MSMail

DATE-TIME	28 June 95 17:15
FROM	Benjamin, Daniel
CLASSIFICATION	UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT	[UNCLASSIFIED]
TO	Walsh, Helen C.
CARBON_COPY	NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY	[[TLAFRIC3.DOC : 4364 in TLAFRIC3.DOC]]
ATTACHMENT FILE DATE	28 June 95 17:15
ATTACHMENT FILE NAME	TLAFRIC3.DOC

6/28/95 5 p.m.
ANTHONY LAKE
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS
REMARKS TO ROUNDTABLE ON SUSTAINED U.S. ASSISTANCE TO AFRICA
TRANSAFRICA FORUM
JUNE 29, 1995

Thank you Randall for that warm introduction and for bringing together such an impre
ssive group of Americans.

I am delighted to be here today -- especially with a group of people who care so dee
ply about Africa, a place that
captured my heart three decades ago when I first traveled there as a young foreign s
ervice officer.

Much has changed since then -- both in Africa and here in America. Almost two-third
s of Africa's nations have
moved to democracy and free-market economies -- and American leadership and assistan
ce has played a major role
in that effort. But our success in helping Africa press ahead is in danger. Foreig
n assistance is under attack by
new isolationists from both the left and the right -- and American leadership is at

risk.

African countries that have bravely chosen the path of democracy and economic reform
are asking why the United
States appears to be on the verge of retreat -- at exactly the moment that they are doing what we have asked of
them for decades. When I traveled to nine African states last December, presidents,
opposition leaders and
individuals from all walks of life told me that the people of Africa do not want our
charity. They want a
partnership -- a partnership in peace, in democracy, and in economic growth. U.S. e
conomic assistance is a
vital link in that partnership.

This partnership benefits us. We spend money on foreign assistance not out of the g
oodness of our hearts, but
out of the conviction that it serves America's goals. The United States has strong interests in Africa...in political
and security issues... in promoting human rights....and establishing the rule of law
. But what fewer people know
is that we also have important economic interests in Africa -- and our support for t
hese developing economies is
essential to promoting our other objectives on the continent.

The return on our foreign assistance investment -- in increased security and greater
prosperity for the American
people -- is substantial. For example, last year we support South Africa's historic elections. Today, that nation
has a vibrant democratic government under the leadership of President Nelson Mandela
-- and the United States
has a strong new friendship with South Africa. In addition, the country's free mark
et economy now absorbs
more American exports than all of Eastern Europe combined.

Americans know that the world is growing closer -- and that to lead, our nation must
be engaged. Your presence
here shows that you share this belief. Your actions demonstrate a commitment to ma
intaining the involvement
abroad that is essential for our nation's future.

This Administration also recognizes that, as we struggle to cut the federal deficit, foreign assistance must also be reduced. But there is a right way and a wrong way to make these reductions.

Let me tell you about the wrong way: [Yesterday,] the House voted to cut the Development Fund for Africa by fully one-third -- considerably more than it reduced assistance to other parts of the world. Singling out Africa is not only unfair, it's unwise. These drastic cuts will come back to haunt us. They will erode our support for free markets -- ones that produce jobs for American workers. They will undercut our ability to fight terrorism and drug-trafficking. They will undermine our efforts to prevent humanitarian crises before they happen. In short, these cuts put our leadership in peril at a time when we can make a difference.

Staying engaged in Africa is in America's interest. Today, the nearly 700 million people who live south of the Sahara comprise one of the major emerging markets in the world. And Africa's wealth of resources -- from oil and uranium to cocoa and coffee -- are in permanent demand here in America. Yet we have barely begun to make our presence felt in the African market or to explore all the possibilities that trade with Africa holds for our companies and consumers.

U.S. exports to Africa totaled $4.4 billion last year -- and more than 80,000 American jobs depend on them. These exports -- which exceed those to the former Soviet Union by nearly a quarter -- can be vastly increased. But to do so, we must continue to help stability take hold and democracy take root throughout the continent.

Indeed, investment is even more important than exports because it is the real engine of growth and job creation for any economy. As Africa progresses toward democracy and free markets, Washington should -- as the Corporate Council on Africa has recommended -- pursue policies that will encourage

American in
vestment in Africa and
strengthen the continent's private sector. U.S. investment will spur demand for Ame
rican exports in areas such

as capital goods, high-tech and services -- and create good, high-wage jobs. As Sec
retary of Commerce Ron
Brown said at last month's African-African American Summit in Dakar, "The United Sta
tes no longer concedes
Africa's markets to European suppliers."

Through the Commerce Department's promotion efforts and the work of EXIM bank, OPIC,
and the Trade and
Development Agency, the Administration been a catalyst in encouraging American trad
e and investment with
Africa. We must continue those efforts. What has worked in East Asia could also wo
rk in Africa -- but only if
we stay engaged. It will not happen if the neo-isolationists get their way and cut funds for building democracy,
sustainable development and peacekeeping.

Today in Africa, we face challenges and opportunities that we cannot walk away from.
We cannot be indifferent
to a continent to which so many American trace their roots. And the plain truth is that helping Africa contend
with its internal problems -- along with nurturing its tremendous economic potential
-- is in America's interest.

Our security demands that we stay engaged. Sudan, for example, has worked its way i
nto the big leagues of
countries that support international terrorism. It poses a direct threat to our int
erests. Or take Nigeria -- some 40
percent of the heroin that enters the United States passes through that nation. Lef
t unchecked, the problems that
plague many African countries today -- overpopulation, disease and environmental dec
ay -- could overflow
borders and be the international crises of tomorrow.

The small fraction of our spending that we devote to Africa -- less than one-tenth o

f one percent of the Federal
budget -- can help contain these problems and even turn some of them around. Resour
ces such as our
Development Fund for Africa are crucial for sustaining the remarkable progress that
so many nations in Africa
have already achieved. It helps create stable, democratic societies of consumers -
- not masses of victims in need
of relief. The DFA along with the African Development Foundation promote sustainabl
e development on a broad
front -- development that is essential to preventing the conflicts that explode into tragedy.

Consider some of the ways our foreign assistance has helped make a difference not on
ly in Africa but throughout
the developing world:

ù Over the past 50 years, infant and child mortality rates in the developing world h
ave been reduced in half, and
life expectancy has increased by nearly a third.
ù In the past two decades, the numbers of the chronically undernourished in developi
ng nations has been halved.

ù Average real incomes in those nations have doubled since World War II.
ù [And today 80% of the world's children are immunized -- up from only 20% in 1980.]

And in a range of African nations, U.S. foreign assistance in recent years has estab
lished a solid record of success.
For example:

ù USAID democratization programs played an important role in South Africa's historic
elections last April and in
Mozambique's polling in November -- educating voters, election officials and the med
ia.
ù Our assistance over the last decade has fostered the opening of stock markets in B
otswana, Mauritius,
Zimbabwe, Namibia, and Kenya.
ù Voice of America broadcasts more than 80 hours a week of first-run programming in

six different languages
in Africa -- a continent where radio provides the most effective means for reaching
citizens.
ù Our programs in Ghana helped remove regulatory bottlenecks and revise the investme
nt code, which resulted
in a 73-percent jump in American exports between 1992 and 1993 alone.
ù Our work in Guinea has helped increase school attendance by 43-percent -- training
7,000 teachers and
building 1,900 new classrooms.

Deep cuts in our assistance would endanger all of these successes. Consider some li
kely results if the
Congressional cuts in our spending in Africa go through:
ù Four million children will not be inoculated against infectious disease, and many
of them will die.
ù Nearly 100,000 children will die from lack of oral rehydration therapy.
ù Our ability to track and limit the spread of HIV will be sharply diminished.
ù Declining population growth rates in many countries -- a key to stable development
-- could increase again.
AID is the foremost sponsor of family planning in Africa. But without the funds to
continue its work, the
progress in slowing Africa's high population growth rates could evaporate. That wou
ld increase the chances
for epidemics, malnutrition, environmental degradation and political instability.

The Congressional budget ax is not just aimed at bilateral programs. It may fall ha
rdest on our contribution to the
World Bank's International Development Association. The IDA is essential -- it is t
he seed money for capitalism. It
provides loans to the poorest reforming countries -- those whose progress is too fr
agile to qualify for commercial
loans. Half of IDA's funding goes to Africa. For these countries poised to make th
e transition to long-term
growth, IDA is a lifesaver.

Take away our contribution to the IDA and the United States loses one of its most ef
fective means of spurring
economic reform and opening new markets. Begun under the Eisenhower

administration
-- and backed by both
parties for decades -- IDA directly reduces these nations' trade and investment
barr
iers, supports private sector
growth and provides new opportunities for the American exports and investment.

[IDA is also cost effective. For every dollar the U.S. contributes, other nations d
onate five. (ck) Other donors
are not likely to compensate for a reduction in American support. Instead, they
may
establish procedures
restricting procurement from U.S. firms. Or these countries may shift their
resourc
es into bilateral programs
where assistance is tied and there is less emphasis on privatization and other
marke
t reforms.]

Deep cuts in IDA will diminish opportunities for U.S. business. The IDA
recipients
of yesterday include South
Korea, Indonesia and Chile. The IDA recipients of today imported $20 billion in
U.S
. goods in 1993 -- about a
third more than in 1988. These are the markets of tomorrow: In the 19 sub-
Saharan
African countries with
IDA-supported reforms, real annual GDP has been growing by 4.5 percent.(ck)

[Many agencies of the United Nations also stand to lose as Congress cuts U.S.
contri
butions. The UN High
Commission on Refugees, the UN Development Program and UNICEF operate
on the front-l
ines to improve the
health of Africa's peoples and help them move forward.]

UN peacekeeping is another tool that Congress must not discard. In Mozambique,
UN p
eacekeepers played a key
role in persuading longtime enemies to end a war in which more than 1 million
people
were killed. And in Angola,
blue helmet troops are arriving now -- the most hopeful sign ever that a 33-year-
old
conflict is coming to an end.
The developments in these two countries means that for the first time in decades,
So
uthern Africa will be at peace.

UN peacekeeping helps us produce progress like this without committing U.S.
forces
or bearing the entire bill.
This is burdensharing at its best.

Like our foreign assistance, peacekeeping is an investment in prevention. We can
p
ay now -- or we can pay a lot
more later. In Africa, as in other parts of the world, we have learned that working
early to avert a crisis is far less
than expensive than mounting a large humanitarian effort or sending in our troops
af
ter tragedy has struck.
Because of Congressional decisions over the last few years, we cannot make
small but
critical investments in
prevention. For example, with a relatively small sum, we could help support
peacek
eepers in Liberia, where a
million people are at risk from renewed civil war.

Looking and acting ahead, we can protect lives, defend our interests and save
money.
We know that when the
all-seeing eye of CNN finds real suffering abroad, Americans want their
government t
o act -- as they should,
and we should. But then the issue is not a small investment but an expensive,
major
operation. Nickel and dime
policies always cost more in the end.

American leadership in the world is not a luxury; it is a necessity. We know from
o
ur own experience that
democracy and free markets are the best means to the ends to which people all
over t
he world aspire: security,
freedom and prosperity. And we know that when others embrace democracy and
free mar
kets, America
becomes more secure, more free and, eventually, more prosperous.

If we are to remain a great nation, we must maintain our focus abroad -- and
Africa
must be an important part of
that focus. That is why President Clinton sponsored last summer's White House
Confe
rence on Africa and why I
took my first and only official visit to Africa. And that's why Commerce

Secretary
Ron Brown has made three
trips to Africa and is preparing to launch a major trade mission to the continent wi
thin the next year. This
Administration knows that significant cuts in programs that benefit Africa will unde
rmine our ability to promote
sustainable development, increase U.S. exports and prevent deadly conflicts.

President Clinton is fully committed to fighting the proposed cuts in foreign assist
ance. We welcome your efforts
to support assistance programs for Africa and, on behalf of the President, I applaud
you for this effort. At this
moment of hope for democracy and free markets -- in Africa and around the world -- w
e must continue to reach
out and not retreat. We must pay the price to maintain American leadership. To sha
pe the future we want, this is
a price well worth paying.
###

MSMail

DATE-TIME	28 June 95 17:32
FROM	Benjamin, Daniel
CLASSIFICATION	UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT	tl-africa [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO	Rice, Susan E.
CARBON_COPY	NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY	[[TLAFRIC3.DOC : 4389 in TLAFRIC3.DOC]]
ATTACHMENT FILE DATE	28 June 95 17:30
ATTACHMENT FILE NAME	TLAFRIC3.DOC

6/28/95 5 p.m.
ANTHONY LAKE
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS
REMARKS TO ROUNDTABLE ON SUSTAINED U.S. ASSISTANCE TO AFRICA
TRANSAFRICA FORUM
JUNE 29, 1995

Thank you Randall for that warm introduction and for bringing together such an impre
ssive group of Americans.

I am delighted to be here today -- especially with a group of people who care so dee
ply about Africa, a place that
captured my heart three decades ago when I first traveled there as a young foreign s
ervice officer.

Much has changed since then -- both in Africa and here in America. Almost two-third
s of Africa's nations have
moved to democracy and free-market economies -- and American leadership and assistan
ce has played a major role
in that effort. But our success in helping Africa press ahead is in danger. Foreig
n assistance is under attack by
new isolationists from both the left and the right -- and American leadership is at

risk.

African countries that have bravely chosen the path of democracy and economic reform
are asking why the United
States appears to be on the verge of retreat -- at exactly the moment that they are doing what we have asked of
them for decades. When I traveled to nine African states last December, presidents,
opposition leaders and
individuals from all walks of life told me that the people of Africa do not want our
charity. They want a
partnership -- a partnership in peace, in democracy, and in economic growth. U.S. e
conomic assistance is a
vital link in that partnership.

This partnership benefits us. We spend money on foreign assistance not out of the g
oodness of our hearts, but
out of the conviction that it serves America's goals. The United States has strong interests in Africa...in political
and security issues... in promoting human rights....and establishing the rule of law
. But what fewer people know
is that we also have important economic interests in Africa -- and our support for t
hese developing economies is
essential to promoting our other objectives on the continent.

The return on our foreign assistance investment -- in increased security and greater
prosperity for the American
people -- is substantial. For example, last year we support South Africa's historic elections. Today, that nation
has a vibrant democratic government under the leadership of President Nelson Mandela
-- and the United States
has a strong new friendship with South Africa. In addition, the country's free mark
et economy now absorbs
more American exports than all of Eastern Europe combined.

Americans know that the world is growing closer -- and that to lead, our nation must
be engaged. Your presence
here shows that you share this belief. Your actions demonstrate a commitment to ma
intaining the involvement
abroad that is essential for our nation's future.

This Administration also recognizes that, as we struggle to cut the federal deficit, foreign assistance must also be reduced. But there is a right way and a wrong way to make these reductions.

Let me tell you about the wrong way: [Yesterday,] the House voted to cut the Development Fund for Africa by fully one-third -- considerably more than it reduced assistance to other parts of the world. Singling out Africa is not only unfair, it's unwise. These drastic cuts will come back to haunt us. They will erode our support for free markets -- ones that produce jobs for American workers. They will undercut our ability to fight terrorism and drug-trafficking. They will undermine our efforts to prevent humanitarian crises before they happen. In short, these cuts put our leadership in peril at a time when we can make a difference.

Staying engaged in Africa is in America's interest. Today, the nearly 700 million people who live south of the Sahara comprise one of the major emerging markets in the world. And Africa's wealth of resources -- from oil and uranium to cocoa and coffee -- are in permanent demand here in America. Yet we have barely begun to make our presence felt in the African market or to explore all the possibilities that trade with Africa holds for our companies and consumers.

U.S. exports to Africa totaled $4.4 billion last year -- and more than 80,000 American jobs depend on them. These exports -- which exceed those to the former Soviet Union by nearly a quarter -- can be vastly increased. But to do so, we must continue to help stability take hold and democracy take root throughout the continent.

Indeed, investment is even more important than exports because it is the real engine of growth and job creation for any economy. As Africa progresses toward democracy and free markets, Washington should -- as the Corporate Council on Africa has recommended -- pursue policies that will encourage

American in
vestment in Africa and
strengthen the continent's private sector. U.S. investment will spur demand for Ame
rican exports in areas such

as capital goods, high-tech and services -- and create good, high-wage jobs. As Sec
retary of Commerce Ron
Brown said at last month's African-African American Summit in Dakar, "The United Sta
tes no longer concedes
Africa's markets to European suppliers."

Through the Commerce Department's promotion efforts and the work of EXIM bank, OPIC,
and the Trade and
Development Agency, the Administration been a catalyst in encouraging American trad
e and investment with
Africa. We must continue those efforts. What has worked in East Asia could also wo
rk in Africa -- but only if
we stay engaged. It will not happen if the neo-isolationists get their way and cut funds for building democracy,
sustainable development and peacekeeping.

Today in Africa, we face challenges and opportunities that we cannot walk away from.
We cannot be indifferent
to a continent to which so many American trace their roots. And the plain truth is that helping Africa contend
with its internal problems -- along with nurturing its tremendous economic potential
-- is in America's interest.

Our security demands that we stay engaged. Sudan, for example, has worked its way i
nto the big leagues of
countries that support international terrorism. It poses a direct threat to our int
erests. Or take Nigeria -- some 40
percent of the heroin that enters the United States passes through that nation. Lef
t unchecked, the problems that
plague many African countries today -- overpopulation, disease and environmental dec
ay -- could overflow
borders and be the international crises of tomorrow.

The small fraction of our spending that we devote to Africa -- less than one-tenth o

f one percent of the Federal
budget -- can help contain these problems and even turn some of them around. Resour
ces such as our
Development Fund for Africa are crucial for sustaining the remarkable progress that
so many nations in Africa
have already achieved. It helps create stable, democratic societies of consumers -
- not masses of victims in need
of relief. The DFA along with the African Development Foundation promote sustainabl
e development on a broad
front -- development that is essential to preventing the conflicts that explode into tragedy.

Consider some of the ways our foreign assistance has helped make a difference not on
ly in Africa but throughout
the developing world:

ù Over the past 50 years, infant and child mortality rates in the developing world h
ave been reduced in half, and
life expectancy has increased by nearly a third.
ù In the past two decades, the numbers of the chronically undernourished in developi
ng nations has been halved.

ù Average real incomes in those nations have doubled since World War II.

And in a range of African nations, U.S. foreign assistance in recent years has estab
lished a solid record of success.
For example:

ù USAID democratization programs played an important role in South Africa's historic
elections last April and in
Mozambique's polling in November -- educating voters, election officials and the med
ia.
ù Our assistance over the last decade has fostered the opening of stock markets in B
otswana, Mauritius,
Zimbabwe, Namibia, and Kenya.
ù Voice of America broadcasts more than 80 hours a week of first-run programming in
six different languages
in Africa -- a continent where radio provides the most effective means for reaching

citizens.
ù Our programs in Ghana helped remove regulatory bottlenecks and revise the investme
nt code, which resulted
in a 73-percent jump in American exports between 1992 and 1993 alone.

Deep cuts in our assistance would endanger all of these successes. Consider some li
kely results if the
Congressional cuts in our spending in Africa go through:
ù Four million children will not be inoculated against infectious disease, and many
of them will die.
ù Nearly 100,000 children will die from lack of oral rehydration therapy.
ù Our ability to track and limit the spread of HIV will be sharply diminished.
ù Declining population growth rates in many countries -- a key to stable development
-- could increase again.
AID is the foremost sponsor of family planning in Africa. But without the funds to
continue its work, the
progress in slowing Africa's high population growth rates could evaporate. That wou
ld increase the chances
for epidemics, malnutrition, environmental degradation and political instability.

The Congressional budget ax is not just aimed at bilateral programs. It may fall ha
rdest on our contribution to the
World Bank's International Development Association. The IDA is essential -- it is t
he seed money for capitalism. It
provides loans to the poorest reforming countries -- those whose progress is too fr
agile to qualify for commercial
loans. Half of IDA's funding goes to Africa. For these countries poised to make th
e transition to long-term
growth, IDA is a lifesaver.

Take away our contribution to the IDA and the United States loses one of its most ef
fective means of spurring
economic reform and opening new markets. Begun under the Eisenhower administration
-- and backed by both

parties for decades -- IDA directly reduces these nations' trade and investment barr
iers, supports private sector
growth and provides new opportunities for the American exports and investment.

Deep cuts in IDA will diminish opportunities for U.S. business. The IDA recipients
of yesterday include South
Korea, Indonesia and Chile. The IDA recipients of today imported $20 billion in U.S
. goods in 1993 -- about a
third more than in 1988. These are the markets of tomorrow: In the 19 sub-Saharan
African countries with
IDA-supported reforms, real annual GDP has been growing by 4.5 percent.(ck)

[Many agencies of the United Nations also stand to lose as Congress cuts U.S. contri
butions. The UN High
Commission on Refugees, the UN Development Program and UNICEF operate on the front-
lines to improve the
health of Africa's peoples and help them move forward.]

UN peacekeeping is another tool that Congress must not discard. In Mozambique, UN p
eacekeepers played a key
role in persuading longtime enemies to end a war in which more than 1 million people
were killed. And in Angola,
blue helmet troops are arriving now -- the most hopeful sign ever that a 33-year-old
conflict is coming to an end.
The developments in these two countries means that for the first time in decades, So
uthern Africa will be at peace.
UN peacekeeping helps us produce progress like this without committing U.S. forces
or bearing the entire bill.
This is burdensharing at its best.

Like our foreign assistance, peacekeeping is an investment in prevention. We can p
ay now -- or we can pay a lot
more later. In Africa, as in other parts of the world, we have learned that working early to avert a crisis is far less
than expensive than mounting a large humanitarian effort or sending in our troops af
ter tragedy has struck.
Because of Congressional decisions over the last few years, we cannot make small but
critical investments in
prevention. For example, with a relatively small sum, we could help support peacek
eepers in Liberia, where a

million people are at risk from renewed civil war.

Looking and acting ahead, we can protect lives, defend our interests and save money.
We know that when the
all-seeing eye of CNN finds real suffering abroad, Americans want their government t
o act -- as they should,
and we should. But then the issue is not a small investment but an expensive, major
operation. Nickel and dime
policies always cost more in the end.

American leadership in the world is not a luxury; it is a necessity. We know from o
ur own experience that
democracy and free markets are the best means to the ends to which people all over t
he world aspire: security,
freedom and prosperity. And we know that when others embrace democracy and free mar
kets, America
becomes more secure, more free and, eventually, more prosperous.

If we are to remain a great nation, we must maintain our focus abroad -- and Africa
must be an important part of
that focus. That is why President Clinton sponsored last summer's White House Confe
rence on Africa and why I
took my first and only official visit to Africa. And that's why Commerce Secretary
Ron Brown has made three
trips to Africa and is preparing to launch a major trade mission to the continent wi
thin the next year. This
Administration knows that significant cuts in programs that benefit Africa will unde
rmine our ability to promote
sustainable development, increase U.S. exports and prevent deadly conflicts.

President Clinton is fully committed to fighting the proposed cuts in foreign assist
ance. We welcome your efforts
to support assistance programs for Africa and, on behalf of the President, I applaud
you for this effort. At this
moment of hope for democracy and free markets -- in Africa and around the world -- w
e must continue to reach

out and not retreat. We must pay the price to maintain American leadership. To sha
pe the future we want, this is
a price well worth paying.
###

MSMail

DATE-TIME	28 June 95 19:06
FROM	Benjamin, Daniel
CLASSIFICATION	UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT	africa remarks [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO	Bass, Peter E. Cicio, Kristen K. Emery, Mary C. Hall, Wilma G. Veit, Katherine M.
CARBON_COPY	NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY	Here are the remarks for tomorrow. Please pass to TL. Also, please save on your hard drive in case I get hit by a truck. [[TLAFRIC3.DOC : 4943 in TLAFRIC3.DOC]]
ATTACHMENT FILE DATE	28 June 95 19:4
ATTACHMENT FILE NAME	TLAFRIC3.DOC

6/28/95 6 p.m.
ANTHONY LAKE
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS
REMARKS TO ROUNDTABLE ON SUSTAINED U.S. ASSISTANCE TO AFRICA
TRANSAFRICA FORUM
JUNE 29, 1995

Thank you Randall for that warm introduction and for bringing together such an impre
ssive group of Americans.

I am delighted to be here today -- especially with a group of people who care so dee
ply about Africa, a place that
captured my heart three decades ago when I first traveled there as a young foreign s
ervice officer.

Much has changed since then -- both in Africa and here in America. Almost two-third
s of Africa's nations have

moved to democracy and free-market economies -- and American leadership and assistan
ce has played a major role
in that effort. But our success in helping Africa press ahead is in danger. Foreig
n assistance is under attack by
new isolationists from both the left and the right -- and American leadership is at risk.

African countries that have bravely chosen the path of democracy and economic reform
are asking why the United
States appears to be on the verge of retreat -- at exactly the moment that they are doing what we have asked of
them for decades. When I traveled to nine African states last December, presidents,
opposition leaders and
individuals from all walks of life told me that the people of Africa do not want our
charity. They want a
partnership -- a partnership in peace, in democracy, and in economic growth. U.S. e
conomic assistance is a
vital link in that partnership.

This partnership benefits us. We spend money on foreign assistance not out of the g
oodness of our hearts, but
out of the conviction that it serves America's best interests. The United States ha
s a strong stake in Africa...in
political and security issues... in promoting democracy and human rights....and esta
blishing the rule of law. But
what fewer people know is that we also have important economic interests in Africa -
- and our economic support
for these developing countries is essential to promoting our political and other obj
ectives on the continent.

The return on our foreign assistance investment -- in increased security and greater
prosperity for the American
people -- is substantial. For example, last year we supported South Africa's histor
ic elections. Today, that nation
has a strong democratic government under the leadership of President Nelson Mandela
-- and the United States has
a thriving new friendship with South Africa. In addition, the country's free market economy now absorbs more
American exports than all of Eastern Europe combined.

Americans know that the world is growing closer -- and that to lead, our nation must be engaged. Your presence here shows that you share this belief. Your actions demonstrate a commitment to maintaining the involvement abroad that is essential for our nation's future.

This Administration also recognizes that, as we struggle to cut the federal deficit, foreign assistance must also be reduced. But there is a right way and a wrong way to make these reductions.

Let me tell you about the wrong way: [Yesterday,] the House voted to cut the Development Fund for Africa by fully one-third -- considerably more than it reduced assistance to other parts of the world. Funding for the World Bank's International Development Association, which provides half of its loans to Africa, has been cut by almost two-thirds. Singling out Africa is not only unfair, it's unwise. These drastic cuts will come back to haunt us. They will erode our support for free markets -- ones that produce jobs for American workers. They will undercut our ability to fight terrorism and drug-trafficking. They will undermine our efforts to prevent humanitarian crises before they happen. In short, these cuts put our leadership in peril at a time when we can make a difference.

Staying engaged in Africa is in America's interest. Today, the nearly 700 million people who live south of the Sahara comprise a major emerging market. And Africa's wealth of resources -- from oil and uranium to cocoa and coffee -- are in permanent demand here in America. Yet we have barely begun to explore all the possibilities that trade with Africa holds for U.S. companies and consumers.

U.S. exports to Africa totaled $4.4 billion last year -- and more than 80,000 American jobs depend on them. These exports -- which exceed those to the former Soviet Union by nearly a quarter -- can be vastly increased. But to do so, we must continue to help stability take hold and democracy take root

througho
ut the continent.

Indeed, investment is even more important than exports because it is the real engine
of growth and job creation for
any economy. As Africa progresses toward democracy and free markets, Washington sho
uld -- as the Corporate
Council on Africa has recommended -- pursue policies that will encourage American in
vestment in Africa and

strengthen the continent's private sector. U.S. investment will spur demand for Ame
rican exports in areas such
as capital goods, high-tech and services -- and create good, high-wage jobs. As Sec
retary of Commerce Ron
Brown said at last month's African-African American Summit in Dakar, "The United Sta
tes no longer concedes
Africa's markets to European suppliers."

Through the Commerce Department's promotion efforts and the work of EXIM bank, OPIC,
and the Trade and
Development Agency, the Administration has been a catalyst for American trade and i
nvestment with Africa. We
must continue those efforts. What has worked in East Asia could also work in Africa
-- but only if we stay
engaged. It will not happen if the neo-isolationists have their way and cut funds f
or building democracy,
sustainable development and peacekeeping.

Today in Africa, we face challenges and opportunities that we cannot walk away from.
We cannot be indifferent
to a continent to which so many American trace their roots. And the plain truth is that helping Africa contend
with its internal problems -- along with nurturing its tremendous economic potential
-- is in America's interest.

Our security demands that we stay engaged. Sudan, for example, has worked its way i
nto the big leagues of
countries that support international terrorism. It poses a direct threat to our int

erests. Or take Nigeria -- some 40
percent of the heroin that enters the United States passes through that nation. Lef
t unchecked, the problems that
plague many African countries today -- overpopulation, disease and
environmental dec
ay -- could overflow
borders and be the international crises of tomorrow.

The small fraction of our spending that we devote to Africa -- less than one-tenth
o
f one percent of the Federal
budget -- can help contain these problems and even turn some of them around.
Resour
ces such as our
Development Fund for Africa are crucial for maintaining the remarkable progress
that
so many nations in Africa
have already achieved. It helps create stable, democratic societies of consumers -
- not masses of victims in need
of relief. It helps reduce disparities of wealth and privilege that blight the live
s of individuals and nations --
improving health care education and the standard of living across Africa. The
DFA,
along with the African
Development Foundation, promote sustainable development on a broad front --
developm
ent that is essential to
preventing the conflicts that explode into tragedy.

Consider some of the ways our foreign assistance has helped make a difference
not on
ly in Africa but throughout
the developing world:

ù Over the past 50 years, infant and child mortality rates in the developing world
h
ave been reduced by half, and
life expectancy has increased by nearly a third.
ù In the past two decades, the numbers of the chronically undernourished in
developi
ng nations has been halved.

ù Average real incomes in those nations have doubled since World War II.

And in a range of African nations, U.S. foreign assistance in recent years has
estab
lished a solid record of success.
For example:

ù USAID democratization programs played an important role in South Africa's

historic
elections last April and in
Mozambique's polling in November -- educating voters, election officials and the med
ia.
ù Our assistance has fostered the opening of stock markets in Botswana, Mauritius, Z
imbabwe, Namibia, and
Kenya.
ù On a continent where radio provides the most effective way of reaching people, Voi
ce of America broadcasts
more than 80 hours a week of first-run programming in six different languages.
ù Our programs in Ghana helped remove regulatory bottlenecks and revise the investme
nt code, which helped
spur a 73-percent jump in American exports between 1992 and 1993 alone.

Deep cuts in our assistance would endanger all of these successes. Consider some li
kely results if the
Congressional cuts in our spending in Africa go through:
ù Four million children will not be inoculated against infectious disease, and many
of them will die.
ù Nearly 100,000 children will die from lack of oral rehydration therapy.
ù Our ability to track and limit the spread of HIV will be sharply diminished.
ù Declining population growth rates in some countries -- a key to stable development
-- could increase again.
AID is the foremost sponsor of family planning in Africa. But without the funds to
continue its work, the
progress in slowing Africa's high population growth rates could evaporate. That wou
ld increase the chances
for epidemics, malnutrition, environmental degradation and political instability.

The Congressional budget ax is not just aimed at bilateral programs. The World Bank
's International Development
Association may suffer a worse blow. The IDA is essential -- it is the seed money f
or capitalism. It provides
loans to the poorest reforming countries -- those whose progress is too fragile to qualify for commercial loans.
Half of IDA's funding goes to Africa. For these countries poised to make the transi
tion to long-term growth, IDA
is a lifesaver.

Take away our contribution to the IDA and the United States loses one of its most effective means of spurring economic reform and opening new markets. Begun under the Eisenhower administration -- and backed by both parties for decades -- IDA directly reduces these nations' trade and investment barriers, supports private sector growth and provides new opportunities for the American exports and investment.

Deep cuts in IDA will diminish opportunities for U.S. business. The IDA recipients of yesterday include South Korea, Indonesia and Chile. The IDA recipients of today imported $20 billion in U.S. goods in 1993 -- about a third more than in 1988. These are the markets of tomorrow: In the 19 sub-Saharan African countries with IDA-supported reforms, real annual GDP has been growing by 4.5 percent.

Other multilateral efforts will suffer as well. Congress' cut in our contribution to the IMF's Enhanced Structural Adjustment Program, which also provides loans to the poorest nations while they implement economic reforms, will set back efforts to foster growth and market development in Africa. A sharp reduction in funds for international debt relief means one of the most crushing burdens will continue to weigh on these struggling nations. Many agencies of the United Nations also stand to lose as Congress cuts U.S. contributions -- agencies that operate on the front-lines to improve the health of Africa's peoples and help them move forward.

UN peacekeeping is another tool that Congress must not discard. In Mozambique, UN peacekeepers played a key role in persuading longtime enemies to end a war in which more than 1 million people were killed. And in Angola, blue helmet troops are arriving now -- the most hopeful sign ever that a 33-year-old conflict is coming to an end.

The developments in these two countries means that soon, for the first day in decade
s, Southern Africa could be at
peace. UN peacekeeping helps us produce progress like this without committing U.S.
forces or bearing the entire
bill. This is burdensharing at its best.

Like our foreign assistance, peacekeeping is an investment in prevention. We can p
ay now -- or we can pay a lot
more later. In Africa, as in other parts of the world, we have learned that working early to avert a crisis is far less
than expensive than mounting a large humanitarian effort or sending in our troops af
ter tragedy has struck.
Because of Congressional decisions over the last few years, we cannot make small but
critical investments in
prevention. For example, with a relatively small sum, we could help support peacek
eepers in Liberia, where a
million people are at risk from renewed civil war.

Looking and acting ahead, we can protect lives, defend our interests and save money.
We know that when the
all-seeing eye of CNN finds real suffering abroad, Americans want their government t
o act -- as they should,
and we should. But then the issue is not a small investment but an expensive, major
operation. Nickel and dime
policies always cost more in the end.

American leadership in the world is not a luxury; it is a necessity. We know from e
xperience that democracy and
free markets are the best means to the ends to which people all over the world aspir
e: security, freedom and
prosperity. And we know that when others embrace democracy and free markets, Americ
a becomes more
secure, more free and, eventually, more prosperous.

If we are to remain a great nation, we must maintain our focus abroad -- and Africa
must be an important part of
that focus. That is why President Clinton sponsored last summer's White House

Confe
rence on Africa and why I
took my first and only official visit to Africa. And that's why Commerce Secretary
Ron Brown has made three
trips to Africa and is preparing to launch a major trade mission to the continent wi
thin the next year. This
Administration knows that significant cuts in programs that benefit Africa will unde
rmine our ability to promote
sustainable development, increase U.S. exports and prevent deadly conflicts.

President Clinton is fully committed to fighting the proposed cuts in foreign assist
ance. We welcome your efforts
to support assistance programs for Africa and, on behalf of the President, I applaud
you for this effort. At this
moment of hope for democracy and free markets -- in Africa and around the world -- w
e must continue to reach
out and not retreat. We must pay the price to maintain American leadership. To sha
pe the future we want, this is
a price well worth paying.
###

MSMail

DATE-TIME	28 June 95 19:07
FROM	Benjamin, Daniel
CLASSIFICATION	UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT	[UNCLASSIFIED]
TO	Rice, Susan E.
CARBON_COPY	NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY	Here is the (provisional) final. [[TLAFRIC3.DOC : 4889 in TLAFRIC3.DOC]]
ATTACHMENT FILE DATE	28 June 95 19:4
ATTACHMENT FILE NAME	TLAFRIC3.DOC

6/28/95 6 p.m.
ANTHONY LAKE
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS
REMARKS TO ROUNDTABLE ON SUSTAINED U.S. ASSISTANCE TO AFRICA
TRANSAFRICA FORUM
JUNE 29, 1995

Thank you Randall for that warm introduction and for bringing together such an impre
ssive group of Americans.

I am delighted to be here today -- especially with a group of people who care so dee
ply about Africa, a place that
captured my heart three decades ago when I first traveled there as a young foreign s
ervice officer.

Much has changed since then -- both in Africa and here in America. Almost two-third
s of Africa's nations have
moved to democracy and free-market economies -- and American leadership and assistan
ce has played a major role
in that effort. But our success in helping Africa press ahead is in danger. Foreig
n assistance is under attack by

new isolationists from both the left and the right -- and American leadership is at risk.

African countries that have bravely chosen the path of democracy and economic reform
are asking why the United
States appears to be on the verge of retreat -- at exactly the moment that they are doing what we have asked of
them for decades. When I traveled to nine African states last December, presidents,
opposition leaders and
individuals from all walks of life told me that the people of Africa do not want our
charity. They want a
partnership -- a partnership in peace, in democracy, and in economic growth. U.S. e
conomic assistance is a
vital link in that partnership.

This partnership benefits us. We spend money on foreign assistance not out of the g
oodness of our hearts, but
out of the conviction that it serves America's best interests. The United States ha
s a strong stake in Africa...in
political and security issues... in promoting democracy and human rights....and esta
blishing the rule of law. But
what fewer people know is that we also have important economic interests in Africa -
- and our economic support
for these developing countries is essential to promoting our political and other obj
ectives on the continent.

The return on our foreign assistance investment -- in increased security and greater
prosperity for the American
people -- is substantial. For example, last year we supported South Africa's histor
ic elections. Today, that nation
has a strong democratic government under the leadership of President Nelson Mandela
-- and the United States has
a thriving new friendship with South Africa. In addition, the country's free market economy now absorbs more
American exports than all of Eastern Europe combined.

Americans know that the world is growing closer -- and that to lead, our nation must
be engaged. Your presence
here shows that you share this belief. Your actions demonstrate a commitment to ma

intaining the involvement
abroad that is essential for our nation's future.

This Administration also recognizes that, as we struggle to cut the federal deficit, foreign assistance must also be
reduced. But there is a right way and a wrong way to make these reductions.

Let me tell you about the wrong way: [Yesterday,] the House voted to cut the Develo
pment Fund for Africa by
fully one-third -- considerably more than it reduced assistance to other parts of th
e world. Funding for the
World Bank's International Development Association, which provides half of its loans
to Africa, has been cut by
almost two-thirds. Singling out Africa is not only unfair, it's unwise. These dras
tic cuts will come back to haunt
us. They will erode our support for free markets -- ones that produce jobs for Amer
ican workers. They will
undercut our ability to fight terrorism and drug-trafficking. They will undermine o
ur efforts to prevent
humanitarian crises before they happen. In short, these cuts put our leadership in peril at a time when we can
make a difference.

Staying engaged in Africa is in America's interest. Today, the nearly 700 million p
eople who live south of the
Sahara comprise a major emerging market. And Africa's wealth of resources -- from o
il and uranium to cocoa
and coffee -- are in permanent demand here in America. Yet we have barely begun to e
xplore all the possibilities
that trade with Africa holds for U.S. companies and consumers.

U.S. exports to Africa totaled $4.4 billion last year -- and more than 80,000 Americ
an jobs depend on them. These
exports -- which exceed those to the former Soviet Union by nearly a quarter -- can
be vastly increased. But to
do so, we must continue to help stability take hold and democracy take root througho
ut the continent.

Indeed, investment is even more important than exports because it is the real engine

of growth and job creation for
any economy. As Africa progresses toward democracy and free markets, Washington sho
uld -- as the Corporate
Council on Africa has recommended -- pursue policies that will encourage American in
vestment in Africa and

strengthen the continent's private sector. U.S. investment will spur demand for Ame
rican exports in areas such
as capital goods, high-tech and services -- and create good, high-wage jobs. As Sec
retary of Commerce Ron
Brown said at last month's African-African American Summit in Dakar, "The United Sta
tes no longer concedes
Africa's markets to European suppliers."

Through the Commerce Department's promotion efforts and the work of EXIM bank, OPIC,
and the Trade and
Development Agency, the Administration has been a catalyst for American trade and i
nvestment with Africa. We
must continue those efforts. What has worked in East Asia could also work in Africa
-- but only if we stay
engaged. It will not happen if the neo-isolationists have their way and cut funds f
or building democracy,
sustainable development and peacekeeping.

Today in Africa, we face challenges and opportunities that we cannot walk away from.
We cannot be indifferent
to a continent to which so many American trace their roots. And the plain truth is that helping Africa contend
with its internal problems -- along with nurturing its tremendous economic potential
-- is in America's interest.

Our security demands that we stay engaged. Sudan, for example, has worked its way i
nto the big leagues of
countries that support international terrorism. It poses a direct threat to our int
erests. Or take Nigeria -- some 40
percent of the heroin that enters the United States passes through that nation. Lef
t unchecked, the problems that
plague many African countries today -- overpopulation, disease and environmental dec

ay -- could overflow
borders and be the international crises of tomorrow.

The small fraction of our spending that we devote to Africa -- less than one-tenth
o
f one percent of the Federal
budget -- can help contain these problems and even turn some of them around.
Resour
ces such as our
Development Fund for Africa are crucial for maintaining the remarkable progress
that
so many nations in Africa
have already achieved. It helps create stable, democratic societies of consumers -
- not masses of victims in need
of relief. It helps reduce disparities of wealth and privilege that blight the live
s of individuals and nations --
improving health care education and the standard of living across Africa. The
DFA,
along with the African
Development Foundation, promote sustainable development on a broad front --
developm
ent that is essential to
preventing the conflicts that explode into tragedy.

Consider some of the ways our foreign assistance has helped make a difference
not on
ly in Africa but throughout
the developing world:

ù Over the past 50 years, infant and child mortality rates in the developing world
h
ave been reduced by half, and
life expectancy has increased by nearly a third.
ù In the past two decades, the numbers of the chronically undernourished in
developi
ng nations has been halved.

ù Average real incomes in those nations have doubled since World War II.

And in a range of African nations, U.S. foreign assistance in recent years has
estab
lished a solid record of success.
For example:

ù USAID democratization programs played an important role in South Africa's
historic
elections last April and in
Mozambique's polling in November -- educating voters, election officials and the
med
ia.

ù Our assistance has fostered the opening of stock markets in Botswana, Mauritius, Z
imbabwe, Namibia, and
Kenya.
ù On a continent where radio provides the most effective way of reaching people, Voi
ce of America broadcasts
more than 80 hours a week of first-run programming in six different languages.
ù Our programs in Ghana helped remove regulatory bottlenecks and revise the investme
nt code, which helped
spur a 73-percent jump in American exports between 1992 and 1993 alone.

Deep cuts in our assistance would endanger all of these successes. Consider some li
kely results if the
Congressional cuts in our spending in Africa go through:
ù Four million children will not be inoculated against infectious disease, and many
of them will die.
ù Nearly 100,000 children will die from lack of oral rehydration therapy.
ù Our ability to track and limit the spread of HIV will be sharply diminished.
ù Declining population growth rates in some countries -- a key to stable development
-- could increase again.
AID is the foremost sponsor of family planning in Africa. But without the funds to
continue its work, the
progress in slowing Africa's high population growth rates could evaporate. That wou
ld increase the chances
for epidemics, malnutrition, environmental degradation and political instability.

The Congressional budget ax is not just aimed at bilateral programs. The World Bank
's International Development
Association may suffer a worse blow. The IDA is essential -- it is the seed money f
or capitalism. It provides
loans to the poorest reforming countries -- those whose progress is too fragile to qualify for commercial loans.
Half of IDA's funding goes to Africa. For these countries poised to make the transi
tion to long-term growth, IDA
is a lifesaver.

Take away our contribution to the IDA and the United States loses one of its most ef
fective means of spurring

economic reform and opening new markets. Begun under the Eisenhower
administration
-- and backed by both
parties for decades -- IDA directly reduces these nations' trade and investment
barr
iers, supports private sector
growth and provides new opportunities for the American exports and investment.

Deep cuts in IDA will diminish opportunities for U.S. business. The IDA
recipients
of yesterday include South
Korea, Indonesia and Chile. The IDA recipients of today imported $20 billion in
U.S
. goods in 1993 -- about a
third more than in 1988. These are the markets of tomorrow: In the 19 sub-
Saharan
African countries with
IDA-supported reforms, real annual GDP has been growing by 4.5 percent.

Other multilateral efforts will suffer as well. Congress' cut in our contribution t
o the IMF's Enhanced Structural
Adjustment Program, which also provides loans to the poorest nations while they
impl
ement economic reforms,
will set back efforts to foster growth and market development in Africa. A sharp
re
duction in funds for
international debt relief means one of the most crushing burdens will continue to
we
igh on these struggling
nations. Many agencies of the United Nations also stand to lose as Congress cuts
U.
S. contributions -- agencies
that operate on the front-lines to improve the health of Africa's peoples and help t
hem move forward.

UN peacekeeping is another tool that Congress must not discard. In Mozambique,
UN p
eacekeepers played a key
role in persuading longtime enemies to end a war in which more than 1 million
people
were killed. And in Angola,
blue helmet troops are arriving now -- the most hopeful sign ever that a 33-year-
old
conflict is coming to an end.
The developments in these two countries means that soon, for the first day in
decade
s, Southern Africa could be at
peace. UN peacekeeping helps us produce progress like this without committing
U.S.

forces or bearing the entire
bill. This is burdensharing at its best.

Like our foreign assistance, peacekeeping is an investment in prevention. We can
p
ay now -- or we can pay a lot
more later. In Africa, as in other parts of the world, we have learned that working
early to avert a crisis is far less
than expensive than mounting a large humanitarian effort or sending in our troops
af
ter tragedy has struck.
Because of Congressional decisions over the last few years, we cannot make
small but
critical investments in
prevention. For example, with a relatively small sum, we could help support
peacek
eepers in Liberia, where a
million people are at risk from renewed civil war.

Looking and acting ahead, we can protect lives, defend our interests and save
money.
We know that when the
all-seeing eye of CNN finds real suffering abroad, Americans want their
government t
o act -- as they should,
and we should. But then the issue is not a small investment but an expensive,
major
operation. Nickel and dime
policies always cost more in the end.

American leadership in the world is not a luxury; it is a necessity. We know from
e
xperience that democracy and
free markets are the best means to the ends to which people all over the world
aspir
e: security, freedom and
prosperity. And we know that when others embrace democracy and free markets,
Americ
a becomes more
secure, more free and, eventually, more prosperous.

If we are to remain a great nation, we must maintain our focus abroad -- and
Africa
must be an important part of
that focus. That is why President Clinton sponsored last summer's White House
Confe
rence on Africa and why I
took my first and only official visit to Africa. And that's why Commerce
Secretary
Ron Brown has made three

trips to Africa and is preparing to launch a major trade mission to the continent wi
thin the next year. This
Administration knows that significant cuts in programs that benefit Africa will unde
rmine our ability to promote
sustainable development, increase U.S. exports and prevent deadly conflicts.

President Clinton is fully committed to fighting the proposed cuts in foreign assist
ance. We welcome your efforts
to support assistance programs for Africa and, on behalf of the President, I applaud
you for this effort. At this
moment of hope for democracy and free markets -- in Africa and around the world -- w
e must continue to reach
out and not retreat. We must pay the price to maintain American leadership. To sha
pe the future we want, this is
a price well worth paying.
###

MSMail

DATE-TIME	28 June 95 19:10
FROM	Benjamin, Daniel
CLASSIFICATION	UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT	africa [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO	Walsh, Helen C.
CARBON_COPY	NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY	

Here is the latest draft. My guess is TL will slash and burn anyway. I would like to get more in on the multilaterals, but hard experience tells me it won't happen. Please check it for new or recalcitrant errors. Sorry and thanks.
[[TLAFRIC3.DOC : 4947 in TLAFRIC3.DOC]]

ATTACHMENT FILE DATE	28 June 95 19:4
ATTACHMENT FILE NAME	TLAFRIC3.DOC

6/28/95 6 p.m.
ANTHONY LAKE
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS
REMARKS TO ROUNDTABLE ON SUSTAINED U.S. ASSISTANCE TO AFRICA
TRANSAFRICA FORUM
JUNE 29, 1995

Thank you Randall for that warm introduction and for bringing together such an impre
ssive group of Americans.

I am delighted to be here today -- especially with a group of people who care so dee
ply about Africa, a place that
captured my heart three decades ago when I first traveled there as a young foreign s
ervice officer.

Much has changed since then -- both in Africa and here in America. Almost two-third
s of Africa's nations have
moved to democracy and free-market economies -- and American leadership and assistan

ce has played a major role
in that effort. But our success in helping Africa press ahead is in danger. Foreig
n assistance is under attack by
new isolationists from both the left and the right -- and American leadership is at risk.

African countries that have bravely chosen the path of democracy and economic reform
are asking why the United
States appears to be on the verge of retreat -- at exactly the moment that they are doing what we have asked of
them for decades. When I traveled to nine African states last December, presidents,
opposition leaders and
individuals from all walks of life told me that the people of Africa do not want our
charity. They want a
partnership -- a partnership in peace, in democracy, and in economic growth. U.S. e
conomic assistance is a
vital link in that partnership.

This partnership benefits us. We spend money on foreign assistance not out of the g
oodness of our hearts, but
out of the conviction that it serves America's best interests. The United States ha
s a strong stake in Africa...in
political and security issues... in promoting democracy and human rights....and esta
blishing the rule of law. But
what fewer people know is that we also have important economic interests in Africa -
- and our economic support
for these developing countries is essential to promoting our political and other obj
ectives on the continent.

The return on our foreign assistance investment -- in increased security and greater
prosperity for the American
people -- is substantial. For example, last year we supported South Africa's histor
ic elections. Today, that nation
has a strong democratic government under the leadership of President Nelson Mandela
-- and the United States has
a thriving new friendship with South Africa. In addition, the country's free market economy now absorbs more
American exports than all of Eastern Europe combined.

Americans know that the world is growing closer -- and that to lead, our nation must

be engaged. Your presence
here shows that you share this belief. Your actions demonstrate a commitment to
ma
intaining the involvement
abroad that is essential for our nation's future.

This Administration also recognizes that, as we struggle to cut the federal deficit,
foreign assistance must also be
reduced. But there is a right way and a wrong way to make these reductions.

Let me tell you about the wrong way: [Yesterday,] the House voted to cut the
Develo
pment Fund for Africa by
fully one-third -- considerably more than it reduced assistance to other parts of th
e world. Funding for the
World Bank's International Development Association, which provides half of its
loans
to Africa, has been cut by
almost two-thirds. Singling out Africa is not only unfair, it's unwise. These dras
tic cuts will come back to haunt
us. They will erode our support for free markets -- ones that produce jobs for
Amer
ican workers. They will
undercut our ability to fight terrorism and drug-trafficking. They will undermine
o
ur efforts to prevent
humanitarian crises before they happen. In short, these cuts put our leadership in
peril at a time when we can
make a difference.

Staying engaged in Africa is in America's interest. Today, the nearly 700 million
p
eople who live south of the
Sahara comprise a major emerging market. And Africa's wealth of resources --
from o
il and uranium to cocoa
and coffee -- are in permanent demand here in America. Yet we have barely
begun to e
xplore all the possibilities
that trade with Africa holds for U.S. companies and consumers.

U.S. exports to Africa totaled $4.4 billion last year -- and more than 80,000
Americ
an jobs depend on them. These
exports -- which exceed those to the former Soviet Union by nearly a quarter --
can
be vastly increased. But to
do so, we must continue to help stability take hold and democracy take root
througho
ut the continent.

Indeed, investment is even more important than exports because it is the real engine
of growth and job creation for
any economy. As Africa progresses toward democracy and free markets, Washington sho
uld -- as the Corporate
Council on Africa has recommended -- pursue policies that will encourage American in
vestment in Africa and

strengthen the continent's private sector. U.S. investment will spur demand for Ame
rican exports in areas such
as capital goods, high-tech and services -- and create good, high-wage jobs. As Sec
retary of Commerce Ron
Brown said at last month's African-African American Summit in Dakar, "The United Sta
tes no longer concedes
Africa's markets to European suppliers."

Through the Commerce Department's promotion efforts and the work of EXIM bank, OPIC,
and the Trade and
Development Agency, the Administration has been a catalyst for American trade and i
nvestment with Africa. We
must continue those efforts. What has worked in East Asia could also work in Africa
-- but only if we stay
engaged. It will not happen if the neo-isolationists have their way and cut funds f
or building democracy,
sustainable development and peacekeeping.

Today in Africa, we face challenges and opportunities that we cannot walk away from.
We cannot be indifferent
to a continent to which so many American trace their roots. And the plain truth is that helping Africa contend
with its internal problems -- along with nurturing its tremendous economic potential
-- is in America's interest.

Our security demands that we stay engaged. Sudan, for example, has worked its way i
nto the big leagues of
countries that support international terrorism. It poses a direct threat to our int
erests. Or take Nigeria -- some 40
percent of the heroin that enters the United States passes through that nation. Lef

t unchecked, the problems that
plague many African countries today -- overpopulation, disease and
environmental dec
ay -- could overflow
borders and be the international crises of tomorrow.

The small fraction of our spending that we devote to Africa -- less than one-tenth
o
f one percent of the Federal
budget -- can help contain these problems and even turn some of them around.
Resour
ces such as our
Development Fund for Africa are crucial for maintaining the remarkable progress
that
so many nations in Africa
have already achieved. It helps create stable, democratic societies of consumers -
- not masses of victims in need
of relief. It helps reduce disparities of wealth and privilege that blight the live
s of individuals and nations --
improving health care education and the standard of living across Africa. The
DFA,
along with the African
Development Foundation, promote sustainable development on a broad front --
developm
ent that is essential to
preventing the conflicts that explode into tragedy.

Consider some of the ways our foreign assistance has helped make a difference
not on
ly in Africa but throughout
the developing world:

ù Over the past 50 years, infant and child mortality rates in the developing world
h
ave been reduced by half, and
life expectancy has increased by nearly a third.
ù In the past two decades, the numbers of the chronically undernourished in
developi
ng nations has been halved.

ù Average real incomes in those nations have doubled since World War II.

And in a range of African nations, U.S. foreign assistance in recent years has
estab
lished a solid record of success.
For example:

ù USAID democratization programs played an important role in South Africa's
historic
elections last April and in

Mozambique's polling in November -- educating voters, election officials and the med
ia.
ù Our assistance has fostered the opening of stock markets in Botswana, Mauritius, Z
imbabwe, Namibia, and
Kenya.
ù On a continent where radio provides the most effective way of reaching people, Voi
ce of America broadcasts
more than 80 hours a week of first-run programming in six different languages.
ù Our programs in Ghana helped remove regulatory bottlenecks and revise the investme
nt code, which helped
spur a 73-percent jump in American exports between 1992 and 1993 alone.

Deep cuts in our assistance would endanger all of these successes. Consider some li
kely results if the
Congressional cuts in our spending in Africa go through:
ù Four million children will not be inoculated against infectious disease, and many
of them will die.
ù Nearly 100,000 children will die from lack of oral rehydration therapy.
ù Our ability to track and limit the spread of HIV will be sharply diminished.
ù Declining population growth rates in some countries -- a key to stable development
-- could increase again.
AID is the foremost sponsor of family planning in Africa. But without the funds to
continue its work, the
progress in slowing Africa's high population growth rates could evaporate. That wou
ld increase the chances
for epidemics, malnutrition, environmental degradation and political instability.

The Congressional budget ax is not just aimed at bilateral programs. The World Bank
's International Development
Association may suffer a worse blow. The IDA is essential -- it is the seed money f
or capitalism. It provides
loans to the poorest reforming countries -- those whose progress is too fragile to qualify for commercial loans.
Half of IDA's funding goes to Africa. For these countries poised to make the transi
tion to long-term growth, IDA
is a lifesaver.

Take away our contribution to the IDA and the United States loses one of its most
ef
fective means of spurring
economic reform and opening new markets. Begun under the Eisenhower
administration
-- and backed by both
parties for decades -- IDA directly reduces these nations' trade and investment
barr
iers, supports private sector
growth and provides new opportunities for the American exports and investment.

Deep cuts in IDA will diminish opportunities for U.S. business. The IDA
recipients
of yesterday include South
Korea, Indonesia and Chile. The IDA recipients of today imported $20 billion in
U.S
. goods in 1993 -- about a
third more than in 1988. These are the markets of tomorrow: In the 19 sub-
Saharan
African countries with
IDA-supported reforms, real annual GDP has been growing by 4.5 percent.

Other multilateral efforts will suffer as well. Congress' cut in our contribution t
o the IMF's Enhanced Structural
Adjustment Program, which also provides loans to the poorest nations while they
impl
ement economic reforms,
will set back efforts to foster growth and market development in Africa. A sharp
re
duction in funds for
international debt relief means one of the most crushing burdens will continue to
we
igh on these struggling
nations. Many agencies of the United Nations also stand to lose as Congress cuts
U.
S. contributions -- agencies
that operate on the front-lines to improve the health of Africa's peoples and help t
hem move forward.

UN peacekeeping is another tool that Congress must not discard. In Mozambique,
UN p
eacekeepers played a key
role in persuading longtime enemies to end a war in which more than 1 million
people
were killed. And in Angola,
blue helmet troops are arriving now -- the most hopeful sign ever that a 33-year-
old
conflict is coming to an end.
The developments in these two countries means that soon, for the first day in
decade

s, Southern Africa could be at
peace. UN peacekeeping helps us produce progress like this without committing U.S.
forces or bearing the entire
bill. This is burdensharing at its best.

Like our foreign assistance, peacekeeping is an investment in prevention. We can p
ay now -- or we can pay a lot
more later. In Africa, as in other parts of the world, we have learned that working early to avert a crisis is far less
than expensive than mounting a large humanitarian effort or sending in our troops af
ter tragedy has struck.
Because of Congressional decisions over the last few years, we cannot make small but
critical investments in
prevention. For example, with a relatively small sum, we could help support peacek
eepers in Liberia, where a
million people are at risk from renewed civil war.

Looking and acting ahead, we can protect lives, defend our interests and save money.
We know that when the
all-seeing eye of CNN finds real suffering abroad, Americans want their government t
o act -- as they should,
and we should. But then the issue is not a small investment but an expensive, major
operation. Nickel and dime
policies always cost more in the end.

American leadership in the world is not a luxury; it is a necessity. We know from e
xperience that democracy and
free markets are the best means to the ends to which people all over the world aspir
e: security, freedom and
prosperity. And we know that when others embrace democracy and free markets, Americ
a becomes more
secure, more free and, eventually, more prosperous.

If we are to remain a great nation, we must maintain our focus abroad -- and Africa
must be an important part of
that focus. That is why President Clinton sponsored last summer's White House Confe
rence on Africa and why I

took my first and only official visit to Africa. And that's why Commerce Secretary
Ron Brown has made three
trips to Africa and is preparing to launch a major trade mission to the continent wi
thin the next year. This
Administration knows that significant cuts in programs that benefit Africa will unde
rmine our ability to promote
sustainable development, increase U.S. exports and prevent deadly conflicts.

President Clinton is fully committed to fighting the proposed cuts in foreign assist
ance. We welcome your efforts
to support assistance programs for Africa and, on behalf of the President, I applaud
you for this effort. At this
moment of hope for democracy and free markets -- in Africa and around the world -- w
e must continue to reach
out and not retreat. We must pay the price to maintain American leadership. To sha
pe the future we want, this is
a price well worth paying.
###

MSMail

DATE-TIME	28 June 95 19:10
FROM	Battenfield, Pat
CLASSIFICATION	UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT	Lake BET Remarks [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO	Fetig, James L. Mitchell, Calvin A. Wozniak, Natalie S.
CARBON_COPY	Battenfield, Pat Deshazer, Macarthur X. McCormick, Shawn H. Rice, Susan E.
TEXT_BODY	[[BET2.DOC : 4878 in BET2.DOC]] Please find attached remarks for Tony Lake's appearance on BET as prepared by African Affairs Directorate.
ATTACHMENT FILE DATE	28 June 95 19:8
ATTACHMENT FILE NAME	BET2.DOC

POINTS TO BE MADE ON AFRICA
ANTHONY LAKE APPEARANCE ON BLACK ENTERTAINMENT TELEVISION
Thursday, June 29, 1995

U.S. Interests

-- Critics say we have no national security or economic interests in Africa -- hence, we must reduce or eliminate economic assistance to the continent.

-- The Clinton Administration believes firmly that such views are wrong. Africa matters to the United States.

-- Our national security and economic interests in Africa include the following:

- Assisting the people of Africa to achieve democracy and sustainable development.

- Capturing the potential of its people and its potential as an important partner in trade and investment, a largely untapped market for U.S. exports and investments. 1994 U.S. exports to Africa totaled $4.4 billion -- 22 percent more than our exports to the entire former Soviet Union;

- Countering the threats of terrorism, narcotics and environmental degradation;

- Preventing and mitigating humanitarian crises;

- Nurturing historic ties that unite this country with Africa -- where 30 million Americans trace their roots.

Sustained Funding for Africa

-- Congress wants to cut development assistance to Africa by one-third, substantially more than cuts to other regions of the world.

-- These cuts will sharply curtail programs that inoculate four million children against disease, provide oral rehydration therapy for 100,000 other children at risk. These cuts will also hamper our ability to track and limit spread of AIDS.

-- The fraction of our budget that we devote to Africa is less than one-half or one-tenth of one-percent of the federal budget -- a small price to pay for increased growth and security for the peoples of Africa and the United States.

President Clinton's Successes in Africa

-- Supported elections throughout the continent (Benin, Ethiopia, Mali); played major role in transition to democracy in South Africa/southern Africa;

-- Helped resolved conflicts: Mozambique, Angola, Liberia;

-- Responded to humanitarian crises -- Rwanda, Angola, Somalia, Sudan, Liberia, others;

-- Initiated Greater Horn of Africa Initiative to address the root causes of potential famine;

-- Led efforts in debt relief, demobilization, demining;

-- Reinforced progress in nations that have taken difficult steps toward democracy and economic reform by hosting more heads of state (12) than any other President in his first term.

-- Encouraged frequent, high-level contacts between Administration officials and African leaders. (Lake, Talbott trips; 3 Ron Brown trips; African-African American Summit; Brian Atwood's Greater Horn of Africa Initiative (currently meeting in Addis); Special Envoys to Sudan, Angola, Liberia and Nigeria.

-- Held first ever White House Conference on Africa.

Nigeria

-- All aspects of our relationship would be improved by return to democracy.

-- After long delays, the National Constitutional Conference issued its report to General Abacha on June 27. We continue to press the Nigerian Government to set a clear timetable for the early transition to civilian democracy.

-- Have called on the Government of Nigeria to respect due process of law and try all alleged coup plotters fairly in open court. We have urged the GON to release former head of state Obasanjo, Chief Abiola and others who remain under arrest.

-- Maintained tough sanctions: visa restrictions, export controls, ended all military assistance.

-- [If raised: In March, President Clinton again denied certification to Nigeria for its lack of cooperation in combatting the narcotics trade. This decision resulted in termination of all direct bilateral aid and suspension of applications for EXIM and OPIC financing.

-- We do not rule out the possibility of additional sanctions.

South Africa

-- Largest bilateral aid donor to South Africa. Last April, President Clinton announced $600 million assistance package to support the economic and political transition in South Africa.

-- Commerce Department named South Africa one of 10 "Big Emerging Markets"; over 500 American companies present.

-- South Africa is a larger market for U.S. goods than is all of Eastern Europe combined.

-- Signed a Peace Corps agreement with South Africa.

-- Largest donor to the historic 1994 election process contributing more than $35 million.

Burundi

-- Remain extremely concerned about the situation in Burundi.

-- Leading an international diplomatic effort to try to prevent further violence.

-- Supporting efforts to create a Commission of Inquiry into the 1993 coup attempt in an effort to establish accountability and responsibility among Burundians.

-- Several high-level Administration officials have recently visited Burundi in an effort to bolster moderates and encourage reconciliation (i.e., Lake, Talbott, Shattuck, Moose).

-- Helped deploy human rights monitors to Burundi.

Rwanda

-- Supporting UN force and UN War Crimes Tribunal with $3 million and personnel to assist with investigations.

-- Promoting regional political conference to try to resolve underlying political and ethnic problems.

-- Dispatched 4,000 U.S. troops to region last year to relieve suffering in camps. Spent more than $400 million on humanitarian crisis last year.

Angola

-- Hope peace may finally be at hand. Encouraged by commitment of both parties to Lusaka Protocol. Welcome initiative of President dos Santos to invite Savimbi into the government as a second Vice President.

-- Actively working with the United Nations to overcome logistical hurdles concerning the deployment of peacekeeping forces.

-- U.S. is largest provider of humanitarian relief to Angola -- average $80 million/year since 1989.

-- Played critical role through special representative in brokering Lusaka Protocol negotiated under UN auspices.

Somalia

-- Proud of actions in Somalia. Intervention saved hundreds of thousands of lives. Re-established order, especially outside Mogadishu. Crops growing, starvation largely over, schools open, hospitals functioning.

-- Gave the Somalis a window of opportunity to re-establish peace. Quote President Isaias in meeting with the President: "Now is the time to leave the Somalis alone for a while to try to work out their own problems ... We do not like it, but the parties may have to convince themselves of the need for peace."

Liberia

-- Still engaged in the search to find peace. Strong/active U.S. commitment to ending warfare. Supported efforts of ECOWAS leader Soglo, now Rawlings, to broker peace.

-- Last year contributed $30.8 million to expand ECOMOG to include peacekeepers from Tanzania and Uganda. Relief: $75 million a year.

-- Special envoy working with faction leaders, regional leaders, Rawlings, to cut the arms flow, restore cease-fire, facilitate peace process.

-- If stable government formed and arms flows cease, offered development aid, diplomatic recognition, debt relief and help to mobilize international support.

-- This is the twelfth cease-fire. Liberians must seize opportunity for peace. Patience of international community is limited.

Sudan

-- Deep difficulties with Government in Khartoum: continued prosecution of war in South, stifling of human rights, hindrance of humanitarian assistance, support for insurgencies in neighbors and support for international terrorists.

-- Goals of U.S. policy: relieve suffering of innocent Sudanese, help emerging democracies in region contain threat, seek end to civil war and Khartoum's unacceptable behavior.

-- Will continue support for countries in region bilaterally and through recently established "Friends of IGADD" with Dutch, Canadians, Italians, others.

-- U.S. humanitarian aid: $280 million over last four years.

Zaire

-- In the event that we believe conditions for free and fair elections develop in Zaire, we would look carefully to assist an electoral process.

-- Actively engaged with our allies, France and Belgium, in pressuring President Mobutu to adopt a credible political and economic reform agenda.

-- Terminated all foreign assistance and military links with the Mobutu regime in 1991.

MSMail

DATE-TIME	28 June 95 19:18
FROM	Benjamin, Daniel
CLASSIFICATION	UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT	TL's Africa Remarks [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO	Danvers, William C.
CARBON_COPY	NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY	

Bill--

I know sending this to you is asking -- from a speechwriter's point of view -- for trouble. But you probably should look at this to make sure that we aren't going to get in worse straits than we already are.

[[TLAFRIC3.DOC : 4892 in TLAFRIC3.DOC]]

ATTACHMENT FILE DATE	28 June 95 19:4
ATTACHMENT FILE NAME	TLAFRIC3.DOC

6/28/95 6 p.m.
ANTHONY LAKE
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS
REMARKS TO ROUNDTABLE ON SUSTAINED U.S. ASSISTANCE TO AFRICA
TRANSAFRICA FORUM
JUNE 29, 1995

Thank you Randall for that warm introduction and for bringing together such an impre
ssive group of Americans.

I am delighted to be here today -- especially with a group of people who care so dee
ply about Africa, a place that
captured my heart three decades ago when I first traveled there as a young foreign s
ervice officer.

Much has changed since then -- both in Africa and here in America. Almost two-third
s of Africa's nations have

moved to democracy and free-market economies -- and American leadership and assistance has played a major role in that effort. But our success in helping Africa press ahead is in danger. Foreign assistance is under attack by new isolationists from both the left and the right -- and American leadership is at risk.

African countries that have bravely chosen the path of democracy and economic reform are asking why the United States appears to be on the verge of retreat -- at exactly the moment that they are doing what we have asked of them for decades. When I traveled to nine African states last December, presidents, opposition leaders and individuals from all walks of life told me that the people of Africa do not want our charity. They want a partnership -- a partnership in peace, in democracy, and in economic growth. U.S. economic assistance is a vital link in that partnership.

This partnership benefits us. We spend money on foreign assistance not out of the goodness of our hearts, but out of the conviction that it serves America's best interests. The United States has a strong stake in Africa...in political and security issues... in promoting democracy and human rights....and establishing the rule of law. But what fewer people know is that we also have important economic interests in Africa -- and our economic support for these developing countries is essential to promoting our political and other objectives on the continent.

The return on our foreign assistance investment -- in increased security and greater prosperity for the American people -- is substantial. For example, last year we supported South Africa's historic elections. Today, that nation has a strong democratic government under the leadership of President Nelson Mandela -- and the United States has a thriving new friendship with South Africa. In addition, the country's free market economy now absorbs more American exports than all of Eastern Europe combined.

Americans know that the world is growing closer -- and that to lead, our nation
must
be engaged. Your presence
here shows that you share this belief. Your actions demonstrate a commitment to
ma
intaining the involvement
abroad that is essential for our nation's future.

This Administration also recognizes that, as we struggle to cut the federal deficit,
foreign assistance must also be
reduced. But there is a right way and a wrong way to make these reductions.

Let me tell you about the wrong way: [Yesterday,] the House voted to cut the
Develo
pment Fund for Africa by
fully one-third -- considerably more than it reduced assistance to other parts of th
e world. Funding for the
World Bank's International Development Association, which provides half of its
loans
to Africa, has been cut by
almost two-thirds. Singling out Africa is not only unfair, it's unwise. These dras
tic cuts will come back to haunt
us. They will erode our support for free markets -- ones that produce jobs for
Amer
ican workers. They will
undercut our ability to fight terrorism and drug-trafficking. They will undermine
o
ur efforts to prevent
humanitarian crises before they happen. In short, these cuts put our leadership in
peril at a time when we can
make a difference.

Staying engaged in Africa is in America's interest. Today, the nearly 700 million
p
eople who live south of the
Sahara comprise a major emerging market. And Africa's wealth of resources --
from o
il and uranium to cocoa
and coffee -- are in permanent demand here in America. Yet we have barely
begun to e
xplore all the possibilities
that trade with Africa holds for U.S. companies and consumers.

U.S. exports to Africa totaled $4.4 billion last year -- and more than 80,000
Americ
an jobs depend on them. These
exports -- which exceed those to the former Soviet Union by nearly a quarter --
can
be vastly increased. But to
do so, we must continue to help stability take hold and democracy take root

througho
ut the continent.

Indeed, investment is even more important than exports because it is the real engine
of growth and job creation for
any economy. As Africa progresses toward democracy and free markets, Washington sho
uld -- as the Corporate
Council on Africa has recommended -- pursue policies that will encourage American in
vestment in Africa and

strengthen the continent's private sector. U.S. investment will spur demand for Ame
rican exports in areas such
as capital goods, high-tech and services -- and create good, high-wage jobs. As Sec
retary of Commerce Ron
Brown said at last month's African-African American Summit in Dakar, "The United Sta
tes no longer concedes
Africa's markets to European suppliers."

Through the Commerce Department's promotion efforts and the work of EXIM bank, OPIC,
and the Trade and
Development Agency, the Administration has been a catalyst for American trade and i
nvestment with Africa. We
must continue those efforts. What has worked in East Asia could also work in Africa
-- but only if we stay
engaged. It will not happen if the neo-isolationists have their way and cut funds f
or building democracy,
sustainable development and peacekeeping.

Today in Africa, we face challenges and opportunities that we cannot walk away from.
We cannot be indifferent
to a continent to which so many American trace their roots. And the plain truth is that helping Africa contend
with its internal problems -- along with nurturing its tremendous economic potential
-- is in America's interest.

Our security demands that we stay engaged. Sudan, for example, has worked its way i
nto the big leagues of
countries that support international terrorism. It poses a direct threat to our int

erests. Or take Nigeria -- some 40
percent of the heroin that enters the United States passes through that nation. Lef
t unchecked, the problems that
plague many African countries today -- overpopulation, disease and
environmental dec
ay -- could overflow
borders and be the international crises of tomorrow.

The small fraction of our spending that we devote to Africa -- less than one-tenth
o
f one percent of the Federal
budget -- can help contain these problems and even turn some of them around.
Resour
ces such as our
Development Fund for Africa are crucial for maintaining the remarkable progress
that
so many nations in Africa
have already achieved. It helps create stable, democratic societies of consumers -
- not masses of victims in need
of relief. It helps reduce disparities of wealth and privilege that blight the live
s of individuals and nations --
improving health care education and the standard of living across Africa. The
DFA,
along with the African
Development Foundation, promote sustainable development on a broad front --
developm
ent that is essential to
preventing the conflicts that explode into tragedy.

Consider some of the ways our foreign assistance has helped make a difference
not on
ly in Africa but throughout
the developing world:

ù Over the past 50 years, infant and child mortality rates in the developing world
h
ave been reduced by half, and
life expectancy has increased by nearly a third.
ù In the past two decades, the numbers of the chronically undernourished in
developi
ng nations has been halved.

ù Average real incomes in those nations have doubled since World War II.

And in a range of African nations, U.S. foreign assistance in recent years has
estab
lished a solid record of success.
For example:

ù USAID democratization programs played an important role in South Africa's

historic
elections last April and in
Mozambique's polling in November -- educating voters, election officials and the med
ia.
ù Our assistance has fostered the opening of stock markets in Botswana, Mauritius, Z
imbabwe, Namibia, and
Kenya.
ù On a continent where radio provides the most effective way of reaching people, Voi
ce of America broadcasts
more than 80 hours a week of first-run programming in six different languages.
ù Our programs in Ghana helped remove regulatory bottlenecks and revise the investme
nt code, which helped
spur a 73-percent jump in American exports between 1992 and 1993 alone.

Deep cuts in our assistance would endanger all of these successes. Consider some li
kely results if the
Congressional cuts in our spending in Africa go through:
ù Four million children will not be inoculated against infectious disease, and many
of them will die.
ù Nearly 100,000 children will die from lack of oral rehydration therapy.
ù Our ability to track and limit the spread of HIV will be sharply diminished.
ù Declining population growth rates in some countries -- a key to stable development
-- could increase again.
AID is the foremost sponsor of family planning in Africa. But without the funds to
continue its work, the
progress in slowing Africa's high population growth rates could evaporate. That wou
ld increase the chances
for epidemics, malnutrition, environmental degradation and political instability.

The Congressional budget ax is not just aimed at bilateral programs. The World Bank
's International Development
Association may suffer a worse blow. The IDA is essential -- it is the seed money f
or capitalism. It provides
loans to the poorest reforming countries -- those whose progress is too fragile to qualify for commercial loans.
Half of IDA's funding goes to Africa. For these countries poised to make the transi
tion to long-term growth, IDA
is a lifesaver.

Take away our contribution to the IDA and the United States loses one of its most effective means of spurring economic reform and opening new markets. Begun under the Eisenhower administration -- and backed by both parties for decades -- IDA directly reduces these nations' trade and investment barriers, supports private sector growth and provides new opportunities for the American exports and investment.

Deep cuts in IDA will diminish opportunities for U.S. business. The IDA recipients of yesterday include South Korea, Indonesia and Chile. The IDA recipients of today imported $20 billion in U.S. goods in 1993 -- about a third more than in 1988. These are the markets of tomorrow: In the 19 sub-Saharan African countries with IDA-supported reforms, real annual GDP has been growing by 4.5 percent.

Other multilateral efforts will suffer as well. Congress' cut in our contribution to the IMF's Enhanced Structural Adjustment Program, which also provides loans to the poorest nations while they implement economic reforms, will set back efforts to foster growth and market development in Africa. A sharp reduction in funds for international debt relief means one of the most crushing burdens will continue to weigh on these struggling nations. Many agencies of the United Nations also stand to lose as Congress cuts U.S. contributions -- agencies that operate on the front-lines to improve the health of Africa's peoples and help them move forward.

UN peacekeeping is another tool that Congress must not discard. In Mozambique, UN peacekeepers played a key role in persuading longtime enemies to end a war in which more than 1 million people were killed. And in Angola, blue helmet troops are arriving now -- the most hopeful sign ever that a 33-year-old conflict is coming to an end.

The developments in these two countries means that soon, for the first day in decade
s, Southern Africa could be at
peace. UN peacekeeping helps us produce progress like this without committing U.S.
forces or bearing the entire
bill. This is burdensharing at its best.

Like our foreign assistance, peacekeeping is an investment in prevention. We can p
ay now -- or we can pay a lot
more later. In Africa, as in other parts of the world, we have learned that working early to avert a crisis is far less
than expensive than mounting a large humanitarian effort or sending in our troops af
ter tragedy has struck.
Because of Congressional decisions over the last few years, we cannot make small but
critical investments in
prevention. For example, with a relatively small sum, we could help support peacek
eepers in Liberia, where a
million people are at risk from renewed civil war.

Looking and acting ahead, we can protect lives, defend our interests and save money.
We know that when the
all-seeing eye of CNN finds real suffering abroad, Americans want their government t
o act -- as they should,
and we should. But then the issue is not a small investment but an expensive, major
operation. Nickel and dime
policies always cost more in the end.

American leadership in the world is not a luxury; it is a necessity. We know from e
xperience that democracy and
free markets are the best means to the ends to which people all over the world aspir
e: security, freedom and
prosperity. And we know that when others embrace democracy and free markets, Americ
a becomes more
secure, more free and, eventually, more prosperous.

If we are to remain a great nation, we must maintain our focus abroad -- and Africa
must be an important part of
that focus. That is why President Clinton sponsored last summer's White House

Confe
rence on Africa and why I
took my first and only official visit to Africa. And that's why Commerce Secretary
Ron Brown has made three
trips to Africa and is preparing to launch a major trade mission to the continent wi
thin the next year. This
Administration knows that significant cuts in programs that benefit Africa will unde
rmine our ability to promote
sustainable development, increase U.S. exports and prevent deadly conflicts.

President Clinton is fully committed to fighting the proposed cuts in foreign assist
ance. We welcome your efforts
to support assistance programs for Africa and, on behalf of the President, I applaud
you for this effort. At this
moment of hope for democracy and free markets -- in Africa and around the world -- w
e must continue to reach
out and not retreat. We must pay the price to maintain American leadership. To sha
pe the future we want, this is
a price well worth paying.
###

MSMail

DATE-TIME	28 June 95 20:08
FROM	Battenfield, Pat
CLASSIFICATION	UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT	Lake Appearance at TransAfrica Forum [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO	Andricos, George M. Danvers, William C. Fetig, James L. Funches, Christina L. Halperin, Morton H. Mitchell, Calvin A. Wozniak, Natalie S.
CARBON_COPY	Cooper, Kathleen H.
TEXT_BODY	

For your concurrence ASAP

[[4970.DOC : 5175 in 4970.DOC]][[4970PRES.DOC : 5176 in 4970PRES.DOC]][[
4970QA.DOC : 5177 in 4970QA.DOC]]

ATTACHMENT FILE DATE	28 June 95 20:7
ATTACHMENT FILE NAME	4970.DOC

4970

June 28, 1995

INFORMATION

MEMORANDUM FOR ANTHONY LAKE

FROM: SUSAN E. RICE

SUBJECT: Your Participation in Roundtable Discussion on Sustained U.S. Assistance to Africa, at

TransAfrica Forum, 2:00 pm, June 29, 1995

You will participate in a roundtable discussion tomorrow on sustained U.S. assistance to Africa. The session will be hosted by Randall Robinson at TransAfrica Forum. This memo summarizes the purpose of the gathering and provides details on the format and your role.

Purpose: Robinson's goal is to bring together a diverse and prominent group of approximately 20 Americans to make the case for sustained U.S. engagement in Africa. (List of participants is at Tab I.)

In addition, Robinson hopes to attract an even broader group to sign an open letter to the Administration and Congressional leaders urging that programs, which benefit Africa, be funded at the level requested by the President. Most of the meeting participants will sign this statement as will many others. An initial list of those who have agreed to sign but cannot attend tomorrow's meeting is also at Tab I. The draft statement is at Tab II. At the suggestion of corporate leaders, TransAfrica plans to add language to the statement on the importance of the Trade and Development Agency (TDA) and increased EXIM support for Africa. Robinson plans to release the statement to the press early the week of July 10. In pursuing a two-step approach, Robinson hopes to maximize the public impact of this effort.

The operative assumption underlying this initiative is that, if there is no discernable and broad-based constituency for preserving Africa's funding, Africa will be an easy target and suffer disproportionately in the budget-cutting process. This gathering and the signed statement are significant in that they will unite an unusual group of African-American leaders, labor, business, religious leaders and others who in the past have perceiveD their interests as competing or even conflicting. While this is indeed a fragile alliance (and TransAfrica's leadership renders the business community's interest lukewarm at best), it should serve to raise the profile of Africa funding in a more effective manner than have past, rather haphazard efforts.

Format: You should arrive promptly at 2:00 pm. Mort Halperin and I will accompany you. The format is as follows:

-- Robinson: brief opening remarks; introduces you.
-- Participants introduce themselves.

-- Lake Remarks (no more than 15 minutes). Draft has been provided to you by Dan Benjamin. Remarks will be released to participants and press after session

concludes.
-- Open discussion among participants (Questions and Answers are at Tab III).
-- Robinson: Outline of next steps, status of statement, brief concluding comments.

The session should end promptly at 3:00 pm. You will make brief (5-10 minute) remarks to the press and then depart. Press points are at Tab IV. A separate press conference involving Roundtable participants will follow.

Concurrences by: Mike Andricos, Mort Halperin, Jim Fetig

Attachments
Tab I Participants List
Tab II Draft Statement
Tab III Questions and Answers
Tab IV Press Points
Tab V Table Summarizing President's Budget Request vs. House- passed Foreign Operati
ons Bill and Helms Mark

ATTACHMENT FILE DATE 28 June 95 16:20

ATTACHMENT FILE NAME 4970PRES.DOC

POINTS TO BE MADE TO THE PRESS FOLLOWING APPEARANCE AT TRANSAFRICA

-- I just finished a very productive one-hour meeting with a distinguished group of Americans in which we discussed the importance of sustained U.S. economic assistance to Africa.

-- I am here because the President cares deeply about foreign assistance funding in general and Africa in particular.

-- In the current climate of budget cuts, we do not want Africa to suffer disproportionately. The House yesterday voted to cut development assistance to Africa by one-third, which is more than the proposed cuts to other regions of the world.

-- The United States has clear and significant national security and economic interests in Africa. These range from supporting democracy and respect for human rights, countering the threats of terrorism, narcotics and environmental degradation to capturing the potential of a huge, largely untapped market for U.S. exports and investments.

-- Africa is an important economic market for the U.S. -- our exports totaled $4.4 billion last year, a full 22-percent more than our exports to the entire former Soviet Union.

-- Congressional cuts will end programs that inoculate four million children against disease and end oral rehydration therapy for 100,000 other children at risk unless another country picks up this program. It may also diminish our ability to track the spread of AIDS.

-- The amount of money that we devote to Africa is very small as a percentage of our overall budget -- one-half of one-tenth of one-percent. Cutting this amount disproportionately would not only be unfair but unwise.

ATTACHMENT FILE DATE 28 June 95 20:7

ATTACHMENT FILE NAME 4970QA.DOC

Questions and Answers
TransAfrica Forum
Thursday, June 29, 1995

Q: Will the President veto the Gilman and Helms Bills?

-- The President has said he will veto these bills if they are passed in their current form. We object to their foreign policy provisions, the consolidation of State and the other international affairs agencies, and the substantial cuts the bills mandate.

Q: Will the President veto the Foreign Operations Appropriations Bills?

-- He has not said he would veto the appropriations bills, but has stressed the need to work with the appropriators to improve the House bill [that was on the floor today]. The Senate appropriators have not begun to mark-up their foreign operations bill yet.

Q: If not, then isn't all you say about the need to sustain foreign assistance funds, including those for Africa, hollow?

-- No. The appropriations process will continue for several months. We will work actively for improvements. The President stands by his FY 96 budget request.

-- We think it important to make the case as strongly as possible for sustained foreign assistance. Most Americans think we spend 15-20% of the federal budget on foreign assistance -- and that 5% would be about right. In fact, we spend about one percent.

-- The American people do not support cuts of the magnitude that Congress is planning. We need to do more to educate the public about the risks and costs of drastically decreased foreign assistance.

-- That is why efforts such as yours are so important.

Q: Will President Clinton travel to Africa?

-- President has said to me several times he wants to visit Africa. He recognizes the symbolic and substantive importance of such a visit. We still hope it may be possible for him to get there in his first term.

-- The obvious constraint is time. As campaign approaches, it will be difficult for President to make time for extended overseas trips. We think it would send wrong signal to blitz just one country, like South Africa. Any trip should show his concern for continent as a whole.

Q: What has President Clinton done to make a difference in Africa?

-- Supported elections throughout the continent (Benin, Ethiopia, Mali); played major role in transition to democracy in South Africa/southern Africa;

-- Helped resolved conflicts: Mozambique, Angola, Liberia;

-- Responded to humanitarian crises -- Rwanda, Angola, Somalia, Sudan, Liberia, others;

-- Initiated Greater Horn of Africa Initiative to address

the root causes of potential famine;

-- Led efforts in debt relief, demobilization, demining;

-- Reinforced progress in nations that have taken difficult steps toward democracy and economic reform by hosting more heads of state (12) than any other President in his first term.

-- Encouraged frequent, high-level contacts between Administration officials and African leaders. (Lake, Talbott trips; 3 Ron Brown trips; African-African American Summit;

Brian Atwood's Greater Horn of Africa Initiative (currently meeting in Addis); Special Envoys to Sudan, Angola, Liberia and Nigeria.

-- Held first ever White House Conference on Africa.

Q: What is the Administration's policy in Africa?

-- We have four broad policy goals:

1) Promoting sustainable development and regional economic integration. Our support for economic integration in the SADC countries and the Greater Horn of Africa Initiative are examples of the Administration's commitment to sustainable development.

2) Promoting democracy, good governance, respect for human rights. The U.S. is committed to ensuring that the phrase "one man, one vote" does not also mean "one time." USG actively supports those African governments that are making tough and lasting political and economic reforms.

3) Promoting U.S. trade with and investment in Africa. The Administration is actively encouraging two-way trade and U.S. investment -- the engines that spur job creation and growth.

4) Offering nations the opportunity to seize windows of opportunity to heal themselves. The U.S. is actively engaged in conflict resolution throughout Africa -- Angola, Liberia, Rwanda, Burundi etc. -- and is supporting regional and sub-regional institutions like OAU, ECOWAS, IGADD etc.

Q: Aren't U.S. interests in Africa exaggerated?

-- No. Critics say we have no national security or economic interests in Africa -- hence, we must reduce or eliminate economic assistance to the continent.

-- The Clinton Administration believes firmly that such views are wrong. Africa matters to the United States.

-- Our national security and economic interests in Africa include the following:

- Assisting the people of Africa to achieve democracy and sustainable development.

- Capturing the potential of its people and its potential as an important partner in trade and investment, a largely untapped market for U.S. exports and investments. 1994 U.S. exports to Africa totaled $4.4

billion -- 22 percent more than our exports to the entire former Soviet Union.

- Countering the threats of terrorism, narcotics and environmental degradation;

- Preventing and mitigating humanitarian crises;

- Nurturing historic ties that unite this country with Africa -- where 30 million Americans trace their roots.

Q: What is U.S. policy on Nigeria?

-- The U.S. is increasingly concerned about developments in Nigeria. Recent arrests, detentions, secret trials, press restrictions and Abacha's failure to demonstrate any concrete commitment to return Nigeria rapidly to civilian rule all have increased tension in bilateral relationship.

-- Have called on the Government of Nigeria to respect due process of law and try all alleged coup plotters fairly in open court. We have urged the GON to release former head of state Obasanjo, Yar'Adua, Chief Abiola and others who remain under arrest.

-- U.S. long-term interest is in stable, prosperous, democratic Nigeria.

-- To pressure GON, have maintained tough sanctions: visa restrictions, export cont
rols, ended all military assistance.

-- In March, President Clinton again denied certification to Nigeria for its lack of cooperation in combating the narcotics trade. This decision requires termination of all direct bilateral aid and suspension of applications for EXIM and OPIC financing.

-- We are coordinating our approach with our allies and do not rule out additional sanctions.

Q: What is the U.S. doing to support the Government of South Africa?

-- Largest bilateral aid donor to South Africa. Last year, President Clinton announced $600 million assistance package to support the economic and political transition in South Africa.

-- Commerce Department named South Africa one of 10 "Big

Emerging Markets"; over 500 American companies present.

-- Signed a Peace Corps agreement with South Africa.

-- Largest donor to the historic 1994 election process contributing more than $35 million.

Q: What is USG doing about Burundi?

-- Remain extremely concerned about the situation in Burundi.

-- Leading an international diplomatic effort to try to prevent further violence.

-- Supporting efforts to create a Commission of Inquiry into the 1993 coup attempt in an effort to establish accountability and responsibility among Burundians.

-- Several high-level Administration officials have recently visited Burundi in an effort to bolster moderates and encourage reconciliation (i.e., Lake, Talbott, Shattuck, Moose).

-- Helped deploy human rights monitors to Burundi.

Q: ... and Rwanda?

-- Supporting UN force and UN War Crimes Tribunal with $3 million and personnel to assist with investigations.

-- Promoting regional political conference to try to resolve underlying political and ethnic problems.

-- Dispatched 4,000 U.S. troops to region last year to relieve suffering in camps. Spent more than $400 million on humanitarian crisis last year.

Q: How do you see the situation in Angola?

-- Hope peace may finally be at hand. Encouraged by commitment of both parties to Lusaka Protocol. Welcome initiative of President dos Santos to invite Savimbi into the government as a second Vice President.

-- Actively working with the United Nations to overcome logistical hurdles concerning the deployment of peacekeeping forces.

-- U.S. is largest provider of humanitarian relief to Angola -- average $80 million/year since 1989.

-- Played critical role through special representative in brokering Lusaka Protocol negotiated under UN auspices.

Q: Hasn't Somalia soured the U.S. on active involvement in Africa?

-- No. Proud of U.S. actions in Somalia. Intervention saved hundreds of thousands of lives. Re-established order, especially outside Mogadishu. Crops growing, starvation largely over, schools open, hospitals functioning.

-- Gave the Somalis a window of opportunity to re-establish peace. Quote President Isaias in meeting with the President: "Now is the time to leave the Somalis alone for a while to try to work out their own problems ... We do not like it, but the parties may have to convince themselves of the need for peace."

Q: Why has the U.S. abandoned Liberia?

-- Still engaged in the search to find peace. Strong/active U.S. commitment to ending warfare. Supported efforts of ECOWAS leader Soglo, now Rawlings, to broker peace.

-- Last year contributed $30.8 million to expand ECOMOG to include peacekeepers from Tanzania and Uganda. Relief: $75 million a year.

-- Special envoy working with faction leaders, regional leaders, Rawlings, to cut the arms flow, restore cease-fire, facilitate peace process.

-- If stable government formed and arms flows cease, offered development aid, diplomatic recognition, debt relief and help to mobilize international support.

-- This is the twelfth cease-fire. Liberians must seize opportunity for peace. Patience of international community is limited.

Q: What is the Administration going to do about Zaire?

-- In the event that we believe conditions for free and fair elections develop in Zaire, we would look carefully at assisting any credible electoral process.

-- Actively engaged with our allies, France and Belgium, in pressuring President Mobutu to adopt a credible political and economic reform agenda.

-- Terminated all foreign assistance and military links with the Mobutu regime in
1
991.

MSMail

DATE-TIME	29 June 95 09:59
FROM	Halperin, Morton H.
CLASSIFICATION	UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT	FW: Coordination [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO	Cooper, Kathleen H.
CARBON_COPY	NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY	

From: Fetig, James L.
To: Halperin, Morton H.
CC: /R, Record at A1; @PRESS - Public Affairs
Subject: Coordination [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Wednesday, June 28, 1995 08:46 PM

[[BETINFO.DOC : 2388 in BETINFO.DOC]][[BET1.DOC : 2389 in BET1.DOC]][[
BET2.DOC : 2390 in BET2.DOC]]

Attached is package for Tony's appearance on Black Entertainment Television's Sunday public affairs program to be taped Thursday at 11:30. Please review Haiti portion.

ATTACHMENT FILE DATE	28 June 95 20:39
ATTACHMENT FILE NAME	BETINFO.DOC

June 28, 1995

INFORMATION

MEMORANDUM FOR ANTHONY LAKE

FROM: JAMES FETIG

SUBJECT: Your participation in Black Entertainment Television's "Lead Story" Sunday morning public affairs program

You will tape a guest appearance tomorrow for airing on Sunday at 11 a.m. Eastern and again at 10 p.m. Eastern. The show is hosted by Ed Gordon. The panel members are: Clarence Page, Chicago Tribune; Dwayne Wiccum, USA Today and George Curry, Emerge Magazine. This memo provides you details and talking points.

Format: You will tape a 20-minute panel discussion from 11:30 - 1200 at 1899 9th St. NE. Topics will be the Haitian elections and African issues. The program reaches 42 million cable subscriber households. The producer is Chris Melville.

Concurrences by: Susan Rice, Mort Halperin

Attachment
Tab I Haitian Election Talking Points
Tab II African Issues Talking Points

ATTACHMENT FILE DATE 28 June 95 20:43

ATTACHMENT FILE NAME BET1.DOC

HAITI - Elections

[Background: Sunday's national elections represent a milestone in the joint efforts

of the Haitian people, the United
States, and the international community to restore democracy to Haiti. Nine months a
fter the U.S.-led coalition was
sent to Haiti, the country freely choose its representatives in the Senate, the Cham ber of Deputies, and at the local
level. In the face of serious obstacles -- initially low voter turn out, scattered low-level violence, and generally
poor organization, the elections process faired well. Virtually all of the polling centers remained opened.

There are problems with ballot counting and about 10% of the over 2000 elections are
being strongly contested by

opposition political parties. Deterring the political parties from a general object
ion will be challenging. We believe
that the United Nations is addressing criticism of the counting process on an
event
by event basis. With
continued quick responsiveness by the United Nations and other monitors, we
believe
that counting will be
satisfactorily managed.

In Haiti, Ambassador Swing has met with concerned political parties to urge
them not
to undermine the process.
He has also met with President Aristide. He has urged him to make a public
statement
; to contact the political
parties; and, to contact Remy -- who remains one of the biggest obstacles.
Ambassad
or Swing will meet with
press this afternoon. He will also request the OAS to release a positive statement
concerning the voting process

In Washington, Brian Atwood and Ambassador Dobbins have briefed the press at
State.
We will be briefing the
Hill this afternoon and requesting Members to make public statements. We are
also a
pproaching Senator Bob
Graham (D-FL) to request that he place an op-ed on the elections.

Swing recommended a high-level phone call to Aristide following his meeting.
Sandy
Berger is making that call.]

-- On Sunday, nine months after the US-led multinational coalition was sent to
Haiti
, Haitians went
to the polls and voted for local and national representatives. Haitians generally v
oted without fear of
intimidation and in an atmosphere that was largely calm. There were some minor
inci
dents of local
violence and logistical problems, not surprising given the enormity of the task.
Bo
th the United States
and the OAS agree that this was a positive major step in the consolidation of
democr
acy in Haiti.

-- Most of the credit must go to the Haitian people. Great credit also is due to th

e United Nations,
the United States and others in the international community whose close partnership
helped create the
conditions necessary for a restoration of democratic life.

-- What is remarkable here is that these elections took place on schedule, without m
ajor
disruption, in an atmosphere of relative calm.

-- It is too early to provide a full reading of the elections but there is no indica tion of widespread
fraud or systematic irregularities. Approximately 90% of the 2,100 elections have g
one uncontested.
The 10% that are being contested by political parties are being investigated and all
efforts are being made
to address the legitimate complaints of the political parties.

-- Of course, there will continue to be difficulties and obstacles on the way. But these are natural
growing pains of democracy. What the Haitians have achieved is a remarkable success
. I am pleased to
welcome Haiti into the expanding global community of democratic nations and look for
ward to a long and
lasting partnership.

ATTACHMENT FILE DATE 28 June 95 20:40

ATTACHMENT FILE NAME BET2.DOC

POINTS TO BE MADE ON AFRICA
ANTHONY LAKE APPEARANCE ON BLACK ENTERTAINMENT TELEVISION
Thursday, June 29, 1995

U.S. Interests

-- Critics say we have no national security or economic interests in Africa -- hence, we must reduce or eliminate economic assistance to the continent.

-- The Clinton Administration believes firmly that such views are wrong. Africa matters to the United States.

-- Our national security and economic interests in Africa include the following:

- Assisting the people of Africa to achieve democracy and sustainable development.

- Capturing the potential of its people and its potential as an important partner in trade and investment, a largely untapped market for U.S. exports and investments. 1994 U.S. exports to Africa totaled $4.4 billion -- 22 percent more than our exports to the entire former Soviet Union;

- Countering the threats of terrorism, narcotics and environmental degradation;

- Preventing and mitigating humanitarian crises;

- Nurturing historic ties that unite this country with Africa -- where 30 million Americans trace their roots.

Sustained Funding for Africa

-- Congress wants to cut development assistance to Africa by one-third, substantially more than cuts to other regions of the world.

-- These cuts will sharply curtail programs that inoculate four million children against disease, provide oral rehydration therapy for 100,000 other children at risk. These cuts will also hamper our ability to track and limit spread of AIDS.

-- The fraction of our budget that we devote to Africa is less than one-half or one-tenth of one-percent of the federal budget -- a small price to pay for increased growth and security for the peoples of Africa and the United States.

President Clinton's Successes in Africa

-- Supported elections throughout the continent (Benin, Ethiopia, Mali); played major role in transition to democracy in South Africa/southern Africa;

-- Helped resolved conflicts: Mozambique, Angola, Liberia;

-- Responded to humanitarian crises -- Rwanda, Angola, Somalia, Sudan, Liberia, others;

-- Initiated Greater Horn of Africa Initiative to address the root causes of potential famine;

-- Led efforts in debt relief, demobilization, demining;

-- Reinforced progress in nations that have taken difficult steps toward democracy and economic reform by hosting more heads of state (12) than any other President in his first term.

-- Encouraged frequent, high-level contacts between Administration officials and African leaders. (Lake, Talbott trips; 3 Ron Brown trips; African-African American Summit; Brian Atwood's Greater Horn of Africa Initiative (currently meeting in Addis); Special Envoys to Sudan, Angola, Liberia and Nigeria.

-- Held first ever White House Conference on Africa.

Nigeria

-- All aspects of our relationship would be improved by return to democracy.

-- After long delays, the National Constitutional Conference issued its report to General Abacha on June 27. We continue to press the Nigerian Government to set a clear timetable for the early transition to civilian democracy.

-- Have called on the Government of Nigeria to respect due process of law and try all alleged coup plotters fairly in open court. We have urged the GON to release former head of state Obasanjo, Chief Abiola and others who remain under arrest.

-- Maintained tough sanctions: visa restrictions, export controls, ended all military assistance.

-- [If raised: In March, President Clinton again denied certification to Nigeria for its lack of cooperation in combatting the narcotics trade. This decision resulted in termination of all direct bilateral aid and suspension of applications for EXIM and OPIC financing.

-- We do not rule out the possibility of additional sanctions.

South Africa

-- Largest bilateral aid donor to South Africa. Last April, President Clinton announced $600 million assistance package to support the economic and political transition in South Africa.

-- Commerce Department named South Africa one of 10 "Big Emerging Markets"; over 500 American companies present.

-- South Africa is a larger market for U.S. goods than is all of Eastern Europe combined.

-- Signed a Peace Corps agreement with South Africa.

-- Largest donor to the historic 1994 election process contributing more than $35 million.

Burundi

-- Remain extremely concerned about the situation in Burundi.

-- Leading an international diplomatic effort to try to prevent further violence.

-- Supporting efforts to create a Commission of Inquiry into the 1993 coup attempt in an effort to establish accountability and responsibility among Burundians.

-- Several high-level Administration officials have recently visited Burundi in an effort to bolster moderates and encourage reconciliation (i.e., Lake, Talbott, Shattuck, Moose).

-- Helped deploy human rights monitors to Burundi.

Rwanda

-- Supporting UN force and UN War Crimes Tribunal with $3 million and personnel to assist with investigations.

-- Promoting regional political conference to try to resolve underlying political and ethnic problems.

-- Dispatched 4,000 U.S. troops to region last year to relieve suffering in camps. Spent more than $400 million on humanitarian crisis last year.

Angola

-- Hope peace may finally be at hand. Encouraged by commitment of both parties to Lusaka Protocol. Welcome initiative of President dos Santos to invite Savimbi into the government as a second Vice President.

-- Actively working with the United Nations to overcome logistical hurdles concerning the deployment of peacekeeping forces.

-- U.S. is largest provider of humanitarian relief to Angola -- average $80 million/year since 1989.

-- Played critical role through special representative in brokering Lusaka Protocol negotiated under UN auspices.

Somalia

-- Proud of actions in Somalia. Intervention saved hundreds of thousands of lives. Re-established order, especially outside Mogadishu. Crops growing, starvation largely over, schools open, hospitals functioning.

-- Gave the Somalis a window of opportunity to re-establish peace. Quote President Isaias in meeting with the President: "Now is the time to leave the Somalis alone for a while to try to work out their own problems ... We do not like it, but the parties may have to convince themselves of the need for peace."

Liberia

-- Still engaged in the search to find peace.
Strong/active U.S. commitment to ending warfare. Supported efforts of ECOWAS leader Soglo, now Rawlings, to broker peace.

-- Last year contributed $30.8 million to expand ECOMOG to include peacekeepers from Tanzania and Uganda. Relief: $75 million a year.

-- Special envoy working with faction leaders, regional leaders, Rawlings, to cut the arms flow, restore cease-fire, facilitate peace process.

-- If stable government formed and arms flows cease, offered development aid, diplomatic recognition, debt relief and help to mobilize international support.

-- This is the twelfth cease-fire. Liberians must seize opportunity for peace. Patience of international community is limited.

Sudan

-- Deep difficulties with Government in Khartoum: continued prosecution of war in South, stifling of human rights, hindrance of humanitarian assistance, support for insurgencies in neighbors and support for international terrorists.

-- Goals of U.S. policy: relieve suffering of innocent Sudanese, help emerging democracies in region contain threat, seek end to civil war and Khartoum's unacceptable behavior.

-- Will continue support for countries in region bilaterally and through recently established "Friends of IGADD" with Dutch, Canadians, Italians, others.

-- U.S. humanitarian aid: $280 million over last four years.

Zaire

-- In the event that we believe conditions for free and fair elections develop in Zaire, we would look carefully to assist an electoral process.

-- Actively engaged with our allies, France and Belgium, in pressuring President Mobutu to adopt a credible political and economic reform agenda.

-- Terminated all foreign assistance and military links with the Mobutu regime in 1991.

MSMail

DATE-TIME	29 June 95 10:27
FROM	Benjamin, Daniel
CLASSIFICATION	UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT	africa remarks[UNCLASSIFIED]
TO	Bass, Peter E. Cicio, Kristen K. Emery, Mary C. Hall, Wilma G. Veit, Katherine M.
CARBON_COPY	NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY	Here is a revised draft. We have made some changes per Gordon Adams's late comments -- and depending on how his slugfest with Susan Rice goes, we may have to make a couple more. I suggest that Tony not read the bracketed language but that we remove the brackets for the press distribution. Let's hold off putting in big type for a half hour until Adams and Rice are finished. [[TLAFRIC4.DOC : 2612 in TLAFRIC4.DOC]]
ATTACHMENT FILE DATE	29 June 95 10:24
ATTACHMENT FILE NAME	TLAFRIC4.DOC

6/29/95 9 a.m.
ANTHONY LAKE
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS
REMARKS TO ROUNDTABLE ON SUSTAINED U.S. ASSISTANCE TO AFRICA
TRANSAFRICA FORUM
JUNE 29, 1995

Thank you Randall for that warm introduction and for bringing together such an impre
ssive group of Americans.

I am delighted to be here today -- especially with a group of people who care so dee
ply about Africa, a place that
captured my heart three decades ago when I first traveled there as a young foreign s
ervice officer.

Much has changed since then -- both in Africa and here in America. Almost two-thirds of Africa's nations are moving toward democracy and free-market economies -- and American leadership and assistance has played a major role in that effort. But our success in helping Africa press ahead is in danger. Foreign assistance is under attack by new isolationists from both the left and the right -- and American leadership is at risk.

African countries that have bravely chosen the path of democracy and economic reform are asking why the United States appears to be on the verge of retreat -- at exactly the moment that they are doing what we have asked of them for decades. When I traveled to nine African states last December, presidents, opposition leaders and individuals from all walks of life told me that the people of Africa do not want our charity. They want a partnership -- a partnership in peace, in democracy, and in economic growth. U.S. economic assistance is a vital link in that partnership.

This partnership benefits us. We spend money on foreign assistance not out of the goodness of our hearts, but out of the conviction that it serves America's best interests. The United States has a strong stake in Africa...in political and security issues... in promoting democracy and human rights....and establishing the rule of law. But what fewer people know is that we also have important economic interests in Africa -- and our economic support for these developing countries is essential to promoting our political and other objectives on the continent.

The return on our foreign assistance investment -- in increased security and greater prosperity for the American people -- is substantial. For example, last year we supported South Africa's historic elections. Today, we all know that nation has a strong democratic government under the leadership of Presiden

t Nelson Mandela -- and the
United States has a thriving new friendship with South Africa. I was surprised to l
earn that South Africa's free
market economy now absorbs more American exports than all of Eastern Europe
combined
.

Americans know that the world is growing closer -- and that to lead, our nation
must
be engaged. Your presence
here shows that you share this belief. Your actions demonstrate a commitment to
ma
intaining the involvement
abroad that is essential for our nation's future.

This Administration also recognizes that, as we struggle to cut the federal deficit,
foreign assistance must also be
reduced. But there is a right way and a wrong way to make these reductions.

Let me tell you about the wrong way: Today, the House may vote to cut the
Developme
nt Fund for Africa by fully
one-third -- considerably more than it reduced assistance to other parts of the
worl
d. Funding for the World
Bank's International Development Association, which provides half of its loans to
Af
rica, may be cut by almost
two-thirds. Singling out Africa is not only unfair, it's unwise. These drastic cut
s will come back to haunt us.
They will erode support for free markets -- ones that produce jobs for American
work
ers. They will undermine
our efforts to prevent conflicts and humanitarian crises before they happen. In sho
rt, these cuts put our
leadership in peril at a time when we can make a difference.

Staying engaged in Africa is in America's interest. Today, the nearly 700 million
p
eople who live south of the
Sahara comprise a major emerging market. And Africa's wealth of resources --
from o
il and uranium to cocoa
and coffee -- are in permanent demand here in America. Yet we have barely
begun to e
xplore all the possibilities
that trade with Africa holds for U.S. companies and consumers.

U.S. exports to Africa totaled $4.4 billion last year -- and more than 80,000
Americ

an jobs depend on them. These
exports -- which exceed those to the former Soviet Union by nearly a quarter -- can
be vastly increased. But to
do so, we must continue to help stability take hold and democracy take root througho
ut the continent.

Indeed, investment is even more important than exports because it is the real engine
of growth and job creation for
any economy. As Africa progresses toward democracy and free markets, Washington sho
uld -- as the Corporate
Council on Africa has recommended -- pursue policies that will encourage American in
vestment in Africa and
strengthen the continent's private sector. U.S. investment will spur demand for Ame
rican exports in areas such

as capital goods, services and high-tech products -- and create good, high-wage jobs
. As Secretary of Commerce
Ron Brown said at last month's African-African American Summit in Dakar, "The United
States no longer
concedes Africa's markets to European suppliers."

Through the Commerce Department's promotion efforts, the Trade and Development Agenc
y -- as well as the
work of EXIM bank, OPIC -- the Administration has been a catalyst for American tra
de and investment with
Africa. We must intensify those efforts. What has worked in East Asia could also w
ork in Africa -- but only if
we stay engaged. It will not happen if the neo-isolationists have their way and cut funds for building democracy,
sustainable development and peacekeeping.

Today in Africa, we face challenges and opportunities that we cannot walk away from.
We cannot be indifferent
to a continent to which so many American trace their roots. And the plain truth is that helping Africa contend
with its internal problems -- along with nurturing its tremendous economic potential
-- is in America's interest.

Our security demands that we stay engaged. Sudan, for example, has worked its way i
nto the big leagues of
countries that support international terrorism. It poses a direct threat to our int
erests. Or take Nigeria -- some 40
percent of the heroin that enters the United States passes through that nation. Lef
t unchecked, the problems that
plague many African countries today -- overpopulation, disease and environmental dec
ay -- could overflow
borders and be the international crises of tomorrow.

The small fraction of our spending that we devote to Africa -- less than one-tenth o
f one percent of the Federal
budget -- can help contain these problems and even turn some of them around. Resour
ces such as our
Development Fund for Africa are crucial for maintaining the remarkable progress that
so many nations in Africa
have already achieved. It helps create stable, democratic societies of consumers -
- not masses of victims in need
of relief. It helps reduce disparities of wealth and privilege that blight the live
s of individuals and nations --
improving health care education and the standard of living across Africa. The DFA,
along with the African
Development Foundation, promote sustainable development on a broad front -- developm
ent that is essential to
preventing the conflicts that explode into tragedy.

Consider some of the ways our foreign assistance has helped make a difference not on
ly in Africa but throughout
the developing world:

ù Over the past 50 years, infant and child mortality rates in the developing world h
ave been reduced by half, and
life expectancy has increased by nearly a third.
ù In the past two decades, the numbers of the chronically undernourished in developi
ng nations has been halved.

ù Average real incomes in those nations have doubled since World War II.

And in a range of African nations, U.S. foreign assistance in recent years has

estab
lished a solid record of success.
For example:

ù USAID democratization programs played an important role in South Africa's historic
elections last April and in
Mozambique's polling in November -- educating voters, election officials and the med
ia.
ù Our assistance has fostered the opening of stock markets in Botswana, Mauritius, Z
imbabwe, Namibia, and
Kenya.
ù On a continent where radio provides the most effective way of reaching people, Voi
ce of America broadcasts
more than 80 hours a week of first-run programming in six different languages.
ù Our programs in Ghana helped remove regulatory bottlenecks and revise the investme
nt code, which helped
spur a 73-percent jump in American exports between 1992 and 1993 alone.

Deep cuts in our assistance would endanger all of these successes. Consider some po
ssible results if the
Congressional cuts in our spending in Africa go through:
ù As many as 4 million children may not be inoculated against infectious disease, an
d some of them will die.
ù Nearly 100,000 children may die from lack of oral rehydration therapy.
ù Our ability to track and limit the spread of HIV will be sharply diminished.
ù Declining population growth rates in some countries -- a key to stable development
-- could increase again.
AID is the foremost sponsor of family planning in Africa. But without the funds to
continue its work, the
progress in slowing Africa's high population growth rates could evaporate. That wou
ld increase the chances
for epidemics, malnutrition, environmental degradation and political instability.

The Congressional budget ax is not just aimed at bilateral programs. The World Bank
's International Development
Association may suffer a worse blow. IDA is essential -- it is the seed money for c
apitalism. It provides loans to
the poorest reforming countries -- those whose progress is too fragile to qualify f

or commercial loans. Half of
IDA's funding goes to Africa. For these countries poised to make the transition to long-term growth, IDA is a
lifesaver.

[Take away our contribution to the IDA and the United States loses one of its most e
ffective means of spurring
economic reform and opening new markets. Begun under the Eisenhower administration
-- and backed by both
parties for decades -- IDA directly reduces these nations' trade and investment barr
iers, supports private sector
growth and provides new opportunities for the American exports and investment.]

Deep cuts in IDA would diminish opportunities for U.S. business. The IDA recipients
of yesterday include South
Korea, Indonesia and Chile. The IDA recipients of today imported $20 billion in U.S
. goods in 1993 -- about a
third more than in 1988. These are the markets of tomorrow: In the 19 sub-Saharan
African countries with
IDA-supported reforms, real annual GDP has been growing by 4.5 percent since 1988.

[Other multilateral efforts will suffer as well. Congress' cut in our contribution to the IMF's Enhanced Structural
Adjustment Program, which also provides loans to the poorest nations while they impl
ement economic reforms,
will set back efforts to foster growth and market development in Africa. A sharp re
duction in funds for
international debt relief means one of the most crushing burdens will continue to we
igh on these struggling
nations. Many agencies of the United Nations also stand to lose as Congress cuts U.
S. contributions -- agencies
that operate on the front-lines to improve the health of Africa's peoples and help t
hem move forward.]

UN peacekeeping is another tool that Congress must not discard. In Mozambique, UN p
eacekeepers played a key

role in persuading longtime enemies to end a war in which more than 1 million people
were killed. And in Angola,
blue helmet troops are arriving now -- as we see real signs that a 33-year-old confl
ict is coming to an end. The
developments in these two countries means that soon, for the first day in decades, a
ll Southern Africa could be at
peace. UN peacekeeping helps us produce progress like this without committing U.S.
forces or bearing the entire
bill. This is burdensharing at its best.

Like our foreign assistance, peacekeeping is an investment in prevention. We can p
ay now -- or we can pay a lot
more later. In Africa, as in other parts of the world, we have learned that working early to avert a crisis is far less
than expensive than mounting a large humanitarian effort or sending in our troops af
ter tragedy has struck.
Because of Congressional decisions over the last few years, we cannot make small but
critical investments in
prevention. For example, with a relatively small sum, we could help support peacek
eepers in Liberia, where a
million people are at risk from renewed civil war.

Looking and acting ahead, we can protect lives, defend our interests and save money.
We know that when the
all-seeing eye of CNN finds real suffering abroad, Americans want their government t
o act -- as they should,
and we should. By then, the issue is not a small investment but an expensive, major
operation. Nickel and dime
policies always cost more in the end.

American leadership in the world is not a luxury; it is a necessity. We know from e
xperience that democracy and
free markets are the best means to the ends to which people all over the world aspir
e: security, freedom and
prosperity. And we know that when others embrace democracy and free markets, Americ
a becomes more

secure, more free and, eventually, more prosperous.

If we are to remain a great nation, we must maintain our focus abroad -- and Africa
must be an important part of
that focus. That is why President Clinton sponsored last summer's White House Confe
rence on Africa and why I
took my first and only official visit to Africa. [And that's why Commerce Secretary
Ron Brown has made three
trips to Africa and is preparing to launch a major trade mission to the continent wi
thin the next year. This
Administration knows that significant cuts in programs that benefit Africa will unde
rmine our ability to promote
sustainable development, increase U.S. exports and prevent deadly conflicts.]

President Clinton is committed to fighting the proposed cuts in foreign assistance.

We welcome your efforts to
support assistance programs for Africa and, on behalf of the President, I applaud yo
u for this effort.

This is a moment of extraordinary hope for democracy and free markets -- in Africa a
nd around the world. But
nothing is inevitable. If we want to seize all the opportunities of our day, we mu
st continue to reach out and not
retreat. We must pay the price to maintain American leadership in the world. To ke
ep the tide of history running
our way, this is a price well worth paying.
###

MSMail

DATE-TIME	29 June 95 12:14
FROM	Benjamin, Daniel
CLASSIFICATION	UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT	Africa speech [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO	Bass, Peter E. Cicio, Kristen K. Emery, Mary C. Hall, Wilma G. Veit, Katherine M.
CARBON_COPY	NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY	Here it is. [[AFRICBIG.DOC : 3073 in AFRICBIG.DOC]]
ATTACHMENT FILE DATE	29 June 95 12:12
ATTACHMENT FILE NAME	AFRICBIG.DOC

ANTHONY LAKE
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR
NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS
REMARKS TO ROUNDTABLE ON
SUSTAINED U.S. ASSISTANCE TO AFRICA
TRANSAFRICA FORUM
JUNE 29, 1995

Thank you Randall for that warm introduction and for bringing together such an impressive group of Americans.

I am delighted to be here today -- especially with a group of people who care so deeply about Africa, a place that captured my heart three decades ago when I first traveled there as a young foreign service officer.

Much has changed since then -- both in Africa and here in America. Almost two-thirds of Africa's nations are moving toward democracy and free-market economies -- and American leadership and assistance has played a major role in that effort. But our success in helping Africa press ahead is in danger. Foreign assistance is under attack by new isolationists from both the left and the right -- and American leadership is at risk.

African countries that have bravely chosen the path of democracy and economic reform are asking why the United States appears to be on the verge of retreat -- at exactly the moment that they are doing what we have asked of them for decades. When I traveled to nine African states last December, presidents, opposition leaders and individuals from all walks of life told me that the people of Africa do not want our charity.

They want a partnership -- a partnership in peace, in democracy, and in economic growth. U.S. economic assistance is a vital link in that partnership.

This partnership benefits us. We spend money on foreign assistance not out of the goodness of our hearts, but out of the conviction that it serves America's best interests. The United States has a strong stake in Africa...in political and security issues... in promoting democracy and human rights....and establishing the rule of law. But what fewer people know is that we also have important economic interests in Africa -- and our economic support for these developing countries is essential to promoting our political and other objectives on the continent.

The return on our foreign assistance investment -- in increased security and greater prosperity for the American people -- is substantial. For example, last year we supported South Africa's historic elections. Today, we all know that nation has a strong democratic government under the leadership of President Nelson Mandela -- and the United States has a thriving new friendship with South Africa. I was surprised to learn that South Africa's free market economy now absorbs more American exports than all of Eastern Europe combined.

Americans know that the world is growing closer -- and that to lead, our nation must be engaged. Your presence here shows that you share this belief. Your actions demonstrate a commitment to maintaining the involvement abroad that is essential for our nation's future.

This Administration also recognizes that, as we struggle to cut the federal deficit, foreign assistance must also be reduced. But there is a right way and a wrong way to make these reductions.

Let me tell you about the wrong way: Today, the House may vote to cut the Development Fund for Africa by fully one-third -- considerably more than it reduced assistance to other parts of the world. Funding for the World Bank's International Development Association, which provides half of its loans to Africa, may be cut by almost two-thirds. Singling out Africa is not only unfair, it's unwise. These drastic cuts will come back to haunt us. They will erode support for free markets -- ones that produce jobs for American workers. They will undermine our efforts to prevent conflicts and humanitarian crises before they happen. In short, these cuts put our leadership in peril at a time when we can make a difference.

Staying engaged in Africa is in America's interest. Today, the nearly 700 million people who live south of the Sahara comprise a major emerging market. And Africa's wealth of resources -- from oil and uranium to cocoa and coffee -- are in permanent demand here in America. Yet we have barely begun to explore all the possibilities that trade with Africa holds for U.S. companies and consumers.

U.S. exports to Africa totaled $4.4 billion last year -- and more than 80,000 American jobs depend on them. These exports -- which exceed those to the

former Soviet Union by nearly a quarter -- can be vastly increased. But to do so, we must continue to help stability take hold and democracy take root throughout the continent.

Indeed, investment is even more important than exports because it is the real engine of growth and job creation for any economy. As Africa progresses toward democracy and free markets, Washington should -- as the Corporate Council on Africa has recommended -- pursue policies that will encourage American investment in Africa and strengthen the continent's private sector. U.S. investment will spur demand for American exports in areas such as capital goods, services and high-tech products -- and create good, high-wage jobs. As Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown said at last month's African-African American Summit in Dakar, "The United States no longer concedes Africa's markets to European suppliers."

Through the Commerce Department's promotion efforts, the Trade and Development Agency -- as well as the work of EXIM bank and OPIC -- the Administration has been a catalyst for American trade and investment with Africa. We must intensify those efforts. What has worked in East Asia could also work in Africa -- but only if we stay engaged. It will not happen if the neo-isolationists have their way and cut funds for building democracy, sustainable development and peacekeeping.

Today in Africa, we face challenges and opportunities that we cannot walk away from. We cannot be indifferent to a continent to which so many American trace their roots. And the plain truth is that helping Africa contend with its internal problems -- along with nurturing its tremendous economic potential -- is in America's interest.

Our security demands that we stay engaged. Sudan, for example, has worked its way into the big leagues of countries that support international terrorism. It poses a direct threat to our interests. Or take Nigeria -- some 40 percent of the heroin that enters the United States passes through that nation. Left unchecked, the problems that plague many African countries today -- overpopulation, disease and environmental decay -- could overflow borders and be the international crises of tomorrow.

The small fraction of our spending that we devote to Africa -- less than one-tenth of one percent of the Federal budget -- can help contain these problems and even turn some of them around. Resources such as our Development Fund for Africa are crucial for maintaining the remarkable progress that so many nations in Africa have already achieved...

It helps create stable, democratic societies of consumers -- not masses of victims in need of relief. It helps reduce disparities of wealth and privilege that blight the lives of individuals and nations -- improving health care education and the standard of living across Africa. The DFA, along with the African Development Foundation, promote sustainable development on a broad front -- development that is essential to preventing the conflicts that explode into tragedy.

Consider some of the ways our foreign assistance has helped make a difference not only in Africa but throughout the developing world:

ù Over the past 50 years, infant and child mortality rates in the developing world have been reduced by half, and life expectancy has increased by nearly a third.
ù In the past two decades, the numbers of the chronically undernourished in developing nations has been halved.
ù Average real incomes in those nations have doubled since World War II.

And in a range of African nations, U.S. foreign assistance in recent years has established a solid record of success. For example:

ù USAID democratization programs played an important role in South Africa's historic elections last April and in Mozambique's polling in November -- educating voters, election officials and the media.
ù Our assistance has fostered the opening of stock markets in Botswana, Mauritius, Zimbabwe, Namibia, and Kenya.
ù On a continent where radio provides the most effective way of reaching people, Voice of America broadcasts more than 80 hours a week of first-run programming in six different languages.
ù Our programs in Ghana helped remove regulatory bottlenecks and revise the investment code, which helped spur a 73-percent jump in American exports between 1992 and 1993 alone.

Deep cuts in our assistance would endanger all of these successes. Consider some possible results if the Congressional cuts in our spending in Africa go through:
ù As many as 4 million children may not be inoculated against infectious disease, and some of them will die.
ù Nearly 100,000 children may die from lack of oral rehydration therapy.
ù Our ability to track and limit the spread of HIV will be sharply diminished.
ù Declining population growth rates in some countries -- a key to stable

development -- could increase again. AID is the foremost sponsor of family planning in Africa. But without the funds to continue its work, the progress in slowing Africa's high population growth rates could evaporate. That would increase the chances for epidemics, malnutrition, environmental degradation and political instability.

The Congressional budget ax is not just aimed at bilateral programs. The World Bank's International Development Association may suffer a worse blow. IDA is essential -- it is the seed money for capitalism. It provides loans to the poorest reforming countries -- those whose progress is too fragile to qualify for commercial loans....

Half of IDA's funding goes to Africa. For these countries poised to make the transition to long-term growth, IDA is a lifesaver.

[Take away our contribution to the IDA and the United States loses one of its most effective means of spurring economic reform and opening new markets. Begun under the Eisenhower administration -- and backed by both parties for decades -- IDA directly reduces these nations' trade and investment barriers, supports private sector growth and provides new opportunities for the American exports and investment.]

Deep cuts in IDA would diminish opportunities for U.S. business. The IDA recipients of yesterday include South Korea, Indonesia and Chile. The IDA recipients of today imported $20 billion in U.S. goods in 1993 -- about a third more than in 1988. These are the markets of tomorrow.

[Other multilateral efforts will suffer as well. Congress' cut in our contribution to the IMF's Enhanced Structural Adjustment Program, which also provides loans to the poorest nations while they implement economic reforms, will set back efforts to foster growth and market development in Africa. A sharp reduction in funds for international debt relief means one of the most crushing burdens will continue to weigh on these struggling nations....

Many agencies of the United Nations also stand to lose as Congress cuts U.S. contributions -- agencies that operate on the front-lines to improve the health of Africa's peoples and help them move forward.]

UN peacekeeping is another tool that Congress must not discard. In Mozambique, UN peacekeepers played a key role in persuading longtime enemies to end a war in which more than 1 million people were killed. And in Angola, blue helmet troops are arriving now -- as we see real signs that a 33-year-old conflict is coming to an end. The developments in these two countries means that soon, for the first day in decades, all Southern Africa could be at peace. UN peacekeeping helps us produce progress like this without committing U.S. forces or bearing the entire bill. This is burdensharing at its best.

Like our foreign assistance, peacekeeping is often an investment in prevention. We can pay now -- or we can pay a lot more later. In Africa, as in other parts of the world, we have learned that working early to avert a crisis is far less than expensive than mounting a large humanitarian effort or sending in our troops after tragedy has struck. Because of Congressional decisions over the last few years, we cannot make small but critical investments in prevention. For example, with a relatively small sum, we could help support peacekeepers in Liberia, where a million people are at risk from renewed civil war.

Looking and acting ahead, we can protect lives, defend our interests and save money. We know that when the all-seeing eye of CNN finds real suffering abroad, Americans want their government to act -- as they should, and we should. By then, the issue is not a small investment but an expensive, major operation. Nickel and dime policies always cost more in the end.

American leadership in the world is not a luxury; it is a necessity. We know from experience that democracy and free markets are the best means to the ends to which people all over the world aspire: security, freedom and prosperity. And we know that when others embrace democracy and free markets, America becomes more secure, more free and, eventually, more prosperous.

If we are to remain a great nation, we must maintain our focus abroad -- and Africa must be an important part of that focus. That is why President Clinton sponsored last summer's White House Conference on Africa and why I took my first and only official visit to Africa. [And that's why Commerce Secretary Ron Brown has made three trips to Africa and is preparing to launch a major trade mission to the continent within the next year. This Administration knows that significant cuts in programs that benefit Africa will undermine our ability to promote sustainable development, increase U.S. exports and prevent deadly conflicts.]

President Clinton is committed to fighting the proposed cuts in foreign assistance. We welcome your efforts to support assistance programs for Africa and, on behalf of the President, I applaud you for this effort.

This is a moment of extraordinary hope for democracy and free markets -- in Africa and around the world. But nothing is inevitable. If we want to seize all the opportunities of our day, we must continue to reach out and not retreat. We must pay the price to maintain American leadership in the world. To keep the tide of history running our way, this is a price well worth paying.

###

MSMail

DATE-TIME	29 June 95 12:23
FROM	Benjamin, Daniel
CLASSIFICATION	UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT	TL's AFRICA SPEECH [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO	Battenfield, Pat Deshazer, Macarthur X. McCormick, Shawn H. Rice, Susan E.
CARBON_COPY	NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY	[[TLAFRIC4.DOC : 3159 in TLAFRIC4.DOC]]
ATTACHMENT FILE DATE	29 June 95 12:22
ATTACHMENT FILE NAME	TLAFRIC4.DOC

ANTHONY LAKE
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS
REMARKS TO ROUNDTABLE ON SUSTAINED U.S. ASSISTANCE TO AFRICA
TRANSAFRICA FORUM
JUNE 29, 1995

Thank you Randall for that warm introduction and for bringing together such an impre
ssive group of Americans.

I am delighted to be here today -- especially with a group of people who care so dee
ply about Africa, a place that
captured my heart three decades ago when I first traveled there as a young foreign s
ervice officer.

Much has changed since then -- both in Africa and here in America. Almost two-third
s of Africa's nations are
moving toward democracy and free-market economies -- and American leadership and ass
istance has played a
major role in that effort. But our success in helping Africa press ahead is in dang

er. Foreign assistance is under
attack by new isolationists from both the left and the right -- and American leaders
hip is at risk.

African countries that have bravely chosen the path of democracy and economic reform
are asking why the United
States appears to be on the verge of retreat -- at exactly the moment that they are doing what we have asked of
them for decades. When I traveled to nine African states last December, presidents,
opposition leaders and
individuals from all walks of life told me that the people of Africa do not want our
charity. They want a
partnership -- a partnership in peace, in democracy, and in economic growth. U.S. e
conomic assistance is a
vital link in that partnership.

This partnership benefits us. We spend money on foreign assistance not out of the g
oodness of our hearts, but
out of the conviction that it serves America's best interests. The United States ha
s a strong stake in Africa...in
political and security issues... in promoting democracy and human rights....and esta
blishing the rule of law. But
what fewer people know is that we also have important economic interests in Africa -
- and our economic support
for these developing countries is essential to promoting our political and other obj
ectives on the continent.

The return on our foreign assistance investment -- in increased security and greater
prosperity for the American
people -- is substantial. For example, last year we supported South Africa's histor
ic elections. Today, we all
know that nation has a strong democratic government under the leadership of Presiden
t Nelson Mandela -- and the
United States has a thriving new friendship with South Africa. I was surprised to l
earn that South Africa's free
market economy now absorbs more American exports than all of Eastern Europe combined
.

Americans know that the world is growing closer -- and that to lead, our nation

must
be engaged. Your presence
here shows that you share this belief. Your actions demonstrate a commitment to
mai
ntaining the involvement
abroad that is essential for our nation's future.

This Administration also recognizes that, as we struggle to cut the federal deficit,
foreign assistance must also be
reduced. But there is a right way and a wrong way to make these reductions.

Let me tell you about the wrong way: Today, the House may vote to cut the
Developme
nt Fund for Africa by fully
one-third -- considerably more than it reduced assistance to other parts of the
worl
d. Funding for the World
Bank's International Development Association, which provides half of its loans to
Af
rica, may be cut by almost
two-thirds. Singling out Africa is not only unfair, it's unwise. These drastic cut
s will come back to haunt us.
They will erode support for free markets -- ones that produce jobs for American
work
ers. They will undermine
our efforts to prevent conflicts and humanitarian crises before they happen. In sho
rt, these cuts put our
leadership in peril at a time when we can make a difference.

Staying engaged in Africa is in America's interest. Today, the nearly 700 million
p
eople who live south of the
Sahara comprise a major emerging market. And Africa's wealth of resources --
from o
il and uranium to cocoa
and coffee -- are in permanent demand here in America. Yet we have barely
begun to
explore all the possibilities
that trade with Africa holds for U.S. companies and consumers.

U.S. exports to Africa totaled $4.4 billion last year -- and more than 80,000
Americ
an jobs depend on them. These
exports -- which exceed those to the former Soviet Union by nearly a quarter --
can
be vastly increased. But to do
so, we must continue to help stability take hold and democracy take root
throughout
the continent.

Indeed, investment is even more important than exports because it is the real
engine
of growth and job creation for
any economy. As Africa progresses toward democracy and free markets,
Washington sho
uld -- as the Corporate
Council on Africa has recommended -- pursue policies that will encourage
American in
vestment in Africa and
strengthen the continent's private sector. U.S. investment will spur demand for
Ame
rican exports in areas such

as capital goods, services and high-tech products -- and create good, high-wage
jobs
. As Secretary of Commerce
Ron Brown said at last month's African-African American Summit in Dakar,
"The United
States no longer
concedes Africa's markets to European suppliers."

Through the Commerce Department's promotion efforts, the Trade and
Development Agenc
y -- as well as the
work of EXIM bank and OPIC -- the Administration has been a catalyst for
American t
rade and investment with
Africa. We must intensify those efforts. What has worked in East Asia could also
w
ork in Africa -- but only if
we stay engaged. It will not happen if the neo-isolationists have their way and cut
funds for building democracy,
sustainable development and peacekeeping.

Today in Africa, we face challenges and opportunities that we cannot walk away
from.
We cannot be indifferent
to a continent to which so many American trace their roots. And the plain truth is
that helping Africa contend
with its internal problems -- along with nurturing its tremendous economic
potential
-- is in America's interest.

Our security demands that we stay engaged. Sudan, for example, has worked its
way i
nto the big leagues of
countries that support international terrorism. It poses a direct threat to our int
erests. Or take Nigeria -- some 40
percent of the heroin that enters the United States passes through that nation. Lef
t unchecked, the problems that

plague many African countries today -- overpopulation, disease and environmental dec
ay -- could overflow
borders and be the international crises of tomorrow.

The small fraction of our spending that we devote to Africa -- less than one-tenth o
f one percent of the Federal
budget -- can help contain these problems and even turn some of them around. Resour
ces such as our
Development Fund for Africa are crucial for maintaining the remarkable progress that
so many nations in Africa
have already achieved. It helps create stable, democratic societies of consumers -- not masses of victims in need
of relief. It helps reduce disparities of wealth and privilege that blight the live
s of individuals and nations --
improving health care education and the standard of living across Africa. The DFA,
along with the African
Development Foundation, promote sustainable development on a broad front -- developm
ent that is essential to
preventing the conflicts that explode into tragedy.

Consider some of the ways our foreign assistance has helped make a difference not on
ly in Africa but throughout
the developing world:

ù Over the past 50 years, infant and child mortality rates in the developing world h
ave been reduced by half, and
life expectancy has increased by nearly a third.
ù In the past two decades, the numbers of the chronically undernourished in developi
ng nations has been halved.

ù Average real incomes in those nations have doubled since World War II.

And in a range of African nations, U.S. foreign assistance in recent years has estab
lished a solid record of success.
For example:

ù USAID democratization programs played an important role in South Africa's historic
elections last April and in
Mozambique's polling in November -- educating voters, election officials and the

med
ia.
ù Our assistance has fostered the opening of stock markets in Botswana, Mauritius, Z
imbabwe, Namibia, and
Kenya.
ù On a continent where radio provides the most effective way of reaching people, Voi
ce of America broadcasts
more than 80 hours a week of first-run programming in six different languages.
ù Our programs in Ghana helped remove regulatory bottlenecks and revise the investme
nt code, which helped
spur a 73-percent jump in American exports between 1992 and 1993 alone.

Deep cuts in our assistance would endanger all of these successes. Consider some po
ssible results if the
Congressional cuts in our spending in Africa go through:

ù As many as 4 million children may not be inoculated against infectious disease, an
d some of them will die.
ù Nearly 100,000 children may die from lack of oral rehydration therapy.
ù Our ability to track and limit the spread of HIV will be sharply diminished.
ù Declining population growth rates in some countries -- a key to stable development
-- could increase again.
AID is the foremost sponsor of family planning in Africa. But without the funds to
continue its work, the
progress in slowing Africa's high population growth rates could evaporate. That wou
ld increase the chances
for epidemics, malnutrition, environmental degradation and political instability.

The Congressional budget ax is not just aimed at bilateral programs. The World Bank
's International Development
Association may suffer a worse blow. IDA is essential -- it is the seed money for c
apitalism. It provides loans to
the poorest reforming countries -- those whose progress is too fragile to qualify f
or commercial loans. Half of
IDA's funding goes to Africa. For these countries poised to make the transition to long-term growth, IDA is a
lifesaver.

Take away our contribution to the IDA and the United States loses one of its most

ef
fective means of spurring
economic reform and opening new markets. Begun under the Eisenhower administration
-- and backed by both
parties for decades -- IDA directly reduces these nations' trade and investment barr
iers, supports private sector
growth and provides new opportunities for the American exports and investment.

Deep cuts in IDA would diminish opportunities for U.S. business. The IDA recipients
of yesterday include South
Korea, Indonesia and Chile. The IDA recipients of today imported $20 billion in U.S
. goods in 1993 -- about a
third more than in 1988. These are the markets of tomorrow.

Other multilateral efforts will suffer as well. Congress' cut in our contribution t
o the IMF's Enhanced Structural
Adjustment Program, which also provides loans to the poorest nations while they impl
ement economic reforms,
will set back efforts to foster growth and market development in Africa. A sharp re
duction in funds for
international debt relief means one of the most crushing burdens will continue to we
igh on these struggling
nations. Many agencies of the United Nations also stand to lose as Congress cuts U.
S. contributions -- agencies
that operate on the front-lines to improve the health of Africa's peoples and help t
hem move forward.

UN peacekeeping is another tool that Congress must not discard. In Mozambique, UN p
eacekeepers played a key
role in persuading longtime enemies to end a war in which more than 1 million people
were killed. And in Angola,
blue helmet troops are arriving now -- as we see real signs that a 33-year-old confl
ict is coming to an end. The
developments in these two countries means that soon, for the first day in decades, a
ll Southern Africa could be at
peace. UN peacekeeping helps us produce progress like this without committing U.S.
forces or bearing the entire

bill. This is burdensharing at its best.

Like our foreign assistance, peacekeeping is an investment in prevention. We can
pa
y now -- or we can pay a lot
more later. In Africa, as in other parts of the world, we have learned that working
early to avert a crisis is far less
than expensive than mounting a large humanitarian effort or sending in our troops
af
ter tragedy has struck.
Because of Congressional decisions over the last few years, we cannot make
small but
critical investments in
prevention. For example, with a relatively small sum, we could help support
peaceke
epers in Liberia, where a
million people are at risk from renewed civil war.

Looking and acting ahead, we can protect lives, defend our interests and save
money.
We know that when the
all-seeing eye of CNN finds real suffering abroad, Americans want their
government t
o act -- as they should,
and we should. By then, the issue is not a small investment but an expensive,
major
operation. Nickel and dime
policies always cost more in the end.

American leadership in the world is not a luxury; it is a necessity. We know from
e
xperience that democracy and
free markets are the best means to the ends to which people all over the world
aspir
e: security, freedom and
prosperity. And we know that when others embrace democracy and free markets,
Americ
a becomes more
secure, more free and, eventually, more prosperous.

If we are to remain a great nation, we must maintain our focus abroad -- and
Africa
must be an important part of
that focus. That is why President Clinton sponsored last summer's White House
Confe
rence on Africa and why I
took my first and only official visit to Africa. And that's why Commerce
Secretary R
on Brown has made three
trips to Africa and is preparing to launch a major trade mission to the continent

wi
thin the next year. This
Administration knows that significant cuts in programs that benefit Africa will
unde
rmine our ability to promote
sustainable development, increase U.S. exports and prevent deadly conflicts.

President Clinton is committed to fighting the proposed cuts in foreign assistance.

We welcome your efforts to
support assistance programs for Africa and, on behalf of the President, I applaud
yo
u for this effort.

This is a moment of extraordinary hope for democracy and free markets -- in
Africa a
nd around the world. But
nothing is inevitable. If we want to seize all the opportunities of our day, we mus
t continue to reach out and not
retreat. We must pay the price to maintain American leadership in the world. To
ke
ep the tide of history running
our way, this is a price well worth paying.

MSMail

DATE-TIME	29 June 95 12:29
FROM	Benjamin, Daniel
CLASSIFICATION	UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT	speech[UNCLASSIFIED]
TO	Rice, Susan E.
CARBON_COPY	NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY	[[TLAFRIC4.DOC : 3153 in TLAFRIC4.DOC]]
ATTACHMENT FILE DATE	29 June 95 12:26
ATTACHMENT FILE NAME	TLAFRIC4.DOC

ANTHONY LAKE
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS
REMARKS TO ROUNDTABLE ON SUSTAINED U.S. ASSISTANCE TO AFRICA
TRANSAFRICA FORUM
JUNE 29, 1995

Thank you Randall for that warm introduction and for bringing together such an impre
ssive group of Americans.

I am delighted to be here today -- especially with a group of people who care so dee
ply about Africa, a place that
captured my heart three decades ago when I first traveled there as a young foreign s
ervice officer.

Much has changed since then -- both in Africa and here in America. Almost two-third
s of Africa's nations are
moving toward democracy and free-market economies -- and American leadership and ass
istance has played a
major role in that effort. But our success in helping Africa press ahead is in dang
er. Foreign assistance is under
attack by new isolationists from both the left and the right -- and American leaders

hip is at risk.

African countries that have bravely chosen the path of democracy and economic
reform
are asking why the United
States appears to be on the verge of retreat -- at exactly the moment that they are
doing what we have asked of
them for decades. When I traveled to nine African states last December,
presidents,
opposition leaders and
individuals from all walks of life told me that the people of Africa do not want
our
charity. They want a
partnership -- a partnership in peace, in democracy, and in economic growth. U.S.
e
conomic assistance is a
vital link in that partnership.

This partnership benefits us. We spend money on foreign assistance not out of the
g
oodness of our hearts, but
out of the conviction that it serves America's best interests. The United States ha
s a strong stake in Africa in
political and security issues, in promoting democracy and human rights, and in
estab
lishing the rule of law. But
what fewer people know is that we also have important economic interests in
Africa -
- and our economic support
for these developing countries is essential to promoting our political and other obj
ectives on the continent.

The return on our foreign assistance investment -- in increased security and
greater
prosperity for the American
people -- is substantial. For example, last year we supported South Africa's histor
ic elections. Today, we all
know that nation has a strong democratic government under the leadership of
Presiden
t Nelson Mandela -- and the
United States has a thriving new friendship with South Africa. I was surprised to l
earn that South Africa's free
market economy now absorbs more American exports than all of Eastern Europe
combined
.

Americans know that the world is growing closer -- and that to lead, our nation
must
be engaged. Your presence
here shows that you share this belief. Your actions demonstrate a commitment to

maintaining the involvement abroad that is essential for our nation's future.

This Administration also recognizes that, as we struggle to cut the federal deficit, foreign assistance must also be reduced. But there is a right way and a wrong way to make these reductions.

Let me tell you about the wrong way: Today, the House may vote to cut the Development Fund for Africa by fully one-third -- considerably more than it reduced assistance to other parts of the world. Funding for the World Bank's International Development Association, which provides half of its loans to Africa, may be cut by almost two-thirds. Singling out Africa is not only unfair, it's unwise. These drastic cuts will come back to haunt us. They will erode support for free markets -- ones that produce jobs for American workers. They will undermine our efforts to prevent conflicts and humanitarian crises before they happen. In short, these cuts put our leadership in peril at a time when we can make a difference.

Staying engaged in Africa is in America's interest. Today, the nearly 700 million people who live south of the Sahara comprise a major emerging market. And Africa's wealth of resources -- from oil and uranium to cocoa and coffee -- are in permanent demand here in America. Yet we have barely begun to explore all the possibilities that trade with Africa holds for U.S. companies and consumers.

U.S. exports to Africa totaled $4.4 billion last year -- and more than 80,000 American jobs depend on them. These exports -- which exceed those to the former Soviet Union by nearly a quarter -- can be vastly increased. But to do so, we must continue to help stability take hold and democracy take root throughout the continent.

Indeed, investment is even more important than exports because it is the real engine of growth and job creation for

any economy. As Africa progresses toward democracy and free markets,
Washington sho
uld -- as the Corporate
Council on Africa has recommended -- pursue policies that will encourage
American in
vestment in Africa and
strengthen the continent's private sector. U.S. investment will spur demand for
Ame
rican exports in areas such

as capital goods, services and high-tech products -- and create good, high-wage
jobs
. As Secretary of Commerce
Ron Brown said at last month's African-African American Summit in Dakar,
"The United
States no longer
concedes Africa's markets to European suppliers."

Through the Commerce Department's promotion efforts, the Trade and
Development Agenc
y -- as well as the
work of EXIM bank and OPIC -- the Administration has been a catalyst for
American t
rade and investment with
Africa. We must intensify those efforts. What has worked in East Asia could also
w
ork in Africa -- but only if
we stay engaged. It will not happen if the neo-isolationists have their way and cut
funds for building democracy,
sustainable development and peacekeeping.

Today in Africa, we face challenges and opportunities that we cannot walk away
from.
We cannot be indifferent
to a continent to which so many American trace their roots. And the plain truth is
that helping Africa contend
with its internal problems -- along with nurturing its tremendous economic
potential
-- is in America's interest.

Our security demands that we stay engaged. Sudan, for example, has worked its
way i
nto the big leagues of
countries that support international terrorism. It poses a direct threat to our int
erests. Or take Nigeria -- some 40
percent of the heroin that enters the United States passes through that nation. Lef
t unchecked, the problems that
plague many African countries today -- overpopulation, disease and
environmental dec
ay -- could overflow

borders and be the international crises of tomorrow.

The small fraction of our spending that we devote to Africa -- less than one-tenth of one percent of the Federal budget -- can help contain these problems and even turn some of them around. Resources such as our Development Fund for Africa are crucial for maintaining the remarkable progress that so many nations in Africa have already achieved. It helps create stable, democratic societies of consumers -- not masses of victims in need of relief. It helps reduce disparities of wealth and privilege that blight the lives of individuals and nations -- improving health care education and the standard of living across Africa. The DFA, along with the African Development Foundation, promote sustainable development on a broad front -- development that is essential to preventing the conflicts that explode into tragedy.

Consider some of the ways our foreign assistance has helped make a difference not only in Africa but throughout the developing world:

ù Over the past 50 years, infant and child mortality rates in the developing world have been reduced by half, and life expectancy has increased by nearly a third.
ù In the past two decades, the numbers of the chronically undernourished in developing nations has been halved.

ù Average real incomes in those nations have doubled since World War II.

And in a range of African nations, U.S. foreign assistance in recent years has established a solid record of success. For example:

ù USAID democratization programs played an important role in South Africa's historic elections last April and in Mozambique's polling in November -- educating voters, election officials and the media.
ù Our assistance has fostered the opening of stock markets in Botswana,

Mauritius, Z
imbabwe, Namibia, and
Kenya.
ù On a continent where radio provides the most effective way of reaching people, Voi
ce of America broadcasts
more than 80 hours a week of first-run programming in six different languages.
ù Our programs in Ghana helped remove regulatory bottlenecks and revise the investme
nt code, which helped
spur a 73-percent jump in American exports between 1992 and 1993 alone.

Deep cuts in our assistance would endanger all of these successes. Consider some po
ssible results if the
Congressional cuts in our spending in Africa go through:

ù As many as 4 million children may not be inoculated against infectious disease, an
d some of them will die.
ù Nearly 100,000 children may die from lack of oral rehydration therapy.
ù Our ability to track and limit the spread of HIV will be sharply diminished.
ù Declining population growth rates in some countries -- a key to stable development
-- could increase again.
AID is the foremost sponsor of family planning in Africa. But without the funds to
continue its work, the
progress in slowing Africa's high population growth rates could evaporate. That wou
ld increase the chances
for epidemics, malnutrition, environmental degradation and political instability.

The Congressional budget ax is not just aimed at bilateral programs. The World Bank
's International Development
Association may suffer a worse blow. IDA is essential -- it is the seed money for c
apitalism. It provides loans to
the poorest reforming countries -- those whose progress is too fragile to qualify f
or commercial loans. Half of
IDA's funding goes to Africa. For these countries poised to make the transition to
long-term growth, IDA is a
lifesaver.

Take away our contribution to the IDA and the United States loses one of its most ef
fective means of spurring
economic reform and opening new markets. Begun under the Eisenhower

administration -- and backed by both parties for decades -- IDA directly reduces these nations' trade and investment barriers, supports private sector growth and provides new opportunities for the American exports and investment.

Deep cuts in IDA would diminish opportunities for U.S. business. The IDA recipients of yesterday include South Korea, Indonesia and Chile. The IDA recipients of today imported $20 billion in U.S. goods in 1993 -- about a third more than in 1988. These are the markets of tomorrow.

Other multilateral efforts will suffer as well. Congress' cut in our contribution to the IMF's Enhanced Structural Adjustment Program, which also provides loans to the poorest nations while they implement economic reforms, will set back efforts to foster growth and market development in Africa. A sharp reduction in funds for international debt relief means one of the most crushing burdens will continue to weigh on these struggling nations. Many agencies of the United Nations also stand to lose as Congress cuts U.S. contributions -- agencies that operate on the front-lines to improve the health of Africa's peoples and help them move forward.

UN peacekeeping is another tool that Congress must not discard. In Mozambique, UN peacekeepers played a key role in persuading longtime enemies to end a war in which more than 1 million people were killed. And in Angola, blue helmet troops are arriving now -- as we see real signs that a 33-year-old conflict is coming to an end. The developments in these two countries means that soon, for the first day in decades, all Southern Africa could be at peace. UN peacekeeping helps us produce progress like this without committing U.S. forces or bearing the entire bill. This is burdensharing at its best.

Like our foreign assistance, peacekeeping is an investment in prevention. We can

pa
y now -- or we can pay a lot
more later. In Africa, as in other parts of the world, we have learned that working early to avert a crisis is far less
than expensive than mounting a large humanitarian effort or sending in our troops af
ter tragedy has struck.
Because of Congressional decisions over the last few years, we cannot make small but
critical investments in
prevention. For example, with a relatively small sum, we could help support peaceke
epers in Liberia, where a
million people are at risk from renewed civil war.

Looking and acting ahead, we can protect lives, defend our interests and save money.
We know that when the
all-seeing eye of CNN finds real suffering abroad, Americans want their government t
o act -- as they should,
and we should. By then, the issue is not a small investment but an expensive, major
operation. Nickel and dime
policies always cost more in the end.

American leadership in the world is not a luxury; it is a necessity. We know from e
xperience that democracy and
free markets are the best means to the ends to which people all over the world aspir
e: security, freedom and
prosperity. And we know that when others embrace democracy and free markets, Americ
a becomes more
secure, more free and, eventually, more prosperous.

If we are to remain a great nation, we must maintain our focus abroad -- and Africa
must be an important part of
that focus. That is why President Clinton sponsored last summer's White House Confe
rence on Africa and why I
took my first and only official visit to Africa. And that's why Commerce Secretary R
on Brown has made three
trips to Africa and is preparing to launch a major trade mission to the continent wi
thin the next year. This
Administration knows that significant cuts in programs that benefit Africa will

unde
rmine our ability to promote
sustainable development, increase U.S. exports and prevent deadly conflicts.

President Clinton is committed to fighting the proposed cuts in foreign assistance.

We welcome your efforts to
support assistance programs for Africa and, on behalf of the President, I applaud yo
u for this effort.

This is a moment of extraordinary hope for democracy and free markets -- in Africa a
nd around the world. But
nothing is inevitable. If we want to seize all the opportunities of our day, we mus
t continue to reach out and not
retreat. We must pay the price to maintain American leadership in the world. To ke
ep the tide of history running
our way, this is a price well worth paying.

MSMail

DATE-TIME	29 June 95 13:00
FROM	Benjamin, Daniel
CLASSIFICATION	UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT	Lake Africa Speech[UNCLASSIFIED]
TO	Battenfield, Pat Deshazer, Macarthur X. Fetig, James L. McCormick, Shawn H. Rice, Susan E.
CARBON_COPY	NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY	

Attached is the final. If Pat could run off 30 of these, it would be great.
[[TLAFRIC4.DOC : 3410 in TLAFRIC4.DOC]]

ATTACHMENT FILE DATE	29 June 95 12:58
ATTACHMENT FILE NAME	TLAFRIC4.DOC

ANTHONY LAKE
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS
REMARKS TO ROUNDTABLE ON SUSTAINED U.S. ASSISTANCE TO AFRICA
TRANSAFRICA FORUM
JUNE 29, 1995

I am delighted to be here today -- especially with a group of people who care so dee
ply about Africa, a place that
captured my imagination three decades ago when I first traveled there as a young for
eign service officer.

Much has changed since then -- both in Africa and here in America. Almost two-third
s of Africa's nations are
moving toward democracy and free-market economies -- and American leadership and ass
istance has played a
major role in that effort. But our success in helping Africa press ahead is in dang
er. Foreign assistance is under

attack by new isolationists from both the left and the right -- and American leaders
hip is at risk.

African countries that have bravely chosen the path of democracy and economic reform
are asking why the United
States appears to be on the verge of retreat -- at exactly the moment that they are doing what we have asked of
them for decades. When I traveled to nine African states last December, presidents,
opposition leaders and
individuals from all walks of life told me that the people of Africa do not want our
charity. They want a
partnership -- a partnership in peace, in democracy, and in economic growth. U.S. e
conomic assistance is a
vital link in that partnership.

This partnership benefits us. We spend money on foreign assistance not out of the g
oodness of our hearts, but
out of the conviction that it serves America's best interests. The United States ha
s a strong stake in Africa in
political and security issues, in promoting democracy and human rights, and in estab
lishing the rule of law. But
what fewer people know is that we also have important economic interests in Africa -
- and our economic support
for these developing countries is essential to promoting our political and other obj
ectives on the continent.

The return on our foreign assistance investment -- in increased security and greater
prosperity for the American
people -- is substantial. For example, last year we supported South Africa's histor
ic elections. Today, we all
know that nation has a strong democratic government under the leadership of Presiden
t Nelson Mandela -- and the
United States has a thriving new friendship with South Africa. I was surprised to l
earn that South Africa's free
market economy now absorbs more American exports than all of Eastern Europe combined
.

Americans know that the world is growing closer -- and that to lead, our nation must

be engaged. Your presence
here shows that you share this belief. Your actions demonstrate a commitment to mai
ntaining the involvement
abroad that is essential for our nation's future.

This Administration also recognizes that, as we work to cut the federal deficit, for eign assistance must also be
reduced. But there is a right way and a wrong way to make these reductions.

Let me tell you about the wrong way: The House may soon vote to cut the Development
Fund for Africa by fully
one-third -- considerably more than it reduced assistance to other parts of the worl
d. Funding for the World
Bank's International Development Association, which provides half of its loans to Af
rica, may be cut by almost
two-thirds. Singling out Africa is not only unfair, it's unwise. These drastic cut
s will come back to haunt us.
They will erode support for free markets -- ones that produce jobs for American work
ers. They will undermine
our efforts to prevent conflicts and humanitarian crises before they happen. In sho
rt, these cuts put our
leadership in peril at a time when we can make a difference.

Staying engaged in Africa is in America's interest. Today, the nearly 700 million p
eople who live south of the
Sahara comprise a major emerging market. And Africa's wealth of resources -- from o
il and uranium to cocoa
and coffee -- are in permanent demand here in America. Yet we have barely begun to
explore all the possibilities
that trade with Africa holds for U.S. companies and consumers.

U.S. exports to Africa totaled $4.4 billion last year -- and more than 80,000 Americ
an jobs depend on them. These
exports -- which exceed those to the former Soviet Union by nearly a quarter -- can
be vastly increased. But to do
so, we must continue to help stability take hold and democracy take root throughout
the continent.

Indeed, investment is even more important than exports because it is the real

engine
of growth and job creation for
any economy. As Africa progresses toward democracy and free markets, Washington sho
uld -- as the Corporate
Council on Africa has recommended -- pursue policies that will encourage American in
vestment in Africa and
strengthen the continent's private sector. U.S. investment will spur demand for Ame
rican exports in areas such
as capital goods, services and high-tech products -- and create good, high-wage jobs
. As Secretary of Commerce

Ron Brown said at last month's African-African American Summit in Dakar, "The United
States no longer
concedes Africa's markets to European suppliers."

Through the Commerce Department's promotion efforts, the Trade and Development Agenc
y -- as well as the
work of EXIM bank and OPIC -- the Administration has been a catalyst for American tr
ade and investment with
Africa. We must intensify those efforts. What has worked in East Asia could also work in Africa -- but only if
we stay engaged. It will not happen if the new isolationists have their way and cut funds for building democracy,
sustainable development and peacekeeping.

Today in Africa, we face challenges and opportunities that we cannot walk away from.
We cannot be indifferent
to a continent to which so many American trace their roots. And the plain truth is that helping Africa contend
with its internal problems -- along with nurturing its tremendous economic potential
-- is in America's interest.

Our security demands that we stay engaged. Sudan, for example, has worked its way i
nto the big league of
countries that support international terrorism. It poses a direct threat to our int
erests. Or take Nigeria -- some
40 percent of the heroin that enters the United States passes through that nation. Left unchecked, the problems
that plague many African countries today -- overpopulation, disease and environmenta

l decay -- could overflow
borders and be the international crises of tomorrow.

The small fraction of our spending that we devote to Africa -- less than one-tenth
o
f one percent of the Federal
budget -- can help contain these problems and even turn some of them around.
Resour
ces such as our
Development Fund for Africa are crucial for maintaining the remarkable progress
that
so many nations in Africa
have already achieved. It helps create stable, democratic societies of consumers --
not masses of victims in need
of relief. It helps reduce disparities of wealth and privilege that blight the live
s of individuals and nations --
improving health care education and the standard of living across Africa. The
DFA,
along with the African
Development Foundation, promote sustainable development on a broad front --
developm
ent that is essential to
preventing the conflicts that explode into tragedy.

Consider some of the ways our foreign assistance has helped make a difference
not on
ly in Africa but throughout
the developing world:

ù Over the past 50 years, infant and child mortality rates in the developing world
h
ave been reduced by half, and
life expectancy has increased by nearly a third.
ù In the past two decades, the number of the chronically undernourished in
developin
g nations has been halved.
ù Average real incomes in those nations have doubled since World War II.

And in a range of African nations, U.S. foreign assistance in recent years has
estab
lished a solid record of success.
For example:

ù USAID democratization programs played an important role in South Africa's
historic
elections last April and in
Mozambique's polling in November -- educating voters, election officials and the
med
ia.
ù Our assistance has fostered the opening of stock markets in Botswana,

Mauritius, Z
imbabwe, Namibia, and
Kenya.
ù On a continent where radio provides the most effective way of reaching people, Voi
ce of America broadcasts
more than 80 hours a week of first-run programming in six different languages.
ù Our programs in Ghana helped remove regulatory bottlenecks and revise the investme
nt code, which helped
spur a 73-percent jump in American exports between 1992 and 1993 alone.

Deep cuts in our assistance would endanger all of these successes. Consider some po
ssible results if the
Congressional cuts in our spending in Africa go through:

ù As many as 4 million children may not be inoculated against infectious disease, an
d some of them will die.
ù Nearly 100,000 children will risk death from lack of oral rehydration therapy.
ù Our ability to track and limit the spread of HIV will be sharply diminished.
ù Declining population growth rates in some countries -- a key to stable development
-- could increase again.
AID is the foremost sponsor of family planning in Africa. But without the funds to
continue its work, the
progress in slowing Africa's high population growth rates could evaporate. That wou
ld increase the chances
for epidemics, malnutrition, environmental degradation and political instability.

The Congressional budget ax is not just aimed at bilateral programs. The World Bank
's International Development
Association may suffer a worse blow. IDA is essential -- it is the seed money for c
apitalism. It provides loans to
the poorest reforming countries -- those whose progress is too fragile to qualify f
or commercial loans. Half of
IDA's funding goes to Africa. For these countries poised to make the transition to long-term growth, IDA is a
lifesaver.

Take away our contribution to the IDA and the United States loses one of its most ef
fective means of spurring

economic reform and opening new markets. Begun under the Eisenhower

administration
-- and backed by both
parties for decades -- IDA directly reduces these nations' trade and investment
barr
iers, supports private sector
growth and provides new opportunities for the American exports and investment.

Deep cuts in IDA would diminish opportunities for U.S. business. The IDA
recipients
of yesterday include South
Korea, Indonesia and Chile. The IDA recipients of today imported $20 billion in
U.S
. goods in 1993 -- about a
third more than in 1988. These are the markets of tomorrow.

Other multilateral efforts will suffer as well. Congress' cut in our contribution t
o the IMF's Enhanced Structural
Adjustment Facility, which also provides loans to the poorest nations while they
im
plement economic reforms, will
set back efforts to foster growth and market development in Africa. A sharp
reducti
on in funds for international
debt relief means one of the most crushing burdens will continue to weigh on
these s
truggling nations. Many
agencies of the United Nations also stand to lose as Congress cuts U.S.
contribution
s -- agencies that operate on
the front-lines to improve the health of Africa's peoples and help them move
forward
.

UN peacekeeping is another tool that Congress must not discard. In Mozambique,
UN p
eacekeepers played a key
role in persuading longtime enemies to end a war in which more than 1 million
people
were killed. And in Angola,
blue helmet troops are arriving now -- as we see real signs that a 33-year-old
confl
ict is coming to an end. The
developments in these two countries means that soon, for the first day in decades,
a
ll Southern Africa could be at
peace. UN peacekeeping helps us produce progress like this without committing
U.S.
forces or bearing the entire
bill. This is burdensharing at its best.

Like our foreign assistance, peacekeeping is often an investment in prevention.
We
can pay now -- or we can pay
a lot more later. In Africa, as in other parts of the world, we have learned that w
orking early to avert a crisis is
far less than expensive than mounting a large humanitarian effort or sending in
our
troops after tragedy has
struck. Because of Congressional decisions over the last few years, we cannot
make
some small but critical
investments in prevention. For example, with a relatively small sum, we could
offer
more to help peacekeepers
in Liberia, where a million people are at risk from renewed civil war.

Looking and acting ahead, we can protect lives, defend our interests and save
money.
We know that when the
all-seeing eye of CNN finds real suffering abroad, Americans want their
government t
o act -- as they should,
and we should. By then, the issue is not a small investment but an expensive,
major
operation. Nickel and dime
policies always cost more in the end.

American leadership in the world is not a luxury; it is a necessity. We know from
e
xperience that democracy and
free markets are the best means to the ends to which people all over the world
aspir
e: security, freedom and
prosperity. And we know that when others embrace democracy and free markets,
Americ
a becomes more
secure, more free and, eventually, more prosperous.

If we are to remain a great nation, we must maintain our focus abroad -- and
Africa
must be an important part of
that focus. That is why President Clinton sponsored last summer's White House
Confe
rence on Africa and why I
took my first and only official visit to Africa. And that's why Commerce
Secretary R
on Brown has made three
trips to Africa and is preparing to launch a major trade mission to the continent
wi
thin the next year. This

Administration knows that significant cuts in programs that benefit Africa will
unde
rmine our ability to promote
sustainable development, increase U.S. exports and prevent deadly conflicts.

President Clinton is committed to fighting the proposed cuts in foreign assistance.

We welcome your efforts to
support assistance programs for Africa and, on behalf of the President, I applaud
yo
u for this effort.

This is a moment of extraordinary hope for democracy and free markets -- in
Africa a
nd around the world. But
nothing is inevitable. If we want to seize all the opportunities of our day, we mus
t continue to reach out and not
retreat. We must pay the price to maintain American leadership in the world. To
ke
ep the tide of history running
our way, this is a price well worth paying.