
The Strategic Priorities of American Foreign Policy

By

**The Honorable Warren Christopher
United States Secretary of State**

[The following is a reprint of Secretary Christopher's statement before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Washington, DC, November 4, 1993.]

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee: I am pleased to have the chance to talk to you today about the strategic priorities of America's foreign policy.

The world is moving away from one of the most dangerous confrontations in history, and in that fact lies tremendous opportunity for the United States. In the Cold War world stability was based on confrontation. In the new world, stability will be based on common interests and shared values.

We stand on the brink of shaping a new world of extraordinary hope and possibility. While I relish the challenge of what lies before us, I am also mindful that the new world we seek will not emerge on its own. We must shape the transformation that is under way in a time of great fluidity. My job as Secretary of State is to help the President guide the country through this transition.

At the same time, I understand that we must accomplish this transformation at a time when the definitions, certainties, and ground rules of the Cold War have disappeared. I hasten to add that I have no regrets about the passing of the Cold War. Nostalgia for its rigidities can only stem from amnesia. But its demise does mean that we must develop a new domestic consensus to sustain our active engagement in a more complex and interdependent world

During this period, the United States must maintain a tough-minded sense of our enduring interests: ensuring the security of our nation; the prosperity of our people; and the advancement, where possible, of our democratic values. And it is with these core interests in mind that the Clinton Administration has defined and is pursuing the overarching priorities of America's foreign policy.

We are renewing and updating our key security alliances, while also building on the historically unique situation that the major powers can be partners cooperating for peace—not competitors locked in conflict. We are reaching out to former adversaries to transform them into partners. We are working to contain and resolve regional conflicts, particularly where the threat of expansion or the risk of proliferation poses a very direct danger to the United States. And we are working to expand trade, spur growth, and enhance the economic security of each and every American.

We can shape the future knowing that the United States is more secure now than at any time since early in this century. Democracy is ascendant from Central America to Central Asia, from South America to Cambodia. Free markets are being established in places where they were long forbidden. Millions of people, for the first time in their lives, have the choice to enjoy political freedom and economic opportunity. The United States is working relentlessly to ensure that an

ever-increasing number of people know the benefits of democratic institutions, human rights, and free markets.

At the same time, new threats to peace and stability have emerged. The unholy marriage of ethnic violence and aggressive nationalism is shattering fragile states, creating humanitarian tragedies, and raising the possibility of wider regional strife. And the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction multiplies the danger of every conflict.

In this period of transition, crises and even setbacks are inevitable. We will work to prevent and manage them. But we will stay on the steady and responsible course we have set. Television is a wonderful phenomenon and sometimes even an instrument of freedom. But television images cannot be the North Star of America's foreign policy.

As I travel the world I see that virtually every nation wants to define its foreign policy in terms relative to the United States, whether seeking security assurances or expanding trade and investment links with us. They look to us as the fulcrum for global security and, in many cases, for regional security. They know that American international leadership is in their interests. This gives us unparalleled opportunities to influence their conduct I am here today to say that American engagement and leadership in the world—an activist American foreign policy—is most fundamentally in our interest.

PRIORITIES

Today I would like to discuss with this committee our efforts with respect to several major issues of enduring national interest. These are not the exclusive areas of concern for this Administration. My speeches last spring to the Council of the Americas and the African-American Institute described our policy objectives toward Latin America and Africa, respectively. Today I want to discuss in my testimony some of our current top priorities—priorities that address the great challenges in this era of change. Let me begin with the new centrality of economic policy in our foreign policy.

1. Economic Security.

Security in the post-cold War era will depend as much on strong economies as on strong arsenals. This Administration understands that America's strength at home and its strength abroad are interlocking and mutually reinforcing. That is why President Clinton and I have placed economic policy at the heart of our foreign policy. And I believe that this new emphasis is already yielding results.

The President's approach was apparent at the successful July summit meeting of the G-7 nations in Tokyo. For more than a decade, our major industrial allies and trading partners complained that we were not serious about reducing the growth of our budget deficit. By working with the Congress to enact an historic deficit reduction program, President Clinton sent a clear message to the world: America is back as a responsible manager of its own economy and as a dependable leader for global economic cooperation and growth.

Armed with that new credibility in Tokyo, President Clinton won a market access agreement to move the Uruguay Round forward. He was also able to win new pledges for multilateral assistance to Russia, and an agreement to negotiate a new economic framework to correct our unacceptable trade imbalance with Japan. This Administration attaches as high a priority to improving our economic and trade ties with Japan as it does to maintaining our important security and political links.

Let me briefly turn your attention to three events—all occurring within the next 40 days—that together will help determine the strength of our economy and the standard of living of our people as we enter the 21st century: the vote on NAFTA, the deadline for GATT, and the meeting of the APEC forum. Each event is also a foreign policy challenge with enormous consequences for our global leadership. I have been making the case for NAFTA repeatedly in recent weeks, and I believe that there is increasing recognition that NAFTA is one of the great foreign policy opportunities of this generation. For the United States, Canada, and Mexico, NAFTA is about more than tariffs and trade, growth, and jobs. It will also build a new cooperative relationship with Mexico. Approval of NAFTA will increase Mexico's capacity to cooperate with us on a wide range of vital issues such as illegal immigration, cross-border pollution, and narco-trafficking.

NAFTA will also mark a turning point in the history of our relations throughout the hemisphere at a time when democracy is on the march, markets are opening, and conflicts are being resolved peacefully. By approving NAFTA, the United States will send a powerful signal that we support these developments. Rejecting NAFTA, on the other hand, would send a chilling signal about our willingness to engage in Latin America at a time when so many of our neighbors—including Mexico—are genuinely receptive to closer cooperation with us.

There is no good time to defeat NAFTA—but there could be no worse time than when the GATT negotiations are in their final crucial days leading up to the December 15 deadline. At this delicate, decisive stage of the Uruguay Round, the United States must maintain maximum leverage—and exercise maximum leadership. A setback on NAFTA would compromise both. Rejecting NAFTA would create the perception that America is not prepared to act on behalf of its global economic interests at a time when those interests are so clearly at stake.

NAFTA is now in our hands, but the United States cannot conclude the Uruguay Round on its own. The EC, Japan, the ASEAN nations, and others must also move. None of the remaining trade-offs in goods, services, or agriculture will be easy for any nation—but they must be made. I want to remind our allies and trading partners in Europe once again that advancing transatlantic security requires us not only to focus on renewing the NATO Alliance but also on successfully concluding the GATT negotiations. The Uruguay Round is critically important to the revival of the world economy, not only to our major industrial allies but to developing countries in Africa, Latin America, and Asia that are seeking sustained growth and sustainable development.

Nowhere is economic growth faster—or the export opportunities for American business greater—than in the dynamic Asia-Pacific region. In two weeks, I will go to Seattle to host a meeting of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation forum. The APEC conference—and the historic gathering of leaders that President Clinton has called at its conclusion—will enable us to establish a framework for regional economic integration and trade liberalization among 15 economies that now account for nearly half the world's GNP. It will expand America's economic presence in a region to which our future is increasingly linked.

These are 40 days that can shake the economic world and shape America's future position in it. With NAFTA, GATT, and APEC, there is an extraordinary convergence of opportunities for the United States. I view each of these challenges, along with the President's deficit reduction program and successes in Tokyo last summer, as integral elements of the most ambitious international economic agenda that any President has undertaken in almost half a century. And as Secretary of State, I see each as a foreign policy as well as an economic policy opportunity—because in the post-Cold War world, our national security is inseparable from our economic security.

2. Support for Reform In Russia and the NIS.

This Administration is placing special emphasis on our support for political and economic reform in Russia and in the other states of the former Soviet Union. Helping ensure the success of this process is our highest foreign policy priority. That is the reason President Clinton is seeking to build a strategic alliance with post-communist reformers throughout the area.

If the people of Russia succeed in their heroic struggle to build a free society and a market economy, the payoffs for the United States will be transforming: a permanently diminished threat of nuclear war; lower defense budgets; vast new markets; and cooperation on the global and regional issues that once divided us. Helping democracy prevail in Russia remains the wisest—and least expensive—investment that we can make in America's security.

Mr. Chairman, the House and Senate have recognized the value of this investment. With the support of Congress, the United States initially pledged \$1.6 billion in bilateral assistance programs to Russia and the new independent states. In Tokyo last July, we proposed a \$3 billion special privatization and restructuring program which our G-7 partners have joined. And in late September, as the crisis in Moscow between reform and reaction was approaching its climax, this Congress approved the Administration's request for \$2.5 billion in additional technical and humanitarian assistance.

As you know, I went to Moscow two weeks ago to reaffirm, on behalf of President Clinton, our steadfast support for reform in the wake of the early October crisis. I made the case that the credibility of December's parliamentary elections—and the prospects for Russian democracy—depend on open dissent and a free press. President Yeltsin and Foreign Minister Kozyrev reiterated their commitment to reform and their determination to hold free and fair elections—and to allow press freedom.

Despite the hardships inevitably associated with a transformation of this magnitude, the Russian people have chosen reform over reaction. My visit gave me renewed confidence that reform will win their support once again. We now look forward to a January summit between President Clinton and President Yeltsin in Moscow—a summit that we expect will broaden and deepen the new cooperative relationship we are forging.

3. Europe and NATO.

The trip I completed last week was designed not only to reinforce our partnership with Russia but to help renew the NATO alliance at a time of new and different security challenges in Europe. The United States has an enduring political, military, economic, and cultural link to Europe that must be preserved. The European Community is our largest single trading partner, and we have a powerful stake in the collective security guaranteed by NATO. This alliance of democracies—the most successful in history—can lay the foundation of an undivided continent rooted in the principles of political liberty and economic freedom.

To meet the new challenges in Europe, the alliance must embrace innovation or risk irrelevance. Accordingly, the United States is proposing to transform NATO's relationship with the new democracies of the East.

The January summit should formally open the door to an evolutionary process of NATO expansion. This process should be non-discriminatory and inclusive. It should not be tied to a specific timetable or criteria for membership.

The summit should also initiate practical military cooperation between NATO forces and those to the East. To that end, we have proposed a Partnership for Peace. The Partnership would be open to all members of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council as well as others. It excludes no nations and forms no new blocs.

Our idea is to build the Partnership for Peace over time, at a pace geared to each partners interest and capabilities. The Partnership would involve tangible cooperation and would channel members' defense efforts toward the ability to participate with NATO in a range of multinational missions. This Partnership would play an important role in the evolutionary process of NATO expansion, creating an evolving security relationship that could culminate in NATO membership.

This Partnership for Peace is a first step by the alliance to help fill the vacuum of insecurity and instability that was created in Central and Eastern Europe by the demise of the Soviet empire. It reflects our strong belief that the reform movements in Eastern Europe must be bolstered by the prospect of security cooperation with the West. Reaction to this proposal has been positive—from Allies, from NATO Secretary General Woerner, from Central and East European countries (including the Baltic States), and from Russia and the new independent states.

4. Asia and the Pacific.

No area of the world will be more important for American interests than the Asia-Pacific region. This region contains the world's most dynamic economies, and it is the most lucrative terrain for American exports and jobs. It is thus crucial to the President's domestic agenda. We have vital security stakes in an area where we have fought three wars in the past half-century and where major powers intersect. And we seek to promote our values in the world's most populous region, where democracy is on the move, yet repressive regimes remain.

The stakes in Asia are therefore high for America. That is why President Clinton traveled there on his first trip overseas. That is why I have been there three times as Secretary.

The upcoming APEC meeting will elaborate the President's vision of a New Pacific Community which he set forth in July in his statements in Tokyo and Seoul. The basic outlines are already clear:

- A more prosperous community through open markets and open societies;
- A more secure community through maintenance of our alliances and forward military presence, nonproliferation policies, and engagement in regional dialogues;
- A freer community through advocacy of open societies that contribute both to development and peace; and
- Regional cooperation on global issues such as the environment, narcotics, refugees, and health.

The Clinton Administration is placing special emphasis on developing regional approaches so as to construct—with others—a New Pacific Community. But clearly bilateral ties are also part of this vision. Let me briefly mention two that are central to our concerns.

The cornerstone of our Asia-Pacific policy remains our relationship with Japan. The President seeks to shape a durable and comprehensive partnership as we head toward the next

century. As I have emphasized, we need to place our economic ties on as sound and cooperative a basis as we have established on security, political, and global issues.

We are working out a comprehensive relationship with China that permits resolution of differences in a broad strategic context. As I have made clear on previous occasions, we have continuing concerns with China, including human rights, proliferation, and market access. We are actively working to make strides in each area, and share with the Congress the need to make measurable progress. The clock is ticking on a decision next spring on MFN [most favored nation] renewal. Unless there is overall significant progress on human rights, the President will not be in a position to recommend extension.

5. The Middle East.

The Middle East is a region where the United States has both vital interests and the influence to protect those interests. This fact was powerfully demonstrated in our successful leadership in stemming aggression in the Persian Gulf. Nowhere is the intersection between our interests and our influence more apparent than in the Arab-Israeli peace process. For four decades we have been involved in the search for Middle East peace not only because it is the right thing to do, but because our interests and those of our friends demand it. The pursuit of peace cannot guarantee stability in the region. But it can reduce the dangers of war and enhance the well-being of our allies—Israeli and Arab alike. This in turn will help preserve our political and economic stake in one of the world's most important strategic regions.

In the Middle East, the recent breakthrough between Israelis and Palestinians has fundamentally changed the landscape of the Arab-Israeli conflict. There is much work to be done to transform the Declaration of Principles into an enduring agreement and changed realities on the ground.

The challenge now is to reinforce this breakthrough and broaden it to achieve a comprehensive settlement that will last. We will continue to work very closely with the parties themselves in pursuit of three goals.

First, it is essential that Israelis and Palestinians implement their Declaration of Principles in a timely manner. Implementing the accord will build the strength of the peace constituencies. It will show that negotiations work and demonstrate that extremists cannot stop the march toward peace. This accord must succeed. This means that Israelis and Palestinians need to be flexible and patient as they work through the complicated issues on the table. It also means that the international community needs to lend its support. That effort began with the October 1, 1983, Conference To Support Middle East Peace, which we organized. It will continue this week in Paris when the Ad Hoc Liaison Committee meets to coordinate assistance to Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza. We must work to make the recent turning point for peace irreversible as we work to make the benefits of peace irresistible.

Second, it is also essential that we continue our efforts to move toward a comprehensive settlement. This means ensuring that progress is achieved on the other tracks, and that progress on the Israeli-Palestinian negotiations facilitates rather than impedes movement on the others. On the Israeli-Syrian track, there are complex issues relating to peace, withdrawal, and security that continue to separate the parties. These issues should be amenable to a negotiated settlement, and we are prepared to play our role as a peace partner with both Israel and Syria. Israel and Lebanon are focused on trying to find a way to meet their respective needs on the same three issues. And Jordan and Israel, having concluded an historic agenda in Washington, are in the process of organizing their negotiations in a practical manner on key issues.

We are committed to a comprehensive settlement, and we believe the parties are, too. Our Special Middle East Coordinator, Dennis Ross, came back from his recent trip to the region with the strong view that all parties are committed to this process and to working with us to find ways to overcome the gaps that separate them. And we will be unflagging in this effort.

Third, we are trying to create the proper environment for peace in the region. As the implementation of the Declaration of Principles moves forward, we are encouraging Israelis and Palestinians to reach out toward one another and create an atmosphere on the ground that facilitates their work at the negotiating table. At the same time, we are asking the Arab states to do their share. Tunisia's decision to host the refugee working group last month was significant, as was the Qatari Foreign Minister's meeting with Israeli Foreign Minister Peres. Oman has offered to host the next working group meeting on water. Egypt will host the next working group meeting on the environment. Morocco hosted Prime Minister Rabin on his return from the September 13 signing ceremony in Washington. Arab and Israeli business people are talking about translating the potential for regional economic growth into reality.

But more needs to be done. Anachronisms such as the Arab boycott of Israel must end, and anti-Israeli UN resolutions that have been on the books for too long must be removed. There has been some movement on both of these issues, and we will work to build greater momentum.

Working at times as a catalyst, as a facilitator, or as a source of reassurance—and, when needed, as an intermediary—the United States is committed to doing everything it can to help secure what has been achieved and to push for breakthroughs on other fronts. The President and I will stay actively involved. I will travel to the region when appropriate to promote the sustained progress that I believe is within reach. There is much work to be done, but I am very hopeful about the prospects for a comprehensive peace.

6. Non-Proliferation and Other Global Issues.

Nuclear weapons give rogue states disproportionate power, destabilize entire regions, and threaten human and environmental disasters. They can turn local conflicts into serious threats to our security. In this era, weapons of mass destruction are more readily available—and there are fewer inhibitions on their use.

This Administration is working for global enforcement of non-proliferation standards. We are also pursuing specific strategies in each region where there is a real potential for proliferation. We lead the international effort to persuade North Korea to adhere to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and to its nuclear safeguards obligations. We are working to ensure that Iran does not acquire nuclear weapons, and that Iraq does not restore its former capabilities. We have sanctioned China and Pakistan for China's transfer of ballistic missile components to Pakistan.

Let me describe the progress made on non-proliferation and denuclearization during my trip to Russia and the NIS. I visited Kazakhstan, Ukraine, and Belarus, where hundreds of old Soviet nuclear weapons remain. In 1992, these former Soviet states committed themselves to ratify the START I treaty and adhere to the NPT as non-nuclear states. We have taken significant steps forward.

Belarus has already fulfilled its commitments. In Kazakhstan, which has ratified START I, President Nazarbayev for the first time set a deadline for accession to the NPT—the end of this year [1993].

Ukraine reaffirmed its commitments and their applicability to all strategic offensive arms on Ukrainian soil. President Kravchuk has pledged to press the Ukrainian parliament to ratify START I during its November session. We still have hard work ahead with Ukraine, where opposition remains to that nation becoming "non-nuclear."

The United States is prepared to help Kazakhstan, Ukraine, and Belarus destroy or dismantle their nuclear weapons. But we have made it clear that action on these matters is a prerequisite to longer-term economic cooperation and security partnerships.

We are also bringing transnational issues such as the environment, population growth, refugees, terrorism, and narcotics where they belong—in the mainstream of American foreign policy. If we ignore these issues, they will return—compounded, more costly, and sometimes threatening to our security. That is why the United States is a leader, not a laggard, on global environmental issues. As part of this commitment, we have signed the biodiversity and climate change treaties. This Administration is placing an unmistakable emphasis on these pressing global concerns.

REGIONAL CONFLICTS

Earlier I noted that the end of the Cold War, while lifting the lid that had smothered freedom for much of the world, also lifted the lid on regional conflict—especially along the periphery of the former Soviet Union. Troublesome conflicts, often spilling across borders, have persisted in Africa. In these conflicts, preventive diplomacy can be employed to great success.

Realism must guide U.S. policies toward these conflicts. Some touch our interests—or will, if they are not checked. But we must accept that other conflicts may not.

In testifying before the committee, Madeleine Albright addressed the importance of taking stock together with the Congress as we look at regional conflicts and the ever-increasing demands on peace-keeping. Ambassador Albright spoke eloquently of the need to preserve a bipartisan consensus as we address our role in UN peacekeeping operations. I completely agree.

Clearly, we will need to consider new mechanisms for conflict resolution and conflict avoidance. The U.N. structure may have to be supplemented by regional mechanisms. Organizations such as the OAU and the OAS can be more effective in conflict prevention, peace-keeping, and disaster relief. Institutions like NATO may need to assume more of a peace-keeping mission, at least in Europe. Our own role and involvement will need to be informed by a strict assessment of our interests and the interests of others. We must examine every case—asking rigorous questions, and giving measured answers—to find the course commensurate with our interests.

That is what we are doing today in Haiti, Somalia, and Bosnia. In each of these places, things have not always gone exactly as we had planned or hoped. These are difficult situations, and some setbacks, unfortunately, are inevitable. We should learn from them. But we should not overreact, for that may mean either losing possible opportunities for success or damaging our interests elsewhere.

Haiti. Haiti demonstrates that temporary setbacks must not prevent us from pursuing our interests. If democracy is not restored, repression, violence, and suffering will continue. More instability may cause large numbers of Haitians to flee, at great risk to themselves and to Haiti's neighbors—including the United States.

Haiti's problems can be addressed only through democratic institutions and economic development. We have supported a political process, culminating in the Governors Island accord, that provides for the restoration of democracy. But now Haiti's military leadership refuses to adhere to the accord.

We are staying on course. We remain committed to the restoration of democracy and the return of President Aristide. The sanctions imposed in June brought the Haitian military to the negotiating table. We have now reimposed sanctions on oil and arms, and a freeze on assets of targeted individuals. These are selective sanctions, designed to compel the military leadership to fulfill its obligations, while sparing, as much as possible, the people of Haiti. We are prepared to increase the pressures on the Haitian military, if that is necessary. Once the accord is implemented, we want to make it possible for Haiti to sustain democracy.

Somalia. The United States is pursuing a noble objective in Somalia, consistent with its finest values and traditions. We have saved literally hundreds of thousands of lives. After the attack on Pakistani peace-keepers in June, significant efforts and resources were dedicated to the military and security aspects of the mission. Not enough attention was given to efforts to achieve political reconciliation, which is essential to prevent Somalia from returning to famine and anarchy. We are now set firmly on the political track and are encouraged by the progress being made. In order to give this process a chance to succeed, American forces will remain until next March and will, as President Clinton stated on October 7, work with U.N. forces to keep open lines of communications and keep pressure on those who would seek to cut off relief supplies.

To be sure, we could have taken the easy, and perhaps popular, way out: simply abandon the effort in Somalia after the tragic deaths of American servicemen on October 2. The President chose another path, one that seeks to protect the real gains made in Somalia while improving the prospects for further progress. This will give the Somalis a reasonable chance to sort out their differences and also permit the United Nations to prepare for our departure.

Bosnia. American policy toward the terrible conflict in Bosnia-Herzegovina responds to our strategic interest in preventing the conflict from spreading to neighboring countries and our humanitarian interest in helping to relieve the suffering of the people of Bosnia.

Negotiations offer the only way to a practical solution. Although the Geneva talks have not been able to produce an acceptable agreement, they have made some progress and remain alive. The negotiators have also explored the option of a "global solution" that would embrace Croatia, Kosovo, and other areas of conflict in the region. The United States has played an active role in support of these diplomatic efforts and will continue to do so.

Unfortunately, none of these efforts provides any assurance that an agreement can be reached this winter. We will continue to press the negotiating track, but with the Bosnian people again at serious risk, we must focus attention on humanitarian relief. The United States has worked very hard to respond to humanitarian needs. We are the single largest country donor of humanitarian aid (more than \$370 million since 1991). With 6,000 flights over 500 days, the Sarajevo airlift has gone on longer than the Berlin airlift of 45 years ago. Air drops of humanitarian relief to the enclaves have delivered more than 10 million meals since February. American planes have made 80 percent of airdrop flights. We remain committed to the relief effort, both by air and overland, where we are working with the UN and EC on ways to resolve immediate problems of secure land access for relief convoys, now suspended because of intense fighting in central Bosnia.

We strongly support the work of the UN's War Crimes Tribunal, and continued economic sanctions against Serbia and Montenegro. We are determined to prevent the conflict from

spreading, and we have deployed U.S. forces to Macedonia as part of an international effort to deter a wider conflict.

At the same time, the President has made it clear that the United States will not attempt to force a settlement on Bosnia militarily. No imposed settlement would endure. Before committing American troops anywhere in the world, we must ask a series of rigorous and searching questions. If we are satisfied with the conditions for our participation we would be prepared to participate in a NATO implementation of a Bosnian settlement. Those conditions would include good-faith agreement to a settlement by all the parties and evidence of good faith implementation. Any such action by the United States would require the fullest consultation with Congress. I want to assure the Members of this Committee that our policy toward any regional conflict will undergo constant and rigorous reevaluation. We will constantly reassess our own assumptions to be sure they are truly validated by events. And any situation in which American men and women may be put in harm's way will always hold the highest priority for me and for every member of this Administration

CONGRESSIONAL CONSULTATIONS

Mr. Chairman, this Administration is committed to frequent and comprehensive consultations with the Congress. When congressional hearings begin on the relationship between the legislative and the executive branches on foreign policy, we will be responsive.

It is in that spirit, Mr. Chairman—a spirit of cooperation and steadfastness about enduring American interests in a fast-changing world—that I have come here today.