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for the American emphasis on the military's obedience to civilian control. Only George Washington rivaled him in his ability to implement military strategy within a civilian democracy.

Marshall's almost unique fitness for high command was seen early by such admirers as Lt. HENRY ARNOLD who in 1914 said to his wife that he had just met a future Army Chief of Staff. Several of his superior officers in the pre–World War I Army commented in fitness reports that they would gladly serve under his command. He built on his reputation with brilliant staff work in the Allied Expeditionary Force in World War I.

During the interwar years, Marshall served in near-obscurity in many typical assignments, using them to develop his command of good doctrines and good people. While in command of the Infantry School at Fort Benning he built a file of promising officers, many of whom would later serve in high commands. He developed a field manual that

Far—rested on the shoulders of the "brass": British Lt. Gen. Frederick Browning, commander British I Airborne Corps; U.S. Lt. Gen. LEWIS H. BRETON, commander of the First Allied AIRBORNE ARMY, Lt. Gen. Brian Horrocks, commander XXX Corps; Gen. Miles Dempsey, Second Army commander; and Field Marshal BERNARD L. MONTGOMERY, the 21st Army Group commander. The problem was not that they sought a bridge too far but, according to one British officer who jumped into Arnhem, they had created "A grand military cock-up."

Mars

(1) Code name for U.S. 5332nd BRIGADE (Provisional) in the China-Burma-India theater; (2) Soviet code name for offensive against the German Ninth Army in the Rzhev salient, fall and winter 1942. See also JRM MARS.

Marshall, Gen. of the Army George C. (1880–1959)

Few other military leaders proved to be as central to their nation's conduct of a major war as did George Marshall. He combined in an incomparable way his ambition for high command with a respect
stressed the importance of not relying on the "school solution," which many of his most successful protégés would demonstrate later.

A brigadier general and deputy Chief of Staff in 1938, Marshall attended a meeting at which President ROOSEVELT held forth on favoring bombers over ground forces in the buildup of the Army. "Don't you think so, George?" Roosevelt asked.

"Mr. President, I'm sorry but I don't agree with you on that," Marshall replied, shocking others at the meeting. He was told that he had finished his career with that remark; he was a new deputy and out-ranked by thirty-three other generals.

But when Roosevelt decided on a new Army Chief of Staff in Sept. 1939, he chose Marshall, beginning a partnership that would continue through Roosevelt's lifetime. Marshall, the man who in 1938 was not supposed to know his way around WASHINGTON, persuaded Congress to change the laws regarding the retirement of older officers and to accept SELECTIVE SERVICE. With the promotion and retirement policy changed, Marshall was able to jump dozens of younger officers into responsible positions throughout the Army. In a confrontation in May 1940, the month Germany invaded France, Marshall convinced a reluctant Roosevelt of the need to increase the Army's budget significantly.

Marshall, who strongly backed the Allied "Germany First" strategy, believed that the United States had to strike back soon because a democracy would not long support an indecisive war. Soon after the U.S. entry into the war, he began pushing for a landing in northwest Europe. He opposed the British alternative of landing in North Africa and developing an indirect threat to Germany through Italy and the Balkans. But he and other American strategists were overcome by superior British staff work and a realization that no such invasion could occur much before mid-1943. In each succeeding Allied strategic conference Marshall advocated a landing in northern France, gaining only grudging British consent in late 1943. By that time, Marshall's 1939-1941 program to expand the Army was in high gear, giving the United States a predominance in land power.

To the initial surprise of many, Marshall was not chosen to lead the campaign in France; it would have been the crowning event of his career. But Roosevelt believed he could not do without Marshall in Washington and by that time no other man could have fulfilled Marshall's unique position as defender of the Army and counselor to the President.

Marshall's view of Pacific strategy was conditioned by his belief that it should not detract from the ability to land in France as soon as possible. Moreover, the Pacific War had strong partisans in Adm. ERNEST J. KING and Adm. CHESTER W. NIMITZ, and in Gen. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR, whose prominence and ego frustrated attempts to apply a formally unified strategy. As a result, Marshall supported MacArthur only up to a point in the latter's pursuit of more troops and greater authority against the opposition of King and Nimitz.

By the end of the war Marshall had earned a reputation as the Olympian Father of the Modern American Army, which had increased more than forty times during his tenure. He was also regarded as almost superhuman in his judiciousness, his talent for noticing qualified officers and promoting them into high command, and his ability to support Army goals without wrecking overall Anglo-American accord.

Marshall's postwar career as secretary of State and secretary of Defense would add to the luster of the man CHURCHILL called "the noblest Roman of them all." In his two years as secretary of State he developed still another monument to his genius, the European Recovery Program, a restoration of the Continent that became known as the Marshall Plan. For it he received the Nobel Peace Prize in 1953.

Marshall Islands

A cluster of thirty-one atolls and hundreds of reefs in the Western Pacific, east of the CAROLINE ISLANDS. There are two main chains, Ratak (Sunrise) and Ralik (Sunset). Each atoll consists of a group of small islands encircling a lagoon: The Marshall's, purchased from Spain by Germany in 1899, were occupied by Japan during World War I and after the war made JAPANESE MANDATED ISLANDS by the LEAGUE OF NATIONS. Japan began secretly and illegally fortifying and building airfields on the islands in the 1930s.
this period, Mao was based at Yenan, where he developed his political and military theory and instituted a purge of party officials. Following the surrender of Japan in September 1945, Mao resumed the struggle against Chiang’s Nationalist forces. See China, Campaigns in.


Mareth Line A slender fortification stretching 22 miles inland from the coast of southwest Tunisia, it was built by the French against any incursions by Italian forces from Tripolitania. 80 miles away (see Map 8): Early in 1943, Rommel’s army had dug into positions around Mareth after retreating from Libya (see Desert War). The British 8th Army’s pursuit was delayed by supply shortages, and its anticipated attack on the Line (Operation Pugilistic Gallop) was not ready until 20 March, by which time Rommel had left Africa and an Italian, General Messe*, had assumed command of the defence.

The main weight of the attack was concentrated on a frontal approach near the coast by 30th Corps but after three days this had made little progress against heavily outnumbered defenders. British commander Montgomery*, therefore switched his armour to support the newly formed New Zealand Division, which had made good progress on the inland flank, but was blocked in the hills northwest of Mareth. This flexibility of approach brought eventual success, and the renewed attack (Operation Supercharge II) broke through to El Hamma on 27 March. By that time, however, the bulk of Messe’s army had escaped positions behind the Wadi Akaft on the orders of Colonel General von Armin*, overall Axis commander in Tunisia. See also Tunisia.

Mariana Islands Strategically important island group in the Central Pacific of which the most important islands are Saipan*, Tinian* and Guam* (see Maps 10 and 11). The Marianas had been garrisoned by Japanese forces at the start of the Pacific War and were the targets of amphibious assaults by American Marine forces during the summer of 1944. Following their recapture, the Marianas served as bases from which B-29s* could bomb Japan. See Strategic Bombing Offensive. See also Battle of the Philippine Sea.

Market-Garden, Operation See Arnhem.

Marshall, General George Catlett (1880-1959). An immensely popular and able American general and administrator, chairman of the American Joint Chiefs of Staff* and one of the key Allied strategists of WW2*, he made a substantial contribution to the Allied victory in 1945. Marshall had already gained a considerable reputation as a staff officer in France during WW1, then as aide and personal friend of Chief of Staff General John Pershing during the 1920s and later as assistant commander of the infantry school at Fort Benning, when war broke out in 1939. Appointed Chief of Staff and full general by President Roosevelt* on the day of the German invasion of Poland*, Marshall was instrumental in preparing, restructuring and enlarging the small US Army* (of approximately 200,000) for war. He was also responsible between 1939 and 1941; for advising on and explaining his activities to a highly sensitive and divided American Senate (see Neutrality, US).

In addition, Marshall made considerable efforts during 1939 and 1940 to establish close working relationships with British military chiefs, developing strategic plans for the coalition that he saw as inevitable.

After the attack on Pearl Harbor*, Marshall also became a chief architect of American strategic planning. An unshakeable advocate of the earliest possible direct attack on German forces in western Europe, Marshall was the key proponent of the ‘Europe First’ strategy, fighting against consistent opposition from General MacArthur*, the American naval chiefs (notably Admiral King*) and a large segment of the American public who demanded priority.
Marshall Islands

for the Pacific theatre. During 1943, Marshall accompanied Roosevelt to the Casablanca, Trident and first Quebec Conferences and was instrumental in the planning of the invasion of Normandy, and it was generally assumed that he would be in overall command of Allied forces (though he finally remained in Washington, persuaded by Roosevelt’s uneasiness at losing his most able strategist).

Appointed Secretary of State by President Truman, the only career Army officer to hold that post, Marshall was responsible for the development of the Marshall Plan, designed to shore-up the war-torn economies of western and parts of eastern Europe. He was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1953 for his contribution to the recovery of the European economies.

Marshall Islands Island group in the Central Pacific consisting of two island chains of coral atolls and islands stretching across 400,000 square miles of ocean, and including two groups of atolls that, by late 1943, had become strategically important to the US Central Pacific offensive (see Pacific War, Maps 10 and 11). Mille, Maloelap, and Wotje in the Ratak chain, and Jaluit, Kwajalein and Eniwetok in the Ralik chain were the sites of Japanese airfields, and would supply the US Pacific fleets with good anchorage within 1,000 miles of Truk, headquarters of the Japanese Combined Fleet. Moreover, in September 1943, Japanese Imperial GHQ had redrawn the defensive perimeters of its empire, reducing the garrisons on the Marshalls as outposts to the new line of defence. Hence a complex and skilfully planned amphibious invasion of the Marshall Islands (code-named Operation Flintlock) envisaged smashing the outer layer of the Japanese defensive perimeter and opening the way for the 1,000-mile advance to the Marianas, bypassing Truk, Japan’s ‘Gibraltar of the Pacific’.

During December 1943 and January 1944, while the large invasion force (nicknamed the ‘Big Blue Fleet’) landed at Enubisi Harbor, the Marshalls were subjected to three days of bombardment by planes based on the Gilbert Islands. The assault force was divided into two (the Northern Landing Force - 2nd Marines - and the Southern Landing Force - 7th Infantry Division), the first to attack Roi and Namur, islets off Kwajalein, and the second to attack Kwajalein, some 300 miles away. In support of Admiral Turner’s 5th Amphibious Force, two carrier task forces of the US 5th Fleet (Admiral Spruance), including Admiral Mitscher’s Task Force 58, were ordered to neutralize the outlying islands and ready to meet and destroy the Japanese fleet, should it sail from Truk on a three-day naval and air bombardment from the 5th Fleet pounded the Japanese defences before the landings began on 31 January 1944.

Undefended, the Majuro atoll was captured on the first day. Kwajalein was taken after four days of fierce fighting with defenders who had survived the naval bombardment. On Roi and Namur, US forces ended any remaining opposition to their capture within two days. While Admiral Mitscher’s Task Force 58 broke to strike at Truk (the attack was broken forward on the basis of the quick success of Operation Flintlock’s first stage), Admiral Turner’s forces invaded Eniwetok after another ferocious naval bombardment. It was captured in four days by a regiment of the 27th Division.

Martin Baltimore Produced by the American Martin company to British requirements, the Baltimore was a development of the Martin Maryland light bomber, with more powerful engines and better conditions for the crew. The RA F ‘used it only in the Mediterranean’ theatre, where it operated as both a day and night bomber. Armament was increased in successive versions, and Baltimores remained in action with some squadrons until the end of the war. Production ended in July 1944, after 1,575 had been built.
Marsh, Reginald (1898–1954), painter. Born to American parents in Paris on March 14, 1898, Marsh graduated from Yale in 1920 and began a career as a magazine illustrator in New York City. He worked for several "slick" magazines as well as the Daily News and soon began to study painting at the Art Students League under John Sloan. He continued his apprenticeship by copying old masters in Europe in 1925, remained active as an illustrator (chiefly for the New Yorker) after his return, and subsequently came under the influence of Kenneth H. Miller, again at the Art Students League. The year 1928 found him in Europe once more; on returning to New York City he opened a studio on Union Square. Within a year he had enough paintings for a first show, which was held in 1930. Consisting primarily of depictions of less than elegant people and life in New York, the show received a mixed reception, owing in part to critics' inability to conceive of Marsh as other than a magazine illustrator. During the 1930s he continued to have frequent shows and despite some earlier criticism earned a reputation as a serious artist and began to teach at the Art Students League. By 1940 he was being honored with an increasing number of prizes, had achieved considerable success with his frescoes in the New York custom house and the Post Office in Washington, D.C., and was represented in the Metropolitan Museum of Art as well as other museums throughout the United States. Working most often in watercolor and then tempera and making etchings as well, he made periodic attempts with oils that slowed the rapid pace of his work. "The Bowery" and "High Yaller" (both in the Metropolitan) are perhaps his best-known works. Poignant and often humorous, his work was never without sympathy for his subjects, despite a tendency for caricature. He was commissioned by Life magazine in 1943 to complete a series of paintings depicting World War II, and until the end of his career he continued to illustrate editions of such books as Theodore Dreiser's An American Tragedy and Sister Carrie and John Dos Passos's U.S.A. Marsh continued to teach at the Art Students League until his death on July 3, 1954, in Bennington, Vermont.

Marshall, George Catlett (1880–1959), soldier and public official. Born in Unióntown, Pennsylvania, on December 31, 1880, Marshall graduated from Virginia Military Institute (VMI) in 1901 and a year later received a commission as second lieutenant in the army. After service in the Philippines he attended the army's School of the Line, graduating in 1907, and in 1908 graduated from the Command and General Staff School. During World War I he served in high planning and administrative posts with the American Expeditionary Force (AEF) in Europe; his great abilities as a staff officer were soon recognized and his request for a combat command was refused. From 1919 to 1924 he was an aide to Gen. John J. Pershing, and after three years in China he became assistant commandant of instruction at the army's infantry school at Fort Benning. In 1933 he seemed for a time to have been signed to obliquity when he was named senior instructor for the Illinois National Guard, but in 1939 he was chosen over the heads of several senior officers to become the army's chief of staff. He served in this position until 1943, handling the major responsibility for organizing, supplying, and deploying U.S. troops in World War II. He was also a principal advisor to President Franklin D. Roosevelt on strategy, attended the Allied planning conferences from Casablanca to Potsdam. From December 1944 he held the five-star rank of general of the army. Soon after resigning as chief of staff in November 1945 Marshall was sent by President Harry S. Truman to attempt—unsuccessfully—the mediation of the civil war in China. In 1947 he was appointed secretary of state by Truman. June of that year, in a speech at Harvard, he posed the European Recovery Program, a Marshall Plan program of aid to the devastated nations of Europe that was undertaken following the outbreak of war, and became known universally as the Marshall Plan. In January 1949 he resigned from the cabinet, but returned in September 1950 as secretary of defense, a post he held for a year during the early phase of the Korean War. He retired permanently from public service in 1951. During the early 1950s he served as president of the American Academy of Art and in 1953 he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, primarily for his plan for European recovery. He died on October 16, 1959, in Washington, D.C.

Marshall, James Wilson (1810–1885), California pioneer. Born in Hope, New Jersey, on October 20, 1810, Marshall was trained by his father as a wheelwright. He left home in the early 1830s and headed West. He lingered for a while in Indiana and Illinois before settling on a farm near Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. His health eventually forced him to seek a more suitable climate and in the spring of 1844 he set out for California. The trip was by wagon train along the Oregon Trail and took more than a year. He spent the winter in Oregon and in the spring joined James Clyman's party for the last leg over the mountains to California. In July 1845 they arrived at the settlement of New Helvétia shortly after John Sutter had been completed on the present site of Sacramento, and were greeted with the enthusiastic hospitality that John A. Sutter customarily extended to all Americans who found their way to Marshall, was one of about 150 Americans who arrived that year, making a total population of less than 700 in the Sacramento Valley. He bought land in the valley and began to raise livestock. When the American settlers seized Sonoma and set up the Bear Flag Republic in June 1846, Marshall joined them. In 1847 he joined with Sutter to build and operate a sawmill along the American River near present-day Coloma, 33 miles northeast of the fort. Marshall supervised the construction, the last stage of which involved
Wars are precipitated by motives which the statesmen responsible for them dare not publicly avow.

David Lloyd George. 1939.

This war [World War II], like the next war, is the war to end all wars.

David Lloyd George. 1941.

The war of the giants is over. The quarrels of the pygmies have begun.

David Lloyd George. In reference to the Paris peace negotiations following World War I. Quoted on PBS, Poland, July 12, 1988.

War is no more inevitable than the plague is inevitable. War is no more a part of human nature than the burning of witches is a human act.


We kind o' thought Christ went agin war an' pil- lage.


James Madison, a second-time President, adopted a remedy for the wrongs of our seamen, infinitely more injurious to them than the evils which they suffered.... He ordered out the militia, in contempt of that very Constitution of which he was one of the principle framers.

John Lowell (1789-1840), American Federalist and pamphleteer. Perpetual War, The Policy of Mr. Madison, 1812.

I decline Christianity because it is Jewish, because it is international, and because, in cowardly fashion, it preaches Peace on Earth.

Erich von Ludendorff (1865-1937), General, German Army. Belief in German God.

I beg that the small steamers ... be spared if possible, or else sunk without a trace being left [spurlos versenkt].


There is no substitute for victory.


The progress and survival of civilization [are] dependent upon ... the realization ... of the utter futility of force as an arbiter.


War is no damn football game.


It is not armaments that cause war, but war that causes armaments.

Salvador de Madariaga y Roho (1886-1979), Spanish writer, diplomat, and statesman. Morning Without Noon.

"War is the continuation of politics." In this sense war is politics and war itself is political action.... It can therefore be said that politics is war without bloodshed while war is politics with bloodshed.


We are advocates of the abolition of war, we do not want war; but war can only be abolished through war, and in order to get rid of the gun it is necessary to take up the gun.

Mao Tse-tung. Problems of War and Strategy, Nov. 6, 1938.

Wars are bred by poverty and oppression. Continued peace is possible only in a relatively free and prosperous world.


Resolved that the present war ... was unconstitutionally commenced by the order of the President ... and that it is now waged by a powerful nation against a weak neighbor ... at immense cost of treasure and life.... That such a war of conquest so hateful in its objects, so wanton, unjust, and unconstitutional in its origin and character, must be regarded as a war against freedom, against humanity, against justice.

Massachusetts State Legislature. Resolution against the Mexican War, Apr. 26, 1847.

All they that take up the sword shall perish by the sword.


It would win for us a proud title -- we would become the first aggressors for peace.


I am not -- as I am sure I will be charged -- peace at any price, but for an honorable, rational, and political solution to this [Vietnam] war.

Eugene J. Senator (D-WI)

We seem bent, Mr. President, on sending to the Vietnam War with a style and bitterness that we describe as a war.

George S. (D), U.S. Senator (D-ND)

It is not possible to make a war with the just amount of care, order, and courage that are necessary to make a war.

George S. (D), U.S. Senator (D-ND)

I have been too dead piled up.

William M. the United States.

We are neither.

William M. 1901.

I found nothing.


Bless the dov

Robert S. Halberstam, The Best of the West.

Some day we will kill our own men for making mistakes.

Golda Meir (Labour). Commencement.

It is true we have not paid for them.

Golda Meir (Labour). Commencement.

There's no decision making decision... exactly the same.

Golda Meir (Labour). Commencement.

Who overcomes his foe.


Peace hath not war.
other nations, if you tangle her in the intrigues of Europe, you will destroy her power for good and endanger her very existence.


155. Our foreign policy doesn't follow events in the world. It follows the dictates of Congress;

156. I don't care if he's got two horns and a tail. As long as he's anti-Communist, we can use him.

157. Europe is a dying system. It is worn out and run down, and will become an economic and industrial hegemony of Soviet Russia.... The lands touching the Pacific with thirty billions of inhabitants will determine the course of history for the next ten thousand years!

158. Once the bear's hug has got you, it is apt to be for keeps.

159. The management of foreign relations appears to be the most susceptible of abuse of all the trusts committed to a government.
James Madison (1751-1836), 4th President of the United States (Democratic Republican-VA). Letter to Thomas Jefferson, May 13, 1798.

160. The bloke who ends up sitting in the White House partially controls what we [the British] get up to.

161. People of the world, unite and defeat the U.S. aggressors and all their running dogs! People of the world, be courageous, dare to fight, defy difficulties and advance wave upon wave. Then the whole world will belong to the people. Monsters of all kinds shall be destroyed.

162. Our policy [the Marshall Plan] is not directed against any country or doctrine, but is directed against hunger, poverty, desperation and chaos. Its purpose should be the revival of a working economy in the world so as to permit the emergence of political and economic conditions in which free institutions can exist.

163. I like Germany so much that I want there to be two of them.

164. Great prosperity is coming. It will be tremendously increased if we can extend reasonable credit to our customers.... To maintain our prosperity we must finance it.
William Gibbs McAdoo (1863-1941), U.S. Senator (D-CA) and U.S. Secretary of the Treasury. Letter to Pres. Wilson requesting American loans to the allies to purchase American arms, Aug. 21, 1915.

165. We need Hawaii as much and a good deal more than we did California; it is Manifest Destiny.
William McKinley (1843-1901), 25th President of the United States (R-OH). Remark when submitting to Congress a treaty to annex the Hawaiian islands. June, 16, 1897.

166. [Russia is] the most realistic regime in the world — no ideals.

167. We self-righteously expect all others to admire us for our democracy and our traditions. We are so smug about our superiority, we fail to see our own glaring faults, such as prejudice and poverty amidst affluence.

168. A strong Germany is an indispensable condition for a durable peace in Europe.
MEMORANDUM

TO:        Bob

FROM:      Terry

RE:        American Center for International Leadership

The ACIL was born out of an AFS (American Field Service)-sponsored trip to the Soviet Union in 1982/83. On this excursion participants traveled around the country meeting with their Soviet counterparts in an effort to build mutual understanding and a dialogue between future leaders.

The trip was so successful that participants were able to secure funding from the Rockefeller Brothers Foundation the following year. This seed money provided the basis for the ACIL and enabled it to form the board of directors which continues to this day. The board spends much of its time organizing cultural exchanges and summits between youths in participating countries.

The ACIL continues to focus its efforts on broadening the horizons of the young but also welcomes the involvement of professional Americans (Margaret Tutwiler is among the center’s alum). Though emphasis is still on U.S.-Russian relations, the center has moved to include other countries around the world such as Vietnam, and has done considerable work in Kazakhstan.
Coca-Cola may be available in Hanoi and Pepsi-Cola in Ho Chi Minh City, but the more difficult task - establishing relations between two peoples separated by a decade of war and 20 additional years of economic sanctions - is just beginning.

In a notable overture, the U.S.-Vietnam Society's secretary-general, Vu Xuan Hong, opened talks this week with the University of Denver on academic exchange programs. His visit comes two months after President Clinton signed the bill lifting economic sanctions against the former wartime foe.

"This is an opportunity for DU to be a leader in establishing relations with Vietnam," said Stephen Hayes, president of campus-based American Center for International Leadership. The center is a national non-profit group, which relocated to Denver and is cooperating closely with DU. If plans materialize, the first class of potential Vietnamese leaders, 25 to 45, will arrive in February for a two-week intensive training course at the center. Other plans call for the creation of a DU exchange program for faculty and students.

"We hope American and Vietnamese faculty will jointly teach the history of their respective countries," Hayes said yesterday.

Although Vietnam has made huge strides, it has a long way to go. Nearly 3 million were killed in the war, another 4 million were handicapped and 2 million were affected by U.S. use of the defoliant Agent Orange. "The war was so terrible," Hong said. "But we would like to put that behind us."

Conflicts with China over Cambodia followed the end of the war with the U.S., so the nation only has enjoyed "full-time peace" since 1989. A country of 72 million people spread over 129,000 square miles, Vietnam is 72 percent agricultural and 28 percent urban. Agricultural wages are incredibly low, even though Hanoi has started to develop a free-market system.

But since 1986, Vietnam went from a nation importing 1 to 2 million pounds of rice annually to one that exports that amount of rice. And rampant inflation is under control. "We have more than 1,000 projects worth $10 billion in U.S. dollars," Hong said.

GRAPHIC: PHOTO: Vu Xuan Hong
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He’s cool. He’s quick. Most of all, Vitaly Churkin can talk the talk.

"If you simply believe that someone is a bad guy, period, then there is not much room for diplomacy," said the Russian deputy foreign minister with that fine blend of earnest persuasion and aloof logicality that top diplomats often affect.

He was speaking, as usual, about Russia’s relationship with the Bosnian Serbs, a rutted, mine-filled garden that has been largely his to tend for much of the past two years. As President Boris Yeltsin’s point man on the Balkans, Churkin has been one of the leading actors in the unfolding Bosnian tragedy, a staple for interviews on CNN and a key behind-the-scenes figure in the high-stakes diplomacy to forge a peace settlement.

Russia, and Churkin, have been both praised and criticized in the West for taking an aggressive diplomatic stance on the conflict, at times upstaging Washington’s efforts despite, sweet words about partnership between the two former rivals. Moscow’s close ties to the Serbs, who are seen as brutal aggressors by the West but as old friends by some Russians, have provoked debate about whether the Kremlin is nudging them toward a peace settlement or naively doing their bidding.

Now, at a crucial juncture in the conflict, with what is billed as the last best peace plan hanging in the balance, Churkin surveyed Russia’s role in Bosnia -- and his own performance -- with a blend of defensiveness and pride.

"This strategy has not been without its downsides, but overall it was exactly the right thing for us to do," he said in an interview. "If we are successful at some point, if this current effort is successful, then it would be to a large extent because of that strategy. And let’s face it: This strategy assures a certain place for Russia in the negotiating effort."

At 42, Churkin is the very model of a modern Russian diplomat. He favors jazzy striped shirts with white collars and cuffs and keeps a stack of American newsmagazines on the coffee table in his office. A graduate of the elite
Institute of Foreign Relations in Moscow, where he was a classmate of Foreign Minister Andrei Kozyrev, Churkin spent five years at the Soviet Embassy in Washington and speaks flawless, even eloquent, English.

His professional coming of age coincided with perestroika—Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev’s political and economic restructuring—and the ideological upheaval in the communist world. And, like many successful Russians of his generation, he has had to adapt and evolve to survive. Before he arrived in the United States in 1982 at age 30, and for some time afterward, he was a committed believer "that in the final analysis our cause was right."

Today, smooth as any pin-striped Foggy Bottom spin doctor, Churkin comes across as agreeably moderate and Westernized, a globe-trotting trouble-shooter who is highly regarded by his counterparts in Washington and Western Europe. Last year he logged 160 days of travel, including fully two weeks in the air. He is reliably rumored to be in line for a new job as Russian ambassador to Brussels, where he would be envoy to NATO and the European Union, as well as Belgium.

Churkin’s diplomatic finesse is credited with reasserting Russia’s influence in Serb-controlled Yugoslavia, where Moscow’s sway had been slight through most of the Tito era. His crowning moment of diplomatic glory came in February when he brokered an eleventh-hour deal with the Bosnian Serbs that averted NATO airstrikes, helped lift the siege of Sarajevo and led to the introduction of Russian troops among U.N. forces in the region. While the threat of airstrikes was at least as important a factor in the Serb pullback, Churkin’s feat was hailed widely — especially in Russia — as a coup for Kremlin diplomacy and a victory for Yeltsin. The young diplomat’s star soared at home.

But like so many moments of promise in the Balkans, this too was ephemeral. In April, with the Serbs pressing in on Gorazde, a Bosnian Muslim-held city that had been declared a "safe area" by the United Nations, Churkin extracted promises from the Serbs that they would go no farther.

The Serbs later ignored Churkin, however, and broke their promises in the course of pressing their military advantage. NATO warplanes hit Serb positions. Churkin, it seemed, had overestimated his influence with Serb leaders. Furious and feeling betrayed, he erupted in uncharacteristic anger.

"It’s time Russia stops all talks with the Bosnian Serbs," he said. The time has passed, he added, "when they can enjoy Russian support as a cover."

Sour at what he felt was a double-cross, he withdrew from Bosnia, turning to other issues. But his absence from the Bosnian conflict proved temporary. In recent days, he was back in the ring, pressing the Bosnian Serbs to accept the latest peace proposal brokered by a "contact group" of diplomats from Russia, the United States, Britain, France and Germany.

"I think we are positioned quite well in order to have the conflict resolved. There is not a guarantee of success, and I’m very worried," he said in the interview last week.

"The Serb side of the story was quite often forgotten. If you simply say that [the Serbs are the aggressors] and operate on that premise, well, first this does not reflect the actual world, which is much more complex ... and second

you lose a lot of opportunities," he said. "It is a way to prepare yourself for fighting the bad guy, but you cannot find a political solution.

"If they reject the plan now, then at least we here ... will be able to say we have tried and given our best effort. We have put together a good plan."
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The Joint Chiefs of Staff have made it clear to President Reagan that if a treaty on medium-range missiles in Europe is politically necessary, they can live with it'-- but not happily. The Soviet proposal to eliminate missiles with ranges of 500 to 5,000 kilometers, say the chiefs, would "stress" NATO defenses. And even their grudging endorsement of the deal is contingent on modernization of NATO's remaining nuclear forces. They are drawing up a list of requirements, topped by an air-launched cruise missile enabling NATO jets to strike deep inside Eastern Europe and a land-based nuclear missile with a range, as one source puts it, "of 499 kilometers if 500 is the cutoff" under a zero-zero plan.

The chiefs were influenced by a recent study by the staff of retiring NATO commander Gen. Bernard Rogers. The document is a follow-up to an earlier study that concluded that NATO should give up shorter-range missiles (under 1,500 kilometers), which don't threaten Soviet territory, in favor of longer-range intermediate systems with greater deterrent value.

With both categories slated for oblivion under Mikhail Gorbachev's proposal, says the new study, deep-strike NATO aircraft could probably fill the gap, though more would be needed -- armed with new cruise missiles. The deal makes it even more urgent that the Soviets cut conventional forces to something approaching equality with NATO and agree to ban chemical and biological weapons, the study concludes.

* Vitaly Churkin, 35, blow-dried first secretary at the Soviet Embassy in Washington, will be rewarded for five years of vigorously defending Moscow's disarmament strategies -- and for his mastery of U.S. TV after the Chernobyl nuclear accident. Headed home last week, Churkin told associates he was moving to the Central Committee's international department, led by ex-ambassador to the United States Anatoly Dobrynin, now Gorbachev's chief adviser on American affairs. Churkin's new assignment could bring him quickly into the loftiest Kremlin circles. "He's going to the top," said one U.S. diplomat who has worked with Churkin.
On paper, he is only a second secretary at the Soviet Embassy, 35 names down from the top in the diplomatic register. But no one doubts that Vitaly Churkin is on his way up. Last week Churkin faced a congressional subcommittee hearing about Chernobyl. He stuck to the letter of the Soviet line on the disaster. But the spirit was all his own. Asked if the accident would force the Soviet's to buy more grain from the United States, Churkin drawled, "Well, I understand this question is not based entirely on humanistic grounds." He dismissed one representative's political barbs as "mumbo jumbo" and, stressing that he is no nuclear expert, refused to explain "in layman's terms" how the accident happened. "Can you tell me in those same layman terms why the Challenger disaster happened?" he retorted.

Just 34, with a razor-cut pompadour of prematurely gray hair, Churkin is one of Mikhail Gorbachev's new Soviet men. He serves as the Soviet Embassy's expert on arms control. His quick mind, dry wit and slick style have made him the embassy's best PR operative, now that Anatoly Dobrynin is back in Moscow. "He's big on the cocktail, dinner and debate circuit," says one Soviet watcher in Washington. Churkin developed his self-assurance -- and his idiomatic English -- as an interpreter at the SALT I talks. A protege of Yuri Andropov, Churkin weathered the Chernenko era and seems to be thriving under Gorbachev. Last fall he served as interpreter when on-again, off-again defector Vitaly Yurchenko chose to return to the Soviet Union from the United States. His four years of work in Washington have clearly won him the confidence of his superiors: Churkin and his wife are allowed to live outside the embassy compound, in Alexandria, Va. Appearing on "The MacNeil/Lehrer NewsHour," Churkin said he had gone before the congressional committee without asking for instructions from Moscow. "We are courageous fellows," he quipped. To talk that way, Churkin had to be smart -- and secure.

GRAPHIC: Picture, Class act: Churkin on the Hill, JOHN DURICKA -- AP
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Hon. Donald M. Payne  
United States Congressman  
10th District, New Jersey

Donald M. Payne was elected to serve as the Representative of the 10th Congressional District of New Jersey in 1988 by an overwhelming majority. He was re-elected in 1990, 1992 and 1994 with a wide margin of the vote. Congressman Payne is a member of the Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee and the International Relations Committee. On the Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee he serves on the Subcommittees on Employer-Employee Relations and Early Childhood, Youth and Families. He serves on the Subcommittee on Africa and the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights for the International Relations Committee.

Congressman Payne has played an active role in both domestic and foreign policy matters. During his first session in Congress his first legislative resolution to promote literacy was unanimously approved by his colleagues and was signed into law by the President. Congressman Payne's literacy resolutions have subsequently been approved by every Congress.

In response to an alarming increase in AIDS cases, Rep. Payne convened congressional hearings in New Jersey on AIDS prevention, education, and treatment. He was instrumental in securing additional funds in the federal budget to address the AIDS crisis. Legislation he introduced to improve the Abandoned Infants Assistance Act to help "boarder babies" was approved by Congress and signed into law by the President. He also held hearings on the rising incidence of tuberculosis, and the impact of incineration on public health. He worked actively for the passage of the Family & Medical Leave Act, and the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Congressman Payne attended the historic African National Congress conference in South Africa, the first such meeting held there in over 30 years. Congressman Payne traveled to Haiti and worked to restore its democracy. He also played an active role in focusing on the plight of Haitian refugees. The Congressman visited the famine-stricken nation of Somalia and was among the first to call for the U.S. military to become involved in humanitarian assistance. He spearheaded an effort among pharmaceutical companies to provide medicine and supplies to the people of Somalia. The drive was successful in raising over $2 million. Congressman Payne headed a presidential mission to war-torn Rwanda to help find solutions to the country's political and humanitarian crises.

Before being elected to serve as New Jersey's first African-American Congressman, he served as a member of the Newark Municipal Council from 1982 to 1989. In 1972, Congressman Payne was elected to the Essex County Board of Chosen Freeholders, and served until 1978. In 1977, he served as the Board's director. A true community leader, he has worked with young people as a teacher from 1957 to 1964, and with various youth-oriented activities throughout his adult life. In 1970, he was elected president of the YMCA of the USA, serving as its first African-American president.

Rep. Payne's work with the YMCA has afforded him the opportunity to help people worldwide. He had visited 75 countries by 1980. During many of these visits, he assisted in the development of education, housing, and local government systems in numerous Third World nations. He became a member of the World YMCA Refugee and Rehabilitation Committee in 1970, and served as its chairman from 1973 to 1981.

Congressman Payne currently serves on the boards of directors of the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation, the Congressional Award Foundation, and the National Endowment for Democracy. He also serves on the Advisory Council of the U.S. Committee for UNICEF. He has served on the Substantive Issues Committee of the United Nations Association of the USA and the Small Business Advisory Council.

Congressman Payne serves as chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus. He is also a member of the House Democratic Leadership Advisory Group.

After receiving a bachelor of arts degree from Seton Hall University in New Jersey, Congressman Payne pursued graduate studies at Springfield College in Massachusetts. He holds honorary doctorates from Chicago State University and Drew University. Prior to his election to the Freeholder Board, from 1964 to 1972, he was an executive with The Prudential Insurance Company and from 1975 to 1988
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WHEN Representative Donald M. Payne was growing up in Newark's predominantly white North Ward, the only time he remembers seeing a black man in a tie was on Sunday at church. He never had a black teacher, he said.

"I never even had a black bus driver," Mr. Payne added in a recent phone interview. "You just never saw a black with the telephone company or the other utilities. You never saw them in any kind of professional position."

The world has changed, Mr. Payne says, but not enough.

In 1986, he became New Jersey's first black Representative. And last December, he was elected chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus.

During his Washington career, Mr. Payne has taken on his share of controversial issues. Early on, he called for United States military involvement in Somalia, and he blasted the Clinton Administration's initial policy on Haiti. Yet Mr. Payne has a reputation for being a low-key consensus builder.

His rise to Congress came after terms as a district leader, freeholder, freeholder director and councilman. He started out early in politics before he could vote, running his older brother's successful campaign for district leader at 19.

Q. How has the Republicans' taking control of the House of Representatives affected your role as a legislator?

A. It throws you for a loop. You get accustomed to being in the majority. You get used to having influence over the Government. You're not in on the creation of legislation anymore. You are in a more reactive mode as opposed to a pro-active one, making positive change. We are now just trying to hold the floodgates back.

Q. With such a close margin between the parties in Congress, how has the role of the black caucus evolved?
A. In the first two years of the Clinton Administration the caucus was essential to the passage of the Brady Bill and Clinton’s budget reconciliation act that shrunk government, kept Wall Street upbeat and helped employment. None of his greatest accomplishments including the policy in Haiti could have been done without the black caucus.

Now, rather than setting the tone and actually influencing legislation, we have turned into the truth squad. We are now dealing with the G.O.P.’s recisions of last year’s budget for low-income heating assistance, summer youth assistance programs, school nutrition, Section 8 housing aid, elimination of veteran training programs, reduction of W.I.C., and Head Start.

It was $17 billion last week and $3 billion from HUD alone. These are truly Draconian cuts.

Q. What is the most common request for Congressional help you get from constituents?

A. Basics like housing and employment. The price of housing in our district is out of line with people’s income. In my district there are large numbers of people underemployed and unemployed. We have seen homelessness take off while the G.O.P. has targeted Section 8 housing assistance.

People will sit in line to see if they can get the privilege of Section 8 vouchers. We have double the number of people who are qualified and looking for vouchers than there are slots in the program.

People simply come down to the district office in large numbers looking for work. We call around to see if anyone is hiring. My staff has become active in the Ironbound Merchants Association so that we can be on top of work and employment opportunities as they open up.

Q. There is considerable debate about the idea of ending Federal entitlement programs and using a block grant approach to the states instead. Is there a resistance on the part of Democrats to trust certain state governments to do the right thing -- in light of the fact that many of these states in the past systematically denied blacks basic civil rights?

A. Absolutely. The shifting from the Federal Government to the states is reminiscent of the Faubus and Wallace Southern governorships. The reason why the Federal Government does so many things is that the states in many instances have historically failed to do so.

Look at water quality and sewer treatment. Many localities would let their raw sewage run into their streams and rivers and head downstream to contaminate other states. They would let their own ground water get contaminated. Up until a few years ago, New York did it to New Jersey, with sewage from Manhattan running into the Hudson or New York’s trash washing up on the Jersey Shore. The Federal Government has had to set some common standard for water.
Q. Throughout your adult life you have been involved with children as a public school teacher, counselor and coach. What is the outlook for the young people in your district?

A. There has never been any question about the effectiveness of the Federal school nutrition program. There has been some complaint about paperwork. I say reduce the paperwork, not the lunches.

Under the G.O.P.’s new nutrition program, the states can fund only 80 percent of the poorest children, which means 20 percent of the funding can subsidize middle-income kids’ hot lunches. It had been 90 percent going to the most disadvantaged. This new majority is almost abdicating the responsibility of the Federal Government when it comes to equity.

The population of children is increasing, and at a faster rate than the G.O.P. plans to fund the program. One in five kids who should be fed are already not getting enough to eat. We are going to end up with more malnourished children that grow up sicker. This has got to exacerbate the health care crisis. Five to ten years from now, we will see a real serious dilemma.

Q. Has America outgrown affirmative action?

A. The affirmative action debate is all about a political party trying to find a wedge issue or scapegoat to placate people who are struggling in our nation. The politicians are using people’s frustration and the downturn in the world’s economy. We are in a whole world competition that has nothing to do with affirmative action.

The pressure on working people is in extending Nafta-like agreements to other third-world countries. We continue to lose certain kinds of well-paying employment in our country as a result. At one time it was unimaginable that white men would have a problem finding a job. This was an expected privilege that the world economy no longer affords us.

The Republicans are not being truthful because they are saying affirmative action is the basic cause for the employment problems that have seized the country. So people are focused on the wrong things. When we lost our edge in the automotive sector, it had nothing to do with affirmative action.

Q. Recently Newark failed to win designation as a federally funded empowerment zone for $100 million. How can we square that turn-down with the Administration’s $20 billion fiscal aid package to Mexico?

A. There may have been a number of problems with the application, but an urgent need was not one of them. I asked the Clinton Administration the same question you asked me. We told Larry Summers, Deputy Secretary of the Treasury, when he addressed the black caucus that we could not support the bailout of Mexico if President Clinton turned his back on American cities. That’s why he chose not to go the legislative route and chose to pursue the bailout through
his prerogatives as Chief Executive.

Q. In recent memory, Thomas D'Alessio, the Democratic County Executive from Essex County, was convicted while in office; Joseph Salema, one of former Governor Florio's top aides, pleaded guilty to his role in a kickback scheme, and Mayor Sharpe James of Newark has been under increasing law-enforcement scrutiny. What is going on in New Jersey, and what does it mean for the Democratic Party?

A. It is dismal and discouraging, and it shakes the public's confidence and lowers voter participation. It's having a negative impact on bringing new and younger people to come in to take over Government. Political campaigning has moved into the negative. The behavior of some high-placed politicians sets the worst example.

We are seeing some of our darkest days, particularly in New Jersey. But we still are the party of inclusion that helps those who need the handout, and I remain optimistic.

Profile

Born: July 16, 1934, in Newark.


Family: Widowed, three children, Donald Jr., 36; Wanda, 34, and Nicole, 20.

GRAPHIC: Photo: Representative Donald M. Payne, new chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, at a recent news conference. (David Scull/The New York Times)
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American Center for International Leadership

1995 Board of Directors

John Claypool, President, Greater Philadelphia First Corp. The company is a consortium of the thirty largest corporations of Philadelphia. It determines corporate and municipal policy in the region. (Chairman of the Board until April)

Jan Berris, Vice President, National Committee on US-China Relations, New York. Nation's major nongovernmental organization for relations with China. Most major political figures dealing with China are on the board of the National Committee. Berris is recognized as one of nation's top experts on China. Helped begin ACIL program with China.

Raoul Carroll, Chief Operating Officer, M.R. Beal & Company, New York, nation's largest minority international finance firm. Deals especially in Africa and the Caribbean. Carroll was President of the Government National Mortgage Association under President Bush, as well as former Counsel of the Veteran's Administration.

Paula Dobriansky, International Trade Specialist, Hunton and Williams Law Firm, Washington, DC. Her mentor was Brezinski. She is a former staff member of the National Security Council under Presidents Carter and Reagan and served as director of programs for the United States Information Agency under President Bush. She is on several boards, including that of the National Endowment for Democracy.

Phillip Geier, President, Armand Hammer World College, Montezuma, New Mexico. Geier is former Executive Vice President of World Learning, the largest international exchange and cross-cultural learning organization in the United States. He is a member of the Fulbright Commission.

Ken Gladish, President, The Indianapolis Community Foundation, one of the twenty largest community foundations in the nation. Gladish is an international relations specialist who received his doctorate from the University of Virginia.

David Greenberg, Managing Partner, Greenberg, Barron, Simon and Miller (GBSM) Denver. Greenberg is a White House Fellow and now manages one of the largest and most influential policy planning companies in the western United States. In addition to public policy planning his company handled the past visits to the United States of Gorbachev and Nelson Mandela. A former partner of the firm is a current member of the White House staff.

Greg Guroff, Director, The Center for Post-Soviet Studies. Chevy Chase, Maryland. He is formerly The President's Coordinator for US-Soviet Studies. Along with co-directors Susan Eisenhower and Murray Feshbach he is one of the nation's top experts on Russia and the Confederation of Independent States.

Jim Hass, Managing Partner, Hamilton, Rabinowitz and Alschuler, Washington office. An international policy and consulting firm with offices in Los Angeles, New York, Washington and London. Hass is a specialist on international finance issues. His company has a major contract with Tunisia relating to the expansion of...
the Port of Tunis.

Charles Isgar, Executive Director of the Los Angeles Sports and International Tourism Commission. Part of the inner team of the Mayor of Los Angeles, Isgar handles the commission responsible for one of the largest income-producing areas in the economy of southern California. Most international programs relating to the City of Los Angeles are under his commission.

Jeanne Jacob, President, Jacob & Associates, Alexandria, Virginia. Her company is a fundraising and consulting company. She organized part of the inaugural ball for President Clinton.

Jamie McConnell, independent finance expert and philanthropist, Rapidan, Virginia. Specialist in International stock investments.

Mary McConnell, Philanthropist and professor in anthropology at the University of Virginia. Expert on Japan and highly regarded in Japan circles. Was consultant to the Japanese Embassy for most recent visit by the Emperor to the United States. (May be the next chairman of the board.)

Ceci Cole McInturff, Vice President for Government Affairs, CBS Television Network, Washington, DC. Handles all government relations for one of the largest television networks in the world.


George Moffett, Diplomatic Correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor, one of most highly respected newspapers on international relations. Moffett was Middle East correspondent for three years and continues to specialize in Middle East events. Was a key staff member in the Carter White House. His books have twice been nominated for National Book Awards.

James Oberwetter, Corporate Vice President, Hunt Oil Company, Dallas, Texas. Directed the Texas campaign for President Bush and is close personal friend and advisor to the Bush family. Hunt Oil Company has major interests in Yemen and North Sea area.

Sean O'Keefe. Chairman of the Board, World Interactive Network, Los Angeles. Currently in negotiations with China for one of the world's major communications projects.

Mary Alice O'Rourke, Producer, the Today Show, NBC one of the most popular and influential morning news shows in America. Used the ACIL program to Vietnam to explore new views of that nation. Extensive international experience.

Hoyt Purvis. Executive Director, The Fulbright Institute, Fayetteville, Arkansas. Also incoming Chairman of the National Fulbright Commission. Close personal friend of the Clinton family for twenty years. President stayed in his home during recent vacation to Arkansas. Was Clinton's boss in early 1970s. The Fulbright Institute recently received a twenty million dollar gift to begin a section on Middle Eastern studies.

Lodis Rhodes, Deputy Director, The Lyndon Baines Johnson School of Public Affairs, Austin, Texas. Has one of the best networks in America of urban administrators.
Elias Shomali, International Vice President for Signet Bank, Baltimore and Richmond, Virginia. Palestinian-American who also is Chair of the Baltimore Council for Foreign Relations.

Carlyle Stewart, Minister, United Methodist Church, Detroit, Michigan. One of most outstanding community leaders in Detroit. Part of national network of emerging minority leaders.

Barry Smitheman, Executive Vice President, First Bank of Boston (Houston office). Has strong international finance network.

Thomas Strickland, Partner in one of largest law firms in Denver. Is candidate for US Senate in 1998. Was a founding member of the ACIL Board. Very close personal friends to Tim Wirth, Assistant Secretary of State for International Affairs.

William Sweeney, Vice President for Governmental Relations, EDS, the largest computer data company in the world. Sweeney also works actively in fundraising and campaigns for the Democratic party.

Margaret Tutwiler, Managing Partner, Tutwiler & Company, Washington, DC. Former Assistant Secretary of State under President Bush. Advisor to James Baker.

David Winn, Partner in law firm of Winn, Beaudry and Winn. Dallas, Texas. Chair of the Texas-Baltic law program, and a member of the American Bar Association's US-Russia Law Program.

Stephen Winnick, Partner in Minneapolis law firm. His clients include several Fortune 500 companies including 3M, Northwest Airlines, Radisson Hotel International. Through ACIL has been asked to help advise China on new national volunteerism program.

Because the University of Denver has provided considerable assistance to ACIL in its relocation and reorganization, the University has been given the right of four places on the Board of Directors. The following are likely members:

Dr. Barry Hughes, Assistant Provost for Graduate Studies. Hughes is a member of the Denver Council of Foreign Relations and is a specialist in European Studies. He serves on several national academic boards.

Dan Ritchie, Chancellor of the University of Denver. The highest official of the University, he recently gave 20 million dollars to the University towards an endowment campaign. He was a founder of the Group W cable company, one of the cable giants in America. It was bought by Westinghouse and Ritchie became head of Westinghouse. He is considered one of the communications leaders in America and his personal friends include some of the most influential corporate leaders in the nation.

Jack Jones, Dean of the School of Social Work, University of Denver one of largest such schools in the nation. Jones spent 18 years in UN International Training and Research, primarily working out of Hong Kong. Has served as chairman of one major national non-profit and serves on other boards of organizations involved in international cross-cultural experiential training.
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Wednesday, May 3, 1995
The Four Seasons Hotel
2800 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, District of Columbia

Reply Card Enclosed
Business Attire
6:30 pm Reception
7:30 pm Dinner
Kathy:

This responds to your request for additional information for Tony's possible participation in the American Center for International Leadership Awards Dinner.

Event contacts indicated that Tony's speech for the dinner would need to be not more than 20 minutes on a subject associated with "The Changing U.S. National/International Security Interests" or some variation of the same. They expect the dinner audience to be approximately 350-400 business professionals, ambassadors and Members of Congress.

The event is scheduled for May 3. Congressman Payne and the Russian Ambassador to Belgium Vitaly Churkin will be honored.

If there is more you need, please call.

Mac
From: DeShazer, MacArthur
To: @NSA - Nat'l Security Advisor
Cc: /R, Record at A1; @UP - APNSA Special Assistants; @AFRICA - African Affairs
Subject: Request from Participation [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Tuesday, March 28, 1995 8:06PM

Tony:

Steve Hayes, President, American Center for International Leadership (ACIL) has requested that you reconsider addressing their annual awards dinner, this year, honoring Congressman Donald Payne and Vitaly Churkin, Russian Ambassador to Belgium. The dinner was originally scheduled April 4. It is now rescheduled for Wednesday, May 3. We believe you regretted the initial invitation. Payne’s office contacted us recently and said that Payne had been in direct contact with you regarding this request for reconsideration.

ACIL is honoring Payne for his leadership in African and Caribbean and Churkin for his general diplomatic efforts including those in Bosnia and Serbia. The dinner audience will be approximately 400 persons, including about 20 Congressmen, several Ambassadors and a generally professional Washington area audience. Past speakers have been David Rockefeller, Boris Yeltsin, Norman Cousins, Hedrick Smith and Harrison Salisbury.

ACCEPT REGRET

Mac
Note for Tony Lake

From Mike Andricos

Subject: Speaking Request from Rep. Don Payne

Rep Don Payne is being presented the George Marshall Award for Outstanding U.S. Fellows by the American Center for International Leadership on the evening of April 4, 1995. This award goes each year to an ACIL fellow who has had a significant impact on international affairs. Also being honored is this year's international recipient of the Dag Hammarskjold Award, Vitaly Churkin, Russian Deputy Foreign Minister and Ambassador to Belgium. ACIL expects about 500 people to attend the annual awards dinner here in Washington. The President was initially invited to speak. This invitation was declined by scheduling. Payne himself asked White House Legislative Affairs to help facilitate another speaker and requested either you or Strobe Talbott. Talbott has declined.

If your schedule permits, are you interested in speaking at this event?
March 10, 1995

To: Dr. Anthony Lake, Assistant to the President for National Security
From: Stephen Hayes, President, ACIL and Director of Internationalization, Univ of Denver

Re: Invitation as Speaker for ACIL Awards Dinner honoring Congressman Payne and Ambassador Churkin

You are aware via the White House Office of Scheduling and calls from Congressman Payne of our request for you as Speaker at the ACIL Annual Awards Dinner to be held at the Willard Hotel on April 4. You may also be aware that the Spokesman for the Secretary-General of the UN, Joe Sills will be an award presenter. Ambassador Vorontsov will be present as well.

The audience of about 400 will be mixed. We anticipate that there will be several Ambassadors at the dinner as well as many Congressmen. I estimate that this will be at least ten percent of the audience. Thirty percent will be corporate representatives, and the remainder will be a combination of professionals who relate in one way or another to the networks of either the Congressional Black Caucus, the American Center of International Leadership, or the area alumni network of the University of Denver with whom ACIL is cooperating closely. Several persons in the White House have participated in ACIL programs. The ACIL network in the Washington area is a far-reaching one and counts among it some of the top emerging leaders in the area.

Past speakers have included Paul Volker, David Rockefeller, Boris Yeltsin, Hedrick Smith, Norman Cousins, Harrison Salisbury, Paul Gigot and others. You will be in excellent company.

Perhaps most importantly, I believe the potential benefits in terms of relationship building at this dinner are significant and I would hope you feel it worthy of your time. You have our commitment of total cooperation and gratitude.

The international audience would probably be most interested in how you view the role of the US in international security issues. So too do I believe would the American audience. Such an audience would be honored and I believe highly supportive by your presentence and remarks.

If your staff has any questions please do not hesitate to call me.

Note: I just received a call from Vitaly Churkin. He is definitely coming and asked that we schedule his flight from Belgium on April 3 and return on April 5.
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I am delighted to join the American Center for International Leadership in honoring two fellow
servants on the frontlines of diplomacy: Russia’s Deputy Foreign Minister Vitaly Churkin and
Representative Donald Payne.

As one who admires the Center’s efforts to broaden the horizons of emerging leaders from around
the world, I must admit that I was puzzled by its choice of honorees. After all, Vitaly and Don
“emerged” some time ago, and I can’t think of two individuals whose horizons are less in need of
expansion. I’m reminded of that old Marx Brothers movie in which Groucho’s dancing partner
urges him to move “closer, closer, closer,” and Groucho responds: “Lady, if I get any closer, I’ll be
behind you.”

But then I understood that Vitaly and Don are being feted for achievements past as well as for
promise future. And they are being held up to the young participants in the ACIL’s programs as
powerful examples of the proposition that choice, not chance, determines destiny. On both counts, no two people are more deserving of recognition.

Mr. Minister, the award you are receiving bears the name of Dag Hammarskjold, the brilliant Swedish diplomat who served as the United Nations' second Secretary General. Hammarskjold was a passionate mountaineer -- indeed, he saw in this pursuit a metaphor for diplomacy. The qualities required in mountain-climbing, he once said, ‘are... perseverance and patience, a firm grip on realities, careful but imaginative planning, a clear awareness of the dangers, but also of the fact that fate is what we make it, and that the safest climber is he who never questions his ability to overcome all difficulties.’

Mr. Minister, you have proven yourself to be sure-handed and quick-footed in a wide variety of key assignments: interpreter at the SALT I talks; secretary at the Soviet Embassy in Washington; senior adviser to former Foreign Minister Shevardnadze. By the age of 40, you had scaled one of the more precipitous peaks in the world: your great nation’s foreign ministry.

Now, you are taking on a new post as Ambassador to Belgium and representative to NATO. In that capacity, you will play a central role in Russia’s participation in the Partnership for Peace...and in developing a long-term relationship between Russia and NATO.

I know all too well that the on-going tragedy in Bosnia -- to which you have dedicated so much of your time -- has thus far proven to be one mountain that defies conquering. We’ve had our
differences over strategy and tactics for stopping the bloodshed. But both of our governments agree that a solution can only be found at the negotiating table, not on the battlefield. And the United States appreciates the key role you played in forging the Contact Group plan. I wish that I could be optimistic about the Bosnian Serbs readiness to accept the plan -- but I cannot. We must focus our efforts on increasing their political and economic isolation, while doing what we can to contain the fighting. And we must remain united in our commitment to help end Bosnia's long nightmare.

Representative Payne, George Marshall -- the great soldier/diplomat whose name adorns the award you will receive -- believed that "wars are bred by poverty and oppression. Continued peace is possible only in a relatively free and prosperous world." Even before you became New Jersey's first African-American representative, you acted on that belief during two decades of international voluntary service, especially on behalf of refugees.

More recently, as a four term member of Congress and Chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, you have pushed and pulled and prodded the United States to keep its focus on countries that need our help -- and whose success is in our interest. Your tireless advocacy has played an important role in moving South Africa and Haiti from repression to freedom. And your hard-headed compassion has helped guide our work in Somalia, Rwanda and other countries torn apart by war and violence.
Minister Churkin, Representative Payne -- your leadership has saved lives and eased suffering around the world. And your example -- in the tradition of Hammarskjold and Marshall -- is more important than ever.

In both Russia and the United States, there are those who would have our nations turn away from the world. Some have been seized with an "end of history" euphoria. They believe that with the Cold War over, we can retrench behind our borders and deal exclusively with problems at home.

These neo-isolationists are well meaning but misguided. Far from the end of history, we stand at a new stage in an enduring struggle -- what President Clinton has called "an age old battle between the forces of freedom and tyranny, tolerance and repression, hope and fear." In this struggle, the challenges we face -- from terrorism to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction...from environmental degradation to drug trafficking and organized crime -- show no respect for borders. To meet them, the powerful reason of engagement must prevail over the wobbly romanticism of "America First" isolationism. And it will.

What troubles me more is another strand of isolationism that is both more subtle and more pernicious. Those who espouse it embrace the rhetoric of engagement -- yet they would deny us the resources and flexibility we need to lead. They tell us America must be prepared to act unilaterally -- yet they would hold back the funds we need to do so and they would prevent us from building coalitions that spread the risk and the burden of engagement. They say America needs a strong military -- yet they would delay in getting our forces the resources they require.
They praise peacemakers -- yet they would cut our assistance to those who take risks for peace. They pay lip service to prosperity -- yet they would oppose our efforts to open markets around the world.

These are the back-door isolationists and unilateralists. If they have their way, America will face the future weak and alone. If they succeed in forcing us to withdraw from the world today, we will have to contend with the consequences of our neglect tomorrow.

In defense to tomorrow however, I would ask you to consider for a moment our stakes in Russia and the newly independent states, or in Africa.

America has a vital security interest in a stable, democratic and strong Russia, and in seeing democracy flourish throughout the NIS.

[INSERT]

The United States also has a clear cut self-interest in a prosperous, stable Africa. To be sure, humanitarian concerns color our policy, and we can hardly be indifferent to a continent in which so many Americans have their roots. But the plain truth is that nurturing Africa’s tremendous economic potential and contending with the security threats several of its nations pose to us are in America’s interest. If we walk away from the challenges and opportunities Africa presents, we will be doing ourselves a grave disservice.
The nearly 700 million people who live south of the Sahara make up one of the largest markets in the world. And Africa’s wealth of natural resources, from oil to _____ helps heat our homes and _____ our ______. Yet we have barely begun to tap the continent’s potential. Our exports to Africa stand at just $4.4 billion a year, and our market share is a paltry 8 percent. Doubling our exports would provide nearly 100,000 jobs in America. And we can do that -- provided we remain engaged, and we help stability take hold and democracy take root.
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I am delighted to join the American Center for International Leadership in honoring two fellow servants on the frontlines of diplomacy: Russia’s Deputy Foreign Minister Vitaly Churkin and Representative Donald Payne.

As one who admires the Center’s efforts to broaden the horizons of emerging leaders from around the world, I must admit that I was puzzled by its choice of awardees. After all, Vitaly and Don “emerged” some time ago, and I can’t think of two individuals whose horizons are less in need of expansion. I’m reminded of that old Marx Brothers movie in which Groucho’s dancing partner urges him to move “closer, closer, closer,” and Groucho responds: “Lady, if I get any closer, I’ll be behind you.”

But then I understood that Vitaly and Don are being feted for their achievements as well as for their promise. And that they are being held up to the young participants in the ACIL’s programs
as powerful examples of the proposition that choice, not chance, determines destiny. On both counts, no two people are more deserving of recognition.

Mr. Minister, the award you are receiving bears the name of Dag Hammarskjold, the brilliant Swedish diplomat who served as the United Nations’ second Secretary General. Hammarskjold was a passionate mountaineer -- indeed, he saw in this pursuit a metaphor for diplomacy. The qualities required in mountain-climbing, he once said, “are... perseverance and patience, a firm grip on realities, careful but imaginative planning, a clear awareness of the dangers, but also of the fact that fate is what we make it, and that the safest climber is he who never questions his ability to overcome all difficulties.”

Mr. Minister, you have proven yourself to be sure-handed and quick-footed in a wide variety of key assignments: interpreter at the SALT I talks; secretary at the Soviet Embassy in Washington; diplomatic adviser to President Gorbachev. Now, at age 43, you have scaled one of the more precipitous peaks in the world: your great nation’s foreign ministry.

I know all too well that the on-going tragedy in Bosnia -- to which you have dedicated so much of your time -- has thus far proven to be one mountain that defies conquering. But we must not give up. [Insert].

Representative Payne, George Marshall -- whose name adorns the award you will receive -- believed that “wars are bred by poverty and oppression. Continued peace is possible only in a
relatively free and prosperous world.” Even before you became New Jersey’s first African-American representative, you worked to act on that belief during two decades of international voluntary service, especially on behalf of refugees.

More recently, as a four term member of Congress and Chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, you have pushed and prodded the United States to always do more to help nations like South Africa, Haiti, Rwanda and Somalia to turn from poverty to prosperity and from repression to freedom.

Vitaly, Don -- your engagement has saved lives, eased suffering, and helped reason prevail over intolerance. And your example -- in the tradition of Hammarskjold and Marshall -- is more important that ever.

In both Russia and the United States, there are those who would have our nations turn away from the world. Some have been seized with an “end of history” euphoria. They believe that the end of the Cold War has removed the main source of conflict in the world and that, consequently, we can now retrench behind our borders and deal exclusively with problems at home.

These neo-isolationists are well meaning but misguided. Far from the end of history, we stand at a new stage in an enduring struggle -- what President Clinton has called “an age old battle between the forces of freedom and tyranny, tolerance and repression, hope and fear.” In this
struggle, the challenges we face -- from terrorism to the proliferation of weapons of mass
destruction...from environmental degradation to drug trafficking and organized crime -- show no
respect for borders. To meet them, we must remain engaged.

I am confident that in the debate over this nation's place in the world, the powerful reason of
engagement will prevail over the soft romanticism of "America First" isolationism. What troubles
me more is another strand of isolationism that is both more subtle and more pernicious. Those
who espouse it embrace the rhetoric of engagement -- but would deny us the resources and
flexibility we need to lead.
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I am delighted to join the American Center for International Leadership in honoring two men
whose thoughtful devotion to foreign affairs proves that you can marry passion and pragmatism:
Russia’s Deputy Foreign Minister Vitaly Churkin and Congressman Donald Payne.

As one who admires the Center’s efforts to broaden the horizons of emerging leaders from around
the world, I must admit that, at first, I was puzzled by its choice of honorees. After all, Vitaly
and Don “emerged” some time ago, and I can’t think of two individuals whose horizons are less in
need of broadening. I’m reminded of that old Marx Brothers movie in which Groucho’s dancing
partner urges him to move “closer, closer, closer,” and Groucho responds: “Lady, if I get any
closer, I’ll be behind you.”

But then I understood that Vitaly and Don are being feted for past achievements past as well as
for future promise. And they are being held up as powerful examples of the proposition that
choice, not chance, determines destiny. On both counts, no two people are more deserving of recognition.

Mr. Minister, the award you are receiving bears the name of Dag Hammarskjold, the brilliant Swedish diplomat who served as the United Nations’ second Secretary General. Hammarskjold was a passionate mountaineer -- indeed, he saw in this pursuit a metaphor for diplomacy. The qualities required in mountain-climbing, he once said, “are...perseverance and patience, a firm grip on realities, careful but imaginative planning, a clear awareness of the dangers, but also of the fact that fate is what we make it, and that the safest climber is he who never questions his ability to overcome all difficulties.”

Mr. Minister, you have proven yourself to be sure-handed, quick-footed and confident in taking on a wide variety of important assignments: interpreter at the SALT I talks; secretary at the Soviet Embassy in Washington; senior adviser to former Foreign Minister Shevardnadze. By the age of 40, you had scaled one of the more precipitous peaks in the world: your great nation’s foreign ministry.

Now, you are taking on a new post as Ambassador to Belgium and representative to NATO. In that capacity, you will play a central role in Russia’s participation in the Partnership for Peace...and in developing a long-term relationship between Russia and NATO.
I know all too well that the on-going tragedy in Bosnia -- to which you have dedicated so much of your time -- has thus far proven to be one mountain that defies conquering. Russia and the United States have differed at times over strategy and tactics for stopping the bloodshed. But both of our governments agree that a solution can only be found at the negotiating table, not on the battlefield. That's why the United States appreciates the key role you played in forging the Contact Group plan. I wish that I could be optimistic about the Bosnian Serbs readiness to accept the plan -- but I cannot. We must focus our efforts on increasing their political and economic isolation, while doing what we can to contain the fighting. And we must remain united in our commitment to help end Bosnia's long nightmare.

The name of George Marshall, our greatest soldier/diplomat, adorns the award Congressman Payne will receive. Marshall believed that "wars are bred by poverty and oppression. Continued peace is possible only in a relatively free and prosperous world." [TK TK Change Quote].

Don; even before you became New Jersey's first African-American representative, you acted on that belief during two decades of international voluntary service, especially on behalf of refugees.

More recently, in your four terms in Congress and as Chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, you have pushed and pulled and prodded the United States to keep its focus on countries that need our help -- and whose success is decidedly in our interest. Your tireless advocacy has played an important role in helping move South Africa and Haiti from repression to freedom.
And your hard-headed compassion has helped guide our work in Somalia, Rwanda and other
countries torn apart by war and violence.

Minister Churkin, Congressman Payne -- your leadership, in the tradition of Dag Hammarskjold
and George Marshall, is more important that ever. Both Hammarskjold and Marshall believed in
their hearts and showed with their actions that the surest path to real peace and prosperity lies in
constructive cooperation among nations. [Served at time when isolationism tempting]

In both Russia and the United States, there are those who would have our nations turn away from
the world. In the wake of the Cold War, some have been seized with an “end of history”
euphoria. They believe that we can now safely retrench behind our borders and deal exclusively
with problems at home.

These new isolationists are well meaning but misguided. Far from the end of history, we stand at
a new stage in an enduring struggle -- what President Clinton has called “an age old battle
between the forces of freedom and tyranny, tolerance and repression, hope and fear.” Yes,
democracy and free markets are spreading to every continent on earth. But they require nurture
and support to take hold. And the new challenges we face -- from terrorism to the proliferation
of weapons of mass destruction...from environmental degradation to drug trafficking and
organized crime -- show no respect for borders. If we are to meet them, the powerful reason of
engagement must prevail over the wobbly romanticism of “America First” isolationism. And it
will.
What troubles me more is another strand of isolationism that is both more subtle and more pernicious. Those who espouse it embrace the rhetoric of engagement -- yet they would deny us the resources and flexibility we need to lead. They tell us America must be prepared to act unilaterally -- yet they would hold back the funds we need to do so and they would prevent us from building coalitions that spread the risk and the burden of action. They say America needs a strong military -- yet they would delay in getting our forces the resources they require. They praise peacemakers -- yet they would cut our assistance to those who take risks for peace. They pay lip service to prosperity -- yet they would oppose our efforts to open markets around the world.

We cannot have it both ways. There is a price to be paid for engagement. We pay it in time. In energy. In resources. But when the American people learn what the bottom line really is, very few of them buy the argument that we cannot afford to lead. Just over 1% of our federal budget goes to foreign policy spending -- $21 billion out of a $1.6 trillion budget -- and less than $16 billion is devoted to foreign assistance. The return on our investment -- in terms of increased security and greater prosperity for the American people -- is worth every penny. We spend it not out of the goodness of our hearts, but out of the conviction that we can secure our vital interests.

Consider our engagement with the newly independent states of the former Soviet Union. The agreements we’ve reached to de-target our nuclear weapons, dismantle thousands of warheads and delivery systems and safeguard nuclear materials have literally made Americans safer than at
any time since the end of World War II. Our carefully planned assistance and technical support programs have helped to privatize and rationalize a vast new market. Over time, that market will absorb billions of dollars in American exports and support tens of thousands of jobs back home.

President Clinton travels to Russia and Ukraine next week to pursue the opportunities of engagement. In the months ahead, we can ratify START II, secure the extension of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and conclude a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. We can expand our cooperation to fight international crime, contain regional conflicts, and produce more energy more efficiently. We can continue to help strengthen democracy and draw the NIS closer to the West’s economic, political and security institutions. And we can better manage our disagreements and prevent them from degenerating into crises. Each and every one of these goals bears a cost. But each and every one of them is in our most fundamental self-interest.

Or consider the resources we dedicate to building a more prosperous, stable Africa. To be sure, humanitarian concerns color our policy, and we can hardly be indifferent to a continent to which so many Americans trace their roots. But the plain truth is that nurturing Africa’s tremendous economic potential and contending with the security threats several of its nations pose to us are in America’s interest. If we walk away from the challenges and opportunities Africa presents, we will be doing ourselves a grave disservice.

The nearly 700 million people who live south of the Sahara make up one of the largest markets in the world. And Africa’s wealth of natural resources, from oil to _____, helps heat our homes and
Yet we have barely begun to tap the continent’s potential. Our exports to Africa stand at just $4.4 billion a year. That’s a good return on the $800 million in annual development assistance we send to Africa, but nowhere near what’s possible. Doubling our exports would provide nearly 100,000 jobs in America. And we can do that -- provided we continue to help stability take hold and democracy take root throughout the continent.

These economic interests are matched by a broad array of security and humanitarian concerns. Sudan, for example, has worked its way into the major leagues of countries supporting and exporting terrorism. It poses a direct threat to our interests. Or take Nigeria -- some 40% of the heroin that enters the United States passes through that nation. And problems that plague many African countries today -- such as overpopulation, AIDS and environmental decay -- could well become the world’s problems tomorrow.

The small fraction of our modest foreign policy budget that we devote to Africa can help to contain these problems, and even turn some of them around. It can help avert future disasters whose cost -- both in terms of resources and human lives -- would be exponentially greater. And it can help build on the terrific progress toward development and democracy that so many nations in Africa have already made.

In Africa, in Russia and the other newly independent states, and in many other countries, America will continue to bear the burden of leadership because it is in our interest to do so. And it also happens to be the right thing to do. We know from our own experience that democracy and free
markets -- for all their imperfections -- are the best means to the ends people all over the world aspire to: security, freedom and prosperity. We can and we should help them to share in the benefits of our knowledge.

Tonight, we salute the accomplishments and commend the dedication of two individuals who understand the necessity of leadership -- and we wish them many more years of success on the frontlines of diplomacy. By their example and by their engagement, Vitaly Churkin and Don Payne carry on the tradition of Dag Hammarskjold and George Marshall. They stand for the proposition that if great nations are to remain strong at home, they must maintain their focus abroad. And they prove to us that if we dare to lead -- if we seize the opportunities and meet the obligations of our time -- we can make tomorrow a little bit better than today.
It is truly a pleasure to be here. For one thing I know that this is an audience that agrees with President Clinton -- and I hope with the Congress -- that we need to keep the funding for our international programs at the levels necessary to win the peace for the next century.
Winning that peace is not just the work of government. Winning that peace is also the work of you, the Non-Governmental Organizations, and the thousands upon thousands of Americans who support America's NGOs, what they stand for, and most importantly, what they do.

What you and they stand for is something that is increasingly important. It is the best of what America stands for as it works to sustain democracy in countries where it is still a new idea -- as it works to relieve suffering in refugee camps -- as it works to give the victims of natural disasters a chance as they try to recover their lives. There is an intrinsic good here. It is an invaluable resource. It is appreciated around the world.
But, our ability to work with you to preserve and to enlarge our victory in the Cold War is in danger. Our legacy of the positive achievements of the last 50 years are not cut in stone. And a new wave of budget slashing, without regard to the consequences, threatens to propel us in the wrong direction at a real moment of hope -- when our engagement can still make a dramatic difference, by securing rather than frittering away our victory in the Cold War.

Let me remind you: It is not assured that we will win the peace that follows our fifty years of Cold War struggle. Democracy is fragile; it needs nurturing. Not all of the new market economies have taken deep root. Aggression by rogue states, ethnic intolerance, international terrorism, and economic dislocation still threaten to disrupt the world.
With threats come opportunity. We can enlarge the scope of democratic governance. We can enlarge the reach of free market economies. We can enlarge the legacy of our victory in the Cold War. But only with the necessary resources.

As I made clear in a speech last week, this is not a partisan issue. There are Republicans and Democrats who support international programs and who support providing the President with the resources we need to implement our programs and protect American interests abroad. There are Democrats and Republicans who do not. Among these are “back-door isolationists” who speak the language of American leadership but who would deny us the resources we need if we are to lead.
Some of them may be acting out of a calculation that the American public wants to hear the rhetoric of international responsibility but doesn’t want to pay the price. There is evidence that they are wrong if they think so. Perhaps the best evidence here is this: the several million people in the United States who have given from their own pockets to support the groups that you represent.

And there is other evidence, as well. A recently released University of Maryland poll indicates that "an overwhelming majority of Americans embrace the principle that the United States should give some aid to people in foreign countries who are in genuine need." This was not a partisan poll -- 78% of the Republican respondents agreed...
And, once informed about the actual amount of spending on foreign aid, a very strong majority indicated that they favored either maintaining it or increasing it. Indeed, 30% of the respondents believed that the current 1% of the national budget spent on foreign aid was "too little." The American people know what is in their interests -- and if they have the facts they will support our investment in international programs.
Ten years ago, the International Affairs account absorbed 2.5% of the federal budget. This year, we are looking at just 1.3% of the budget, at a time when I believe the payoff of our international programs investment has never had greater potential. And the United States, the most powerful nation in the world, ranks dead last among 25 industrialized nations in the percentage of GNP devoted to aid. In 1993, the United States spent only 0.15% (zero point one five percent) of its GNP on nonmilitary foreign aid. Japan spent 0.26%; Germany and France still more.
And yet the American people, while arguing that domestic problems should be addressed first, do support meeting out international responsibilities. As reported in the New York Times, 58% of the people agree with the following statement: "If I knew that most foreign aid was going to the poor people who really need it rather than to wasteful bureaucracies and corrupt governments, I would be willing to pay more in taxes for foreign aid."
Well, I am not here to argue for raising taxes. But I am here to tell you that we are working to get more resources more efficiently to more of the people who most need it. We all know that the Vice President is engaged in the National Performance Review -- the reinventing of government. We all know that Brian Atwood has been reinventing AID. And I believe that an important aspect of that effort, in addition to eliminating 27 overseas missions and cutting its workforce by 1200, has been working to get our government resources closer to where the rubber meets the road -- by "contracting out" to you NGOs. The proportion of USAID funding of NGOs has grown from just 19% in 1985 to 32.5% in 1994, and that percentage will continue to grow.
So, we are becoming more efficient. We are becoming more results oriented. We are discovering that we can get a lot more aid for our buck by working closely with the NGO community. We have the "New Partnership Initiative" aimed at focusing on the local level and increasing to 40% the percentage of our aid that is channeled to NGO's. We have begun this because your organizations are on the ground and your counterparts are more responsive than distant national governments. This puts our resources to better use -- but only as long as we have resources to channel.\(\text{to you}\)

For years we have been living under the constraints of short-sighted policies and funding levels that only Mr. Micawber could call sufficient. And now we face a still more clear and present danger. Budget legislation being prepared in Congress could reduce foreign affairs spending by nearly a quarter -- or $4.6 billion dollars.
The enormity of this cut is even more bruising to American interests abroad when one stops to consider that it would have to come out of just a portion of the International Programs budget. This would mean drastic cuts in programs that could throw away decades of our investment in democracy and in our search for stability and predictability in our international policies.

That would be tragic -- in the short run because innocent people would be harmed, and in the long run because American interests abroad would be undercut. And in the end, it would cost more money.

\[\text{it would be just plain stupid because}\]
We have learned that prevention is far less expensive than cure. When the all-seeing eye of television finds real suffering abroad, Americans want their government to act -- and rightly so. And we have learned that funding a large humanitarian effort after a tragedy, or sending in our forces abroad to assist at such a moment, will cost many times the investment in prevention. It was for just this reason that the President approved the "Horn of Africa Initiative." This initiative will enable us to invest in measures to prevent famine, rather than force innocent victims to pay for the consequences of recurrent natural disasters.
The fact that there is public support for meeting our international responsibilities is extraordinary, because in this new era, we have entered, we no longer face a single overarching threat to our survival—a threat that, during the Cold War, rallied the American public to sacrifice for its security. In this new era, we face a new, more diffuse challenge of enlarging the circle of democracies and free market economies throughout a changing world. As we navigate through these uncharted waters, most Americans understand that this effort requires commitment and resources. And yet, there are some who would recoil from this new course, perhaps because it is new. A half century ago, Franklin Roosevelt encountered that same reaction as he battled the Great Depression with the unprecedented innovations of the New Deal. What he said then applies to those who would turn America's back on the developing world.
"Governments can err. Presidents do make mistakes. But the immortal Dante tells us that divine justice weighs the sins of the cold-blooded and the sins of the warm-hearted in different scales. Better the occasional faults of a government that lives in charity than the constant omissions of a government frozen in the ice of its own indifference."

Will we sail flawlessly in the new waters of the post-Cold War world? Probably not. Should we keep trying and learning? Absolutely.
The strategy of enlargement -- of democracy and of free market economies -- that we would embrace with the American people has another meaning that is relevant to everyone in this room. In this era, when ideas are increasingly important, we can and must enlarge the circle of individuals and organizations that help advance our ideas, ideals and goals in the world. For example, private firms are natural allies in our efforts to strengthen market economies, such as in the dynamic middle-income regions of Asia and Latin America. And our goal of strengthening democracy has natural allies in labor unions, human rights groups, environmental advocates, and the full range of organizations represented here.
Yet there is a danger here as well. In the face of constrained resources, it is important for groups who care about the developing world not to turn against each other. We cannot afford to see human rights groups battling democracy advocates, for Africanists to be at odds with Latin Americanists, and for each group to believe that "mine is the one gate to the kingdom of heaven." Instead, these communities must recognize how their individual goals are linked: for example, democracy helps protect human rights and promotes the broad and just distribution of resources that makes economic growth politically sustainable.
InterAction -- those of you in this room and your broader membership -- are well suited to act as bridges among the various communities. And we should all challenge ourselves to put new effort into exploring these linkages, both intellectually and politically -- for if we do not hang together, then at budget resolution time, we shall certainly hang separately.

Ultimately, InterAction and its groups are on the front lines of a battle we must all wage against backdoor isolationist pressures for the United States to withdraw from the world. Such a retreat, like the fog, comes in on little cat feet -- it comes in small increments, vote by vote by vote.

In the late 1940s, there was a great national debate between isolationists and internationalists. And the isolationists argued for that position. Today, there is no clearly drawn debate. Instead, we have backdoor isolationism.
President Clinton and his entire Administration are committed to fighting at your side for the resources that are necessary to sustain America's role as a global leader. I am confident this is a fight the American people understand and support. And that we will win, because, simply, we must.

We look forward to working with InterAction and its organizations in the months to come -- to keep America engaged in the world; to work for the passage of measures to draw the developing world into the global economy; to continue the reform of our foreign assistance programs; to work on new efforts toward the most in need; and to ensure that we realize the great potential of American leadership at this unique moment of international opportunity.
Foreign assistance is a central part of our national security calculus; it is, pure and simple, something we do because it is in our, in America’s interests.