TRILATERAL COOPERATION AFTER SEPTEMBER 11TH
AN AMERICAN PERSPECTIVE

Colin Powell

What I would like to do this morning is just muse with you for a few moments on a number of issues of the day. I will touch on the Middle East in due course since it is of such moment and then open it up to questions as quickly as possible. But before getting to the Middle East, I really would like to talk about the other issues that are occupying my time. When you see a crisis like the Middle East suddenly heat up so much, you tend to find everything else overwhelmed; you tend to overlook some successes that we have noted in the past few days.

For example, a cease-fire in Angola, finally between that government and UNITA in a way that, hopefully, will bring that conflict of several decades to an end. We woke up this morning to see that North Korea has indicated to the South Korean Presidential Representative, Mr. Lim, that they are ready to begin discussions again with South Koreans. And, as they said, at every level. And they also indicated to the South Koreans, who indicated to us, that the North Koreans are ready to consider meeting again with the United States. So there is some progress, notwithstanding some of the concerns that existed a few weeks ago, when the President clearly described the North Korean regime for what it is. And everybody was afraid we might be heading into a negative direction with North Korea. But now the possibility of a dialogue is once again on the table -- the kind of dialogue that the President called for.

And so my life -- and the life of my colleagues in the State Department -- goes back and forth every day, just as has been the case with every Secretary of State, between the opportunities that are there, the opportunities to push our agenda forward, and the dangers that are there, and the crises that are there. And to make sure that at least part of the day is spent in optimism. Part of the day is spent looking at the opportunities and making sure that we seize those opportunities. Especially in those areas of the world that the Trilateral Commission has focused on over these past almost 30 years: the Euro-Atlantic Partnership and our relations with the nations of Asia.

With respect to Europe, I think President Bush has made it clear to all of our European Allies and friends that the United States is a European nation, as well as an American nation. Because our history is so linked with Europe. Our future is so linked with Europe and defined by the Euro-Atlantic Partnership. That's why he went to Europe last year, and at Warsaw, gave a powerful statement about a Europe continuing to move down a path to being whole, free and at peace. That's why he has made such a commitment to expanding the NATO Alliance. That's why he is so interested in seeing the European Union expand, why we will stay in the Balkans and play a productive role. As he has said, "We went in together, we will come out together." We understand our responsibilities to work with our European friends while we are helping to allow and permit and encourage Europe to put into place the European Security and Defense Initiative.

And in the European account, no account is more important than Russia. Bringing Russia to the West. Embracing Russia in the economic system of the West. Giving Russia a sense of purpose and promise. And in the next month or so you will see a lot of activities on the part of the administration to move this agenda forward. I hope that next month at the Ministerial at Reykjavik we will be able to conclude work with respect to NATO, Russia at Twenty, or whatever term we finally settle for, where Russia will find that it is in a partnership, if not in an alliance, with the rest of NATO.

A couple of weeks after that the President will be in Moscow for a summit with President Putin. And at that summit meeting I am confident that we will be able to put on the table -- if not for signature, certainly
for agreement, but perhaps also for signature by next month -- a strategic framework agreement that will legally bind the reductions in strategic nuclear weapons that the two Presidents have been talking about for many months. And negotiators are hard at work. I've had three conversations already this week with Foreign Minister Ivanov and I think we're moving in the right direction.

It's fascinating to deal with the Russian account these days. My staff came in to me about three weeks ago and said, "We have a crisis with Moscow." And suddenly my old software from 12 years ago kicked in, and I said, "Should we go to Def Con II?" And they said, "No, it's not that kind of crisis." I said, "What kind of crisis is it?" They said, "Chickens." "Chickens? What do you mean, chickens?" "The Russians have stopped importing American chickens." I said, "Why don't you go see Don Evans? Why is this my problem? Go see Zoellick." "It is a major commercial problem, Mr. Secretary, and a major political and policy problem." "Why?" "Because half of all American chicken exports go to one country, Russia. Fifty percent. Millions of tons a month." I said, "When did that happen?" "Over the last ten years. The Soviet Union ended and we focused on trade. We focused on exporting to them. We focused on providing what their people wanted."

It took us three weeks; multiple conversations between Don Evans and his colleagues; Ann Veneman, at the Department of Agriculture and her colleagues. I had to talk to not only Ivanov but to the Russian Prime Minister on several occasions. President Bush finally had to get involved and talk directly to President Putin about this issue. And I am pleased to report that the chicken crisis is over. Not without us agreeing to Russian chicken inspectors coming to the United States this week to look at some of our plants. And the issue all had to do with salmonella. Now, some days, I wish it were the old days, where things were much clearer, with a nice line running through the Fulda Gap with the red side of the map, and the blue side of the map. And it's perfect clarity as to who we are and what we are. But that is not the world that we deal with this day. And it has become a much more complex world. But in some ways, a world with perhaps even greater promise, notwithstanding the crisis we see.

We are working with Russia in ways that would have been unimaginable just a few years ago, or even just a year ago. After September 11, and we made it clear to the world that the President would act against al Qaeda, and the Taliban, and Afghanistan. And we knew that we would need access to bases in Central Asia. We knew that we needed a new relationship with Pakistan in order to deal with this crisis. We knew that we would be right on the border of Iran. We knew that the Indians would have more than a passing interest in what we were doing. And we knew that Russia viewed that as their part of the world. In old terms it might have been called their sphere of influence. And yet within two weeks' time, after we had gotten the support of NATO and the United Nations and the OIC, and the OAS and so many other organizations, for what we had to do in this campaign against terrorism, President Putin stepped forward and made an important speech, and aligned himself with what we were doing, and said to us, "I want to be a part of this campaign, I want to be a part of the West." And for the past six months our forces have been in that part of the world, as you well know, and I need not document for you. Bases in Uzbekistan and other places that would have been unthinkable a while ago. We have assured the Soviets we are not looking for permanent bases, but we need permanent access. We need permanent relations with these nations. A year ago, Ivanov, my Russian counterpart, complained to me about the possibility that the United States might be trying to insert itself into Central Asia. Last month, he was giving a press conference in Moscow and someone said to him, Minister Igor, why aren't you deeply upset because the United States is now in Central Asia and Uzbekistan and places like that? Why aren't you irate? They're the enemy. And his answer was, "No the enemy is fundamentalism. The enemy is extremism. The enemy is smuggling. The enemy is illegal immigration. There are many enemies in that part of the world now, and we and the United States are allied, aligned in the fight against that enemy."

Now, does that thinking permeate all of the Russian bureaucracy, all of the Russian political system? Not yet. But it reflects the kind of promise, the kind of possibilities there are for a new relationship with
Russia, that I think will strengthen the Euro-Atlantic Partnership in a very, very significant way. And recognize as Henry has pointed out to us many times, that as you move down this road, you add more members to NATO, then you will see a dilution, somewhat, of the organization. And we have to make sure that as you add more members, that dilution does not affect its ability to do what it needs to do for -- first and foremost -- NATO, and not just NATO-Plus-One More. And so we are sensitive to that kind of issue. But we are also willing to bring Russia closest to us in every possible way, because we think it is in their interest, it is in our interest, it is in the interest of world peace and stability.

We'll move quickly to Asia. Asia, where we have succeeded in the past year, I think, in demonstrating to the world that America is just as committed as it has ever been in the past, to being a Pacific nation. A nation with solid alliances with South Korea and Japan, Thailand and Australia. A nation that sees China as a powerful new nation coming forward, coming out. A nation that we don't want to have as an adversary, we don't want to make an adversary. But we want the Chinese to understand that we have interests in the region, interests we will represent, interests we will protect, alliances we will maintain. The president had two good meeting in China in the past several months: in Shanghai for the APEC summit, and when he went to Beijing just a few weeks ago. There were a lot of ups and downs to the relationship in our first few months. The EP-3 reconnaissance plane incident of last spring made it look for a moment like we might be off-track. But we quickly got behind that. It was clear the Chinese were looking for a good relationship.

The issue of Taiwan is always there and is discussed in every phone call. I called Foreign Minister Tang, the Chinese Foreign Minister, yesterday to review the situation in the Middle East and to talk about other bilateral issues and once again, we had to go through the One China Policy discussion, The Three Communiqués and Taiwan Relations Act. We know where they stand, they know where we stand and there are areas of cooperation beyond that area of understanding. Economic cooperation. Certain knowledge that China needs access to our markets. A certain knowledge that if they are going to continue to grow and see this wealth that is so represented in Shanghai and Beijing spread to rest of the country, they need a good economic relationship with the West. We are committed to that as well.

But we were also committed to defending our values and defending our principles, so we will not hold back in talking to the Chinese about human rights and religious freedom. Values that we hold dear. Universal values not just American values. And we will not hold back when we speak about their actions concerning weapons proliferation, or their other actions that we find are troublesome.

We can do this without either putting it into one cliché statement or another cliché statement. It's a broad relationship, really not reducible to a single cliché statement. And I have every reason to believe that we can keep moving in a positive direction with China.

There are other areas out there that are worthy of note this morning. The India-Pakistan situation was a very troubling one. It still is a troubling one. Though I believe that as a result of our diplomatic efforts, as well as the diplomatic efforts of many others -- the Chinese, the Russians, the United Kingdom, and a number of others -- Kofi Annan -- we have, both sides, committed to finding the political solution, out of the tense situation that exists there now. And we are in almost daily contact with President Musharraf and Indian leaders, from Prime Minister Vajpayee on down, to make sure that that happens. Ultimately we have to find a way to begin discussions between the two sides that will deal with Kashmir, and we are committed to that as well.

I could not leave this tour of the horizon so to speak without touching on our own hemisphere. President Bush has a commitment to this hemisphere that is evidenced by his very first set of visits with the Canadian leadership last year, and by going to Mexico for a summit meeting with President Fox last February. And then the Quebec Summit, which dedicated itself to democracy, a community of nations
committed to democracy in this hemisphere, with rules of behavior, in order to make sure that we have this universal value system spread throughout our hemisphere. A community of nations committed to open and free trade, taking NAFTA and expanding it. A Central American Free Trade Agreement, Bilateral Free Trade agreements, and then ultimately, a Free Trade Agreement of the Americas going from the Arctic Circle all the way down to Tierra del Fuego, in the interest of all of the nations of the Americas.

The big challenge with these free trade agreements and with liberalizing trade, and with these new democracies, is that there is a time lag. The time lag that we talked about in the Monterrey Summit a few weeks ago. Nations become democratic -- as 34 of the 35 nations of our hemisphere are -- and people immediately want to see results. But results don’t come that quickly. You don't suddenly find the job creation. You don't suddenly find the economic benefits that are promised by democracy. There is a time lag, a development lag and it is that lag that we have to shorten. President Bush made an important step in that direction at the Monterrey meeting a few weeks ago when he announced the New Millennium Challenge Fund. A 50% increase in the development aid that the United States will be giving. This is on top of the more modest increases I have been able to get through the normal appropriations process: roughly five to six percent in every one of the two budget years that I have testified on. This is 50% more on top of that. But it is geared to those nations of the world, both in our hemisphere and elsewhere, that have committed themselves to good governance, the end of corruption, rule-based economies, privatization, and above all, individual rights of men and women. If you practice those rules, if you show that you want to be part of a world that is moving forward, values its people, then this money will be available to you. And it will be available to you to go directly to those activities and structures within your society that will focus on good governance, that will focus on education, clean water, infrastructure, so that we can build up your economies and your societies. You can take advantage of open trade, liberalized trade. It all connects.

We also have not forgotten our obligations in Africa. The Africa Growth and Opportunity Act has permitted a number of African nations to increase significantly their trade with the United States. But no crisis in the world is greater than what is happening in sub-Saharan Africa with respect to HIV/AIDS. I went last year, along with my wife, and visited a number of these countries. Many of you have had the same experience. You have seen not just how people are ill from this horrible plague, you see how societies are being destroyed, whole generations are being wiped out, the future is being hostage. Countries that have an infection rate up to 39%. Countries where the average life expectancy has dropped from 65 years to 44 years in just a decade. It is a catastrophe of the worst kind on the face of the earth. And I am pleased that the United States is playing a leadership role in doing something about it. Not only through the research efforts that we do here in this country, but also by the work we did in putting together the Global Health Fund that Tommy Thompson -- Secretary of Health and Human Services -- and I managed for the President, and have developed with the United nations. And it will begin making grants in the very near future, and it has raised close to $2 billion already.

So these are active times for American diplomacy. An active time that requires American leadership. The leadership that President Bush is giving to all of these efforts. We have sometimes been accused of being unilateralist. We are not multilateralist enough. And I take this charge head on. You can come look at my calendar, you can come look at my phone logs, you can come look at anything you wish. You can come examine the evidence and you will see that this nation is as active now with this administration as it has ever been with respect to multilateral activities. But that does not mean that when there is an issue on which we have strong feelings, and in which we believe principles are involved, and in which we have considered the views of our friends and come to a different conclusion -- we will not go along for the sake of going along if we think it is the wrong choice for us and the wrong choice for the world. And we will stake ourselves out in principle. Very often that results in charges of us being unilateralists, and we will deal with that, and we will try to work with our friends.
No better example of this could I give than the debate over the ABM Treaty and whether the United States would withdraw from that treaty. Everybody expected that as soon as we came into office last year there would be an immediate announcement of withdrawal from the ABM Treaty. Turned out not to be the case. President Bush understood the significance of such a withdrawal, he was absolutely committed to going forward with missile defense as a matter of principle, as he made it clear to all of our friends and to the Chinese, the Russians, everyone else, that we would not be deterred from this goal. We thought it was the right goal for a world where we are trying to devalue strategic offensive weapons. We spent 10 months -- more than 10 months, close to 11 months -- presenting our case, discussing it with the Russians. Repeated meetings with the Russians. Trying to find a way for us to go with missile defense research and development activities without violating the treaty or getting outside the bounds of the treaty. And we found there was no way to do that, and the Russians could not find a way to give us the flexibility that we needed. And so in early December, after these 10-plus months of discussion, President Bush sent me to Europe, I met with President Putin, and we talked about it one more time. I met with our European colleagues in a variety of capitals, and we discussed it one more time. And I let them know that President Bush had reached the point where we had to leave the treaty -- or announce our intention to leave the treaty. But we did it after thorough consultation. After making every effort to see whether or not we could accommodate these diverging views. And everybody was getting ready to accuse us of a unilateral action that was going to blow apart the relationship between the United States and Russia. Blow apart the whole strategic framework. In fact, what happened is that when we made the announcement, there was some controversy, but we quickly got over it, because we had worked closely with the Russians. And the Russians had made it clear that they disagreed with our decision, but at the same time they understood why we were doing it and they wanted to move forward with a strategic framework in any event. And that strategic framework has now been developed for the most part, and I hope it will be codified next month in Moscow. That's an example, when there is a disagreement we will coordinate, we will discuss, we will consult, but at the end of the day we will act on principle. Hopefully, with our friends. Hopefully, with all of our friends, or coalitions of the willing, of those few nations who might agree with us. But we will act. We will not shrink from the tough choices.

I would like to end this brief overview by talking about the Middle East, one of the most difficult problems on the face of the earth today. I will leave tomorrow for the region. I will start out in Morocco where I will consult with Crown Prince Abdullah on the vision he presented at the Arab Summit, the vision that was adopted by all 22 nations of the Arab League. The vision that anticipates Israel living in peace with its Arab neighbors. Israel will have normal relations with its Arab neighbors. It's a powerful vision that has to be brought now to reality. A reality that is being denied by the violence in the region. We have been engaged in this problem since the first days of the administration. In the last days of President Clinton's administration, I stayed in close touch with Dr. Albright, and Dennis Ross and with President Clinton himself. I spoke to President Clinton at four o'clock on the 19th of January, just as he was getting ready to leave office, and we had a long conversation about where we were. Strobe Talbott is here, and we had conversations about it as well. The previous administration put their heart in it. Did everything they could to try to get an agreement, and I give them full credit for that effort. What we found when we came in, though, was a government in Israel that was about to be defeated because of the intifada, and because of the failure to get that agreement; and a new government coming in, led by Prime Minister Ariel Sharon, that first and foremost, was committed to ending the intifada and creating an environment of security. Security in which they could then move forward to discussion, to negotiation, and get back on a political track. One of the first steps we took was to ask Senator George Mitchell to remain engaged and to complete his work. He had put it in abeyance until we asked him not to keep it in abeyance but come out, go back to the region and come up with a plan. He came up with a terrific plan. It's a plan that realizes the importance of security, it's a plan that realizes the importance of rebuilding
confidence, it's a plan that realizes the essentiality of political discussions on the basis of 242 and 338. It's a plan that points out the responsibilities, obligations and burdens that both sides must take and must share. We have tabled the Mitchell plan. We were unable to get it started because of the continuing violence, because of the inability of Chairman Arafat, or the unwillingness of Chairman Arafat and Palestinian leaders and other Arab leaders, to bring the intifada under control. We then sent George Tenet off to start a work plan that would lead a way into the Mitchell plan. George did that, but once again, violence kept us from moving forward.

We then felt the need to lay down a comprehensive statement. We began that with President Bush going to the United Nations last fall. And for the first time, an American President standing before an international body such as that, calling for -- talking about -- the need for a Palestinian state with the name of Palestine. I then laid out in my Louisville speech of last November, a comprehensive vision, once again restating all the obligations that both sides had to meet. And with the agreement of the two parties -- the agreement of the two parties to participate at a senior level, with Special Representative Zinni, I sent General Zinni in. First to assess the situation, come back and then get ready to go right back in. He was greeted with bombs. Bombs that made it difficult for any nation to simply sit there and not respond to this kind of terror. I sent General Zinni back a second time and he was greeted with bombs again. Although he got some conversations going, it wasn’t enough to sustain the effort.

And then we moved a little further. We had the Arab summit come along; we had the of Saudi Arabia's positive statement and a vision. We had several UN resolutions, which were rather historic, in that we had a statement from the UN supported, introduced, by the United States, 1397, that talked about, once again, the Palestinian state. Both sides again showed a willingness to receive Tony Zinni. So we sent Tony in again. And a week ago, just a week and a half ago, and we had seen a lot of progress. The Saudi vision now adopted as an Arab vision, the UN resolutions, my speech, the President’s speech, willingness on both sides to engage. Ariel Sharon had taken another step by saying he would waive the seven-day period of quiet -- which Mr. Arafat last year permitted -- said he would try to do everything he could to make happen -- but didn’t happen. And so we tried again, and it was greeted with the Passover Massacre the Thursday before last. And we are into this current situation of horrible fighting within the region.

We recognize Israel's right to defend herself. We are concerned however, and the President expressed this concern in a speech the other day that the fighting is now spreading in new and different ways that may hurt Israel in the long run. It won't be enough merely to solve the problem of terrorist bombers in Israel if you have lost the entire Arab world as potential partners. There is a danger that Israel's strategic position, and the United States' strategic position, will be badly damaged in a way that might be irrevocable or hard to recoup unless something is done to bring this violence under control. And so the President, while condemning terrorism, while laying out the situation, I think, in very direct terms, and giving his vision for where we have to go, also asked for Israel to curtail its actions. And the UN passed another resolution following up on that some 48 hours ago.

We are in close touch with the Israeli government and we are also in close touch with our Arab friends. And General Zinni saw Chairman Arafat yesterday. And we hope that we will see some movement in the days ahead that will bring this violence to some end -- this conflict to some end. Because at the end of the day, I see no way out of this simple proposition: that no matter how successful the Israeli incursion might be, and no matter what the various suicide bombers may or may not be able to accomplish with respect to killing innocent people, when both have done what they are going to do we are going to need a political process to get out of this. We are going to need negotiations. We are going to need a way for these two people to sit down across a table -- these two peoples -- to sit down across a table and find a way to create a Palestinian state that can live side by side with its neighbor Israel. Otherwise we will be in a constant state of war that will produce neither security nor peace.
The President is committed to this proposition. And I go forward tomorrow to see if I can advance it, initially meeting with the Arab leaders and then with my European colleagues in Madrid, Kofi Annan in Madrid, the Russian foreign Minister in Madrid. And then I will return to the region toward the end of next week. And I hope I go with your good wishes and your blessings.

Achieving Peace in the Middle East: The most difficult points in a possible Middle East peace settlement will be the future of Jerusalem, the boundaries that will have to separate the two nations, and then ultimately how you deal with the refugee issue. All will be the most difficult and will have to wait until that time, when other things have been dealt with. When there has been confidence-building, when the issue of settlements has been dealt with. And it may well be necessary that a state be created. Some have suggested -- and this isn't an American position yet -- but some have suggested that -- create a state with borders that are not yet defined, but are subject to discussion and negotiation as you continue. And also put the question of Jerusalem and the capital of that Palestinian state into the later phases of discussion. You are quite right. It would be a difficult issue to negotiate right now. But keep in mind, just some 18 months ago, those kinds of issues were on the table and were being negotiated. And so I don’t rule out that, if we can get the situation stabilized and moving in the right direction these are issues to be discussed, and as difficult as they are, solutions may be found.

U.S. Relations with Israel: With respect to the perceptions of a lack of U.S. impartiality, those perceptions do exist. We are often accused of being pro-Israeli and not taking into account the frustrations that exist in the Palestinian community and the humiliations they feel they are exposed to every day. And the European Union is seen very often by the Israeli leadership as just being on the opposite side. We have tried to deal with this question. I tried in my Louisville speech to talk to both sides. President Bush in his remarks the other day, while being tough on Arafat, without question, he also, I think, spoke to the hopes and visions of the Palestinian people. And I think he recognized that they have grievances and that they are subjected to these daily humiliations, and he talked about the need for ending the occupation of land. And he spoke about the ending of settlement activity. So I think as we go forward we will try to show to the Palestinian people that we support them as well.

I gave a "60 Minutes" interview the other day and I got a question similar to this. I said, "Yes, we support Israel. We always will. We were there at their birth, we are there now. We will always be with Israel. But we also support the Palestinian people. I support the Palestinian people and their vision of a land where they can raise their children, have a functioning economy -- which has to be one part of our strategy, to build an economy for the Palestinian people. And I support their aspirations, and I don’t find that this causes me to be schizophrenic. Because the solution ultimately will come about when both sides realize that the international community, Europe, the United States and the whole world, is trying to satisfy both of their interests." And as I go forward in this, I will speak more and more, not only about our commitment to Israel, but our support and commitment to the aspirations of the Palestinian people, as laid down at the Arab Summit, and as the President has clearly recognized in his statements, and I have tried to recognize in my statements.

ASEAN-Plus-Three: We have been in contact with our ASEAN friends, and Japan, Korea and China, as to what formulations might best serve their mutual interests in the region. There are not the same kinds of organizations in Asia as there are in Europe -- the Euro-Atlantic Partnership. And so, we haven't taken a firm position on this yet, but I think it's worth exploring how we can expand cooperation in various fields between ASEAN and the other three nations.

Unilateralism: If they call you unilateralist, whether you agree with it or not, you have got to treat it as a real charge. And I think we have become much more sensitive to the fact that when we are about to take a position that might go against the prevailing view, we have to spend more time explaining our position. We have to spend more time talking to our friends and allies about it. Kyoto is a perfect example that I
think we went to school on. Rather than taking more time to explain our position and point out that we were going to come up with an alternative strategy we made a bold statement one day, which essentially caused us to be odd-man-out on that issue. It wasn't just the President's concern with respect to Kyoto on our own national interest. It was he just didn't believe that the protocol would serve the world’s national interest, if I can put it that way -- or international interest. And so it was a principal view of his belief in the effectiveness of that protocol and the effect it would have on the American economy and other economies as well, and how it didn't adequately deal with the actions of undeveloped nations. Nevertheless, it was seen as a unilateral action. As has also our view on the international criminal court been seen, as a unilateral action, even though we have made it clear in previous administrations, and in this administration that even if we signed it, it is not a treaty we had expected to go forth for ratification, and we still don't.

And so I understand more clearly now than perhaps I did when I first came into the office, that when we have these kinds of issues, where we are going against the prevailing wisdom, or we are going against the grain, we have an obligation to take the time to explain it to our friends, to listen to their views, consult with them, see if we are right, listen to them, make sure that we have taken into account all other points of view, and see if we can modify our position to gather more people to a consensus position. But if, at the end of the day we can't, then I think we have an obligation to do what we believe is right.

And what I would ask from our friends is for you to recognize that we are making the effort and to understand our position, and don't -- and here I'll be rather direct -- don't immediately knee-jerk as a way of criticizing our position. Criticize it on its merits, just don't immediately [go], "Aha! Its unilateralism." "Ha! It's simplistic."

I had a wonderful debate with some of my European colleagues after the Axis of Evil speech when we were busy going to thesauruses looking up little expressions we could expose each other to. Hubert Vedrine called it simplistic, I said that he was having the vapors, he came back and said that I was engaging in a manly conversation, and then we decided that we'd had enough of that. Let's get on with more serious discussion. So, I would ask our European and Asian friends, don't immediately react with condemnation of the Untied States' principal position on the basis of its being simplistic or on the basis of it being, "See? Unilateralism again." Because if that's the charge then you are saying, "We cannot accept anything you do that does not agree with what most of us think." And that's not a position we can be in. We're leaders. And when we have a principal position we should take it, and we hope that you will examine it, to understand why we are taking it. And we have to do a better job of explaining that decision to the rest of the world.

More on the Middle East: We have to not just focus in an ad hoc manner on solving the current fighting, but getting beyond that to poverty elimination; to making sure we are not seeing money wasted on excess military capability that is not needed beyond legitimate needs of self-defense. There is a need for a code of conduct where we will stop inciting violence, stop inciting hatred, where there will be expressions of respect for each other's religion and culture. President Bush, to this end, really is -- throughout the world he plans to double the size of the Peace Corps as a part of that effort.

The other thing that we have to face squarely, and as part of our regional approach to this is that there are many nations in the region that have to do a better job, within their own governing systems, of giving hope to their people. There is a need for democratization throughout the region. There is a need for moving away from fundamentalism. There is a need for educating young people, not just in fundamentalism, but in the tools that they need to be successful in a 21st century world. And I think if that's also part of your formulation, I certainly support it entirely. And we have been trying to view this
whole region as a region, with all of its many interrelated parts. And that will continue to be our policy approach.

**Sanctions against Iraq:** Prime Minister Blair is down at the President's ranch this morning. They are not planning a war. The purpose of his trip was not to come to any conclusions about Iraq. Our policy with respect to Iraq is clear. We are working in a multilateral way with the United Nations to complete work on a revision of the sanctions regime, so that the sanctions will no longer hurt innocent Iraqi civilians, but will remain targeted on Iraqi efforts to produce weapons of mass destruction. When we came into office that regime was about to collapse totally. And as the result of a lot of hard work, and frankly, in the last few weeks, the Russians coming on board, our proposals with respect to smart sanctions -- I expect that the smart sanctions resolution will pass -- I expect the smart sanctions, as they are called -- to be put into effect in the very near future. We've got the Russians on the proposal now.

**U.S. Policy on Iraq:** We believe a regime change is appropriate. And as the President has said on many occasions there are no plans on his desk for a military operation. His advisors have not given him a recommendation. Prime Minister Blair did not come with a recommendation today. But he continues to examine all options that might lead to a change in that regime. He identified clearly Iraq on the Axis of Evil in his speech because it is an evil regime. It continues to pursue weapons of mass destruction, weapons of mass destruction that it has demonstrated previously, it will use against its neighbors and it will use against its own people. And those weapons, if developed, are more of a danger to the people in the region, to his neighbors, than they are to the United States. And the United States here, is taking a position of leadership, to point this danger out to the rest of the world, and to demonstrate our willingness to do something about it.

**The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and the Biological Weapons Treaty:** It wasn't that we were against the purposes of the agreements, we just didn't think that they were serving those purposes well, or serving our interests, with respect to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. I had been a supporter of this, at one time, when I was Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. But over time, I sensed that we did not have sufficient knowledge about how we would protect our own stockpile, the safety and reliability of our stockpile, without holding out some promise that it might be necessary to do some limited testing at some point in the future. Right now there no is plan for any testing. And we were concerned about our ability to verify the actions of others under the CTBT. And it became clear that this was not a treaty that would serve our interests or would serve the purpose for which it was written. That was our view. And the previous administration offered it to the Congress for ratification and the Congress rejected ratification of the treaty.

**The Biological Weapons Protocol:** We worked very hard with the international community trying to develop this protocol in a way that was fair and balanced and would serve the purpose of the protocol. And what we discovered, over time, as we got further and further into it, is that it would not. It would open up a lot of U.S. facilities, without having the same impact on others. And it was something that would not achieve its intended purpose. When I arrived in the Department last year, this was well underway -- this discussion was well underway. And I found that there was a unanimity of view within the United States government. Everybody looking at it, our intelligence people, our technical people, the State Department, the Defense Department, the Commerce Department all looking at this in as balanced a way as they could. And it was a unanimous view that as much as we would like to be a part of this protocol -- and we worked on it, and we are one of the originators of it -- the way it finally came out, ready for action, was not in a form that would serve our interests, or in our judgment serve the intent and purpose of the protocol. And so we did not go forward with it. And we are looking now, to see if we can improve it as we have the next set of meetings. And we will participate in that next set of discussions on the protocol. And that's our situation.
North Korea: The nature of the regime is such that I think it will be a long time before we could ever see a normalization of relations. It’s a one-person -- not even a one-party -- a one-person dictatorial system that has proven incapable of feeding its people. We are the largest contributor of food to North Korea to help those starving people. So I think it’s a long time before we can see a way to any kind of normalization. Or, it would be a long time before we can see that South Korea and North Korea completely resolve their differences and in some way become one nation again. But in the short-term, and in the mid-term, the things we would like to see North Korea do, and the world we would like to see it embark down would include stopping the production of missiles for export, stop using the sale of weapons as a source of income, because it's dangerous and it's destabilizing. We would like to see a total commitment to not developing weapons of mass destruction. We would like to see, as we go forward with the light-water reactors an early commitment to allowing international inspectors in to take a look at what is going on. And the new element that the administration has put on the table last year that was slightly different from what President Clinton and his administration -- was we think in due course we have to talk about the conventional forces that are arrayed on the north side of the 38th parallel. The wealth of this nation, such as it is, is devoted to keeping this force in being, as a threatening force, just 40 kilometers or so, from Seoul. There will always be a danger, there will always be a risk, there is always a misuse -- there will always be a misuse of resources -- in this poor starving nation as long as they find it necessary for whatever reason to keep this kind of an army poised. And so I think proliferation, weapons of mass destruction, the national inspections of the light-water reactor-process, KEDO, as it goes forward. And then at some point talking about this conventional force that is on the north side of the 38th parallel, which is the source, I think of so much instability. We would like to see ways to have more discussions with North Korea in a less strained environment and on a more regular basis. And we would like to see greater interaction between North and South Korea. We would like to see the North pick up more aggressively the offers put on the table by the South as part of its Sunshine Policy.

Iraq: The President has been able, I think, to gain an understanding from a number of his European colleagues at his level, about the danger that Iraq presents. We have been able to rally everybody behind the smart sanctions after some difficult work. And I don't want to get into who would be with us and who would not be with us if the President ever decided on a military option. Because he has not. And it would be not useful to speculate as to who might or who would be. But I think that if the President moved in this direction he would make the case, he would encourage others to be a part of such a coalition. It would be much preferable to do it with others going with us.

But the President has also made it clear that he will decide what it is that has to be done to protect our national interest and frankly the interests of our friends and allies in the region. And he will act. And so I don't know the answers to who might be with us at such a time, but I don't think it would be no one. I think there are others that are slowly coming to the recognition -- the realization -- that Iraq is a problem that will have to be dealt with sooner or later. I think Prime Minister Blair has been forthcoming, considering his party is not entirely agreed on this issue. But I think that if the President moved in this direction he would make the case, he would encourage others to be a part of such a coalition. It would be much preferable to do it with others going with us.

Palestinian Leadership: I am sure there are those Palestinian leaders who still harbor the view that Israel belongs somewhere in the middle of the Mediterranean -- and all Israelis. But I think responsible Palestinian officials, and the official positions they have taken, recognize that there has to be an Israeli state. Whether they like it or not there is going to be one. There is one. It isn't going anywhere. The United States will not let anything happen to it. Nor will the rest of the world. And as I said in my Louisville speech, and I remember the worlds quite precisely, a Jewish state by the name of Israel. It can't be a state that has been overwhelmed by others. It has to be a Jewish state by the name of Israel. That is our position and that's the position that the Arab Summit recognized. And that's the position that any
Palestinian leader, whether it's Yasir Arafat or anyone else, must understand is the only acceptable position that will allow us to move forward on a political track.

**International Development:** We are very supportive of the NEPAD process and we have been in conversation with President Mbeki and President Obasanjo and others as to how we can best help it. Monterrey, the commitment the President made, the $1.2 billion dollar increase the first year, then another, then another and another and finally steady-stating at $5 billion additional dollars every year after that. His principal focus was on Africa. He recognized that there are some nations in our own hemisphere that might well be at such a level of poverty and such a level of need that they would also be claimants. But in his mind, his vision was that the bulk of this money would be for African nations and I think that feeds into what NEPAD is trying to do.

But I think it's important that if NEPAD is going to be successful then the African leaders, frankly, have to stand up and be counted. And do some things that are difficult for them. They can't ask the rest of the world to come and support them in democracy and governance and infrastructure development if they won't stand up to this problem in Zimbabwe; if they won't stand up to Mugabe, then it's a little difficult for us to take it as seriously as we might otherwise.

And we are making it clear to them that if you want a new environment, if you want a new environment for trade, a new environment for cooperation, a new environment for investment, then you've got to stand up to these kinds of challenges where you ought to be providing the leadership role. Not a distant U.S. Secretary of State, or a British Foreign Secretary speaking from London and Washington. This is your problem and you should have done more about Robert Mugabe than you did. And so I think it's important for us not to just have nice conferences and sing lovely songs and say NEPAD's going to solve all the problems. They have to make some difficult choices, about governance, about transparency in their societies, about the rule of law and about tyrants who are still running countries.
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