



United States Department of State

*Focus* on the Issues  
**Strengthening  
Civil Society  
And the  
Rule of Law**

Excerpts of testimony, speeches, and remarks by  
U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright on  
strengthening civil society and the rule of law

*Focus on the Issues*  
**Strengthening Civil Society and the  
Rule of Law**

Excerpts of testimony, speeches, and remarks  
by U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright  
on ongoing U.S. efforts to promote democratic values,  
human rights, and civil society.

For full text of these and all testimony, speeches,  
and remarks by the Secretary see the State  
Department website at [http:// www.secretary.gov](http://www.secretary.gov)

**Public Information Series**  
**United States Department of State**  
*Bureau of Public Affairs*

January 2000

# Foreword

One of the overriding objectives of American foreign policy in the post-Cold War era is to encourage nations to come together around basic principles of democracy, open markets, the rule of law, and a commitment to peace.

*Focus on the Issues: Strengthening Civil Society and the Rule of Law* highlights ongoing U.S. efforts to promote democratic values, human rights, and civil society. It is the fourth in a series of publications regarding American foreign policy and featuring excerpts from testimony, speeches, and remarks by U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright.

# Freedom of The Press

*Remarks to the Institute for International  
Education*

*New York City*

*October 14, 1999*

. . . The Institute for International Education is dedicated to the exchange of knowledge and the pursuit of truth. Tonight, I want to say a few words—in the context of American foreign policy—about the closely related subjects of free press and free expression.

It is especially appropriate to do so here in New York—the free speech capital of the world—where, to paraphrase Shakespeare, some are born with opinions, some develop opinions, and all have opinions thrust upon them. It is also appropriate because the IIE is a champion of free expression, training jour-nalists in many key countries.

But even more important, freedom of speech and expression are fundamental to the principles and values that America promotes around the world. The Universal Declaration on Human Rights provides that everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and to impart and receive ideas through the media. The very importance of this right is what causes dictators to want to suppress it—for to dictators, the truth is often inconvenient—and sometimes a mortal threat. That is why so often they try to grab the truth and leash it like a dog, ration it like bread, or mold it like

clay. Their goal is to create their own myths, conceal their own blunders, direct resentments elsewhere, and instill in their people a dread of change.

Consider, for example, Serbia. For years, Slobodan Milosevic, now an indicted war criminal, has fed his people lies, while repressing and terrorizing those who sought the truth. Slavko Curuvija, a newspaper owner and critic of Milosevic, was murdered this spring after being harassed repeatedly by Serb authorities. Other independent voices, such as the opposition newspaper Glas Javnosti, have also been fined or temporarily shut down.

In Cuba, it is hard for an honest person to get on a soapbox without having it yanked out from beneath. Numerous correspondents, including Raul Rivero and Manuel Gonzalez Castellanos, have been arrested or detained for directly or indirectly criticizing Fidel Castro.

In Belarus, the government closed down newspapers 2 weeks ago after one published a story about a cabinet minister's construction of a luxurious summer home. In Syria, the government arrested human rights journalist Nizar Nayyoub back in 1992. He is now near death after years of solitary confinement, torture, and neglect.

Even in somewhat more open societies, criticizing the powers that be can be hazardous to your health and livelihood. For instance, in Zimbabwe, two journalists, Mark Havunduka and Ray Choto, were arrested, tortured, and are now on trial for reporting on an alleged army plot to remove President Mugabe.

In Croatia, journalist Orlanda Obad is being prosecuted for writing about the financial holdings of President Tudjman's family. More than 900 other Croat journalists currently face civil or criminal charges. In Peru, television station owner Baruch Ivcher was stripped of his citizenship and forced into exile for reporting on allegations of government abuses, including illegal wiretapping and torture.

Governments that respond to hostile or investigative reporting with threats and prosecutions betray their own insecurity and misuse power. No society can advance very far unless its government is accountable, and governments are not accountable unless journalists are able to do their jobs.

It is true that reporters and independent broadcasters are capable of abusing their rights; of poisoning the airwaves by inciting hate, spreading fear, and telling lies. We have seen that happen this decade in, among other places, Rwanda.

Press codes that establish standards of professionalism and accountability can be a vital safeguard, and authorities should have the right to rebut, correct, and argue with their critics. But they do not have the right simply to silence them. This is a point we make to all countries, including friends and allies.

In Ukraine, for example, we are concerned by apparent efforts to hinder news coverage of opposition candidates in the current presidential campaign. Federal authorities have frozen the bank accounts of the television station STB, which has a reputation for unbiased reporting, thereby forcing the station to curtail political and other programming.

Earlier this year, in Turkey, a journalist named Nadire Mater published a book of interviews with soldiers that was banned for allegedly insulting the military. The author faces a possible 6-year prison sentence.

It must be emphasized, however, that there has been noteworthy progress on human rights in Turkey since Prime Minister Ecevit, with whom I met recently in Washington, came to power. For example, in August, the Turkish parliament suspended the sentences of some journalists convicted for speech-related offenses. This is a step in the right direction, and we will continue to encourage further progress.

Around the world, Americans may be proud that our diplomats regularly stress the importance of free speech and a free press. Both publicly and privately,

we urge that the rights of journalists and other reporters be respected.

One place where we have made a special effort is Kosovo. This is a region where past efforts to control and misuse information contributed to a terrible harvest in suffering and blood. That is why creating a climate in which a free and independent media could operate was a priority for NATO and the UN in the aftermath of the conflict earlier this year.

Today, thanks in part to American assistance, Kosovo has six daily newspapers and more than 20 radio stations, reflecting a wide range of editorial viewpoints. One influential publisher, Veton Surroi, has been particularly courageous in championing the cause of better relations between ethnic Albanians and Serbs.

As we scan the horizon, we see the ongoing problems of intolerance in the Balkans and the obstacles to a free press created by organized crime in Russia. We see the clashes in Iran and China between those who favor greater openness and those who fear it—and the tendency in so many countries still to censor ideas rather than debate them.

We are reminded daily that the quest for free expression must confront many hurdles and remains a long distance race. But with H.G. Wells' aphorism in mind, we must, and will, continue to educate, advocate, and insist that global norms be respected.

. . . Let me emphasize how strongly I feel about the issues I have discussed tonight. When I was in graduate school, I wrote my thesis on the role of the media in Czechoslovakia before and during what came to be called Prague Spring.

In the 1980s, as a professor, I watched the freedoms promised by the Helsinki Accords inspire writers such as Andrei Sakharov and Vaclav Havel and help erode the foundations of communism in central Europe and the Soviet Union. And as UN Ambassador and Secretary of State, I have come into

contact with courageous men and women throughout the world who still strive at great cost and risk to report and broadcast the facts.

These heroes remind me of the old story about the wavering dissident in a repressive regime who tells his friend "It is because I have children, I dare not speak out." To which his friend replies, "it is because I have children, I dare not remain silent."

I am proud that throughout this century, America has been the world's leading defender of every person's right, everywhere, to speak, write, publish, and broadcast freely and without fear. . . . ■

# Human Rights

*Remarks to the Rosalynn Carter  
Distinguished Guests Lecture Series  
Emory University  
Atlanta, Georgia  
December 3, 1998*

. . . I am happy to be here. It is a great privilege to visit with the First Lady from Plains. Whether living in the State House, the White House, or her own house, Rosalynn Carter has forged a remarkable record of public service. She has been and remains a friend to me and a wellspring of strength to millions around the world. I am sure that you here at Emory, like we across America, are very, very proud of her. . . .

[Today] I want to explore in some depth a subject that is especially appropriate to a lecture with this name at this Institute. That subject is America's support for fundamental human rights. Since I am in my professor mode, I will begin with a little history.

Fifty years ago this month, representatives from nations around the world came together under the leadership of another great American, First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt, to sign the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Since its unveiling, that Declaration has been included or referred to in dozens of national constitutions and reaffirmed many times. It is a centerpiece of the argument that we make that respect for human rights is the obligation not just of some but of every government. Atlantans should be proud that President

Jimmy Carter did so much to ensure that the Declaration's principles would be at the core of the foreign policy of the United States.

For reasons both strategic and personal, President Carter placed far greater emphasis on human rights than did his predecessors. And by so doing, he strengthened America's claim to moral leadership, spurred growth in the global human rights movement, and directly or indirectly, freed many political prisoners and saved many lives.

President Carter's determination to advance human rights helped make this a better world. But it remains very far from a perfect world.

There are many today who point to the gap between the ideals set out in the Universal Declaration and the violations that persist 50 years after that document was signed. These skeptics conclude that we might as well give up, that no matter what we say or do, there will always be repression and discrimination. In this view, the violation of human rights is just another sad reflection on the limits of human nature.

To that, I would reply as Katharine Hepburn did to Humphrey Bogart in the movie *African Queen*: "Nature, Mr. Allnut, is what we were put into this world to rise above."

The Clinton Administration believes that, if we are to build the kind of future we want, we must insist that there is nothing inevitable and certainly nothing natural about gross violations of human rights. We must point out that, for the torturer, cruelty is a choice. For the abuser, violence is a choice. For the bigot, intolerance is a choice. And what we have the power to choose, we have the power to change. Moreover, support for human rights is not just some kind of international social work; it is vital to our security and well-being, for governments that disregard the rights of their own citizens are not likely to respect the rights of anyone else.

In this century, virtually every major act of international aggression has been perpetrated by a regime that repressed political rights. Such regimes are also more likely to spark unrest by persecuting minorities, sheltering terrorists, running drugs, or secretly building weapons of mass destruction. And they are enemies not only of political freedom but also of social and economic development. In any society, people who are free to express their ideas, organize their labor, and invest their capital, will contribute far more than those stunted by repression.

. . . A fundamental right spelled out in the Universal Declaration is the right to take part in government, either directly or through freely chosen representatives. To the United States, this right is basic. And we are encouraged that, in recent decades, the right to democratic governance has won increasing acceptance worldwide as the cornerstone for protecting the full range of human rights.

Of course, we know that each country must come to democracy at its own speed and by its own path. But countries that have already established such systems can help: first, by defending their own freedom and that of the entire democratic community so that no nation that enters the democratic ranks is forced, either by internal or external foes, to leave it; and, second, by helping nations in transition to develop durable democratic institutions.

That is why today, from Asia to Africa to the Andes, U.S. agencies and non-governmental organizations are training judges, drafting commercial codes, aiding civil society, and otherwise helping to assemble the nuts and bolts of freedom. In the months ahead, we can expect many important tests of democracy.

In Indonesia, for example, leaders must heed their people's desire for far-reaching political reform, heal ethnic divisions, deal fairly with the

aspirations of those in East Timor and Iryan Java, and prevent further violations of human rights. In Cambodia, the new coalition government must put aside past habits of confrontation and corruption and find a way to work together based on democratic principles. In our own hemisphere, Colombia's promising new president is determined to overcome threats posed by drug cartels, guerrillas, paramilitary forces, and poverty—and we are determined to help.

In Africa, there is an opportunity for historic progress in Nigeria, the continent's largest nation. During the past two decades, military governments plundered that country's natural resources, exploited ethnic divisions, and brutally abused human rights.

The new interim leadership has promised a sharp break from this sad past. Local elections will be held this week and national elections next year. Independent political parties have been allowed to register, political prisoners have been released, and noted exiles—such as Emory University Professor Wole Soyinka—have returned home.

The United States strongly supports these developments. Nigerians deserve to live in freedom. But the road ahead will be difficult, and Nigerians have seen promises betrayed all too often.

Nigeria's course will be determined, as it must be, by its own people. But the international community must do all it can to reinforce the movement toward a political system in which all Nigerians may participate and the rights of all are protected. This is a top priority for the Administration, and I know, for the Carter Center, as well.

As we look ahead to the new century, we can expect that perhaps the greatest test of democracy, human rights, and the rule of law will be in China, where more than one in five of the world's people live.

America has vital interest in non-proliferation, Asian security, and the regional economy that will be affected by the choices China makes. So we are

engaged in a dialogue with Chinese leaders to expand cooperation and narrow differences.

Since that dialogue began, the issue of human rights has been among the most difficult. And the importance we attach to it has been reflected both in private discussions and in the very public endorsements of democratic values by President Clinton during the recent summits in Washington and Beijing.

We acknowledge that the Chinese people have far greater freedom now than their parents did to make economic choices, move around their country, and choose village committee leaders. Unfortunately, on the core issues of human rights, we still have grave concerns. It is no cause for celebration when one prisoner of conscience is released into exile and another is picked up for essentially the same offense. Nor is it much of a step forward when some avenues for debate are opened up, but individuals such as Xu Wenli and others are harassed, detained, and arrested for trying to exercise the rights of organized political expression.

Overall, the pace of progress toward full respect for human rights is disappointing. I would, however, cite China's recent decision to sign the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights as a potentially important step in the right direction.

Under the terms of that Covenant, governments are obliged to protect and respect universal human rights, including freedom of thought, religion, and expression; and the right "to take part in the conduct of public affairs." Once ratified, the Covenant will reinforce the accountability of Chinese leaders to their people for progress in these areas.

Skeptics might suggest that China's decision to sign the Covenant will not matter and that the government will simply ignore its promises. Obviously, that remains to be seen. It is worth recalling, however, that similar skepticism was voiced 24 years ago when the Soviet Union signed the Helsinki Final Act, committing itself to observe basic human rights.

What no one predicted then is that there would evolve a sustained public demand within the Soviet Union, itself, for compliance with that declaration. Helsinki gave Soviet dissidents a new rallying cry and a new means to contrast the government's practices to principles it had voluntarily embraced.

Increasingly, China's indigenous democratic movement is testing the limits of what is possible. This, in itself, is a welcome sign. We may hope that as time goes by and the connection between political openness and economic prosperity becomes even more apparent, the scope of allowable expression will expand further to the benefit both of China and the world.

Although the specifics of our approach to promoting democracy will vary from country to country, the fundamental goals are the same. We seek to encourage where we can the development of free institutions and practices. Some fault these efforts as unrealistic for presuming that democracy is possible in less developed nations. Others suggest we are being "hegemonic" by trying to impose democratic values.

In truth, we understand well that democracy must emerge from the desire of individuals to participate in the decisions that shape their lives. But we see this desire in all countries. And there is no better way for us to show respect for others than to support their right to shape their own futures and select their own leaders. Unlike dictatorship, democracy is never an imposition; it is, by definition, always a choice. . . . ■

# Justice

*Remarks at opening of the Washington  
Conference on Holocaust-Era Assets  
Washington, DC  
December 1, 1998*

. . . On behalf of President Clinton and the American people, I'm pleased to join in welcoming all of you to the Washington Conference on Holocaust-Era Assets. . . .

We are here to chart a course for finishing the job of returning or providing compensation for stolen Holocaust assets to survivors and the families of Holocaust victims. This mission began more than five decades ago, even before the war was over, when Nazi looting was condemned by the London Declaration of 1943. In the early postwar period, the Allies made good faith but incomplete efforts at restitution.

For decades thereafter, the job lingered unfinished, with vital questions unanswered, important documents unexamined, and critical issues unresolved. Then, in just the past few years, as Holocaust survivors aged and the century began drawing to a close, the quest for answers received a fresh burst of energy. For that, the credit must be widely shared.

Certainly, the eyes of the world would have remained averted from this issue if not for the remarkable work of the World Jewish Congress and other Jewish and public interest groups. In the face of daunting obstacles, they've been tireless, creative, and very effective.

We are indebted as well to the many governments represented here that have come forward to address this issue with generosity and zeal. I mention particularly Foreign Secretary Robin Cook and the British Government for their insightful publications and statements and for convening last year's landmark conference in London on Nazi gold.

I am very proud of Under Secretary of State Stutz Eizenstat and his team for setting out the historical record with rigorous objectivity and exhaustive detail in two U.S. Government reports. All this is important work and hard. It requires that painful memories be revisited, easy evasions confronted, and inconvenient questions asked and answered. Above all, it demands that we be relentless in our search for truth, despite the fact that in dealing with the Holocaust, the truth is terrible beyond comprehension.

In recent years, the world has done much to retrieve facts from obscurity concerning the secretive handling and pernicious use of Nazi-looted gold. No fewer than 17 historical commissions are studying this subject from the perspective of their own countries. The Tripartite Gold Commission has closed out its work. Almost \$60 million has been pledged to the relief fund for the victims of Nazi persecution that was launched at the conference in London. We hope that the progress on gold will serve as a catalyst for similar progress in the categories of assets we will focus on this week, which are insurance and art, as well as communal property.

In each of these areas, the world's experts are here—from governments and non-governmental organizations, corporate boardrooms, and university classrooms. We are here to compare views and share knowledge; frame the issues; and achieve consensus on ways to move forward as rapidly, thoroughly, and fairly as possible.

The historical and legal challenges vary from issue to issue, but whether we're seeking the payment of life insurance to families of those who

perished in the camps, researching artwork from the walls of a museum in Warsaw, or weighing compensation for a synagogue reduced to ashes in Czechoslovakia, the moral imperative is the same.

I hope, therefore, that we will be able to work together constructively—in an atmosphere free from threats—to develop specific principles and identify best practices for art, insurance, and other topics. I hope, as well, that our work will be driven by certain overarching imperatives.

The **first** is that our goal must be justice, even though justice in this searing context is a highly relative term. We know well our inability to provide true justice to Holocaust victims. We cannot restore life nor rewrite history. But we can make the ledger slightly less out of balance by devoting our time, energy, and resources to the search for answers, the return of property, and the payment of just claims.

Our **second** imperative must be openness. Because the sands of time have obscured so much, we must dig to find the truth. This means that researchers must have access to old archives; and by that, I don't mean partial, sporadic, or eventual access—I mean access in full, everywhere, now.

Our **third** imperative is to understand that the obligation to seek truth and act on it is not the burden of some but of all; it is universal. As the United States has recognized by declassifying documents and creating its own Presidential Advisory Commission on Holocaust Assets, every nation, every business, every organization, and every person able to contribute to the full telling of the story is obliged to do so. In this arena, none of us are mere spectators; none are neutral; for better or worse, we are all actors on history's stage.

The **fourth** imperative that propels our work is urgency. Remaining Holocaust survivors have reached an advanced stage in life. More than five

decades have passed since the Nazis perpetrated their thefts and murders. As records are lost and memories fade, effective restitution becomes more difficult. So let us each vow that by the dawn of the new century, we have done all things possible to conclude the unfinished business of the old.

**Finally**, we must remember that our efforts here serve a twin purpose. Part one is to forge a common approach to the issues still surrounding Holocaust assets. Part two is to advance Holocaust education, remembrance, and research. This is a task that knows no end. It must be renewed as the human race is renewed, generation by generation, so that the reality of the Holocaust is always before us and never ceases to disturb us.

It is encouraging that in the months preceding this conference, we have seen significant strides forward. The American Association of Art Museum Directors has formulated principles and guidelines to govern the handling of tabled Holocaust-era art.

An international commission led by former Secretary of State Larry Eagleburger has been formed to resolve unpaid insurance claims. Companies participating in that commission have agreed to establish a \$90-million humanitarian fund and to audit their books to identify unpaid Holocaust-era claims. And at Sweden's initiative, an unprecedented inter-governmental [effort] to promote Holocaust education around the world is underway. We hope that every country will participate in that effort.

The struggle to reveal and deal with the full truth surrounding the handling of Holocaust-era assets is wrenching but also cathartic. Only by knowing and being honest about the past can we gain peace in the present and confidence in the future. That is true for nations and for institutions, and it's true as well for people.

I cannot conclude this statement without addressing briefly a subject for which I have not yet found—and will never find—exactly the right words;

and that concerns my grandparents, whom I learned recently were Jewish and died along with aunts, uncles, and cousins in the Holocaust.

When I was young, I didn't often think about grandparents; I just knew I didn't have any. I was an infant when I separated from them. Now I, too, have become a grandparent, and I look at my children's children, and the love and pride literally overflows. I am sure now that I was once the object of such affection not only from my parents but from those who gave them life. And as I think of my life now in my 62d year, I think also of my grandparents' lives in those final years, months, and days.

I think of the faces at the Holocaust Museum and Yad Vashem and the long list of names on the wall of the Pynkas Synagogue in Prague—among them those of my grandparents, Olga and Arnost Korbel and Ruzene Spieglova. I think of the blood that is in my family's veins. Does it matter what kind of blood it is? It shouldn't; it is just blood that does its job. But it mattered to Hitler, and that matters to us all—because that is why 6 million Jews died. And that is why this obscenity of suffering was visited on so many innocent, irreplaceable people—people who loved and enriched life with their warmth, their smiles, and the embrace of their arms; people whose lives ended horribly and far too soon; people whose lives and suffering we must never forget or allow to diminish, even if we must, from time to time, intentionally shock our collective memory.

The people of the world differ in language, culture, history, and choices of worship. Such differences make life interesting and rich. But as the Holocaust cries out to us, we must never allow these distinctions to obscure the common humanity that binds us all as people. We must never allow pride in "us" to curdle into hatred of "them."

Remembering that lesson is what this effort at research and restitution of Holocaust-era assets is really all about—for it is about much more than gold

and art and insurance; it's about remembering that no one's blood is less or more precious than our own.

There are those who say that we're all prisoners of history and that humankind is doomed to repeat its worst mistakes over and over again. There are those who view the Holocaust as the freakish consequence of a sole demented mind—an accident of history whose repetition we need not fear. Still others point to the passing decades and ask whether it's not time to forget and move on and leave remaining questions unasked and the rest of the truth unknown. And, yes, there are still a few who deny the reality that it happened at all.

In reply, we must admit that we're not given perfect wisdom, nor the power to change human character, nor the gift of prophecy. But we do have the power of memory and can make certain that the dead shall never be forgotten from our hearts. We have the power of reason and can separate right from wrong. We have the power of hope and can pray, in the words of the *Psalms*, for a time when "truth shall spring out of the Earth and righteousness shall look down from Heaven."

And we have the power to choose. We can contemplate the Holocaust in despair, or we can consider the Holocaust and vow never again to allow complacency or fear or despair to excuse inaction.

We gather here this week not to achieve miracles but rather to do everything in our power to replace dark with light, injustice with fairness, contention with consensus, and falsehood with truth. That is the most we can do. That is the least we must do. It is what we owe to the past; it is our hope for the future; and in the largest sense, it is the hope of the world.

Let me welcome you again to this conference, and may our shared efforts prosper. Thank you all very, very much. ■

# Security, Democracy, and Law

*Remarks at USAID Conference on Promoting  
Democracy, Human Rights, and Reintegration  
In Post-Conflict Societies  
Washington, DC  
October 31, 1997*

. . . The subject of this conference is not new, because conflict is not new. People have been striving to ensure that wars, once ended, stay ended since the dawn of human history. But in our era, the stakes are higher because the weapons are more destructive and the connections between what happens "over there" and "back here" are more direct. And as we know, the end of the Cold War was accompanied by violence on a massive scale from the Caucasus and the Balkans and to Central Africa. Much of this was intrastate violence, and most of the victims were civilian.

Some of these conflicts resulted from the pursuit of power or its abuse; others from extreme nationalism or the resurfacing of long-submerged ethnic grievances. Some were caused by a breakdown in authority aggravated by unrestrained population growth, unplanned urbanization, unchecked environmental degradation, or the ready supply of cheap and

deadly arms. And some were caused by a combination of these and other factors.

From 1993 until 1996, as America's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, I had a close-up view of international efforts to respond to these conflicts. Today, I will draw on those years at the UN, but also I want to speak from a broader perspective as Secretary of State.

### **Post-Conflict Societies and American Interests**

In my view, it is possible now to divide the world very generally into four categories of countries: those that participate as full members of the international system; those that are in transition and seek to participate more fully; those that reject the rules upon which the system is based; and finally, the states that are unable—for reasons of underdevelopment, catastrophe, or conflict—to enjoy the benefits and meet the responsibilities that full membership in the system entails.

I am convinced, moreover, that the United States has a vital strategic interest in seizing the opportunity that now exists to strengthen the international system by bringing nations closer together around basic principles of democracy, open markets, law, and a commitment to peace.

This conference deals with an important part of that effort—the restoration, reform, and rebirth of societies devastated by conflict or war. Obviously, providing assistance in post-conflict situations is not the responsibility of the United States alone; it is a multinational enterprise. It requires active involvement of the UN system and other international organizations, and it benefits from the contributions of a vast network of private voluntary organizations. But the United States is not just another player.

Looking back, we know that America would not be as strong now if we had not helped the nations of Europe and East Asia to rebuild after World War II.

Looking ahead, we know that we cannot maintain our position of world leadership without doing our fair share to fix the places within the international community that have split apart or broken down. We do, after all, have a security interest in preventing conflicts from reigniting, spreading across international borders, drawing in regional powers, and creating a risk that our armed forces will have to respond to.

We have an economic interest in opening new opportunities for American commerce and in preventing new demands on the resources we have available for emergency relief and refugees. We have a budgetary and social interest in helping the people of other countries to build a future for themselves at home, instead of being forced—out of fear or desperation—to flee to our shores. We have a political interest in helping post-conflict societies to embrace democracy and to become part of the solution to global threats such as proliferation, pollution, illegal narcotics, and transnational crime. Finally, we have a humanitarian interest in helping those who have survived the cauldron of war or—in a case such as Haiti, the cruelty of repression—to revitalize their societies.

To advance our interests, we will benefit from the opportunities for cooperation created by the Cold War's passing, from the worldwide trend toward democracy, and from the incentives for reintegration caused by our increasingly global economy.

### Some Principals

As we proceed, we must be selective. We cannot want peace or reintegration more than those we seek to help. The leaders and factions in post-conflict nations must meet their commitments and play by the rules. If they do not, the efforts we make will likely be in vain. We must also bear in mind, even as we discuss past lessons learned, that we cannot shape our peace-building efforts with a cookie cutter.

What works in one place may well fail in another. Assumptions based upon our expectations and our culture need to be examined in light of local history, attitudes, and economic and social conditions. We must maintain a balance among security, political, economic, and social objectives. And we must have the right tools.

When Brian Atwood arrived at USAID 4-1/2 years ago, the United States lacked the ability to respond quickly, flexibly, and comprehensively to the crises and opportunities spawned by the Cold War's end. So in early 1994, with the support of Congress, USAID launched its Office of Transition Initiatives, or OTI, to provide such a capability. And I am pleased to say that, in cooperation with other donors and organizations, this 3-year-old has already contributed much.

This past May, for example, I visited Guatemala where OTI had built the demobilization camps that enabled former guerrilla fighters to rejoin civil society. Earlier this month, I visited Haiti, where OTI has helped consolidate democracy by working to restore community and economic life in every region of the country. In Angola, OTI has helped create the climate of greater security needed to encourage compliance with the Lusaka Accords. And in Bosnia, OTI has been at the forefront of efforts to establish an independent and objective press.

### **Patience, Planning, Coordination, and Momentum**

Although OTI highlights the need to act flexibly when a conflict ends, one of the most important lessons learned in recent years is the parallel need for patience. Peace agreements are not panaceas. The imperative during a negotiation is to persuade the parties to stop the killing. If that goal is achieved, other important issues may be left unresolved. Nor will an agreement by itself provide the security, mend

the infrastructure, rebuild the hospitals, restore the croplands, or create the other conditions needed for a return to normal life.

These tasks may take years, even if political and security developments are favorable. If they are not, the risk is that reconstruction will never occur and that those dissatisfied with the constraints of peace will slip their harnesses and return to war.

Unfortunately, patience is not a quality for which the 1990s are known. It is relatively easy to summon a sense of urgency and commitment at the moment a conflict ends, handshakes are exchanged, and photographs are taken. But it requires a healthy dose of political will to maintain that commitment later, when the ambitious plans designed at the outset face their severest tests.

There is, moreover, never enough money in a post-conflict situation to finance all the good ideas. We live in an era of tight budgets and diminishing enthusiasm for international assistance. It is essential, therefore, that participation in relief efforts be broad, priorities be set with discipline, expectations be realistic, and resources be efficiently used. All this requires sound planning. And one of the key lessons we have learned in recent years is that the more and earlier the planning, the better.

In Cambodia, the peace agreement called for electing a government that would then determine the nation's reconstruction needs. As a result, efforts to repair infrastructure and build institutions were delayed. In Haiti, the United States had time to organize a comprehensive plan that became operational as soon as the elected leaders of that country were restored. More recently, following the peace accords in Guatemala, donors were well-prepared to begin reintegrating former combatants into society.

This is crucial because once a peace agreement is signed, momentum counts. Speed is essential to show the parties that peace pays. We can't spend

years deciding where to put a demobilization camp or how to turn on the lights in the nation's capital. We have to create from the outset a sense that the decision to lay down arms is irreversible and that the parties must either join the peace-building effort or run the risk of being left permanently behind.

### Building Security

The immediate challenge after a peace agreement is signed is to create a climate of security so that the fighting can stop and reconstruction can begin. This is often the job of an outside military force assembled by the United Nations, a regional organization, or a coalition. A dilemma in many post-conflict situations is how and when to move from dependency on this outside force to reliance on a local force or forces. Preparing to take this step is not simply a question of rebuilding a prewar capability. Wholesale reform is often required.

This may entail establishing a clear separation between the responsibilities of soldiers and police; underlining the primacy of civilians over the military; restructuring and purging security forces; disbanding paramilitary units; and creating what may be entirely new standards for evaluating performance within both the military and police. That is some list.

As we have seen most prominently in Latin America in recent years, democracy may demand of the military nothing less than a 100% reassessment of its purpose and place in the country. But the foundation of true democracy cannot rest on the concessions made by the armed forces alone. Civilian leaders must capably perform the tasks they have told the military it can no longer do. And they must demonstrate their own commitment to the rule of law.

International aid to domestic law enforcement has been a growth industry throughout this decade.

The specific challenges may vary from teaching the ABCs of police investigation to human rights education to overcoming ethnic rivalry, but the overall goal is the same: to create a force that serves and protects the people, instead of repressing them. In some societies, this idea of police as friend and ally will be novel to citizens and police alike. As a result, years may elapse between the signing of a peace accord and the development of a satisfactory police force. Training takes time, and success depends not only on the arrest of criminals but on their just prosecution and punishment.

However difficult, military, police, and judicial reform are indispensable to lasting peace. If ex-combatants do not feel equal under the law and protected by it, they will take measures to protect their own security and begin the cycle of violence anew.

## Exit Strategy

This leads to what is perhaps the most controversial and difficult question facing those of us involved in peace building. When do we know that the international military force sent to a post-conflict country can leave without inviting renewed war? Obviously, there is no scientific answer to this question. Ordinarily, however, the level of force required to maintain security will decrease as combatants are demobilized, local security forces are stood up, and economic rebuilding gets underway.

As we have seen in El Salvador, Haiti, and Mozambique—and as we are now seeing in Eastern Slavonia and as we hope to see in Bosnia—it is possible to move down a continuum from a relatively large military force, to a smaller force, to a predominantly civilian mission oriented toward police and judicial training and monitoring human rights. Such a transition can only be achieved with steady support from international donors and with the commitment of the host government to embrace the rule of law.

The need for an exit strategy for military deployments in post-conflict situations has been the subject of much discussion in recent years. I believe that an exit strategy is essential. It requires policymakers to give the armed forces a clear sense of mission and mandate. And a target date for completion puts pressure on local leaders to meet their responsibilities.

But an exit strategy cannot be an end in itself. And in peace building, best case scenarios rarely play out. To be effective, our strategy must be flexible enough to accommodate setbacks and stretch-outs but firm enough to keep the parties moving in the right direction.

## Democracy

In our efforts to help post-conflict societies, we should always bear in mind that democracy provides the best route to long-term reconciliation. In a democracy, former combatants can continue fighting at the ballot box for the principles they once defended on the battlefield. Moreover, the need to win votes, build coalitions, and propose concrete programs can have a moderating influence on the extremes. And once the mindset of democratic competition sets in, even threatening return to past mayhem can become impolitic and, thus, unthinkable.

Clearly, elections are necessary to provide legitimate and representative government, maintain stability, and promote progress. But although elections must be part of a post-conflict strategy, they are not a sufficient strategy.

Nations come to democracy at their own speed. In the early stages of a transition, an interim coalition government may work better and do more for the cause of reconciliation than a weak elected one. But whether elections are held sooner or later, the international community should strive from day one to help assemble the core ingredients of democracy:

free press, political parties, equal rights for women and minorities, and even a new constitution if one is needed.

## Refugees

Nothing provides a more visible symbol of healing after a conflict than the safe return of refugees and displaced persons to their prewar homes. Through the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, the international community has developed a system for protecting refugees that has saved countless lives. Today, however, that system faces some significant challenges.

For example, the recent events in Central Africa underline the need to ensure that the refugees who seek shelter from the conflict are not used as cover by the initiators of conflict. Countries of asylum have primary responsibility for the protection of refugees and for separating armed elements from the refugee population. Unfortunately, the government of former Zaire had neither the will nor the ability to perform these functions with respect to the refugees who flooded across its borders in the wake of the Rwandan genocide 3 years ago. Ultimately, the camps were broken up forcefully at a high cost in lives and principle. If such episodes are not to be repeated, the international community must devise effective and realistic strategies for ensuring that refugee camps are not misused as military bases or as hideouts for war criminals.

Second, the problem of sexual abuse against displaced and refugee women needs to be addressed further. This is a problem both for women on the road and in camps. The challenge is not simply to care for the victims of such violence, but to prevent the violence and exploitation in the first place.

And third, for economic and social reasons, female ex-combatants and war-affected families—often headed by women—have particular difficulty

reestablishing themselves in society after conflict. Their problems should be incorporated in a broader strategy for community reintegration. Two projects in this category are the UNHCR's Rwandan Women's Initiative and the Bosnian Women's Initiative, which strive to create economic opportunity for returning women refugees.

## Landmines

Finally, one of the cruelest legacies of conflict in our era is ground made deadly by the presence of landmines. Today, an estimated 100 million mines lay scattered around more than five dozen countries—each mine a threat to life and limb; each an obstacle to economic recovery and the return of refugees; each a reminder that the costs of war continue long after the guns of war are silent.

During the past several years, I have met with mining victims on four continents. I have watched little children without legs propel themselves on wagons through the streets, seen old men fitted with prosthetic limbs, and watched mothers tether their children to trees to prevent them from straying into nearby mine-infested fields.

Like other Americans, I have been heartened by the recent dramatic increase in support for protecting civilians from the danger of landmines. I am appreciative of the contributions made to this cause by leaders such as Senators Patrick Leahy and Chuck Hagel, and by the Nobel Prize-winning International Campaign to Ban Landmines. And I am proud that today, America is the leader in humanitarian demining.

Since 1993, we have devoted \$153 million to this purpose. Our experts are helping to remove mines in 14 nations. They have trained and equipped about one-quarter of those engaged in demining around the world, and we are continuing to increase our com-

mitment. But still, there is much more that we, and others in the international community, can and must do.

Accordingly, I am pleased that later today I will join Secretary of Defense William Cohen in announcing a major new Presidential initiative. The purpose of that initiative will be to ensure that civilians in every country on every continent are secure from the threat of landmines by the end of the next decade.

Our premise is that the best way to protect civilians from landmines in the ground is to pull them out like the noxious weeds that they are. But given the scale and urgency of the problem, we need a massive increase in global resources devoted to identifying and clearing mines. We need to intensify research into better methods of demining, for in this era of technological miracles, the most common tool we have for detecting landmines is still a stick attached to a person's arm. And we need to expand efforts to heighten awareness among vulnerable populations so that when we achieve our goal of eliminating landmines that threaten civilian populations, the children of the world will be there to witness it.

The initiative we are announcing today is intended to increase public and private resources devoted to demining worldwide by approximately five-fold to \$1 billion a year. The initiative will be coordinated by Assistant Secretary of State Karl F. "Rick" Inderfurth, who, because of his dedication to this case and cause has agreed, in addition to his duties as Assistant Secretary of State for South Asia—a region that has Afghanistan in it, with a lot of landmines in it—has today been asked to serve as the U.S. Special Representative of the President and Secretary of State for Global Humanitarian Demining.

Thirty-six years ago, President Kennedy set for our nation the goal of enabling a man to walk on the moon. Today, President Clinton is reaffirming the

goal of enabling people everywhere to walk safely on the Earth.

This conference is about rebuilding post-conflict societies. I can think of no better contribution to that cause than to mobilize public and private resources from around the world to see that landmines are removed forever from the ground on which our children tread.

## Reconciliation

The issues I have discussed so far relate to the creation within a post-conflict society of what I would call the nuts and bolts of normalcy—the ability of people to go about their daily business free from violence, in hopes of increased prosperity, in communities where the trains are running and basic services are being provided.

This is how the physical scars of war are healed, and it is important and necessary to the rebuilding process. But it is not enough, for many of the wounds that war inflicts are not against land or body but mind and spirit.

During the past 5 years, I have met with victims of war from the Caucasus to Cambodia to Kigali to Quiche. I have talked to people no different than you or I whose lives have been turned wrong-side out by ethnic cleansing and murder. I have spoken to grandparents in Georgia who have been driven from the homes in which they had lived their entire lives and to women in Rwanda now raising children conceived in rape by the murderers of their husbands. And I have met with the widows of Vukovar and Srebrenica who will not believe their loved ones are dead because they have seen no bodies, because they have no faith in what anyone tells them, and because even steel would lose a test of strength compared to human hope. I suspect many of you have had similar conversations.

No international program, no matter how generous or well-planned, can erase the bitterness created by war. That is beyond mortal power. But we do have tools available to provide a degree of help and this matters, not only for humanitarian reasons, but because it is hard to build a democratic community on a foundation of unresolved anger and grief.

The tools include such programs as the International Voluntary Fund for the Victims of Torture, counseling programs run by private voluntary groups, and self-help projects organized by survivors themselves. Donors can also help to locate and identify the remains of the missing, search out and care for unaccompanied children, and aid in the reuniting of families. And we have a particular responsibility to support reconciliation through the prosecution of war crimes, a truth commission, or other appropriate means. These are imperfect instruments, but they can provide at least a measure of closure and accountability to past outrages so that their repetition is less likely and so that the families of victims don't feel that their suffering has been ignored. . . . ■

# Freedom of Religion

*Centennial Address  
Columbus School of Law  
The Catholic University  
Washington, DC  
October 23, 1997*

. . . Today, I'd like to focus on a subject that has been increasingly in the news lately and that I believe will continue to play a significant role in U.S. foreign policy and in the affairs of the world. That is the ceaseless quest for religious freedom and tolerance.

In the United States, we believe in the separation of church and state. Our Constitution reflects the fear of religious persecution that prompted many in the 17th and 18th centuries to set sail for American shores. But this principle has never blinded us to religion's impact on secular events, whether for the worse, as when intolerance contributes to conflict and strife; or for the better, as when faith serves as a source of moral inspiration and healing.

There are many examples of the latter in recent years, thanks to leaders of many faiths from many lands, including the efforts of the Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew on behalf of the environment and inter-ethnic understanding; the eloquence of Archbishop Tutu in helping to consign apartheid to the dustbin of history; the inspiring and culturally transcending ministry of Mother Teresa; and most dramatically, the historic contributions made by Pope John Paul II to the cause of freedom.

As a native of central Europe and as a professor who has lectured on the region, I will never forget the impact of the Pope's visit to his native Poland while the nation was still behind the Iron Curtain and under martial law. Those visits were arranged by the church and not the state. And the outpouring of enthusiasm astonished the government, which had assumed that years of dictatorship had caused religious faith to erode. They were wrong, for rarely has a message so important found such a receptive audience. And never has a people been made aware so suddenly of their own inner feelings and collective strength.

His Holiness argued that if people are to fulfill their responsibility to live according to moral principles, they must first have the right and ability to do so. In this spirit, he spoke with carefully chosen words of the need for solidarity with workers and among all human beings. In this spirit, he challenged the dogmas of the communist system, which denied to millions the right to speak freely and to participate in shaping the social and political systems of their societies. In this spirit, he challenged the artificial division that Stalin had imposed by reasserting the fundamental unity of Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. And in this way, he helped unleash a tidal wave of intellectual renewal and personal courage that helped bring down the Berlin Wall and transform the face of the world.

Now as we strive to shape this new era, it is an important part of American policy to promote greater freedom of religion and to encourage reconciliation among religious groups. We take this stand because it is consistent with our values and because it is one of the reasons people around the world have chosen at critical times in this century to stand with us. We believe that nations are stronger, and the lives of their people richer, when citizens have the freedom to choose, proclaim, and exercise their religious identity.

We have also learned that the denial of religious freedom or threats to it can cause fear, flight, fighting, and even all-out war. So we have developed a focus in our policy on regions where religious divisions have combined with other factors to engender violence or endanger peace. To implement our policy, we have publicly identified the promotion of religious freedom as a foreign policy priority.

I have instructed U.S. diplomats to provide frequent and thorough reports on the status of religious freedom in the countries to which they are accredited. Second, we have intensified the spotlight given to religious freedom in the reports we issue annually on human rights practices around the world. Third, we are modifying our procedures for reviewing requests for political asylum to ensure that those fleeing religious persecution are treated fairly. Fourth, we promote religious freedom through our foreign broadcasting by sponsoring programs and exchanges that foster understanding and through our work in international organizations such as the UN Human Rights Commission and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. Fifth, we often raise issues related to religious freedom with foreign governments and their representatives.

That was the case, for example, earlier this year when I discussed restrictions on religious activity in Vietnam and, more recently, when President Clinton raised with President Yeltsin our serious concerns about Russia's new law on religion.

Next week, during the U.S.-China summit, we will be stressing to President Jiang Zemin the importance of respecting the religious heritage of the people of Tibet and of ensuring that China's growing Christian community is allowed to worship freely, without harassment or intimidation.

Finally, we reinforced our commitment to religious tolerance last winter when my predecessor, Warren Christopher, established an Advisory Commit-

tee on Religious Freedom Abroad. The committee includes distinguished scholars, activists, and religious leaders representing the major spiritual traditions in the United States. Its purpose is to help direct attention to the problem of religious persecution abroad and to provide advice on how to achieve reconciliation in areas now sundered by religious enmity. In February, I chaired the first meeting of the committee, and I look forward to its recommendations and observations later this year.

As we proceed with our efforts to promote religious freedom, we should be mindful of one danger, which is the possibility that as we pursue the right goal we may choose the wrong means. For example, legislation has been introduced in Congress that would create a White House Office for Religious Persecution Monitoring that would automatically impose sanctions against countries where religious freedoms are not fully observed.

Although well-intentioned, this bill would create an artificial hierarchy among human rights with the right to be free from torture and murder shoved along with others into second place. It would also establish a new and unneeded bureaucracy and deprive U.S. officials of the flexibility required to protect the overall foreign policy interests of the United States.

I have said many times—for I believe it in my heart and have experienced it in my life—that the United States is the greatest and most generous nation on the face of the Earth. But even the most patriotic among us must admit that neither morality, nor religious freedom, nor respect for human rights were invented here—nor are they perfectly practiced here.

It is in our interest, and it is essential to our own identity for America to promote religious freedom and human rights. But if we are to be effective in defending the values we cherish, we must also take into

account the perspectives and values of others. We must recognize that our relations with the world are not fully encompassed by any single issue or set of issues. And we must do all we can to ensure that the world's attention is focused on the principles we embrace, not diverted by the methods we use.

Perhaps the clearest intersection between American interests and the principle of religious tolerance occurs in regions where ethnic and religious differences contribute to division and the risk of violence. Here, the United States works to persuade parties of their mutual stake in learning to get along and their mutual responsibility for doing so. For example, President Clinton has been personally involved in encouraging multi-party talks aimed at achieving a durable settlement to the dispute in Northern Ireland.

Those talks resumed recently following a cease-fire declaration by the IRA which shares with Unionist paramilitary groups the responsibility for maintaining a climate of nonviolence. We are very proud of the role that former Senator George Mitchell has played in establishing the framework for discussion. And we will continue to support ecumenical initiatives aimed at bridging differences between the Catholic and Protestant communities and at addressing longstanding problems of economic inequity and discrimination.

In Bosnia, we are working to promote reconciliation in a land that has literally been torn apart by conflict among three communities of differing ethnicity and religious faith. To that end, we have reinvigorated our commitment to the implementation of the Dayton peace accords. And although many serious obstacles remain, we have made significant progress in recent months.

For example, municipal elections have been held, and it is clear from the results that many Bosnians do not want, and will not accept, a country permanently

frozen along ethnic lines. They want to go home and, in fact, the return of refugees and displaced persons has increased.

In addition, the cause of justice received a boost earlier this month when 10 persons indicted for war crimes surrendered to the Tribunal in The Hague. The cause of security has benefited from the destruction of thousands of heavy weapons. The cause of truth has been served by a substantial increase in independent television and radio broadcasting. The cause of prosperity is gaining ground in those communities that are implementing the Dayton accords. And the goal of reconciliation is being advanced by the emergence of a new leader of the Bosnian Serbs who appears to understand that implementing Dayton is the key to a decent future for her people.

Many Americans, when they think of Sarajevo, may remember the Olympics held there in 1984. But the Sarajevo of that time was also the ecumenical city—host to mosques, churches—both Catholic and Orthodox—and synagogues, as well. So when cynics suggest that the people of Bosnia cannot live together, I can only say but they did, they have, they must, and they will again.

In building peace, momentum matters. So I was encouraged by the Pope's visit in April to Sarajevo where he delivered a passionate plea for reconciliation and interethnic healing. I was pleased by the decision in June of the leaders of the faith communities in Bosnia to create a joint council to promote respect for human rights and to issue a Statement of Shared Moral Commitment. And I welcome the address earlier this month by the new Archbishop of Zagreb, who expressed warmth toward the leaders of other faiths in his country and cited the need for—and I quote—"the people of spirit who will bring understanding, negotiations, and peace to an excessively radicalized and tense public life."

Community and religious leaders play a vital role in Bosnia and throughout the Balkans, for the ethnic hatred that splintered that region was not a natural phenomenon. It was not something in the water or a virus carried through the air. Rather, it was injected into the informational bloodstream; it was taught, published, broadcast, and yes, even preached over and over again. And the fears aroused were manipulated by ruthless leaders for the purpose of enhancing their own position, power, and wealth.

The physical and psychological wounds that resulted from the devastation of Bosnia were deep and will take time and treatment to heal. The United States has made a commitment, which we should keep, to assist and persist in that healing process.

There are some who see in the rivalries that exist in the Balkans and elsewhere—in the Middle East, the Gulf, Africa, and Asia—the potential for a vast clash of civilizations, in which differences not only of spiritual tradition but of culture, history, and ideology divide the world into bitter contending camps. The United States has a different view.

We are the defender of no one faith but the respecter of all and of the right of all to proclaim and exercise faith. We are friends with nations in which the predominant religion is Buddhist and others where it is Christian or Hindu or Islamic or Jewish. We are, ourselves, a nation of all these faiths and more and of those without religious faith and of those within whom such faith and doubt engage in constant struggle.

In our policy toward other nations, we do not act or judge on the basis of religion or cultural tradition but on behavior, on compliance with international norms. And when those norms are not observed, we express our opposition to the acts in question, not to the religion of those involved.

For this reason, we reject stereotypes, for we know that actions in violation of international standards, including extremist violence and terror, are not

the province of any particular religion, culture, or part of the world.

In recent years, we have seen bloody acts of terrorism committed by Kurdish separatists in Turkey. We have seen a Jewish man who had been raised in the United States murder 29 Arabs while they were at prayer in a Hebron mosque. We have seen a Japanese cult release poison gas in the Tokyo subway. We have seen Islamic suicide bombers destroy the lives of people riding on buses or shopping in the streets of Jerusalem. We have seen extremists engaged in a grisly campaign of terror against their co-religionists in Algeria. And we have heard Serbian leaders justify the campaign of ethnic cleansing and mass rape inflicted upon Muslims in Bosnia as a defense, in their words, of “Christian Europe.”

Clearly, the central conflict in the world today is not between the adherents of one religion or culture and another. Rather it is between those of all cultures and faiths who believe in law, want peace, and embrace tolerance and those driven, whether by ambition, desperation, or hate to commit acts of aggression and terror.

The great divide now is not between East and West or North and South but between those imprisoned by history and those determined to shape history.

Almost a half-century ago, the nations of the world enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights the principle that every person has the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion. To those who argue that the Universal Declaration reflects western values alone, I would point to the first Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference held in Indonesia more than four decades ago. There, the representatives of 29 nations from China to Saudi Arabia and from Sudan and Libya to Iran and Iraq cited the Universal Declaration as “a common standard of

achievement for all peoples and all nations.” And countries on every continent reaffirmed the Declaration just 4 years ago at the Vienna Conference on Human Rights.

Today, our great opportunity in the aftermath of Cold War and the divisions is to bring the world closer together around shared principles of democracy, open markets, law, human rights, and a commitment to peace. . . .

In that effort, religious freedom and tolerance are among the great principles we strive to defend. By so doing, we maintain the vigor of our own freedoms; we serve our interest in a world where civilizations cooperate and communicate instead of clash and collide; and we honor not one, but all of the great spiritual traditions that lend meaning to our time here on Earth. . . . ■