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Fog at the Summit: U.S. Hopes Yeltsin Will Clear Up Moscow Policy Puzzles

By STEVEN ERLANGER

MOSCOW, May 7 — Chechnya, NATO expansion and an apparent reactor sale to Iran hang over this week’s Russian-American summit meeting as the great pressing issues. But the prominence and stickiness of the differences stems from a delusion of the need for a clear delineation of responsibilities.

American officials do not always agree on what is new, more assertive and nationalist policies. But they distinctly dislike not knowing what any moment what those policies are — and who speaks legitimately for Russia and President Boris N. Yeltsin.

That is the main reason why so little has been seen in advance, unlike the usual pattern of summity, and why the Americans are relying so heavily on President Clinton’s face-to-face meeting with President Yeltsin.

Mr. Yeltsin himself, who looks and acts older than his 51 years, is widely understood to be an intermittent player these days, Russian officials and Western diplomats say. He works relatively short hours, ducks in and out of issues, sometimes makes decrees that contradict the policy of his Government and sees very few outsiders or foreign ambassadors. He is heavily reliant on a group of aides with narrow experience and conservative views who have proven their devotion to him.

These loyalists are based within the huge presidential bureaucracy, which control the unelected National Security Council, a kind of personal poliburo that is dominant on military, security and sometimes economic issues. This body functions quite separately from the Office of Prime Minister Viktor S. Chernomyrdin.

Mr. Yeltsin, who looks and acts more like a party general secretary or czar rather than a populist democrat — perhaps partly inevitable on Russia’s culture and history — remains the final arbiter, though sometimes even his orders and decrees are ignored.

But if Mr. Yeltsin should decide to cancel the sale of reactors to Iran, as Washington wants, or more likely to alter the contracts to mollify Mr. Clinton, it will be done.

While facing with the sale of light-water nuclear reactors to Iran, Mr. Yeltsin is expected to assure that Russia will not sell gas centrifuges that would make it easier for Iran to convert spent nuclear fuel for military use and that there will be more international oversight of the contract and perhaps less training of Iranian nuclear scientists in Russia.

He is also expected to say that all nuclear materials will be returned to Russia, which is normal in Moscow’s nuclear contracts in any case.

But no one really knows where the difficulties, for the Russians as well as the Americans, is how to reach him with the right message.

Mr. Yeltsin’s aides, like Georgi Satarov and Mark Y. Urnov, the head of his Analytical Department, which does policy planning, contend that he is not isolated from the main currents of Russian life and policy, but they freely admit that they have been working for months on a better institutional mechanism to get important information to the president and to ensure that he sees it.

“It’s a country in transition toward a more active democracy, and the Government is the same,” Mr. Urnov said. “We have a democratic Constitution, but how to make it work?”

Discordant voices from the Kremlin confuse American officials.

The issue of expanding the North Atlantic Treaty Organization offers a good example of one part of the Russian Government’s not knowing what another part is doing. Foreign Minister Andrei V. Kozyrev kept reassuring the Americans that NATO expansion to Russia’s borders would be all right as long as it was slow, which it is. But Mr. Yeltsin does not want to be embarrassed by his political opponents on nationalist grounds, especially loyalists around Mr. Yeltsin getting to the President and underlining Mr. Kozyrev.

The disastrous, disorganized, brutal invasion of Chechnya, an action widely condemned by the West for Russian abuses of human rights, also stemmed from decisions made by the National Security Council, without discussion by the Government.

The invasion, carried out with little preparation or tactical skill, was understood to be a last-ditch solution to separate the separatist leadership in Chechnya. Mr. Chernomyrdin distanced himself from the debacle as fast as he could.

The contract to sell Iran nuclear reactors, originally signed in Soviet times, is but the latest example of internal confusion causing diplomatic problems.

It is unclear whether a gas centrifuge, which can speed up the enrichment of nuclear material to bomb quality, is part of the contract. The Americans say, presumably, that the real goal of intelligence-gathering, that a centrifuge was promised to the Iranians by Viktor N. Medvedev, Russian Minister of Atomic Energy, as a sweetener to seal the contract.

If so, that was a big surprise to Foreign Minister Kozyrev and, it seems, to President Yeltsin, who both learned of the centrifuge from the Americans.

Mr. Mikhailov’s spokesman, Georgi Kaurov, denied any final deal on a centrifuge, saying carefully, “Neither contracts nor agreements on this issue have been signed.” He later said, “No contracts with Iran have been drafted, much less signed” on a centrifuge.

But he did not deny that there was some sort of oral agreement on a centrifuge. And Yuri Vishnevsky, chairman of Russia’s Nuclear Safety and Radiation Inspection agency, said he expected the Atomic Energy Ministry to try to sign a contract to sell a centrifuge. Mr. Vishnevsky has objected, because of the dangers of nuclear proliferation.

On Friday, Mr. Yeltsin’s foreign advisers, Dmitri Ryurkov, said there would be no serious clash over the issue at the summit meeting, but rather “normal, calm discussion.”

Finally on Saturday, in an interview with Agence France-Presse, Mr. Yeltsin’s spokesman, Sergei Medvedev, said Russian officials had indeed reached an accord in principle to sell Iran enrichment technology — the centrifuge — but that no deal had been signed.

Any part of a final contract “that goes against the demands of the International Atomic Energy Agency will be eliminated” by Mr. Yeltsin, Mr. Medvedev said.

One can only ask what leave American officials? “Waiting and seeing,” one said today. “Hoping Yeltsin means it when he promises Clinton a successful summit.”
An Unlikely Matchmaker for Shabazz and Farrakhan

THE hundreds who filled Harlem’s Apollo Theater on Saturday night to see the improbable meeting between Louis F. Farrakhan and Dr. Betty Shabazz, Malcolm X’s widow, revealed the irony. They spoke about it, laughed at it, winked at it if they way people do when they share a winked joke.

Think of it, so many of them said. If not for the Federal Government acting as unincidental matchmaker, this evening might never have happened. If not for the Federal Government’s decision to charge Dr. Shabazz’s daughter with involvement in a sketchy plot to murder Mr. Farrakhan, the 36-year estrangement between him and Dr. Shabazz—who has long maintained that Mr. Farrakhan had a role in her husband’s death—might have continued.

When I practiced law, I never thanked the Government for a conspiracy, but F.B.I. thank you for this,” shout ed Vernon Mason, a disturbed lawyer and confrontation civil right figure.

Speaker after speaker denounced the Government at the combination prayer meeting, political rally and fundraising event, voicing sentiments that were markedly similar to the concerns of the right-wing militia groups that have attracted so much attention lately. The specifics of the perceived wrongs were different, but not the broader complaint—that the Government conspires to undermine the freedom of its citizens.

“Members of the Nation of Islam were involved in the assassination of Malcolm,” acknowledged Mr. Farrakhan, the leader of the Nation of Islam and final speaker in the more than four-hour event in the gilded theater on 125th Street. “We cannot deny our part.”

But we cannot be the real culprit get away with divid ing us,” he continued, his voice rising to a crescendo as the audience intoned agreement. “The Government of the United States is the outside force that divided us.”

Mr. Farrakhan, who denied any involvement in Mal colm X’s murder himself, was hardly critical of the authority for charging Qubilah Shabazz in a murder-for-hire case that was suddenly settled last week when she agreed to “accept responsibility” for her involvement in the plot; prosecutors agreed not to take the case to trial if she sought psychiatric, drug, and alcohol treatment.

But the 34-year-old Ms. Shabazz subsequently appeared to contradict her statement, blaming the plot on a former classmate and Government informant. Mr. Farrakhan joined others Saturday night in saying that the case was one of entrapment, part of a “much wider conspiracy” to divide black people and to show the world the assassination of Malcolm X on Feb. 21, 1965, in the Audubon Ballroom.

Curiously, Dr. Shabazz was the only main speaker who did not dwell on conspiracy theories. Instead, she spoke eloquently of her husband’s legacy, even saying that he predicted his murder and told her, “Don’t be bitter.”

If so, the members of the audience—many of whom have long linked to Malcolm X’s death and allowed him to use this opportunity to gain advantage.

It was hard to tell Saturday night who was the most popular figure with those assembled at the Apollo—Dr. Shabazz, Malcolm X or Mr. Farrakhan his disciple turned enemy turned “brother.”

Every mention of each brought cheers from the audience, more than 1,400 people who paid $50 to $100 for tickets, then were frisked by grim-looking young men wearing red bow ties and women in white gowns. Reporters and photographers also paid admission and were also frisked.

Those who may have avoided the pat-downs were the
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celebrities, and the audience was rich with them. They ranged from Mike Wallace and Exp. Charles S. Rangel of Manhattan, each of whom pledged $1,000 to the Shabazz family. Almost every recognizable personality either had a seat on the stage or was introduced, including Lionel Hampton, the Rev. Cahn O. Butts of the Abyssinian Baptist Church, Benjamin F. Chavis Jr., who was ousted as executive director of the N.A.A.C.P., and Percy Sutton and William Kunstler, Ms. Shabazz’s lawyers.

A MONG those noticeable for his absence was former Mayor David N. Dinkins. He was “otherwise engaged,” he said yesterday, but added that he doubted he would have gone if he were free. “The quarrel I had with Farrakhan had nothing to do with Malcolm X,” Mr. Dinkins said. “It had to do with what he was saying about Jews and the Jewish religion.” Mr. Farrakhan has referred to Judaism as “a gutter religion,” praised Hitler and accused Jews of dominating the slave trade.

Those and other incendiary Farrakhan views about Jews, whites and racial separatism were not heard from the stage Saturday night. They were represented in the audience, however, by Professor James W. Jones, who was dismissed as chairman of the black studies department at the City College of New York for making anti-Semitic remarks. After Mr. Farrakhan and Dr. Shabazz, he drew the loudest cheers, as well as a standing ovation.

Other than Mr. Farrakhan, though, the draw of the evening was Dr. Shabazz, a determined, outspoken woman who grew a bit impatient when the event’s organizers tried to get her to shorten her remarks. They were a bit agitated because their time on a satellite— which was sending the broadcast to audiences around the country— was running out, and Mr. Farrakhan hadn’t spoken yet. Dr. Shabazz continued to speak and the Nation of Islam bought another hour of satellite time.

In response to a scathing speech ended with an emotional defense of her husband and includes an unmistakable jab at Mr. Farrakhan. Noting that Mr. Farrakhan had recently referred to her husband as “another Malcolm,” Dr. Shabazz said, “I hope he will continue to see my husband as Brother Malcolm.”

If there was a mild edge to Dr. Shabazz’s voice, she also thanked Mr. Farrakhan graciously. Was the reconciliation genuine? Opinions differ. Some standing beside the police writers outside the theater on Saturday night were dubious, theorizing at Dr. Shabazz had believed her husband would go to trial and need the financial support Mr. Farrakhan offered.

Congressman Rangel offered another viewpoint, suggesting that both Mr. Farrakhan and Dr. Shabazz made a show of peace to prevent a possible act of retaliation against the Shabazz family. “Who cares whether Rabin loves Arafat?” Mr. Rangel asked. “Who cares whether Nelson Mandela really liked his jailors well enough to have them at his inauguration? It’s not what is in their hearts that counts. It’s whether they are at working toward peace.”
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Good afternoon. I would like to thank President Brand for that warm welcome, and Indiana University for inviting me to speak today. I am pleased to be here with Robert Orr, former Indiana Governor and former Ambassador to Singapore.

Four decades ago, Indiana President Herman Wells showed foresight in founding the Russian and East European Institute. Today, the Institute is among the country’s most respected centers of regional study. And many of its graduates have forged distinguished careers in this field, including Jim Collins, my special advisor for the New Independent States.

Your state's political leaders have played a crucial role in shaping our policy toward the former Soviet Union. When I called Senator Lugar to ask if he could join me here today, he said he really needed to be in Washington shepherding the ratification of our START II Treaty with Russia through the Senate. Under these circumstances, I reconsidered my invitation. And I will always be indebted to your highly respected Congressman, Lee Hamilton, for his counsel and support. You should be proud that Indiana has produced two such outstanding leaders of both parties.

Since his first day in office, President Clinton has pursued a pragmatic policy of engagement with Russia and the other New Independent States as the best investment we can make in our nation’s security and prosperity. Our approach is to cooperate where our interests coincide, and to manage our differences constructively and candidly where they do not. We support reform because in the long run, its success benefits not only the people of the region, but the American people as well. We understand that Russia and the other new states face a tumultuous future. For that reason, our policy is focused on the long haul. In sum, our approach is realistic and grounded in America’s strategic interests.
The successful transformation of the former Soviet empire into a region of sovereign, democratic states is a matter of fundamental importance to the United States. These 12 nations cover one-sixth of the world's surface. Their territory is home to tens of thousands of nuclear weapons. Their people and resources give them vast economic potential.

Twice in this century, political events in this region have remade the world -- profoundly for the worse in 1917, and profoundly for the better in 1991. The events of 1991 set in motion two historic transformations, both of which served our fundamental interests and those of the people of the region. The first is the disappearance of a hostile totalitarian empire, and its replacement by twelve newly independent states. The second is the collapse of communist dictatorship, and the movement toward democratic institutions and free markets.

These transformations have presented us with a remarkable opportunity to encourage stability in the region and enhance the security of the American people. We have taken advantage of that opportunity in ways that have paid enormous dividends. Indeed, our engagement with Russia, Ukraine, and their neighbors has made America safer than at any time since the end of World War II. Thousands of nuclear warheads, built to destroy America, are themselves being destroyed. Those that remain no longer target our cities and homes.

Last year, President Clinton negotiated a trilateral understanding with Russia and Ukraine that sets Ukraine on the path to become a non-nuclear power. In so doing, Ukraine joined Kazakhstan and Belarus in agreeing to give up nuclear weapons. We are leading efforts to dismantle their weapons and safeguard nuclear materials under a bipartisan program sponsored by Senator Nunn and Senator Lugar. In Defense Secretary Perry's words, it literally "removes the threat -- missile by missile, warhead by warhead, factory by factory."

Last December, President Clinton and the leaders of the region's nuclear states brought the START I agreement into force and paved the way for implementing START II. Together, these important treaties will cut strategic nuclear forces in Russia and the United States by almost two-thirds.

Our diplomacy has also made Europe more secure. After patient but firm efforts by President Bush and President Clinton, Russian troops completed their withdrawal last August from Germany and the Baltic states. Now, for the first time since World War II, the people of Central Europe are free of occupying forces.
Despite the progress that has been made, we have no illusions about how difficult the region’s transformation will be, or how long it will take to overcome centuries of empire and autocracy. Ultimately, only the peoples of the region can assure their success.

From the outset, our approach has been focused on the entire region of the former Soviet Union, in part because the futures of all these countries are closely linked. I am convinced that the success of reform in each of these countries will have a positive impact on success in the others.

Our region-wide approach can be seen in the emphasis we have placed on financial support to the non-Russian states -- which in 1995 will represent two-thirds of our assistance to the region. Increasingly, we are supporting private sector trade and investment. American firms have signed multi-billion dollar energy deals in Kazakhstan and in Azerbaijan -- the latter country so rich in oil that its capital was described in the 12th century as "blazing like a fire all night." Last year, our Overseas Private Investment Corporation provided almost $1 billion in financing for projects in the region. These programs will generate new exports and jobs for Americans.

The Clinton Administration has been steadfast in support of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all the new independent states. The region’s history of imperial conquest underscores how important it is that all countries scrupulously respect international law and the rights of their neighbors.

Of course, some states of the former Soviet Union command particular attention because of their potential to influence the future of the region. Ukraine is critical. With its size and its position, juxtaposed between Russia and Central Europe, it is a linchpin of European security. An independent, non-nuclear, and reforming Ukraine is also vital to the success of reform in the other New Independent States. That is why the United States has joined Britain and Russia in providing security assurances for Ukraine.

The United States has consistently led the international effort to support economic reform in Ukraine. Last year, we convinced the G-7 to pledge over $4 billion for that country. In October, Ukraine’s government launched a courageous program of market reform. We responded by increasing our assistance for 1994 by $250 million, to a total commitment of $900 million. Ukraine is now the fourth largest recipient of U.S. assistance after Israel, Egypt, and Russia. It is important that the Ukrainian Rada fully support President Kuchma’s economic reform program.
Of course, the future of Ukraine and every other state in the region will be profoundly affected by the outcome of Russia's new revolution. That is why the deliberations of Russia’s parliament and the fate of the ruble are on everyone’s mind, not just in Moscow, St. Petersburg, and Vladivostok, but also in Kiev, Almaty, and Baku.

In May, President Clinton will travel to Moscow to meet President Yeltsin for the seventh time. This summit comes at an important moment. Reform in Russia is under strain. The war in Chechnya continues. We have differences with Russia in foreign policy.

But whatever the problems, we must not lose sight of the breathtaking changes we have witnessed since the breakup of the Soviet Union. Ten years ago, almost 400 million people from the Baltic to the Bering Seas were subject to totalitarian dictatorship and hemmed in by minefields and barbed wire. Today, Vilnius, Warsaw and Kiev are free. Moscow is alive with political debate. Siberia is becoming a synonym for opportunity, not oblivion.

Perspective and a sense of history are also important. Not long ago, a severe disagreement between the United States and the Soviet Union could threaten a nuclear confrontation. Today, we do not always agree, and there are obviously new challenges in our relationship. But every difference is not a crisis. We address our differences constructively, without threatening to blow up the world.

Today, the real question is not whether we should engage with Russia, but how. We will reject policies that reflect short-term political pressures, but undermine the long-term interests of the United States. We will continue to work with Russia where our interests coincide. We will not hold our relationship hostage to any one issue. But we will remain ready to speak openly and act appropriately when Russian actions run counter to our interests.

Our policy toward Russia has been and will continue to be based on a clear-eyed understanding of the facts on the ground. As President Clinton has stressed, we reject the superficial caricature of Russia that suggests it is predestined to aggression, predisposed to dictatorship, or predetermined to economic failure. At the same time, we are under no illusion that success is assured.

The truth is, Russia has a choice. It can define itself in terms of its past or in terms of the future.
In many areas Russia is courageously making the right choices. It has a freely elected President and Parliament and a democratic constitution. It has an independent press, which often criticizes central government policies. Debate in the parliament is vigorous and open.

Economic reform is continuing. The government has acted boldly to bring inflation down. An ambitious privatization program has altered Russia’s economic landscape. The private sector now accounts for 50 percent of Russia’s GDP.

Two weeks ago, Russia initialled a $6.4 billion agreement with the IMF, which requires Russia to continue its fight against inflation, implement an austere budget, liberalize the energy sector, and free more prices from state control. This agreement is a significant landmark on the hard march to a stable market economy.

These positive changes are all the more notable in light of the ruinous legacy that Russian reformers are having to overcome. After 75 years of communism, much of the old elite remains entrenched in government and industry. Trust in democratic institutions is fragile -- and so are the institutions themselves. The rule of law is in its infancy. Crime and corruption are rampant. These problems could undermine democracy if they are not dealt with effectively.

The economic legacy is also difficult. The new Russia inherited from the Soviet Union a decrepit industrial base that has wasted natural resources and produced a string of environmental disasters -- from Chernobyl, to chemical pollution in the Urals, to the drying up of the Aral Sea.

And then there is the legacy of empire. Some 150 ethnic groups live within Russia’s eleven time zones. During the Soviet period, borders between the internal regions and republics of the empire were changed by communist leaders over 90 times. The central government of Russia has made progress in improving relations with the diverse peoples within the Russian Federation. But its actions in Chechnya today threaten its ability to emerge as a democratic, multi-ethnic state.

The Chechnya crisis began as Russia sought to deal with a complex problem with deep historical roots. Now a city and many villages have been destroyed, thousands have died, and the tensions that led to the fighting have surely been exacerbated. Russia’s conduct in Chechnya has been tragically wrong. Its decision to escalate fighting there in the last week is a serious mistake.
That is why I have urged the Russian government to end the carnage, to accept a permanent mission from the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, to provide humanitarian relief and to reach a political settlement. It is patently clear that the Russian government is paying a very high price for Chechnya both at home and internationally.

It is easy enough to enumerate our differences with Russia, or with other states of the former Soviet Union. But I do not have the luxury of making a list and walking away. My job is to build areas of agreement, to develop policies to manage our differences, and always to advance our nation's interests. Let me describe the five key goals of our strategy for the coming year, as they relate to all the states of the former Soviet Union.

First, we aim to resolve a number of important security issues vital to every American. In 1995, we are pursuing the most ambitious arms control agenda in history. President Clinton and I have urged the Senate to ratify START II before the U.S.-Russian summit in May. The Russian parliament should act promptly to do the same. We are working closely with Russia to achieve the indefinite extension of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. We will also press to conclude a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty -- thereby realizing the vision set forth three decades ago by President Kennedy.

We are also determined to combat the growing threat posed by nuclear smuggling. We must prevent rogue states and terrorists from acquiring nuclear weapons and materials. Nunn-Lugar programs will help us achieve this goal by dismantling nuclear weapons in the former Soviet Union and safeguarding the resulting nuclear materials. Full funding for Nunn-Lugar is vital to our nation's security.

Because of the importance we attach to fighting the spread of nuclear weapons, we are firmly opposed to Russia's nuclear cooperation with Iran. Russia is a neighbor of Iran. It will rue the day it cooperated with this terrorist state if Iran builds nuclear weapons with the benefit of Russian expertise and equipment. Russia should take note that no major industrial democracy cooperates with Iran on nuclear matters. It is simply too dangerous to be permitted. For this reason, it is important that in our meeting last week, Foreign Minister Kozyrev and I agreed to set up a working group to examine non-proliferation issues, including the consequences of nuclear cooperation with Iran.

A second goal for 1995 will be to cooperate on a newer set of global or transnational issues, including crime, energy, the environment, and space. During the Cold War, such cooperation was impossible. Today it is essential.
International crime is a growing threat to the lives and livelihoods of countless Americans, and to the prospects for reform in the former Soviet Union. I have made the fight against global crime a top priority of U.S. foreign policy. FBI Director Louis Freeh and I have worked together to set up an FBI office in Moscow -- to cooperate with the Russians to combat organized crime, corruption and drug trafficking.

Vice President Gore and Prime Minister Chernomyrdin are spearheading efforts to improve the efficiency of the Russian oil and gas sector, thereby raising productivity and reducing that industry's high levels of pollution. They are also strengthening our cooperation with Russia in space -- symbolized today by the space station Mir, with its first American crew member on board.

Our cooperation on these issues is not limited to Russia. We will continue to work with Ukraine and our G-7 partners to overcome the dangerous aftermath of Chernobyl. We are also helping Kazakhstan to manage its enormous energy resources in economically sound and environmentally safe ways.

Third, we will continue carefully targeted assistance programs that increase our security, expand our prosperity, and promote our interest in democratic reform. Nunn-Lugar monies will continue to advance our strategic interest in dismantling nuclear weapons. Our assistance will also continue to support the vital elements of a working democracy and civil society, including a free press and jury trials. And by supporting privatization and small business development, it will encourage free markets, and open new opportunities for American companies. Most of our assistance will go to private organizations and local governments outside Moscow.

Assistance has put America on the right side of the struggle for change in Russia. Some people say we should end these programs to punish Russia when it does something we oppose. I am all for maximizing our leverage. But I have personally reviewed our assistance programs and concluded that cutting them back now would make no sense. The critics of those programs need to ask themselves some tough questions. Would they stop the funding necessary to dismantle the nuclear weapons that once targeted American cities? Would they cut off support for privatization and free elections -- wiping out programs that strengthen the very forces in Russian society that share our interests and values?

I believe that when they understand these choices, the American people will adopt the only course that makes sense: That is, to make the necessary investments now to make our nation more secure and prosperous for generations to come. I call on both the House and Senate to fund fully our request for assistance to the New Independent States.
The fundamental basis of the assistance program is to encourage all of the New Independent States to move forward with reform. Free elections are especially vital. President Nazarbayev’s recent effort to extend his term unilaterally is a step backward for Kazakhstan. We call on him to renew his commitment to hold timely parliamentary elections, followed by scheduled presidential elections in 1996. We applaud President Yeltsin’s commitment to hold parliamentary elections at the end of this year and presidential elections next year. When President Clinton goes to Moscow in May, you can be sure he will underscore the importance we attach to that commitment.

In meeting with President Yeltsin, President Clinton will be dealing with the first freely elected leader of Russia. But he will also talk directly to the Russian people and meet a cross section of Russian society -- especially those who are committed to reform. The United States will continue to cultivate strong ties with a wide range of leaders and institutions in and out of the Russian government. To encourage pluralism in Russia, we will deal with Russia as a pluralistic society.

Fourth, we will reinforce the independence of Russia’s neighbors and support their further development as market democracies. We will also use our good offices to help resolve conflicts in the region. Last December, we persuaded Russia that an OSCE-led peacekeeping mission in Nagorno-Karabakh was preferable to unilateral action. If a settlement is reached, such a mission would set a powerful precedent for conflict resolution in the New Independent States. It is vital that Russia continue to cooperate with the OSCE to ensure its success.

Fifth, we will advance the President’s comprehensive strategy for building a stable, peaceful and integrated Europe. Just as we had in Western Europe after World War II, we now have a rare and historic opportunity to build a new security architecture for all of Europe that will last for generations.

President Clinton’s vision includes several key elements. The OSCE will have a larger and more operational role. NATO’s Partnership for Peace will strengthen its ties to Central Europe and to the New Independent States. NATO will move forward with its steady and deliberate process to accept new members, following the approach laid out by the NATO ministers last December. And we will seek a stronger relationship between NATO and Russia in parallel with NATO expansion.
In the process of NATO expansion, each potential member will be judged individually, according to its capabilities and its commitment to the principles of the NATO treaty. The fundamental decisions will be made by NATO, in consultation with potential members. The process will be transparent to all and there will be no vetoes by third parties.

As I emphasized to Foreign Minister Kozyrev last week, it is in Russia's interest to participate constructively in the process of European integration. Russia has an enormous stake in a stable and peaceful Europe. No country has suffered more when Europe has not been at peace. Russia's path to deeper involvement in Europe is open. It should not choose to isolate itself from this effort.

Building a new security architecture in Europe is part of a larger strategy of integrating the new democracies of the former Soviet Union into the major institutions of the West, including the European Union, the World Trade Organization, the OECD, and the G-7. These institutions give structure, legitimacy, and strength to the common enterprise of the Western democracies -- namely, promoting peace and economic growth. It will serve our interests to extend the benefits of integration -- as well as its considerable obligations -- to Europe's new democracies, including the New Independent States.

The pace of integration, however, will depend on the extent to which the nations of the former Soviet Union continue on the reform path and adhere to international norms. WTO membership, for example, is only possible for nations that adopt trade and investment rules consistent with world standards. Likewise, the evolution of Russia's participation in Western institutions will be affected by the world's judgment of its conduct in Chechnya and its respect for international norms.

The United States will continue to pursue a realistic and pragmatic course toward all the New Independent States -- a course that has produced concrete benefits for Americans. We will not take for granted the success of the historic transformations now under way in the former Soviet Union. But we will continue to work to bring about the best possible outcome. Our enduring interests demand that we stay engaged. Our policy is rooted in American interests. We will protect our security, our welfare, and our values.

As we travel this difficult yet promising path, we will call upon the same qualities that have sustained American leadership in the past: steadiness, consistency, and reliability in pursuing our interests and upholding our commitments. These are the qualities that have kept America strong and free. These are the qualities that must guide us now as we build the more secure and integrated world that is in the fundamental interest of the American people.

Thank you very much.
Secretary Christopher
June 22, 1994

Address to the North Atlantic Council,
Brussels, Belgium.

Mr. Deputy Secretary General, it is a
great pleasure to join our NATO col-
leagues and Foreign Minister Kozyrev
to mark this historic occasion and to
welcome Russia as the newest member
of the Partnership for Peace.

Our meeting today is a powerful ex-
pression of Europe's remarkable trans-
formation. Who could have imagined
even a few short years ago that after 40
years of bitter confrontation across the
Iron Curtain, a newly democratic Rus-
sia and this alliance would join in a
partnership of cooperation. Within our
grasp lies the historic opportunity to
build an undivided, peaceful, and demo-
cratic Europe. That is the dream that
has animated this alliance and my coun-
try for more than four decades. That is
the vision that President Clinton set
forth when he proposed the Partner-
ship for Peace. That is the goal that
the United States remains fully com-
mited to achieving.

Today, as Russia joins the Partner-
ship, we take a major step toward
building the bonds of cooperation that
can secure the peace of a broader Eu-
rope. As an alliance, we are reaching
out to Russia's Government and its
military to establish a new, more con-
structive relationship. But no less im-
portant—as the alliance has done with
other European neighbors—we are ex-
tending a hand of friendship to the Rus-
sian people.

Russia is and will remain a country
of immense importance to the rest of
Europe and the world. Its efforts to
build democratic institutions and a
market economy have profound impli-
cations for European security. A broad
and constructive NATO-Russia rela-
tionship will serve the interests of this
alliance. It will serve Russia's inter-
ests. It will serve the interests of all
the nations of Europe—particularly
those that so recently won their free-
dom from communist rule.

The Partnership for Peace is central
to NATO's relationship with Russia.
We also look forward to constructive
dialogue and cooperation to supplement
the Partnership in areas where Russia
has unique and important contributions
to make. At the same time, President
Clinton will continue to work closely
with President Yeltsin to build a strong
and cooperative U.S.-Russian bilateral
relationship in the interests of both our
peoples and the world.

Other European states may also
have interests or capabilities that
would warrant "16-plus-one" consulta-
tions outside the Partnership. We
should welcome these possibilities. As
NATO promotes security and stability
in Central and Eastern Europe, that
too will benefit all European nations—
including Russia.

Russia's accession to the Partner-
ship for Peace is a reflection of the
policy of extending to the East the in-
stitutions that have allowed the West
to achieve unparalleled security and
prosperity. Two weeks ago in Paris,
Russia signed a cooperation agreement
with the OECD. In two days in Corfu,
President Yeltsin will sign an agree-
ment with the EU that will open Euro-
pean markets to many Russian
products. Next month in Naples, the
G-7 will welcome President Yeltsin for
broad political consultations.

By widening the reach of the great
postwar security and economic institu-
tions, we can help ensure that war, po-
verty, and oppression never again engulf
this continent. We are committed to
working for an integrated Europe
where sovereign and independent
states need not fear their neighbors.

Today, we are taking another deci-
sive step toward banishing Europe's
historic divisions. We are building a
security partnership that has the poten-
tial to encompass all the nations of the
continent. With Russia's action, 21
countries have now joined the Partner-
shop for Peace. Several have already
entered into close consultations with
NATO to develop Individual Partner-
ship Programs tailored to their unique
capabilities and interests. By this fall,
joint exercises will commence, with Po-
land hosting the first exercise on the
soil of a partner country. In this way,
the Partnership will build the habits of
cooperation that are the lifeblood of the alliance. It can thus pave the way for NATO's eventual expansion.

We cannot build the Europe we seek without a strong NATO alliance. We cannot build it without a democratic Russia. We cannot build it without the nations of Central and Eastern Europe. The "best possible future for Europe," which President Clinton invoked at the January summit, depends on all our nations working together in pursuit of common security interests and democratic ideals. That is the purpose of the Partnership, and it is the spirit in which we welcome Russia as a partner today.

Foreign Minister Kozyrev, Secretary Christopher
June 22, 1994

Opening statements from a news conference, Brussels, Belgium.

Foreign Minister Kozyrev (through an interpreter). Ladies and gentlemen, today, as usual, in the Russian embassy, we have had a frank and substantive discussion with the Secretary of State. We have discussed, today, a number of urgent issues:

* First of all, as regards the official visit by President Yeltsin to the United States at the end of September;
* Secondly, the meeting of President Yeltsin and President Clinton in Naples, which will be a major milestone in the Russian-U.S. partnership;
* Also, on the instruction of our two Presidents, we have discussed the joint initiative as given in the text of the draft resolution regarding nuclear issues connected with North Korea. I must say that our positions have become closer and almost coincide on the majority of all the aspects, and I think that our representatives in New York should be ready to reach agreement on that very soon;
* Of course, we also discussed the settlement in Bosnia, and I think that, in this respect, the work of the Contact Group can rely on the understanding that is between us;
* Finally, we discussed the issue of the Baltic states. In particular, I expressed concern regarding the adoption bilaterally of legislation which withstands any criticism—not only on the part of Russian human rights organizations but also of the Council of Europe and the OSCE. We also discussed the question of living up to the agreements on the withdrawal of troops from Estonia; and I think that, given the goodwill on the part of our colleagues, there may be rapid progress in this area soon. We also discussed some other problems.

Secretary Christopher. It's always a pleasure to be with my good friend, Andrei Kozyrev. We've been seeing a good deal of each other recently, and I am sure that will continue. It reflects the intensified consultations between the United States and Russia, giving us an opportunity to harmonize our policies and to make sure we are on the same track.

The United States especially welcomed the accession by Russia to the Partnership for Peace, which, of course, we've just seen taking place in the ceremony at NATO Headquarters. This reflects the transformation of Europe in the direction that President Clinton had in mind when, last January, he called for the Partnership for Peace as a possible way—as the best way, indeed—to achieve a peaceful, democratic, undivided Europe.

We also, as Minister Kozyrev said, discussed a number of matters of common interest. We are very pleased that President Yeltsin has accepted President Clinton's invitation to visit the United States in September, which will follow on their bilateral meeting during the time of the G-7.

We discussed a number of issues of importance to both countries. I briefed the Foreign Minister on the results of President Carter's trip to North Korea. I explained to him that we are going back through official diplomatic channels now to seek confirmation of indications that President Carter perceived that North Korea is prepared to freeze its nuclear program. We need to have more specificity on that, and I indicated to the Foreign Minister the precise areas in which we are seeking specificity.

Of course, both of us hope that North Korea will take steps to come into compliance with its international obligations, but until that has been confirmed, we believe that consultations should go forward on the sanctions resolution at the United Nations. As the Foreign Minister indicated, we have developed a common approach toward such a sanctions resolution, which will integrate the concept of the international conference—possible international conference—as well. But I want to emphasize that both of those aspects would be looking toward ensuring compliance by North Korea with its international obligations.

Finally, a word about Bosnia. We discussed and commended the work of the Contact Group, looking toward the achievement of a common proposal as well as a proposal with respect to incentives and consequences—sometimes called, I think, the carrots and sticks.

The Contact Group will meet again next week, probably on June 28. If they are able to come into concurrence on these various aspects, I think the Foreign Minister and I would welcome another ministerial meeting to press forward on this front, and—here as in various other matters—I think we have made good progress in developing a common approach.
Secretary Christopher

U.S. Support for Russian Reform: An Investment in America's Security

Address at the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, May 27, 1993.

Fritz Mondale suggested that I come here today, and I am delighted to be back in the Upper Midwest. Scranton, North Dakota, where I grew up, was much too small to have a daily paper, and I depended upon the Minneapolis Tribune, which was brought only one day late on the Milwaukee railroad. I grew up on Gopher football, and probably could still name some of the members of the 1935 team.

In those Depression years, I learned that politics should be about helping people. Through my life and in my career, no single state has produced more caring politicians than Minnesota—notable among them Fritz Mondale.

Fritz Mondale is a man I have been proud to work with and stand by for nearly thirty years. We worked together to advance justice at home and human rights abroad. In the Carter Administration, we worked together to win approval of the Panama Canal Treaties and the Taiwan Relations Act, two of the signature endeavors of the Carter Administration. We also worked together on behalf of Southeast Asian refugees and against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

In recent years, in private life, Fritz Mondale has worked to promote democracy and human rights around the world as Chairman of the National Democratic Institute. Wherever he has gone, Fritz has shown America's most decent face to the world, and reminded Americans of our most inspiring values.

I am especially pleased to be speaking to you today at a great state university that honors the memory of Hubert Humphrey. His achievements on the domestic front were so imaginative and so important—from civil rights to Medicare—that we sometimes forget the lasting contribution he made in the field of international affairs.

Like many of his contemporaries, Hubert Humphrey knew what he was against: communism and repression. But like few others, he was also just as passionate about what he stood for and what America ought to stand for in the world: peace and freedom. He knew where America should go—and as much as anyone of his generation, he knew how to get there. The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty; the Peace Corps and the Food for Peace program; these are all part of Hubert's legacy. Hubert's ideas made the world better, by bringing out the best in America.

This is one in a series of speeches I will be giving around the United States. I want to make sure that foreign policy isn't foreign to the American people.

At the State Department, we have a desk for virtually every foreign country: a China desk; a Brazil desk; a Russia desk. As Secretary of State, I am determined that we will also have an American desk—and that I will sit behind it. My principal mission is to advance the vital interests and values of the citizens of the United States. That's my job.

I want to help American businesses succeed in the global economy. That is why I visited Honeywell earlier today to discuss their investments in Russia. It was an inspiring visit to a very great company.

I want to underscore our unshakable commitment to human rights. That is why I am visiting later today the Center for Victims of Torture here in Minneapolis.

And I want America to make essential investments in our national security. That is why I have come here to talk to you about America's policy toward Russia. No relationship is more important to the long-term security of the United States than our strategic relationship with Russia.

Today's students are the first generation of Americans to have come of age in the post-Cold War era. It is your generation that will define America's destiny in the next century. It is your generation that will decide to what purpose America's leadership and power will be put.
Today, I want to talk about our new opportunity to make a new democratic world. As we meet, the people of Russia are struggling heroically to build a free society and a market economy. If they succeed, the payoffs for America promise to be profound: in the reduced threat of nuclear war; in lower defense budgets; and in the vast new markets that can fuel global prosperity and create jobs for Americans.

But if reform fails, and if Russia reverts to dictatorship or collapses into anarchy, the consequences would be appalling. The shadow of nuclear confrontation could return. Our "peace dividend" would be cancelled. Cooperation in foreign policy would vanish. And the worldwide movement toward democracy would suffer a devastating setback.

America faces a choice. Either we do all we can now to help Russia's reformers succeed—or we stand aside, take our chances, and just watch events unfold. If we stand aside, we will forfeit a rare chance to shape a more peaceful world.

Some believe that with the end of the Cold War, America ought to step back from the world stage. What a disservice that would be to all Americans, especially to young Americans. You deserve the same chance my generation had to fulfill America's unique destiny to promote freedom and democracy around the world.

Some say that our nation is on a course of decline, that we can no longer afford to lead. It is true that the United States faces many challenges today unlike any in the nation's history. But to me, that means we must be more engaged internationally, not less; more ardent in our promotion of democracy, not less; more inspired in our leadership, not less.

America must lead because the need for American leadership is undiminished. We are a blessed and a powerful nation. We must shoulder the responsibility of world leadership.

We stand prepared to act decisively to protect our interests wherever and whenever necessary. When it is necessary, we will act unilaterally to protect our interests. Where collective responses are appropriate, we will lead in mobilizing such collective responses. But let me make it clear today. Make no mistake: The United States will lead.

At two other points in this century, America faced a choice similar to the one we face today.

The first defining moment for American leadership came in 1918 in the aftermath of World War I. After that terrible conflict, Europe lay devastated and demoralized. Empires that had stood for centuries collapsed overnight. Violent revolution and revenge erupted.

Amid the chaos, the world looked to the United States for the strength and moral vision to ensure a lasting peace. That was the dream of President Wilson. He was a visionary in his grasp of a profound truth of this bloody century: American leadership is the linchpin of a more just international system.

But Wilson's plan to join the League of Nations was defeated in Congress. Instead of deciding to lead, the United States chose to retreat. For America and the world, the consequences were tragic.

Within a decade, the storm clouds gathered. Hitler became Germany's chancellor, and, six years later, Germany marched into Czechoslovakia. A militarist Japan invaded Manchuria. Fascist Italy conquered Ethiopia. And the systematic persecution and destruction of Europe's Jews commenced. All the while, America declined in isolationism. Then the infamous attack on Pearl Harbor shattered a false peace. And nearly 300,000 Americans gave their lives on the battlefields of Europe and the Pacific to help win World War II.

Then came the second defining moment for American leadership. Americans saw European democracies teetering on the edge, economies lying in ruin, communist dictatorships consolidating their hold in Eastern Europe, the Iron Curtain descending, and a Cold War chilling the new peace.

Once again, the world looked to America's strength and moral force to build peace from the ruins of war. But this time, America responded positively.

It took principled presidential leadership—and bipartisan statesmanship—to win congressional approval and lasting public support. Fortunately, we were blessed with leaders—Truman, Marshall, Acheson, Vanden­berg—who had learned the bitter lessons of 1918.

Together, Democrats and Republicans put the pillars of peace and security in place—at Bretton Woods, with the Marshall Plan, and through NATO. And those pillars still stood as the Berlin Wall fell.

Put simply, Communism was defeated. Freedom was defended. Our values triumphed.

In the late 1940s, I had returned from service in the Pacific during the Second World War and was attending law school. I remember the atmosphere when, as Averell Harriman once said, most Americans wanted nothing more than to "go to the movies and drink a Coke."

Yet when the American people saw what was at stake, they exercised their common sense. They accepted the necessity for American leadership of the post-war world. They understood it was right, it was necessary, and it was in America's interest.

We spent literally trillions of dollars to deter the communist threat. And we put the lives of our finest young Americans on the line to preserve freedom.

The sacrifices were great, but the payoffs were even greater. My generation enjoyed security and unparalleled prosperity. And we helped to turn our former wartime adversaries—Germany and Japan—into peace-time allies and leading partners in the democratic community.

Certainly, there are differences between the situations we faced after two world wars and the situation today. But there are also important parallels—dangerous world later; the need to talk sense to the American people.
Even as we make the tough choices at home to put our economy in order, we must extend a hand of cooperation to the peoples of the former Soviet Union, not out of charity, but out of responsibility to ourselves—to secure our own interests and to defend our own values. Helping democracy succeed in Russia is probably the wisest—and least expensive—investment that we can make today in America’s security.

A democratic Russia creates a new global political landscape. Today, Russia is showing a willingness to work with the United States and other nations to prevent the spread of the conflict in Bosnia and to exert pressure for a political outcome. Our new relationship with Russia gives us the chance to work together on the world’s problems, and to carry out preventive diplomacy and solve conflicts.

The need for American action is reinforced by the results of Russia’s April 25 referendum. In a great expression of democratic faith, the Russian people reaffirmed their commitment to political and economic reform. While the experts insisted that Russians had grown cynical about democracy and apathetic toward politics, nearly two-thirds of voters came to the polls.

Even more remarkable was the outcome of the referendum itself. After almost 18 months of painful economic reforms, a strong majority of the Russian people expressed their support for President Yeltsin and for more reform. And they did so with the backing of President Clinton, whose support of Yeltsin and reform in Russia has been strong and unflinching.

President Clinton is determined to meet the challenge of leadership—to tip the global balance in favor of freedom. This is why he has led America into an alliance with Russian reform. Working closely with Russia’s democrats and our Western allies, the President has developed a two-part strategy to support the new Russian revolution: First, a focused program of U.S. initiatives to help the development of Russian democracy and free enterprise; second, a large-scale package of measures to support a transformation of the Russian economy, a package jointly sponsored by the world’s major industrial democracies and major financial institutions.

President Clinton is delivering on the commitments that he made to President Yeltsin at Vancouver in early April—commitments that were important to the outcome of the referendum.

He pledged concessional loans for agricultural products. Very soon, Russia will sign a $700 million Food for Progress concessional loan agreement, an agreement that will provide aid for Russia. That will also help wheat, corn, and soybean farmers here in the Midwest.

He pledged support for privatization in Russia. U.S. teams are now in Russia helping establish capital markets, including a fledgling stock market, and an Enterprise Fund to invest in start-up small businesses in Russia.

He pledged support for student exchange programs as part of a Democracy Corps. More than 2,000 Russian students will come to America in the coming weeks as part of “Democracy Summer.”

Other parts of the Vancouver program are also moving ahead. We are working to revive Russia’s energy sector—to provide hard currency for Russia—and lessen U.S. dependence on Persian Gulf oil. We are also helping to resettle recently demobilized Russian soldiers. That action will support the withdrawal of Russian troops from neighboring countries.

President Clinton’s initiative is guided by several basic principles.

First, we want to deliver quick and tangible benefits to the Russian people. If the faith demonstrated in last month’s referendum is to be sustained, they must see that they are the beneficiaries of reform and not its unintentional victims. And if Americans are to support this initiative, we must—and we will—make sure that the aid is not just well-intentioned but also well-spent.

A congressional delegation, led by House Majority Leader Richard Gephardt, recently saw first-hand how the United States is helping to make privatization work in Russia. They observed auction centers in Moscow and Nizhny Novgorod both funded by USAID and operated by Price Waterhouse, to carry out the sale of state-run enterprises.

Second, we need to assist Russia’s conversion to a market economy. Ultimately, increased interaction with the world economy—far more than aid—will transform Russia. For its part, Russia needs to establish the necessary legal and political conditions to attract foreign trade and investment—which we hope will include businesses that will create American jobs.

For our part, President Clinton has ordered a full review of Cold War laws and regulations. They were meant to restrict trade with a communist Soviet Union, but they now only impede our relations with a democratic Russia. To the maximum extent possible, consistent with America’s interests, U.S. markets should be open to competitive Russian products. Similarly, Americans should be allowed to export our goods and technology to Russia.

Third, we want to dramatically expand efforts to send American business and trade union leaders, farmers, and community organizers to Russia. We want to increase contact and cooperation between our armed forces and the Russian military. We want to bring tens of thousands of Russians to the United States, where they can experience the sights, sounds, and practices of a thriving democracy and a market economy.

Our exchange programs will place a special emphasis on the younger generation of Russians and Americans. I hope each of you consider taking part at some point.

Fourth, our assistance to Russia must also reinforce U.S. security. This approach means helping Russia and its neighbors dismantle their dangerous nuclear arsenals. This is simply the best security that our money can buy.

Fifth and finally, our assistance efforts must not take place in isolation, but must be part of a larger partnership between Russia and the international community. That is why Presi-
dent Clinton's strategy to support Russia's democracy is tied to a large-scale multilateral initiative with our principal industrial partners around the world.

This multilateral program was announced last month in Tokyo at an extraordinary meeting of foreign and finance ministers from the seven major industrialized countries and Russia. At that meeting, Russia's representatives outlined a bold new plan to control Russia's money supply, to cut its budget deficits, and to undertake even more fundamental economic reform.

In response to such actions, the world's leading democracies—working through the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank—announced their readiness to provide Russia with financial support. Fifteen billion dollars of Russia's foreign debt has recently been rescheduled. The multilateral package announced at Tokyo amounts to more than $28 billion to help Russia stabilize its currency, finance critical imports, and divest itself of inefficient state enterprises.

The disbursement of these resources will be closely linked to Russia's progress in economic reform. In contrast to previous assistance efforts, the Tokyo program sets realistic standards for Russian performance. We plan to match Russia's progress with a prompt infusion of resources that will reinforce reform and will benefit Russian people at the grass-roots level.

At the G-7 meeting in Tokyo in April, the United States committed to going beyond the pledges made in Vancouver. We put forth a $1.8 billion additional proposal to build upon our efforts in support of reform.

I am pleased that just yesterday, the funding for that proposal was approved by the House subcommittee that oversees these matters, chaired very effectively by Congressman Dave Obey from your neighboring state of Wisconsin. And I am also pleased that the package drew strong bipartisan support.

We have made important progress since Vancouver. I am confident that we will sustain that progress until the July summit meeting in Tokyo, when we hope for another burst of enthusiasm and commitment to support free markets and democracy in Russia.

Our closest allies clearly recognize that helping Russia is in their interest, too. Canada, Germany, Japan, and Britain have each announced substantial new aid packages during the last two months. We hope that by the July summit in Tokyo, we will be able to announce agreement with our allies on the creation of a new special privatization fund. We will work closely in this effort with Japan and Germany. And we hope that Japan fully recognizes the leading role it can play not only in Tokyo this summer, but thereafter in helping deliver the kind of total package that will secure Russia's place in the community of democratic nations.

I think that all of us in Washington realize that asking American taxpayers to help support Russia is not easy, especially when we face important challenges here at home. But I disagree with those who think it's wrong or politically unwise to ask the American people to support a program that is so clearly in our interests.

That's why we are asking—and that's why we're asking now. I urge you to support the President's plan to help Russia's democracy succeed. I am convinced that this investment in Russia's democracy is essential to America's future security.

I am especially asking the young people here today to make your choice. I am not among those who think that your generation is disengaged, or cynical, or apathetic about what happens in the world around you. Don't let those critics sell you short. I believe you deserve more credit, and I ask you today to help prove me right. I ask you to tell your parents, your peers, your representatives in Congress, that you understand the vital link between the success of Russian democracy and America's long-term security.

You understand that freedom abroad means opportunity in America. You understand that assistance to our friends in Russia is insurance against having enemies in Russia.

If we do not act today, your generation may inherit an America of few choices and many burdens. You may inherit an America of lost opportunities. We may never build a national service program. We may never fully fund Head Start for poor children. We may never be able to afford the technologies we need to clean up our environment. Unless we help Russian democracy now, we will pay the price. And my responsibility, together with you, is not to let that happen.

We have come so far. We have spent so much. We have earned the promise of a safer, freer, and better world. To retreat now would be to walk away from nearly a half century of American leadership, sacrifice, and commitment.

Our purpose over the last half century was to arrive right where we are today: to be able to ask the American people to form a partnership with Russia because it is in America's most fundamental interest. That is why we ask—and that is why we are confident that the Congress and the American people will respond affirmatively when we make this request to measure up to our mutual responsibilities.
Secretary Christopher

The Three Pillars of U.S. Foreign Policy
And Support for Reform in Russia


It is a pleasure for me to be here today. This might surprise you, but I am happy to be here on a white and snowy morning. It reminds me of growing up in North Dakota—walking home from school and having my mother greet me with a cup of hot chocolate. You can see I have happy memories of the Midwest, so I'm especially happy to be here.

I'm particularly pleased to be speaking to this very audience. Secretaries of State spend probably too much of their time explaining American foreign policy to foreign diplomats, and they might tend to take for granted audiences such as this, the audiences that really count: the American people.

I want to say a special welcome today to the students that are here from the congressional districts of Congressmen Reynolds and Rush. You students have a tremendous stake in our foreign policy. After all, you are the ones that will have to live with the consequences of all that we do. So it's critical that your voice be heard, and I am particularly glad that you're here today.

My trip today is only the first of many that I hope to be making to the cities and towns of the United States. My mission is quite a simple one: to begin an ongoing conversation with the people here in America about the world we live in and our country's proper role in it.

It is fitting that I launch this process, I think, here in Chicago. Your city is a city that symbolizes America in so many ways—by its location here in the country's heartland, by its fighting spirit, by its broad shoulders, and most of all by its good common sense. Yet at the same time, Chicago is very much at the center of the world—with its mighty industries exporting goods around the globe, with its commodity markets linking international investors near and far.

Chicagoans and all Americans have a right to a foreign policy that serves their interests in very concrete ways. They want a foreign policy that will build a safer world, a more prosperous world, and a world where their values can be secure. That is exactly the kind of foreign policy that Governor—President Clinton sometimes—has he has charged me to carry out.

At the State Department, we have a desk responsible for every foreign country, or virtually every foreign country—the China desk, an Argentine desk, a Russia desk. As Secretary of State, I am determined that the State Department will also have an "American desk"—and I want to be sitting behind that desk. My foremost mission is to advance the vital interests of the citizens of the United States. Today, and over the coming weeks and months, I want to outline how the Clinton Administration plans to pursue that objective—pursue the objective of furthering the interests of the American people.

America In a New World

As you all know, our world has changed fundamentally in recent years. Walls have come down. Empires have collapsed. Most important, the Cold War is over, and the Soviet Union is no more. Soviet communism is dead. But with it is the reference point that guided our policies for over 40 years. It was easy when we could simply point to the Soviet Union and say that what we had to do was to contain Soviet expansion. That reference point explained why our international leadership was so necessary, why our defense burden was so heavy, and why assistance to other countries was so critical.

Today, we face a vastly more complicated world. It is a world of breathtaking opportunities to expand democracy and free markets. But it also is a world of grave new perils. Long-simmering ethnic conflicts have flared up anew in the former Yugoslavia and elsewhere. Weapons of mass destruction are falling into the hands of very dangerous dictators. And new global challenges cry out for attention around our entire world—challenges like the environment, over population, drug trafficking, and AIDS.
Like the last generation's great leaders who met the challenges of the Cold War, we need a new strategy for protecting and promoting American interests in this new era. We need a strategy that will face the questions that Americans are asking, and most understandably asking: Why, they say, with the threat of Soviet expansionism gone, do we need to be active on the international front? Why must America continue to carry the heavy burdens of leadership? Why, when we so urgently need renewal here at home, should we continue to dedicate large resources abroad?

The Three Pillars: Renewing America's Foreign Policy

President Clinton has responded to these challenges by laying out an American foreign policy based upon three pillars:

First, building American prosperity;

Second, modernizing America's armed services; and

Third, promoting democracy and human rights abroad.

This policy's fundamental premise is that in today's world foreign and domestic policy are inseparable. If we fail to maintain our strength at home, we will be, certainly, unable to lead abroad. If we retreat into isolationism, it will be impossible to revitalize our domestic strength. America cannot thrive in a world of economic recession or violent conflicts or a world which is riven with dictatorships.

It is no accident that President Clinton has identified promotion of America's economic security as the first pillar of our foreign policy. We've entered an era where economic competitiveness is vital to our ability to succeed abroad. As an essential first step, as you know, the President has put forward a bold, new program to get America's own economic house in order. It's a comprehensive strategy that will invest in the needs of our people, reduce our deficits, and lay the foundation for long-term economic growth. The single most important step that we can take to strengthen our foreign policy, to strengthen our position in the world, is to enact the President's economic program—and to do so just as soon as possible.

But steps at home cannot ensure America's prosperity. Today, we are irreversibly linked to the global economy. Our lives are constantly touched by huge flows of trade and finance that cross many borders. To take another example, over 7 million Americans are now employed in export-related jobs—many of them here, of course, right in the Chicago area.

Our ability to prosper in this global economy depends upon our ability to compete. That means harnessing our diplomacy to serve our economic goals. We must ensure that foreign markets are open to U.S. goods and U.S. investments. We must fight unfair competition against U.S. business and labor. And we must press the world's other financial powers to enact responsible policies that foster growth.

The second pillar of our foreign policy will be to modernize our armed forces to meet new needs around the world and to meet continuing threats. The collapse of the Soviet Union enables us to significantly scale back our military establishment. But, nevertheless, our power must always be sufficient to counter any threat to our vital interests. We must be able to deter and, when necessary, to defeat any potential foe. That's why we are taking steps to make our military more agile, mobile, flexible, and smart. Let me emphasize that President Clinton is determined to have the best-equipped and best fighting force in America to defend America.

As we talk about our armed forces, I think it is important for me to say that America cannot be the world's policeman. We cannot be responsible for settling every dispute or answering every alarm. We are indispensable, but we certainly must not be indiscriminate. America's leadership will require that we wisely marshal the West's collective strength.

Ethnic conflicts—and the humanitarian disasters they generate—deeply offend our conscience. In many cases, they also pose a serious risk to international peace. And they produce thousands of refugees, so often, that strain the political and economic stability of an entire region. Our imperative is to develop international means to contain and, more important, to prevent these conflicts before they erupt. Here, it is critical that we use the United Nations in the manner its founders intended, and there is high, new hope that this may take place. UN peace-keeping capabilities must be strengthened so as to allow prompt, preventive action. Our other instruments of collective security, such as our NATO alliance, must be adapted in this new era to support the UN efforts.

One of the most promising areas for preventive diplomacy is in the Middle East. Here, fortunately, the end of the Cold War has not unleashed conflict; but, rather, it has created new opportunities, new chances for ending conflict. I recently returned from a 7-day trip to the region, where I held extensive talks with all the top leaders of the Arab and Israeli Governments. I came back absolutely convinced that there is a historic opportunity to take new strides toward peace in this troubled region.

Now it's imperative that all sides to this long-simmering conflict seize this opportunity to return to the negotiating table in Washington on April 20, as we have invited them to do. If they return and enter negotiations, the United States is ready to act as a full partner in their efforts. If they do not, however—if they allow this unique chance to slip away—another generation in the Middle East could be lost to an endless cycle of confrontation and, eventually, to renewed conflict.

Let me now turn to the third pillar of this Administration's foreign policy: encouraging the global revolution for democracy and human rights that is transforming the world. By helping promote democracy, we do more than honor our deepest values. We are also making a strategic investment in our
nation's security. History has shown that a world of more democracies is a safer world. It is a world that will devote more to human development and less to human destruction. And it is a world that will promote what all people have in common rather than what tears them apart.

The Challenge of Our Time: Helping Russian Democracy

These three pillars of American foreign policy—building American's prosperity, modernizing America's armed forces, and promoting democratic values—form the core of the Clinton Administration's new diplomacy. Now I would like to tell you how these three pillars converge and form the basis for one of our highest foreign policy priorities—and that is helping the Russian people to build a free society and a market economy. This, in my judgment, is the greatest strategic challenge of our time. Bringing Russia—one of history's most powerful nations—into the family of peaceful nations will serve our highest security, economic, and moral interests.

For America and the world, the stakes are just monumental. If we succeed, we will have established the foundation for our lasting security into the next century. But if Russia falls into anarchy or lurches back to despotism, the price that we pay could be frightening. Nothing less is involved than the possibility of renewed nuclear threat, higher defense budgets, spreading instability, the loss of new markets, and a devastating setback for the worldwide democratic movement. This circumstance deserves the attention of each and every American.

Over the days and weeks ahead, the Clinton Administration will set forth a comprehensive strategy to support Russia's democracy and its efforts to build a market economy. My intention today is not to announce a detailed program of new initiatives; rather, what I would like to do is to try to provide a strategic context for the approach that we will follow. I want to explain the tremendous interest we have in doing everything we can to help Russia's democracy succeed.

Let me stress here today that by focusing on Russia, I do not mean to neglect the other new independent states. The well-being of Ukraine, of Kazakhstan, of Belarus, of Armenia, and, indeed, of each of the former republics, is a matter of utmost importance to America. We are committed to developing strong bilateral relations with each of these countries. We will support their independence and do everything we can to assist in their integration into the world community. Indeed, it is partly out of concern for their welfare that I want to concentrate on Russia today. For the fact is that the future security of each of these neighbors of Russia depends so heavily on Russia's own democratic revolution.

Let me step back for just a moment and analyze with you the breathtaking benefits that the end of the Cold War has brought to the United States and the world. To mention just a few of the results:

- Historic agreements have been reached to slash the nuclear arsenals that threatened our country with annihilation.
- The nations of the former Warsaw Pact are now free of Soviet domination and of the burden of communism.
- The possibility of a superpower conflict on the European continent has now all but vanished, allowing us to bring home thousands of troops and to reduce our defense budgets.
- Around the globe, totalitarian regimes that looked to the Soviet Union for help and support are now isolated and on the defensive.
- And from Vilnius on the Baltic to Vladivostok on the Pacific, vast new markets are opening—opening slowly but nonetheless opening—to Western business.

With a reforming Russia, all of these historic achievements were possible. But without it, many will not be sustainable.

So we stand again at a historic crossroads. It is very reminiscent of the crossroads that we faced in 1918 and 1945. Then, we were summoned after conflicts to lead the world by building a new peace. After World War I, we chose to retreat, and the consequences were disastrous. However, after World War II, our leaders had the wisdom to answer the call. We fostered institutions that rebuilt the free world's prosperity. And we helped to lead a democratic alliance that contained and, ultimately, drained Soviet communism.

Today, for the third time this century, we have a historic opportunity to build a more secure world. We must redouble our efforts to help the Russian people as they struggle in an effort that has no historical precedent. With great courage, they are attempting to carry out three simultaneous revolutions: first, transforming a totalitarian system into a democracy; second, transforming a command economy into one based upon free markets; and third, transforming an aggressive, expansionist empire into a peaceful, modern nation-state. If they succeed in this tremendous experiment, we all will succeed.

Now it appears that another turning point has been reached in Russia's transition. For months, a constitutional crisis between President Yeltsin and the parliament has paralyzed Russian politics. That crisis came—as you all know—to a head over the weekend. President Yeltsin has called for a national plebiscite to resolve the constitutional impasse. In doing so, he has again demonstrated his faith that the only force that can guarantee reform is the people—the Russian people.

We welcome President Yeltsin's assurance that civil liberties, including freedom of speech and of the press, will be respected at this difficult moment. We also welcome his firm rejection of imperial and Cold War policies. The most important point is that Russia must remain a democracy during this period, moving toward a market economy. This is the basis, the only basis, for the U.S.-Russian partnership.

The United States has strongly supported Russia's efforts to build a democracy. Under President Yeltsin's...
leadership; historic progress has been made toward a free society. We urge that this progress continue and that the Russian people be allowed to determine their future through peaceful means and with full respect for civil liberties. On that basis, Russia can be assured of our full support in the days ahead.

Now, today's crisis in Russia results from one indisputable fact: The pain of building a new system virtually from scratch is exacting a tremendous toll. The patience of the Russian people is wearing thin, a fact that is reflected in Russia's current political stalemate. Nevertheless, we should notice that over the last year, President Yeltsin and Russia's other democrats have demonstrated their commitment to reform in many ways. Civil liberties have been dramatically expanded. The military budget has been significantly cut. Prices have been freed in most sectors, and the result has been [that] the once-long lines that formed outside Russia's stores have come to an end. Tens of thousands of shops, restaurants, and other firms have been put into private hands, and a real start has been made on the most difficult process of even privatizing the large enterprises. As a result of these steps, the share of the work force engaged in private commerce has more than doubled over the last 2 years.

I'm glad to say that over the weekend, President Yeltsin recommitted his government to economic reform. He laid out in clear and strong language the key elements of such a program: continued privatization of firms, selling land to farmers, stopping inflation, and stabilizing the ruble. If this program is implemented, our capacity to help will be greatly enhanced.

Russia's reformers are now looking to the West for support at this moment of extreme difficulty. The United States has a deep self-interest in responding to this historic challenge. We should extend to the Russian people not a hand of pity but a hand of partnership. We must lead a long-term Western strategy of engagement for democracy.

Here in America, it is very important that we not create a false choice between what is required to renew our economy at home and what is necessary to protect our interests abroad. We can and must do both. During the long struggle of the Cold War, we kept the American dream alive for all people here at home. At the same time, we made great sacrifices to protect our national security, and today we can and must meet the same challenge. To succeed, we must first change our mindset. We must understand that helping consolidate democracy in Russia is not a matter of charity but a security concern of the highest order. It is no less important to our well-being than the need to contain a hostile Soviet Union was at an earlier day.

We must understand that helping consolidate democracy in Russia is not a matter of charity but a security concern of the highest order.

Tomorrow and the next day, in Washington, [DC] President Clinton and I will meet with the Russian Foreign Minister, Andrei Kozyrev. We will communicate to him our support for Russia's continued democratic development. And we will reiterate that the current situation in Moscow must be resolved peacefully and in a way consistent with civil liberties. At his meeting with President Yeltsin next month in Vancouver [Canada], President Clinton intends to spell out the tangible steps we will take to assist Russian reform. The President is still considering the specific measures he will announce. But our bottom line is that we will be increasing and accelerating our support for Russia's democracy. We cannot do it alone, but we must be prepared to do our part and to do it fully. The United States favors a meeting later in April where the foreign and finance ministers of the leading industrial democracies will coordinate their joint efforts to assist in Russia's historic transformation.

As I said earlier in my remarks, my task today is not to spell out specific initiatives. Nevertheless, I would like to offer just a few thoughts on the central issue of Western aid to Russia in general terms. Clearly, our assistance must be better targeted and better coordinated than it's been in the past. It must focus on areas and constituencies in Russia that have the greatest impact on their long-term reform. It must not and cannot be limited solely to public funds. Rather, it must catalyze our private sectors to take a leading role in Russia's transformation through trade, investment, and training. And our aid must be felt at the grassroots, to ease the pain of the Russian children, workers, and senior citizens who are suffering through this transformation.

Despite all of its current economic difficulties, it is worth remembering that Russia is inherently a rich country. Its people are well-educated. Its natural resource base exceeds that of any other country in the world. For example, Russia's oil reserves are huge and, if properly exploited, could probably finance much of Russia's economic reform. But today, thousands of aging oil wells and pipelines in Russia stand idle, decaying and desperately in need of critical spare parts. If Russia could find the means to repair them, perhaps with our help, the oil soild would be a lucrative source of foreign exchange that could do a great deal to stabilize their economy.

One area of possible assistance where America's vital interests are directly engaged is our effort to dismantle the nuclear weapons of the former Soviet Union. The $800-million program established through the leadership of Senators Nunn and Lugar to destroy these weapons is a direct investment in our own security. Unfortunately, some bottlenecks, both here and in Russia, have allowed only a small fraction of the $800 million to be
spent up to this point. Part of it has been caused by bureaucratic delays in Washington, and we are fully determined to remove these obstacles. We want to see these weapons dismantled in the very shortest possible time.

Another important goal we should have is strengthening the groups in Russia that will form the bulwark of a thriving democracy. There are public opinion polls in Russia, too, as you know, and time after time they show one thing: By large margins, it's the younger generation that expresses the greatest sympathy for democracy. The younger people are the ones who are pushing for more economic freedom and closer contacts with the West. Ultimately, whatever the result of today's political turmoil, this is the group that will carry the day for Russia's successful transition to democracy.

Through exchange programs, many young Russians can be brought to the West and exposed to the workings of democracy and our free market. Russian students, public officials, scientists, and businessmen are hungry for such experiences. Upon their return home, they can adapt their knowledge to best suit Russia's conditions. And, perhaps most important of all, we can win lifelong friends and partners for freedom.

The existence, to take another example, of a strong, independent media is also essential for a democratic society. While Russia's free press has experienced tremendous growth in recent years, there is still a real need for professional training of reporters, editors, and news managers. Here, technical assistance can make a real difference.

Another area that deserves strong support is Russia's privatization effort, which, as I said, has made some progress. This process has continued across many of Russia's regions despite the political problems in Moscow. Putting private property into the hands of the Russian people is a critical step in building a free market economy. It will create millions of property owners and private entrepreneurs—a genuine middle class with a powerful stake in continued reform.

Of course, at the end of the day, Russia's progress toward the market and democracy cannot occur without an overhaul of the general ground rules of the Russian economy. It will be vital to reduce their budget deficit, control the money supply, stabilize the ruble, and close down inefficient factories. Unfortunately, these are also steps that will cause the greatest pain and political risk. Here again, Russia needs our help. The West must find a way to respond, and the response can't be limited to big promises and little delivery. We are now engaged in intensive consultations with our partners from the leading industrial democracies to develop a program of joint assistance to Russia in these areas.

Helping Russia's Democracy: A Long-Term Commitment

Let me close by making two points. First, we must have no illusions about the situation in Russia. Even with our help, the road ahead is rocky. Setbacks will be inevitable. Russia's transformation will take a great deal of hard work—probably a generation to complete. As we meet, a great struggle is underway, as you know, to determine the kind of nation that Russia will be. However, as we focus on today's drama, it's important that we maintain a long-term perspective. Just as our vigilance in the Cold War took more than 4 decades to pay off, our commitment to Russia's democracy must be for the duration. Our engagement with the reformers must be for the long haul—whether they're "out" as well as when they're "in," whether they're "down" as well as when they're "up." However difficult things may be in the short run, we should have faith that the strategic course we have set—supporting democracy's triumph—is the correct one.

Second, we should know that any realistic program to assist Russia won't be cheap. But there's no question that our nation can afford its fair share of the international effort. We can afford, indeed, to do otherwise. Together with President Clinton, I am determined to work with the Congress to find the funding. I am confident that the necessary resources can be found as we restructure our defense budget. But it will require bipartisanship, leadership, and vision. And, vitally, it will take a Russian partner committed to democratic values and to market reform.

At a time of great domestic challenge, some would say that we should delay bold action in the foreign realm. But history will not wait. As Abraham Lincoln advised his countrymen, "We cannot escape history. We... will be remembered in spite of ourselves." Today, history is calling again for our nation to decide whether we will lead or defer, whether we will shape this new era or be shaped by it. How will history remember us? I, for one, am confident that we will make the right choice—that we will be bold and brave in revitalizing our nation here at home, while continuing to promote our interests and ideals abroad.