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THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN

In Both Parties, Hazy Thinking On World Stage

IF NOTHING ELSE, Haiti shows that things sure have changed. In the 1980s, the way to get a pre-election bump-up in the popularity polls was to invade a country. Now it's pretty clear that the best way to enhance poll ratings is to arrange not to invade anybody.

But Haiti also exposes a much more basic truth about the politics of U.S. foreign policy in 1994: Both the Democratic and Republican parties are essentially lost in their foreign policy thinking. After four years to come to grips with the evaporation of communism, neither has found a coherent view that could unite a political party, much less a nation.

Democrats simply look confused. President Clinton has put his finger on the core idea that should drive American foreign policy: With the communist threat gone, America's overarching goal should be to expand the reach of democracy. "We know that the larger the pool of democracies, the better off we will be," national security adviser Tony Lake told a Council on Foreign Relations audience last week. But no one will accuse Democrats of consistency in pursuit of this noble goal.

In China, Democrats have now decided that the way to promote democracy and pluralism is by economic engagement. In Cuba and Haiti, democracy and pluralism are promoted by enforcing economic embargoes. Some Democrats who opposed invading Panama and Grenada to throw out undemocratic regimes now endorse invading Haiti to do the same thing. And vice versa. In North Korea, a Democratic administration has decided that the way to deal with an outdated Communist dictatorship is to offer a specific set of economic and diplomatic inducements. But that kind of offer is off limits in dealing with another outdated Communist dictatorship in Cuba.

A DEMOCRATIC president makes his mark on economic policy by negotiating and winning a personal campaign for approval of the North American Free Trade Agreement, but a majority of fellow Democrats in the House abandon him along the way. The president argues that economic development in Mexico will keep refugees from flowing to the U.S. But in the cases of Haiti and Cuba, Democrats generate economic embargoes that only fuel the pressure for migration.

Only in dealing with Russia have both President Clinton and his party clearly muddled their post-Cold War philosophy with a plan of sustained engagement. "Russia always been pretty big but has been inconsistent and successful. Not coincidentally, the public seems neither confused nor hostile."

For their part, Republicans seem to be reeling onto dangerous ground they have occupied, unhappily, earlier in their history. They are flirting with a kind of fortress America, neo-isolationist thinking, even while insisting that isn't the case.

Republican leaders were strikingly united in their view that intervention in Haiti isn't worth the price. That was clear at a meeting last weekend of the Christian Coalition, a group with a distinctly Republican flavor. Both former Tennessee governor Lamar Alexander and former education secretary William Bennett earned rousing cheers by declaring that nothing in Haiti was worth the risk of an American life.

THIS EVOLUTION in Republican thinking seems best illustrated by a remark by former vice president Dan Quayle, who declared amid the Haiti debate: "Are we going to say as a nation that every country in the world has an entitlement to be democratic?"

Yet that was pretty much the bedrock of Bush and Bush foreign policies, particularly in Latin America. In fact, the 1991 national security strategy of the Bush administration declared: "Our interests are best served in a world in which democracy and its ideals are widespread and secure."

Others in the GOP are worried that the party is sending the wrong vibes on a less spectacular test case, the new General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Even such free-traders as Sen. Phil Gramm of Texas are calling for putting off ratification until next year, raising questions about whether Republicans are growing cool toward open trade as well.

"This drift worries some Republicans. "A less interventionist posture, which has been gaining for a long time in the Republican party, has picked up strength," frets Vin Weber, a former GOP House leader who now is a director of the Empower America advocacy group, "it's hard to imagine circumstances where you would see Republican support for intervention short of direct military threat.""

The conclusion for all this is the knowledge that, as Mr. Lake points out, it took several years after World War II for the country to unite behind the policy of Soviet containment. In the meantime, given the drift among America's leaders, the public can be excused if it is a little confused.
When the Korean War turned unpopular, Truman made a solemn decision that may well have foreseen and tragic consequences. This decision was not the President's to make, nor the Constitution's. Nor does the existence of a presidential power, as commander in chief, justify it. Truman acted under the pressure of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Central Intelligence Agency very seriously again.

President Clinton is, like President Kennedy, a bright man with an impressive technical grasp of complicated issues. Is he, like President Kennedy, a learner? And, if so, what should he learn from his Haitian experience?

The first thing he should learn is the need for a campaign of public education before he plans to take the country into war. His Haitian speech was pretty good, but it came late in the day and had the effect of merely inviting the issue on an unpopular nation. If the Haitian question demanded so strong a reaction, the secretary of state, the national security advisor and Democratic congressional leaders should have been carrying the case to the country for months before the scheduled D-Day.

Congressional Consent

A related lesson is the need for congressional consent. The Haitian question beguiled the administration into exorbitant claims of inherent presidential power to go to war. But the Constitution gives Congress the exclusive power to send the nation into war— a power that is qualified only by the need to repel a sudden invasion of the U.S. or by the need to protect the lives of American citizens abroad. Nor do presidential powers as commander in chief suspend Article I, Section 8, of the Constitution. Nor does the existence of a United Nations resolution replace that constitutional provision.

President Truman, admirable in so many ways, set a bad example in 1950 when he defined the Korean War as a "police action" and repudied congressional authorization and rejected Sen. Robert Taft's proposal of a joint resolution.

Now, there is nothing new about lobbying to make foreign policy. In the very first decade of the republic Citizen Genet got into trouble organizing a pro-French lobby. A century ago Henry Adams was lamenting the lobbying activities of the German and Russian legations and the Clayton-Gaige. After the Communist takeover of China, the China lobby—Alfred Kohlberg, Walter Fehl, and the publication of One Million—exercised veto power over U.S. China policy. The continuing influence of the Cuba lobby by U.S. foreign policy is notorious.

No one should be surprised by new lobbying to make foreign policy. Foreign policy is all too likely to become foreign policy by the back door. Lobbyists sometimes force the national security establishment to take fresh looks and rethink its policies. But in the Haitian case, President Truman decided to recognize Israel in 1948, and it is true in the recent Irish case. The establishment worked up pomposis disapproval a few months back when President Clinton granted a visa to Gerry Adams of Sinn Fein against the opposition of the British, the Irish Democratic Party and the American ambassador to London and the conventional wisdom. Subsequent developments vindicate President Clinton's decision.

But more often lobbying derails policy. Their effect is often to subordinate the national interest of the U.S. to the private interests of some country or to the political or economic interests of the lobbyist. Haiti and Cuba provide revealing examples of the ways lobbying can distort foreign policy.

Thus the Congressional Black Caucus, though in the end its members divided on the question of military intervention, forced the administration to give Haiti a second chance. But they were not wise to overlook the lesson to be learned from Haiti. Haiti played a vital role in stabilizing the region's delicate political balance. It was no accident that the Clinton administration did well in its dealings with Haiti. A strong and viable Haiti is the best way to repel a sudden invasion of the U.S. or the lives of American citizens abroad. Nor do presidential powers as commander in chief suspend Article I, Section 8, of the Constitution. Nor does the existence of a United Nations resolution replace that constitutional provision.

Houdinisism is not to be recommended as a permanent presidential style. Presidents must learn from their troubles. Is President Clinton a learner? And, if so, what should he learn from his Haitian experience?

| Board of Contributors |

Houdinisism is not to be recommended as a permanent presidential style. Presidents must learn from their troubles. Is President Clinton a learner? And, if so, what should he learn from his Haitian experience?

The Cuban case is far worse than the Haiti case. The hard line against Castro was a product of the days when Fidel Castro gave the Soviet Union a base in the New World. It was not in the interest of the U.S. to repel a sudden invasion of the U.S. or the lives of American citizens abroad. Nor does presidential power as commander in chief suspend Article I, Section 8, of the Constitution. Nor does the existence of a United Nations resolution replace that constitutional provision. The disintegration of the Soviet Union leaves a vacuum, and since policy makers have not yet found a new guiding concept, foreign policy lobbies based on domestic constituencies rush to fill the vacuum. The influence of the lobbies is visible in the recent evolution of U.S. policy toward Haiti, toward Ireland and toward Cuba.

Now, there is nothing new about lobbying to make foreign policy. In the very first decade of the republic Citizen Genet got into trouble organizing a pro-French lobby. A century ago Henry Adams was lamenting the lobbying activities of the German and Russian legations and the Clayton-Gaige. After the Communist takeover of China, the China lobby—Alfred Kohlberg, Walter Fehl, and the publication of One Million—exercised veto power over U.S. China policy. The continuing influence of the Cuba lobby by U.S. foreign policy is notorious.

Nor is the intervention of lobbies new. The Cuba lobby is reminiscent of the Cuban American National Foundation, founded by wealthy right-wing Cubans exiled in Miami and run by the arrogant Jorge Mas Canosa. Mr. Mas Canosa's ambition is to become the Cuban version of Mr. Reagan as Cuba's president. During the 1998 Florida primary, Gov. Clinton was pursued to endorse the Cuban-American National Foundation Act; and he has continued to consult Mr. Mas Canosa as an authority on the future of Cuba.

Today we are prepared to normalize relations with Vietnam, which killed 50,000 American soldiers, and with North Korea, which killed 5,000 American soldiers, but not with Cuba, where no American soldiers have been killed since 1960 (and then by Spaniards, not by Cubans). There has been no discussion of the Cuban lobby in the hard line. Many newspapers—this one included—have come to see the best way to dispose of Mr. Mas Canosa and the Cuban lobby is to drown his revolution in a flood of American tourists, investors and consumer goods. But we continue the hard-line because, it would seem, of the power of the Cuba lobby and because the administration is under the delusion that, with its help, the Democrats might carry Florida in 1996.

An Emerging Pattern

The Cuba lobby is reminiscent of the China lobby of the 1950s. For years fears of nouveau-riche Chinese-American lobby influenced U.S. China policy. Then President Nixon moved to do the unimaginable and create a relationship between the U.S. and China. The Cuba lobby, which turned unpopular in the press and was defeated when President Clinton turned to a widespread popular acclaim.

The China lobby rapidly faded away. The same thing would probably happen to the Cuba lobby if President Clinton were to move toward normalization.

There is in fact an emerging pattern in international politics—a pattern that might produce a guiding concept for the making of foreign policy. For the end of the Cold War has led to a new flexibility in the making of foreign policy. For the end of the Cold War has led to a new flexibility in the making of foreign policy. For the end of the Cold War has led to a new flexibility in the making of foreign policy. For the end of the Cold War has led to a new flexibility in the making of foreign policy.

Why not make the resolution of local problems—France's dissatisfaction with the Clinton administration—done in a way that would benefit both sides? That is, why not make the resolution of local problems—France's dissatisfaction with the Clinton administration—done in a way that would benefit both sides?
THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

Internal Transcript
June 10, 1994

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO AMERICAN STUDENTS AT OXFORD

Rhodes House
Oxford University
Oxford, England

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. I thought when she finished
that last sentence, she was going to say "yet." (Laughter.) Thank
you, Sara, and thank you for your help on the health care project.
And we need you back. (Laughter.)

It's wonderful to see all of you here. I'm glad to be
here. I think you know some of the people who are here with me. My
wife, Hillary, is here. (Applause.) The gentleman between Sir
Anthony and Lady Kenny and my wife is Sir Edgar Williams, who was the
warden of Rhodes House when I was here back in the dark ages, and I'm
glad to see him here. (Applause.) Behind my wife is Tim Woods who
is from South Africa, and he and I shared the same stairwell at Unif
(sp) 100 years ago. (Laughter.)

And next to Tim are three Rhodes Scholars in my party:
my classmate, the Secretary of Labor Bob Reich -- (applause) -- my
valued staff member, Mr. George Stephanopoulos -- (applause) -- and
my military aide -- this is her last trip with me; she's going off to
rise to the top of the Air Force -- Major Michelle Johnson.
(Applause.) Next to Mr. Reich is maybe the most important person of
all, the man I met every day in the lodge at Unif, (sp) -- Douglas
Millen. (Applause.)

I left Oxford in 1970, and I came back once briefly in
1973. And then Hillary and I spent Christmas week and New Year's in
England in 1978 after I had been elected Governor. Well, I was
feeling fairly significant at the time -- (laughter) -- and so I went
back to my old college, thinking they would think I had done
something good. And the first person I saw was Douglas, who said,
"Clinton, I hear you've been elected king of someplace with three men
and a dog." (Laughter.) I'm sure all of you will have some similar
memory of this wonderful place when you leave here. (Laughter.) It
has a way of building you up and deflating you at the same time.

Let me say to all of you, I'm delighted to see you here.
I asked for an opportunity to see the Americans who were in
residence. I'm gratified that you came out in such good numbers, and
I hope I'll have a chance to shake hands with as many of you as
possible, so I want to give only very brief remarks. But I would
like to reiterate a point I made inside just a moment ago.

I have been now in this wonderful place at various times
over the last 26 years almost. I have seen very many different
things happen in the world. I've seen the mood, the spirit of our
people up and down, divided and united. But I just want to make this
point: I've been through one of the most moving experiences of my
life in the last few days, having the great honor of representing the
United States at the 50th anniversary first of the Allied invasions
of Italy and then of D-Day, an event which literally was the pivot
point of the 20th century.
when you go home, but for the spirit that you can bring back to the common enterprise which must always be democracy. We need that.

I'm glad you're here. I hope you have half as much fun as I did. (Laughter.) I hope you have twice as much, but if you do you might not ever come home. (Laughter.) And you just remember, when you do come home, that's what we need. Make the people of this country believe again. Stay friends with England. We'll always need a partnership with Britain, but most of all, we need the belief that we can make a difference.

God bless you, and thank you for coming out today.

(Applause.)
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For: ML Donald Baer
From: Fouad Ajami

Don, Don, here are some thoughts. I am at home in NYC if you need me.

212-678-4843 (phone)

Fouad

Fonex
202-456-5709
The United Nations is a year short of its fiftieth anniversary. Imperfect, its still universal inheritance bequeathed us by leaders who in the midst of war and its wreckage could still dream and plan for a better international order of nations. The founders of this world body knew what had befallen their world in the inter-war years; order had broken down, aggressor nations had risen, vengeance and retribution were everywhere. They were determined to do better, they were determined to give us a system of collective security, to put an end to the rule of self-help and the law of the jungle. This world body had pride of place in the post-war world they sought to build. Standing here today, I think of the great and buoyant spirit of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and of the place he gave the United Nations in his scheme of things. His heart and vision, bigger than illness and approaching death, he wanted to spare us --generations to come--the descent to chaos his generation had witnessed, the tearing asunder of the fabric of civilized life. So tenacious, so generous was Roosevelt's vision of the United Nations that he had in mind a second career in retirement, working with the United Nations Organization, conveniently located in New York City, holding forth at his home in Hyde Park New York, giving advice to younger leaders, who would come up the Hudson to visit with him.

That dream of idyllic retirement was not to be, but the larger public dream that animated Roosevelt and his partners and saw them through a devastating war endures. The world over, in the west and in the post-colonial world of Afro-Asia alike, men and women born at or about the time the United Nations itself was born now dispose of enormous power, command the destinies of nations. This is our time and our challenge, a sacred, generational responsibility we cannot duck or let slip. If our burden is great, if the weight of what we have to carry seems unduly heavy, we should think of all we are spared, all that is now behind us. The battles of the cold war have receded, and good riddance to all that. The fights of colonialism and anti-colonialism belong to the past. The legitimate quest for self-determination, for the sovereign equality of nations, is enshrined in our practice as it should be. The ideological wars that hit the United Nations in the 1970s, the fights between the first and the third worlds which turned the United Nations into a gladiators arena a generation ago, are not our fights today. It's not quite farewell to arms yet, but ours is an order of nations that old habits cannot comprehend or deal with.

Yesterday's bi-polar order of nations has lapsed into history, it has given way to a genuine balance of power and resources and responsibility. Asia has risen, it has become a veritable workshop of the world, putting behind it the poverty of times past. A democratic wave, irresistible and relentless, fed by the sacrifices and yearnings of so many who never gave up the fight, has remade and revitalized Latin America. The world of Islam has been reawakened and its proud people who enrich modern civilization with their genius and their crafts will not be...
denied their place in the sun. Old parts of Europe that had been caught between the grindstones of the Cold War have sprung to life and beyond the old walls they now grow free economies that work, for open democratic politics. It hasn't been easy, this politics of rebirth, this regeneration. And let us face it, it hasn't always been pretty, but we can take pride, we can find great comfort and hope, in the courage and fidelity of the democratic reformers in many former communist lands.

Some tell us that we have replaced the wars of ideology with civilizational wars, with new battle lines along religious and racial frontiers. They summon us to the ramparts to take up arms as standard bearers of civilizations at war. They tell us that democracy is the way and the habit of a small segment of the world, that democracy will not travel and will not flourish in distant places and climates, that authoritarianism and blind obedience and cruelty are the lot of the majority of mankind. Their logic is not ours. The battle lines we see are drawn between reason on one side and extremism on the other, between pluralism and self-defeating intolerance, between moderation and ruin. We cannot give in to the call of blood and soil nationalisms that have arisen in some parts of the world, offering the bewildered the false panaceas of demigods and the deadly gift of revenge for old furies and hurts. So much of our work will have been in vain if we celebrate the passing of the cold war only to see the rise of dark nationalisms with their pursuit of ethnic cleansing and settlement of historical scores. This new order of nations will have been compromised and sullied beyond redemption if we allow such forces to prevail.

As for the democratic nations of the world, the pursuit of democracy in fragile settings, its spread and promotion, is no idle crusade or luxury. Nor is such a cause a cover for intervening in other lands, imposing on them our ways. We think of democracy, of humane rule, as a universal human aspiration. As Americans we have always believed that a democratic international order was essential to our peace and commerce and prosperity. Democracies, we know, are reluctant to wage war; they don't send their people scurrying in fear to distant lands and shores. Democracies, we know, create wealth where dictatorships appropriate it and mis-appropriate it and grind down their people.

This is the third time this century that nations have been given the chance to construct new global orders in the aftermath of great upheavals. The first turning point came in 1919. The leaders of that time sensed that old habits will not see them through, that the old obsessions with territories and frontiers and the balance of power will have to yield to new ways. But the past was vengeful and it won; ruin overtook the world in no time. The second great transformation came in 1945, and its legacy was a mixed one. Left we yearn for that vaunted stability of the cold war, we must remember all its waste and sacrifices. We must remember that its long nuclear peace was an armed peace.
This third moment of this century, our moment, our trust, will test our inventiveness and our resolve. It will test, as never before, the ability of a generation to do its sacred work, its sacred duty—that of bequeathing those who come after it, a world that is intact and sane, a world better and safer and more noble than its own.

Democratic

and free
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build for themselves. This is our generation's fundamental obligation and its greatest
opportunity

America promotes democratic forms of government and free market economies not only
because history teaches us that they are the fastest road to progress. We promote them
because their growth is in our national interest. Democracies make for stability. They are
reluctant to wage war but ready to check the ambitions of would-be tyrants and
aggressors. They make room for free markets to grow. They provide people with the
economic opportunities that encourage them to build their own nations -- and not flee for
the borders. And they promote human rights, strengthening civil society within their
boundaries and beyond.

Reaching this goal requires patient and persistent application of the tools of world affairs:
diplomacy, economic power, alliances and military force.

HAITI
Today, in Haiti, twenty-five members of this Assembly are engaged in a just and humane
cause. Under Security Council Resolution 940, a multinational coalition led by the United
States has been authorized to remove from power Haiti's illegitimate military leaders and
restore that nation's democratically elected government. The shared resolve of the
coalition, backed by the certainty that military force would be used, if necessary, has
enabled us to take the first steps toward that goal in a climate of cooperation, not
confrontation.

The operation proceeds well, if not always smoothly. Haiti's military leaders, its armed
forces and its police have grown more cooperative. But let there be no doubt. After three
years of efforts by the United Nations and two American Administrations, General Cedras will cede power no later than October 15. Security Council Resolution 940 will be carried out.

In the weeks ahead, we will continue to work closely with President Aristide and his advisers to establish an atmosphere in which free elections may again be held and where democratic institutions can mature. As the leader of the multinational force, the United States will continue to consult regularly with the Secretary-General. We look forward to the day -- only months from now -- when the situation allows the multinational force to turn over its responsibilities to the U.N. mission, as Resolution 940 requires. The United States will provide a vastly reduced contingent of personnel to that mission; we urge other nations to do so as well.

In recent years, this Assembly and these United Nations have backed the forces of freedom by facilitating or observing democratic transitions in places as diverse as Namibia, El Salvador, Cambodia and South Africa. No change has been easy. Every newly democratic nation is fragile. We have no illusions about Haiti's future. Its people will have to muster great strength and patience to travel the road to dignity. The international community will have to do its part. But we can take great pride in our common resolve to support the Haitian people's aspirations for liberty, and our shared belief that no nation has a monopoly on freedom or opportunity.
IV. Structures and Actions

But like the founders of the United Nations, we recognize that pooling the talents and resources of many nations is often a better way to achieve our goals. The United States has neither the resources, the ability nor the desire to be the world's policeman, its all-purpose relief agency, or chief trade negotiator. But we will take the lead in multinational efforts when the conditions are right -- when our interests are plain, the cause is good, the mission is achievable and the nations of the world stand with us.

The leaders who drafted the U.N. charter and met at Bretton Woods understood these central truth: that defeating the foes of peace and freedom in the short term was not enough. That responding only after crises occurred was a strategy doomed to failure. That they had to build structures that would help prevent political crises and build strong economies -- structures strong enough to endure but flexible enough to adapt to new realities. And that no structure could stand unless its words were backed by deeds.

Today those structures are being tested as never before. They have been forced to contend with the "traditional" threats of ethnic conflicts and coups. But the end of the Cold War has brought into stark relief the so-called "transnational" threats -- challenges like overpopulation or deforestation that know no borders. And we have learned that institutions must produce real benefits for their members and citizens. Now we must balance diplomacy and power with structures that are capable of constant renewal.

A. The United Nations

Never before have the United States and the United Nations been in a better position to advance this goal. The end of the Cold War has freed this organization from the divisions
that paralyzed it all too often. As age-old conflicts in South Africa and the Middle East have begun to give way to justice and peace, decades of loud ideological wars are waning.

No organization offers us a better second chance than the United Nations. The end of the Cold War has removed the artificial obstacle that stopped almost every important initiative dead in its tracks. The rising recognition of transnational threats and decreasing budgets at home have forced all nations to take a new look at multilateral cooperation. The United Nations has taken on the world's toughest problems -- aiding refugees, battling AIDS, helping to contain ethnic strife, stopping deserts from expanding -- and still it survives.

My nation's commitment to the United Nations is deep and long-standing. We are its leading founding member, host nation, and single largest contributor. Over the years American personnel have proudly participated in countless United Nations missions, from Korea to Kashmir [TK]; today they serve in seven separate peacekeeping operations around the world. In the past year we have helped provide the U.N. Situation Center with the resources it needs to monitor and direct its peacekeeping missions around the world. And I am very happy to report that -- thanks to support in our Congress, and as I promised to you last year -- we will make good on our outstanding peacekeeping bills early next month.

We are pleased that the United Nations has responded to our call to establish an Office of Internal Oversight Services. Now we must make that office an effective force for change. It will be difficult, unglamorous work, as we have learned here in the United States from our own efforts to "reinvent government." But it is necessary if we are to restore lost faith in the organization, distribute financial burdens more evenly, and ask the U.N. to take on new tasks.
Today I ask the members of this Assembly to seriously consider two initiatives that my country strongly supports.

In the past year, sudden, massive refugee flows and horrible ethnic conflicts have severely tested our capacity to react quickly to humanitarian catastrophes. Images of Rwandans fleeing across borders to escape a blood bath have filled our newspapers and television screens. Problems are less visible, but no less deadly, elsewhere. In Angola, 1,000 children (TK) are dying every day from starvation and disease. From the borders of Thailand to the valleys of Mozambique, huge refugee camps cry out for our attention. And in the Horn of Africa, some 20 million people may face famine this year. Where people live in constant fear, are divorced from their homes or desperate for food, thoughts of progress and democracy can find few roots.

In all these situations, the world relies on changing combinations of private groups that are strapped for cash and international agencies that are slow to react. These groups deserve our thanks and praise, as does the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, which has done a tremendous job under the most difficult circumstances. But too often the solution of last resort has been United States armed forces, who lack the training and resources for the task. Argentine President Carlos Menem has suggested forming a U.N.-based rapid response corps for humanitarian crises. The United States supports this conception -- and I urge the Security Council at its January (TK) meeting to move quickly to solve the questions of funding and organizations that stand in the way of the corps' creation. Establishing this corps would be a fine legacy for our generation to leave behind.

This great Assembly was built on the proposition that, for all that separates us, we are united by a basic belief in the value of peace and human life. Just as member nations are
capable of noble endeavors, the continuing carnage in places like Bosnia and Rwanda demonstrates that the Cold War's end has not brought a halt to our capacity for crimes against humanity. Some crimes are so heinous that we have a responsibility to do everything within our power to prevent them and, if necessary, to punish their perpetrators. If nothing else, establishing a standing United Nations War Crimes Tribunal might give some of the world's tyrants a reason to pause before they torture and butcher those who defy their edicts or express their opinions.

B. Economic institutions

Let me now reach outside the United Nations and speak in more detail about two of our generation's most pressing responsibilities: preparing our citizens for the 21st century economy and protecting our people from the deadly combination of terrorism, crime and weapons of mass destruction.

Today we are facing a rapidly moving, ever expanding global economy. As we move forward, we must make certain to create and nurture new free market economies, which provide the most fertile ground for opportunity and freedom. And we must adapt today's financial institutions to the times ahead.

On the one hand, the newly open and competitive world enriches us. It spurs us to innovate and forces us to compete. It connects us with new customers and produces new jobs. But at the same time, this rapidly-changing economy produces fear and uncertainty. Governments are subject to international economic trends and developments they cannot control. From America to Europe's more mature democracies and beyond, once-secure individuals struggle with uncertainty. In turn, demagogues and extremists exploit their fears; they preach nativism and counsel intolerance.
This dilemma demands that every country seek to expand opportunities for its citizens while taking steps to renew peoples' faith in diversity. Our international tasks are equally daunting. We must begin the difficult process of defining and renewing the architecture of the 21st century economy. And we must build structures that will produce real, tangible benefits for our people.

In the year past we have seen the possibilities. Though still in its infancy, the North American Free Trade Agreement has produced hundreds of thousands of jobs and offered a model to nations throughout the Americas. The GATT treaty -- which I urge our Congress to pass before it adjourns -- holds the promise of increased exports, higher wages and improved living standards for scores of nations. And we have launched a new cooperative economic forum for the nations of the Pacific rim.

In this, their 50th anniversary year, it seems only natural that we reexamine and adapt the institutions born at Bretton Woods. Establishing the World Trade Organization -- a smart and far-reaching successor to GATT -- gives us a promising start. Now we must examine the World Bank and the globe's other lenders. In our efforts to revise and update these organizations, we should ask three critical questions. Will this change enhance the growth of free markets and private enterprise? Is the loan or program designed to produce sustainable development in the receiving nation? And how can this structure produce more and better benefits for the citizens it intends to serve? If we follow these guidelines, our efforts are more likely to yield positive, concrete results.

C. Proliferation/terrorism
In the year to come, let us also resolve to form a global partnership to continue our never-ending quest to protect human life. The tense nuclear standoff between the superpowers is over but the dangers of the nuclear age are not.

In my address to this Assembly last year, I laid out a long agenda of action to help stop the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. We have made some progress since: our efforts in the Security Council have, for the moment, halted North Korea's dangerous production of weapons-grade material. In June the United States and Russia signed an agreement to shut down our remaining plutonium producing reactors by the year 2000. And this Assembly agreed that we should seek a treaty [TK] to halt production of fissile materials.

Now we must move forward. Today I once again call on all nations, including my own, to ratify quickly the Chemical Weapons Convention [TK] so that it may enter into force by January, as expected. I also renew my call for all nations to suspend nuclear testing. I have extended the United States moratorium on nuclear testing; we will redouble our efforts in Geneva to conclude negotiations on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. And I urge all nations to join us in seeking indefinite extension of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty when we meet in April. The NPT is the cornerstone of our long-standing efforts to control the spread of nuclear weapons.

Taking all these steps, ratifying all these treaties, will not be enough, as we have learned in the past year. We have discovered what is certainly the most unpredictable, and may soon be the most dangerous, threat to all of our nations -- the theft and trafficking of plutonium and uranium that could be used to build nuclear weapons.
This threat is terrifying and ironic. The remarkable progress we have made toward nuclear disarmament now provides criminals with opportunities to steal or buy nuclear materials as weapons are dismantled. The extraordinary, positive changes in the former Soviet Union have scattered nuclear materials through several newly independent states. And in many countries making the transition to market economies, organized crime has set down strong roots. Add to these disturbing trends the fact that the amount of plutonium needed to build an explosive nuclear device is no bigger than a can of soda, and it should be clear that mere vigilance is not enough. No country can consider itself safe -- as recent reports of police seizing nuclear materials smuggled through Europe attest.

As a nuclear power, the United States has a special obligation to ensure the security of nuclear materials. We have already taken strong steps to prevent these nightmare scenarios from becoming real. We worked hard to convince Belarus, Ukraine and Kazakhstan to join the NPT and ship their nuclear weapons back to Russia to be dismantled. We are helping finance construction of a storage facility for fissile materials in Russia, and are working to improve that nation's control and accounting procedures. We have dispatched law enforcement specialists to Europe, increased cooperation with Russian and German agencies, engaged in joint anti-terrorist training, and opened a Moscow office of our Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Our response to this threat will soon give birth to a new transnational structure. Under the leadership of the F.B.I., we are planning to open a law enforcement training academy in Central Europe. It will train police drawn from many nations to deal more effectively with the trafficking of nuclear weapons components, adapting techniques used today to fight drug trafficking, organized crime and money laundering. Similar academies could be set up in other regions, with police instructors drawn from around the world.
No nation or small group of nations can respond adequately to these threats. The answer lies, instead, in a new, unprecedented form of international cooperation in law enforcement. That is why today the United States offers to host a world-wide conference next spring that will focus on breaking the nexus between terrorists, organized crime and the smuggling of nuclear materials. Over time this conference could lead to new, cooperative and regular structures to combat international criminals. In the meantime, we must act.

V. Conclusion

The goals and plans that I have discussed today are neither small nor unambitious. But our generation must take responsibility and make its choices.

History has given us a rare opportunity -- the chance to form a world in which democracy, tolerance and free markets know no boundaries but nations can rest easy that their borders will always be secure. The chance to build a world not without conflict, but in which conflict can be contained. A world not without inequality, but in which opportunity can expand. A world not with repression, but in which freedom can grow. We have the opportunity to consolidate the victories of generation that came before us and expand on their dreams.

We must not be complacent. If we move timidly, history will judge us as it judged those who preached isolationism between the World Wars. But if we move boldly, we will meet the standard set by the architects who brought the United Nations to life. Those leaders understood the gap between promised behavior and reality. But they also understood the perils of missed opportunities and failed responsibility.
Living up to these responsibilities will be as difficult as our ambitions are large.

The challenges our generation faces are far different than those our parents found. They are problems that, in many cases, lack pressing drama. Even the most dramatic demand quiet, careful solutions. They will not yield easily. If we meet them well, our reward will not be stunning moments of glory, but gradual improvement in people's lives. And if we succeed in preventing crises before they occur, our triumphs will be silent: disasters that never materialize, states that don't collapse, bombs that never explode, people never forced from their homes.

Finding these solutions will require enormous patience. We must focus on our goal of spreading democracy and the values that make it thrive. We must celebrate when it takes root, and help people try again when it fails. We must adjust to the fact that transnational threats -- overpopulation, environmental decay and lack of education -- cannot be tackled one at a time, so our progress will be even slower than we expect. We must recognize that centuries of ethnic hatred will not disappear in months or years. As one of our nation's most famous delegates to the United Nations, Ralph Bunche, once said: "It is only by patience, persistent, undismayed effort, by trial and error, that peace can be won." We must be steadfast. We must never turn back. We must never give up.

In our time, the success of democracy will depend on the capacity of peoples and nations to develop and consolidate traditions of civility and tolerance, and our ability to nurture a culture of pluralism. There are positive signs everywhere we look: a German President visit Poland's shrine to the victims of World War II, Israelis, Jordanians and Palestinians live side by side, Protestant and Catholic abandon their feud, the French invite German tanks to roll up the Champs Elysee, and in South Africa, the black majority rules. There is evidence that people around the world are summoning what my nation's greatest healer,
Abraham Lincoln, called "the better angels of our nature." Every day more and more people speak their own dialect of democracy.

Our job, as Americans and as members of the United Nations, is to provide windows of opportunity, a breathing space for those with ambitions. Our task is to work with them, not impose upon them; to offer assistance while they build their own societies and to establish relationships based on shared recognition and respect. In so doing we advance our strategic interests and validate our democratic values. But the people themselves must learn never to deny to others the justice and opportunity they demand for themselves. They must summon the civil courage to secure the gains of freedom for which so many sacrificed so much.

Individuals and nations must be free to discover -- through trial and error -- the solutions that work best for themselves. As the historian Orlando Patterson has observed: freedom means more than escape from tyranny. It means the opportunity to realize one's greatest potential. It is the responsibility of our generation -- and the mission of the United Nations -- to shape and protect the civil, tolerant and democratic societies that can make that ideal real.

As President Truman said, "I believe that we must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way."
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Then overnight, coming out of the mist as in a dream, the Americans arrived, bringing us hope and strength. The price was enormous. At Anzio, Nettuno, no one and no place was safe. German guns and airpower made every last person here a combatant, every cook and baker, every driver and mechanic, every doctor, nurse, and chaplain. But amid the horror of the guns something rare was born, a driving spirit of common cause."

The late General Ernest Harmon, Commander of the 1st Armored Division, put it well when he said, “All of us were in the same boat. We were there to stay or die. I have never seen anything like it in the two world wars of my experience, a confidence in unity, an unselfish willingness to help one another.” That spirit is known as brotherhood, and that is why the statue behind us is called “Brothers in Arms.”

Our duty is to preserve the memory of that spirit, memories like that of Private Robert Mulroney. On February 7, 1944, his brother, Private Eugene Mulroney, lay wounded in the field hospital. Robert was visiting when they heard the sound of planes overhead. As the bombs fell, Robert threw his body on top of his wounded brother. He saved his brother’s life, even as he gave his own.

Italy’s devastation then seemed total. I have been told a story by my cousin about my own father, who served here in Italy. Back home, his niece had heard about the beautiful Italian countryside and wrote him asking for a single leaf from one of the glorious trees here to take to school. My father had only sad news to send back: There were no leaves; every one had been stripped by the fury of the battle.

The battle for Italy, as Mr. Shirley so eloquently said, hastened Hitler’s demise. It cemented the alliance, supported by the British, the French, the Canadians, free Poles, and New Zealanders. The battle here pulled German troops away from other fronts. It yielded vital lessons that helped to win the day at Normandy. It inspired the Italian Resistance, as the President has said. Along the way, the Italians took up their rightful place as loyal allies, and they have remained there ever since, through these 50 years.
The spirit of common cause did not die here. A generation of Americans went back home to carry on their work. There was a platoon leader from Kansas savagely wounded in combat; an anti-aircraft commander from South Carolina who fought in Corsica; a Hawaiian lieutenant who lost his arm while in the war's only American fighting force of Japanese ancestry; a coastguardsman from a young American who came of age here, each an American patriot who went home to build up our Nation. We honor what they have given to America in the United States Senate as we honor what they did for us here. Thank you, gentlemen.

Fifty years later, we can see the difference their generation has made. America is strong; freedom is on the march. Here in Italy, the glorious trees, like the country, have been restored to life.

Too many Americans do not know what that generation did. Somewhere in America a child rummaging in an attic may find a war medal or a black and white photo of a younger but familiar face in uniform. Yet we cannot leave memory to chance. We must recall Elie Wiesel's commandment to fight forgetfulness. And we must apply it to the valor as much as to the horror, for to honor we must remember.

And then we must go forward, for our job is not only to praise their deeds but to pursue their dreams, not only to recall their sacrifices for freedom but to renew freedom's promise once again.

We are the sons and daughters of the world they saved. Now our moment for common cause has come. It is up to us to ensure a world of peace and prosperity for yet another generation.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters in Rome
June 3, 1994

The Economy

The President. As all of you know, we got some good news from the homefront today. The unemployment rate has dropped almost a half a point to 6 percent. We now know that over 3.3 million new jobs have come into the economy in the last 16 months. The economy is creating jobs at 7 times the rate of the previous 4 years. I think this is most of all a tribute to the American people, but clearly supports the wisdom of the economic strategy we have been following: a determined effort to bring the deficit down, to get investment in education and training and new technologies up, to expand trade.

We have to stay on this course. We have to pass this new budget. We have to keep going. This is the thing which will enable us to do the other kinds of reform and renewals that we need to do in America. I am very, very encouraged.

And again, I want to say how much I appreciate the work that was done by the Congress last year in passing this tough economic program. There is no question that it spurred an enormous percentage of this activity. And I am very pleased by it.

North Korea

Q. Mr. President, have you spoken to Boris Yeltsin about the situation in North Korea?

The President. No, I have not talked to President Yeltsin or President Kim, but I will today. And I don't think I should—I have nothing to add to what I said yesterday except to tell you that I will talk to them, and after I do I'll be glad to—

Q. Do you support his proposal for an international conference on the situation?

The President. I don't want to say anything about President Yeltsin or President Kim until I talk to them today. I have to talk—

Q. [Inaudible]—say something about the United Nations, whether you think the United Nations is up on this. It has not done a very good job in Bosnia and other parts of
Statement by the Press Secretary on the President's Telephone Conversations With President Boris Yeltsin of Russia and President Kim Yong-sam of South Korea
June 3, 1994

President Clinton spoke separately today with President Yeltsin and President Kim Yong-sam of the Republic of Korea, who is currently in Moscow. The topic of both calls was the current situation in North Korea.

President Clinton told President Yeltsin that following the IAEA's report to the United Nations, the continuity of safeguards had been broken, the United States is pursuing the issue of sanctions in the United Nations Security Council. They discussed President Yeltsin's proposal that an international forum on the Korean situation be convened. President Clinton said that such a meeting might be appropriate at some point while underscoring the need first to return the North Korean nuclear issue to the United Nations Security Council. The two agreed to remain in close contact as the issue develops.

In the conversation with President Kim, both Presidents agreed that the next step is to pursue the issue of sanctions in the United Nations Security Council. President Clinton reaffirmed the United States desire for a diplomatic resolution of this issue but emphasized the United States commitment to the security of the Republic of Korea. They, too, agreed to work closely together in addressing the issue.

NOTE: This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Remarks on Arrival in the United Kingdom
June 4, 1994

Mr. Prime Minister, Hillary and I are delighted to be here. I remember well the first time I arrived in the United Kingdom. I am deeply honored to be here today representing my nation.

Fifty years ago, our two nations joined forces on the beaches of Normandy to turn back the Nazi armies that had overrun Europe. This week I have come across the Atlantic to commemorate D-Day and the many other battles of the Second World War and to honor the sacrifices borne by the war generation in all the nations.

Freedom continues to require our sacrifice and persistence. And I would like to say, on behalf of all the American people, how very sorry we are and how we offer our condolences to the loved ones of those who died in the tragic RAf helicopter accident on Thursday.

Freedom continues to require effort. When he visited the United States after World War II, Winston Churchill spoke of our two nations role in forging the post-war world. He urged the United States and Britain to walk together in majesty and peace. For he said, "It is in the years of peace that wars are prevented and that those foundations are laid upon which the noble structures of the future can be built."

I look forward to working with the Prime Minister and the British people as we work together to meet those challenges. The Prime Minister has already mentioned the many things that we will be discussing today. I am glad to be back in Great Britain, glad to be honoring the sacrifices and the triumphs of the World War II generation, glad to be about the work of honoring what they have done for us by trying to preserve the peace and the future.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:48 a.m. at the Royal Air Force station, Mildenhall. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks at the United States Cemetery in Cambridge, United Kingdom
June 4, 1994

Mr. Prime Minister and Mrs. Major, Mr. MacLean, Chaplain, Secretary Bentsen, thank you for your fine remarks. To our British hosts and to all the distinguished Americans who are also here, Members of the Congress, the administration, the Armed Forces, we have come here today, all of us, on a journey of remembrance. For some, like Secretary Bentsen, it was a journey to retrace our troops the feeling that they were not so a graduate of West Point, and told him: "If
I didn’t have the air supremacy, I wouldn’t be here.” After D-Day, the Air Corps continued to fly toward freedom’s horizon, until the entire continent was retained and a world was set free.

The victory of the generation we honor today came at a high cost. It took many lives and much perseverance. After D-Day, it took freedom another year to reach the Elbe; it took another 44 years to reach Warsaw and Prague and East Berlin. And now it has reached Kiev and Moscow and even beyond. The mission of this time is to secure and expand its reach further.

The airmen who flew these skies had a ritual that Secretary Bentsen mentioned for signaling to their comrades on the ground at the end of a mission. As they were coming in for landing, if they fired off a red flare it meant that there were casualties aboard. And if they fired off a green flare, it meant some lucky pilot had just completed his last mission before shipping out.

Well, the generation that won the Second World War completed their mission, whether they walk among us or lie among us today. And after looking down in sorrow at those who paid the ultimate price, let us lift our eyes to the skies in which they flew, the ones they once commanded. And let us send to them a signal, a signal of our own, a signal that we do remember, that we do honor, and that we shall always carry on the work of these knights borne on wings.

May God bless them and all our peoples.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 11 a.m. In his remarks, he referred to Ed Maclean, president, 9th Army Air Force Association, and Lt. Col. Johnny R. Almond, USAF, who gave the invocation. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters Following Discussions With Prime Minister John Major in North Aylesbury, United Kingdom
June 4, 1994

Prime Minister Major: Hello. Good afternoon. I suppose I should begin by apologizing to you for the D-Day weather; I’m sorry about that.

Could I also say, at the outset, that the President tonight will be able to take a question or two afterwards, that I need to be in Portsmouth very speedily, and I know the President has a night broadcast. So I’m afraid the question time will be limited.

We’ve had the opportunity, this morning, of discussions for nearly a couple of hours, and we’ll take the opportunity over the next 2 days to pursue some other matters as well. We looked at a wide range of issues. We looked forward, firstly, to the Naples Summit. We anticipate the emphasis there will be on employment, following the Detroit Jobs Conference, and we discussed some of the preliminary work that’s now in course in preparation for that conference.

We will, of course, at Naples, be welcoming President Yeltsin. And we both agree that the more stable economic and political situation in Russia at present, a better foreign policy partnership than perhaps there has been at any stage in recent years. And we had the opportunity of looking at the responsible handling we’ve seen thus far by both Russia and Ukraine of the problems that exist in the Crimea.

Self-evidently today, we spent some time discussing our joint interests in Bosnia. We are at the middle, in the midst of crucial negotiations in Geneva. The United Nations continues to seek a cessation of hostilities. At present, as you’ll know, the contact group is still meeting, pressing for settlement of territorial questions, and it’s my view, and that of the President as well, that it’s vital for all three parties in Bosnia to recognize that continued war will not advance their positions, but would continue to strain international patience.

Saying that, we must recognize what has already been achieved in Bosnia. Many feared the war would spread beyond those borders; it hasn’t done so. And I think there’s some satisfaction we can draw from the peaceful developments in much of Central Bosnia as well. We have a cease-fire there, in Sarajevo, in Gorazde, and the conflict has been contained. So far, that is good. We hope we can achieve more at the end of the contact group discussions.

The joint initiative the President and I launched in Washington seems to be success-
Every person in the democracies pitched in. Every shipbuilder who built a landing craft. Every woman who worked in a factory. Every farmer who grew food for the troops. Every miner who carved coal out of a cavern. Every child who tended a victory garden. All of them did their part. All produced things with their hands and their hearts that went into this battle. And on D-Day, all across the free world, the peoples of democracy prayed that they had done their job right. Well, they had done their job right.

And here, you, the Army Rangers, did yours. Your mission was to scale these cliffs and destroy the bowitzers at the top that threatened every Allied soldier and ship within miles. You fired grappling hooks onto the cliff tops. You waded to shore, and you began to climb up on ropes slick with sea and sand, up, as the Germans shot down and tried to cut your lines, up, sometimes holding to the cliffs with nothing but the knives you had and your own bare hands.

As the battle raged at Juno, Sword, and Gold, on Omaha and Utah, you took devastating casualties. But you also took control of these commanding heights. Around 9 a.m., two Rangers discovered the big guns hidden inland and disabled them with heat grenades. At the moment, you became the first Americans on D-Day to complete your mission.

We look at this terrain and we marvel at your fight. We look around us and we see what you were fighting for. For here are the daughters of Colonel Rudder. Here are the son and grandson of Corporal Bargmann. Here are the faces for whom you risked your lives. Here are the generations for whom you won a war. We are the children of your sacrifice. We are the sons and daughters you saved from tyranny’s reach. We grew up behind the shield of the strong alliances you forged in blood upon these beaches, on the shores of the Pacific, and in the skies above. We flourished in the nation you came home to build.

The most difficult days of your lives bought us 50 years of freedom. You did your job; now we must do ours. Let us begin by teaching our young people about the villainy that started this war and the valor that ended it. Let us carry on the work you began here. The sparks of freedom you struck on these beaches were never extinguished, even in the darkest days behind the Iron Curtain. Five years ago the miracle of liberation was repeated as the rotting timbers of communism came tumbling down.

Now we stand at the start of a new day. The Soviet empire is gone. So many people who fought as our partners in this war, the Russians, the Poles, and others, now stand again as our partners in peace and democracy. Our work is far from done. Still there are cliffs to scale. We must work to contain the world’s most deadly weapons, to expand the reach of democracy. We must keep ready arms and strong alliances. We must have strong families and cohesive societies and educated citizens and vibrant, open, economies that promote cooperation, not conflict.

And if we should ever falter, we need only remember you at this spot 50 years ago and you, again, at this spot today. The flame of your youth became freedom’s lamp, and we see its light reflected in your faces still and in the faces of your children and grandchildren.

We commit ourselves, as you did, to keep that lamp burning for those who will follow. You completed your mission here. But the mission of freedom goes on; the battle continues. The “longest day” is not yet over.

God bless you, and God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:45 a.m. In his remarks, he referred to Gen. William A. Downing, USA, commander in chief, U.S. Special Operations Command, and D-Day veteran Richard Hathaway, president, Ranger Battalions Association of World War II, who introduced the President.

Remarks on the 50th Anniversary of D-Day at Utah Beach in Normandy
June 6, 1994

Thank you. Thank you very much, General Talbott, Secretary Perry, Secretary Brown. Let me begin by asking all the veterans here present, their families, their friends, the people from France who have been wonderful hosts to us, to acknowledge those who worked so hard to make these D-Day ceremonies a great success: General Joullvan, the SAC here, and his European command,
2,700 members of Armed Forces who worked to put these events together, and the Secretary of the Army's World War II commemorative committee, General Mick Kicklighter and all of his committee. Let's give them a big hand; they have done a wonderful job. [Applause]

My fellow Americans, we have gathered to remember those who stormed this beach for freedom who never came home. We pay tribute to what a whole generation of heroes won here. But let us also recall what was lost here. We must never forget that thousands of people gave everything they were, or what they might have become, so that freedom might live.

The loss along this coastline numbs us still. In one U.S. company alone, 197 of 205 men were slaughtered in just 10 minutes. Hundreds of young men died before they could struggle 20 feet into the red-tinged tide. Thousands upon thousands of American, Canadian, and British troops were killed or wounded on one brutal day.

But in the face of that mayhem emerged the confident clarity born of relentless training and the guiding light of a just cause. Here at Utah Beach, with the Army's 4th Division in the lead, the Allies unleashed their democratic fury on the Nazi armies.

So many of them landed in the wrong place; they found their way. When one commanding officer, Russell "Red" Reeder, discovered the error, he said, "It doesn't matter. We know where to go."

Here to help point the way were the fighters of the French Resistance. We must never forget how much those who lived under the Nazi fist did to make D-Day possible. For the French, D-Day was the 1,453d day of their occupation. Throughout all those terrible days, people along this coast kept faith. Whether gathering intelligence, carving out escape routes for Allied soldiers or destroying enemy supply lines, they, too, kept freedom's flame alive with a terrible price.

Thousands were executed. Thousands more died in concentration camps. Oh, the loved ones of all who died, no matter what their nationality, they all feel a loss that cannot be captured in these statistics. Only one number matters: the husband who can never be replaced, the best friend who never came home, the father who never played with his child again.

One of those fathers who died on D-Day had written a letter home to his wife and their daughter barely a month before the invasion. He said, "I sincerely pray that if you fail to hear from me for a while you will recall the words of the Gospel: 'A little while and you shall not see me, and again a little while, and you shall see me.' But in your thoughts I shall always be, and you in mine." He was right. They must always be in our thoughts.

To honor them, we must remember.

The people of this coast understand. Just beyond this beach is the town of Ste. Mère Église. There brave American paratroopers floated into a tragic ambush on D-Day, and there the survivors rallied to complete their mission. The mayor's wife, Simone Renaud, wrote the families of the Americans who had fought and died to free her village. And she kept on writing them every week for the rest of her life until she died just 6 years ago. Her son, Henri-Jean Renaud, carries on her vigil now. And he has vowed never to forget, saying, "I will dedicate myself to the memory of their sacrifice for as long as I live."

We must do no less. We must carry on the work of those who did not return and those who did. We must turn the pain of loss into the power of redemption so that 50 or 100 or 1,000 years from now, those who bought our liberty with their lives will never be forgotten.

To those of you who have survived and come back to this hallowed ground, let me say that the rest of us know that the most difficult days of your lives brought us 50 years of freedom.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:12 a.m. In his remarks, he referred to Lt. Gen. Orwin C. Talbott, USA (Ret.), president, Society of 1st Infantry Division, and Gen. George A. Joulwan, USA, Supreme Allied Commander, Europe.
Remarks on the 50th Anniversary of
D-Day at the United States Cemetery
In Colleville-sur-Mer, France
June 6, 1994

Mr. Dawson, you did your men proud today. General Shalikashvili, Mr. Cronkite, Chaplain, distinguished leaders of our Gov-
ernment, Members of Congress, members of the armed services, our hosts from France, and most of all, our veterans, their families,
and their friends:

In these last days of ceremonies, we have heard wonderful words of tribute. Now we come to this hallowed place that speaks,
more than anything else, in silence. Here on this quiet plateau, on this small piece of American soil, we honor those who gave their lives for us 50 crowded years ago.

Today, the beaches of Normandy are calm. If you walk these shores on a summer’s day, all you might hear is the laughter of children playing
on the sand or the cry of seagulls overhead or perhaps the ringing of a distant church bell, the simple sounds of freedom barely breaking the silence, peaceful silence, ordinary silence.

But June 6th, 1944, was the least ordinary day of the century. On that chilled dawn, these beaches echoed with the sounds of staccato gunfire, the roar of aircraft, the thunder of bombardment. And through the wind and the waves came the soldiers, out of their landing craft and into the water, away from their youth and toward a savage place many of them would sadly never leave. They had come to free a continent, the Americans, the British, the Canadians, the Poles, the French Resistance, the Norwegians, and others; they had all come to stop one of the greatest forces of evil the world has ever known.

As news of the invasion broke back home in America, people held their breath. In Boston, commuters stood reading the news on the electric sign at South Station. In New York, the Statue of Liberty, its torch blacked out since Pearl Harbor, was lit at sunset for 15 minutes. And in Newcastle, Pennsylvania, a young mother named Pauline Elliot wrote to her husband, Frank, a corporal in the Army, “D-Day has arrived. The first thought of all of us was a prayer.”

Below us are the beaches where Corporal Elliot’s battalion and so many other Americans landed, Omaha and Utah, proud names from America’s heartland, part of the biggest gamble of the war, the greatest crusade, yes, the longest day.

During those first hours on bloody Omaha, nothing seemed to go right. Landing craft were ripped apart by mines and shells. Tanks sent to protect them had sunk, drowning their crews. Enemy fire raked the invaders as they stepped into chest-high water and waded past the floating bodies of their comrades. And as the stunned survivors of the first wave huddled behind a seawall, it seemed the invasion might fail.

Hitler and his followers had bet on it. They were sure the Allied soldiers were soft, weakened by liberty and leisure, by the mingling of races and religion. They were sure their totalitarian youth had more discipline and zeal.

But then something happened. Although many of the American troops found themselves without officers on unfamiliar ground, next to soldiers they didn’t know, one by one they got up. They inched forward, and together, in groups of threes and fives and tens, the sons of democracy improvised and mounted their own attacks. At that exact moment on these beaches, the forces of freedom turned the tide of the 20th century.

These soldiers knew that staying put meant certain death. But they were also driven by the voice of free will and responsibility, nurtured in Sunday schools, town halls, and sandlot ballgames, the voice that told them to stand up and move forward, saying, “You can do it. And if you don’t, no one else will.” And as Captain Joe Dawson led his company up this bluff, and as others followed his lead, they secured a foothold for freedom.

Today many of them are here among us. Oh, they may walk with a little less spring in their step, and their ranks are growing thinner, but let us never forget; when they were young, these men saved the world. And so let us now ask them, all the veterans of the Normandy campaign, to stand if they can and be recognized. [Applause]

The freedom they fought for was no abstract concept, it was the stuff of their daily lives. Listen to what Frank Elliot had written
to his wife from the embarkation point in England: "I miss hamburgers à la Coney Island, American beer à la Duquesne, American shows à la Penn Theater, and American girls à la you." Pauline Elliot wrote back on June 6th, as she and their one-year-old daughter listened on the radio, "Little DeRonda is the only one not affected by D-Day news. I hope and pray she will never remember any of this, but only the happiness of the hours that will follow her daddy's homecoming step on the porch."

Well, millions of our GI's did return home from that war to build up our nations and enjoy life's sweet pleasures. But on this field there are 9,386 who did not: 33 pairs of brothers, a father and his son, 11 men from tiny Bedford, Virginia, and Corporal Frank Elliot, killed near these bluffs by a German shell on D-Day. They were the fathers we never knew, the uncles we never met, the friends who never returned, the heroes we can never repay. They gave us our world. And those simple sounds of freedom we hear today are their voices speaking to us across the years.

At this place, let us honor all the Americans who lost their lives in World War II. Let us remember, as well, that over 40 million human beings from every side perished: soldiers on the field of battle, Jews in the ghettos and death camps, civilians ravaged by shell fire and famine. May God give rest to all their souls.

Fifty years later, what a different world we live in. Germany, Japan, and Italy, liberated by our victory, now stand among our closest allies and the staunchest defenders of freedom. Russia, decimated during the war and frozen afterward in communism and cold war, has been reborn in democracy. And as freedom rings from Prague to Kiev, the liberation of this continent is nearly complete.

Now the question falls to our generation: How will we build upon the sacrifice of D-Day's heroes? Like the soldiers of Omaha Beach, we cannot stand still. We cannot stay safe by doing so. Avoiding today's problems would be our own generation's appeasements. For just as freedom has a price, it also has a purpose, and its name is progress. Today, our mission is to expand freedom's reach forward; to test the full potential of each of our own citizens; to strengthen our families, our faith, and our communities; to fight indifference and intolerance; to keep our Nation strong; and to light the lives of those still dwelling in the darkness of undemocratic rule. Our parents did that and more; we must do nothing less. They struggled in war so that we might strive in peace.

We know that progress is not inevitable. But neither was victory upon these beaches. Now, as then, the inner voice tells us to stand up and move forward. Now, as then, free people must choose.

Fifty years ago, the first Allied soldiers to land here in Normandy came not from the sea but from the sky. They were called Pathfinders, the first paratroopers to make the jump. Deep in the darkness, they descended upon these fields to light beacons for the airborne assaults that would soon follow. Now, near the dawn of a new century, the job of lighting those beacons falls to our hands.

To you who brought us here, I promise we will be the new pathfinders, for we are the children of your sacrifice.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:58 p.m. In his remarks, he referred to Walter Cronkite, master of ceremonies, and Maj. Gen. Matthew A. Zimmerman, USA, Chief of Chaplains.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Iraq
June 6, 1994

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President.)

Consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution (Public Law 102-1), and as part of my effort to keep the Congress fully informed, I am reporting on the status of efforts to obtain Iraq's compliance with the resolutions adopted by the U.N. Security Council.

It remains our judgment that the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has effectively disbanded the Iraqi nuclear weapons program at least for the near term. The United Nations has destroyed Iraqi missile launchers, support facilities, and a good deal of Iraq's indigenous capability to manufacture prohibited missiles. The U.N. Special Commission on Iraq (UNSCOM) teams have
should burn forever brightly in the hearts of all the people of France and the United States of America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:19 p.m. in the Salle des Fetes at the Elysée Palace. In his remarks, he referred to Danielle Mitterrand, wife of President Mitterrand; Marie Joseph Balladur, wife of Prime Minister Balladur; and U.S. Ambassador to France Pamela Harriman.

Statement on Assistance to California
June 7, 1994

Californians have been working extraordinarily hard to get their homes, their businesses, and their lives back to normal. This is creating unexpected and unprecedented needs, and their lives back to normal. Their feet remains strong and unwavering. [Laughter]

NOTE: The President's statement was included in a statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the President's request to Congress for additional funds to assist the State of California in the wake of the earthquake earlier this year.

Remarks on Receiving a Doctorate in Civil Law from Oxford University in Oxford, United Kingdom
June 8, 1994

Thank you very much, Chancellor, distinguished members of the university community. I must say that it was quite easy for me to take the chancellor's gentle ribbing about the Presidency, since he is probably the only chancellor of this great university ever to have written a biography of an American President. I thank you for your biography of President Truman and for your leadership and for honoring me.

You know, as I walked today through the streets of Oxford with my wife and with my classmate, now the Secretary of Labor in our administration, Mr. Reich, who is here, it seemed almost yesterday when I first came here. And I remembered when I walked in this august building today how I always felt a mixture of elation and wariness, bordering on intimidation, in your presence. I thought if there was one place in the world I could come and give a speech in the proper language, it was here, and then I heard the degree ceremony. [Laughter] And sure enough, once again at Oxford I was another Yank a half step behind. [Laughter]

This week the world has taken a profound journey of remembrance. Here in Great Britain, in the United States and France and Italy, all around the world we have reflected on a time when the sheer will of freedom's forces changed the course of this century.

Many of you in this room, including my good friend, the former warden of Rhodes House, Sir Edgar Williams, who is here with me today, played a major role in that great combat. It was a great privilege and honor for me to represent the United States in paying tribute to all the good people who fought and won World War II, an experience I have never had the like of and one which has profoundly deepened my own commitment to the work the people of the United States have entrusted to me.

I am also deeply honored by this degree you have bestowed on me, as well as the honorary fellowship I received from my college today. I must say that, as my wife pointed out, I could have gotten neither one of these things on my own. [Laughter] I had to be elected President to do it—with her help. Indeed, it was suggested on the way over here that if women had been eligible for the Rhodes Scholarship in 1968, I might be on my way home to Washington tonight at this very moment. [Laughter]

I am profoundly grateful for this chance to be with you and for this honor, not only because of the wonderful opportunity I had to live and study here a quarter century ago but because of the traditions, the achievements, the spirit of discovery, and the deep inspiration of this noble university. Even in a country so steeped in history, there are few institutions as connected to the past as Oxford. Every ritual here, no matter how small, has a purpose, reminding us that we must be part of something larger than ourselves, heirs to a proud legacy.

Yet Oxford could hardly be called backward-looking. Over the centuries, as a center of inquiry and debate, this great university
has been very much involved in the action and passion of its time. Just listen outside here: everything from disputes over battles to the nature of the Italian Government to the character of the word "skinhead"—[laughter]—is being debated even as we are here.

This university has been very much committed to passing on our legacy to yet another generation. Our first obligation is what I have been doing here this week: It is remembrance—to know how we came to be what we are we have all learned again this week in reflecting on the uncommon valor and the utter loss that bought us 50 years of freedom. I know I speak for everyone in this theater when I say, again, a profound thank you to the generation which committed to passing on its time. Just listen outside. Our memories of that sacrifice will be forever alive.

But our obligations surely go beyond memory. After all, when the soldiers of D-Day broke through at Normandy, when the sons and daughters of democracy carried on their struggle for another half-century, winning the cold war against the iron grip of totalitarian repression, they fought not for the past but for the present and the future. And now it falls to us to use that hard-won freedom, to follow through in this time, expanding democracy, security, prosperity, fighting bigotry, terrorism, slaughter, and chaos around the world.

There are—make no mistake about it—forces of disintegration at work in the world today, and to some extent even within our own countries, that could rob our children of the bright future for which so many of our parents gave their lives.

There are also, be sure, forces of humanity in progress which, if they prevail, could bring human history to its highest point of peace and prosperity. At this rare moment, we must be prepared to move forward, for in the end, the numberless sacrifices of our forebears brought us to precisely this, an age in which many threats to our very existence have been brought under control for the moment.

So what shall we do with the moment? Our challenge is to unite our people around the opportunities of peace, as those who went before us united against the dangers of war and oppression. The great Oxford don Sir Isaiah Berlin once said, "Men do not live only by fighting evils; they live by positive goals, a vast variety of them, seldom predictable, at times incompatible."

History does not always give us grand crusades, but it always gives us opportunities. It is time to bring a spirit of renewal to the work of freedom—to work at home to tap the full potential of our citizens, to strengthen our families and communities, to fight indifference and intolerance; and beyond our borders, to keep our nations strong so that we can create a new security, here especially, all across Europe; to reverse the environmental destruction that feeds the civil wars in Africa; to halt the spread of nuclear weapons and terrorism; to light the lives of those still dwelling in the darkness of undemocratic rule.

Our work in this world, all of it, will surely take all of our lifetimes and more. But we must keep at it, working together with steadiness and wisdom, with ingenuity and simple faith. To those of you here in this ancient temple of learning and those beyond who are of a younger generation, I urge you to join this work with enthusiasm and high hope.

This week, at the gravesites of the generation that fought and died to make us the children of their sacrifice, I promised that we would be the new pathfinders, lighting the way in a new and still uncertain age, striving in peace as they struggled in war. There is no greater tribute to give to those who have gone before than to build for those who follow. Surely, that is the timeless mission of freedom and civilization itself. It is what binds together the past, the present, and the future. It is our clear duty, and we must do our best to fulfill it.

Thank you very much for this wonderful day.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:32 p.m. in the Sheldonian Theater. In his remarks, he referred to the Rt. Hon. Lord Jenkins of Hillhead, chancellor of the university.
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It has been said that if it were not for the people of Poland, democracy might have perished on the continent of Europe a half-century ago. For it was the Polish mathematicians from the laboratories of Poznan who broke the secrets of the Enigma Code, what Winston Churchill called the most important weapon against Hitler and his armies. It was these code-breakers who made possible the great Allied landings at Normandy, when American, English, French, Canadian, and yes, Free Polish forces joined together to liberate this continent, to destroy one terrible tyranny that darkened our century.

Yet, alone among the great Allied armies who fought in Normandy, the Poles did not return to a liberated land. Your fathers instead returned to a nation that had been laid waste by its invaders. Then one would-be conqueror gave way to another, and an Iron Curtain fell across your borders, a second foreign tyranny gripped your people and your land.

It was here in Poland that all those who believe communism could not stand, first found their hopes fulfilled; here that you began to hammer on the Iron Curtain and force the first signs of rust to appear; here that brave men and women, workers and citizens, led by Solidarnosc, understood that neither consciousness nor economics can be ordered from above; here that you showed the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe that with hearts and hands alone, democracy could triumph.

But I come here today not simply to recall the events of 50 years past or even to rejoice at those of 5 years ago, for others have done that and done it very well. Instead, I come to the heart of a new, democratic Central Europe to look ahead, to speak of how we can reverse the legacies of stagnation and oppression, of fear and division; how we can eradicate the artificial lines through Europe's heartland imposed by half a century of division, and how we can help chart a course toward an integrated Europe of sovereign free nations.

The challenges our generation faces are different from those our parents faced. They are problems that in many cases lack pressing drama. They require quiet and careful solutions. They will not yield easily. And if we
meet them well, our reward will not be stum-
ning moments of glory but gradual and real
improvement in the lives of our people.
—We must find the will to unite around
these opportunities of peace as previous gen-
erations have united against war's life-or-
death threats and oppression's fatal grip. To
the courage that enables men and women
to drop behind enemy lines, face down rum-
bling tanks, or advance freedom's cause un-
derground, we must add a new civil courage:
the energy and optimism and patience to
move forward through peaceful but hard and
rapidly changing times.

Our course must be guided by three prin-
ciples: supporting democracy, advancing free
markets, and meeting new security chal-
lenge. Half a century after our fathers beat
tyrranny into submission and half a decade
after the Soviet empire collapsed, the voices
of violence and militant nationalism can once
again be heard. Would-be dictators and fiery
demagogues live among us in the East and in
the West, promoting ethnic and racial hatred,
promoting religious divisions and anti-semit-
ism and aggressive nationalism. To be sure,
you are weak imitators of Hitler and Stalin,
et we dare not underestimate the danger
they pose. For they feed on fear, despair,
and confusion. They darken our road and
challenge our achievements.

In this fight, democracy remains our indis-
pensable ally. For democracy checks the am-
bitions of would-be tyrants and aggressors.
It nurtures civil society and respect for
human rights and the habits of simple tol-
erance. Its progress is slow and uneven, and
as you doubtless know in this chamber, occa-
sionally frustrating. But it cements econom-
reforms and security cooperation. And it of-
ers once-captive peoples the opportunity to
shape their own future.

Five years ago, your nation seized that oppor-
tunity. Discarding dictatorship and a
failed command economy that was imposed
upon your nation, you stepped into the un-
known and started to build a free market
economy. Doubters said that it couldn't be
done, but the Polish people have proved
those naysayers wrong. Poland’s reforms are
working. You are beginning to win the strug-
gle for economic transformation. You have
ended hyperinflation, stabilized your cur-
rency, privatized enterprises that drive
growth, and doubled your exports. You have
proved that free people need not wait for
the state to tell them what to do. You have
demonstrated an entrepreneurial talent that
generates one of Europe's highest growth
rates.

But we must be sober and honest in our
judgment. When you began this process the
old Communist economic system was already
collapsing. You knew then your journey
would be difficult at best. And although many
Poles are prospering today, many others have
lost their jobs through no fault of their own,
and their hardships abound. In a time like
this it is easy to focus on that pain, not on
the promise of reform.

My message today to the people of Poland
and to all the people of Central and Eastern
Europe is simple and direct: Free markets
and democracy remain the only proven path
to prosperity and to peace. You must hold
hard to those tracks. Sustain the civil courage
that has brought you so far so fast, and do
not give up or turn back. You will not be
alone.

The United States has stood with you since
you began to build the modern economy, and
we stand with you now. America is the num-
er one investor in Poland, with $1.2 billion
already in place and much more on the way.
The American people are proud to have sup-
ported Poland as you have put tens of thou-
sands of your people to work, created thou-
sands of new enterprises, and begun to free
your economy from its inherited burden of
debt.

Today we are announcing new initiatives
that will pump hundreds of millions of dollars
into the Polish economy. For example, our
Government, along with some of our Na-
tion's largest labor unions, has established a
$65 million Polish Partners Fund to promote
new investments in business. We are also
working to quicken the speed of privatiza-
tion, to assist people in finding new jobs and
housing, to help protect your citizens from
the economic pirates of organized crime.

Taken together, these goals—hopeful citi-
zens, thriving entrepreneurs, new invest-
ments and expanded trade—are the future
pillars of a prosperous, reformed Poland.
Economic reform and democracy, though
important, however, will only flourish if the free peoples of Central and Eastern Europe are also secure.

In moving to guarantee its own security, Poland has indeed become a model for the other nations of Central and Eastern Europe. Your decisions to establish good relations with Russia, Ukraine, Germany, and Lithuania are shining examples of the potential for peace that the new Europe provides. At this moment, in fact, Poland faces what may fairly be described as its best prospects for peace and security in 350 years. And yet, as you have taught us, we must not forget the lessons of history. There appears to be no immediate or short-term threat to Polish sovereignty, but history and geography caution us not to take this moment for granted.

When my administration began, I stressed that Poland’s security and the security of all democratic nations in the region is important to the United States. In January of last year, when I visited Prague and met with the heads of the Visegrad nations, I learned a Polish phrase: Nie o nas bez nas, “Nothing about us, without us.” That phrase echoes in my mind today as we solidify and search for a new security arrangement in Europe. Because the simple fact is that Poland should never again have its fate decided for it by others. No democracy in the region should ever be consigned to a gray area or a buffer zone. And no country should have the right to veto, compromise, or threaten democratic Poland’s or any other democracy’s integration into Western institutions, including those that ensure security.

I know that these are ambitious goals, but history has given us a rare opportunity, the opportunity to join together and to form a new, integrated Europe of sovereign nations, a continent where democracy and free markets know no borders, but where nations can rest easy that their own borders will always be secure. This is the vision behind the Partnership For Peace.

Twenty-one nations have now joined that Partnership since we began it, and they are already moving to fulfill the dream of a unified and peaceful Europe. They have sworn not only to pursue democracy but also to respect each other’s sovereignty and borders. They are moving along a course that is both visionary and realistic, working for the best while always preparing for the worst.

Poland, as all of you know, has taken a leading role in the Partnership For Peace, and I am proud and pleased that some 2 months from now your nation will host the first Partnership exercise on the territory of a former Warsaw Pact state. For the first time since 1945 Polish and American troops, troops that once faced each other across the Iron Curtain, will train together on the plains of Europe.

The United States recognizes that full participation in the Partnership requires resources. And I am pleased to announce today that I will ask our Congress to designate $100 million, effective in the fall of next year, to help America’s new democratic partners work with us to advance the Partnership For Peace’s goals. In response to your nation’s demonstrated commitment to security and democracy, I will ask that fully one-fourth of that money, $25 million, be directed to Poland.

But the Partnership For Peace is only a beginning. Bringing new members into NATO, as I have said many times, is no longer a question of whether, but when and how. And that expansion will not depend upon the appearance of a new threat in Europe. It will be an instrument to advance security and stability for the entire region. We are working with you in the Partnership For Peace in part because the United States believes that when NATO does expand, as it will, a democratic Poland will have placed itself among those ready and able to join. The Partnership For Peace, and planning for NATO’s future mean that we will not let the Iron Curtain be replaced with a veil of indifference.

I have learned another Polish phrase which, even in my tortured accent, well describes our goal for a more secure, democratic, and prosperous Poland: Rowni z równymi, wolni z wolnymi, “Equal among equals, free with the free.” It is time to bring that phrase to life.

Here in the middle of the rebuilt city of Warsaw, we are reminded that the Polish people have always fought for that right. Fifty years ago this month, the Polish home army was planning the greatest urban uprising of
Remarks at the Children’s Memorial in Warsaw
July 7, 1994

The President. Thank you very much, Byrzard Paclawski, Adam Bielaczki. And to Magda Kierszniewska, didn’t she do a good job? Let’s give her another hand. [Applause] We are gathered at the wall of an old city to honor a people whose love of freedom is forever young. Fifty years ago a heroic chapter of history was written here, a chapter stained with the blood of war but brightened by the enduring power of the human spirit. Next month you will honor that spirit by marking the 50th anniversary of the Warsaw Uprising. And I am pleased to say that the Vice President of the United States, Al Gore, will be here with you in August, just as I am today.

The seeds of rebirth that are now flowering across this wonderful country were planted a half-century ago. When the brave Poles took up arms against Hitler’s tyranny in the summer of 1944, Warsaw was on the verge of total destruction. For 63 days, Polish men, women, and children struggled against the Nazis. For 63 days they faced the tanks, machine guns, and bombers with courage and faith and solidarity. Two hundred thousand of them died. And this beloved city seemed beyond salvation.

I have seen photographs of Warsaw at the end of the war. An exquisite city that took six centuries to build was razed to the ground in 2 monstrous months. The statue of King Zigmund was toppled from its base, an elegant column literally blown to bits. The majestic arches of St. John’s Cathedral were battered until only a skeleton remained. The Old City marketplace was obliterated.

No one sacrificed more than the children. The statue behind me honors the children of the Warsaw Uprising. The terror of war took their innocence. Their childhoods were buried in the rubble. Young girls braved sniper fire to deliver messages for the Resistance, and the Szare Szeregi, the Young Scouts, faced the frontlines of battle.

Thousands of children witnessed the unimaginable. One boy was 8 years old when the bombs began raining down, when the Nazi planes destroyed the building where he lived, when his family courtyard was turned into a graveyard for his neighbors. But that little boy survived. He never forgot Warsaw, and he never gave up trying to give meaning to the tragedy. Today, that little boy is the highest ranking military officer in the United States of America, General John Shalikashvili, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who has dedicated his life to the fight for peace and freedom.

His life, like the lives of so many other children of Warsaw, teaches us what Poland taught the world: out of the wreckage of oppression can grow the redeeming spirit of freedom. Some of those other children, now grown, are with us today. Let us thank them all for that profound lesson. [Applause]

Sometimes in life, we do not realize the good we have done. Fifty years ago, the heroes of Warsaw seemed defeated. Fifty years later, we know the Polish spirit did not die in the ruins. Sometimes what seems to be the final chapter in history is but one sad page of an unfinished and triumphant story.

The Polish people never gave in to the shadow of despair. They found strength through the light cast for the uprising, and after the war the survivors returned to the ruins. Brick by brick, with cold and tired hands, they rebuilt this city. Day by day, they...
The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:20 p.m. at the Hotel Matignon. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks to the French National Assembly in Paris
June 7, 1994

Mr. President, distinguished Deputies, representatives of the people of France, it is a high honor for me to be invited here, along with my wife and our distinguished Ambassador, Pamela Harriman, to share with you this occasion. There is between our two peoples a special kinship. After all, our republics were born within a few years of each other. Overthrowing the rule of kings, we enthroned in their places common ideals: equality, liberty, community, the rights of man.

For two centuries, our nations have given generously to each other. France gave to our Founders the ideas of Montesquieu and Rousseau. And then Lafayette and Rochambeau helped to forge those ideas into the reality of our own independence. For just as we helped to liberate your country in 1944, you helped to liberate our country two full centuries ago.

Your art and your culture have inspired countless Americans for that entire time, from Benjamin Franklin to John and Jacqueline Kennedy. In turn, we lent to you the revolutionary genius of Thomas Jefferson, the fiery spirit of Thomas Paine, and the lives of so many of our young men when Europe's liberty was most endangered.

This week you have given us yet another great gift in the wonderful commemorations of the Allied landings at Normandy. I compliment President Mitterrand and all the French people for your very generous hospitality. I thank especially the thousands of French families who have opened their homes to our veterans.

Yesterday's sights will stay with me for the rest of my life, the imposing cliffs of Pointe du Hoc, the parade of our Allied forces on Utah Beach, the deadly bluffs at bloody Omaha, the rows upon rows of gravestones at our cemetery at Colleville.

D-Day was the pivot point of the 20th century. It began Europe's liberation. In ways great and small, the Allied victory proved how democracy's faith in the individual saved democracy itself. From the daring of the French Resistance to the inventiveness of the soldiers on Omaha Beach, it proved what free nations can accomplish when they unite behind a great and noble cause.

The remarkable unity among the Allies during World War II, let us face it, reflected the life-or-death threat facing freedom. Democracies of free and often unruly people are more likely to rally in the face of that kind of danger. But our challenge now is to unite our people around the opportunities of peace, as those who went before us united against the dangers of war.

Once in this century, as your President so eloquently expressed, following World War I, we failed to meet that imperative. After the Armistice, many Americans believed our foreign threats were gone. America increasingly withdrew from the world, opening the way for high tariffs, for trade wars, for the rise to fascism and the return of global war in less than 20 years.

After World War II, America, France, and the other democracies did better. Led by visionary statesmen like Truman and Marshall, de Gaulle, Monnet, and others, we reached out to rebuild our allies and our former enemies, Germany, Italy, and Japan, and to confront the threat of Soviet expansion and nuclear power. Together, we founded NATO, we launched the Marshall plan, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and other engines of economic development. And in one of history's great acts of reconciliation, France reached out to forge the Franco-German partnership, the foundation of unity and stability in modern Western Europe. Indeed, the members of the European Union have performed an act of political alchemy, a magical act that turned rubble into renewal, suspicion into security, enemies into allies.

Now we have arrived at this century's third moment of decision. The cold war is over. Prague, Warsaw, Kiev, Riga, Moscow, and many others stand as democratic capitals, with leaders elected by the people. We are reducing nuclear stockpiles, and America and
Russia no longer aim their nuclear missiles at each other. Yet once again, our work is far from finished. To secure this peace, we must set our sights on a strategic star. Here, where America and our allies fought so hard to save the world, let that star for both of us, for Americans and for Europeans alike, be the integration and strengthening of a broader Europe.

It is a mighty challenge. It will require resources. It will take years, even decades. It will require us to do what is very difficult for democracies, to unite our people when they do not feel themselves in imminent peril to confront more distant threats and to seize challenging and exciting opportunities. Yet, the hallowed gravestones we honored yesterday speak to us clearly. They define the price of failure in peacetime. They affirm the need for action now.

We can already see the grim alternative. Militant nationalism is on the rise, transforming the healthy pride of nations, tribes, religious and ethnic groups into cancerous prejudice, eating away at states and leaving their people addicted to the political painkillers of violence and demagoguery, and blaming their problems on others when they should be dedicated to the hard work of finding real answers to those problems on others when they should be dedicated to the hard work of finding real answers to those problems. We see the signs of this disease from the purposeful slaughter in Bosnia to the random violence of skinheads in all our nations. We see it in the incendiary misuses of history and in the anti-Semitism and irredentism of some former Communist states. And beyond Europe, we see the dark future of these trends in mass slaughter, unbridled terrorism, devastating poverty, and total environmental and social disintegration.

Our transatlantic alliance clearly stands at a critical point. We must build the bonds among nations necessary for this time, just as we did after World War II. But we must do so at a time when our safety is not directly threatened, just as after World War I. The question for this generation of leaders is whether we have the will, the vision, and yes, the patience to do it.

Let me state clearly where the United States stands. America will remain engaged in Europe. The entire transatlantic alliance benefits when we, Europe and America, are both strong and engaged. America wishes a strong Europe, and Europe should wish a strong America, working together.

To ensure that our own country remains a strong partner, we are working hard at home to create a new spirit of American renewal, to reduce our budget deficits, to revitalize our economy, to expand trade, to make our streets safer from crime, to restore the pillars of our American strength, work and family and community, and to maintain our defense presence in Europe.

We also want Europe to be strong. That is why America supports Europe's own steps so far toward greater unity, the European Union, the Western European Union, and the development of a European defense identity. We now must pursue a shared strategy, to secure the peace of a broader Europe and its prosperity. That strategy depends upon integrating the entire continent through three sets of bonds: first, security cooperation; second, market economics; and third, democracy.

To start, we must remain strong and safe in an era that still has many dangers. To do so we must adapt our security institutions to meet new imperatives. America has reduced the size of its military presence in Europe, but we will maintain a strong force here. The EU, the WEU, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, and other organizations must all play a larger role. I was pleased that NATO recently approved an American proposal to allow its assets to be used by the WEU. To foster greater security cooperation all across Europe, we also need to adapt NATO to this new era.

At the NATO summit in January, we agreed to create the Partnership For Peace in order to foster security cooperation among NATO allies and the other states of Europe, both former Warsaw Pact countries, states of the former Soviet Union, and states not involved in NATO for other reasons. And just 6 months later, this Partnership For Peace is a reality. No less than 19 nations have joined, and more are on the way. Russia has expressed an interest in joining.

The Partnership will conduct its first military exercises this fall. Imagine the transformation: Troops that once faced each other
across the Iron Curtain will now work with each other across the plains of Europe.

We understand the historical anxieties of Central and Eastern Europe. The security of those states is important to our own security. And we are committed to NATO’s expansion. At the same time, as long as we have the chance, the chance to create security cooperation everywhere in Europe, we should not abandon that possibility anywhere.

There are signs that such an outcome may be possible. Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and Belarus have now committed to eliminate all the nuclear weapons on their soil. And by this August we may well see all Russian troops withdrawn from Eastern Europe and the Baltics for the first time since the end of World War II.

Do these developments guarantee that we can draw all the former Communist states into the bonds of peaceful cooperation? No. But we would fail our own generation and those to come if we did not try.

Do these arrangements mean we can solve all the problems? No, at least not right away. The most challenging European security problem and the most heartbreaking humanitarian problem is, of course, Bosnia. We have not solved that problem, but it is important to recognize what has been done, because France, the United States, Great Britain, and others have worked together through the United Nations and through NATO. Look what has been done. First, a determined and so far successful effort has been made to limit that conflict to Bosnia, rather than having it spread into a wider Balkan war. Second, the most massive humanitarian airlift in history has saved thousands of lives, as has the UNPROFOR mission, in which France has been the leading contributor of troops. We have prevented the war from moving into the air. We have seen an agreement between the Bosnian Muslims and the Croats. Progress has been made.

What remains to be done? Today the United Nations has put forward the proposal by Mr. Akashi for a cessation of hostilities for a period of several months. The United States supports this program; France supports this proposal. We must do all we can to get both sides to embrace it.

Then, the contact group is working on a map which can be the basis of a full and final cessation of hostilities there. We must do all we can, once all parties have been heard from, to secure that agreement.

And finally, let us not forget what has happened to make that more likely, and that is that Russia has been brought into the process of attempting to resolve this terrible crisis in what so far has been a very positive way, pointing the way toward a future in which we may all be able to work together to solve problems like this over a period of time. We must be patient. We must understand that we do not have total control of events within every nation. But we have made progress in Bosnia, and we must keep at it, working together, firmly together, with patience and firmness, until the job is done. We can do this if we stay together and work together.

The best way to sustain this sort of cooperation is to support the evolution of Europe across the board. We must also have an economic dimension to this. We must support Europe’s East in their work to integrate into the thriving market democracies. That brings me to the second element of our strategy of integration. Integration requires the successful transition to strong market economies all across broader Europe.

Today, the former Communist states face daunting transitions. Our goal must be to help them succeed, supporting macroeconomic reforms, providing targeted assistance to privatization, increasing our bonds of trade and investment. That process invariably will proceed slowly and, of course, unevenly. It will depend in part on what happens within those countries. We have seen voters in former Communist states cast ballots in a protest against reform and its pain. Yet as long as these states respect democratic processes, we should not react with too much alarm. The work of reform will take years and decades.

Despite many problems the economic reforms in Europe’s East have still been impressive. Russia’s private sector now employs 40 percent of the work force, and 50 million Russians have become shareholders in privatizing companies. In Prague last January, I said the West needed to support such reforms by opening our markets as much as
possible to the exports of those nations. For if our new friends are not able to export their goods, they may instead export instability, even against their own will.

We can also support other reforms by stimulating global economic growth. One of the most important advances toward that goal in recent years has been the new GATT agreement. It will create millions of jobs. France played an absolutely pivotal role in bringing those talks to fruition. I know it was a difficult issue in this country. I know it required statesmanship. I assure you it was not an easy issue in the United States. We have issues left to resolve. But now that we have opened the door to history's most sweeping trade agreement, let us keep going until it is done. My goal is for the United States Congress to ratify the GATT agreement this year and to pursue policies through the G-7 that can energize all our economies.

We have historically agreed among the G-7 nations that we will ask each other the hard questions: What can we do to promote economic growth and job creation? What kind of trade policies are fair to the working people of our countries? How can we promote economic growth in a way that advances sustainable development in the poorer countries of the world so that they do not squander their resources and, in the end, assure that all these endeavors fail? These are profoundly significant questions. They are being asked in a multilateral forum for the first time in a serious way. And this is of great significance.

In the end, no matter what we do with security concerns or what we do with economic concerns, the heart of our mission must be the same as it was on Normandy's beaches a half a century ago, that is, democracy. For after all, democracy is the glue that can cement economic reforms and security cooperation. That is why our third goal must be to consolidate Europe's recent democratic gains.

This goal resonates with the fundamental ideals of both of our republics. It is, after all, how we got started. It also serves our most fundamental security interests, for democracy is a powerful deterrent; it checks the dark ambitions of would-be tyrants and aggressors as it respects the bright hopes of free citizens.

Together, our two nations and others have launched a major effort to support democracy in the former Communist states. Progress will not come overnight. There will be uneven developments, but already we see encouraging and sometimes breathtaking results. We have seen independent television stations established where once only the state's version of the truth was broadcast. We've seen thousands of people from the former Communist world, students, bankers, political leaders, come to our nations to learn the ways and the uses of freedom. We've seen new constitutions written and new states founded around the principles that inspired our own republics at their birth. Ultimately, we need to foster democratic bonds not only within these former Communist states but also among our states and theirs.

There is a language of democracy spoken among nations. It is expressed in the way we work out our differences, in the way we treat each other's citizens, in the way we honor each other's heritages. It is the language our two republics have spoken with each other for over 200 years. It is the language that the Western Allies spoke during the Second World War.

Now we have the opportunity to hear the language of democracy spoken across this entire continent. And if we can achieve that goal, we will have paid a great and lasting tribute to those from both our countries who fought and died for freedom 50 years ago.

Nearly 25 years after D-Day, an American veteran who had served as a medic in that invasion returned to Normandy. He strolled down Omaha Beach, where he had landed in June of 1944, and then walked inland a ways to a nearby village. There, he knocked on a door that seemed familiar. A Frenchwoman answered the door and then turned suddenly and called to her husband. "He's back. The American doctor is back," she called. After a moment, the husband arrived, carrying a wine bottle covered with dust and cobwebs. "Welcome, Doctor," he cried. "In 1944, we hid this bottle away for the time when you would return. Now let us celebrate."
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flag, and swam and scrambled to the main mast. There, he ran up the flag. And as he swam off, our flag opened into the breeze. In the Corry's destruction, there was no defeat. Today, the wreckage of that ship lies directly beneath us, an unseen monument to those who helped to win this great war. Thirteen of the Corry's crew rest there as well, and these waters are forever sanctified by their sacrifice.

Fifty years ago, General Eisenhower concluded his order of the day with these words: "Let us all beseech the blessing of almighty God upon this great and noble undertaking." As we begin this new day of remembrance, let us also ask God's blessing for all those who died for freedom 50 years ago and for the Americans who carry on their noble work today. May God bless them, and may God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:21 a.m. aboard the U.S.S. George Washington off the coast of Normandy, France. In his remarks, he referred to Dean Rockwell, D-Day veteran who introduced the President, and Admiral J.M. Boorda, commander in chief, U.S. Naval Forces Europe. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks on the 50th Anniversary of D-Day at Pointe du Hoc in Normandy, France
June 6, 1994

General Downing, Mr. Hathaway, honored leaders of our military, distinguished veterans and members of the armed services, family and friends, my fellow Americans. We stand on sacred soil. Fifty years ago at this place a miracle of liberation began. On that morning, democracy's forces landed to end the enslavement of Europe.

Around 7 a.m., Lt. Colonel James Earl Rudder, 2d Ranger Battalion, United States Army, led 224 men onto the beaches below and up these unforgiving cliffs. Bullets and grenades came down upon them, but by a few minutes after 7, here, exactly here, the first Rangers, stood. Today, let us ask those American heroes to stand again. [Applause].

Corporal Ken Bargmann, who sits here to my right, was one of them. He had just celebrated his 20th birthday out in the Channel. A young man like all the rest of them, cold and wet, far from home, preparing for the challenge of his life. Ken Bargmann and the other Rangers of Pointe du Hoc and all the other Americans, British, Canadian, and Free French who landed, were the tip of a spear the free world had spent years sharpening, a spear they began on this morning in 1944 to plunge into the heart of the Nazi empire. Most of them were new to war, but all were armed with the ingenuity of free citizens and the confidence that they fought for a good cause under the gaze of a loving God.

The fortunate ones would go home, changed forever. Thousands would never return. And today we mourn their loss. But on that gray dawn, millions, literally millions, of people on this continent awaited their arrival. Young Anne Frank wrote in her diary these words: "It's no exaggeration to say that all Amsterdam, all Holland, yes, the whole west coast of Europe talks about the invasion day and night, debates about it, makes bets on it, and hopes. I have the feeling friends are approaching."

The young men who came fought for the very survival of democracy. Just 4 years earlier, some thought democracy's day had passed. Hitler was rolling across Europe. In America, factories worked at only half capacity. Our people were badly divided over what to do. The future seemed to belong to the dictators. They sneered at democracy, its mingling of races and religions, its tolerance of dissent. They were sure we didn't have what it took.

Well, they didn't know James Rudder or Ken Bargmann or the other men of D-Day. The didn't understand what happens when the free unite behind a great and worthy cause. For human miracles begin with personal choices, millions of them gathered together as one, like the stars of a majestic galaxy. Here at this place, in Britain, in North America, and among Resistance fighters in France and across Europe, all those numberless choices came together: the choices of lion-hearted leaders to rally their people; the choices of people to mobilize for freedom's fight; the choices of their soldiers to carry on that fight into a world worn weary by devastation and despair.
Every person in the democracies pitched in. Every shipbuilder who built a landing craft. Every woman who worked in a factory. Every farmer who grew food for the troops. Every miner who carved coal out of a cavern. Every child who tended a victory garden. All of them did their part. All produced things with their hands and their hearts that went into this battle. And on D-Day, all across the free world, the peoples of democracy prayed that they had done their job right. Well, they had done their job right.

And here, you, the Army Rangers, did yours. Your mission was to scale these cliffs and destroy the howitzers at the top that threatened every Allied soldier and ship within miles. You fired grappling hooks onto the cliff tops. You waded to shore, and you began to climb up on ropes slick with sea and sand, up, as the Germans shot down and tried to cut your lines, up, sometimes holding to the cliffs with nothing but the knives you had and your own bare hands.

As the battle raged at Juno, Sword, and Gold, on Omaha and Utah, you took devastating casualties. But you also took control of these commanding heights. Around 8 a.m., two Rangers discovered the big guns hidden inland and disabled them with heat grenades. At the moment, you became the first Americans on D-Day to complete your mission.

We look at this terrain and we marvel at your fight. We look around us and we see what you were fighting for. For here are the daughters of Colonel Rudder. Here are the son and grandson of Corporal Bargmann. Here are the faces for whom you risked your lives. Here are the generations for whom you won a war. We are the children of your sacrifice. We are the sons and daughters you saved from tyranny's reach. We grew up behind the shield of the strong alliances you forged in blood upon these beaches, on the shores of the Pacific, and in the skies above. We flourished in the nation you came home to build.

The most difficult days of your lives bought us 50 years of freedom. You did your job; now we must do ours. Let us begin by teaching our young people about the villainy that started this war and the valor that ended it. Let us carry on the work you began here. The sparks of freedom you struck on these

beaches were never extinguished, even in the darkest days behind the Iron Curtain. Five years ago the miracle of liberation was repeated as the rotting timbers of communism came tumbling down.

Now we stand at the start of a new day. The Soviet empire is gone. So many people who fought as our partners in this war, the Russians, the Poles, and others, now stand again as our partners in peace and democracy. Our work is far from done. Still there are cliffs to scale. We must work to contain the world's most deadly weapons, to expand the reach of democracy. We must keep ready arms and strong alliances. We must have strong families and cohesive societies and educated citizens and vibrant, open, economies that promote cooperation, not conflict.

And if we should ever falter, we need only remember you at this spot 50 years ago and you, again, at this spot today. The flame of your youth became freedom's lamp, and we see its light reflected in your faces still and in the faces of your children and grandchildren.

We commit ourselves, as you did, to keep that lamp burning for those who will follow. You completed your mission here. But the mission of freedom goes on; the battle continues. The "longest day" is not yet over.

God bless you, and God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:45 a.m. In his remarks, he referred to Gen. William A. Downing, USA, commander in chief, U.S. Special Operations Command, and D-Day veteran Richard Hathaway, president, Ranger Battalions Association of World War II, who introduced the President.
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June 6, 1994

Thank you. Thank you very much, General Talbott, Secretary Perry, Secretary Brown. Let me begin by asking all the veterans here present, their families, their friends, the people from France who have been wonderful hosts to us, to acknowledge those who worked so hard to make these D-Day ceremonies a great success: General Joulwan, the SAC here, and his European command,
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Thank you.
I'm delighted to be here. And Mort, thank you for that generous introduction. It's always a pleasure to hear any words of praise from a prominent member of the Fourth Estate. Still vivid in my memory are the times that's happened before -- both of them.

I want to talk to you tonight about the purpose of American power in the world, as we chart a course in a radically new international environment.

Charting such a course has never been easy. While the policy of containment looks obvious to us in retrospect, we should remember that it took President Truman and Dean Acheson several years to define their way and build a policy consensus behind it. And they had the advantage of an ideologically and geographically distinct adversary with whom to contend.

Today, we -- all of us in this room who believe in American engagement -- have a still more difficult challenge. We must seek to be as creative and constructive -- in the literal sense of that word -- as the generation of the late 1940’s. For we see a world of opportunity for such construction. But we must do it in the domestic circumstances not of the 1940’s but of the 1920’s, when there was no single, foreign threat against which to rally public opinion.

To most Americans, the post-Cold War era seems chaotic. The easy divisions of the Cold War have given way to a confused complex of problems: “Traditional” threats of aggression by regional bullies. Emerging transnational threats like environmental decay, over-population and
refugees. A global economic and information free-for-all that increases wealth and opportunity, but also produces fear and uncertainty within all nations. And the carnage of terrible ethnic conflicts.

In short, for too many of our people and commentators, we seem to face an incomprehensible chaos that prevents us from setting a clearly defined goal for the exercise of American power and diplomacy.

I believe that view is profoundly and dangerously wrong.

For there is a simple truth about this new world. That truth is this: the same idea that was under attack by fascism and then by communism remains under attack today, but on many fronts at once.

In defeating fascism, and prevailing over communism, we were defending an idea that comes under many names—democracy, liberty, civility, pluralism—but has a constant face. It is the face of the tolerant society, in which leaders and governments exist not to use or abuse people, but to provide them with freedom and opportunity, to preserve individual human dignity. Societies in which the wonderful paradox of democracy is at work—the paradox that a central devotion to pluralism best allows the unity of the free.

Today, those societies—from the fragile to the mature—remain under assault. Far from reaching the end of history, we are at the start of a new stage in this old struggle. This is not a clash of civilizations. Rather, it is a contest that pits nations and individuals guided by openness, responsive government and moderation against those animated by isolation, repression and extremism. The enemies of the tolerant society are not some nameless, faceless force. They are
extreme nationalists and tribalists, terrorists, organized criminals, coup plotters, rogue states and all those who would return newly freed societies to the intolerant ways of the past.

But for all its dangers this new world presents immense opportunities — the chance to reshape and create new international security and economic structures that are not merely adapted to post-Cold War realities, but are specifically designed to consolidate the victory of the idea of democracy and open markets.

The issue for the next decade is whether our efforts at this construction can succeed in the face of the centrifugal forces at work within and among nations. This requires designing structures with the flexibility to withstand shifting threats to their stability, much like skyscrapers in Los Angeles or Mexico City are built with enough give to weather an earthquake. And it means that we must infuse these structures with the ideals and habits of democracy.

Democracy is at once the foundation and the purpose of the international structures we must build. It is the foundation because, as Zbig Brzezinski has put it, “If one builds...only with bricks and mortar we will find that something profound is missing, and the structure may not prove enduring, because societies as viable entities exist on the basis of conviction, of commitment, of certain shared values.” It is also the purpose because the security structures that defend our safety and the economic institutions that expand trade and create jobs, give democracy the chance to flourish.

We are not starry eyed about the prospects for spreading democracy — it will not soon take hold everywhere. But we know that the larger the pool of democracies, the better off we will be. Democracies create free markets that offer economic opportunity and make for more reliable trading partners. They tend not to abuse the civil and political rights of their citizens. And democracies are far less likely to wage war on one another. Civilized behavior within borders
encourages it beyond them. So it is in our interest to do all that we can to enlarge the community of free and open societies, especially in areas of greatest strategic interest, as in the former Soviet Union.

I. Building New Structures
I believe that over the past nineteen months, building often on the work of our predecessors, we have made a good start at this process of construction. Working with our allies, President Clinton has moved to create new security arrangements, or revitalize old ones, and to devise pro-trade economic institutions, or modernize existing ones.

To meet the new reality in Europe, we are deeply engaged in transforming existing structures to fulfill President Clinton's vision of an integrated continent. While NATO is and must remain the foundation of security and stability for the trans-Atlantic community, it must adapt to changing times so as to keep the peace -- and, if necessary, make the peace. That's why President Clinton has taken the lead in establishing the Combined Joint Task Forces for peacekeeping and crisis management, and the "Partnership for Peace," to begin the process of expanding security in Europe eastward.

For the new European democracies, the Partnership for Peace is the lighthouse at the entrance to NATO's harbor, offering real, practical military and defense cooperation with NATO. For Russia, the Partnership gives a boost to reformers and commits Moscow to open up and democratize its defense forces. While keeping us prepared for the worst, the Partnership allows us to work toward the best possible outcome for Europe -- a community of democratic and stable nations.
In Asia, because there is no equivalent to NATO, we must develop a series of arrangements that will function, as President Clinton has put it, "like overlapping plates of armor, individually providing protection and together covering the whole body of our common security concerns." These plates include the deployment of American forces to meet bilateral treaty arrangements and varied multilateral efforts -- from our attempt to defuse the North Korean nuclear threat to our participation in regional security dialogues, such as last year's unprecedented gathering of the ASEAN countries, including the United States, Russia, and Vietnam.

While the new global economy has delivered wonderful possibilities for growth and creativity, it also has limited governments' ability to control their nations' economic future. This has bred fear and insecurity within each of our societies -- especially among those left behind, and who blame their personal predicament on ominous, unidentified international forces.

There is a powerful lesson here for those of us concerned with sustaining our country's prosperity in the decades to come. That is the need to design structures with the every day, real interests of Americans in mind, that produce tangible benefits for them and turn their uncertainty into hope.

One striking example is NAFTA, whose passage President Clinton went to the mat to secure. Already, NAFTA has dramatically accelerated the exchange of goods and ideas between the United States, Mexico and Canada. For all it promises to achieve in its own right, NAFTA is just the starting point for the integration of our hemisphere. Other regional compacts modeled after NAFTA will follow. And we will pursue hemispheric integration at the Summit of the Americas, convened by the President in Miami next December.

In Asia, where our trade translates into almost 2.5 million American jobs, President Clinton took the lead and hosted the first ever gathering of the Organization for Asian-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) leaders. By setting pro-growth policies, toppling trade barriers, and cutting
regulatory red tape within the fast growing Asian-Pacific economies, we can take tangible steps to improve our peoples' lives. And a heavier flow of American goods, services and people in the region will help spread the ideals and the wealth of tolerant societies and build an integrated Asian-Pacific community.

Our difficult but successful completion of the GATT Uruguay Round, begun eight years ago, also will make a real difference in real lives. By lowering barriers to trade and bringing more nations into an open trading system, this accord promises to lift substantially American wages and living standards, and to do the same for other nations around the world. GATT's successor, the World Trade Organization, not only will ensure a more even international playing field, but also will provide a forum to resolve disputes openly and amicably.

The process of construction also involves the patient application of diplomacy, and the measured exercise of power.

We use diplomacy to pursue peace. But peace is not just an end in itself. It also creates conditions necessary for the habits of democracy and community to thrive. Thus, when we support and foster peace in the Middle East or Northern Ireland or Southern Africa, we are promoting the tolerant society as well. It is no accident that the enemies of peace in such areas are also apostles of intolerance and extremism.

Effective diplomacy today -- as throughout human history -- depends not only on the skill of our diplomats, but also on the power that lies behind it.

The progress we have made in Bosnia, for example, came when power -- implicit or explicit -- was tied to our diplomatic ends. The Sarajevo ultimatum largely succeeded because the threat of NATO air power was judged real. It provided the catalyst for the agreement on a federation
between the Croatians and Muslims in Bosnia, in itself a development of great strategic importance there. And I believe that after the recent rejection of peace by the Bosnian Serbs, it was the threat of further action by NATO, combined with the effect of our sanctions, that led Slobodan Milosevic to promise to effectively close Serbia’s border with them.

Our approach to Haiti has also relied on diplomacy backed by power — the power of our sanctions as well as the real threat of the use of force. The responsible course has been to pursue every possible diplomatic way to reach our goal there. But make no mistake: when diplomacy fails, the power behind it then becomes the only alternative.

Our goal is clear. For two Administrations, that goal has been the restoration of democratic government.

For almost twenty months we have vigorously pursued every diplomatic avenue available to achieve a peaceful transfer of power from the coup leaders back to the democratically elected government. We have tightened sanctions all we can without crushing the Haitian people. Our efforts have failed to move the military leaders. Their brutality, if anything, gets worse. They alone are responsible for Haiti’s terrible predicament.

In response, the international community has spoken clearly and authoritatively, through the United Nations Security Council. Resolution 940 authorizes the use of all necessary means, including force, to restore democracy to Haiti.

Thus far, more than a dozen countries have told us they will join the international coalition in some form, and others are considering it. Additional nations will sign up when the coalition is replaced by the UN mission.
I believe there is a great deal at stake here. First is the essential reliability of the United States and the international community. Having exhausted all other remedies, we must make it clear that we mean what we say. Our actions in Haiti will send a message far beyond our region — to places like North Korea and Iraq and wherever else our interests are threatened.

Second, there is a new wave of democracy sweeping over this hemisphere. But it is not irreversible. Haiti is a critical test of our commitment to defend democracy, especially where it is most fragile.

Third, the United States has a particular interest in curbing gross abuses of human rights when they occur so close to our shores. Murder, rape and intimidation are a systematic part of this regime's reign of terror. The victims are women, children, orphans and even priests. These abuses will end only when the dictators are gone.

Finally, the consequences of this festering problem will not be confined to Haiti. We risk a further explosion of refugees, a mass exodus that could de-stabilize the region and prove difficult for us to contain.

So the military leaders must go. We still hope that they will do so voluntarily. The more resolute and united we are, the more likely it is that they will.

But it must be absolutely clear to them: we will act if we must, and time is running out.

II. The Threats to Construction

As we build new structures and wield the tools of power and diplomacy, we must keep an eye to the long term threats to our efforts. In effect, we have to adopt the habits of the architect. Before starting a project, any good designer sits down with the client and asks a few basic
questions: what’s the building for; what are your needs; how much time do you spend in each room? And in New England, we know also to ask this question: what direction do the high winds and storm fronts come from?

The threats to our international construction come from many quarters. Bosnia and Haiti, for example, are not simply transitory tragedies, immediate crises that can divert us from the “big picture.” Rather they are part of something bigger and more menacing that threatens to undermine the foreign policy structures we are working so hard to build: the ethnic and other historic divisions within nations that tear them apart and in some regions threaten the definition of the nation itself.

It cannot and must not be the responsibility of the international community or this nation finally to resolve those conflicts. We cannot force a reversal of centuries of animosity in a few years. To attempt to do so would condemn peacekeeping efforts to costly failure.

But where practical, we can save lives, as in Rwanda, and we can offer conflicted societies a breathing space in which to sort out their own affairs. Whether or not they do so must, in the end, be their own responsibility.

Where and when UN peacekeeping can and should engage cannot, in a world of such rapid changes, clearly be predicted on some briefer’s multicolored map. But we can be very clear about the criteria to use in making those decisions. Following our very careful policy review, we are insisting, for example, that every peacekeeping operation have a clear mission, with adequate funding and a reasonable plan for completion.
These explosions within nations — in the former Soviet Union, in Africa and elsewhere — while rooted in historic hatreds, are also exacerbated by the so-called transnational problems whose dimensions have been more clearly exposed by the end of the Cold War.

Mass migration and refugees. The population explosion. An endangered environment. A nefarious nexus of crime, terrorism and weapons of mass destruction. Our institutions must be built to withstand, and ultimately to reverse, these threats.

The Cairo Conference on population growth and sustainable development rightly addresses perhaps the single most important underlying transnational threat before us, and America is leading in the response.

But more attention must also be given, I believe, to the horrific prospect of the growing links among organized crime, drug trafficking, terrorism, and the spread of weapons of mass destruction. Four times in the last month, police seized weapons-quality plutonium smuggled into Germany from Russia. We should be thankful that superior police work and cooperation among various intelligence services — including our own — intercepted this deadly cargo. But we also should be concerned. Imagine, for example, what would have happened if the World Trade Center terrorists had detonated a non-conventional device.

This nexus demands a coordinated, international response. Mere vigilance will not suffice. The amount of plutonium needed to make a bomb is no bigger than a can of Coke. Intensified cooperation among various criminal justice systems is one of the most potent weapons in our arsenal. Over the past few years, we have greatly enhanced our intelligence sharing with allies and through Interpol, increased regular consultations, and engaged in joint anti-terrorist training. Most recently, in July, FBI director Louis Freeh visited several Eastern European countries and Russia, where he stressed the risks of nuclear proliferation through the efforts of organized crime.
and proposed new cooperative initiatives in response. Ultimately, this informal network of concerned nations will likely evolve into a new structure to counter what must rank as one of the greatest long term threats to our security.

And, as I said before, there is the immediate threat to our efforts at construction posed by the regional rogue states who seek to develop and traffic in the weapons of mass destruction, who support terrorism, who are no less dedicated to the destruction of the tolerant society than were the defeated leaders of fascism and communism.

That is why this President is determined to maintain and modernize the finest military in the world so we can deter aggression — and counter it when the need arises. Why we have developed and are pursuing a strategy of “dual containment” of both Iraq and Iran. And why we will maintain our commitment to our South Korean allies, even as we negotiate a resolution of the nuclear issue with the North.

III. Our Challenge

The struggle before us, while in the tradition of the centuries-old fight between the ideas of freedom and authoritarianism, is also very new. Because we must fight on so many fronts at once, we can only make progress over time, in small victories, not only through the exercise of our power but also through patience, persistence and pragmatic experimentation.

We Americans are an impatient people. But patience, persistence and pragmatism are not evidence of indecision: they are the hallmarks of determination.

Choice, not chance, determines destiny. After World War I, we chose withdrawal, leaving a vacuum that was filled by the forces of hatred and tyranny. After World War II, we chose engagement, creating the institutions that guaranteed 50 years of freedom and prosperity.
Today, at this century's third major turning point, the Clinton Administration has chosen. Rather than throw up our hands in despair at the complexities of the post-Cold War era, we have thrown ourselves with determination into the fight against those who would deny people their human rights, terrorists who threaten innocents, and pariah states who choose repression and extremism over openness and moderation. We have thrown ourselves, in short, into the long struggle for democracy and the order it brings.

In so doing, we take up the challenge previous generations met so well. Inspired by their example, aware of the responsibility they left, we are helping to create a world where tolerance, freedom and democracy prevail.
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Good morning. This week I am in Chicago, where my radio address is carried live each week by radio station WMAQ.

One week ago, we were prepared to invade Haiti to help restore its democratically elected government. Haiti’s military leaders understood that, if we had to, we were committed to using force to achieve our objectives. As a result, they agreed to leave power no later than October 15. And our troops entered Haiti peacefully and without bloodshed, leading an international coalition of 28 nations that will work to bring greater security to the people and restore to power Haiti’s democratically elected government.

Today, I am pleased to report on the progress of our mission.

The U.S. contribution to the international coalition will soon be at full strength — some 14,000 American service men and women. Our troops include nearly 1000 Military Police, who are working to help ensure that the Haitian police act with restraint towards the Haitian people. Police monitors from our coalition partners Argentina, Jordan and Bolivia are expected to arrive next week. And the United Nations human rights observers expelled from Haiti two months ago will soon return.

We also have begun programs to confiscate heavy weapons controlled by the Haitian military and to buy back light weapons from the militia and civilians.

Our presence, in short, is helping to restore civil order to a country wracked by violence and instability. Perhaps the best evidence of our success is that 200 to 300 Haitian refugees who we have sheltered at our base in Guantanamo will go home on Monday. We expect more to follow soon.

This remains a difficult undertaking — as with all military operations — and as I speak to you, Secretary of Defense Perry and General Shalikashvili, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, are traveling to Haiti to review our progress on the ground. I am proud of our troops and their commanders. They deserve our thanks and our praise.

Our success in Haiti to date shows what the international community, with American leadership, can achieve in helping countries in their struggle to build democracy. Our mission, however, is limited. We must remember — as I plan to tell the United Nations General Assembly on Monday — that it is up to the people in those countries ultimately to ensure their own freedom. That is the great challenge — and opportunity — of democracy.
That is also one of the lessons I hope Americans will learn as Russian President Boris Yeltsin and South African President Nelson Mandela visit our country in the next two weeks. Their visits will be occasions to reflect on the remarkable democratic transformations of Russia and South Africa -- which the United States has done a great deal to promote.

Americans should be proud of our leadership in helping to build open societies around the world. By supporting democracy and promoting economic growth, we are actively helping others. And we are helping ourselves at the same time.

Despite this, some people in our country question the importance of American engagement in the post-Cold War world. They say we should hide behind walls of protectionism and isolation. They are wrong.

That is why early next week I will submit to Congress legislation to implement the GATT world trade agreement -- the largest trade agreement in history. By cutting tariffs around the world, GATT will mean a $36 billion tax cut for Americans over the next ten years. It will generate between 300,000 and 700,000 permanent new jobs in ten years -- and, in time, many more for our children. And most of all, it will mean that we are facing this moment of decision with the confidence we need to meet the challenges of the post-Cold War world -- tearing down walls that separate nations instead of hiding behind them.

As we have learned again this week, when we approach our responsibilities around the world with that same sense of purpose, we can, indeed, accomplish great goals.

Thanks for listening.