

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS OF
SECRETARY OF STATE MADE-
LEINE K. ALBRIGHT AT HAR-
VARD UNIVERSITY 50 YEARS
AFTER SECRETARY OF STATE
GEORGE C. MARSHALL AN-
NOUNCED THE MARSHALL PLAN

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1997

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, this past week the United States and the countries of Western Europe celebrated the 50th anniversary of the June 5, 1947, Commencement Address at Harvard University by then Secretary of State George C. Marshall in which the idea of the Marshall plan was first publicly discussed.

Fifty years to the day after Secretary Marshall delivered that seminal speech, our current Secretary of State, Madeleine K. Albright, was likewise honored with an honorary degree from Harvard University. It was an appropriate and well-deserved honor for Secretary Albright. She has demonstrated during her 5 short months as Secretary of State great sensitivity and outstanding ability to deal with the foreign policy issues facing our Nation. During the previous 4 years when she served as the Permanent U.S. Representative to the United Nations, she demonstrated great diplomatic capability as she acted to further our interests in that world body. She has had a most distinguished academic career, and she has been actively involved in public service throughout her life.

In her address at the Harvard University commencement, Secretary Albright, gave an address that was a masterfully crafted balance of graduation humor, tribute to her predecessor coupled with proper commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Marshall plan, and the articulation of a vision of the challenges and opportunities for United States foreign policy at the end of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that Secretary Albright's historic commencement address be placed in the RECORD and I urge my colleagues to give it the serious and thoughtful attention it clearly deserves.

Secretary Albright: Thank you. Thank you, President Pforzheimer, Governor Weld, President Rudenstine, President Wilson, fellow honorands, men and women of Harvard, all those who comprise the Harvard community, guests and friends, thank you.

I'm delighted to be here on this day of celebration and rededication. To those of you who are here from the class of '97, I say congratulations. (Applause.) You may be in debt, but you made it. (Laughter.) And if you're not in debt now, after the alumni association get through with you, you will be. (Laughter and applause.)

In fact, I would like to solicit the help of this audience for the State Department budget. (Laughter.) It is under \$20 billion.

As a former professor and current mother, I confess to loving graduation days—especially when they are accompanied by a honorary degree. I love the ceremony; I love the academic settings; and although it will be difficult for me today—let's be honest—I love to daydream during the commencement speech. (Laughter.)

Graduations are unique among the milestones of our lives, because they celebrate past accomplishments, while also anticipat-

ing the future. That is true for each of the graduates today, and it is true for the United States. During the past few years, we seem to have observed the 50th anniversary of everything. Through media and memory, we have again been witness to paratroopers filling the skies over Normandy; the liberation of Buchenwald; a sailor's kiss in Times Square; and Iron Curtain descending; and Jackie Robinson sliding home.

Today, we recall another turning point in that era. For on this day 50 years ago, Secretary of State George Marshall addressed the graduating students of this great university. He spoke to a class enriched by many who had fought for freedom, and deprived of many who had fought for freedom and died. The Secretary's words were plain; but his message reached far beyond the audience assembled in this year to an American people weary of war and wary of new commitments, and to a Europe where life-giving connections between farm and market, enterprise and capital, hope and future had been severed.

Secretary Marshall did not adorn his rhetoric and high-flown phrases, saying only that it would be logical for America to help restore normal economic health to the world, without which their could be no political stability and no assured peace. He did not attach to his plan the label, Made in America; but rather invited European ideas and required European countries to do all they could to help themselves. His vision was inclusive, leaving the door open to participation by all, including the Soviet Union—and so there would be no repetition of the punitive peace of Versailles—also to Germany.

British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin called the Marshall Plan a "lifeline to sinking men," and it was—although I expect some women in Europe were equally appreciative. (Laughter)

By extending that lifeline, America helped unify Europe's west around democratic principles, and planted seeds of transatlantic partnership that would soon blossom in the form of NATO and the cooperative institutions of a new Europe. Just as important was the expression of American leadership that the Marshall Plan conveyed.

After World War I, America had withdrawn from the world, shunning responsibility and avoiding risk. Others did the same. The result in the heart of Europe was the rise of great evil. After the devastation of World War II and the soul-withering horror of the Holocaust, it was not enough to say that the enemy had been vanquished, that what we were against had failed.

The generation of Marshall, Truman and Vandenberg was determined to build a lasting peace. And the message that generation conveyed, from the White House, from both parties on Capitol Hill, and from people across our country who donated millions in relief cash, clothing and food was that this time, America would not turn inward; America would lead.

Today, in the wake of the Cold War, it is not enough for us to say that Communism has failed. We, too, must heed the lessons of the past, accept responsibility and lead. Because we are entering a century in which there will be many interconnected centers of population, power and wealth, we cannot limit our focus, as Marshall did in his speech to the devastated battleground of a prior war. Our vision must encompass not one, but every continent.

Unlike Marshall's generation, we face no single galvanizing threat. The dangers we confront are less visible and more diverse—some as old as ethnic conflict, some as new as letter bombs, some as subtle as climate change, and some as deadly as nuclear weapons falling into the wrong hands. To defend

against these threats, we must take advantage of the historic opportunity that now exists to bring the world together in an international system based on democracy, open markets, law and a commitment to peace.

We know that not every nation is yet willing or able to play its full part in this system. One group is still in transition from centralized planning and totalitarian rule. Another has only begun to dip its toes into economic and political reform. Some nations are still too weak to participate in a meaningful way. And a few countries have regimes that actively oppose the premises upon which this system is based.

Because the situation we face today is different from that confronted by Marshall's generation, we cannot always use the same means. But we can summon the same spirit. We can strive for the same sense of bipartisanship that allowed America in Marshall's day to present to both allies and adversaries a united front. We can invest resources needed to keep America strong economically, militarily and diplomatically—recognizing, as did Marshall, that these strengths reinforce each other. We can act with the same knowledge that in our era, American security and prosperity are linked to economic and political health abroad. And we can recognize, even as we pay homage to the heroes of history, that we have our own duty to be authors of history.

Let every nation acknowledge today the opportunity to be part of an international system based on democratic principles is available to all. This was not the case 50 years ago.

Then, my father's boss, Jan Masaryk, foreign minister of what was then Czechoslovakia—was told by Stalin in Moscow that his country must not participate in the Marshall Plan, despite its national interest in doing so. Upon his return to Prague, Masaryk said it was at that moment, he understood he was employed by a government no longer sovereign in its own land.

Today, there is no Stalin to give orders. If a nation is isolated from the international community now, it is either because the country is simply too weak to meet international standards, or because its leaders have chosen willfully to disregard those standards.

Last week in the Netherlands, President Clinton said that no democratic nation in Europe would be left out of the transatlantic community. Today I say that no nation in the world need be left out of the global system we are constructing. And every nation that seeks to participate and is willing to do all it can to help itself will have America's help in finding the right path. (Applause.)

In Africa, poverty, disease, disorder and misrule have cut off millions from the international system. But Africa is a continent rich both in human and natural resources. And today, it's best new leaders are pursuing reforms that are helping private enterprise and democratic institutions to gain a foothold. Working with others, we must lend momentum by maintaining our assistance, encouraging investment, lowering the burden of debt and striving to create successful models for others to follow.

In Latin America and the Caribbean, integration is much further advanced. Nations throughout our hemisphere are expanding commercial ties, fighting crime, working to raise living standards and cooperating to ensure that economic and political systems endure.

In Asia and the Pacific, we see a region that has not only joined the international system, but has become a driving force behind it—a region that is home to eight of the ten fastest growing economies in the world.

With our allies, we have worked to ease the threat posed by North Korea's nuclear program, and invited that country to end its

self-imposed isolation. We have encouraged China to expand participation in the international system and to observe international norms on everything from human rights to export of arms-related technologies.

Finally, in Europe, we are striving to fulfill the vision Marshall proclaimed but the Cold War prevented—the vision of a Europe, whole and free, united—as President Clinton said this past week—“not by the force of arms, but by possibilities of peace.”

Where half a century ago, American leadership helped lift Western Europe to prosperity and democracy, so today the entire transatlantic community is helping Europe's newly free nations fix their economies and cement the rule of law.

Next month in Madrid, NATO will invite new members from among the democracies of Central and Eastern Europe, while keeping the door to future membership open to others. This will not, as some fear, create a new source of division within Europe. On the contrary, it is erasing the unfair and unnatural line imposed half a century ago; and it is giving nations an added incentive to settle territorial disputes, respect minority and human rights and complete the process of reform.

NATO is a defensive alliance that harbors no territorial ambitions. It does not regard any state as its adversary, certainly not a democratic and reforming Russia that is intent on integrating with the West, and with which it has forged an historic partnership, signed in Paris just nine days ago.

Today, from Ukraine to the United States, and from Reykjavik to Ankara, we are demonstrating that the quest for European security is no longer a zero-sum game. NATO has new allies and partners. The nations of Central and Eastern Europe are rejoining in practice the community of values they never left in spirit. And the Russian people will have something they have not had in centuries—a genuine and sustainable peace with the nations to their west.

The Cold War's shadow no longer darkens Europe. But one specter from the past does remain. History teaches us that there is no natural geographic or political endpoint to conflict in the Balkans, where World War I began and where the worst European violence of the past half-century occurred in this decade. That is why the peaceful integration of Europe will not be complete until the Dayton Peace Accords in Bosnia are fulfilled. (Applause.)

When defending the boldness of the Marshall Plan 50 years ago, Senator Arthur Vandenberg observed that it does little good to extend a 15-foot rope to a man drowning 20 feet away. Similarly, we cannot achieve our objectives in Bosnia by doing just enough to avoid immediate war. We must do all we can to help the people of Bosnia to achieve permanent peace.

In recent days, President Clinton has approved steps to make the peace process irreversible, and give each party a clear stake in its success. This past weekend, I went to the region to deliver in person the message that if the parties want international acceptance or our aid, they must meet their commitments—including full cooperation with the international war crimes tribunal. (Applause.)

That tribunal represents a choice not only for Bosnia and Rwanda, but for the world. We can accept atrocities as inevitable, or we can strive for a higher standard. We can presume to forget what only God and the victims have standing to forgive, or we can heed the most searing lesson of this century which is that evil, when unopposed, will spawn more evil. (Applause.)

The majority of Bosnia killings occurred not in battle, but in markets, streets and

playgrounds, where men and women like you and me, and boys and girls like those we know, were abused or murdered—not because of anything they had done, but simply for who they were.

We all have a stake in establishing a precedent that will deter future atrocities, in helping the tribunal make a lasting peace easier by separating the innocent from the guilty; in holding accountable the perpetrators of ethnic cleansing; and in seeing that those who consider rape just another tactic of war answer for their crimes. (Applause.)

Since George Marshall's time, the United States has played the leading role within the international system—not as sole arbiter of right and wrong, for that is a responsibility widely shared, but as pathfinder—as the nation able to show the way when others cannot.

In the years immediately after World War II, America demonstrated that leadership not only through the Marshall Plan, but through the Truman Doctrine, the Berlin airlift and the response to Communist aggression in Korea.

In this decade, America led in defeating Saddam Hussein; encouraging nuclear stability in the Korean Peninsula and in the former Soviet Union; restoring elected leaders to Haiti; negotiating the Dayton Accords; and supporting the peacemakers over the bomb throwers in the Middle East and other strategic regions.

We welcome this leadership role, not in Teddy Roosevelt's phrase, because we wish to be “an international Meddlesome Matty,” but because we know from experience that our interests and those of our allies may be affected by regional or civil wars, power vacuums that create opportunities for criminals and terrorists and threats to democracy.

But America cannot do the job alone. We can point the way and find the path, but others must be willing to come along and take responsibility for their own affairs. Others must be willing to act within the bounds of their own resources and capabilities to join in building a world in which shared economic growth is possible, violent conflicts are constrained, and those who abide by the law are progressively more secure.

While in Sarajevo, I visited a playground in the area once known as “sniper's alley,” where many Bosnians had earlier been killed because of ethnic hate. But this past weekend, the children were playing their without regard to whether the child in the next swing was Muslim, Serb or Croat. They thanked America for helping to fix their swings, and asked me to place in the soil a plant which they promised to nourish and tend.

It struck me then that this was an apt metaphor for America's role 50 years ago, when we planted the seeds of renewed prosperity and true democracy in Europe; and a metaphor as well for America's role during the remaining years of this century and into the next.

As this great university has recognized, in the foreign students it has attracted, the research it conducts, the courses it offers and the sensibility it conveys, those of you who have graduated today will live global lives. You will compete in a world marketplace; travel further and more often than any previous generation; share ideas, tastes and experiences with counterparts from every culture; and recognize that to have a full and rewarding future, you will have to look outward.

As you do, and as our country does, we must aspire to set high standards set by Marshall, using means adapted to our time, based on values that endure for all time; and never forgetting that America belongs on the side of freedom. (Applause.)

I say this to you as Secretary of State. I say it also as one of the many people whose lives have been shaped by the turbulence of Europe during the middle of this century, and by the leadership of America throughout this century.

I can still remember in England, during the war, sitting in the bomb shelter, singing away the fear and thanking God for America's help. I can still remember, after the war and after the Communist takeover in Prague, arriving here in the United States, where I wanted only to be accepted and to make my parents and my new country proud.

Because my parents fled in time, I escaped Hitler. To our shared and constant sorrow, millions did not. Because of America's generosity, I escaped Stalin. Millions did not. Because of the vision of Truman-Marshall generation, I have been privileged to live my life in freedom. Millions have still never had that opportunity. It may be hard for you, who have no memory of that time 50 years ago, to understand. But it is necessary that you try to understand.

Over the years, many have come to think of World War II as the last good war, for if ever a cause was just, that was it. And if ever the future of humanity stood in the balance, it was then.

Two full generations of Americans have grown up since the war—first mine, now yours; two generations of boys and girls, who have seen the veterans at picnics and parades and fireworks saluting with medals and ribbons on their chests; seeing the pride in their bearing and thinking, perhaps, what a fine thing it must have been—to be tested in a great cause and to have prevailed.

But today of all days, let us not forget that behind each medal and ribbon, there is a story of heroism yes, but also profound sadness; for World War II was not a good war. From North Africa to Solerno, from Normandy to the Bulge to Berlin, an entire continent lost to Fascism had to be taken back, village by village, hill by hill. And further eastward, from Tarawa to Okinawa, the death struggle for Asia was an assault against dug-in positions, surmounted only by unbelievable courage at unbearable loss.

Today, the greatest danger to America is not some foreign enemy. It is the possibility that we will fail to hear the example of that generation; that we will allow the momentum toward democracy to stall; take for granted the institutions and principles upon which our own freedom is based; and forget what the history of this century reminds us—that problems abroad, if left unattended, will all too often come home to America. (Applause.)

A decade or two from now, we will be known as neo-isolationists who allowed tyranny and lawlessness to rise again; or as the generation that solidified the global triumph of democratic principles. We will be known as the neo-protectionists, whose lack of vision produced financial meltdown; or as the generation that laid the groundwork for rising prosperity around the world. We will be known as the world-class ditherers, who stood by while the seeds of renewed global conflict were sown; or as the generation that took strong measures to forge alliances, deter aggression and keep the peace.

There is no certain road map to success, either for individuals or for generations. Ultimately, it is a matter of judgment, a question of choice. In making that choice, let us remember that there is not a page of American history, of which we are proud, that was authored by a chronic complainer or prophet of despair. We are doers. We have a responsibility, as others have had in theirs, not to be prisoners of history, but to shape history; a responsibility to fill the role of pathfinder, and to build with others a global network of

purpose and law that will protect our citizens, defend our interests, preserve our values, and bequeath to future generations a legacy as proud as the one we honor today.

To that mission, I pledge my own best efforts and summon yours. Thank you very, very much.

125TH ANNIVERSARY OF ENTERPRISE STEAMER COMPANY'S SERVICE TO THE VILLAGE OF WALDEN AND WALDEN FIRE DISTRICT

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1997

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the Enterprise Steamer Company's 125th anniversary of devoted service to the village of Walden and the Walden fire district. A parade will be held on June 14th in honor of the Enterprise Steamer Company's dedication to the village.

On June 11, 1872, the Walden Village trustees purchased the button steam fire engine. Shortly thereafter, the late Thomas W. Bradley used it to organize the Enterprise Steamer Company No. 2. This vehicle is a vital part of home town parades in the village of Walden, as it has been for 125 years.

Like the button steamer, there are also several members of the company who have been instrumental in its affairs. Former Chief Richard Tenney has been active in the company for 68 years and is currently its oldest living member; consequently, Mr. Tenney is one of the few who saw the button steamer in operation. Other long time members include another previous chief, Robert Goldsmith, who has served for 44 years, Lawrence Shaffer, who has worked for 53 years, and the current president of the Enterprise Steamer Company, Michael Pangia. Mr. Pangia, who has been the company's president for 12 years, is a former chief, assistant chief, and deputy chief, and thus has 44 years of active service. The present chief of the Enterprise Steamer Company is Howard R. Edwards, who is the youngest chief ever to serve for any Walden Fire Company.

In order to celebrate its 125th anniversary of assistance to the Walden fire district, the Enterprise Steamer Company has refurbished its original ticker tape. In addition, the original button steamer has been refurbished, and will be drawn by a team of Clydesdale horses in the anniversary parade, akin to the method in which it was used in the late 1800's. The truck used by the company at present time is a 1972 maxim pumper. Refurbished in 1985, the truck has served the company for 26 years and will also be a part of the anniversary parade.

At the 100th anniversary of the Enterprise Steamer Company, President Johnson attended the festivities. The Enterprise Steamer Company is the only company in Walden to be honored with the presence of an American President. This year, I will be attending this momentous occasion in order to pay tribute to a company which has long benefitted the people of the village of Walden. The Enterprise Steamer Company has provided an invaluable service to the community. The parade held in its honor is a tribute to all those citizens who have performed a great service to all.

HONORING JERUSALEM AS ISRAEL'S UNDIVIDED CAPITAL

HON. MICHAEL P. FORBES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1997

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution calling upon the Clinton administration to publicly reaffirm as United States policy that Jerusalem remain the undivided capital of Israel and congratulate the residents of Jerusalem and all of Israel on the 30th anniversary of the city's reunification. Two years ago, Congress overwhelmingly passed the Jerusalem Embassy Relocation Act of 1995. This historical legislation marked the first time that United States policy recognized Jerusalem as the undivided capital of Israel, and that the United States Embassy be established in the city no later than May 1999. Today, I rise to commend the House on its most recent vote on this issue. Yesterday, by an overwhelming majority, the House passed House Concurrent Resolution 60 expressing the sense of Congress that Jerusalem is the undivided capital of Israel and urging the Clinton administration to publicly affirm it. I wholeheartedly embrace this resolution.

It is imperative that the United States Government adopt a strong public policy affirming that an undivided Jerusalem must remain the capital of Israel, in support of the only democratically elected government, and America's strongest ally in the Middle East. There are good political reasons why the administration should adopt this congressional mandate as U.S. policy. More importantly, there are significant religious, historical, and moral reasons why Jerusalem must remain the undivided capital of Israel.

Jerusalem is the center of Jewish identity and worship and has been since King David made it his capital 3,000 years ago. Throughout that history, the Jewish people have been faithful stewards of the city of Jerusalem, keeping it safe and open to people of all faiths. So deep is the connection to Jerusalem that almost every piece of Jewish literature—from ancient prayers to modern stories—speaks to Jerusalem's religious and cultural significance.

Only once in its history has Jerusalem been divided—from 1948 to 1967. Barb wire and mine fields split the city, Jews were forbidden access to the sacred holy sites of Judaism, synagogues were demolished, and gravestones were torn up. Today, all Christians, Muslims, and Jews are allowed unrestricted access to their holy sites and the Israeli Government remains committed to preserving the peaceful coexistence between the diverse religious faiths which live side by side in the city.

Jerusalem has been Israel's capital since the rebirth of the state. Even with the city divided, Jerusalem was dedicated as the capital in 1948. For more than four decades, the offices of Israel's President and Prime Minister, the Knesset, and most government ministries have been located in Jerusalem.

We cannot ignore the challenge that has been placed before us if we are to see Israel survive as a free and flourishing state. We must back up our good intentions with action. Congress must ensure that adequate funds are made available to facilitate the eventual

move of the United States Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. This will send a message to our allies and foes alike that the United States will not stand for a divided Jerusalem and a war-torn Israel. I urge my colleagues to support Jerusalem's rightful place in the world as the capital of Israel.

STATEMENTS BY LUC FILLION AND EVAN PAUL, CANAAN HIGH SCHOOL, REGARDING INDUSTRIAL HEMP

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1997

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues I would like to have printed in the RECORD this statement by high school students from Canaan High School in Vermont, who were speaking at my recent town meeting on issues facing young people.

Mr. FILLION. Congressman Sanders, fellow students, we are here today to voice our opinion on the legalization of industrial hemp. Industrial hemp is not a drug, it is not marijuana; it is a relative of the marijuana plant, but contains virtually no delta-9 tetrahydrocannabinol, or THC, the mind-altering drug found in marijuana. This means that industrial hemp cannot get anyone high, even the most stubborn pot smoker.

There are innumerable benefits to be gained from the cultivation of industrial hemp. If only 6% of the contiguous United States were used to grow hemp, it could supply to us all of the electricity, heat, and all the fuel we need for our cars. Hemp could also be used to make stronger and more moisture-resistant paper which would stop paper from shrinking, curling or deteriorating as easily. An acre of hemp can produce four times as much paper as an acre of trees, saving this country's diminishing forests and the rainforest.

Vermont definitely could benefit from industrial hemp's legalization. If Vermont's agricultural and dairy farmers would turn to industrial hemp as their main asset, the farmers could quadruple their agricultural income.

These are just a few of the ways that industrial hemp can be utilized. We would like to know why we are striving if this invaluable resource can help us so tremendously with our problems today?

Mr. PAUL. Hemp can be used to improve so many of the products that we use today. It can be used in ropes and sails for ships; stronger papers and materials ranging in quality from burlap to silk; and healthier, less fatty foods, especially meat substitutes and birdseed.

Hemp can be used for fuel with a 95% efficiency conversion, and unlike fossil fuels (petroleum) or nuclear power, it is a renewable and replenishable resource, and it is extremely easy to grow in nearly all climates, including Vermont's.

Hemp fiber needs little more than nitrogen to grow. Even here in Vermont hemp and other cannabis plants grow wild in ditches and forests. In fact, Australia survived two 19th century famines on the seeds and leaves of industrial hemp alone.

Mr. FILLION. Many officials believe that legalizing hemp would lead to the legalization of marijuana and eventually even harder drugs such as cocaine and heroin. There is no basis whatever for these assumptions. Industrial hemp, as we have stated, is not a drug,