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This was the greatest event in history and it was the pivot point of the 20th century. It was the point at which was decided whether totalitarianism or democracy would prevail in the 20th century and as of 1940 it sure looked like the totalitarians were going to win. The Red Army was on the march, the German army was on the march, France was gone...the United States was sucking its thumb. And it just looked for sure like the totalitarians owned the future. Hitler was certain, sure that that was the case. He thought that any country that allowed an opposition political party to exist in wartime was a country that was doomed—that the Furher principle of unquestioning obedience from the very top down to the lowest private in industry as well as in the army would just always prevail over democracies with their squabbling parliamentary tactics and the inherent disorderliness of democracy. But when we got into the war—maybe I shouldn’t use this line tonight but it’s one that I love and I bring to your attention—what Dwight Eisenhower called the fury of an aroused democracy came into play and the teamwork that evolved in the United States and in Great Britain and in Canada was just an absolutely remarkable thing that produced these quantities of goods, weaponry and equipment far beyond anything Germany could produce. We doubled and then we doubled again and we doubled once more our industrial plant which had been working at half capacity as late as 1940. The statistic here is when Roosevelt called for the production of 4000 planes a month in 1941 people thought he was just crazy. By '44 they were producing 8000 planes a month. This was a miracle a triumph for democracy. And the other miracle of democracy was the creation of the United States Army from ranking 16th in the world in 1940 to an army of 8 million very well equipped and very well trained men. Hitler's other bet had been that the sons of democracy would never be soldiers.

—Hitler used the term the "soft effeminate sons of democracy". That’s right—grown up in the boy scouts, emphasis on individual liberties and individual freedoms—would just melt in front of the tough young fanatical kids brought up in the Nazi Youth.

The critical moment of the war came at 08:30 on June 6th at Omaha Beach and you had America troops huddled at the seawall(?), exhausted, confused, leaderless, many of them weaponless. They had been told that the battle would begin when they got to the top of that bluff and all the German defenders on the beach would be blown away by the B17; and if the B17 didn’t get them the Navy bombardment was gonna get them; and if the Navy bombardment didn’t get them, the tanks were going to get them coming in swimming beside it. They were briefed to expect that their war would start when they got to the top of that bluff. They got to the ?, those that were still alive and nothing they had been told turned out to be so. The B17s had delayed for a fatal two seconds before dropping their bombs for fear of hitting their own men. They killed a lot of cattle, some French civilians. Not one bomb fell on that beach. The Naval bombardment also went over...
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The critical moment of the war came at 08:30 on June 6th at Omaha Beach and you had America troops huddled at the seawall(?), exhausted, confused, leaderless, many of them weaponless. They had been told that the battle would begin when they got to the top of that bluff and all the German defenders on the beach would be blown away by the B17; and if the B17 didn’t get them the Navy bombardment was gonna get them; and if the Navy bombardment didn’t get them, the tanks were going to get them coming in swimming beside it. They were briefed to expect that their war would start when they got to the top of that bluff. They got to the ?, those that were still alive and nothing they had been told turned out to be so. The B17s had delayed for a fatal two seconds before dropping their bombs for fear of hitting their own men. They killed a lot of cattle, some French civilians. Not one bomb fell on that beach. The Naval bombardment also went over
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This was the greatest event in history and it was the pivot point of the 20th century. It was the point at which was decided whether totalitarianism or democracy would prevail in the 20th century and as of 1940 it sure looked like the totalitarians were going to win. The Red Army was on the march, the German army was on the march, France was gone...the United States was sucking its thumb. And it just looked for sure that the totalitarians owned the future. Hitler was certain, sure that that was the case. He thought that any country that allowed an opposition political party to exist in wartime was a country that was doomed—-that the Führer principle of unquestioning obedience from the very top down to the lowest private in industry as well as in the army would just always prevail over democracies with their squabbling parliamentary tactics and the inherent disorderliness of democracy. But when we got into the war—maybe I shouldn’t use this line tonight but it’s one that I love and I bring to your attention—-what Dwight Eisenhower called the fury of an aroused democracy came into play and the teamwork that evolved in the United States and in Great Britain and in Canada was just an absolutely remarkable thing that produced these quantities of goods, weaponry and equipment far beyond anything Germany could produce. We doubled and then we doubled again and we doubled once more our industrial plant which had been working at half capacity as late as 1940. The statistic here is when Roosevelt called for the production of 4000 planes a month in 1941 people thought he was just crazy. By ‘44 they were producing 8000 planes a month. This was a miracle a triumph for democracy. And the other miracle of democracy was the creation of the United States Army from ranking 16th in the world in 1940 to an army of 8 million very well equipped and very well trained men. Hitler’s other bet had been that the sons of democracy would never be soldiers.

---Hitler used the term the "soft effeminate sons of democracy". That’s right—-grown up in the boy scouts, emphasis on individual liberties and individual freedoms—-would just melt in front of the tough young fanatical kids brought up in the Nazi Youth.

The critical moment of the war came at 08:30 on June 6th at Omaha Beach and you had America troops huddled at the seawall(?), exhausted, confused, leaderless, many of them weaponless. They had been told that the battle would begin when they got to the top of that bluff and all the German defenders on the beach would be blown away by the B17; and if the B17 didn’t get them the Navy bombardment was gonna get them; and if the Navy bombardment didn’t get them, the tanks were going to get them coming in swimming beside it. They were briefed to expect that their war would start when they got to the top of that bluff. They got to the ?, those that were still alive and nothing they had been told turned out to be so. The B17s had delayed for a fatal two seconds before dropping their bombs for fear of hitting their own men. They killed a lot of cattle, some French civilians. Not one bomb fell on that beach. The Naval bombardment also went over
the top of the bluff but it was way too short. Of the 35 swimming tanks, 32 sank. So now you have these American kids, college kids two years earlier, and Hitler’s armies are overrunning the earth. Up the seawall, had they been Germans, the junior officers absolutely for certain would have gotten on the radio and called back to the commanding ships and said, "What the hell do we do now?" The American kids, these boy scouts, they really—couldn’t retreat, the plan was kaput, no way in the world you’re going to get those ?, they’re way too heavy to fit and there were no tanks to follow up. They didn’t know the guy, the private to their left, they didn’t know the three privates to their right, but they seized the initiative, they took the responsibility; they said follow me, and they led these groups, five here, ten there, fifteen there, many of these men, Colonel Dawson was one of the first, the President’s going to be meeting him, Colonel Dawson was one of the first, but by no means a lot of them are just nameless to us today. Only the soldiers of democracy could have done it and it was a turning point in the 20th century and it was an individual taking responsibility and realizing "I, me, Karl Dossen," the other one’s name is Spalley, John Spalley, he was a lieutenant...

--Is he still alive?
No, died in 64. Lyn Lamel who is still alive he was a ranger, was a seargent, saying "Goddammit, I can make a difference. I ain’t gonna get killed here. I’m gonna take some Germans with me if I gotta go. C’mon follow me." And they did. And they came to those conclusions independently, they didn’t have to be told that. That’s one of the things wrong with Zanuck’s movie. Gee, this Colonel Taylor is the one to say it, and according to Zanuck’s movie, he calls that out and everybody hears him and they all...bullshit, they couldn’t hear five feet. They had to decide that on their own. Each one of them, absolutely, hundreds of them in the end. And they got up on top of that bluff and this was the triumph of democracy over totalitarianism—changed the history of the world.
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--Is he still alive?
No, died in 64. Lyn Lamel who is still alive he was a ranger, was a seargent, saying "Goddammit, I can make a difference. I ain't gonna get killed here. I'm gonna take some Germans with me if I gotta go. C'mon follow me." And they did. And they came to those conclusions independently, they didn't have to be told that. That's one of the things wrong with Zanuck's movie. Gee, this Colonel Taylor is the one to say it, and according to Zanuck's movie, he calls that out and everybody hears him and they all...bullshit, they couldn't hear five feet. They had to decide that on their own. Each one of them, absolutely, hundreds of them in the end. And they got up on top of that bluff and this was the triumph of democracy over totalitarianism--changed the history of the world.
It is both an honor and a challenge to be here with you tonight. This is not an easy building within which to speak. Inscribed on its walls are some of the most eloquent manifestations of language ever recorded. Embedded in its exhibitions are some of the most monstrous deeds ever perpetrated. Yet language must confront deed in this living Museum, which educates beyond words and without compromise; educates deeply and troubles deeply. There is no more appropriate a place to discuss the War Crimes Tribunal for former Yugoslavia.

We all have a stake in the success of this Tribunal. Tonight, I will discuss why that is true; but I will begin with the arguments of some who suggest it is not.

There are those who dismiss the War Crimes Tribunal as a weak substitute for stronger international action; they see it as a means for expiating guilt for failure to do more, earlier, to stop the killing in Bosnia.

Others ridicule the Tribunal because it has no guaranteed means of gaining custody over the principal suspects, even those we consider most responsible for the atrocities that have occurred.

Others ask why the conflict in former Yugoslavia merits special attention. War crimes have been and are being committed elsewhere; ethnic cleansing is perpetrated elsewhere; there are other wars with more victims; other wars of international aggression; other wars where outrages have been ordered from the top. Why punish crimes in former Yugoslavia and leave the likes of Pol Pot and Saddam Hussein uncharged?

Finally, some see the Tribunal as an obstacle to peace, believing that the negotiators will never agree to peace unless amnesty for war crimes is included.

The U.S. Government does not believe that because some war crimes may go unpunished, all must. We do not believe that the difficulty of the Tribunal's work should bar the attempt. We oppose amnesty for the architects of ethnic cleansing. We believe that establishing the truth about what happened in Bosnia is essential to--not an obstacle to--national reconciliation. And we know the Tribunal is no substitute for other actions to discourage further aggression and encourage peace.
Two weeks ago, I was in Sarajevo to dedicate the site of America's new embassy. I found there a new sense of hope mixed with firm determination.

In central Bosnia, reconciliation between the Government and the Bosnian Croat faction has ended the deadly siege of Mostar. The threat of intervention by Croatian troops has ended. In the embattled east, the airport in Tuzla is now open. It is becoming easier and safer to move around the country. We hope that planners will soon be able to concentrate less on humanitarian relief and more on laying the groundwork for national reconstruction.

However, the road ahead remains steep. Gains already made must be consolidated. Ceasefires must be expanded. Further aggression in Gorazde and elsewhere must end. Where possible, the displaced must be allowed to return home. The Bosnian Serbs must be persuaded to accept peace. And the principle that the Bosnian people fought for, suffered for, died for, and lived for must be preserved. Bosnia must remain a multi-ethnic state.

The work of the War Crimes Tribunal does not and should not depend on political events. It stands on its own. Its constituency is the civilized world; its hidden enemy is the complacency of our world. But complacency is not something one is born with; it is not an internal organ; it is a choice. And there is no more appropriate place than here to sound a clarion call against indifference and towards the harder choice of dedication to the rule of law.

The War Crimes Tribunal was formally established by the Security Council last May. Its jurisdiction includes several categories of serious violations of international humanitarian law that I have subsumed within the heading of "war crimes" for convenience tonight. These include grave breaches of the 1949 Geneva Convention, genocide, and crimes against humanity, as recognized in conventional and customary international law and in the Charter and Judgement of the Nuremberg Tribunal.

The Tribunal's eleven judges, including Judge Gabrielle Kirk McDonald of Texas, were elected last fall and are preparing actively. Rules of evidence and procedure are now in place. The UN has approved eleven million dollars in budget authority for 1994. We believe that this amount, along with the voluntary contributions received, will be fully adequate to get the Tribunal off the ground.

The search for a Chief Prosecutor has been long and frustrating. The Security Council's first choice waited three
months before declining formally to accept the position. The search for a successor has dragged on too long, but we expect an announcement very soon. I can assure this audience that the United States has done everything it could to see that this critical position would be filled. Fortunately, the acting Deputy Prosecutor—in whom we have great confidence—is hard at work.

The job of compiling the facts upon which investigations and prosecutions must be based is well advanced. Thousands of pages of documentation and testimony are on file. Statements and reports have been received from victims, witnesses, governments, UN agencies, international organizations, nongovernmental organizations and from the European Community's investigation into crimes against Muslim women. I particularly want to salute the efforts of the nongovernmental organizations, which have performed invaluable work in the cause of justice.

The United States is fully engaged:

- We are working to see that the Tribunal is adequately funded;
- We are making a special voluntary contribution of $3 million;
- Congress has authorized the President to provide up to $25 million in goods and services to the Tribunal (last month, the President approved the first drawdown—about $6 million—from that authority);
- We have assembled a group of about 25 prosecutors, investigators, area specialists and others to work directly with the Tribunal, beginning in the next few weeks;
- We are constantly collecting and analyzing information pertaining to war crimes; and
- We have provided hundreds of refugee interview reports to the Tribunal and are preparing to provide hundreds more.

These reports were gathered through the diligent efforts of US Government employees in several parts of the world. Most are eyewitness accounts of atrocities or ethnic cleansing. As we speak, a member of my staff is part of a team, operating under the auspices of the Tribunal Prosecutor's office, that is interviewing the victims of some of the worst violence of the war.
Finally, we have repeatedly asked other governments to join us in supporting the Tribunal, financially, politically and legally. Governments must be willing to share information, interview witnesses, comply with Tribunal requests and take custody of suspects found within their jurisdictions. In this respect, I note that Germany has arrested a person suspected of ordering horrible atrocities at a concentration camp in Bosnia. The Danes also have a suspect under arrest.

The United States will continue to take into account good faith cooperation with the War Crimes Tribunal by Serbia/Montenegro and the Bosnian and Croat Serbs in determining how to sequence any easing or lifting of economic sanctions imposed by the Security Council on Serbs in the former Yugoslavia.

We should have no illusions about the obstacles that the tribunal will face. This is not Nuremberg. The accused will not be the surrendered leaders of a broken power. It will be very difficult to gain access to evidence, including mass grave sites, especially in areas under local Serb control. It will be difficult to gain custody over many of the accused.

But realism about the Tribunal's prospects must not engender cynicism about its importance. Although there will be no trials in absentia, there will be investigations and findings of fact. The Tribunal is empowered to deliver indictments and issue arrest warrants. Governments will be obliged to hand over for trial those indicted who are within their jurisdiction. The Tribunal is empowered to request the Security Council to take enforcement action against any government that fails to do so. And indicted individuals will face the choice of standing trial or becoming international pariahs, trapped within the borders of their own lands, subject to immediate arrest should they leave.

One advantage we have now is Nuremberg, itself. Many of the legal arguments put forward by defendants at Nuremberg were disposed of in the judgment there. Today, there should be no question that political and military leaders may be held criminally accountable if they do not stop atrocities by their followers or do not punish those responsible. A person who gives the order to commit a war crime is culpable, as is the person who actually commits it. Conversely, a person acting pursuant to orders remains responsible, providing a moral choice was in fact available. Neither "just following orders", nor "just giving orders" is a tenable defense.

Let me review now the reasons why the U.S. Government believes the War Crimes Tribunal is so important.
First, the magnitude of the war crimes committed in former Yugoslavia demands an international legal response.

The war, itself, is the result of premeditated armed aggression. Bosnian Serb leaders have sought a "final solution" of extermination or expulsion to the problem of non-Serb populations under their control. The means chosen include murder, torture, indiscriminate bombing, fire, dismemberment, rape and castration. Half of Bosnia's population has been displaced. Five percent has been killed. Abuses have been massive, repeated, deliberate and gross. And no side is without guilt.

Earlier this year, I visited the mass grave near Vukovar. What I saw there was a garbage dump; a field of rusted refrigerators and scraps of farm equipment beneath which two to three hundred human beings are buried. There are no flowers, no signs or markers, no excavation of the soil. Hannah Arendt wrote about the banality of evil. There is a sickening evil in the banality there.

I thought during that same visit of the pictures that I had seen of the streams of refugees expelled from their homes in and around Vukovar. The images were eerily familiar. They could have come right out of the pictures in this Museum of families fleeing Warsaw or Minsk or Bucharest or Prague. The faces were not the same, but the expressions and the movements were: the slow, stumbling, bewildered pace of uprooted families, burdened by all their remaining possessions, trudging down an unfamiliar road towards an uncertain future, the strong helping the weak until their own strength is drained.

Most of the victims of the war in Bosnia, like the victims memorialized in this building, are not soldiers. They include average citizens of every description and of various nationalities, children, grandparents, doctors, nurses, mental patients and church officials. The majority were killed not because they wandered into a crossfire, or were too close to a military target; these dead were not—in the terminology of the soldier—collateral damage. They were men and women like you and me; boys and girls like those we know; intentionally targeted not because of what they had done, but for who they were.

The racialism at the center of Nazi ideology has not been present in the conflict in Bosnia. This is not the Holocaust. But there have been crimes of genocide. In 1939, when Field Marshall Wilhelm Keitel ordered the purge of Poland, he called it "political housecleaning." Today, it's called ethnic cleansing. But the questions raised are similar:
How do we respond when the authority and resources of a state are directed towards the destruction of whole categories of human beings?

How is it possible for so many people--capable of generosity and warmth in other contexts--to descend to the level of beasts?

How can civilization not respond to crimes of this magnitude and still call itself "civilized?"

And how can we calibrate our response so that it leads in the direction not of revenge, but of justice?

This brings me to a second argument in support of the War Crimes Tribunal. Even the threat of punishment for war crimes can save lives.

The prospect of war crimes trials in the latter stages of World War II caused some Nazi leaders to modify their treatment of Jews and other prisoners. In former Yugoslavia, each time the prospect of punishing war criminals has been publicized, the treatment of detainees has improved and atrocities have diminished. Today, there are signs that some of the worst violators of human rights are being deprived of their authority by one-time protectors who now fear justice under the law.

In short, the more serious we are about the Tribunal, the greater the potential deterrent the Tribunal will be. If this means that one village that would otherwise be attacked is spared; that one woman who would otherwise be violated is respected; that one prisoner who would otherwise be executed is allowed to live--the existence of the Tribunal would be validated on these grounds alone.

Third, the Tribunal will make it easier for the Bosnian people to reach a genuine peace.

The scars left on the bodies and in the minds of the survivors of this war will take time to heal. In too many places, neighbors were betrayed by neighbor and friend divided from friend by fierce and hostile passion. Too many families have assembled at too many cemeteries for us to say that ethnic differences in Bosnia do not matter. But responsibility for these crimes does not rest with the Serbs or Croats or Muslims as peoples; it rests with the people who ordered and committed the crimes. The wounds opened by this war will heal much faster if collective guilt for atrocities is expunged and individual responsibility is assigned.
Fourth, the Tribunal can provide a deterrent to other potential aggressors.

Adolf Hitler once dismissed arguments against killing Jews with the rhetorical question: "Who, after all, remembers the Armenians?"

If the architects of war and ethnic cleansing in Bosnia go unpunished, the lesson for would-be Milosevic's around the globe will endanger us all; for today's world is a tinderbox of open and potential nationalist conflict.

National pride can be the custodian of rich cultural legacies; it can unite people in defense of a common good; it can provide a sense of identity and belonging that stretches across territory and time.

But when pride in "us" curdles into hatred of "them," the result is a narrowing of vision and a compulsion to violence. As we saw in Germany a half century ago, as we have seen in America with the Ku Klux Klan, and as we see in Serbia today, at the far fringe of ethnic pride is fascism.

There are thousands of self-defined ethnic groups in the world, more than 100 in the former Soviet Union alone. Not everyone can reasonably expect to have its own flag, currency, airline and state.

Today, violent separatist movements are gaining strength. Left unchecked, they may engulf whole chunks of Europe, Asia and Africa in conflict. History from Sarajevo to Sarajevo warns us that when small powers fight, big powers are often drawn in. We have a stake in seeing that the embers of ethnic conflict are cooled, and models for easing fear, reconciling ambition and clarifying principle are established.

That is why we will continue to stress our view that individuals are entitled to basic human rights irrespective of group identity. It is why we will continue to support the work of the CSCE and others to enhance respect for the rights of minorities. It is why we will continue to work through the UN and regional organizations to settle disputes peacefully. It is why we should be determined to salvage from the conflict in Bosnia, if we can, two lessons: first, that aggressors and outlaws will be called to account, and second that the problem of minorities cannot be resolved through ethnic cleansing.

And it is why we will continue to view with deadly seriousness the rise of ultra-nationalist groups in strategic parts of the globe.
Let us never forget that the extreme views of Adolf Hitler caused many to ridicule him when they should have opposed him. Today, we may want to agree with the Russian Foreign Minister that Vladimir Zhirinovsky is less a political problem than a medical one. But it is disquieting to see bonds build between radical nationalists in Russia and former Yugoslavia. And history teaches us that individuals can be deranged and dangerous at the same time.

Finally, the War Crimes Tribunal can strengthen the fabric of international law.

What we have witnessed in former Yugoslavia goes beyond war to the brutalization of law and civilization, itself. We Americans, living in a free society, have a deep interest in a world where acceptable "rules of the game" are observed. Today, the most severe threats we face come from regimes that have chosen to operate outside the law. We are determined that a price be exacted for such behavior, whether in the form of diplomatic isolation, economic sanctions, military containment or coercion. The War Crimes Tribunal complements this approach.

For example, it gives life to the principle that the laws of war should be applied irrespective of battlefield success.

It reinforces the status of rape during armed conflict as a violation of international humanitarian law.

It recognizes that interference with the delivery of humanitarian aid is a war crime, something which has broad implications for future UN missions.

And it clarifies that there is a corollary to the right to emigrate; and that is what the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, Dr. Sadako Ogata has called "the right to remain"—a right directly opposed to ethnic cleansing.

These are key principles. Made concrete, they would shield the citizens not of one ethnic group in former Yugoslavia, but of each. And they would provide an extra margin of security to us all.

Clearly, the War Crimes Tribunal will not revolutionize human behavior; it will not stop all aggression; it will not end war crimes; it will not—even in the best case—ensure more than a measure of justice in former Yugoslavia. But it will at least place the force and prestige of international law squarely on the side of the victims of this conflict. It will enhance the prospects for a durable peace. It will add a measure of caution to the scales in the minds of would-be
aggressors. It will strengthen perceptibly the foundations of civilized society in a perilously unstable world. And it will rebut the song the New York Times reports is now popular in Belgrade: "Daddy is a war criminal, but no one dares take him to Court."

Tonight, with both the war and the War Crimes Tribunal in mind, here in this Museum dedicated to memory, let us vow not to allow the future to be defined by the past.

There are those who say we are all the prisoners of history; and that the violence that has wracked former Yugoslavia was but the inevitable aftershock of grievances incurred decades, even centuries, before.

There are those who feel unaffected by crimes perpetrated against the people of Bosnia because the victims are so far away, and because other problems--and other crimes--demand our attention here at home.

There are those who view the human tragedy and legal outrage in Bosnia against a broad geopolitical canvas and say it would be "unrealistic" for us to care very much or for very long.

There are those so appalled by the savagery of this and other wars that they despair of human progress, and refuse to recognize that some measure of justice is preferable to no justice at all.

There is much within our experience to support each of these attitudes. There is much within this building to cause pessimism and despair.

We cannot escape the damnable duality of human nature. We cannot base our lives or our policies on illusions about human character.

But we can understand that there will be limits on what we can accomplish without ourselves limiting what we attempt. We can accept the reality of cruelty without accepting cruelty. We can think of Auschwitz and despair; or we can contemplate Auschwitz and vow never to allow despair to excuse inaction.

We are the same species as Adolf Hitler, but also Anne Frank, Oskar Schindler, Raoul Wallenberg and the rebels in the Ghetto in Warsaw.
We are the same species as the stranglers of Sarajevo, and of its defenders; the same as the killers of Bosnia and the same as the many, including many Bosnian Serbs, who have risked their lives to save others.

We are the inheritors of a nation that did too little, too late to stop the Holocaust, and that liberated Buchenwald.

We are a nation that has been hesitant to get involved directly in Bosnia, and that has done more than any other nation to inspire hope.

We do not come to this Museum for facile understanding. We do not come here for reassurance. We come here to learn—not answers, but questions.

The War Crimes Tribunal for former Yugoslavia is a test of whether we are asking the right questions. By supporting it and fighting for it, we can do our part not to be imprisoned by history, but to shape it; to build a world not without conflict, but in which conflict is effectively contained; a world, not without repression, but in which the sway of freedom is enlarged; a world not without lawless behavior, but in which the interests of the law-abiding are progressively more secure.

This Museum demands what life demands; that we choose.

To stand aside as long as we can, or to do as much as we can.

Let us, in the name of the long and newly dead, and of the living, and of those to come, do all we can—to stop genocide and serve life.

Thank you very much.
America and the League of Nations: Lessons for Today
Ambassador Madeleine Albright
The Wilson Center
March 4, 1994

Let me start by wishing a happy 25th birthday to the Wilson Center. I will never forget my own time here as a Wilson fellow. Where else can you do truly independent research, meet scholars from all over the world and get paid for working in a castle? I have always felt that in a town full of monuments, the Center is unique because it is a living monument; it memorializes not only Wilson, but Wilson's lifelong effort— as educator and President—to map a trail for the future that would elude the traps of the past.

That effort is especially relevant to the commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the League of Nations. For although the League did not survive, many of the controversies surrounding it are with us still.

Seventy-five years ago, the world was witnessing, as we are, the end of one historical era and the beginning of another.

Then, too, revolution in Russia was sending ripples of change around the world. Then, too, peoples long-suppressed by empire were clamoring for recognition; violence reigned in the Caucasus and the Balkans; and debate raged about the uses of multilateral peacekeeping and international law.

And then, too, American leaders were challenged to create a conceptual framework for engagement in a world that appeared to pose no "clear and present" danger to the American people.

We cannot observe the League's 75th anniversary—or contemplate the UN's upcoming 50th—without recognizing a fundamental reality. During this century, we have transformed utterly the daily environment in which we live. We have realized many of the dreams—and some of the nightmares—of our greatest scientists. We can transplant hearts, split the atom, and dial Mongolia direct. We have reinvented the world, but we have not re-ordered it as envisioned by President Wilson, or even by President Bush in his "New World Order" speech of less than three years ago.

The truth is that we are wrestling with many of the same questions that bedeviled President Wilson:

- Is collective security the key to world peace; an illusion that could imperil our own security; or something inbetween?
How do we accommodate the legitimate hopes of nationalities without encouraging separatism and ethnic cleansing?

How do we make economic sanctions a more effective way of isolating and influencing rogue regimes?

How do we generate greater respect for international law?

How do we forge a consensus within America so that we can play the leading role we must play if international institutions are to be effective?

To me, as a child growing up in Prague, Woodrow Wilson was a giant. A free Czechoslavakia had arisen like a phoenix from the Fourteen Points. The Czech Constitution was modeled on America's. In almost every town, you could find a train station or some other public place named after Woodrow Wilson.

Wilson asked all of us to believe in "the people." He felt that only informed publics could move governments away from war; away from the stockpiling of arms; and away from an obsession with the balance of power.

In an era of American exceptionalists, Wilson was no exception. He affirmed repeatedly that America had a special place among nations; that we, more than others, took an expansive and uplifting view of national interest. He had the confidence to predict that Americans would "take pride in...offering every dollar of her wealth, every drop of her blood, (and) every energy of her people to maintain the peace upon" a foundation of international law.

Wilson's decision to enter the war, and his vision of a just peace, established American credentials on the world stage. But he lost the fight for the League because his view of American leadership did not account for our age-old caution about entanglements overseas. He was right when he said that without the US, the League would likely fail; he was right that if the League failed "another attempt would be made to crush the new nations of Europe"; but he couldn't convince the Senate that, without the League, US interests would be imperiled. This fissure between the Executive and Congress did not profit either side; rather it harmed America and reduced US influence in a turbulent world.
Today, we are re-learning both the imperative of American leadership and the habit of American caution. To avoid past mistakes, we must marry purpose with practice, emphasizing not plans that promise much, but strategies that deliver what they promise. To that end, I will outline tonight an updated Fourteen Points; fourteen principles derived from the League of Nations experience but applied to our own very different day. Now before your stomachs start growling, I remind you: this is the Clinton Administration. Points one through seven are the economy, jobs, trade, health care, welfare reform, crime and national service. So relax, I'll finish in time for dinner and start with number eight.

And number eight is simply that the isolationists of today are as wrong as those of 75 years ago. American leadership in the world is essential to American interests and inseparable from American character.

Few imagined in Wilson's time that when shots rang out in Sarajevo, hundreds of thousands of American troops would be drawn across the Atlantic, many never to return. The linkages among nations today are far closer. Political borders are being overrun by everything from refugees to Reeboks to revolutionary ideas; being overrun, it sometimes seems, by refugees in Reeboks with revolutionary ideas.

We have no interest, in Theodore Roosevelt's phrase, in becoming an "international Meddlesome Matty." We can't play Dr. Welby to the world. But experience warns us that it is far more effective, far less expensive and far less risky to treat the symptoms of global disorder when they appear, then to sit and wait until the contagious consequences of conflict arrive at our door. It is in our interest to promote cooperative arrangements that enlarge freedom, prevent strife, control the spread of nuclear weapons and penalize those who run roughshod over international law. Nations, in this sense, are like people. The quality of our life depends not only on the kind of home we make for ourselves, but on the kind of international neighborhood in which we live.

The next point—again using Clinton math—is number nine. We must demolish the myth that effective multilateral institutions can only be built at the expense of national sovereignty.

Seventy-five years ago, opponents charged that the League of Nations would "send Japanese over here to crowd out our workmen...seize our homes...(and) turn our wives and children (into) beggars...."

Today, some are accusing the Clinton Administration of taking its foreign policy marching orders from the UN. The charges are equally ridiculous.
The UN's authority comes from the Member states; it is servant, not master. Its job is to help governments do together what they cannot do as easily or as well on their own.

The challenge for us is to judge when working through the UN serves our interests and when it does not. We do not, for example, look to the UN to defend our territory, to set the rules of trade or to define international economic policy. But the universality of the UN can be helpful in, among other things:

- keeping the peace, especially where there is a genuine peace to keep;
- controlling the spread of nuclear arms;
- monitoring elections;
- advocating human rights;
- stopping the spread of disease;
- fighting pollution;
- responding to emergencies;
- caring for the victims of war; and
- we are determined, in prosecuting the criminals of war, starting with those in former Yugoslavia.

Acting through the UN does not foreclose opportunities to act on our own. On the contrary, it puts the UN's prestige and resources at the service of goals that Americans support. This does not diminish our sovereignty; it strengthens it. It allows us to contribute to a global system more acceptable than anything either we or others could achieve alone. And the cost is not large: a price per capita for us, for everything from blue helmets for peacekeepers to polio vaccines for babies, of less than $7 a year. That's about the same as a ticket to see America's hottest movie, which these days gives you a choice between "Schindler's List" and "Ace Ventura, Pet Detective."

Point ten is related to point nine. We must recognize both the potential and the limits of UN peacekeeping.

From our perspective near millennium's end, we can look back at centuries of international efforts to deter conflict through a combination of force and law. Before the UN, there was the League of Nations; before that the Congress of Vienna; before that the Treaty of Westphalia; before that medieval nonaggression pacts; before that the Athenian League.
Still, no magic formula has been found. In America today, there are those from both political parties who would walk away from UN peacekeeping altogether. There are others, like former President Reagan, who have called for "a standing UN force--an army of conscience--...prepared to carve out humanitarian sanctuaries through force if necessary."

The Clinton Administration is navigating a middle course. UN peacekeeping is a contributor to, not the centerpiece of, our national security strategy. It is no substitute for vigorous alliances and a strong national defense. When threats arise to us or to others, we will choose the course of action that best serves our interests. We may act through the UN; we may act through NATO; we may act through a coalition; we may sometimes mix these tools; or we may act alone. But we will do whatever it takes to defend the vital interests of the United States.

We know that past UN peace missions have achieved important goals in places as diverse as the Middle East, Namibia, El Salvador and Cambodia. To the extent future missions succeed, they will lift from the shoulders of American servicemen and taxpayers a great share of the burden of collective security. When we intervene alone, we bear all the costs and all the risks. When the UN intervenes, the bulk of the burden falls to others. Of the 70,000 peacekeepers now deployed around the world, the U.S. contribution is less than 5%. Of the total costs, America bears 30%, and we are going to get that reduced. Of the more than 1000 UN peacekeepers who have died on the job, 36 were Americans.

But if UN peacekeeping is to be effective, it must be made ready for the 21st century. UN peacekeepers need better planning and organization, reformed budget procedures, more dependable sources of personnel, better training, better intelligence, better equipment and more adequate resources. We are working with the UN and with other member states to achieve these reforms.

We are also working to bring UN responsibilities into line with its capabilities. The success of peacekeeping does not depend on how many operations there are, but on how well each operation is conducted. So we are insisting that tough questions concerning mission, resources, risk, scope and duration be asked before not after new obligations are undertaken.

I emphasize that the purpose of our policy is not to expand UN peacekeeping, but to fix it. We want to know that when we do turn to the UN, it will be able to do the job, at an acceptable cost, in a finite period of time. We know that threats that affect our interests will continue to arise. The world will continue to look to us for leadership. We will continue to provide that leadership, but we should not bear the full burden alone. We will be better off if the UN is better able to prevent and contain international conflict.
Point Eleven. We must work to make economic sanctions a more effective instrument of international policy.

One of the designers of the League of Nations predicted that "the economic weapon (would be) the great discovery and the most precious possession of the League." But the success of an international organization depends not on what member states are pledged on paper to do; but on what they are willing in reality to do.

And in 1935, when Italy invaded Ethiopia, League members were not willing to do very much. Sanctions were too gradual, too limited and too poorly enforced. Mussolini said later that if the League had embargoed oil, he would have withdrawn his troops within a week. The League did embargo arms, but hauntingly in light of our recent experience in Bosnia, to aggressor and victim alike.

In the UN during the Cold War, superpower rivalry prevented sanctions, like peacekeeping, from being used very often. More recently, they have been imposed for generally good cause against former Yugoslavia, Iraq, Haiti and Libya. As long as the permanent members of the Security Council continue to cooperate, sanctions will be an option for responding to potential crises. But they will be a better option if we are able to transform them from a blunt instrument into a more precise tool of policy. That process has only begun.

As I mentioned earlier, we are asking tough questions whenever a new UN peacekeeping operation is considered. I have appointed a task force at our mission in New York to recommend similar questions for when UN sanctions are considered.

Conventional wisdom dictates, for example, that sanctions should be applied before a resort to military force. That is logical and in most cases would seem right. But we should at least ask whether imposing sanctions is preferable in each case to the use or threatened use of force.

We also need to consult closely with other nations so that we are clear about objectives. Do we seek sanctions to protest, to punish, to deter or to compel a government or some combination of those? Do we seek to bring a target government down or simply to change its policies? If sanctions don't work, what are next steps? What must happen before sanctions are lifted? Can the sanctions be enforced? Might they boomerang by mobilizing domestic support for an embattled regime? Might the sanctions create unintended hardships for neighboring countries or for innocent people within the targeted state? If so, is there a plan to mitigate those hardships?
These and other questions should be considered before sanctions are imposed. As the Bosnian arms embargo illustrates, an ill-advised step can be difficult to take back. Sanctions must be more than a reflex borne of frustration, a rain dance we perform when we are unable to make it rain. Unless sanctions are ultimately to add to public cynicism, they must have clear and achievable goals clearly explained. Sanctions can be valuable, but they are not cost-free and they should not be over-sold.

The Twelfth Point is no simpler. We must find ways to accommodate legitimate aspirations for ethnic and national identity without encouraging separatism, extremism or violence.

My father was a Czech patriot who once served as Ambassador from what is now the former Czechoslovakia to what is now the former Yugoslavia. He described nationalism "as a permanent, vital and influential force for good and evil."

It was his experience, as it is ours, that national pride can be the custodian of rich cultural legacies; it can unite people in defense of a common good; it can provide a sense of identity and belonging that stretches across territory and time.

But when pride in "us" curdles into hatred of "them", the result is a narrowing of vision and a compulsion to violence. As we saw in Germany a half century ago, as we have seen in America with the Ku Klux Klan, and as we see in Serbia today, at the far fringe of ethnic pride is fascism.

Throughout history, when great multi-ethnic empires have broken up, nationalist movements have emerged. That happened in Woodrow Wilson's time; it is happening today.

The Soviet empire sought to destroy the separate ethnic identities of its subject peoples--to re-write history, to manipulate provincial borders, to discourage religion, to create what Vaclav Havel has called "the monstrous illusion that we are all the same."

But now, as Havel has observed:

after decades of falsified history...nothing has been forgotten. Nations are now remembering their ancient achievements...their ancient suppressors...their ancient statehoods and their former borders.

There are thousands of self-defined ethnic groups in the world, more than 100 in the former Soviet Union alone. Not every one can reasonably expect to have its own flag, currency, airline and state. President Wilson, who has been called the father of self-determination, never equated that concept with ethnicity, nor believed that ethnic and political boundaries should be the same. Nor can we say that the world would be a better place if they were the same.
Clearly, something has to give. Separatist movements today are gaining strength. Left unchecked, they may engulf whole chunks of Europe, Asia and Africa in conflict. History from Sarajevo to Sarajevo warns us that when small powers fight, big powers are often drawn in. We have a stake in seeing that the embers of ethnic conflict are cooled, and models for easing fear, reconciling ambition and clarifying principle are established.

That is why we support the work of the CSCE and others to enhance respect for the rights of minorities. It is why we will continue to work through the UN and regional organizations to settle disputes peacefully. It is why we will continue to stress the principle that individuals are entitled to basic human rights irrespective of group identity. And it is why we will continue to view with deadly seriousness the rise of ultra-nationalist groups in strategic parts of the globe.

Let us never forget that the extreme views of Adolf Hitler caused many to ridicule him when they should have opposed him. Today, we may want to agree with the Russian Foreign Minister that Vladimir Zhirinovsky is less a political problem than a medical one. But it is disquieting to see bonds build between radical nationalists in Russia and those in Milosevic's Serbia. And history teaches us that individuals can be deranged and dangerous at the same time.

The thirteenth point is basic. We must have Congressional and public support for our policies at the UN.

Woodrow Wilson has been quoted as saying that "I would rather lose in a cause that will someday win, then win in a cause that will someday lose." The current Administration prefers to prevail in a policy that will serve American interests long and well. That requires understanding something that President Wilson appears not to have understood sufficiently. American leadership in international organizations does not depend on Executive action alone. Congress, like the President, must play an important role because Congress, like the President, is accountable to the people.

There will always be some on both sides of the political spectrum with whom agreement is--shall we say--difficult. In its day, the League was assailed from the left as "a capitalist scheme" and from the right as a plot hatched by "Negroes and...mulattoes." There are some in our day who see every UN issue through a narrow, partisan lens. But most Members of Congress are looking for a formula that will allow them to further American objectives at the UN, without wasting American dollars.
Such a formula was suggested in a recent study headed by Representative Lee Hamilton and Senator Nancy Kassebaum. It includes:

- reforms to eliminate waste and professionalize management at the UN;
- changes in the financing of UN peacekeeping operations, including a reduction in the share of costs to be borne by the United States;
- an appropriate Congressional role in US decisions about UN peace operations; and
- a Congressional commitment to full payment of UN assessments.

Clearly, if the UN is to succeed, it must enter a "season of reform"; it must become more accountable, more professional, more equitable in its sources of funding and more service-oriented in its outlook. At the same time, our leadership at the UN will be undermined if the US falls too far behind in paying its bills. What we need is a comprehensive approach perhaps along the lines suggested by the Hamilton-Kassebaum study. That is precisely what the Administration is now exploring at the UN and with the Congress.

Finally, the fourteenth point—encompassing all of the others. We must not allow the future to be defined by the past.

There are those who say that we are the prisoners of history; that we can do little to contain ethnic violence because the scars of past grievance are too often too deep.

There are those who say that we will never succeed in enlarging democracy or extending free markets or relieving poverty or enhancing human rights because too many cultures are impervious to change.

There are those who say that Cold War I will inevitably be followed by Cold War II.

And there are those who say that international institutions are doomed to fail.

There is much within our experience to support each of these grim conclusions. This evening, I have cited puzzles that have resisted solution from Woodrow Wilson's time to our own. It is no wonder that there is a pessimistic and despairing side to us all. But let us not, in studying history, get our lessons wrong.
Eleanor Roosevelt once said that "within all of us there are two sides. One reaches for the stars, the other descends to the level of beasts."

We honor Woodrow Wilson precisely because he spoke to the other, more hopeful side of our nature; to the side that Jefferson spoke to in the Declaration of Independence and Lincoln in his Second Inaugural Address; to the side that liberated Buchenwald, resisted apartheid, marched on Washington and faced down tanks in Tiananmen and Prague. He spoke to the side of our nature that prompted two bitter rivals to shake hands last September on the White House lawn; and that created the United Nations, not because human society is capable of perfection, but because it is not.

Make no mistake, there is purpose to our efforts in the world today; to weave out of the varied threads of peacekeeping, sanctions, human rights, international law and military resolve a tapestry that will brighten the tomorrows of our people and of all people. That purpose is redeemed daily in the eyes of Cambodian children, the dreams of entrepreneurs in Poland, the courage of political prisoners in Burma, the pride of American servicemen and women wherever they serve and in the stubborn will to survive of people just like us who happen to live in Srebrenica and Mostar.

In his final public speech, Woodrow Wilson acknowledged that there can be no "absolute guarantee against the errors of human judgment or the violence of human passion." But we have a responsibility in our time, as others have had in their's, not to be imprisoned by history, but to shape it; to build a world not without conflict, but in which conflict is effectively contained; a world, not without repression, but in which the sway of freedom is enlarged; a world not without lawless behavior, but in which the interests of the law abiding are progressively more secure.

That is our mission as we enter this new era. And that is a future that we can bequeath with pride to our children and to theirs.

Thank you very much.
Nine months ago, when President Yeltsin and I first met in Vancouver, we committed ourselves to strengthening the growing partnership between our two nations. Today we took important steps to do just that.

In our discussions today I reaffirmed my Administration's support for Russian reform during this extraordinary transformation to markets and democracy. President Yeltsin and I agreed today that Russia must continue apace in its economic reforms -- including privatization and controlling inflation -- while also helping those most vulnerable to the conversion of the economy.

Today I also congratulated President Yeltsin on the creation of Russia's first post-Soviet constitution. He and I share the conviction that the December elections, by establishing the rule of law in Russia, closed the door on the Soviet era of governance and laid strong foundations for continued reform.

As you know, earlier this week I attended the NATO summit in Brussels. At that summit NATO established the Partnership for Peace, a plan to bring Russia and other states of the former Soviet Union and Eastern and Central Europe into closer cooperation with NATO. [President Yeltsin's views]

I believe that we have the opportunity today to build a durable democratic peace across a broader Europe -- and that such a peace begins with the efforts of Russia and America. Our two nations continue to work together to reduce our nuclear arsenals. At the same time, we have worked to ensure that [Ukraine tk]. In the Middle East, Russia and the U.S. remain dedicated to promoting a just and lasting peace.

Together, we are pursuing objectives that are in the national interests of both Russia and the United States. As I have said before, America has a strategic alliance with Russian reform. It was in that spirit of realistic friendship and shared long-term interest that President Yeltsin and I held our very productive meetings today.

Let me close simply by thanking President Yeltsin and the Russian people for their hospitality. When I came to Moscow as a student twenty four years ago, I was moved by the courage and the faith of the Russian people. Today, Russia's greatness is evident once again in your journey to freedom. It is with deep admiration and appreciation that I leave Russia today. Thank you.
I want to thank you all for the outstanding work you have done to make my visit such a success. I am especially grateful for your extraordinary performance over the last several months -- especially, and I will say more about this in a few moments, the heroism of the Marine detachment here.

Three months ago, the world watched as a bloody clash erupted between the forces of reform and reaction in Russia. For two days, Russia teetered on the brink of civil chaos, while you and your families were forced to take refuge in this gymnasium. As millions of Americans watched events unfold on television, we feared for your safety. But never did we doubt your courage.

For even as the Embassy buildings shook from the rumble of cannon fire outside, even as protestors stormed the Moscow mayor’s office, the Embassy staff provided us in Washington with steady reporting on the confrontation.

More recently, you had the opportunity to witness a drama of a different and far better variety. You have literally been present at the creation of a new Russia, ruled by law, governed by a constitution of the people’s own making.

Both the events of October and the elections last month reminded Americans why we must do all we can to strengthen our strategic alliance with Russian reform. They reminded us that we support freedom here and around the world not only because doing so resonates with our values; but because it advances our interests.

That is why expanding our partnership with a free democratic Russia is my Administration’s highest priority. And that is why the work you do here every day is so important.

During my visit here, I had the opportunity to discuss a wide range of issues with President Yeltsin. [more on results of meetings]

I know that Moscow in January is not always an easy place to be. But I also know that under the leadership of Tom Pickering, it is one of the best places to be in the foreign service. Ambassador Pickering’s dedicated public service brings to mind others who have represented America here: Averell Harriman, George Kennan, Charles Bohlen, Bob Strauss. And if some of the names on that distinguished roster are a guide, there is a junior officer in this gymnasium who will return to Moscow someday as Ambassador.

I would like to close by expressing my deepest gratitude -- and that of the nation -- for the United States Marines who serve at our embassy here. During those days of crisis three months ago, this unit was the only line of defense between the embassy compound and the unpredictable violence outside.

The Marines of Embassy Moscow did not flinch. Your uncommon valor ensured the safety of your colleagues. And it confirmed the faith that America has in you. Let me say too that the nation’s prayers are with Corporal McClain Bell, who narrowly
escaped death by a sniper's bullet while on patrol October third.
In recognition of your sacrifice and service, I now present this
Marine Security Guard detachment with the following Meritorious
Service Citation: [read citation as appropriate].

Thank you very much.
Mr. President, Mrs. Yeltsin, distinguished guests:

Tonight, this wondrous hall sparkles with the many facets of your nation's freedom. You, Mr. President, deserve so much credit for the progress all of Russia has made toward renewal.

For under your leadership, Russia is constructing a market economy amid the ruins of the old command system. Russia is building a great multi-ethnic democracy, joined by the mortar of freedom and faith. And last month, the Russian people performed the miracle of creating a constitution. In the words of Pushkin, you have "married sacred liberty with mighty law."

Not far from here, at the corner of Red Square, stands the Kazan Cathedral. This ancient sanctuary was recently rebuilt with new materials. But it still stands on its old foundations. In the same way, Mr. President, Russia today is creating a new society, inspired by universal aspirations for freedom, yet grounded in the greatness of your history and people.

Sometimes, especially on such an occasion, in such a magnificent setting, politicians like us are tempted to think that the world's changes are solely our doing. But that is not the case. It is the people of our nations whose strong hands and broad shoulders shape this new world. Though our moment in power shall one day pass, the free citizens we represent shall forever remain sovereign.

So it is with deep humility and great admiration that I raise my glass in a toast -- to you, Boris Nikolayevich, to the great peoples of Russia and America, and to the bright and enduring promise of freedom that illuminates our common future.
I want to thank our hosts, Ambassador and Mrs. Pickering, for having us here this evening. Spaso House is a wonderful venue for this occasion.

I am told this House has seen its share of memorable get-togethers. Sixty years ago, I'm told, at a Christmas Eve party here, three trained seals went berserk in the ballroom. A year later, a small bear borrowed from the Moscow Zoo spoiled the occasion -- by spoiling a Soviet general's uniform. I am glad that today, the expression "party animals" has a different meaning.

I don't want to keep you from your conversation for too long, but I do want to say this: I am excited and privileged to be among so many representatives of the new Russia here tonight.

Today your nation is undergoing history's greatest peaceful revolution. The changes that have swept across Russia are awe-inspiring. In America we're trying to reform a health care system that comprises one-seventh of the economy. But you are working to reform seven-sevenths of your economy. And on top of that, you face the creation of a new political order, the repair of decades of economic and spiritual damage done by Soviet communism.

But while the scope of the challenges is different in Russia and America, the essential tasks we face are similar. For the hardest thing in the world is to persuade people to give up the certainty of muddling through for the uncertain promise of a better life. That's why I have nothing but admiration for those of you with the courage to realize your bold vision of Russia's future. You are truly moving a nation.

Your endeavors express all that is great about the Russian people. They resonate with the values we Americans hold so dear -- freedom and opportunity. And they are helping build a world for both our peoples that is safer and more prosperous than any of us might have imagined possible only a few short years ago.

That is why America stands with you in your heroic effort to remake Russia. That is why I urged your nation today to stay the course with reform. That is why I wanted to join each of you tonight to celebrate the wider importance of your work.

Your presence here tonight reminds us all that change is not some abstract force; that individuals -- people like you -- make it happen. For as in my own country, the currents of change in Russia are being fed by countless tributaries of individual courage and initiative: by citizens casting votes; by hard working men and women forming trade unions; by young entrepreneurs starting businesses; by visionary artists committing the bright hopes of a generation to canvas; by public leaders denouncing intolerance; by parents and neighbors taking responsibility for the well-being of their communities.
Tonight, let us celebrate your efforts. Let us celebrate Russia's rebirth. And let us dedicate ourselves to the success of the *velikiy podvig* -- the great feat -- that the Russian people have begun.
It is a great pleasure to be here. Ever since I came to Moscow as a student a quarter century ago, my imagination has been captivated by the rich history and deep pride of the Russian people. Today, that greatness is amplified by your achievements of the last two years.

As you know, I have just come from a NATO Summit and a meeting with my colleagues in the European Union. Our discussions yielded some important policy decisions. But they also followed a larger purpose: to seize the opportunity created by the end of the Cold War; to build a durable peace among former adversaries.

Such a peace begins, of course, with America and Russia. I have come to Moscow today to strengthen the growing partnership between our two great nations, a partnership made possible by your astounding transformation to democracy and free markets.

One month ago today, the Russian people voted to govern themselves in peace, though a parliament and a constitution of their own making. By doing so, you have closed the door on the Soviet era and laid strong foundations for continued reform.

But the success of that reform faces many more obstacles still. While the changes in your society have generated incredible opportunity for countless Russians, for some they have also caused uncertainty and dislocation. So let me make clear to you today that America remains steadfast in its support for Russia's transformation to markets and democracy.

During our meetings, President Yeltsin and I will be discussing specific proposals that will assist the reform process. We will also discuss a wide range of security issues, including the Partnership for Peace just adopted at the NATO Summit.

The Partnership for Peace will create the opportunity for Russia and other nations of Central and Eastern Europe to engage in closer cooperation with NATO. And it will therefore create a more stable security environment for all of Europe.

Ultimately, whatever we undertake here in the spirit of cooperation must arise first from the national interests of both Russia and the United States. It is in that spirit of realistic friendship that I have come to Moscow.

This magnificent hall, resplendent in the gilded glory of the Order of Saint George, testifies to Russia's heroism. Today, I stand here as the first American President to visit a free democratic Russia. And I know that because of your heroism, I will not be the last.

I am looking forward to the important work we have ahead of us in the days ahead and in the years to come. Thank you.
Thank you, Ambassador Basora, and my deepest thanks to all of you on the embassy staff. I know you have all put in long hours to make my visit here such a great success. And as I stand here ready to depart, I imagine the smiles on your faces are smiles of genuine relief.

You are blessed to be serving at this wonderful post. This city is bathed in the luxuriant hues of history. But Prague is also vibrant with hope for the future. From the avant-garde dancers at the Magic Lantern Theater to the frenzied young entrepreneurs running businesses out of their apartments, Prague is constantly in motion.

Five years ago the world witnessed a miracle here, as the brittle Iron Curtain gave way to a lush Velvet Revolution. That miracle has been repeated across this ancient region, renewing the faith of its people and filling the eyes of Americans with wonder.

But you here at the embassy have been more than witnesses. You have played a major role in the historic transformation from communism to freedom. In your daily work, you have strengthened the bonds of friendship between America and the Czech Republic -- a relationship that reaches from Antonin Dvorak to Madeleine Albright.

At the same time, you have done important work here to promote democracy and facilitate American business efforts in this country. Every time you provide support for our democratization programs here, you nurture the seeds of a flourishing civil society. And every time you help an American businessperson crack the Czech market, you help advance economic growth at home.

The work you do is rooted firmly in America's larger strategy for engagement in Central and Eastern Europe. During my visit here, I had the opportunity to meet with the leaders of the Visegrad nations and to discuss with them the Partnership for Peace just adopted by NATO. This proposal goes to the heart of the challenge we face as we build a new security for a new Europe.

As I walked around Prague last night with President Havel, I was reminded of my visit here as a student in 1969. That was only a year after the Prague Spring, and I remember how the saints of Charles Bridge stood over a city smothered by oppression.

Today, those saints still stand there in quiet reverie. But the city and the people they watch over are free. So as you walk through Prague's spired streets, remember the power of their faith -- and of our dedication to freedom's success.
Thank you for your warm welcome. It is a great pleasure to be back in Prague, and a delight to be at this glorious castle. It was twenty-four years ago this week that I came here as a student. Prague was under the cloud of communist oppression. Faint stirrings of freedom had been brutally stifled, and the prospects for Czech freedom any time soon were bleak.

Today, because of your vision and leadership, President Havel, and because of the courage of the Czech people, Prague is once again the shining capital of a thriving democracy. Tonight, President Havel and I will be walking across the Charles Bridge and through the spired streets of this city. My reunion with Prague is made possible by Prague’s reunion with freedom.

When World War II ended, only half the promise of the Allied victory over fascism was realized. The other half, as you know so well, was caught captive behind Europe’s walls of division.

But five years ago the brittle Iron Curtain gave way to a lush Velvet Revolution. That miracle has been repeated all across this ancient region. And now, at last, we have the opportunity to realize the full promise of a durable democratic peace across a broader Europe.

I came to Europe this week to seize that opportunity, and I am delighted that I will be meeting here with the leaders of Poland, Hungary, Slovakia and the Czech Republic.

Just today, I left Brussels, where I attended summits with both NATO and the European Union. My message at both summits was clear — and it is the message I send today: Europe’s western half cannot thrive if its eastern half is struggling. We must integrate Central and Eastern Europe into a broader trans-Atlantic partnership.

I believe we took a major step toward that goal on Tuesday [ck] when NATO established the Partnership for Peace, designed to enlarge the Alliance without drawing new lines in Europe. And that is why yesterday, I urged the members of the European Union to join the U.S. in opening their markets to the goods produced in Europe’s east.

During the next two days, I will meet with the leaders of the four Visegrad states. We will be exchanging views on the Partnership for Peace, as well as our shared commitment to expanding Europe’s economic integration. We will also discuss American initiatives to support the historic transition these nations are making to democracy and market economies.

My nation understands that freedom’s gains cannot be taken for granted. We are committed to supporting Central and Eastern Europe during this period of sweeping and sometimes difficult change. I look forward to working with Presidents Havel, Walesa, Goencz and Kovac as we build a new security for a new Europe.

Thank you very much.
I have just come from a very productive session with President Delors and Prime Minister Papandreou, as well as an excellent meeting with members of the European Union Commission and Presidency.

I came to Brussels because I believe that now is the time for us to build a new security for a broader, more integrated Europe. At the heart of this new security is the economic vitality of the trans-Atlantic relationship.

That is one reason my Administration strongly supports European integration. We believe that a strong and more unified Europe makes for a more effective economic and political partner. That was certainly made clear by our combined efforts in leading the world to a new GATT agreement.

In our discussions today, we agreed that the U.S. and the EU must now build on the momentum generated by the successful conclusion of the Uruguay Round. We intend now to make a concerted effort not only to implement the agreement but to resolve our differences in those sectors left unfinished in December.

We also discussed measures to help all our economies adjust to the structural changes in the global economy. Those changes are causing rising unemployment and sluggish growth in many European nations. We look forward to pursuing this dialogue on economic growth at the G-7 Jobs Summit, to be held in the U.S. in March.

There was agreement today that one of the most important challenges we face is the integration of the new market democracies of Europe’s eastern half into the trans-Atlantic community.

This morning NATO took an historic step toward that goal by establishing the Partnership for Peace. And this afternoon, we discussed steps to open our markets to the nations of Central and Eastern Europe.

During today’s meetings, we also exchanged views and insights on a wide range of other issues, including Russia’s democratic and market reforms and our common efforts to build on the historic breakthroughs toward peace in the Middle East.

In closing, let me note that this trip is but the first of three I will make to Europe in the first part of 1994 alone. I will be returning in June for the 50th Anniversary commemoration of D-Day, and then again in July for the G-7 meeting. This agenda, and the productive meetings we have had today, are proof that America’s commitment to the trans-Atlantic relationship is as strong -- and as fundamental to our mutual security and prosperity -- as it has ever been.

Thank you very much.
Mr. Secretary General, distinguished leaders and guests: I am honored to join the North Atlantic Council this morning, as eight other Presidents have done before me. Each came here for a compelling reason: The security of the North Atlantic region is vital to the security of the United States. This remains as true today as it was in this century's two world wars or during the "long twilight struggle" of the Cold War. Our North Atlantic ties are the bedrock of American engagement abroad.

The founders of this Alliance sought to enlarge the common security of free peoples by banding together at a time of nominal peace. They created the greatest military alliance in human history. It was a bold undertaking. We have come together this week because history calls on us to be equally bold once again.

During the years that followed the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty, this Alliance laid the foundation for the most hopeful development on this Continent in a thousand years -- the fact that nations of Western Europe have abolished war among themselves. The Alliance forged unbreakable links across the Atlantic. It secured our victory in the Cold War. NATO kept alight the spark of freedom for hundreds of millions of people who suffered under communism -- and five years ago, that spark touched off a peaceful explosion of freedom all across this continent.
Now we no longer fear attack from an implacable enemy. But if our common adversary has vanished, our common dangers have not. With the Cold War over, we must confront the destabilizing consequences of the unfreezing of history. The threat is not of advancing armies, but of creeping chaos.

The best strategy against that threat is to integrate the former communist states into our fabric of liberal democracy, economic prosperity and military cooperation. For our security in this generation will be shaped by whether reform in these states succeeds in the face of economic frustration, ethnic frictions and intolerant nationalism. The reactionary vote in Russia's elections reminds us of the strength of democracy's opponents. The ongoing slaughter in Bosnia tallies the price when those opponents prevail.

If we do not meet our new challenge, then most assuredly we will once again face our old challenges. If democracy in the east fails, then violence and disruption from the east will once again haunt us and other kindred democracies.

Our generation's stewardship of this grand alliance will be most critically judged by whether we succeed in integrating the nations to our east within the compass of Western security. For we have been granted an opportunity without precedent: to recast European security on new historic principles, grounded on faith in human
potential and the pursuit of economic and political freedom. We must succeed, for this opportunity will not soon, if ever, recur.

All democracies ultimately depend for their survival on their citizens voting their long-term interests in the face of immediate pressures. So it is with democratic alliances. Over the past few years, the world watched to see if NATO could adapt to new times in the absence of a clear and present danger, and in the presence of pressures in each of our nations to focus only on domestic needs. In effect, the world wondered whether we have the foresight and courage our predecessors had to act on our long-term interests.

I am confident the steel in this Alliance has not rusted. Our nations proved that by joining with others to defeat a common danger in the Gulf War. We proved it anew this past year by helping the world to reach a new GATT agreement. Now we are proving our mettle once again.

To seize the great opportunity before us, I proposed that we forge a new Partnership for Peace, open to all the states of Europe, including the former communist states of Central and Eastern Europe and the new states of the former Soviet Union. The members of this Partnership will plan, train and exercise together, and work together on missions of common concern. They should be invited to work directly with NATO, both here and in a Planning Cell in Mons.
This Partnership will prepare the NATO Alliance to undertake new tasks that the times impose on us. The Combined Joint Task Force created will let us act both effectively and with dispatch in helping to make and keep the peace. We must also ready this Alliance to meet new threats, notably that from weapons of mass destruction and the means of delivering them.

Building on NATO's creation of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council two years ago, the Partnership for Peace set in motion a process that leads to the enlargement of NATO. We began this Alliance with twelve members. Today we have sixteen. We were strengthened by each addition. Indeed, our Treaty has always looked to the addition of new members who shared the Alliance's purpose and who could enlarge its orbit of democratic security. Thus, in leading us toward the addition of these eastern states, the Partnership for Peace does not change NATO's original vision; it realizes NATO's original vision.

The Partnership for Peace draws inspiration from NATO's founding. At that time, courageous peoples, rebuilding from the carnage of World War II, sought association across the Atlantic to bolster confidence in the possibilities of their own efforts. Today, many countries that have emerged from communism are asking to join our Alliance for much the same reason. We must answer them based on our hard-earned knowledge that security on this continent is
indivisible. Let us say to peoples in Europe's east: "we share with you a common destiny; we are committed to your success."

At the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty, Harry Truman compared the original members of this Alliance to a group of homeowners who "decide to express their community of interests by entering into a formal association for their mutual self-protection." Now the democratic community has grown, and it is time to begin welcoming the newcomers into our neighborhood.

As Allies, let us be clear among ourselves about certain assumptions and consequences. First, moving forward in this manner requires that we mutually reaffirm our bonds of Alliance -- our compact of mutual trust and security. America pledges its enduring commitment to this common purpose. As President, I pledge to maintain roughly 100,000 troops in Europe, consistent with the expressed wishes of our Allies. As was true at every critical moment in this century, the peoples of Europe can count on America.

Second, we must recognize that our new security challenges require a range of responses. That is why my Administration supports Europe's efforts to advance its security in other ways beyond NATO. We supported the Maastricht Treaty. We support the commitment of the European Union to a Common Foreign and Security Policy. And we support your efforts to refurbish the Western European Union so that it will assume a more vigorous role in keeping Europe secure.
Consistent with that goal, we have proposed making NATO assets available to WEU operations in which NATO itself is not involved. All these efforts will show all our peoples and legislatures a renewed purpose in European institutions and a better balance of responsibilities within the trans-Atlantic community.

Finally, in adopting the Partnership for Peace, each of us must willingly assume the burdens to make it succeed. This Partnership is not a gesture. It is not a forum. It is a military and security initiative. There must be a somber appreciation that expanding our membership will mean extending commitments that must be supported by military strategies and postures. Adding new members entails not only hard decisions but also hard resources.

Three days after the North Atlantic Treaty was signed, Walter Lippman wrote these prophetic words: "The pact will be remembered long after the conditions that have provoked it are no longer the main business of mankind. For the treaty recognizes and proclaims a community of interest which is much older than the conflict with the Soviet Union and, come what may, will survive it."

This meeting has proved him right. The Soviet Union is gone, but our community of interest endures. Now, acting in unison, as we have always done, we have reaffirmed those interests, strengthened our community and signalled our determination to build a new security for a new generation of free peoples. Thank you.