Americas. Never before has the Western Hemisphere been more free or more prosperous. And never before have our relationships with our Latin American and Caribbean neighbors been so strong. When the hemisphere's democratic trend was threatened in Haiti, it was our decisive action that restored legitimate government. And when free markets were threatened by the financial crisis in Mexico, it took our leadership to restore confidence.

Mexico's repayment of our loan three years ahead of schedule has vindicated President Clinton's bold decision and given confidence in our neighbor's ability to take tough but necessary actions. We are continuing to encourage further political and economic reform in Mexico, with which we share a 2,000-mile border and many common interests, including the combating of crime, narcotics, illegal migration, and damage to the environment. The President and I will also continue to press our allies and friends to join with us in isolating Cuba's dictatorship. In South America, the strength of our relations with Argentina, Brazil, and Chile was demonstrated when our four nations cooperated to end the border violence between Ecuador and Peru in early 1995. Across the hemisphere, we must continue to

foster the spirit of cooperation that we forged at the historic Summit of the Americas in Miami two years ago.

Leadership to Control Deadly Arms

Mr. Chairman, with American leadership, the world has made important progress in controlling nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction. The hands of the doomsday clock, once so close to midnight, have retreated. For the first time since the beginning of the nuclear age, no Russian missiles are pointed at the United States, and no American missiles are pointed at Russia. Nuclear weapons have been removed from Belarus, Kazakstan, and Ukraine. Iraq's nuclear capability has been dismantled and North Korea's frozen. The nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty has been extended indefinitely and unconditionally, and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty has been approved.

Despite these advances, the threat is far from over. That is why arms control and non-proliferation remain a fundamental part of our foreign policy framework, and why our continued support of ACDA and the IAEA remains an important part of our budget.

Our most immediate arms control imperative is to ratify the Chemical Weapons Convention, or CWC, before it enters into force in late April. As you know, the CWC was negotiated by the Reagan and Bush administrations, and signed in January 1993 by Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger. It enjoys wide support among our two parties, military leaders, and the business community. Like any arms control agreement, the CWC is not a panacea. But it will be a powerful tool in preventing those hostile to our interests from developing or obtaining chemical weapons. Approval of the Convention would make all our people safer, while making it less likely that our armed forces will encounter chemical weapons on the battlefield.

We have several other priorities as well. We will seek the swift approval of the CFE Flank Agreement, which will fortify the CFE Treaty and thereby enhance European security. We will be working with Russia to secure the Duma's early ratification of the START II Treaty and then begin negotiations for further reductions in our nuclear arsenals. And we will continue our pursuit of a global agreement to ban the use, stockpiling, production, and transfer of anti-personnel landmines.

"The hands of the doomsday clock, once so close to midnight, have retreated. For the first time since the beginning of the nuclear age, no Russian missiles are pointed at the United States, and no American missiles are pointed at Russia."

Finally, we are taking important measures in addition to the CWC that are designed to prevent weapons of mass destruction from being obtained by those who might be tempted to use them. We are working to improve the security and prevent the diversion of fissile materials. We have convinced the other 32 major arms suppliers in the Wassenaar Arrangement not to trade in arms or sensitive technologies with Iran and other countries who have a proven disregard for international standards. And we are insisting on the maintenance of tough sanctions on Iraq unless and until it complies with relevant Security Council resolutions.

Leadership in Support of Peace

Mr. Chairman, because of America's unique capabilities and unmatched power, the world often looks to us to help end conflicts and respond to crises. Yet our primary obligation is to protect our own citizens. We have limited resources and broad—but still limited—interests. To maintain our credibility and avoid quagmires, we must be careful in our commitments and selective in our actions.

Nevertheless, we recognize that occasions will arise when our interests and those of our allies require an active American role. We also understand that small conflicts may, if left unattended, grow into large ones that will create dangers for us that could have been avoided. Accordingly, during the past four years, President Clinton and Secretary Christopher have been steadfast in supporting peace in those regions of the world where our interests are engaged. We recognize that while we cannot impose solutions, we can make it easier for the champions of peace to take the risks required to achieve it.

In the Middle East, last month's agreement on the redeployment of Israeli forces in Hebron was an extraordinary success for U.S. diplomacy. The intensive negotiations helped to create new confidence and trust between the Israelis and Palestinians. The agreement not only provides a road map for the future of their relations, it restores momentum to the overall peace process.

I congratulate Prime Minister Netanyahu and Chairman Arafat for their courage in personally concluding the accord, and I thank King Hussein for his important role in helping to bring the long talks to a successful end. Former Secretary Christopher and special coordinator Dennis Ross and his team deserve great credit for their tremendous effort not only on the Hebron agreement but throughout the past four years. You may be assured that I will

maintain fully America's commitment to an active U.S. role in this region of vital importance to our interests.

To maintain the momentum produced by the Hebron agreement, we have a three-part agenda. First, we will support continued progress between the Israelis and Palestinians. Second, we will search for ways to stimulate the negotiations between Israel and Syria and between Israel and Lebanon. And third, we will encourage other Arab states to expand their ties with Israel. To support all these efforts, we must preserve our current levels of bilateral assistance to Israel, Egypt, Jordan, the West Bank and Gaza, and Lebanon.

As you know, Prime Minister Netanyahu and Chairman Arafat will visit Washington shortly, and President Mubarak and King Hussein will come next month. Under President Clinton's leadership, we will persevere in our quest for a secure, comprehensive, and lasting peace between Israel and her Arab neighbors. In all our efforts, we will be guided by America's unwavering commitment to Israel's security and by our equally strong opposition to those who would use violence and terror to deter the advent of peace.

In Cyprus, the long-standing conflict between the Turkish and Greek communities remains unresolved. Last year's increased violence on the island impeded efforts to restart negotiations, but it also dramatized the urgent need for a lasting solution. The dispute, of course, divides more than the two Cypriot communities; it continues to act as a wedge between two NATO allies—Turkey and Greece. In so doing, it threatens European stability and our vital interests. Accordingly, the United States is prepared to play a larger role in promoting a resolution to the conflict. But for such an effort to yield results, the parties must agree to concrete steps that will reduce tensions, build confidence, and make productive negotiations possible.

In Northern Ireland, we are encouraged that multi-party talks began last June, but we are disappointed by their lack of progress. Still, we recognize the historic significance of gathering the representatives of the nationalist and unionist communities as well as of the British and Irish Governments around one table. Meanwhile, we deplore the IRA's return to violence, and we support the decision to bar Sinn Fein from the talks until the IRA restores an unequivocal and lasting cease-fire. I applaud Senator Mitchell and his Canadian and Finnish colleagues for their determined leadership of the negotiations. We will certainly work hard for a breakthrough in the coming months.

In Central Africa, we are cooperating with regional leaders and our allies to prevent further tragedy in this area already so devastated by genocide, refugees, and war. In Rwanda, most of the refugees have returned home, but we will continue to do our part in providing emergency assistance until the remaining refugees have been reintegrated. In Burundi, we are urging the government and the rebels to declare a cease-fire and begin serious talks on national reconciliation. And in Zaire, we are deeply concerned by recent signs that heavy fighting will resume in the eastern part of the country. We maintain support for a resolution of the conflict based on recognition of Zaire's territorial integrity and full respect of human rights.

Given Central Africa's continuing crisis, we will give priority to our proposal for the African Crisis Response Force. The ACRF would give Africa a standing force for carrying out peacekeeping missions. The international community would supply the training and equipment, but African nations would themselves supply the soldiers and the military leaders.

In Africa generally, the prospects for democracy and economic growth are improving. Many of Africa's new democratic governments are facilitating growth through policies that allow private enterprise to take hold, while investing public resources wisely in education, health, and measures that expand opportunities for women. We will work with Africa's democratic leaders to broaden and deepen these trends. But daunting problems of debt, conflict, environmental stress, and inadequate investment remain. It is in our interest to help Africa's leaders overcome these problems and to build a continent that is more prosperous, democratic, and stable. We will foster the integration of Africa into the global economy and help deserving countries, where we can, through targeted programs of bilateral aid.

In Africa and elsewhere, the United States will continue to promote sustainable development and to provide humanitarian and refugee assistance when crises occur. But our limited resources create a powerful incentive for us to strengthen other mechanisms for responding to emergencies and conflicts, including the peacekeeping, development, and humanitarian activities of the United Nations. The President is requesting \$100 million this year and a \$921 million advance appropriation, to be made available next year, to pay our arrears to the UN and other international organizations. Our goal is to ensure continued American leadership within these organizations and to work with other member states, in consultation with Congress, toward further UN reform.

Mr. Chairman, this is an area where it is absolutely imperative that we establish common ground. American leadership at the UN matters. For four years, I had the privilege of sitting in the Security Council, behind a sign that read simply "the United States," defending American interests. During that time, we maintained sanctions on Libya and Iraq. We argued for a balanced approach to the Middle East. We condemned the Cuban shootdown of unarmed aircraft. We authorized peacekeeping missions that have worked well in Angola, Haiti, Eastern Slavonia, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and elsewhere. We established a war crimes tribunal and are engaged in diplomacy to prevent a recurrence of genocide in Central Africa.

In the General Assembly and other UN bodies, and in its specialized agencies, a great deal of the world's business is conducted: Compliance with nuclear safeguards is verified; efforts to end the exploitation of children are pursued; refugees are cared for; epidemic disease is contained; and standards are established that allow American companies to export billions of dollars in goods. This is but a sample. We have an enormous stake in this system—a system that Americans did more than any other nation to create.

Now, we are at a critical point. We are \$1 billion behind in paying our assessments, which are required under rules to which our nation long ago voluntarily agreed. We have a broad agenda for reform that, if approved, would go far to prepare these organizations for the 21st century. We have a new Secretary General who has made it clear that he supports reform but that he also believes—as our nation has always believed—that obligations should be met.

In the days ahead, I want to work with you to find a way to implement the President's plan: Our continued leadership at the UN depends upon it; our principles require it; our budget allows it; and our interests demand it.

Make no mistake. To those who are jealous or hostile to American leadership, these arrears are an open invitation to run America down. We need to put this issue behind us and move forward with a better set of international organizations led by a strong and respected United States.

"The President is requesting \$100 million this year and a \$921 million advance appropriation, to be made available next year, to pay our arrears to the UN and other international organizations."

Leadership for a Global Economy

Mr. Chairman, shortly after President Clinton took office in 1993, he declared that “we must compete, not retreat.” Since then, his leadership has produced spectacular success in creating jobs for Americans at home by opening markets abroad. We have signed more than 200 trade agreements and vigorously enforced our trade laws. We have passed NAFTA and concluded the GATT Uruguay Round. And we have forged the commitment of the Miami summit to complete negotiations by 2005 for a Free Trade Area of the Americas and the APEC commitment to achieve free and open trade in the Asia-Pacific by 2020.

These historic measures have contributed to a one-third increase in our exports since the beginning of 1993 and to the creation of 1.6 million new jobs. More important, this Administration has positioned the United States to become an even more dynamic hub of the global economy in the 21st century.

But we cannot rest on past progress. We will be working closely with other federal agencies and calling on our posts around the world to move forward on our economic agenda. In our hemisphere, we will seek the early addition of Chile to NAFTA on equitable terms and the extension to Central America and the Caribbean of arrangements equivalent to NAFTA. In the Asia-Pacific, we will ensure that our market agreements with Japan and our intellectual

property rights agreements with China are fully implemented. We will also pursue wider access to key sectors in China and work with China as it makes the changes necessary to gain acceptance to the WTO on commercially acceptable terms. And we will encourage U.S. trade and investment with India as it continues to carry out path-breaking economic reforms.

In Europe, the New Transatlantic Agenda that we and our EU partners signed in 1995 provides a blueprint for making our trade even freer and easier. We will also intensify our efforts with our OECD partners to combat the corrupt trading practices that cheat American companies and workers—and corrode the rule of law around the world. Finally, we will continue to work with our partners in the Middle East to strengthen the economic dimension of the peace process.

“ . . . as a refugee from tyranny, I cherish these principles [law, human dignity, and freedom. . . .] I can assure you that as Secretary of State I will speak out against the violation of human rights wherever they may occur. I will also support our promotion of democracy around the world.”

In today’s fiercely competitive world markets, our firms must often compete with foreign companies that receive active support from their governments. That is why the State Department must—and will—do all it can to ensure that American firms and workers receive fair treatment. And that is why I ask you to continue your support for the programs of the Export-Import Bank, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, and the Trade and Development Agency.

In addition to creating opportunities for U.S. businesses abroad, we must also continue to show leadership in the multilateral institutions that help the global economy to expand. I am confident that our firms can succeed in a truly fair competition. But our challenge is to keep the system fair. That takes hard work and vigilance. Within the WTO, we must make sound rules and ensure strong enforcement—and we must persevere in our support for high standards on labor and business practices as well as on the environment.

We must not forget that developing countries around the world offer the fastest-growing markets for American companies. We must continue to encourage these countries to participate fully in the global economy. And where possible, we should support their reforms through our bilateral development assistance and through the multilateral development banks. For every \$1 that the United States contributes, the Inter-American Development Bank lends out \$40, the Asian Development Bank \$80, and the World Bank \$135.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most important ways we contribute to sustainable development is through our support for international family planning. By stabilizing population growth rates, developing nations can devote more of their scarce resources to meet the basic needs of their citizens. Moreover, our voluntary family planning programs serve our broader interests by elevating the status of women, reducing the flow of refugees, protecting the environment, and promoting economic growth. That is why I urge Congress to adopt a joint resolution by the end of the month to release immediately USAID’s FY 1997 population funds. As the President has determined, a further delay will cause a tragic rise in unintended pregnancies, abortions, and maternal and child deaths.

Leadership for Freedom And the Rule of Law

The United States was founded on the principles of law, human dignity, and freedom—not just for some, but for all people. Mr. Chairman, as a refugee from tyranny, I cherish these principles. I can assure you that as

Secretary of State I will speak out against the violation of human rights wherever they may occur. I will also support our promotion of democracy around the world. Democracy is not only the best guarantee of human rights; it is the most fundamental source of peace and prosperity as well. That is why we must continue to support our democracy programs, which are strengthening elections, political parties, governmental institutions, civil society, and the rule of law in many developing nations.

The United States will also increase our efforts overseas to defeat the forces of international crime and narcotics trafficking. With our help, many drug-producing nations are strengthening their democratic institutions against the corrupting influence of criminals. We have made important progress: More kingpins than ever before are behind bars; Peru, the world's largest producer of coca, has decreased its cultivation to the lowest level in a decade; and we have negotiated many bilateral treaties of extradition and mutual legal assistance.

We will also persevere in our efforts to defeat international terrorism. Our policy is forthright: We make no concessions to terrorists; we exert pressure on states that sponsor terrorism; and we do all we can to bring terrorists to justice. Under President Clinton's leadership, we are mobilizing support around the world in opposition to the forces of terror. Together with our G-7 partners and Russia, we have agreed to improve our counter-terrorist cooperation in many areas, including protecting mass transit, strengthening law enforcement, tightening border controls, blocking terrorist fundraising, and pursuing an international treaty against terrorist bombings.

We will maintain our strong backing for the UN war crimes tribunals for Rwanda and the Balkans. After all the horror of this century, history will not forgive us if we do not strive to hold accountable perpetrators of ethnic cleansing, mass rape, and other atrocities. Our proposed contributions to the UN's peacekeeping activities include continued support for these tribunals.

Mr. Chairman, one final note. I would like to make it clear that I will carry on Secretary Christopher's landmark initiative to integrate environmental issues into the mainstream of our foreign policy. The threats of global warming, pollution, deforestation, and loss of biodiversity may not be as dramatic as those posed by nuclear missiles or a terrorist's bomb, but if we ignore them, we will surely pay the

price in terms of poor health, lost jobs, and the deterioration in our quality of life. That is why we must continue to forge bonds of cooperation in protecting the health and productivity of our common heritage of air, water, and land.

This year will be a critical one for the protection of the international environment. Our major goal is to conclude by December an agreement on the next steps to take on global warming. There is a consensus within the scientific community that the problem is real and serious. Indeed, we must act soon to prevent the disastrous effects of climate change, including rising sea levels, more severe weather, and increased spread of infectious disease. In the coming year, the United States will also launch an international drive to ban the production of some of the world's most toxic chemicals. Although already outlawed in our country, these chemicals are still manufactured overseas—and when released into the air and water, they can travel thousands of miles to harm us.

Conclusion

Members of the committee, the success of our new foreign policy will depend largely on whether we can revive the spirit of bipartisanship that prevailed after World War II. A bipartisan foreign policy is important because it allows us to act with more authority on the world stage, because it inspires greater cooperation from our allies and greater caution from our actual and potential adversaries, and because it reinforces our role as a model for democracies and democrats around the world.

Bipartisanship not only suits our currently divided government; it is appropriate to our times. The end of the Cold War has already changed the domestic politics of American foreign policy as much as it has changed world politics. Now the greatest split in our foreign policy debate is not between our two parties but between the proponents and opponents of American engagement. The leadership of both our parties understand the imperative of continued American leadership.

One of the first tests of our bipartisanship will be whether we can agree on the FY 1998 international affairs budget. Let me reiterate: The enactment of this budget is essential if we are to maintain American leadership in the world. We must stem the erosion of our diplomatic resources that has begun to hamper our foreign policy in recent years. This budget gives us the opportunity to begin that process. Mr. Chairman and members: Let's get started.

Thank you very much. ■

Secretary Albright

Promoting America's Interests And Ideals Through Diplomacy

February 12, 1997

*Statement before the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations
of the House Appropriations Committee, Washington, DC.*

Good morning. I am glad to have this opportunity to address you so soon after my confirmation. Together, we have an important job to do.

Last week in his State of the Union address, the President challenged us all to “do what it takes to remain the indispensable nation, to keep America strong, secure, and prosperous.” That requires maintaining American leadership abroad to promote our interests at home. President Clinton’s foreign affairs budget request for FY 1998 sets out our strategy for leadership and asks your help in providing the tools we need to sustain it. There could scarcely be a better time than now to begin to revive what has historically been, and I hope will be, a strong sense of bipartisanship in foreign policy.

American power and prestige derive primarily from three sources—the strength of our economy, the might of our military, and the vigor of our diplomacy. Each played a role in our birth as an independent nation, from the day Ben Franklin was sent abroad to report on our military victories to France, our first ally and trading partner. Each was essential after World War II, when our economic and diplomatic power helped rebuild Europe while our military kept us secure. Each was essential to win the Cold War, as we confronted communism with the determination of a free and prosperous people. Each reflects the genius and patriotism of our citizenry. And each is essential today, as we prepare to meet the challenges of a new century. That is why President Clinton has placed the highest priority on a sound and growing economy; that is why he is committed to keeping our armed forces modern, mobile, and strong; and it is why he has requested the funds we need to maintain our world-class diplomacy.

Through our diplomacy, we promote America’s interests and ideals. Our strength abroad has helped us prosper, kept us safe, and made us an inspiration to those around the world who cherish freedom. Global leadership is ours to take into the next century and build

an even better world for our citizens—or it is ours to squander by turning inward and away from the responsibilities that leadership entails.

Let me be clear at the outset. The purpose of American foreign policy is to protect and promote American interests. These interests are not abstract, but real. I said last month at my confirmation hearing that the 1% of our budget that we invest in foreign affairs may well determine 50% of the history of our era. Today, I would add that this 1% of the budget affects 100% of the American people.

All of us who believe in America’s global leadership, in both parties and on both ends of the Mall, must do more to show the American people how our engagement overseas works for them—and, in many cases, how it brings dividends directly to them. For example, when we help to fund the UN Special Commission, we do more than ensure that Saddam Hussein’s efforts to obstruct, evade, and deceive international inspectors will fail; we make it less likely that soldiers from Fort Polk and fliers from Maxwell Air Force Base will again be sent into harm’s way in response to Iraqi aggression. When we support educational and cultural exchange programs, we give students from Northern Virginia and teachers from Southern California their first glimpse of the wider world in which they will compete after graduation.

When we help other nations to grow, we expand the system of market democracies in which our own nation has the largest stake. We also create opportunities for universities and businesses here at home. For example, close to 80% of USAID contracts and grants go directly to American firms, like the \$20 million of fertilizer and agricultural training supplied by one Alabama contractor in FY 1995—and that was less than one-fifth of USAID’s grants and contracts in Alabama during that year alone. Those contracts create markets and contacts that will be useful long after aid programs have ended.

President Clinton has put forward a foreign affairs budget which proposes a modest increase over last year’s appropriation, thereby

giving us the tools we need for leadership. By approving our request for foreign operations, this subcommittee can help promote peace and keep America strong and secure. You can provide resources to build our prosperity at home by opening new markets and creating new jobs. You can support programs for sustainable development to help other countries grow wisely, without harming the global environment we all share. You can support those around the world, from students to senators, who share our democratic ideals. And you can help to care for those around the world who are in desperate need of humanitarian aid. Finally, you can build our diplomatic readiness, making sure that our diplomats are well-equipped and well-trained for their work. Let me address in more detail how the funds this subcommittee appropriates help us to meet each of these objectives.

Promoting Peace

Mr. Chairman, nothing we do is more important than promoting peace and security. We begin by working to ensure that Americans are safe—at home and abroad—from terrorism, crime, and the threat posed by weapons of mass destruction. We work for peace in regions of vital interest. And we maintain strong relationships with our key allies and partners to build support for our efforts to combat transnational threats that no country could defeat alone.

Although the Cold War has ended, the threat posed to Americans by weapons of mass destruction has not. Arms control and non-proliferation efforts remain a key part of our strategy to keep Americans safe.

The great arms control achievements of recent years—the removal of nuclear weapons from Belarus, Kazakstan, and Ukraine; the negotiation of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and a Chemical Weapons Convention; the indefinite extension of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty—have all enjoyed bipartisan support. With your support for this budget, in particular for the work of the International Atomic Energy Agency—IAEA, we can continue our efforts to improve the security and prevent the diversion of fissile materials.

Our \$36 million voluntary contribution to the IAEA helps that agency to verify compliance with the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in more than 820 locations in 61 countries. The IAEA supports our efforts in the most problematic countries, such as Iraq and North Korea, and achieves broader coverage than we ever could achieve if we tried to go it alone.

We have a major national interest in preventing states such as Iran from obtaining weapons of mass destruction. We will continue to oppose strongly the sale or transfer of arms

and arms-related technologies to all such states. And we will maintain tough UN sanctions against Iraq unless and until it complies with the relevant Security Council resolutions. The subcommittee's decision to fully fund our contribution to the UN Special Commission would ensure that Saddam Hussein's efforts to obstruct, evade, and deceive UN inspectors continue to fail.

The 1994 Agreed Framework between the United States and North Korea froze that country's dangerous nuclear weapons program; its full implementation would completely dismantle that program. With our partners, we created the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization—KEDO—to implement key aspects of the agreement. Our earlier commitment helped jump-start KEDO and generated contributions from Japan and South Korea that will ultimately dwarf our own. KEDO now has 10 members, and we will bring in at least three more this year to share the burden. But we must keep our commitment—\$30 million for 1998—to make sure others keep theirs.

International narcotics trafficking and organized crime also endanger Americans at home and our interests abroad. The President and law enforcement agencies and educators at all levels are committed to doing the job here. But we cannot hope to safeguard our citizens unless we fight these menaces overseas, where illicit goods are produced and ill-gotten gains are hidden away. President Clinton has directed us to work aggressively against growers and dealers of narcotics, and to put a stop to the accompanying money laundering, financial, and other criminal operations.

A consensus is building that corruption and crime are global security threats, and that decent people from around the world must close ranks, share information, and take cooperative action. This past year, our support for cocaine eradication and interdiction helped knock coca production in Peru to its lowest level in 10 years. Drug kingpins from Latin America to Europe to Nigeria to Burma are feeling pressure. We have requested a modest \$17 million increase above the FY 1997 level for anti-narcotics programs to maintain our momentum, primarily through training and increased support for aerial programs.

“Although the Cold War has ended, the threat posed to Americans by weapons of mass destruction has not. Arms control and non-proliferation efforts remain a key part of our strategy to keep Americans safe.”

We are also requesting \$19 million to fund the State Department's anti-terrorism programs, most of which will be used to train foreign law enforcement officials, so that they can be more effective partners.

When we support arms control and anti-crime efforts in other countries and regions, we advance the long-term interests and the safety of Americans. The same is true when we help end conflicts and reduce tensions in strategic regions such as South Asia, Nagorno-Karabakh, and Northern Ireland.

Neither our resources nor our responsibilities are unlimited. We must be careful in our commitments and selective in our actions. But we do have an interest in defusing situations which might endanger American security or which, if left unattended, might require the deployment of American troops. We have an interest in avoiding power vacuums that create targets of opportunity for criminals and terrorists. We have an interest in helping young market democracies survive the threat of conflict to become stable partners. And we share an interest, with all civilized people, in preventing and ending genocide and dire humanitarian emergencies.

Today, let me cite three examples of situations in which our interests are engaged and our participation required, either to resolve conflicts or prevent them. First, the Middle East.

Just last month, our skilled diplomacy was essential in producing an agreement on Israeli redeployment in Hebron. The intensive negotiations, including direct talks between Prime Minister Netanyahu and Chairman Arafat, helped to create new confidence and trust between the sides, restored momentum to the process, and provided a road map for the future.

To maintain this momentum, we have a three-part agenda:

First, continuing to support the progress of the Israelis and Palestinians;

Second, to make progress toward a comprehensive peace for the region, we will look for ways to energize the Israel-Syria and Israel-Lebanon negotiations;

Third, we will continue to encourage other Arab states to broaden the peace process by expanding ties with Israel. To that end, we have requested \$12 million to fund Arab-Israeli technical cooperation and the five working groups on regional issues.

Any attempt to create a stable peace must also aim at fostering economic growth. We must try to ensure that the peace process changes the quality of people's lives and broadens their economic horizons. Last fall's

Cairo Economic Conference was a great success in promoting private sector engagement in the region. It featured the largest private sector delegations and the largest contingent of U.S. business representatives ever to attend such a conference. Clearly, the private sector believes that investment in the region is worth pursuing and that the conditions for it are ripening.

To make sure this progress continues, the United States needs to remain involved. That means making good on our commitments to assist Israel, Egypt, Jordan, and others when they take risks for peace—as they have continued to do in this very challenging time. We have also requested \$75 million in economic support funds for the Palestinian Authority to promote economic development and democratic institutions.

As you know, Prime Minister Netanyahu and Chairman Arafat will visit Washington this month, and President Mubarak and King Hussein will meet with President Clinton in March. As Secretary of State I will assure them, as I assure you, that America will continue to stand with the peacemakers and against the bombthrowers in this strategic region. That is in America's interests; it is consistent with the commitments we have made; it reflects the kind of people we are; and it is right.

Under the President's leadership, we will continue to press forward toward a comprehensive peace. Our approach will continue to be guided by our firm commitment to those who genuinely seek peace and our equally strong opposition to those who would disrupt this process through terrorism and violence.

In southeastern Europe, we face rising tensions with the potential to harm Europe's stability. Disputes between our NATO allies, Turkey and Greece in the Aegean, and over Cyprus may have consequences far beyond the region, affecting NATO and the European Union and our vital interest in a peaceful Europe.

Last year, disturbing outbreaks of violence marred relations between the two communities on Cyprus. The economic and social consequences of that island's division are weighing heavily on its inhabitants. This year, the United States will seek to play a heightened role in promoting negotiations and a settlement in Cyprus. However, for any initiative to bear fruit, the parties themselves must agree on concrete steps to reduce tensions and move toward direct negotiations. We have again requested economic support funds in Turkey and Cyprus, and foreign military financing for both Turkey and Greece, to help keep the region—and the military balance—stable and closely tied to NATO and other European institutions.

Of the many conflicts and disputes around the world, the interrelated conflicts in Central Africa have been the most deadly over the last year.

In Rwanda, most refugees have returned. But there is a great deal still to do in reintegrating them into society—and rebuilding the institutions destroyed or discredited during the fighting. In Burundi, the task is to spur meaningful political negotiations that will open the door to reconciliation and to needed international assistance.

In Zaire, the problems are even more daunting—to encourage a halt to factional violence, ensure respect for human rights, and create stability based on democratic principles throughout the country. The stakes are high. Zaire is a country of 41 million people that borders nine states. We have seen already that violence in the Great Lakes region spreads with alarming ease—and grave consequences. Unless tensions ease, we face the risk of years of violence, a massive outflow of refugees, and emergency humanitarian costs in the billions of dollars. Accordingly, we are working closely with regional leaders and our allies in support of a solution based on full respect for Zaire's sovereignty and protection for human rights.

We have recently committed an additional \$153 million to deal with the emergency situation throughout the region. And we are placing a priority on our efforts to increase the peacekeeping capacities of African nations through an African Crisis Response Force—ACRF.

The voluntary peacekeeping account, for which we are seeking \$90 million in FY 1998, enables us to provide modest support to projects such as the ACRF that strengthen states' ability to deter or respond to conflicts in their own backyards. This account is also used to fund operations where our interest is so direct we choose to act with a coalition or a regional organization as in the Sinai, the OSCE missions in the former Soviet Union, support for democratic elections in Bosnia, and the Israel-Lebanon Monitoring Group.

As we work with others to resolve problems such as civil conflict and proliferation, we need strong partnerships with other leading nations. These are the bonds that hold together not only our foreign policy, but the entire international system.

By acting together, we are able to elevate standards of international behavior, spur economic and social progress, and strengthen the rule of law. We also leverage resources far beyond our own.

Next week, I will visit key capitals in Europe and Asia to build on the relationships I inherited from my predecessor and he from his. I will explore the prospects for deeper cooperation on many of the critical issues of our day—and many of the initiatives for which we request that you fund our part.

In Europe, for example, the seven years since the fall of the Berlin Wall have shown how much we can accomplish if we stand together with our European partners. With U.S. leadership and European unity, American fliers, Russian paratroopers, German doctors, and Hungarian mechanics have helped the people of Bosnia begin to build the basis for a lasting peace. Today, American soldiers and their counterparts from NATO and 17 non-NATO states are cooperating in SFOR, giving Bosnia the breathing space it needs for economic reconstruction and political healing. As we help the Bosnian people establish a stable military balance and better judicial and legal institutions, the need for an international military presence will diminish. I hope that this subcommittee will back our SFOR forces by supporting the President's supplemental request for Bosnia and that you will—on a related matter—also endorse our request for continued financial support for the International War Crimes Tribunal, to which we are the largest contributor.

The same countries that are working to implement peace in Bosnia are also striving to build lasting stability through NATO's Partnership for Peace. This year, we have requested \$70 million in military assistance for Partner countries. This is an increase of \$10 million over last year and will help all Partners to participate more fully in NATO activities and train for joint action with the alliance. It will also help some Partners to prepare for NATO membership. In addition, we are requesting \$20 million for Central European Defense Loans, to help those countries build defensive, civilian-controlled militaries and stronger ties with the United States.

We are working to transform NATO so that it can play its part in building a fully united and stable Europe. Our European partners are taking on a more responsible role in ensuring our common security. NATO is preparing to invite several central European states to begin negotiations to join the alliance. And NATO is working to create a robust partnership with Russia and an enhanced relationship with Ukraine.

Mr. Chairman, this century has shown that the United States must remain a European power. We have an equally vital interest in remaining a Pacific power as well. Today, we

are working with allies and friends to build an Asia-Pacific community based on shared interests and a common commitment to peace.

Over the last few years, we have reinvigorated our Asian alliances while maintaining our forward deployment of 100,000 American troops in the Western Pacific. We are encouraging new efforts to build security and resolve disputes peacefully through bodies such as the ASEAN Regional Forum.

Our core alliances in Asia are as strong, and our cooperation as broad, as they have ever been. Our relationship with our closest Asian ally, Japan, is underpinned by our shared

commitment to open and democratic societies. We consult regularly on issues from peace in Asia to development in Africa. We appreciate Japan's generous financial support for the Middle East peace process and for our Common Agenda of environmental initiatives around the world.

With another key Asian ally, the Republic of Korea, we are working closely to deal with the challenge posed by North Korea—and to respond in a humane way to the North's critical shortage of food. Our cooperation is growing in numerous areas as Seoul—anchor of the world's 11th-largest economy—takes on a larger regional and global role.

We must also manage our complex relationship with China as it emerges as a key Asian and global power. U.S. policy toward China has long been controversial in Congress and among the American people. There are healthy disagreements about balancing various elements of that policy. But there should be no doubt about the importance of this relationship, and the need to integrate, not isolate, the world's most populous nation and our fourth-largest trading partner.

The United States and China do have important differences, especially on trade, arms transfers, and human rights, including Tibet. I will not hesitate to speak out about them. We will continue to voice strong concern about the need for China to meet its commitments to maintain democratic practices in Hong Kong.

And, while we will adhere to our "one China" policy, we will also maintain robust unofficial ties with Taiwan.

But it is essential that we continue our work with China on issues, including the Korean Peninsula, crime, nuclear testing, and the environment. The best way for the United States to pursue the interests we share with China, and those where our views diverge, is through a consistent policy of engagement. In order to advance these and other interests—from non-proliferation to human rights—the United States needs a strong foreign policy with a full toolbox. Your vote on this budget will help decide whether or not we have it.

Promoting Economic Prosperity

The Clinton Administration has had extraordinary success in helping the economy grow at home by opening markets abroad. Our exports have grown by 34% since 1993, generating 1.6 million new jobs. We have laid the groundwork for free and open trade in our hemisphere by 2005 and in the Asia-Pacific region by 2020. And we have put our full weight behind better enforcement of intellectual property standards and fuller consideration of core labor rights at the World Trade Organization.

But we cannot rest on our past accomplishments. Our future growth in an ever-more competitive global marketplace depends upon strong export promotion efforts and a vigorous State Department presence around the world. I am committed to helping American business and labor compete and win in a global market that is open and fair.

And our diplomats are doing their job. One of the pleasures of my own job is hearing about compliments from American corporations like this one. After winning a \$5.8 million contract to supply weather radar to the Government of India, corporate officials wrote of our team in New Delhi: "Their interest in our cause was genuine and with no red tape and no 'yeah, buts.' "

But our diplomats need your commitment as well and your support for our requests for the Export-Import Bank and the Trade and Development Agency. As Secretary of State, I want to stress that these programs not only serve to build American exports and jobs, they are a fundamental tool of our foreign policy.

The Overseas Private Investment Corporation, I am pleased to say, is now self-sustaining. Its commitments have grown by a factor of five over the last five years, and it has shown profits repeatedly, reaching \$209 million last year. Programs like these help make the United

"This year, the President will seek fast-track authority for trade negotiations that open more markets to our goods and services. We must move forward in this area, not only to expand our exports, but to avoid being left behind as emerging economic powers forge trade ties with other nations."

States an even more vital hub of the global economy and create more opportunities for our citizens. But as any entrepreneur knows, support from Washington is not enough; we must be active on the ground.

This year, the President will seek fast-track authority for trade negotiations that open more markets to our goods and services. We must move forward in this area, not only to expand our exports, but to avoid being left behind as emerging economic powers forge trade ties with other nations.

In the Asia-Pacific region, we must ensure full implementation of the many agreements we have already negotiated with Japan and others, pursue improved access to key sectors in China, and encourage U.S. trade and investment with India as it continues to carry out path-breaking economic reforms.

In Europe, the New Transatlantic Agenda that we and our EU partners signed in 1995 provides a blueprint for making transatlantic trade even freer and easier. We will also intensify our cooperation with the OECD to combat the corrupt business practices that cheat American companies and workers—and corrode the rule of law around the world.

Promoting Sustainable Development

Mr. Chairman, many of America's fastest-growing markets are developing where the transition to an open economic system is underway but incomplete. Many of these countries are held back by high rates of population growth, lack of access to health care and education, and a scarcity of natural resources or conflict.

When democratic institutions in a developing country are weak, unstable, or absent, that country will be less likely to grow peacefully, less inclined to confront international terrorists and criminals, and less able to do its part to protect the environment. That is why our sustainable development programs are a sound investment in American security and well-being. The funds allocated to State and USAID by this subcommittee are helping us to encourage democratic and economic development in Africa, where more than three dozen countries have now at least begun democratic reforms—and where U.S. trade rose by 23% in 1995 alone. I know that Brian Atwood will testify before you later this spring, so let me say just a few words about our priorities here.

This year, we have given our sustainable development programs a new focus on one of the most basic problems that stifles development and sparks conflict—food security. Programs to improve the dependability of crops

and distribution of food in Africa can help make sure hunger is no longer a constant threat to the lives of people and the stability of societies.

Our financial support and pressure for reform has helped the United Nations Development Program [UNDP] become the central coordinating and funding mechanism for UN development assistance. Every dollar we contribute leverages \$8-\$10 from other nations in support of Bosnian reconstruction, Rwandan judicial reform, and Cambodian demining—to name just a few projects.

We have increased our request for funding for UNICEF to \$100 million for FY 1998. Like UNDP, UNICEF plays an important role in countries suffering from, or recovering from, the devastation caused by civil or international conflict. UNICEF helps protect children—a society's most vulnerable members and its hope for the future—from the Balkans to Liberia.

The \$780 million we have requested for population and health programs works to provide better health and family planning information and services to millions worldwide. By stabilizing population growth rates, developing nations can devote more of their scarce resources to meet the basic needs of their citizens. Moreover, our voluntary family planning programs serve our broader interests by elevating the status of women, reducing the flow of refugees, protecting the environment, and promoting economic growth. That is why I urge Congress to adopt a joint resolution to release immediately USAID's FY 1997 population funds. As the President has determined, a further delay will cause a tragic rise in unintended pregnancies, abortions, and maternal and child deaths.

We are developing forward-looking programs to protect the global environment and promote sound management of natural resources with our request of \$290 million. USAID programs are helping to reclaim land for agriculture in Mali, cut greenhouse gas emissions in the Philippines, and fund acquisition of American "green technology" in Nepal. America's cutting-edge environmental technology is an important tool in this process, and we aim to give its makers a boost in global markets as well.

Our \$100 million request for the Global Environment Fund—GEF—provides loans for developing country projects to preserve biodiversity, address ozone depletion, protect oceans, and prevent the release of gas inhibited in global warming. GEF projects can have important benefits for recipients and Americans alike: A 1996 project to introduce more efficient

lighting in two Mexican cities, for example, induced a 40% rate of change and a boom in orders for U.S. lighting technology and training.

We have also requested an increase to restore full funding and begin to pay our debts to the multilateral development banks [MDBs] and the IDA. Over the past few years, our pressure for reform has had dramatic effects. The World Bank has increased accountability and transparency while cutting its administrative budget by 10% in two years, steps all the MDBs are now moving to emulate. The most far-reaching success story is the turnaround of the African Development Bank, which has tightened its lending rules, cut staff by 20%, and appointed external auditors. Now is the time for us to meet our own obligations so that the banks can provide loans which further our goals, and which result in more contracts with American firms than those of any other nation.

Promoting Democracy

Mr. Chairman, America's global leadership is not possible unless we are true to American ideals. And we cannot do that unless we do what we can to promote democratic institutions and values around the world. That is in our interest. And it is right. When we work to strengthen democracy, we are strengthening the only sound base from which to fight transnational threats, improving the chances that countries will live in peace with their neighbors, and empowering citizens to stand up for their own rights and look after their environment.

As you know, the main programs through which we support democracy are the FREEDOM Support Act for the former Soviet Union, the SEED programs for the states of central and eastern Europe, as well as economic support and other programs around the world. Since I have already discussed our integrated programs for sustainable, democratic development, let me focus here on our programs in Europe.

If Europe itself is to be strong and at peace, we must not let a new line emerge where the wave of democratic change falters. Making sure that the new Europe is a continent of stable democracies is critical to achieving the vision of European security I discussed earlier. Our support will be crucial, both for those countries making the difficult transition to NATO membership, and for those not in the first group to join.

The SEED programs administered by the State Department and USAID focus on economic restructuring, democratic institution building, and developing strong civil societies.

It includes a special focus on reconstruction and reform in Bosnia. Our contribution is critical to generating the bulk of assistance to Bosnia which our European partners provide.

Let me also mention that the SEED program, which was intended to be finite, has had another round of successes. This budget request foresees phasing out assistance to the Czech Republic and Slovenia during FY 1997.

A democratic Russia is an essential partner in our efforts to build a secure Europe. Russia's transition has been arduous and uncertain. More difficult times lie ahead. But open markets and democratic institutions have taken hold. If Russia is to become a full and productive partner in a Europe at peace, that progress must continue. And we must help.

The United States has a profound interest in encouraging Russia to accelerate its democratic and economic reforms, to respect fully the sovereignty of its neighbors, and to join us in addressing critical regional and global issues. Our aid to Russia helps us achieve all those ends. This year, we have revamped our assistance to Russia and the other New Independent States. Out of the \$900 million we have requested, \$535 million will fund a new Partnership for Freedom. This reflects an evolution in our approach to the region. For years, we have been providing technical advice on how to achieve political and economic reform. Our focus will now be on cementing the irreversible nature of those reforms.

The initiative will concentrate on activities to promote business, trade and investment, and those that would strengthen democracy and more fully establish the rule of law. Our efforts here are a priority because the democratic transformation of this region is of vital and historic importance to us—and because the ultimate victory of freedom in this part of the world is not yet assured.

Ukraine is again this year our fourth-largest recipient of foreign assistance, reflecting our belief that investment in a stable, democratic Ukraine is an investment in the linchpin of stability in central Europe.

Providing Humanitarian Assistance

Of course, no one can predict and prevent every natural disaster, famine, or conflict. The United States should be prepared to respond when we can in such terrible circumstances. This budget allows us to provide humanitarian assistance that can make a critical difference in ending or alleviating human suffering—a basic interest of any civilized people.

Never forget, though, that even the most charitable aid is in our national interest. As long as we are dependent on the rule of law to promote our trade, protect our security, and preserve our ideals, we cannot look indifferently at failed states and massive upheavals. Equally, we should not stand by when war, famine, or disease threaten to spill over and menace our friends and allies.

This year, we have made a modest reduction in our request for migration and refugee assistance, because large numbers of Rwandan refugees returned home last year and because we expect to complete our repatriation programs with Laos and Vietnam. We have also requested that our international disaster assistance and Office of Transition Initiatives programs be funded at the same levels as last year. We believe that those levels will be sufficient to provide for contingencies and continue efforts like our justice program in Rwanda.

Promoting Diplomatic Readiness

Mr. Chairman, it has often been said that our diplomats are our first line of defense. It is they, after all, who administer our aid programs, negotiate arms control agreements, and assist American business. We ask a great deal of them, including, occasionally, risking their lives in places like Bosnia and Iraq.

What is more, every American has the right to expect that our response to any emergency will be strong and sure-footed. To make sure that is the case, we must maintain our diplomatic readiness—well-trained staff, dependable communications, and posts open everywhere necessary.

Without that global presence, our programs will not succeed. We cannot lead. And our leadership, after all, is what has built our strength in this century and laid the groundwork for the next.

Our security depends on our efforts to prevent the spread of weapons of mass destruction and to defeat the forces of international terror. Our prosperity depends on the existence of an expanding global economy fueled by free and fair rules of trade, in which American products are welcome and American workers are rewarded. We will keep making those efforts, whether pursuing violations of labor standards in South Asia, or opening new trade opportunities in South America.

Our future in a world of friendly states depends on our efforts to promote the democratic principles by which we live and others are inspired—from Burma to Belgrade.

And, as President Clinton said last week at the National Prayer Breakfast, “We can be a model for the rest of the world, but we also know we have to model the behavior we advocate, which is to give a helping hand when we can.”

Our budget request is an investment in a strong foreign policy—one that keeps American diplomacy flexible in responding to crises, firm in pursuing our strategic priorities, and vigilant in protecting our security. Surely, that is a bipartisan vision of how best to further our role in the world. I believe it is one that this committee, Congress, and the American people can share—and I hope you will do so by supporting the President’s request.

Nothing matters more to our future than whether America continues to lead, and America cannot lead in the international arena without the resources necessary to maintain our influence and the tools required to get the job done. Thank you. ■

“This budget allows us to provide humanitarian assistance that can make a critical difference in ending or alleviating human suffering—a basic interest of any civilized people.”

Secretary Albright

Building a Bipartisan Foreign Policy

February 7, 1997

Address at the Rice Memorial Center, Rice University, Houston, Texas.

Mr. Secretary, President Gillis, Ambassador Djerejian: Thank you for the introduction and for the Texas hospitality. This is my first official trip as Secretary of State, and I can't imagine a better destination or more distinguished company.

My original thought was to come here next Thursday, on February 13, but one of my advance people who went to Rice told me that you close the university on the 13th of every month—due to your celebration of the ancient academic rite of streaking. And, as the first female Secretary of State, I wasn't sure I was quite ready for that!

In a world where many claim to have all the answers, this institute and this university understand the importance of asking the right questions. And, in your search for wisdom, you have certainly found the right guide.

James Baker's memoirs were entitled *The Politics of Diplomacy*—and, as his record gives evidence, he was a master of both. He has earned our nation's gratitude, and I am delighted to be a witness to the exciting new work he has initiated here. And I am also glad to learn that former Secretaries of State can get day jobs.

This afternoon, I want to talk with you about some exciting new work of my own. I have just completed my second full week as Secretary of State. Already, I have a reputation for speaking in sound bites. This is not a reputation I have sought. When I speak, I always think I'm sounding like Henry Kissinger; unfortunately, what the audience seems to hear sounds more like David Letterman.

My goal—and it is causing some culture shock back in DC—is to clear away the fog from Foggy Bottom, a place where the elevator inspection certificates—and I am not making this up—do not refer to elevators but to “vertical transportation units.”

As Secretary, I will do my best to talk about foreign policy—not in abstract terms but in human terms and bipartisan terms. I consider this vital because in our democracy, we cannot pursue policies abroad that are not understood and supported here at home.

When I was nominated by the President, I said that I would have an obligation to explain to you the “who, what, when, where” and especially the “whys” of the policies we conduct around the world in your name. Today, I intend to begin that job.

Last Tuesday, in his State of the Union address, President Clinton said that, “To prepare America for the 21st century, we must master the forces of change in the world and keep American leadership strong and sure for an uncharted time.” Fortunately, thanks to the President's own leadership and that of his predecessor President George Bush—Houston's most distinguished adopted son—I begin work with the wind at my back.

Our nation is respected and at peace. Our alliances are vigorous. Our economy is strong. And from the distant corners of Asia, to the emerging democracies of central Europe and Africa, to the community of liberty that exists within our own hemisphere, American institutions and ideals are a model for those who have, or who aspire to, freedom.

All this is no accident, and its continuation is by no means inevitable. Democratic progress must be sustained as it was built—by American leadership. And our leadership must be sustained if our interests are to be protected around the world. That is why our Armed Forces must remain the best-led, best-trained, best-equipped, and most respected in the world. And as President Clinton has pledged: They will.

It is also why we need first-class diplomacy. Force, and the credible possibility of its use, are essential to defend our vital interests and to keep America safe. But force alone can be a blunt instrument, and there are many problems it cannot solve.

To be effective, force and diplomacy must complement and reinforce each other. For there will be many occasions, in many places, where we will rely on diplomacy to protect our interests, and we will expect our diplomats to defend those interests with skill, knowledge, and spine.

Unfortunately, in the words of Senator Richard Lugar of Indiana, our international operations today are "underfunded and understaffed." We are the world's richest and most powerful nation, but we are also the number one debtor to the UN and the international financial institutions. We are dead last among the industrialized nations in the percentage of our wealth that we use to promote democracy and growth in the developing world.

And diplomatically, we are steadily and unilaterally disarming ourselves. Over the past four years, the Department of State has cut more than 2,000 employees, closed more than 30 overseas posts, and slashed foreign assistance by almost one-third.

This trend is not acceptable. Many of you are students. Someday, one of you may occupy the office I hold and that Secretary Baker held. I hope you do. And I assure you that I will do everything I can in my time to see that you have the necessary diplomatic tools in your time to protect our nation and do your job.

Yesterday, the President submitted his budget request to Congress for the coming fiscal year. That budget, which totals some \$1.8 trillion, includes about \$20 billion for the entire range of international affairs programs. This would pay for everything from our share of reconstruction in Bosnia to enforcing sanctions against Saddam Hussein to waging war around the world against drug kingpins and organized crime.

Approval of this budget matters, not only to me, or to those who consider themselves foreign policy experts, but to each and every one of us. For example, if you live in Houston, more than likely your job—or that of a member of your family—is linked to the health of the global economy, whether through investments, or trade, or competition from workers abroad, or from newly arrived workers here. This region's robust agricultural and energy sectors are particularly affected by overseas prices, policies, and politics.

Your family, like most in America, probably has good reason to look ahead with hope. But you are also anxious. For you see crime fueled by drugs that pour across nearby borders. You see advanced technology creating not only new wonders, but new and more deadly arms. On your television screen, you see the consequences of letter bombs and poisonous serums and sudden explosions and ask yourself when and where terrorists may strike next.

Whether you are a student, or parent, or teacher, or worker, you are concerned about the future our young people will face. Will the global marketplace continue to expand and generate new opportunities and new jobs? Will

our global environment survive the assault of increasing population and pollution? Will the plague of AIDS and other epidemic disease be brought under control? And will the world continue to move away from the threat of nuclear Armageddon, or will that specter once again loom large, perhaps in some altered and even more dangerous form?

If you are like most Americans, you do not think of the United States as just another country. You want America to be strong and respected. And you want that strength and respect to continue through the final years of this century and into the next.

Considering all this, one thing should be clear. The success or failure of American foreign policy is not only relevant to our lives; it will be a determining factor in the quality of our lives. It will make the difference between a future characterized by peace, rising prosperity, and law; and a more uncertain future in which our economy and security are always at risk, our peace of mind is always under assault, and American leadership is increasingly in doubt.

We are talking here about 1% of the federal budget. But that 1% may determine 50% of the history that is written about our era, and it will affect the lives of 100% of the American people. Let me be more specific.

First, foreign policy creates jobs. The Clinton Administration has negotiated more than 200 trade agreements since 1993. Those agreements have helped exports to soar and have boosted employment by more than 1.6 million.

For example, earlier today I met with Mexican Foreign Minister Gurria. Our growing trade with Mexico is a genuine success story. Last year alone, \$125 billion in exports were traded. And with NAFTA now in place, we estimate that this coming year some 2.2 million American workers will produce goods for export to our NAFTA partners. By passing NAFTA, concluding the Uruguay Round, and forging commitments to free trade in Latin America and Asia, we have helped create a growing global economy with America as its dynamic hub.

This matters a lot down here. Houston is one of America's great ports. Texas is our second-leading exporting state. Commerce makes you grow. And there are more direct

"If you are like most Americans, you do not think of the United States as just another country. You want America to be strong and respected. And you want that strength and respect to continue through the final years of this century and into the next."

benefits. For years, Texas grains have been among the leading commodities sold through the Food for Peace Program.

America's economic expansion is no accident. It derives primarily from the genius of our scientists, the enterprise of our businesspeople, and the productivity of our factories and farms. But it has been helped along by American diplomats who work to ensure that American business and labor receive fair treatment overseas.

For example, if an American businessman or woman bribes a foreign official in return for a contract, that American is fined or goes to jail. If a European bribes that same foreign official,

chances are he will get a tax deduction. We are working hard to create higher standards that apply to all. And we have opened the doors of embassies around the world to U.S. entrepreneurs seeking our help in creating a level playing field for American firms and more opportunities for Americans back home.

Have no doubt: These efforts will continue. For as long as I am Secretary of State, America's diplomatic influence will be harnessed to the task of helping America's economy grow. We will also use diplomacy to keep America safe.

The Cold War may be over, but the threat to our security posed by weapons of mass destruction has only been reduced, not ended. In recent years, with U.S. leadership, much has been accomplished. Russian warheads no longer target our homes. The last missile silos in Ukraine are being planted over with sunflowers, and nuclear weapons have also

been removed from Belarus and Kazakhstan. North Korea's nuclear weapons program has been frozen. The nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty has been extended. A comprehensive ban on nuclear tests has been approved. And we are continuing the job begun under President Bush of ensuring that Iraq's capacity to produce weapons of mass destruction is thoroughly and verifiably dismantled.

The President's budget empowers us to build on these steps. It provides the resources we need to seek further reductions in nuclear stockpiles, to help assure the safe handling of nuclear materials, to back international inspections of other countries' nuclear programs, and to implement the agreements we have reached.

“As Secretary of State, I will ensure that America continues to stand with the peacemakers and against the bombthrowers in [the Middle East]. That is in America's interests; it is consistent with the commitments we have made; it reflects the kind of people we are; and it is right.”

The President's budget also reflects America's role as the indispensable nation in promoting international security and peace. Our largest, single program is in support of the peace process in the Middle East. Even here, the price tag does not compare to the cost to us and to our friends if that strategic region should once again erupt in war. The oil crisis caused by fighting there in 1973 threw our economy into a tailspin, caused inflation to soar, and resulted in gas lines that stretched for miles.

Today, as a result of courageous leaders in the region, and persistent American diplomacy, the peace process launched by Secretary Baker has been sustained. Israel has signed landmark agreements with Jordan and the Palestinian authorities. And as the recent pact on Hebron illustrates, the movement toward peace continues despite episodes of violence, outbreaks of terrorism, and a tragic assassination.

As Secretary of State, I will ensure that America continues to stand with the peacemakers and against the bombthrowers in this strategic region. That is in America's interests; it is consistent with the commitments we have made; it reflects the kind of people we are; and it is right.

Because the United States has unique capabilities and unmatched power, it is natural that others turn to us in time of emergency. We have an unlimited number of opportunities to act. But we do not have unlimited resources nor unlimited responsibilities. We are not a charity or a fire department. If we are to protect our own interests and maintain our credibility, we have to weigh our commitments carefully and be selective and disciplined in what we agree to do. Recognizing this, we have good reason to strengthen other instruments for responding to emergencies and conflicts and for addressing the conditions that give rise to those conflicts.

These other instruments include the United Nations, regional organizations, and international financial institutions. Together, these entities remove from our shoulders the lion's share of the costs of keeping the peace, maintaining sanctions against rogue states, creating new markets, protecting the environment, caring for refugees, and addressing other problems around the globe.

Unfortunately, in recent years, we have fallen behind in our payments to these institutions. We owe about \$1 billion to the UN and other organizations and almost another \$1 billion to the multilateral banks.

In his budget, the President requests enough money to repay many of these obligations. The reason is that these debts hurt America. They erode the capacity of these

organizations to carry out programs that serve our interests. They undermine the proposals we have made for reform. And, to those around the world who are hostile to our leadership, they are an open invitation to run America down.

The United States can—and should—lead the way in strengthening and reforming international organizations so that they better serve the world community and American interests. But if we are to succeed, we must also pay our bills. As in poker, if we want a seat at the table, we have to put chips in the pot.

Before closing, I would like to highlight one of the President's top early priorities, which has little to do with money but much to do with America's standing in the world. The President has asked the Senate to give its approval to a Convention intended to ban chemical weapons from the face of the Earth. That agreement, known as the Chemical Weapons Convention—or CWC—will enter into force on April 29. Our goal is to ratify the agreement before then so that America will be an original party.

Chemical weapons are inhumane. They kill horribly, massively, indiscriminately, and are no more controllable than the wind. That is why the United States decided years ago to eliminate our stockpile of these weapons and to purge from our military doctrine any possibility of their use. Countries that join the CWC will undertake a legal obligation to pursue a similar policy.

The Convention makes it less likely that our Armed Forces will ever again encounter chemical weapons on the battlefield, less likely that rogue regimes will have access to the materials needed to build chemical arms, and less likely that such arms will fall into the hands of terrorists or others hostile to our interests. The result will be a safer America and a safer world.

Unfortunately, not everyone sees it that way. Senate approval of the Convention is by no means assured. Opponents of the CWC argue that it does not provide full protection, because we do not expect early ratification by the rogue states. We regret that, but the CWC remains very much in our interests.

The CWC establishes the standard that it is wrong to build or possess chemical weapons. That standard will put added pressure on rogue regimes. It will send a message that if a country wants to be part of the international system and to participate fully in its benefits, it must ratify and comply with the CWC.

What it comes down to is this question: Who should set the rules for the international community—law-abiding nations or the rogues? Are we barred from establishing any

rule that the outlaw nations do not first accept, or does it serve our interests to draw the clearest possible distinction in law between those who observe international standards and those who do not? Unfortunately, as General Norman Schwarzkopf recently observed, if the foes of the CWC have their way, the United States would draw a line in the sand, put our friends and allies on one side, and then cross over to the other, joining hands with Libya and Iraq.

If the opponents have their way, we would forego the right to help draft the rules by which the Convention is enforced and the destruction of chemical weapons assured. We would lose the right to have Americans help administer and conduct inspections within the CWC. We would risk the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars in export sales because the American chemical industry would become subject to trade restrictions imposed upon non-members of the CWC. Finally, we would lose credibility in negotiating arms reduction agreements generally, because our ability to deliver in the Senate what we have proposed at the bargaining table would be undermined, for reasons that friends and allies around the world would find very difficult to understand.

Make no mistake: The Chemical Weapons Convention is in the best interests of the United States. In fact, the CWC has "made in America" written all over it. It was endorsed by President Reagan and negotiated under President Bush—very ably negotiated I might add, thanks to his Secretary of State. Now, and until success is achieved, the President, our new Secretary of Defense, Bill Cohen, and I will be working with every member of the Senate to ensure the timely and favorable consideration of this important Convention.

In closing, let me say that I well understand, as I undertake my new job, that there is no certain formula for ensuring public support for American engagement overseas. Certainly, frankness helps. Consultations with Congress are essential, and we are working with congressional leaders of both parties to an unprecedented degree. But we Americans are brutally fair. As President Kennedy observed after the Bay of Pigs, success has a thousand fathers, while defeat is an orphan. Ultimately, we will be judged not by our rhetoric or our rationales but by our results.

The reality is that Americans have always been ambivalent about activism abroad. At the end of World War I, an American Army officer stuck in Europe while the diplomats haggled at Versailles, wrote to his future wife about his yearning to go home: "None of us care if the

“We have a responsibility in our time, as others have had in theirs—not to be prisoners of history but to shape history. . . .”

Russian government is red or not red, (or) whether the king of Lollipops slaughters his subjects.”

Thirty years later, that same man—Harry Truman—would lead America in the final stages of another great war. In the aftermath of that conflict, it was not enough to say that

what we were against had failed. Leaders such as Truman, Marshall, and Vandenberg were determined to build a lasting peace. And together with our allies, they forged a set of institutions that would defend freedom, rebuild economies, uphold law, and preserve peace.

Today, the greatest danger to America is not some foreign enemy; it is the possibility that we will ignore the example of that generation; that we will succumb to the temptation of isolation; neglect the military and diplomatic resources that keep us strong; and forget the fundamental lesson of

this century, which is that problems abroad, if left unattended, will all-too often come home to America.

A decade or two from now, we will be known as the neo-isolationists who allowed totalitarianism and fascism to rise again, or as the generation that solidified the global triumph of democratic principles. We will be known as the neo-protectionists whose lack of vision produced financial chaos or as the generation that laid the groundwork for rising prosperity around the world. We will be known as the world-class ditherers who stood by while the seeds of renewed global conflict were sown or as the generation that took strong measures to deter aggression, control nuclear arms, and keep the peace.

There is no certain roadmap to success, either for individuals or for generations. Ultimately, it is a matter of judgment, a question of choice. In making that choice, let us remember that there is not a page of American history of which we are proud that was authored by a chronic complainer or prophet of despair. We are doers.

We have a responsibility in our time, as others have had in theirs—not to be prisoners of history but to shape history; a responsibility to use and defend our own freedom and to help others who share our aspirations for liberty, peace, and the quiet miracle of a normal life. To that end, I pledge my own best efforts and solicit yours.

Thank you very much. ■

Secretary Albright

Atlantic Unity and European Unity Remain our Common Vision

February 18, 1997

*Statement before the North Atlantic Council,
Brussels, Belgium.*

Mr. Secretary General, distinguished colleagues: Thank you for welcoming me today and for coming to Brussels for this occasion. I know this is an extraordinary session of the North Atlantic Council. But it is also an extraordinary time in the history of our alliance. I look forward to our consultations and to sharing your thoughts with President Clinton upon my return home. For me, there could be no more appropriate place than here, on this continent, before this gathering of allies and friends, to make my first formal remarks overseas as America's Secretary of State.

Nor could there be a more appropriate year. For it was in 1947, a half-century ago, that America made its fateful decision, in the aftermath of war, to remain a European power. Instead of settling for the illusion of security as it had following World War I, America joined its European partners and built real security.

In March of that year, President Truman asked the American people, despite their weariness with sacrifice, and their wariness of new commitments, to rejoin the battle for the future of this continent. He said that

the free people of the world look to us for support in maintaining their freedoms. If we falter in our leadership, we may endanger the peace of our world—and we shall surely endanger the welfare of our own nation.

Out of that insight and the resolve of a Europe determined to remain free, there evolved first the Truman Doctrine, then the Marshall Plan and soon this great alliance. I am pleased, at the very outset of my service in this new position, to reaffirm America's steadfast commitment to the sentiments expressed by President Truman 50 years ago.

America stands with Europe because Americans understand, without regard to political party, that it is in our national interest as well as our collective interest that we do so. Atlantic unity and European unity remain our common vision. And, as we look ahead to the

next 50 years, we are determined that NATO will endure, and adapt, and become the essential foundation for an ever-widening Atlantic community.

To judge NATO's future potential, we must understand fully its past accomplishments. For NATO has always been more than a defensive shield: It was the roof over our heads when we rebuilt post-war Europe; it was the floor upon which the first structures of European unity were laid; it was the door through which one-time adversaries were welcomed into our family of democracies. And because of its strength and the courage of its members, it has been a mighty deterrent to aggression.

Today, we are privileged to live at a time of relative stability and peace. But we know from history that we cannot take the extension of these blessings for granted. Peace is not a gift; it must be earned and re-earned. And if it is to last, it must be constantly reinforced.

That is why, through our joint efforts, NATO—a great instrument of peace—has been transformed to meet the demands of a new era. Our military forces and strategy have changed. No longer is NATO arrayed in opposition to any one enemy; its mission is peace and cooperation with all who wish to walk with it.

To this end, the alliance has sparked unprecedented collaboration on European security through the Partnership for Peace. It has adapted to new roles, including the historic mission in Bosnia, which has halted the terrible carnage there and mobilized a remarkable coalition to help implement the Dayton accords. It has undertaken a program of internal adaptation which offers greater visibility and responsibility to European members. The prospect of its enlargement has contributed to the resolution of historic differences involving borders and minority rights in central and eastern Europe. In so doing, NATO has helped bring within our

grasp the most elusive dream of this century: An undivided Europe, at peace, in which every nation is free and every free nation is a partner.

This vision of Europe is not the property of any one nation or group; it is an aspiration shared across the continent and on both sides of the Atlantic. It is being realized through the efforts not only of NATO but of the European Union—EU, the OSCE, the Western European Union—WEU, the Council of Europe—CE, and democratic reformers in every affected nation.

This is critical; for increasingly in this new era, security will not rest on a single pillar. It must be supported by democratic institutions and values; bolstered by the wealth of free peoples freely engaged in production, agriculture, and commerce; and glued together by habits of cooperation and consultation on matters of mutual interest.

So, as we contemplate the next phase in the evolution of NATO, we understand that its development is part of, and complementary to, a larger process. But we also understand that if we are to achieve for Europe the kind of future we all want, we have to manage the evolution of this alliance correctly. We have to get it right.

That is why we have charted our course carefully, moved ahead deliberately, and acted together. It is why we have chosen as our common purpose to do for Europe's east what NATO did 50 years ago for Europe's west: to integrate new democracies, eliminate old hatreds, provide confidence in economic recovery, and deter conflict. And it is why the road ahead is clear. Let there be no doubt:

- NATO will complete its internal adaptation;
- It will begin accession talks;
- It will accept new members;
- It will create an Atlantic Partnership Council and keep the door to membership open;
- It will have an enhanced relationship with Ukraine; and
- It will do all it can to forge a long-term strategic partnership with Russia.

Our adherence to this course will keep NATO evolving and modernizing through the remaining years of this century and into the next. We must stay that course. We must stand by our commitments. And I am confident we will do so.

In 20 weeks, NATO leaders will gather at a summit in Madrid. That summit will not change our direction but, rather, reaffirm it. Our job, during these next five months, will be to move ahead, step-by-step, on all fronts.

NATO's internal adaptation is already well advanced. The coalition assembled in Bosnia is evidence that a new NATO has already come into being—a NATO capable of undertaking new missions, a NATO capable of mobilizing members and non-members alike in support of European security, a NATO capable of performing tasks that must be done in a manner only NATO could achieve.

But the adaptation of NATO is also evident in other ways. We have agreed to the Combined Joint Task Force concept. We are building the European Security and Defense Identity within the alliance. We have agreed to share NATO assets with the WEU for European-led operations. We are streamlining our command structures, and we are providing more senior positions for European commanders.

Our goal, in all these efforts, goes right to the bottom line. We want an alliance that is stronger, broader, more cohesive, and more effective. That is also our goal in expanding the alliance.

The start of accession negotiations with a number of our central European partners will be a milestone in the history of the alliance. But it is no sudden event.

The process of enlargement began three years ago at the NATO summit here in Brussels. It will not end in Madrid. Nor will it end with a division between winners and losers; for, ultimately, all who are interested in a peaceful and democratic Europe—whether they are in NATO or partners of it—will win. Our goal should be to complete the membership negotiations by the end of this year so that we can sign accession instruments at our meeting in December. This will allow us time to complete what may be the most important part of the process: working with our parliaments and our publics to ratify the changes we will propose. That process of public information and education has already begun and should be pursued with energy in every member state.

I note, in this connection, that President Clinton will be submitting to our Congress later this week a report on NATO enlargement, including an estimate of the costs. Ambassador Hunter will brief you on that report in the coming days.

At its December meeting, this Council agreed on the goal that the first new members should join the alliance by 1999. At the Madrid summit, we should make that a firm commitment.

Those we invite should be confident that for them, this process is entering its final stage. And they should prepare to fulfill as many obligations of membership as possible on the day they join.

For those not invited to join this year, but who wish to join, NATO's door must remain open. NATO has always been a dynamic alliance and has always been willing to take in qualified new members. Today, that open door has become a force for stability and an incentive for continued democratic reform throughout the region. This promise of enlargement is helping to bring Europe together, and it is a promise that must be kept.

The intensified dialogues we have conducted previously with potential NATO members have been vital. We need to conduct another round at 16-plus-1 this spring to give every ally a chance for direct discussion with potential members and to give every aspirant a fair hearing.

These dialogues must continue in some form beyond Madrid. We cannot make specific commitments, but we can and should offer a program to bring our partners up to NATO standards. We should inform aspirants clearly what they must do to meet the political and military conditions for membership, and we should be candid about shortcomings. In this way, NATO can continue to encourage the broadening of democratic institutions and values across the continent.

Two months ago, at the ministerial here, this Council also agreed to strengthen the Partnership for Peace. We must go forward to implement the elements we have approved, and look to other possibilities for deepening our ties to Partner countries, especially those in the New Independent States.

We should also launch the Atlantic Partnership Council, so that it can be agreed to at or before the Madrid summit. The Council will be the collective voice of the Partnership for Peace. It will deepen consultation and practical cooperation between the alliance and Partner states and further strengthen their links to NATO. Moreover, all of our partners should be invited to the summit in Madrid. Because the summit will help shape the future of Europe, all of Europe should be represented.

Our goal is an undivided Europe. We must ensure that every European democracy, whether it joins NATO sooner, later, or not at all, has a role. This includes Russia. A critical task in the weeks ahead will be to build the partnership with Russia from which both Moscow and Europe will clearly benefit.

This is not a zero-sum game. On the contrary, NATO has recognized that we cannot build a Europe that is whole and free until a democratic Russia is wholly part of Europe. And I believe that most Russians understand, or will come to understand, that their great nation can best build a secure future for itself in a Europe without walls, with a transformed NATO as a partner.

The process of defining this new partnership is well underway. We envision a NATO-Russia Joint Council that would promote a regular dialogue on major security issues, reach concerted decisions wherever possible, and seize opportunities for joint action. Russian and NATO planners would work together at our major military commands. And we could begin immediately to develop a joint NATO-Russia brigade. We have made progress on these issues, and we have every chance through the efforts of Secretary General Solana, NATO's negotiator, to make more progress prior to Madrid.

We recognize that Russian leaders oppose the enlargement of our alliance and that this is not likely to change. But neither will we change. Russia has legitimate concerns that are being met: We have no plan, no need, and no intention to station nuclear weapons on the territory of new members. NATO's conventional and nuclear forces have been dramatically reduced.

In any event, our alliance is a positive alliance. It is not directed against any nation, and it need not be feared by any nation that does not seek first to instill fear in others.

To underline this point, last December, we agreed that the alliance should put forward a comprehensive proposal to adapt the CFE Treaty. I am pleased to learn that we are near agreement on the details of that proposal. Early tabling of alliance ideas in Vienna will make an important contribution to our preparations for Madrid.

The alliance must be united, and I believe we are united in our policy toward Russia. We cannot realize our shared vision of a united, secure, and democratic Europe without Russia. We will not delay or abandon our own plans. But we will be steadfast in offering to Russia our respect, our friendship, and an appropriate partnership in providing for the future security of Europe.

Our relationship with Ukraine is also critical. Ukraine has made great strides, against tremendous odds, toward freedom and stability. It is clearly ready to play its part in building a secure and undivided transatlantic community. We should strive to have a NATO-Ukraine agreement ready for signature in Madrid.

Before I conclude, I also want to say a few words about Bosnia. Bosnia is a daily, practical challenge for NATO—perhaps the most complex we have ever undertaken. But it is also deeply connected to our larger challenge of building a New Atlantic Community. For four murderous years in Bosnia, we came face-to-face with the future we wish to avoid for Europe. For the last year, we have seen a glimpse of the future we are trying to build.

NATO-led troops have been on the ground in Bosnia for 14 months. All 16 allies have been deeply involved—standing shoulder to shoulder with 14 Partnership countries and nations from around the world. They have not achieved perfection, but compared to what they found when they arrived, they have achieved a miracle.

Our troops no longer face the task of patrolling fixed fronts and former battlefields but, rather, local threats to peace, such as the recent violence in Mostar and the larger challenges of reconstruction, democracy, and justice.

Working with the local parties and others in the international community, we must continue to diminish the need for an external military presence. We must establish a stable military situation, improve judicial and legal institutions, help more people return safely to their homes, and see that those indicted as war criminals are arrested and prosecuted.

On Friday, arbitrator Roberts Owen announced his decision on the status of Brcko—the one dispute that was not resolved by the Dayton accords. His decision is a fair one. The goal is to further reduce the tensions that still stand in the way of a final determination of arrangements for this sensitive area.

Alliance members should work closely with the High Representative to implement the decision, including contributing additional police needed to help ensure freedom of movement in the area. And we must insist that the parties accept and cooperate with it.

I have said that the vision of a united and democratic Europe has been elusive, and that it extends back decades in history. That reality could not better be illustrated than in a speech delivered 50 years ago by Mr. Winston

Churchill. The aims he spoke of then bear a striking resemblance to the aims we speak of now:

It is not our task or wish to draw frontier lines,

he said,

but rather to smooth them away. Our aim is to bring about the unity of all the nations of all Europe. We seek to exclude no state whose territory lies in Europe and which assures to its people those fundamental . . . liberties on which our democratic civilization has been created.

He went on to say that:

Some countries will feel able to come into our circle sooner and others later according to the circumstances in which they are placed. They can all be sure that, whenever they are to join, a place and a welcome will be waiting for them at the European council table.

Twice before in this century, we have faced the challenge, in the aftermath of war, of building together a free, secure, and united Europe. We had the opportunity after World War I, but too many, in the United States and elsewhere, lacked the vision.

After World War II, as Churchill's remarks illustrate, and the memory of Marshall, Monnet, Bevin, Adenauer, and their counterparts bears witness there was no shortage of vision. But across half of Europe, the opportunity was denied.

Today, we have both the vision and the opportunity, and together we are building that Europe. It will be my great privilege to work with you, on behalf of President Clinton and the American people, as we continue with this historic task. And by our success, we will ensure that the next century begins with a solid foundation for lasting liberty and enduring peace.

Thank you very much. ■

Acting Secretary Tarnoff

Building a New Consensus on China

February 20, 1997

Address to the America-China Society, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Foreign Policy Association, and the National Committee on U.S.-China Relations on the occasion of the 25th Anniversary of the Shanghai Communique, New York City.

On behalf of the President and the Administration, I offer my condolences to Ambassador Li and to the people of the People's Republic of China on the death of Deng Xiaoping, who was a major factor in China's policy of engagement and cooperation with the United States. As President Clinton said yesterday, his vision was indispensable to normalizing relations between the United States and China in 1979. In a long, active, and remarkable life, Deng Xiaoping's contributions to China's modernization and engagement in the international community are part of his and his nation's legacy. It is a sad coincidence that as we gather here today to commemorate a key event in U.S.-China relations—the 1972 Shanghai Communique—we must also mourn Deng Xiaoping, a man who did so much to foster closer ties with the United States.

Now let me turn to the future—and most particularly the next 25 years of U.S.-China relations. We all know what tremendous changes have occurred in Sino-U.S. relations since the signing of the Communique. We had little contact with the P.R.C. before 1972, save for the occasional frosty meeting between officials in Warsaw and encounters between scholars and sports teams. Now, high-level exchanges between our Cabinet officials are routine. Secretary Albright is headed to China. This year both the Vice President and the Speaker of the House will travel to China, and summit visits will be scheduled. Our doors today are not only open to such high-level exchanges, but to tens of thousands of Americans—and tens of thousands of Chinese—who are studying, working, and living in each others' countries.

China's economy a quarter-century ago was insular and centralized. I think it's fair to say the Shanghai Communique helped to encourage in China an extraordinary period of opening to the world and economic change. Since 1972, China has quadrupled its economic output, and today the P.R.C. participates in more than 1,000 international organizations.

Twenty-five years ago, we were still in some respects Cold War foes, but today our Embassy in Beijing and our four consulates handle an immense flow of diplomatic, commercial, cultural, and educational interchange between our nations. For its part, China has integrated itself into international economic and political systems which have served to strengthen not only China's security but regional and global security as well.

Each of these strides forward was the result of a conscious choice by the Chinese leadership to reform their economy and to play a more constructive international role. While these choices were not made as a result of U.S. pressures, the United States consistently made the case to China that its participation in broad-ranging international activities was needed and that its growth and development were important to global stability and prosperity.

Here in America, such changes in China produced an era of optimism and a broad consensus that the road we had taken from Shanghai was the right one. But in the late 1980s, shifts in the strategic balance following the collapse of the Soviet Union, Taiwan's progress toward democracy, and, finally, the violent events of Tiananmen Square fractured this consensus.

One result of events in China was the decision to link China's progress on human rights to its most-favored-nation trade status. It turned out, however, that the MFN stick threatened our interests as well as China's, putting our economic relationship with China—and arguably our entire relationship—on the line.

For that reason, the Clinton Administration moved away from five years in which the MFN debate overshadowed the sum and substance of our China policy and toward comprehensive engagement and a renewed strategic dialogue with China. We have pursued this dialogue as the most effective way to expand areas of cooperation on shared problems while dealing with our differences candidly, respectfully, patiently.

Our strategic dialogue with China is built around three propositions.

First, China is at an important point in its rich history with some forces pulling inward toward nationalism and some forces pulling outward toward integration. Despite its economic progress, the prospect of social ferment remains a concern in a nation of 1.2 billion people. Since communism has declined as a unifying ideology—and until democracy is established—forms of nationalism seek to fill the void.

In this regard, economic interaction is a powerful and constructive force, especially as it

engages China with the United States and with the international economy. Last year, foreign firms were the source of more than 40% of China's exports. Each ingredient of the new global economy—computers and modems, faxes and photocopiers, contract law—carries with it ingredients of greater openness and conformity with international practices.

Second, our strategic dialogue is based on the premise that our relationship with China is multifaceted—that no one issue should be allowed to put the entire relationship on hold.

Our engagement on a broad range of subjects has yielded positive, albeit uneven results. There has been resolution of many issues, but we hope for more and quicker progress.

For example, stopping the spread of weapons of mass destruction is one of this Administration's core foreign policy goals. China supported the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the Chemical Weapons Convention, and it plans to develop comprehensive national nuclear export controls. Our cooperation with China on this issue has been noteworthy, although difficult problems remain. We are urging China to comply with its commitment not to assist unsafeguarded nuclear facilities in third countries, to curtail nuclear cooperation with Iran, and to curb sales of missile-related equipment and technology to Iran and Pakistan.

On the economic front, we have done much together to our mutual benefit. Since Deng's reforms began, American firms have invested \$175 billion in the Chinese economy. We have worked through some very tough trade concerns, particularly the enforcement of our

intellectual property rights and a recent agreement on textiles. Still, our growing trade deficit with China is a considerable worry that must be reversed soon. For that reason, market access will remain a key issue on our bilateral agenda. And while China's accession to the WTO is in the interests of the world trading system, China must make commercially meaningful commitments.

China has also undertaken a constructive role on regional security matters. As the high tension of recent days reminds us, the Korean Peninsula remains volatile—one of the most dangerous flashpoints on earth. Together with China, we worked to convince North Korea to freeze its dangerous nuclear program. China also agreed to take part in the Four-Party peace talks proposed by South Korea and the United States to advance a lasting peace with North Korea. It remains very much in the interests of both China and the United States to use our influence jointly and wisely.

Let me refer as well to one of the most sensitive issues we have in our relations with China: human rights. Expanding our cooperation with China does not mean ignoring our differences. On the contrary, engagement permits frank discussion of such matters and the ability to put them into the perspective of a broad, important relationship.

Although deep commitment to human rights is part of our American heritage, what we seek from the Chinese—and other countries in the world where human rights practices are a concern—is greater respect for basic rights that are universally recognized by the international community. We have asked China—and will continue to do so—to observe these internationally established norms. We will speak out for human rights in China, as in other countries where conditions require us to do so. And as Secretary Albright has said, we will tell it like it is.

Another aspect of our strategic dialogue with China relates to the future of Hong Kong. The process by which the United Kingdom and China reached their accord on Hong Kong was difficult—but the result quite remarkable. In the Joint Declaration and Basic Law, China pledged to maintain Hong Kong's autonomy, freedoms, and way of life.

Nonetheless, we are concerned by some of the recent developments in Hong Kong, particularly proposals by China's Preparatory Committee to dilute basic human rights laws and by the appointment of the provisional legislature. At the same time, we must remember that the transition has been underway for 13

“...what we seek from the Chinese—and other countries in the world where human rights practices are a concern—is greater respect for basic rights that are universally recognized by the international community.”

years, and Hong Kong has remained a thriving center of international trade. This will not end on July 1. And we will continue to have a significant stake in Hong Kong's future and watch developments there closely.

The **third** basic proposition behind our strategic dialogue is our enduring commitment to a "One-China" policy. We have been heartened by the movement toward democracy in Taiwan. At the same time, our "One-China" policy provides the stability necessary for a peaceful settlement of the Taiwan question by Chinese themselves.

Today's anniversary of the Shanghai Communique marks an opportunity for all of us to commit to build a renewed public consensus on China: a consensus that President Nixon succeeded in forging with the help of so many

of you here today; a consensus which was weakened by the events in Tiananmen Square eight years ago. But America's goal has not changed in 25 years; it is to engage China as a constructive partner and responsible stakeholder in the international system.

To succeed will require both the vision and the courage that President Nixon, Secretary Kissinger, Chairman Mao, and Premier Zhou brought to Shanghai a quarter-century ago. Today, the vision is to develop a new relationship between two great powers. Today, the courage requires China and the United States to deal with complex areas of agreement and disagreement in a spirit of respect and cooperation.

I can assure you that President Clinton and Secretary Albright are dedicated to this task. ■

MULTILATERAL**Children**

Convention on the rights of the child. Done at New York Nov. 20, 1989. Entered into force Sept. 2, 1990.¹

Accession: Oman, Dec. 9, 1996.

Convention on protection of children and cooperation in respect of intercountry adoption. Done at The Hague May 29, 1993. Entered into force May 1, 1995.¹

Signature: El Salvador, Nov. 21, 1996.

Genocide

Convention on the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide. Adopted by UN General Assembly at Paris Dec. 9, 1948. Entered into force Jan. 12, 1951; for the U.S. Feb. 23, 1989. Accession: Burundi, Jan. 6, 1997.

Judicial Procedures

Convention on the civil aspects of international child abduction. Done at The Hague Oct. 25, 1980. Entered into force Dec. 1, 1983; for the U.S. July 1, 1988. TIAS 11670.

Signature & Ratification: Venezuela, Oct. 16, 1996.²

Convention abolishing the requirement of legalization for foreign public documents, with annex. Done at The Hague Oct. 5, 1961. Entered into force Jan. 24, 1965; for the U.S. Oct. 15, 1981. TIAS 10072; 33 UST 883.

Signature: Ireland, Oct. 29, 1996.

Accession: Lithuania, Nov. 5, 1996.

Law, Private International

Statute of The Hague conference on private international law. Done at The Hague Oct. 9-31, 1951. Entered into force July 15, 1955; for the U.S., Oct. 15, 1964. TIAS 5710; 15 UST 2228.

Acceptance: Monaco, Aug. 8, 1996.

Terrorism

Convention on the safety of United Nations and associated personnel. Done at New York Dec. 9, 1994.³

Ratification: Argentina, Jan. 6, 1997.

Weapons, Conventional

Convention on prohibitions or restrictions on the use of certain conventional weapons which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects, with annexed protocols. Adopted at Geneva Oct. 10, 1980. Entered into force Dec. 2, 1983; for the U.S. Sept. 24, 1995. [Senate] Treaty Doc.

Protocol on non-detectable fragments (Protocol I) to the Convention on prohibitions or restrictions on the use of certain conventional weapons which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects.

Adopted at Geneva Oct. 10, 1980. Entered into force Dec. 2, 1983; for the U.S. Sept. 24, 1995. [Senate] Treaty Doc. 103-25.

Protocol on prohibitions or restrictions on the use of mines, booby-traps, and other devices (Protocol II) to the convention on prohibitions or restrictions on the use of certain conventional weapons which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects. Adopted at Geneva Oct. 10, 1980. Entered into force Dec. 2, 1983; for the U.S. Sept. 24, 1995. [Senate] Treaty Doc. 103-25.

Protocol on prohibitions or restrictions on the use of incendiary weapons (Protocol III) to the convention on prohibitions or restrictions on the use of certain conventional weapons which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects. Adopted at Geneva Oct. 10, 1980. Entered into force Dec. 2, 1983. Succession: Macedonia, Dec. 30, 1996.

BILATERAL**Belarus**

Postal money order agreement. Signed at Washington and Minsk May 1 and Nov. 7, 1996. Entered into force Jan. 1, 1997.

Brazil

Agreement extending the memorandum of understanding of May 8, 1994, as extended (TIAS 11252), concerning the Landsat System. Effected by exchange of notes at Brasilia Oct. 18 and Nov. 28, 1996. Entered into force Nov. 28, 1996.

Memorandum of understanding concerning flight of the Humidity Sounder for Brazil (HSB) instrument of NASA's Earth Observing System (EOS) PM-1 spacecraft. Signed at Brasilia Dec. 5, 1996. Entered into force Dec. 5, 1996.

Mongolia

Agreement regarding cooperation and mutual assistance in customs matters. Signed at Hong Kong June 19, 1996. Entered into force June 19, 1996.

Nepal

Express mail agreement, with detailed regulations. Signed at Nepal and Washington July 9 and Oct. 25, 1996. Entered into force Jan. 1, 1997.

New Zealand

Agreement regarding mutual assistance between their customs services. Signed at Hong Kong June 13, 1996. Entered into force June 13, 1996.

Nigeria

Agreement regarding the provision of commodities and services to Nigerian forces participating in ECOMOG peacekeeping

operations. Effected by exchange of notes at Abuja Nov. 9, 1996. Entered into force Nov. 9, 1996.

Turkey

Agreement relating to the reciprocal granting of authorizations to permit licensed amateur radio operators of either country to operate their stations in the other country. Effected by exchange of notes at Ankara Nov. 27, 1996. Entered into force Nov. 27, 1996.

Arrangement relating to radio communications between amateur stations on behalf of third parties. Effected by exchange of notes at Ankara Nov. 27, 1996. Entered into force Nov. 27, 1996.

United Kingdom

Memorandum of understanding for cooperation in the development of combined arms tactical training equipment. Signed at Alexandria and Abbey Wood Dec. 6, 1996. Entered into force Dec. 6, 1996.

¹Not in force for the U.S.

²With reservations.

³Not in force. ■