

the state of Michigan, to all those who gave so generously in this time of need. I would include in this category, not only Chrysler Corp., Northwest Airlines, the American Red Cross, and Shoney's, but also Eunice Miles of my Southfield office, and Steve Hessler, my deputy press secretary. Both provided quick response and extra time and effort during a critical time.

I yield the floor.

NORTH KOREAN FAMINE—A HUMAN TRAGEDY AND A THREAT TO PEACE

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise to address a great human tragedy silently unfolding in North Korea and the urgent need for the United States to respond.

The North is experiencing a severe famine and has asked the world for help. Pyongyang has gratefully acknowledged our past assistance. It is in our interest to respond generously to their plight.

ON THE BRINK OF STARVATION

According to experts from the World Food Program [WFP] who recently returned from extensive travels in North Korea, tens of thousands of people are on the brink of starvation. Hundreds of thousands more are suffering from severe malnutrition, the result of several years of scarcity.

The public food distribution system on which 78 percent of the North's population depends has effectively ceased to function in most parts of the country. In those few rural areas where the public distribution system still is operating, rations have fallen to below 100 grams per day, the equivalent of a small handful of rice or corn for each person.

The evidence of famine is pervasive and undeniable. Children are among the hardest hit, their hair tinged red from malnutrition, their growth stunted, their eyes sunken and listless.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from this week's copy of Newsweek magazine, which includes a photograph of starving North Korean children into the RECORD. I'd like to note for the record that a photograph of a Andrew Cunanan graced the cover, while the poignant photo of four starving North Korean kindergarten students was on page 46.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsweek Magazine, July 28, 1997]

JUST SKIN AND BONES

(By Tom Masland and Jeffrey Bartholet)

It's a slow-motion catastrophe, largely hidden from outsiders. But the latest visitors to North Korea confirm the world's worst fears. A nation of 23 million people is starving, slowly and painfully. "Mere survival is becoming more and more difficult," wrote one man to his mother in Japan. "There are people dying." Travelers describe scenes that once were unthinkable in this police state: beggars in the streets of Pyongyang,

masked, armed robbers raiding private homes for food, trees totally stripped of leaves and edible bark. Perhaps most persuasive of all are the first photographs to document the deepening tragedy. The one on this page was taken in an orphanage by an official visitor from a Roman Catholic charity. The blank stares of the spindly infants cry out: time is short.

In response to the crisis, Washington last week doubled its previous donation of food aid to the north. The promised 100,000 tons of grain represents slightly more than half the \$45.6 million requested by the World Food Program earlier this month in direct response to the plight of North Korea's children. Executive director Catherine Bertini says the WFP needs enriched baby food for children who are too malnourished to digest the customary relief meal, a handful of ground corn. Bertini reports that the program's staff members in North Korea "estimate that 50 to 80 percent of the children they have seen in nurseries are underweight and markedly smaller than they should be for their age. They are literally wasting away."

Playing politics: The emergency food aid will help, but it's not a lasting answer to North Korea's creeping famine. The crisis is bound up with politics: North Koreans are going hungry because their Stalinist economy is collapsing, and the United States, Tokyo and Seoul are using food aid to lure Pyongyang into four-way peace talks and economic reform. Yet North Korean leader Kim Jong Il and his cronies are wary of any compromise that could loosen their grip on power. They're prepared to do whatever they feel is necessary to survive—and they're wildly unpredictable.

Managing North Korea's collapse has become a top priority of the Clinton administration. The United States has 37,000 troops based in South Korea to help deter Pyongyang. Yet as North Korea deteriorates, fears mount that its leaders will "use it before they lose it." The endgame is no longer a matter of if, but when. As a Rand Corporation study concluded last year, "The Korean Peninsula presents a strange paradox. Nobody knows what might happen this year or next, but everyone agrees on how things will look in 10 or 20 years. The North Korean regime is doomed in the long run."

In part to obtain famine relief, Pyongyang last month finally agreed to attend peace talks in New York aimed at ending the formal state of war that still applies on the peninsula. And last week North Korea promised to lift a ban that has prevented Japanese wives of North Koreans from visiting their homeland for more than three decades. Japan, which has vast stocks of surplus rice, now is considering providing additional food aid. But anyone who thought Pyongyang was turning soft got a rude reminder last week. A squad of North Korean troops briefly crossed the demilitarized zone and provoked the heaviest exchange of fire with South Korean troops in two decades.

Why increase tensions along the most heavily armed border in the world? Pyongyang may believe that by instigating a fire fight along the border it reinforces the message that North Korea is dangerously unstable—springing loose more food aid from Washington, Japan and others. Some analysts also think that there's a power struggle underway within the regime between hardliners in the military and moderates in the civilian bureaucracy. According to this view, every time the moderates move to open relations with the outside world, hard-liners resist. Last September the incursion of a North Korean submarine on the South Korean coast led to a manhunt in which 24 North Koreans and 13 South Koreans were

killed—just as Pyongyang was trying to persuade foreign businesses to invest in a new free-trade zone. This time, hard-liners may have wanted to pre-empt the Aug. 5 peace talks.

Once sanguine about a "soft landing" in Korea—in which Pyongyang embraces economic reforms and gradual, peaceful reunification—U.S. intelligence analysts now predict a crash. In one scenario, reformers topple Kim in a palace coup and call for help from Seoul or Beijing—creating yet another delicate, hard-to-manage issue between Beijing and Washington. Or perhaps North Korea attempts to seize Seoul, hoping to achieve reunification on its own terms. One former Pentagon analyst warns of a human-wave assault down high ridges and hills where tanks can't operate. This would likely come during the summer, when chemical weapons work most effectively and haze hinders air operations. The argument against such a disaster: China, North Korea's neighbor and longtime socialist ally, can be expected to use all its influence to deter such an attack.

Could famine bring on the collapse of the Pyongyang regime? Conceivably, if North Koreans come to fear starvation more than they do the government. But so far discipline remains strong. U.S. Rep. Tony Hall, who visited the North in April, recalls visiting a maternity clinic where mothers were dying and 6-month-old infants looked like newborns. "If you asked what they planned to do, people answered, 'The Dear Leader will take care of us. He always does.'" Hall said. Whoever eventually rules a united Korean peninsula could pay the price for years. "This is one of the few countries I know where the kids are growing up to be smaller than their parents," says Hall. Some call it "generational stunting." "If [children] are malnourished in these critical years, they can't make it up," says one U.N. official. For North Korea's hungry kids, the endgame is now.

INADEQUATE U.S. RESPONSE

Mr. BIDEN. The United States has a long tradition of responding generously to people in need. By sharing our bounty we have saved millions in Sudan, Ethiopia, Somalia, and Angola.

To date, however, our response to North Korea's famine has been cautious and inadequate.

Over the past 12 months, the United States has provided a total of about \$60 million in food aid, including the recent announcement of \$27.4 million for 100,000 metric tons of grain.

The world, following our restrained lead, has been slow to meet the genuine emergency needs of the North Korean people. According to the World Food Program, the North began 1997 roughly 2 million tons of grain short of what it would need to avoid famine. But as of July 1, the North had received a total of only about 423,000 tons of food aid. It had managed to purchase or barter another 330,000 tons, leaving a shortfall of more than 1 million tons for the remainder of the calendar year.

The United States has never linked politics with emergency food assistance, and we should not do so now.

We can do more.

And we should do more to avert mass starvation and the incumbent risk of political and military instability of the Korean peninsula.

ROOTS OF FAMINE

Why is the North experiencing a famine? North Korean authorities attribute the shortages to a string of bad weather, including serious flooding in 1995 and 1996. Truth be told, however, the famine is largely the result of wrong-headed, discredited Communist economic policies and the devotion of vast resources to the North Korean armed forces.

But this does not make the North Korean people less deserving of emergency relief. It is not ethically permissible to use starvation as a weapon to force the North Korean dictatorship to undertake essential economic reforms.

Some observers worry that the North might divert our food aid from those who are truly hungry to the military or party elite.

But international relief agencies are able to send their monitors throughout the famine-stricken areas where supplies are being delivered. The World Food Program has even chartered a helicopter to facilitate oversight.

United States private voluntary organizations will soon begin directly supervising the distribution of American assistance, opening another window into life inside the hermit kingdom.

The bottom line? We can have a high degree of confidence that the vast majority of any assistance we provide will reach the intended targets.

WHY NOT STARVE THEM OUT?

Opponents of emergency famine relief for North Korea wonder aloud whether the famine might not be a blessing in disguise; the perfect mechanism to bring about the downfall of one of the most repressive regimes left on the planet. But this cynical view is not only immoral, it displays a total disregard for the potentially explosive results of such a policy of strangulation.

Famines are profoundly destabilizing events. No one can predict with confidence how North Korea might respond. But it is obvious to me that we do not want the North—which may possess one or two nuclear weapons—to experience panic, massive population migrations, and instability.

In testimony earlier this month before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Andrew Natsios, director of foreign disaster assistance during the Bush administration and now vice-president of World Vision, a nongovernmental relief organization operating in North Korea, warned that the North's famine could soon reach the irreversible stage.

He added that by the time the world sees CNN broadcasts or emaciated North Korean children too weak to lift themselves off their cots, it will be too late to save them.

FOOD FOR PEACE

Next Tuesday, August 5, representatives of North Korea, South Korea, China, and the United States are scheduled to convene talks aimed at replacing the tattered 1953 Armistice with a peace treaty. If history is any guide, these historic negotiations are likely to be both difficult and protracted.

But while the diplomats talk and the world waits and prays for peace, famished innocent North Koreans move closer to death.

It is time for the United States to lead a comprehensive, humane response to the North's famine.

Not because the North has agreed to peace talks;

Not because the North has frozen its nuclear program and accepted international atomic energy agency monitoring of its Yongbyon nuclear facility; and

Not because the North is cooperating for the first time in 50 years in the search for the remains of America's 8,000 missing servicemen from the Korean war.

We should respond because it is the smart thing to do. It is the noble thing to do. It is an expression of all that is best about America that cannot help but resonate in the hearts of the North Korean people.

NATO ENLARGEMENT AFTER MADRID

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, earlier this month in Madrid the North Atlantic Treaty Organization held a momentous summit meeting, which brought together the heads of state and government of its 16-member countries to discuss the future of the Alliance in the 21st century.

Mr. President, I was privileged to be a member of a bipartisan, bicameral Congressional delegation to the summit meeting. Today, I would like to discuss the results of Madrid and their important implications for American foreign policy.

At Madrid, NATO took the historic step of inviting Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary to begin accession talks with the alliance.

The alliance now has several pressing priorities as a followup to the summit.

As its first priority, NATO must complete these accession talks this fall with the three prospective new members. Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary have all met the basic alliance membership requirements—democracy, civilian control of the military, the rule of law, no conflicts with neighbors, and the willingness and ability to assume alliance responsibilities.

NATO and the candidates must now assess the military capabilities of each of the three in detail, and must plainly state each country's responsibilities and tasks within the alliance.

Of particular importance is that the issues of cost of enlargement must be forthrightly addressed, both by the three prospective members and by all the current members of the alliance.

The goal is to successfully conclude the talks with Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary in time for the Protocol of Accession to be signed at the NATO ministerial meeting in December of this year. The next step is for each of the 16 current NATO members to begin the process of ratification

of amending the Washington treaty. Of course, Mr. President, according to our constitution, it is the U.S. Senate that is responsible for advice and consent to treaties, and we anticipate that we will consider the NATO enlargement treaty amendment next spring.

NATO's second major priority after Madrid is developing a strengthened cooperative relationship with those countries that were not invited to be in the first group of new members. At Madrid, NATO re-emphasized an "Open Door" policy by which the first group of invited countries will not be the last. Additional candidacies will be considered, beginning with the next NATO summit, to be held here in Washington in April 1999 on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the alliance.

In an important gesture, the Madrid summit communique singled out for special mention the positive developments toward democracy and the rule of law in Slovenia and Romania. As many of my colleagues will remember, I was a strong advocate of Slovenia's being included in the first group of new members.

I anticipate that both Slovenia and Romania, and perhaps other countries, will be invited to accession talks with NATO in 1999.

In addition, in a thinly veiled bow to Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, the Madrid summit communique reiterated conditions set forth in NATO's 1995 study whereby no European democratic country will be excluded from consideration for membership because of its geographic location.

Translated into real English that means that NATO will not allow Moscow to give the three Baltic states a double whammy.

In other words, the Soviet Union's illegal, forcible incorporation of the Baltic states in 1940—which, I am proud to say, was never recognized by the United States—will not be used as a pretext to veto their consideration for NATO membership.

Mr. President, Ukraine, with an area and population the size of France, is arguably the most strategically important country in East-Central Europe. At Madrid, NATO and Ukraine signed a Charter on a Distinctive Partnership. Ukraine is currently not seeking NATO membership, but under President Kuchma (KOOCH-ma) it has undertaken democratic and free-market reforms in an attempt to move closer to the West. This charter should reinforce this trend.

In order to keep the enlargement momentum going in the countries not yet ready for membership, a new Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council was inaugurated at Madrid. This body will direct an enhanced Partnership for Peace Program—a program involving more than two dozen countries, which, incidentally, has already far exceeded our most optimistic expectations.

Of vital importance to the new security architecture in Europe is NATO's