



Dispatch Magazine (1993)

Return to: [Index of Dispatch Magazine Archives](#)

[Index of 1993 Issues](#)

[Index of "Briefings and Statements"](#)

[Electronic Research Collection](#)

[ERC Reference Desk](#)

[Alphabetic Index](#)

[Sitemap](#)

[ERC Homepage](#)

US DEPARTMENT OF STATE DISPATCH
VOLUME 4, NUMBER 24, JUNE 14, 1993
PUBLISHED BY THE BUREAU OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

ARTICLES IN THIS ISSUE:

1. China: Most-Favored-Nation Status -- President Clinton, Executive Order, Winston Lord
2. Creation of Presidential Council on Sustainable Development -- President Clinton
3. U.S. Support for Global Commitment To Sustainable Development -- Vice President Gore
4. Economic Diplomacy: Key to Domestic Prosperity -- Joan E. Spero
5. U.S. Policy Toward Liberia, Togo, and Zaire -- George E. Moose
6. CSCE Negotiations on Nagorno-Karabakh -- John J. Maresca, Joint Statement
7. Joint Statement Following U.S.-North Korea Meeting
(###)

ARTICLE 1:

China: Most-Favored-Nation Status
President Clinton, Executive Order, Winston Lord

President Clinton
Statement released by the White House, Office of the Press Secretary,
Washington, DC, May 28, 1993.

Yesterday, the American people won a tremendous victory as a majority of the House of Representatives joined me in adopting our plan to revitalize American's economic future. Today, Members of Congress have joined me to announce a new chapter in United States policy toward China.

China occupies an important place in our nation's foreign policy. It is the world's most populous state, its fastest growing major economy, and a permanent member of the UN Security Council. Its future will do much to shape the future of Asia, our security and trade relations in the Pacific, and a host of global issues, from the environment to weapons proliferation. In short, our relationship with China is of very great importance.

Unfortunately, over the past 4 years, our nation spoke with a divided voice when it came to China. Americans were outraged by the killing of pro-democracy demonstrators at Tiananmen Square in June 1989. Congress was determined to have our nation's stance toward China reflect our outrage.

Yet, twice after Congress voted to place conditions on our favorable trade rules toward China--so-called most-favored-nation status--those conditions were vetoed. The annual battles between Congress and the Executive divided our foreign policy and weakened our approach over China. It is time that a unified American policy recognize both the value of China and the values of America.

Starting today, the United States will speak with one voice on China policy. We no longer have an executive branch policy and a congressional policy; we have an American policy.

I am happy to have with me, today, key congressional leaders on this issue. I am also honored to be joined by representatives of the business community and several distinguished Chinese student leaders. Their presence here is a tangible symbol of the unity of our purpose.

I particularly want to recognize Senate Majority Leader George Mitchell of Maine and Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi of California. Their tireless dedication to the cause of freedom in China has given voice to our collective concerns. I intend to continue working closely with Congress as we pursue our China policy.

We are here, today, because the American people continue to harbor profound concerns about a range of practices by China's communist leaders. We are concerned that many activists and pro-democracy leaders, including some from Tiananmen Square, continue to languish behind prison bars in China for no crime other than exercising their consciences. We are concerned about international access to their prisons. And we are concerned by the Dalai Lama's reports of Chinese abuses against the people and culture of Tibet.

We must also address China's role in the proliferation of dangerous weapons. The Gulf War proved the danger of irresponsible sales of technologies related to weapons of mass destruction. While the world is newly determined to address the danger of such missiles, we have reason to worry that China continues to sell them.

Finally, we have concerns about our terms of trade with China. China runs an \$18 billion trade surplus with the U.S.--second only to Japan. In the face of this deficit, China continues practices that block American goods.

I have said before that we do not want to isolate China, given its growing importance in the global community. China, today, is a nation of nearly 1.2 billion people--home to one of every five people in the world. By sheer size alone, China has an important impact on the world's economy--and politics. The future of China and Hong Kong is of great importance to the region and to the people of America.

We take some encouragement from the economic reforms in China--reforms that, by some measures, place China's economy as the third largest in the world, after the United States and Japan. China's coastal provinces are an engine for reform throughout the country. The residents of Shanghai and Guangzhou are far more motivated by markets than by Marx or Mao.

We are hopeful that China's process of development and economic reform will be accompanied by greater political freedom. In some ways, this process has begun. An emerging Chinese middle class points the antennae of new televisions toward Hong Kong to pick up broadcasts of CNN. Cellular phones and fax machines carry implicit notions of freer communications. Hong Kong, itself, is a catalyst of democratic values, and we strongly support Governor Patten's efforts to broaden democratic rights.

The question we face, today, is how best to cultivate these hopeful seeds of change in China while expressing our clear disapproval of its repressive policies. The core of this policy will be a resolute insistence upon significant progress on human rights in China. To implement this policy, I am signing today an executive order that will have the effect of extending most-favored-nation status for China for 12 months. Whether I extend MFN next year, however, will depend upon

whether China makes significant progress in improving its human rights record.

The order lays out particular areas I will examine, including respect for the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the release of citizens imprisoned for the non-violent expression of their political beliefs, including activists imprisoned in connection with Tiananmen Square. The order includes China's protection of Tibet's religious and cultural heritage and compliance with the bilateral U.S.-China agreement on prison labor. In addition, we will use existing statutes to address our concerns in the areas of trade and arms control.

The order I am issuing today directs the Secretary of State and other Administration officials to pursue, resolutely, all legislative and executive actions to ensure that China abides by international standards. I intend to put the full weight of the Executive behind this order; I know I have Congress' support.

Let me give you an example. The Administration is now examining reports that China has shipped M-11 ballistic missiles to Pakistan. If true, such action would violate China's commitment to observe the guidelines and parameters of the Missile Technology Control Regime. Existing U.S. law provides for strict sanctions against nations that violate these guidelines.

We have made our concerns on the M-11 issue known to the Chinese on numerous occasions. They understand the serious consequences of missile transfer under U.S. sanctions law. If we determine that China has, in fact, transferred M-11 missiles or related equipment in violation of its commitments, my Administration will not hesitate to act.

My Administration is committed to supporting peaceful democratic and pro-market reform. I believe we will yet see these principles prevail in China. For in the past few years, we have witnessed a pivot point in history, as other communist regimes across the map have ceded to the power of democracy and markets.

We are prepared to build a more cooperative relationship with China and wish to work with China as an active member of the international community. Through some of its actions, China has demonstrated that it wants to be a member of that community.

Executive Order--Conditions for Renewal of Most-Favored-Nation Status for the People's Republic of China in 1994

Released by the White House, Office of the Press Secretary, Washington, DC, May 28, 1993.

Whereas, the Congress and the American people have expressed deep concern about the appropriateness of unconditional most-favored-nation (MFN) trading status for the People's Republic of China (China);

Whereas, I share the concerns of the Congress and the American people regarding this important issue, particularly with respect to China's record on human rights, nuclear nonproliferation, and trade;

Whereas, I have carefully weighed the advisability of conditioning China's MFN status as a means of achieving progress in these areas;

Whereas, I have concluded that the public interest would be served by a continuation of the waiver of the application of sections 402 (a) and (b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2432 (a) and 2432 (b)) (Act) on China's MFN status for an additional 12 months with renewal thereafter subject to the conditions below;

Now, Therefore, by the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. The Secretary of State (Secretary) shall make a recommendation to the President to extend or not to extend MFN status to China for the 12-month period beginning July 3, 1994.

(a) In making this recommendation the Secretary shall not recommend extension unless he determines that:

--extension will substantially promote the freedom of emigration objectives of section 402 of the Act; and

--China is complying with the 1992 bilateral agreement between the United States and China concerning prison labor.

(b) In making this recommendation the Secretary shall also determine whether China has made overall, significant progress with respect to the following:

--taking steps to begin adhering to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

--releasing and providing an acceptable accounting for Chinese citizens imprisoned or detained for the non-violent expression of their political and religious beliefs, including such expression of beliefs in connection with the Democracy Wall and Tiananmen Square movements;

--ensuring humane treatment of prisoners, such as by allowing access to prisons by international humanitarian and human rights organizations;

--protecting Tibet's distinctive religious and cultural heritage; and

--permitting international radio and television broadcasts into China.

Sec. 2. The Secretary shall submit his recommendation to the President before June 3, 1994.

Sec. 3. The Secretary, and other appropriate officials of the United States, shall pursue resolutely all legislative and executive actions to ensure that China abides by its commitments to follow fair, nondiscriminatory trade practices in dealing with U.S. businesses, and adheres to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Missile Technology Control Regime guidelines and parameters, and other nonproliferation commitments.

Sec. 4. This order does not create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable by any person or entity against the United States, its officers, or employees.

Assistant Secretary Lord

Statement by Winston Lord, Assistant Secretary for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, before the Subcommittee on Trade of the House Ways and Means Committee, Washington, DC, June 8, 1993.

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee: On May 28, 1993, President Clinton signed a historic executive order which renewed China's MFN status for 1 year with human rights conditions. After years of sharp disagreement, the United States can now speak with one voice in dealing with China. Congressional leaders of varying viewpoints, human rights and business representatives, and Chinese student leaders attending the

signing ceremony demonstrated the breadth of support for the Administration's approach, which seeks to balance key U.S. goals while firmly promoting human rights and democracy. The President's decision has received broad approval in this country and abroad.

This was not an easy task. People of good will disagreed on the best means to remain engaged with China while pressing Beijing for responsible behavior in core areas of concern. Some would revoke MFN status now. Some would impose very wide-ranging conditions for future extension. Some believe that China is inexorably moving toward political openness and we should focus on other issues. Some remain very critical of Beijing but believe that trade legislation is an inappropriate instrument for leverage. And everyone has a different ordering of priorities among human rights, economic interests, non-proliferation, and Chinese cooperation on international issues.

Only after extensive consultations with the Congress, human rights organizations, business interests, and others did the President decide on the approach defined in his executive order. Such consultations will continue to be a hallmark of this Administration's China policy.

The President also reached his decision after intensive and quiet dialogue with the Chinese on areas of major interest, including trade, non-proliferation, and human rights. We sought to make the maximum possible progress at the outset of this Administration before deciding with the Congress on the optimum course of action with respect to China's trade status.

Accordingly, for more than 3 months we have been setting forth our concerns and urging Chinese movement. In Washington, Secretary Christopher, Under Secretary Tarnoff, and I have been engaged with the Chinese. In Beijing, Ambassador Roy and his team have been meeting with a broad range of Chinese officials. Last month, I traveled to Beijing to make one final effort.

The progress to date has not been dramatic, but it is not inconsequential. It includes Beijing's release of prominent political and religious figures; dispatch of several trade missions to buy American products; the signing of the Chemical Weapons Convention; cooperation on Americans missing in action; and, after lengthy delay, the welcoming of Peace Corps volunteers. China has also played a constructive role on some regional issues, notably including the North Korean nuclear challenge. The President's report to Congress accompanying his executive order gives a full survey of Chinese progress--and lack of it--on key issues.

Such actions, together with balancing our various interests, led the President to recommend extension of MFN status for another year. But they clearly were insufficient to meet our basic concerns or the President's past commitments. And, thus, he decided, through executive order, to invoke human rights conditions while pledging to pursue other issues diligently with the other instruments available to us.

China is an influential member of the international order. More than one of every five humans live there. It possesses nuclear weapons and exports nuclear technology. It launches satellites and sells missiles. It represents a huge market and one of the world's richest civilizations. It holds a permanent seat on the United Nations Security Council. It has an influential role on key regional issues like Indochina, Korea, and disputed islands. It abuts the unsettled Central Asia region. It is salient in new challenges that require global action, like the environment, population, refugees, and narcotics traffic.

In recent years, China has opened up to the world, moved toward a market

economy, and enjoyed the fastest growth rate in the world. Together with the greater Chinese communities of Taiwan and Hong Kong, it has become one of the most promising areas for investment and trade.

At the same time, its leaders cling to an outdated authoritarian system. Serious abuses persist. While Beijing releases some prominent activists toward the end of their jail sentences, it arrests others for the peaceful expression of political views. Hundreds, if not thousands, of Chinese citizens languish in prison merely for their peaceful expression of political views. Tibetans and other minorities face serious challenges to their religions and cultures.

The Chinese leaders are gambling that open economics and closed politics will preserve their system of control. It is a gamble that sooner or later will be lost. Economic reform produces--and requires--political reform. In today's world, nations cannot prosper for long without opening up their societies. Technology and information, the forces of modernization, and global democratic trends have been eroding communism and totalitarianism across the globe.

All of the Asian models of economic success toward which China looks--many of them Chinese societies--have shown that political relaxation, tolerance of opposition, a freer press, the rule of law, and other democratic elements are inescapably linked with economic development.

In encouraging human rights and democracy, we are not singling out China. The Clinton Administration seeks these goals worldwide. This policy will be promoted in the upcoming United Nations conference in Vienna, and it will be reflected in the establishment of a Radio Free Asia.

Our policy challenge with China, therefore, is to reconcile our need to deal with this important nation with our imperative to promote international values. We will seek cooperation with China on a range of issues. But Americans cannot forget Tiananmen Square.

Despite that tragedy, the process of change continues in China. The erosion of Marxist-Leninist orthodoxy in the last decade has unleashed the talents of the Chinese people. We can see the results today in the dynamic Chinese economy. The U.S. has a basic national interest in a more open, prosperous, and humane China which will also be a more peaceful and cooperative member of the world community. Our policies will reflect this national interest.

China, already an important market for U.S. goods, may become even more significant. Based on some estimates of growth in the P.R.C. economy, our exports could reach as much as \$20 billion by the year 2000, up from \$7.5 billion last year. There is the potential for a major expansion of U.S. exports, including in certain high-tech industries, such as aerospace and telecommunications. This growth will create jobs for Americans. Moreover, in addition to improving the quality of life for the Chinese people, it will guarantee the continued flow of new ideas and values into the P.R.C.

The American business community has been effectively expressing its views to the executive and legislative branches on the issue of MFN. This is entirely appropriate. We hope, however, that it will also express to the Chinese concerns that Americans have on humanitarian and other issues.

The Chinese Government cannot expect to enjoy the full fruits of membership in the international community unless it abides by universally recognized standards regarding treatment of its citizens, global commerce, and the transfer of weapons of mass destruction and sensitive technology. It is especially important that China do this

now, while its institutional reforms and policies are still taking shape.

The President's conditional renewal of China's MFN status recognizes Beijing's need for access to our market as an incentive for improved human rights conditions. We believe that the conditions set out in the executive order are firm and credible. We also believe they are achievable in the coming year. We are hopeful the Chinese Government will take significant steps in the human rights area which will permit the President next year to renew the P.R.C.'s MFN status in a positive fashion. But the President is prepared to revoke that status if satisfactory progress does not occur.

While conditioning renewal on human rights, the President's executive order directs the Administration vigorously to use existing legislation and executive authority to insure Chinese compliance with agreements on fair trade practices and non-proliferation. The President believes existing statutory and policy resources offer powerful tools to advance American goals in these areas.

In recent years, as trade between the U.S. and China has ballooned, so has our trade deficit with China, which is now close to \$20 billion, second only to Japan. Our export growth remains strong at nearly 20% this year, but Chinese policies continue to resist access to the Chinese market and present U.S. firms with barriers in goods and services that Chinese firms do not face in selling to us. With the support of this committee, the Administration intends to ensure Chinese compliance with agreements signed last year on protection of intellectual property, prison labor products, and market access.

In the area of non-proliferation, China's signing of the Chemical Weapons Convention in January now makes Beijing an adherent to all major non-proliferation agreements. We welcome these commitments, which are essential for strengthening global non-proliferation regimes. But we will very closely monitor Chinese behavior to ensure that it is fully consistent with Beijing's obligations. In this respect, we are deeply concerned about reports that China last year transferred M-11 missile-related equipment to Pakistan. In keeping with the executive order, we will not hesitate to take the actions required under U.S. missile proliferation law if we determine that such a transfer occurred.

Let me emphasize here, as I have to the Chinese, that in the areas of trade and non-proliferation we are not raising new demands. We are merely asking China to implement agreements to which it has already adhered. We are not asking for major concessions. We are only insisting on faithful implementation. The follow-through on agreements will not only serve American interests. It will serve Chinese interests as well as buttress China's credibility.

The Clinton Administration's China policy looks beyond the annual debate on MFN and seeks to broaden the framework for bilateral ties. It defines an effective course which will advance U.S. goals and balance U.S. interests. Mindful of the need to maintain unity with the Congress on China, the President has now established a basis for using our influence most effectively to encourage improved Chinese policies. With a collaborative approach governing our actions, we will strive to resolve our serious differences with Beijing while building on areas of agreement. We will engage the Chinese in a variety of ways to make progress during the coming year and beyond.

President Clinton would like to restore momentum in the Sino-American relationship and build stronger foundations for the future. This will require serious efforts by Beijing to meet our core concerns and international norms. We, in turn, are prepared to listen to Chinese perspectives and take steps of our own. In the long run, sound U.S.-

perceptions and some steps of our own. In the long run, sound Sino-Chinese relations are of vital importance not only for our mutual prosperity and welfare but for international peace and stability. By restoring broad consensus on China policy, President Clinton has placed America in the best possible position to move toward these goals. (###)

ARTICLE 2:

Creation of Presidential Council on Sustainable Development

President Clinton

Remarks at signing of the executive order on the Presidential Council on Sustainable Development, Washington, DC, June 14, 1993

Thank you, thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much for being here. It has been a year since the Earth Summit in Rio. I think you might be interested to know that a year ago at the Earth Summit in Rio I placed a call to Senator Al Gore of Tennessee to get a report on the goings on there from him and from Senator Wirth of Colorado and to begin the process by which we came together as a team. Not very long after that I asked Al Gore to join the Democratic ticket and the rest was history.

I don't want to make any bones about it. When we had our first very long meeting, one thing that then-Senator Gore said was that he wanted to be part of a ticket that, if elected, could put the environment back on the front burner in American public life and do it in a way that would be good for the economy, not bad for the economy--do it in a way that would bring the American people together, not divide them.

All the policy positions that the Vice President just announced that we have taken to change the direction of the previous Administrations--and, more importantly, to go beyond politics to embrace a new philosophy of uniting our goals of preserving the environment and promoting economic growth--would have been very difficult to achieve had it not been for his leadership and constant involvement and faithfulness to this cause. And the American people owe him a great debt of gratitude.

I would also like to acknowledge the presence of one other person in this audience who has not been introduced and is not up here, but it will become obvious when I say what I want to say. The Deputy Secretary of Education, Madeline Kunin, is here. She was formerly the Governor of Vermont. And, as far as I know, she was the only governor in the country who actually had a sustainable development commission actively operating on the problems of the people of Vermont when she was the governor. And she, in many ways, blazed a trail for what we are attempting to do today. And I thank you for that.

A year ago, the United States was in Rio fighting the Global Warming Treaty and the Biodiversity Treaty. Our leading economic competitors were at the Earth Summit signing off on the Global Warming Treaty, signing off on the Biodiversity Treaty; and while the United States was fighting to water it down, change it, or thwart it, they spent all their time selling environmental technology to other nations in the world, making money while we made hot air.

What a difference a year can make. This morning, the Vice President made us all proud in his opening address before the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development. America is now doing what we ought to do. We're leading again--leading the nations of the world in the pursuit of a great purpose.

This afternoon, I am announcing the creation of the President's Council on Sustainable Development to help set policies to grow the economy and preserve the environment for our children and our children's children, bringing together some of the most innovative people from business from

bringing together some of the most innovative people from business, from government, from the environmental movement, the civil rights movement, and the labor movement; people who bring a wealth of experience and accomplishment to this mission; people who have developed environmentally sound products, found ways to protect our air and water, and defended communities all across the country against pollution and health hazards.

In the past, many might not have ever had the chance to sit down at the table and work together. But now they are working together. These men and women have real experience in the real world, and I am counting on them to achieve real results. I am asking them to find new ways to combine economic growth and environmental protection, to promote our best interests in the world community, to bring our people together to meet the needs of the present without jeopardizing the future. I am asking the council to be guided by three principles that inform our environmental policies.

First, we believe a healthy economy and a healthy environment go hand in hand. Environmental problems result not from robust growth but from reckless growth. And we can grow the economy by making our people healthier, our communities more attractive, and our products and our services more environmentally conscious.

Second, America must lead the way in promoting economic growth and environmental preservation at home and abroad. We live in an era of global economics, global environmentalism, global epidemics. Our lives and our livelihoods depend upon people throughout the world being healthy and prosperous and respectful of the planet we all share. What is good for the world in this sense is very good for America.

And, third, we must move beyond the false choices and unnecessary antagonisms of the past. From American business and American labor to the world's wealthiest nations and the world's poorest, we all share a common interest in economic growth that preserves rather than pollutes our environment. America can set an example by achieving economic growth that can continue through the lifetimes of our children and grandchildren because it respects the resources that make that growth possible.

That is what we mean by sustainable development. That is why I'm asking this council to promote healthy communities and environmentally sound products and services that will do the best in the world to make our marketplace the best in the world now and well into the 21st century.

When we talk about environmental justice, we mean calling a halt to the poisoning and the pollution of our poorest communities, from our rural areas to our inner cities. We don't have a person to waste, and pollution clearly wastes human lives and natural resources. When our children's lives are no longer cut short by toxic dumps, when their minds are no longer damaged by lead paint poisoning, we will stop wasting the energy and the intelligence that could build a stronger and a more prosperous America.

When we talk about environmentally sound products and services, we mean light bulbs and computers and refrigerators that use less energy and automobiles that produce less pollution. People all across the world want to buy these goods and services, and when we make them in America, that means better-paying and more secure jobs and higher living standards for all of our people.

Americans take pride in our know-how, our can-do spirit, and our love of this remarkable land that God has given us. With leaders like the men and women here today, we can put what is best about America to work building a stronger economy and preserving this planet for our children and all generations to come. Thank you very much. (###)

ARTICLE 3:

U.S. Support for Global Commitment To Sustainable Development
Vice President Gore
Address to the Commission on Sustainable Development, United Nations,
New York City, June 14, 1993

It is an honor to be here with you at an event of such importance to all of our countries and to countries whose representatives are not in this room. It is a year since Rio, and while we usually focus on the ideas expressed during the official proceedings of the Earth Summit, I remember a lot more. For the great riches of human creativity were on full display in Rio: that giant "tree of life" decorated with messages written in crayon on paper leaves from children around the world; representatives of indigenous peoples like the Kayapao, Yanomami, Inuit, and Penan presenting impassioned defenses of the endangered remnants of wilderness within which their ancient cultures are struggling to survive. Scientists displayed startlingly beautiful computer images of every square inch of the earth, as seen from space and artists crafted spectacular sculptures, paintings, music, graphics, and films. And they all seemed more alike than different--the indigenous person and the artist, the scientist and the child, and the tourist and the diplomat. All seemed to share a deeper understanding--a recognition that we are all part of something much larger than ourselves, a family related only distantly by blood but intimately by commitment to each other's common future.

And so it is, today. We are from different parts of the globe. My words are being translated into many different languages. Over the next few days we will need to resolve some significant differences, but we are united by a common premise--that human activities are needlessly causing grave and, perhaps, irreparable damage to the global environment. The dangers are clear to all of us. The earth's forests are being destroyed at the rate of one football field's worth every second. An enormous hole is opening in the ozone layer, reducing the earth's ability to protect life from deadly ultraviolet radiation. Living species die at such an unprecedented rate that more than half may disappear within our lifetimes. More and more chemical wastes seep down to poison groundwater--and up to destroy the atmosphere's delicate balance. Degradation of land, forests, and fresh water--individually and synergistically--play critical roles in international instability. Huge quantities of carbon dioxide, methane, and other greenhouse gases dumped in the atmosphere trap heat and raise global temperatures. You know this. Our shared sense of urgency has brought us here, today.

Would that everyone saw things the same way; they don't. A few weeks ago Harvard Prof. Edward Wilson, writing in The New York Times, summarized the notions of those who have a different view.

"Population growth? Good for the economy--so let it run. Land shortages? Try fusion energy to power the desalting of sea water, then reclaim the world's deserts . . . by towing icebergs to coastal pipelines . . ." "Species going extinct? Not to worry," the skeptics say. "That is nature's way. Think of humankind as only the latest in a long line of exterminating agents in geological time. Resources? The planet has more than enough resources to last indefinitely."

Wilson called this group the "exemptionalists," because they hold that humans are so transcendent in intelligence and spirit that they have been exempted "from the iron laws of ecology that bind all other species."

The human race is not exempt. The laws of ecology bind us, too. We

the human race is not exempt. The laws of ecology bind us, too. We made a commitment at Rio to change our course. We made a commitment to reject the counsel of those who would continue along the road to extermination. And if there was any doubt about the support of the United States for that commitment, let me lay it to rest. This Administration not only supports that commitment, we intend to join with all those determined to demonstrate real leadership. Don't take my word for it. Listen to the words of President Clinton commemorating Earth Day.

"Unless we act, and act now," the President said, "we face a future where our planet will be home to 9 billion people . . . but its capacity to support and sustain our lives will be very much diminished. "Unless we act, we face the extinction of untold numbers of species that might save . . . our very lives. Unless we act now, we face a future in which the sun may scorch us, not warm us . . . and where our children's children will inherit a planet far less hospitable than the world in which we came of age."

President Clinton mentioned the critical importance of the Biodiversity Treaty emerging from Rio and announced [that] the United States would now sign that treaty. And so we did, on June 4. He mentioned the importance of reducing greenhouse gas emissions and committed the United States to reducing emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2000--a major change for my country. The President announced a series of executive orders that will transform our government into a leader in pollution prevention and energy efficiency--for we ask for changes in everyone else's house, shouldn't we get our own house, the federal government of the United States, in order?

And this afternoon, I am pleased to tell you, we will announce one of the many fruits of this new attention to the environment from the United States: the President's Council on Sustainable Development. This 25-member council will build a new partnership among representatives from industry, government, and environmental groups. It will develop new approaches to integrating economic and environmental policies. President Clinton will formally establish the council in a ceremony at the White House this afternoon. By the end of this year, the council will have contributed to the U.S. Sustainable Development Action Plan. That plan will then be reported to you. We believe in this mission. We are committed to making it work. But of course, what we have done so far is only a beginning. We cannot overestimate the difficulties that lie ahead. In fact, from the vast array of problems about which it is possible to be pessimistic, let me mention two.

Population Growth

First, population growth. It is sobering to realize what is happening to the world's population in the course of our lifetimes. From the beginning of the human species until the end of World War II, when I was born, it took more than 10,000 generations to reach a world population of a little more than 2 billion. But in just the past 45 years, it has gone from a little over 2 billion to 5.5 billion. And if I live another 45 years, it will be 9 or 10 billion.

The changes brought about by this explosion are not for the distant future. This is not only a problem for our grandchildren, the problems are already here--soil erosion, the loss of vegetative cover, extinction, desertification, famine, and the garbage crisis. The population explosion, accompanied by wholesale changes in technology, affects every aspect of our lives, in every part of the globe.

Now, sometimes, developing countries feel the population argument is one made by wealthy countries who want to clamp down on their ability to grow. Let me answer that. Sometimes the developing countries are right. So I say this to citizens of the developed nations: We have a disproportionate impact on the global environment. We have less than a

disproportionate impact on the global environment. We have less than a quarter of the world's population, but we use three-quarters of the world's raw materials and create three-quarters of all solid waste. One way to put it is this: A child born in the United States will have 30 times more impact on the earth's environment during his or her lifetime than a child born in India. The affluent of the world have a responsibility to deal with their disproportionate impact.

But population growth affects everyone. By the year 2000, 31 low-income countries will be unable to feed their people using their own land. At the Second Preparatory Committee Meeting for the International Conference on Population and Development, the United States pledged its commitment to help promote international consensus around the goal of stabilizing world population growth. We called for a comprehensive approach built around three areas--the environment, development, and the rights and needs of women.

Is population growth only a problem of birth control? Of course not. Paradoxically, reducing infant mortality is important as well. Several decades ago, Julius Nyerere put this matter cogently: "The most powerful contraceptive is the confidence by parents that their children will survive." More recently, a doctor in India put the matter a slightly different way, as he explained the success of programs in Kerala that have dramatically reduced birth rates. "The most enduring contraception is female education," he said. "Women realize they have a conscious choice and that hopes and dreams for their children are not unrealistic." Slowing population growth is in the deepest self-interest of all governments. It is a responsibility for rich and poor countries alike.

Emerging Technologies

Rapid population growth is only one of the causes of a profound transformation in the relationship between human civilization and the ecological system of the earth. The emergence of extremely powerful new technologies which magnify the impact each of us can have on the global environment has also played an important role. Most significant of all, many people now think about our relationship to the earth in ways that assume we don't have to concern ourselves with the consequences of our actions, as if the global environment will forever be impervious to the rapidly mounting insults to its integrity and balance. But the evidence of deterioration is all around us. Take, for example, the threat to our supply of fresh water. There is a lot of water on earth, but there isn't very much fresh water. Only about 2.5% of all water on earth is fresh, and most of that is locked away as ice in Antarctica, or Greenland, or other areas. Furthermore, much of that water is used inefficiently. It also may be polluted by toxics and human waste. Meanwhile, by the year 2000, 18 of the 22 largest metropolitan areas in the world--those with more than 10 million people--will be in developing countries. By 2025, 60% of the world's population will live in cities--that's more than 5 billion people. They will urgently need fresh water and water sanitation--and not just to drink. Water affects industrial development. It is the medium necessary for heat exchange, processing, and transport. It affects the world's ability to produce food; 76% of global water use is agricultural. A significant change in the availability of fresh water supply can trigger massive human migrations. Because we know how precious drinkable water is, our ways of supplying it have become justly celebrated as triumphs of human ingenuity, whether from the first irrigation networks along the Nile to the monumental system of tunnels that bring water to this city so you could brush your teeth in the hotel room this morning. We will need all our ingenuity to prevent that supply from drying up. Rapid growth itself is a threat to our supply of fresh water, whether in Mexico City where the water level of the main aquifer drops as much as 11 feet a year or in any of the approximately 80 countries which already suffer from serious water shortages.

Meanwhile, the World Health Organization estimates that contaminated water causes at least 25 million deaths in developing nations each year. Hundreds of millions more suffer from debilitating water-borne diseases. In fact, about 80% of all diseases and over one-third of all deaths in developing countries are caused by the consumption of contaminated water. More than 3 million infants die each year from diarrhea alone, due to contaminated drinking water and inadequate sanitation.

What is the reason for the great popular indifference to these crises? I sometimes like to remind people of the old science experiment involving a frog. Put the frog into a pot of boiling water, and it jumps right out; it recognizes the danger. But put the same frog into a pot of lukewarm water, and bring it slowly to a boil; it'll just sit there until it is rescued. I've learned over the years that it's important to rescue the frog in the middle of the story. The point of this story is that when the process of change seems gradual, we have trouble recognizing it. From day to day, the lives of most of us seem not to change all that much. It is only when we lift our gaze beyond the next few days or years that we see the truth.

Similarly, even though our worldwide civilization confronts an unprecedented global environmental crisis, we can go from day to day without confronting the rapid change now underway. We must recognize the extent to which we are damaging the global environment, as we must develop new ways to work together to foster economic progress without environmental destruction.

How do we do it? Let me dispose of a few myths. No matter what this commission does, it can't do everything by itself. Archimedes said if he had the right lever and a firm place to stand, he could move the world. This commission should seek to exert leverage on other institutions which can help us accomplish our task. Second, the industrial countries do not have a monopoly on ideas. In fact, last year at Rio many developing countries showed the way. Third, we must once and for all abandon the idea that economic development and environmental responsibility are incompatible.

Economic development is no excuse for environmental vandalism. Rich countries cannot impose limits on poor countries or deny them the right to achieve wealth. At the same time, there is increasing recognition that the fastest growing markets are in developing countries--countries where the demand for environmentally responsible technologies is also growing rapidly. Economic progress without environmental destruction: That's what sustainable development is all about.

Two principles must guide us as we set about the pursuit of sustainable development.

National Responsibility. First, the principle of national responsibility. After all, the role of this commission is primarily catalytic. It can focus attention on issues of common interest. It can serve as a forum for raising ideas and plans. It can help resolve issues that arise as nations proceed in their sustainable development agendas. It can monitor progress. It can help shift the multilateral financial institutions and bilateral assistance efforts toward a sustainable development agenda. It can help revitalize the UN system to ensure that sustainable development is a central theme in each organization. Indeed, this commission, through its focus on sustainable development, can enhance UN efforts to maintain peace, stability, and prosperity in this post-Cold War world. But it can do none of these things unless each country makes a strong commitment to change. This commission will simply be a meeting about meetings if the members fail to bring to the table a strong sense of national responsibility.

Will the United States show that sense of commitment? We can. We will. That's why we'll announce a plan to move forward on climate change by August--a detailed outline for action that will continue the trend of reduced emissions past the next 7 years. That's why we've established a National Biological Survey to protect our own biodiversity. That's why we're moving immediately to reduce toxic releases in federal facilities. That's why we're buying energy-efficient technologies, including alternative fuel vehicles for federal fleets. That's why we will soon announce a new management plan for federal forests. That's why President Clinton, in his first full day in office, changed the so-called Mexico City policy and acted to promote access to the full range of quality reproductive health care for women everywhere. And that's just the start. But just as each nation must assume national responsibility, so must we all act together.

Global Partnership. If sustainable development is to become a reality, the second principle we must follow is that of partnership. There are still those who think the wealthy countries on this planet have a monopoly on technology and insight. That's nonsense. We can all learn from each other. That's why this commission must encourage partnership among countries, especially between North and South. Over the last 20 years, we have made some progress in creating the basis for a global partnership. UNCED was a landmark in unifying "environment" and "development" in the term "sustainable development." Now, this insight must be given life within the policies of every government. Trade, commerce, agriculture--all interests need to be part of the effort, and that's why this commission as well must help create partnerships within countries.

There are those who expect us to rely on a single financial mechanism, such as the GEF for Agenda 21 implementation. But Agenda 21 addresses much too broad a range of issues for the GEF. That's why this commission must create partnerships between it and all multilateral development banks. All of them have to be involved. Finally, there are those who believe that only government can marshal the resources for this task--not true. Public policy that gets input from everyone is better public policy. The fact is the private sector played a huge role in Rio. And if this commission is to succeed, it must help create partnerships between government and non-governmental organizations.

National responsibility, partnership--can we actually translate these ideas, the staple of political rhetoric, into reality? I don't blame those who are pessimistic. In fact, a few months ago, I was going through the solutions for our environmental crisis for a group of scientists. And at the end, one of them raised his hand and said, "You know, I agree with everything you've said, but I know enough about politics to tell you that it's not likely to occur. The momentum toward continuing our current way of doing things is just too powerful." There's something to that. But what if 4 or 5 years ago we had said that in the next few months all of the communist countries in Eastern Europe will suddenly become democracies and choose free market capitalism? What if we had said that all the statues of Lenin would be torn down and that we would have a chance to remake the world in the aftermath of the Cold War? What if we had said that Nelson Mandela would be free and F.W. de Klerk would announce the end of apartheid, and together they would set out on the road to reconciliation in South Africa? None of those seemed likely. We can assume change is impossible, or we can be part of the solution. We can assume our enemies are too powerful, or we can assume the urgency of our mission is more powerful.

I believe there is every reason for hope. Part of the reason is this group, from every part of the planet, committed to the idea of sustainable development. But that's not the only reason. For there are millions who believe as we do. Some are working in government, attending meetings like this one. But there are countless others whose

work goes uncelebrated: a woman in Kenya's Greenbelt Movement plants a tree, then organizes a meeting about family planning; an engineer in Detroit comes up with a way to use less gasoline; a scientist in Antarctica, drilling through the ice, finds clues to the history of our planet; a teacher in Brazil leads a class full of children in a discussion about the rain forests. These are the men and women who give us hope.

Conclusion

In the next few days, as we plan the future of this commission, let us remember the spirit animating our meeting, thousands of miles to the south, exactly a year ago; remember how we achieved unity of purpose out of diversity. And let that memory of past success give us confidence that we will succeed in the future--and for the future. (###)

ARTICLE 4:

Economic Diplomacy: Key to Domestic Prosperity

Joan E. Spero, Under Secretary for Economic and Agricultural Affairs
Statement before the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy,
Trade, Oceans and Environment of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, DC, May 27, 1993

Mr. Chairman, this is my first appearance before the Congress as Under Secretary of State. It is particularly appropriate for it to take place before the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy. I said at my confirmation hearing that I wanted a continuing dialogue with the Congress. Thus I appreciate your offering me this first official opportunity.

The theme of today's hearing--linkages among trade, investment, external debt and foreign assistance--is one in which the Administration, and specifically the State Department, are deeply engaged. When we think about linkages, we must start with the most fundamental one: that our foreign economic programs must be part and parcel of our larger strategy to revitalize the domestic economy.

In his February 26 remarks at American University, President Clinton laid out five steps to renew economic growth in America and the world:

- A strengthened U.S. economy;
- A trade policy directed at open markets;
- Improved macroeconomic coordination;
- Expanded growth in the developing world; and
- Helping Russia build a democratic government and a market economy.

These objectives bear directly on what we are discussing today.

Developing countries are critical to our national interest. They buy almost 40% of American exports, directly supporting some 3 million American jobs. They are host to about a quarter of our overseas investment. Stable growth in developing countries will strengthen trends underway to expand democratic, accountable government, with direct benefits for American and global security. Their prosperity will make them stronger partners in protecting the global environment, dealing effectively with population growth, and combatting illicit drugs.

Similarly, we have a historical opportunity to support economic reform and democracy in the former Soviet Union. We have much to offer Russia and the other newly independent states, not just in government assistance, but also in trade, investment, and the exchange of know-how among our companies and citizens.

Our relationships with these countries and our effectiveness in pursuing

mutual goals are influenced heavily by the international economic environment. We need an open trade and investment regime, one in which the fresh breeze of competition can invigorate all markets, including those of the developing countries. And we need our major economic partners in the G-7 to coordinate policies that will foster sustainable growth, stimulate investment, and reduce structural barriers to greater economic integration.

New Opportunities

The Clinton Administration comes to office at a moment when activist economic diplomacy is essential to the preservation of domestic prosperity and America's leadership role in the world. The good news is that opportunities abound. Interest in market-oriented policies, including domestic reform, as well as open trade and investment policies, has probably never been higher. Developing countries are lowering trade barriers unilaterally, privatizing inefficient state-owned firms, and, in increasingly democratic societies, responding to the will of the people. Liberal economic policies have accelerated the improvement in foreign debt burdens. Finally, the breakup of the Soviet Union gives us the luxury of redirecting national resources spent containing communism to pressing domestic needs, and to redirect our foreign assistance away from expenditures against communism to investments in democracy.

The bad news is that we have limited resources to bring to the task, given the priority of our domestic agenda and a federal deficit that simply must be reduced. Furthermore, slow growth and high unemployment in the industrialized economies generates protectionist pressures making the challenge of opening markets that much more difficult. The enormity of the economic, political and social problems facing the former Soviet Union presents unprecedented challenges to reformers there and to those abroad who support them. These challenges underscore the need to make our international programs as effective as possible, and to design them to leverage to the maximum other official and private sources. Our programs must tap a variety of energies, at home and abroad, and keep government commitments in line with available resources.

Policy Objectives

Our objectives must be pursued on two levels--the first in terms of broad policy and international cooperation and the second through our international programs.

The Uruguay Round is a prime example of policy at the macro level. For the first time, developing countries are deeply engaged in a multilateral trade round. They understand the importance of liberalization to their own economic future and they understand the determination of trading partners like ourselves to see that all participants reduce barriers and provide genuine market access. A successful round will be a win/win situation for all GATT members.

The same can be said for a successful NAFTA, which will bring economic benefit to all the nations of the continent and serve as a model of the advantages of liberal trade for the rest of the hemisphere.

Mr. Chairman, let me move on now to our international programs. Some--such as Eximbank's export promotion programs--are designed to help American business directly in taking advantage of growing markets. Others--such as debt relief and development assistance--are needed to stimulate economic development and to meet urgent humanitarian needs in developing areas. In discussing these programs, I would like you to bear in mind two things. First, the FY 1994 budget is a transitional one. New directions in policy are a work in progress. This budget marks the beginning.

Second, the international programs funded by this budget request serve

five mutually reinforcing objectives:

- Promoting economic growth and sustainable development;
- Building democracy;
- Promoting and maintaining peace;
- Addressing global problems, especially the environment and population growth; and
- Providing humanitarian assistance.

I will focus on promoting economic growth and sustainable development. By sustainable development we mean broad-based economic growth which protects the non-renewable natural resource base, improves the quality of life for current generations and preserves that opportunity for future generations. However, I would stress that U.S. efforts in all the areas I enumerated will improve prospects for global economic development and U.S. economic growth.

International Programs

Let me begin with Eximbank, which is an indispensable vehicle for expanding the U.S. presence in developing country markets, building long-term commercial relationships that go beyond any single sale, and assuring that our producers can hold their own in competition with their industrialized country rivals. We are requesting \$751 million for the U.S. Export-Import Bank, a sum that will enable total export financing of more than \$16 billion, an increase of more than \$1 billion over the current fiscal year.

A parallel organization on the investment side, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC), enables us--with a modest appropriation--to support private sector development and market reform in emerging countries, while also stimulating U.S. jobs and competitiveness. We are requesting \$17.9 million for OPIC programs to provide insurance and other financing for U.S. investments in developing countries and, increasingly, in the reforming economies of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. Investments supported by OPIC programs provide a direct boost to U.S. exports and jobs.

The Trade and Development Agency (TDA) is an international program that illustrates a focus on mutual development. TDA provides grant funding for U.S. firms to conduct feasibility studies of infrastructure and industrial projects in developing and transitional economies. These studies support the development priorities of the host country. They also increase the chances that U.S. companies will supply goods and services to the actual projects. Thus, TDA can be a catalyst for long-term commercial relationships. Since its creation just over a decade ago, TDA projects have resulted in \$4.6 billion worth of U.S. exports, a return of \$25 for every dollar invested by U.S. taxpayers. TDA has moved quickly to support new business opportunities in the newly independent states. For FY 1994, we are requesting \$60 million for TDA, a substantial increase that will allow the agency to serve U.S. companies better by beginning to fund more detailed engineering and design work as part of its feasibility studies.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to these direct trade promotion programs, the new budget requests funding for various bilateral and multilateral assistance programs that further our agenda for economic growth and sustainable development.

Multilateral Development Banks

The multilateral development banks (MDBs) will play a central role in the Administration's global economic strategy. While Under Secretary Summers will go into more detail, I want to stress a few points. The MDBs leverage relatively small donor contributions with those of other shareholders to extend large amounts of assistance. Their advancement of economic growth and sustainable development in developing countries

contributes to our economic security and growth as well. We and other donor governments have also looked to the MDBs to address the challenges posed by the transition economies of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union.

We have asked for full funding of U.S. obligations due to the World Bank and the four regional development banks in 1994, an amount totaling \$1.9 billion. Almost 65% of this request would go for our first payment under the recent replenishment of the International Development Association, the World Bank's soft loan window that lends only to the poorest countries.

Debt

Mr. Chairman, let me now turn to debt restructuring. The Administration is seeking \$78 million in appropriations in FY 1994 for debt restructuring in support of market-based development. Most of these funds would be used to continue an initiative under which the United States has supported democratization and economic reform in Latin America through the provision of debt relief and other assistance.

The Administration also has a new initiative for non-concessional debt reduction in the poorest and most needy developing countries, particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa. We need authorization for this new initiative and \$7 million in appropriations to enable the United States to take the first steps to join the international consensus in favor of this non-concessional debt relief effort.

We believe it is time that the United States join with the international community to support the often difficult economic restructuring process in the poorest countries with non-concessional debt relief. Although the countries that would benefit from this initiative play a relatively small role in the world economy, we believe they should not be excluded from the benefits of participation in this increasingly interdependent global economy. Many have debt burdens in excess of their GDP. They have little prospect of successful economic restructuring without non-concessional debt relief. Although the U.S. portion of such relief would be small--both in absolute terms and as a share of these countries' outstanding debts--participation in the international consensus will send a strong signal of U.S. support for these countries' efforts to break out of poverty.

Bilateral Development Assistance

Mr. Chairman, let me now address bilateral development assistance. Upon taking office, the Secretary of State asked the Deputy Secretary to look at possible restructuring of USAID's programs and institutions. Dr. Wharton's policy review is not yet complete, so I cannot report today on his conclusions. However, I can discuss a few general principles which have emerged. In addition, I pledge the Department's close consultation with Congress as we move forward.

We are interested, first, in establishing a focused set of priorities, to weed out the unworkable number of programs which have accrued over the years. We should concentrate broadly on sustainable development, building democracy, global issues such as environment and population, and humanitarian concerns. We want to judge our performance on the basis of results, not spending, and we will pay particular attention to leveraging bilateral programs by working more closely with the multilateral banks, international organizations, and other donors. The underlying philosophy of our programs will be one of participation, empowerment and democracy-building. We must help people to realize the fundamental human aspiration to gain greater control over their own lives and destinies.

Mr. Chairman, U.S. bilateral development assistance is a vital element of our effort to promote sustainable economic growth in developing

countries. We are requesting \$2.1 billion for development assistance in FY 1994; \$800 million would go for the Development Fund for Africa. These resources will be targeted on sustainable development by helping to build the human capital and institutions that underpin economic growth and civil society. Our request, although smaller in nominal terms than in 1993, will target investments in people--in improving health care, nutrition and access to clean water, and by encouraging literacy. In addition to the benefits for developing countries, sustainable development protects us, because demographic, health and environmental crises run the risk of long-term negative consequences for our citizens.

Economic Support Funds (ESF)-- another of our bilateral economic programs--is an all-grant program that encourages economic reform and development in friendly countries. We are requesting about \$2.6 billion in ESF, most of it planned for Israel and Egypt in support of Middle East peace and stability.

Mr. Chairman, as I noted, the Administration is committed to supporting the political and economic transformations underway in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. Our FY 1994 request would fund these vital programs with \$704 million for former Soviet republics and \$409 million for Eastern Europe. Here, too, the aim is to weave assistance efforts with our trade, investment, and debt relief policies by building market institutions, consolidating democracy, and integrating the former communist countries into the international economy.

Mr. Chairman, the numerous programs, institutions, and initiatives I have reviewed with you today offer a comprehensive set of instruments for advancing American interests internationally. Clear synergies exist among them, which we are determined to enhance through more effective coordination and collaboration among agencies and through greater consultation with the Congress. The National Economic Council, the Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee, and Dr. Wharton's foreign assistance review are all vehicles for achieving this goal. I hope to have the opportunity to report back to you frequently on the progress we are making. (###)

ARTICLE 5:

U.S. Policy Toward Liberia, Togo, and Zaire
George E. Moose, Assistant Secretary for African Affairs
Statement before the Subcommittee on African Affairs of the Senate
Foreign Relations Committee, Washington, DC, June 9, 1993

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: I appreciate the opportunity to testify before you again--this time on developments in--and U.S. policy toward--Liberia, Togo, and Zaire.

The situations in the three countries represent different stages of two major issues with which Africa is currently dealing: democratization and conflict. The transition to democracy in Togo has reached a stalemate which could have serious repercussions, but we understand that talks continue. Mobutu's refusal to relinquish power to the high council goes beyond thwarting transition to democracy in Zaire; it puts Zaire in a pre-conflict status. The challenge now in Liberia is to secure peace and move to democracy and rehabilitation in that country. I would like to discuss each of these in some detail.

Liberia

In Liberia, we have been shocked by a brutal new atrocity--the massacre of over 250 civilians on June 6 at a camp for displaced persons on the Firestone rubber plantation near Harbel. The United States condemns this deplorable act, which underscores the need to support UN and ECOWAS

efforts to bring an end to this tragic war. U.S. policy remains focused on clear and long-standing objectives. We seek a negotiated settlement with the assistance of the UN and the Economic Community of West African States; full disarmament of all Liberian warring factions; the return home of more than 1 million displaced Liberians; free and fair internationally monitored elections; and the establishment of a unified government based on respect for human rights, democratic principles, and economic accountability.

The West African peace-keeping force known as ECOMOG has borne the major financial burden for maintaining peace-keeping forces in Liberia, but the six contributing nations look forward to concluding their mission and bringing their troops home. U.S. assistance to this endeavor serves all of our interests.

The ECOWAS initiative offers an appropriate and cost-effective alternative to calls for massive UN intervention. The ECOWAS consensus, which was skillfully hammered out in more than 20 summit meetings on Liberia, enjoys strong support from the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the UN. In two recent resolutions, the Security Council, with our strong support, has unanimously endorsed the ECOWAS effort in Liberia. As we have seen elsewhere in Africa and the world, international consensus does not necessarily guarantee cooperation by all parties. In Liberia, however, the regional initiative, supported by the OAU and the UN, offers by far the best prospect for achieving a settlement that will restore peace and stability to Liberia and the immediate subregion.

We believe the UN can play an important role as a catalyst to get negotiations restarted. UN Special Representative Trevor Gordon-Somers has been carrying out an intensive, 6-week round of negotiations in the region, and we support his efforts to lay the groundwork for a meeting of factions under auspices of the UN Secretary General. The UN can play an important complementary role in support of the existing regional effort.

Many obstacles must be overcome. Liberian faction leaders have proven unreliable and their troops undisciplined. An even-handed approach to disarmament of all factions, backed up by convincing military power, will be needed to ensure compliance. We do not believe a military solution is possible or desirable, but we recognize that continuing pressure is an inescapable part of the equation for peace in Liberia.

While supporting ongoing diplomatic efforts, the United States continues to respond to the humanitarian needs of the Liberian people. The relief effort is one of the great unsung success stories of averting greater tragedy in Africa. In addition to almost \$29 million in support for the regional peace-keeping, the United States has provided almost \$260 million in humanitarian aid for victims of the conflict, far more than all other donors combined. We continue to stress the need for distribution throughout Liberia, urging ECOMOG to facilitate up-country assistance and Charles Taylor to end his resistance to cross-line deliveries.

While meeting the immediate needs of Liberians, we must also be poised to foster and support moves to build a lasting peace. We are prepared to assist with repatriation, demobilization, and the holding of free and fair elections when conditions allow. We have requested funds in fiscal year 1994 to assist the peace-keeping efforts of ECOWAS in Liberia. In the post-Cold War world, our concern for the Liberian people and our desire for peace is unconstrained by strategic necessities; we seek a future relationship based on fundamental principles of human rights, accountability, and democracy. Liberia's neighbors, the United States, and the UN have all signaled their readiness to assist, and we are all providing tangible support. But, ultimately, it will be the people of

Liberia themselves who must resolve to make the most of their opportunity and chart the future of this nation.

Togo

The people of Togo launched a process toward multi-party democracy in July 1991, with a national conference and a schedule for transition to a democratic government selected in free, fair, representative elections. However, over the past year, that transition has disintegrated under the pressure of intimidation and violence. Members of the transitional government and the High Council of the Republic have been held hostage and abused by members of the military. Their homes have been firebombed and opposition political candidates shot and, in one case, killed. Opposition press offices and personnel have been assaulted and unarmed opposition demonstrators fired on by military forces. In response to those events, there were acts of revenge and defiance against the military and the ruling party of President Eyadema, including mob killings of soldiers, attacks on the homes of ruling-party officials, and an armed night-time raid on the military headquarters.

The result is an atmosphere of fear and insecurity which reigns in the capital, Lome, and throughout much of the country. Togo's economic life has been essentially paralyzed since November by a general strike called by opposition unions and politicians to protest the breakdown of the transition. Over 200,000 Togolese citizens have fled the country since January 1993. Their flight was triggered by security force attacks on opposition neighborhoods in Lome. Those who fled, including almost all significant members of the political opposition, remain outside Togo, primarily in neighboring Benin and Ghana. There is concern that the ongoing crisis will affect regional as well as domestic stability.

Against this backdrop, President Eyadema and his supporters announced elections beginning June 20. Unfortunately, these elections were called without full participation of major elements of the opposition. In the absence of a mutually agreed framework, the coalition of opposition political parties announced its intention to boycott the elections and called on the Togolese electorate to do the same. However, behind-the-scenes efforts, primarily led by the French, have continued to work toward bringing all sides back to the negotiating table. On June 1, the government announced a 15-day delay in the election schedule. During this delay, it is hoped that talks with the opposition can resume with the aim of reaching agreement among all parties for elections to move forward. Our view remains that elections, to be meaningful, will require careful preparation.

Throughout the transition, we have maintained a continuous dialog with all sides in Togo, urging compromise and conciliation as the only means to move Togo forward on the road to democracy. Responding to the military's intimidation tactics, the United States has suspended much of its assistance. In the remaining projects, we work primarily through private voluntary organizations to meet basic human needs. Our actions mirror those of the French, the Germans, and the EEC--donors who have historically provided the bulk of Togo's foreign assistance and whose lead we are following with regard to Togo.

We are consulting regularly with Togo's friends abroad in an effort to ensure that a unified, clear message is sent to all Togolese parties: We will not return to business as usual until the transition is back on track. In line with that policy, we have announced that the United States will not provide electoral support or observers for the unilaterally arranged and announced elections beginning June 20. In the wake of the new effort to negotiate, we are cautiously optimistic that Togo's impasse can be broken. We are following closely preparations for imminent talks in Ouagadougou. Should those talks result in a mutually agreed framework for free, fair elections held in a secure environment, we will re-evaluate our decision concerning electoral observers and

assistance. In the meantime, we will continue to consult with all sides, urging them to take advantage of this opportunity to move Togo back to the path of democracy.

Zaire

Africa's third-largest country faces an increasingly dangerous crisis--one that threatens the livelihood of 40 million Zairians and the stability of neighboring countries. There is no doubt about the cause of the problem. It is President Mobutu's stubborn refusal to honor his promise to permit a democratic transition process to proceed. The results include a near total breakdown of Zaire's modern economic sector, rampant hyper-inflation, growing malnutrition in Kinshasa itself, and, most notably in Shaba, a pernicious pattern of government-provoked or tolerated violence against minority ethnic groups. Because of the regime's increasing use of intimidation against political opponents, there has been a sharp escalation of human rights abuse in recent months.

The current crisis in Zaire is, in part, a tragic consequence of the Cold War era, when policies of the United States and its allies were strongly influenced by broader strategic interests, often to the detriment of other considerations. Our concept of what is "strategic" is no longer what it was. Today, it centers on support for democratization and sustainable development. In Zaire, we are encouraging constructive change through a combination of pressure on the current regime and a clear offer of help for the establishment of a democratic successor government. We support the democratic transition established by the National Conference, not any particular Zairian party or individual. We are working with the Belgians and French to increase political and economic pressure through a range of measures, including visa restrictions, prohibition of arms exports, and public statements. Additional measures, which I would prefer not to discuss in open session, are under active consideration.

As we look toward Zaire's future, it is clear that any resolution of the current tragedy will require rapid deployment of both bilateral and multilateral resources. There will be two immediate requirements. One is military reform. No democratic transition will be sustainable until the present regime's relatively well-armed and well-trained troops are brought under civil control through a combination of military reform and demobilization. Otherwise, they will obstruct the transition, repeating a tragic pattern played out in Liberia. Defusing this problem will demand a multilateral effort, but the United States must be ready to participate with appropriate levels of assistance for the demobilization and reform process.

The second and equally pressing need will, of course, be economic stabilization and reform. We, the French, and the Belgians told the Government of Zaire in January that we are willing to provide support for stabilization and reform under clearly defined conditions. These include a credible plan for elections and strict controls to deny President Mobutu unimpeded access to public funds and the management of public finances. Working with the IMF and the World Bank, we determined that the crucial first stages of such a program could be, in large part, financed by proper use of the funds, which are currently being diverted for unauthorized personal use. The second phase, longer and more arduous, will involve a pattern of economic reform, debt rescheduling, new development investment, and multi-donor support similar to that undertaken by many other countries and certainly not beyond the capability of Zaire once a reform-oriented administration is in place.

In short, while we believe that the situation in Zaire is critical, it is not beyond hope. We are determined to play a leadership role in the international effort which will be required to achieve a solution. (###)

ARTICLE 6:

CSCE Negotiations On Nagorno-Karabakh
John J. Maresca, Joint Statement

John J. Maresca

Excerpts from opening statement by Ambassador John J. Maresca, U.S. negotiator for Nagorno-Karabakh, at a briefing in Washington, DC, June 8, 1993.

We announced today... a joint proposal, an initiative, to get our negotiations back on the track again. This proposal is jointly sponsored by all the members of the so-called Minsk Group that are not directly parties to the conflict. We are hoping that it will be accepted by the parties to the conflict by the end of the week.

It's for that reason that I thought it would be a good idea to provide you with some background information on how we got where we are, what we're doing, and what the prospects are.

We have agreed with the other co-sponsors of this initiative not to go into the details of it prior to acceptance by all the parties to the conflict. However, I can tell you some of the general things about it. Moreover, it is designed to implement Security Council Resolution 822, which I also have available if you don't have it on your own.

The points which are in the proposal are largely those points that are in the Security Council resolution. Just to give you some of the background, the U.S. approach on this from the beginning of the negotiating process has included a number of points. We have deliberately decided to be impartial in this dispute to condemn violence on both sides--but to be impartial. We are essentially a mediator in this dispute.

We have decided to play a part in an international effort rather than trying to do something our own, and that international effort is represented by the so-called Minsk Group of the CSCE, which is the recognized negotiating body on this effort--recognized by the UN and by the CSCE, of course.

We've decided that we won't have a U.S. military presence on the ground in this area, and we've decided that the two democratically chosen leaders in the two countries--Armenia and Azerbaijan, both moderates who are interested in converting their countries to democratic systems and free market economies--are both deserving of support, and we have been supporting both of them.

Our effort has been to bring about, first of all, a cease-fire with international monitoring in order to stabilize it and some other stabilizing measures like lifting of what are called "blockades" in the region in order to permit a sensible, rational political negotiation to go forward. We are not trying to decide in advance what the solution, ultimately, on this problem will be. This is something that will have to be negotiated.

There have been a number of visits to the region. I've been there myself several times. Reports have been written about the problem. Last spring, the CSCE set up a thing called the Conference on Nagorno-Karabakh to be held in Minsk. That's where the name comes from. It's called the Minsk Conference, and the group which has been preparing for this conference is called the Minsk Group for that reason.

It has, I think, become a credible negotiating process, to the extent that it is recognized in Security Council resolutions and it has

that it is recognized in Security Council resolutions, and it has brought all of the parties to the conflict to the table, which, of course, is the first step in any negotiation. It's produced one agreement already--that is, the Terms of Reference for an international monitoring operation as soon as a cease-fire has been agreed and stabilized.

These Terms of Reference include a lot of political points. It was agreed not just by the two states involved but also by representatives from Nagorno-Karabakh. So, it does represent a serious negotiating effort, and the CSCE is ready to send this monitoring team as soon as the cease-fire holds.

The Minsk Group negotiations also now, in the latest Security Council resolution, do have the direct backing of the Security Council. So, I think, there is no question now where the negotiation process should take place.

As happens in any dispute like this, the events on the ground are very volatile. There are events going on right now, too. And throughout the negotiating process, we've had ups and downs based on skirmishes of one kind or another--an attack, a seizure of a village, or whatever. This is part of this kind of conflict and part of the negotiating process that goes with it.

What we're doing right now is trying to get back to the negotiating table after one such military operation--which was a seizure by the Armenian side of a valley area called Kelbajar, which is not specifically shown on your map but which is to the north and west of the Nagorno-Karabakh outline on that map--which was seized about a month ago by the Armenian side.

Since that time, we've been trying to get back to the negotiations. We have made proposals--first of all, along with Russia and Turkey--to try to accomplish this. For one reason or another, those proposals were not accepted right away. But we have, as of last week, revised this proposal in certain ways, clarified certain points about it, filled in some details, and acquired the backing of all the other members of the Minsk Group. That is what constitutes the proposal that we put forward and which we announced today.

The last thing I'd mention, before I take questions, is that, essentially, what the Minsk Group is doing with this proposal is implementing--attempting to implement--the Security Council resolution. I think this is kind of an interesting new feature of the way this arrangement has worked, where a CSCE group is actually trying to implement a Security Council resolution. That's where we stand today.

Joint Statement by CSCE Minsk Group

Text of joint statement by the U.S. and other members of the CSCE Minsk Group released by Acting Spokesman Joseph Snyder, Washington, DC, June 8, 1993.

The representatives of the following countries belonging to the CSCE Minsk Group: Belarus, the Czech Republic, France, Germany, Italy, the Russian Federation, Sweden, Turkey and United States, have met in Rome on June 3-4 under the chairmanship of the Representative of the Chairman of the CSCE Minsk Conference on Nagorno-Karabakh, and with the participation of observers of the UN Secretariat, in order to prepare a proposal intended to provide for the implementation of the UN Security Council Resolution 822 and the resumption of the CSCE negotiating process.

Acceptance of this proposal would contribute to the overall resolution of the conflict and the establishment of stability and peace in the region

region.

Thus, the nine States and the Chairman of the CSCE Minsk Conference call upon all to accept and implement the proposal without exception or delay. (###)

ARTICLE 7:

Joint Statement Following U.S.-North Korea Meeting
Text of U.S.-North Korean joint statement released by the Office of the Spokesman, New York City, June 11, 1993.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States of America held government-level talks in New York from the 2nd through the 11th of June, 1993. Present at the talks were the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea headed by First Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs Kang Sok Ju and the delegation of the United States of America led by Assistant Secretary of State Robert L. Gallucci, both representing their respective Governments. At the talks, both sides discussed policy matters with a view to a fundamental solution of the nuclear issue on the Korean Peninsula. Both sides expressed support for the North-South Joint Declaration on the Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula in the interest of nuclear non-proliferation goals.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States have agreed to principles of:

- assurances against the threat and use of force, including nuclear weapons;
- peace and security in a nuclear-free Korean Peninsula, including impartial application of fullscope safe-guards, mutual respect for each other's sovereignty, and non-interference in each other's internal affairs; and
- support for the peaceful reunification of Korea.

In this context, the two Governments have agreed to continue dialogue on an equal and unprejudiced basis. In this respect, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has decided unilaterally to suspend as long as it considers necessary the effectuation of its withdrawal from the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. (###)

END OF DISPATCH VOL 4, NO 24

[To the top of this page](#)

[Index of Dispatch Magazine Archives 1993 Issues](#) || [Index of Dispatch Magazine Archives](#) || [Index of "Briefings and Statements"](#)

[Index of Electronic Research Collections](#) [ERC Reference Desk](#) || [Alphabetic Index](#) || [Sitemap](#) || [ERC Homepage](#)

Last modified: Jun. 3, 1999

Designed by: Lin Dou