''stick'' is snap-back tariffs. This year, I plan to more energetically push the Bereuter-Ewing-Pickering legislation—H.R. 1712: The China Market Access and Export Opportunities Act. It offers a strategic plan that includes snap-back tariffs to compel Beijing to join the WTO. Equally important, unlike repealing NTR, my approach does not invoke the impossible, severe, wide-ranging set of sanctions that would adversely impact American jobs and industry. Neither does it ease, as China has urged, WTO accession restrictions, which could seriously undermine support for free trade. Now to the final category of challenges for the U.S. in the region:

V. HUMAN RIGHTS & DEMOCRACY

There can be no serious discussion of U.S. policy toward Asia—or of challenges and opportunities in that region—without addressing U.S. democracy and human rights objectives. As you all know, last year was the 50th anniversary of the signing of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In looking back at that half century, an impressive body of international law has been enacted, and the ranks of committed individuals, organizations, and countries have swelled as has their power to command world attention in promoting and protecting the dignity and freedom of all people.

It should be noted that in 1998, for example, Beijing signed the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. In 1998, the U.N. Human Rights Commission and 36 Asian-Pacific nations—representing about one-half the world's people—also signed in 1998 the framework for an agreement on technical cooperation in human rights, which commits them to work together to strengthen national human rights strategies, plans, institutions, and education. Strides have been made, but we must do more to translate the legal instruments—the words—that guarantee human rights into actions that transform the daily lives of those citizenries that still live under oppression.

Competing ideologies on the role of democracy versus authoritarian rule in building Asian stability and economic prosperity have impaired the strengthening of democratic institutions and individual freedoms. The Asian economic crisis brought simmering political tensions to a boil, and amplified regional—indeed, worldwide—calls for government accountability and profound social and political change. If equitable recovery measures are not adopted in 1999, the cycles of violence witnessed last year, and for much of history, well may be repeated.

Nowhere is that more true than in Indonesia. The widespread protests that brought an end to President Suharto's regime have not abated. President Habibie has lifted some restrictions on freedom of expression and political parties, but sources of political, ethnic, and economic unrest continue to abound. The June '99 parliamentary election process is a key test for democracy and government legitimacy. With political parties blossoming and competing for seats in what hopefully will be the first real election in over three decades, the stakes are very high. Moreover, another important watershed event may be on the horizon: Recently, the Indonesian government announced that it may be willing to consider East Timor's autonomy, perhaps even independence if the East Timorese deem the autonomy plan unacceptable. The jailed rebel leader, Xanana Gusmao, who I visited last month, appears destined for early release. I am told that U.N. Special Envoy Marker has redoubled his efforts to devise a formula that is acceptable to all parties. Portugal and Indonesia must be told it is time to find an acceptable agreement *now*. The door is opening for an end to this 23 year old violent controversy.

In another Southeast Asian example, Cambodia's recent electoral history has been bloody. After the violent July 1997 coup, in which scores of Cambodians were executed, Hun Sen delivered a devastating ''body blow'' to the democratic aspirations of the Cambodian people. Following a very difficult year, where Hun Sen was ostracized from the international community, elections were held last July. These elections resulted in a small majority for the Cambodian People's Party, led by Premier Hun Sen. Extra-judicial killings, co-opting and coercion of political opponents, human rights abuses, and media censorship that led up to the election tarnished the process at large while allegations of election improprieties undercut claims of a democratic process.

Moreover, the current power sharing arrangement between Hun Sen and Prince Ranarridh is tenuous at best, and rumors of special deals with Khmer Rouge leaders who recently surrendered have fed additional suspicions. This small, long-suffering country has far to go before Western observers will be convinced it is on the way to democratization. I was the author of an amendment that was passed in the foreign operations appropriation bill that barred aid to the government of Cambodia until democracy is restored. I remain unconvinced that this has occurred.

And, finally, as for China, despite its signing of the U.N. Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, it has yet to be ratified. China's desire for improved relations with the West contributed to the release of some high profile political prisoners and slight loosening of limits on public expression in early 1998; however, the crackdown on the newly formed Chinese Democratic Party and other unregistered pro-democracy groups has demonstrated the continuing closed nature of the political system.

I want to emphasize here that I continue to support the excellent work of Mr. John Kamm, who has done much to learn the fate, and push for the release, of long-forgotten political prisoners. The physical and psychological lives of these prisoners, and of many other victims of Chinese human rights abuses, hang in the balance. We must continue to vigorously press Beijing to live up to both the letter and spirit of the international agreements it has signed. To this end, the first hearing this year in the House International Relations Committee concerned the recent crackdown on democracy movement leaders; a second hearing already has been held, and more are likely to be scheduled.

VI. CONCLUSION

I have reviewed a fraction—although a substantial and important fraction—of challenges and opportunities that will face the United States and Congress in Asia as we move into the 21st century. What I do I recommend, as both a Member of Congress and Chairman of the Asia and Pacific Subcommittee to my colleagues and to the Administration? A few bottom lines:

Vigorously promote regional security. In addition to maintaining our forward-deployed forces and strengthening our web of security Alliances, we need to explain the requirement for, promote, and collaboratively develop a regional missile defense system, as well as a limited national defense system at home.

Push the Administration to develop an effective, long-term strategy for dealing with Pyongyang in concert with our regional Allies. Such a strategy must hold the North to its commitment to the framework agreement if we are to release any of the $35M pledged. Further, it must link the nuclear initiative with other U.S. security objectives related to ballistic missile proliferation and discussions on peace and stability in Korea and in the region. Most importantly, we must replace the reaction stance our actions and policy have become. They are too much like paying blackmail to avoid North Korean aggression or to delay facing a growing threat of weapons of mass destruction.

Actively assist Asian countries' recovery plans where possible and appropriate and strengthen U.S. leadership of systemic and structural reform. To do this, we must remain engaged in Asian markets and avoid protectionism, and exert more leadership in pressing for IMF reforms. We also must provide private and public sector expertise for reforming the Asian economic architecture.

Adopt the Bereuter-Ewing-Pickering plan for Chinese accession to the WTO through snap-back tariff legislation. Engaging China now, on our terms, in a free market economy, is a key means to encourage it toward responsible domestic and international behavior.

Energetically promote the advancement of democracy and freedom throughout Asia. The United States, for example, should support the Indonesian elections in June—free, fair, and transparent elections are too important for the U.S. not to get involved. We also should support the rule of law and village election assistance in the PRC, and not let a few of our misguided colleagues block the effort and discourage further Administration initiatives. While the costs of such programs are minimal, they can make a significant contribution to the evolution of democratic institutions in Asia.

Thank you very much for your attention.

CRISIS IN THE HORN OF AFRICA

HON. JIM SAXTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1999

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I spoke on February 9, 1999, to remark that it was essential that we act to help stop the escalation of the crisis in the Horn of Africa, and particularly the Ethiopia-Eritrean war, if the region was not to slide further into chaos. Since then, the anticipated war between Ethiopia and Eritrea has erupted and it keeps escalating. The war has already long-term and dire ramifications for both countries—beyond the impact of the growing numbers of casualties on both sides. The war is largely a low-tech and fairly static war of attrition along long miles of rugged and inhospitable terrain. The new offensive just launched by the Ethiopians is yet to alter the overall character of the war. However, both sides have embarked on an intense effort to acquire high quality air power in order to break the deadlock. Both countries not only purchased several late model combat aircraft and helicopters from states of the former Soviet Union but also engaged a large number of air crews and technicians to fly and maintain them. This effort, that is yet to impact the situation on the front line, is rapidly exhausting the hard currency holdings of these already

impoverished states, thus further reducing their chance of economic recovery and development.

Dire as the situation in the Horn of Africa is, and as much as the casualties are lamentable, it is a valid question to ask: Why should we—the United States—care about yet another debilitating war in a remote part of Africa? Fortunately, the war has so far had little impact on the civilian population, there were no massacres, and there is no famine. Hence, there is no humanitarian catastrophe to attract our attention. Hence, I repeat, why should we care?

The reason we should pay close attention to the mounting crisis and escalating war is the vital strategic importance of the Horn of Africa to the United States and its close allies. The geo-strategic position of Ethiopia is central to several mega-dynamics stretching all the way from the Middle East to East Africa. Thus, the impact of instability and war reverberates directly to the heart of such areas commonly accepted as vital interests of the United States as Israel or the oil producing states of the Persian Gulf. Here are several major strategic factors in the region, demonstrating its great importance to the security interests of the United States:

1. The security of the Red Sea/Suez Canal Sea Lane of Communication (SLOC), which vitally affects East-West trade (not just the oil trade) between Europe and Asia, including particularly Japan and Australia. Within this context, the ability of Israel and Jordan to maintain adequate maritime access to the Red Sea (and therefore world trade) is significant.

2. The containment of the spread of Islamist radicalism and terrorism—a process currently sponsored by Sudan's National Islamic Front (NIF) Government with the assistance of Iran. The hub of international terrorism in Sudan supports subversion throughout the Arab world and East Africa. A personal patron of Osama bin Laden, Hassan al-Turabi, Sudan's spiritual leader, was instrumental in inspiring and sponsoring the bombing of the U.S. Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania. Having sponsored the eviction of the United States from Somalia, Khartoum is now trying to capitalize on the crisis in the Horn of Africa in order to evict the United States from the rest of this strategically critical area. Toward this end, the Islamists support several Islamist separatist movements in both Eritrea and Ethiopia, most notably the support for the radical separatist Oromo forces designed to break up Ethiopia still further.

3. The management of the Nile waters is critical to the stability, prosperity and growth of Sudan and Egypt, and therefore the stability of the entire Middle East. Egypt is completely dependent on the Nile water for its very existence and Cairo will therefore do anything to ensure the Nile's uninterrupted flow—including joining the radicals of the Muslim world, turning on the United States, Saudi Arabia, and Israel, etc. Sudan is also the driving force behind and key sponsor of the destabilization of Egypt. Gaining a foothold in Ethiopia will provide Khartoum with the possibility to manipulate the Nile's flow without direct implications.

Thus, stability in the Horn of Africa, and especially the existence of a unified and pro-Western Ethiopia, is of crucial importance to the national security of the United States. We must care and worry about the escalation of the Ethiopia-Eritrea war and the Sudan-sponsored Islamist forces exploiting it. This position is shared by the Ethiopia Crown Council. In my previous comments, I urged that we help reinforce the position of Prince Ermias SahleSelassie, the President of the Crown Council of Ethiopia, who is attempting to restore a policy of unity and moderation on Ethiopia and the region. Recently, Prince Ermias has written an excellent analysis of the crisis for the Defense & Foreign Affairs: Strategic Policy, the journal of the respected International Strategic Studies Association. In this overview, he urges that we see the Eritrea-Ethiopia conflict in the context of the broader regional strategic situation, to ensure that radicalization of the region. Prince Ermias stresses the dire ramifications of the deteriorating situation in Ethiopia:

"What we see now [in Ethiopia] is far less democracy and opportunity and prosperity than was being created under the Constitutional Monarchy of Haile Selassie. What we are witnessing today is a society led by people who arrived on the scene by accident; who are mired in divisive, petty squabbling. The result is that the region is divided and at risk. And the risk is one shared by the entire world: a further breakdown in the region could lead to the collapse of the pivotal powers, and a total disruption of the trade routes and the Middle Eastern oil trade. But worse than this, by not seeing the Ethiopia-Eritrea dispute in the broader context and acting accordingly, the world may be condemning the peoples of the region, including those of Egypt and North Africa, Arabia and the Northern Tier, to many more years of despair."

I share the view and the anguish. I add that the strategic posture of the United States is adversely affected by the reverberations from, and impact of, the continued war in the Horn of Africa. This is why we should not only pay attention to events there, but also act to bring an end to the war. However, any negotiated settlement that would leave the regional strategic posture unchanged would only be a short term and temporary solution. Ultimately, it is imperative that long-term solutions are attained—nation building and economic revitalization under condition conducive for flow of private funds, not just hand outs of humanitarian assistance.

What makes the situation in the Horn of Africa so unique is that there is no need for a U.S. military intervention in order to establish such stability. There are indigenous forces in Ethiopia that, if properly supported, can help their own country and the entire region. I'm talking about the Ethiopian Crown Council. Constitutional monarchy, as was the case in the days of Emperor Haile Selassie, provides the best opportunity for Ethiopia. Mr. Speaker, it is clear that in Prince Ermias we have someone who understands, and can help stabilize the entire Horn of Africa. The situation is now becoming critical, and we must find ways to support him in the process of reunifying Ethiopia, which cannot be allowed to be dismembered, and in helping to bring about regional reconciliation—thus protecting and furthering national security interests of the United States and its close allies.

AFRICAN AMERICANS WHO HAVE MADE A VITAL ROLE IN SHAPING OUR NATION

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1999

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the many African Americans who, through personal sacrifice and unyielding perseverance, have had a vital role in shaping our nation. African Americans have made countless contributions throughout the history of the United States in the arts, sciences, literature, politics and in the military. They have made these achievements while working under extremely adverse conditions. In Virginia, we have a special appreciation for Black History Month and for the contributions of African-Americans to our state and nation.

Dr. Carter G. Woodson, considered the father of black history, was born in 1875 in Buckingham County, Virginia. Dr. Woodson originally conceived Negro History Week in 1926 as a celebration of African American achievement. This week of African American recognition later became Black History Month. Dr. Woodson was the youngest of nine children to former slaves. He was largely self taught due to the long hours required of him on his family's farm. Throughout his young adulthood, Dr. Woodson worked to support himself while studying. His hard work and discipline culminated in his becoming only the second African-American to earn his doctorate at Harvard. In 1915, Dr. Woodson established the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History to highlight African American contributions to American history and culture. Beginning in 1916, Dr. Woodson began publishing books and information on the African American experience in America. He held teaching positions at both Howard University and Virginia State College. At the end of his life in 1950, Dr. Woodson was working on an Encyclopedia Africana. Dr. Woodson is just one of many remarkable African Americans from Virginia.

Other black Virginians have been similarly distinguished. Tennis great Arthur Ashe learned to play tennis on segregated courts in Richmond and went on to become, not only a legend in the sport but also an international human rights leader. Mary Elizabeth Bowser spied for the Union army during the Civil War while a servant in the Confederate White House in Richmond. Henry "Box" Brown shipped himself to freedom in 1849 and then went on to become an outspoken advocate for the abolition of slavery. Virginia has contemporary African American heroes as well. Jazz legend Ella Fitzgerald was born in 1918 in Newport News Virginia. Samuel Lee Garvey, Jr. of Richmond became the first African American Navy Admiral in 1962. Samuel Dewitt Proctor, from Norfolk, who passed away in 1997, was a distinguished educator, preacher and speaker. Booker T. Washington was born in 1856 in Franklin County and became the founder of Tuskegee University in Alabama. And I am proud to say that Virginia was the first state in American history to elect an African American as Governor. With the