

1-1-1989

# Foreign Policy Statements of Vice President George Bush and Governor Michael Dukakis

Geroge Bush

Michael Dukakis

---

## Recommended Citation

Geroge Bush and Michael Dukakis, *Foreign Policy Statements of Vice President George Bush and Governor Michael Dukakis*, 11 Loy. L.A. Int'l & Comp. L. Rev. 1 (1989).

Available at: <http://digitalcommons.lmu.edu/ilr/vol11/iss1/1>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Law Reviews at Digital Commons @ Loyola Marymount University and Loyola Law School. It has been accepted for inclusion in Loyola of Los Angeles International and Comparative Law Review by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Loyola Marymount University and Loyola Law School. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@lmu.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@lmu.edu).

# LOYOLA OF LOS ANGELES INTERNATIONAL AND COMPARATIVE LAW JOURNAL

VOLUME 11


1989

NUMBER 1

## Foreign Policy Statements of Vice President George Bush and Governor Michael Dukakis

The Loyola of Los Angeles International and Comparative Law Journal in its continuing commitment to enlighten and educate the international legal community has asked the Republican and Democratic Presidential Nominees to provide written statements outlining their foreign policy objectives.

The following foreign policy statements provided by Vice President George Bush and Governor Michael Dukakis are printed unedited and in their entirety.



Governor Michael Dukakis



Vice President George Bush

## FOREIGN POLICY STATEMENT OF VICE PRESIDENT GEORGE BUSH.

## 1. Arms Control.

The INF treaty President Reagan signed in December was a major step forward in our relations with the Soviet Union. It is not the millennium. But it is something we can build on, and it is a victory of will and determination. The President first proposed the so-called "zero option" six years ago, when the Soviets had a monopoly on these intermediate-range missiles in Europe. They said no to our offer—and so we countered their missiles with our missiles. Then they changed their mind.

Just as important as our strength was our steadiness—our refusal to be stampeded into unwise concessions by our desire for peace. We must continue to maintain that same resolve. While we should be willing to take bold steps for peace, we must not do so under artificial deadlines.

I believe the INF treaty will be looked upon some day as a watershed agreement—the first to actually reduce—not just limit, but reduce—the number of nuclear weapons in the world; one that achieves a balance through asymmetrical reductions—1600 of their warheads to 400 of ours; one that breaks new ground on verification and puts us on a new track toward a more stable and enduring deterrence. I hope the Senate gives the treaty its full support, and I am confident it will.

What is significant is not just that we are eliminating a small percentage of our nuclear arsenal, but that we are reversing the patterns of the past—away from more and more weapons and toward greater stability and safety.

The verification requirements are a major achievement in themselves. The Soviets have agreed to a new level of openness we have sought for many years. Our scientists will now be allowed to visit Soviet weapons plants that were completely shut off to the West. Soviet inspectors will have equivalent access to our installations.

These on-site, on-demand inspection procedures are major steps forward—ones that will reveal far more about the Soviets than simply whether they are willing to abide by the terms of the treaty. They will, in my view, demonstrate just how far the Soviets are willing to go in seeking a new kind of relationship with us, and they may be the beginning of a whole new chapter in East-West relations.

But we must be realistic. From my days at the UN and the CIA to the White House, I have observed that the Soviets test every Presi-

dent and push every agreement to its limits and beyond. We must be vigilant, and we must be tough, and we must stand up for the values that define us as a nation.

We have taken the first step toward a more stable nuclear balance. What is the next step, and how will it move us toward our destination?

We have proposed to the Soviets that we cut in half the number of weapons in our strategic forces—with a particular eye on the Soviets' destabilizing, multiple-warhead, land-based missiles.

At the end of the summit, we issued a detailed joint statement that built on the INF breakthrough and instructed our negotiators to push for similar progress on the START treaty. Success in these talks would bring a measurably safer world.

Such substantial reductions in our nuclear arsenals would move us away from a deterrence strategy of Mutual Assured Destruction, toward a more stable balance based on fewer missiles and the development of a strategic shield.

The Soviets have been working on strategic defenses, including SDI-type technologies, much longer and harder than we have—indeed, well before my time at the CIA in the mid-1970s.

They don't like the fact that the United States has an SDI research program of its own. They want a monopoly on strategic defense, and they have made a major effort to achieve that at the bargaining table. But they will not succeed. I strongly support this research—because SDI, when perfected, will put weapons at risk instead of people, and because it would reduce the threat of accidental attack turning into massive tragedy. It would be wrong—even immoral—to turn our backs on technology that could reduce the risk of annihilation.

The INF treaty and a START treaty will give us a way to measure Soviet intentions more concretely, and to reduce our forces, step by cautious step, without compromising our security. That's why the verification process is so important. We will be breaking down the Soviets' wall of secrecy and observing whether the reality matches the rhetoric—laying the groundwork for future negotiations.

In the coming months and years, we must seek reductions in the Soviets' substantial advantage in conventional and chemical weapons. The Warsaw Pact has half again as many combat divisions as NATO. It has more than twice as many tanks and artillery pieces. Our commitment to the defense of Western Europe is at the very heart of our

defense strategy, and it is absolutely essential that we maintain a deterrent to aggression. To do so, we must properly equip and modernize our conventional forces, and that will not be cheap.

We must also move toward the verifiable elimination of chemical and biological weapons. On the President's instructions, I put such a proposal on the table in Geneva in 1984, and it would be a top priority of my administration. Our allies and the Soviets both support the elimination of these weapons in principle.

We can start by reducing their numbers to much lower levels. We must develop stringent new verification techniques to prevent cheating—a very difficult assignment, but a critical one. Ultimately, these terrible weapons should be banned from the face of the earth.

Overshadowing this arms control agenda, however, is the inescapable fact that the threat of nuclear attack comes not only from the Soviets. In the 1990s, more and more countries will have the capability of building a nuclear bomb.

Many of us have concluded that such weapons are more likely to be used in a regional conflict or in a terrorist attack than in a standoff between the superpowers. Yet any use poses enormous dangers to us all.

Nuclear proliferation is even tougher to restrain by negotiation than the arms race. But it is our moral obligation to do everything we can to keep nuclear blackmail out of the hands of madmen like Qaddafi or Khomeini.

Our strategy depends on multiple sources of nuclear restraint. Bilaterally, we have a very effective process in place to screen U.S. technology exports for nuclear-related technology. Our participation in multilateral non-proliferation agreements, even with our adversaries, has also been a model of effective restraint. We can exercise through our formal agreements very effective impediments to proliferation.

We should spearhead a new effort to commit every nation to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, and we should push more countries to be open to on-site inspection. We must also strengthen the International Atomic Energy Agency—one U.N. agency that does its work well.

We must promote the perception among populations and leaders of non-nuclear countries that nuclear weapons are simply not useful to them. Their acquisition requires an expensive and difficult cycle of

maintenance and testing and gives them no security benefit commensurate with the costs or dangers.

It is this last negative aspect of proliferation that I think is the most persuasive. That it is well understood accounts, I believe, for most of our success to date in restraining proliferation.

In the years ahead, we will face challenge and change in our dealings with the Soviets. If Gorbachev can transform Soviet society—not just economically, but in terms of human rights as well—we will be waiting for him, at the door of a new century, ready to move from an era of confrontation to one of cooperation.

In the meantime, we must remain ever watchful. We must act with high resolve as well as high hopes—with a strength that is real and that is recognized by the world as real.

As we move ahead, the question remains unanswered: What will prevail—the voices of hostility and fear that counsel us never to bargain, the voices of trust and faith that tell us to deal at any price, or the voices of confidence and hope that call us to seize the opportunity to make the world safer for generations to come?

I promise you, I will be a voice for freedom and for peace.

## 2. U.S./Soviet Relations.

We need to talk to the Soviets. This is a nuclear age, which means it's simply not sane to sit in stony silence at bomb's length from a powerful adversary. The East-West conflict is so dangerous that we owe it to our people to make every effort to resolve practical problems whenever possible, or to seek measures that might reduce the risk of military confrontation. But we must act with a strength that is not only real, but is recognized by the world as real.

## 3. Central America.

Our role in Central America is the same as our role in other parts of the world. This role is to promote peace—but not peace at any price. In the case of Central America, our objective is not a peace that merely stops the shooting and entrenches a Soviet beachhead. Our main objective is the maintenance and establishment of governments committed to freedom and democracy, governments that respect human rights and the sovereignty of their neighbors. A peace that does not accomplish this objective is just another word for surrender.

The specific goals of the United States in Central America are:

- 1) Democratic self-determination.
- 2) Economic and social development.
- 3) Respect for human rights.
- 4) Furtherance of solutions through diplomatic means.
- 5) Cooperation in meeting threats to security and peace.

Many of today's problems in Central America can be traced to the Cuban Missile Crisis. The outcome of the Cuban Missile Crisis was a major blow to the Monroe Doctrine and to stability in Latin America. It led to a *de facto* recognition of the right of the Soviet Union to prevail in Cuban affairs. Consequently, Cuba is now a Soviet island in the Caribbean and a staging ground for Soviet imperialism in our hemisphere. In a personal conversation, General Rafael del Pino, the highest ranking military defector to flee Cuba, confirmed to me the degree to which the Cuban economy is in shambles; there is widespread corruption inside the elite that runs the country, and human rights abuses are frequent. Yet, although Cuba's Marxist revolution has been a total failure at home, Castro and his Soviet allies continue to interfere in the internal affairs of the sovereign Latin American countries and have helped to establish a Communist regime in Nicaragua.

We liberated Grenada from Castro's grip and gave the people of that Caribbean nation the opportunity to restore a viable democratic government. Our task, however, is not complete. We must continue to resist the efforts of the Soviets and Cubans to foment Marxist revolution throughout Central and South America. We must continue our policy of isolating Castro and do everything we can to tell the brave Cuban people about the world as it really is, and not as Castro tells them it is.

#### 4. South Africa.

The Republic of South Africa is by far the richest, most powerful, and most highly developed country in sub-Saharan Africa. It is the most influential country in southern Africa—a superpower in the region. South Africa's location at the tip of Africa has great strategic significance, and South Africa has large reserves of minerals which are vitally important to the West.

But South Africa is a pariah state. The vastly outnumbered Afrikaners, acting out of fear, have constructed the racist system of apartheid to ensure their political and economic supremacy. That

system is morally repugnant to all who believe in human liberty, and we cannot rest until apartheid is eliminated from South Africa.

The United States must balance its strategic interest in a stable, pro-Western South Africa with the equally pressing political and moral imperative to change South Africa's apartheid system. The long-range political interests of the United States will only be served by the elimination of apartheid.

We need to convince all South Africans that the United States seriously desires the end of apartheid. We have taken positive, effective, and tangible steps to achieve this goal. The passage of the 1986 Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act puts in place strong sanctions against South Africa and sets conditions for their removal. Unfortunately, the political and economic effects of the sanctions have been marginal to negative: we believe the South African government has made little progress in dismantling apartheid and black South Africans have been set back economically.

In addition, we work closely with the business community to encourage adherence to the Sullivan principles of fair employment practices. These practical programs which build and strengthen the black South African community politically and economically are the key to a peaceful power-sharing in South Africa.

The 1986 Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act is the law of the land and we have faithfully implemented the law. The debate over sanctions was about means, not ends. But sanctions are not a policy in and of themselves. Under present circumstances, I will not recommend further sanctions. Rather, we must continue to use diplomacy and negotiations for constructive change.

While I believe that United States policy in the past seven years has made progress, fresh initiatives should acknowledge new realities and focus clearly on the central issue of political change in South Africa. We should encourage the development of strong, democratic black political institutions to aid in the peaceful transition to majority rule. American trade unions, religious groups, and other groups should work with their South African counterparts to help develop such democratic institutions.

## 5. World Hunger.

I strongly agree on the need to do all we can to alleviate hunger around the world. We must dedicate ourselves to addressing this pressing problem.



Over the long term, the best means of overcoming hunger is to allow farmers to produce by encouraging poor countries to rely on the enterprise of their own people. For example, in a 1985 speech given in Niger during that country's famine, I emphasized, "... how important it is to trust the farmer and the herdsman; trust their aspirations; trust their resourcefulness; trust them in the open and free market."

To help alleviate world hunger in the short term, the United States continues to rely on traditional methods like food and medical aid (some \$46 million worth in that particular famine) and the Peace Corps. But already, greater reliance on free markets within China has boosted its food production; India now exports grain. I have also supported private sector development organizations such as Africare, which trains African farmers in modern techniques and provides them with credit.

The Grameen Bank in Bangladesh represents an encouraging development in this direction, and I am very interested in and supportive of the concept. I will carefully examine proposals for similar programs.

## 6. The Middle East.

My experiences in dealing with the various Middle East nations for the past 20 years have reaffirmed my conviction that the seemingly intractable problems that have rocked the region can be resolved—and that the United States has a vital role in bringing about a resolution. The people of the Middle East want peace. Our role must be to help the nations of the Middle East recognize areas of common interest and potential agreement. Under no condition should the United States attempt to impose the terms and conditions of a settlement upon the nations but should continue to function as an honest broker, facilitating negotiations between the nations.

The security and freedom of Israel are fundamental to both American strength and Middle East stability for all our conceivable tomorrows. Of equal importance is our moral obligation to the people of Israel. This does not mean we must adopt all of Israel's positions with respect to her ongoing debate with the Arab world. It does mean, simply put, that Israel must be able to count on American political and economic support and military assistance.

Our special relationship with Israel remains strong and steadfast. Israel remains the bulwark of democracy in the Middle East, a faith-

ful ally, economic partner, and a light of hope for millions. We will never abandon her people.

*George Bush*

## FOREIGN POLICY STATEMENT OF GOVERNOR MICHAEL DUKAKIS.

## 1. Seizing the Opportunity on Arms Control.

We have today the best opportunity in our lifetime to achieve meaningful arms control and to reduce the risk of nuclear war: to get our children thinking again about what they'll do **when** they grow up, not if they'll grow up.

We should begin with an agreement for the elimination of medium and short range missiles in Europe—the zero-zero option; and we should move beyond this agreement by negotiating a mutual and balanced reduction in conventional forces.

But an agreement in Europe is only a first step; it will do little, on its own terms, to reduce the threat of nuclear war. As President, I will:

- \* work to achieve a comprehensive strategic arms agreement with the Soviet Union that will result in deep reductions in the number of all nuclear arms;
- \* support a comprehensive test ban treaty;
- \* maintain compliance with the SALT II and ABM Treaties, as long as the Soviet Union does the same;
- \* seek to limit the testing and deployment of anti-satellite weapons; and
- \* place a very high priority on efforts to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to other countries.

In negotiating with the Soviet Union, we must recognize that we have a shared interest in maintaining a balance between our nuclear capabilities; in doing all we can to discourage either side from being tempted to launch a first nuclear strike; and in restraining any developments in the nuclear field, including the so-called "Star Wars" program, that would inject new uncertainties into the relationship between our two countries.

The nuclear dilemma is central to our life on this planet. The power and complexity of nuclear weapons can create a sense that we have become the prisoners of our own technology, a race of Doctor Frankensteins helpless to rein in the product of our own best intentions and finest technical expertise.

But our country has never failed to respond to a genuine threat to its security; and we face such a threat now—to our very survival—not only from the weapons of our adversaries, but also from the arms we have built ourselves.

We should challenge the leaders of the Soviet Union, and we should challenge ourselves, to seize the opportunity; to reduce the risk of nuclear war through agreements that are mutual and verifiable and that will make real progress towards peace.

## 2. Revitalizing International Trade.

The trade deficit is one of the three or four most significant economic and foreign policy challenges our nation confronts today. Last year, America's trade deficit was a record \$170 billion, up from a record \$148 billion in 1985. America's share of the world market is shrinking; farm exports have declined by 37% in six years; and more than a million manufacturing and a million agricultural jobs have been lost.

It should be no surprise that there is pressure in the United States for new tariffs and quotas, and that there is a search for a quick and simple solution to the trade problem. And the fact is that the plea for a level playing field on which to compete economically is a just plea.

But such barriers should be the exception, not the rule. Unfair trading practices are only a partial cause of our overall trade deficit; many of our products are already sheltered from foreign competition; and a trade war—like any war—will yield only victims, not victors. **In fact, if every barrier to American goods abroad disappeared tomorrow, we would still have a trade deficit of \$125 billion.**

So the central question we must address has to do not with the labels traditionally used in debating the trade issue, but instead with goals.

What are we trying to achieve?

Where are the elements of a strategy for national economic growth?

How do we create opportunity and a high standard of living for all our people in an increasingly global economy?

**As President, I will be committed to policies that will produce more trade, not less trade.**

**And I will begin by developing and implementing a national strategy for economic growth designed to create opportunity for every citizen in every part of this land. I will work with Congressional leaders from both parties to reduce the single greatest cause of the U.S. trade imbalance, the \$150-\$200 billion budget deficit; and I will establish budget priorities that will allow us to:**

- \* **invest** in good teachers and good schools so that our children will enter the twenty-first century with twenty-first century skills;
- \* **invest** in training and re-training our workers so that they can keep pace with economic change and find well-paying and satisfying jobs;
- \* **invest** in the highways, roads, bridges, water and mass transit systems that are the building blocks of our economic future;
- \* **invest** in the technology of the future, and in the application of that technology not only to new industries, but to our older, more mature industries, so that American products will find new markets and the number of jobs created by exports will grow; and
- \* **invest** in regional development programs aimed at helping those parts of the country—31 states in all—that have been in recession for all or part of the past seven years.

There are those who say that America must de-industrialize. I disagree. Our national security cannot become hostage to raw materials purchased abroad, processed abroad, and transported to America from manufacturing enterprises abroad.

We need our basic industries. We need a stable and abundant supply of food. And there is no reason why we can't have both—if we're prepared to work at it.

As President I will:

- \* **seek** to end unfair trade practices that subsidize foreign goods and close markets to U.S. products;
- \* **support** temporary relief from foreign imports for particular American industries, if those industries are committed to investing and modernizing and becoming more efficient;
- \* **work** with foreign statesmen and international financial leaders to develop a creative and flexible response to the international debt crisis that threatens the stability of democratic governments in Asia and Latin America and that has contributed heavily to our deficit in trade; and
- \* **help** small businesses enter the export market. More than 18,000 U.S. companies **could** enter that market, but have not done so.

In response to our trade deficit, the core question, not just this month or this year but for decades to come, is whether the United States has the will to reverse its competitive decline and to expand into the world market, not just with services or fast food franchises, but with products conceived and designed by Americans, built in

American factories, on American soil, by American hands, with old-fashioned American quality and durability.

Can we do it? Of course, we can.

We are a great trading nation. We are the descendants of frontiersmen and pioneers. We should not be afraid to look beyond our borders. We should not be afraid to compete. And in the long run, we will solve our trade problem not by putting an end to competition, but by becoming better and stronger competitors ourselves.

### 3. A New Partnership for the Americas.

Not long ago, most Latin American countries were governed by military dictators.

But today, democratic elections have given the region its best group of leaders in at least a quarter century. And if we listen to those leaders, we will understand that the greatest danger we face in this hemisphere is not Nicaragua or Cuba; it is the suppression of the desire of those in Latin America who are poor, jobless, landless or malnourished to lead a better life.

The next President will have the opportunity—and the responsibility—to **build a strong and durable partnership with a new generation of democratic leaders in Latin America.**

A partnership that will recall the spirit of FDR's Good Neighbor policy and build on the best elements of JFK's Alliance for Progress.

A partnership:

- \* to restore economic development and economic opportunity;
- \* to ensure peace and security;
- \* to promote democracy and human rights.

Today, Latin America is in the middle of its worst economic crisis since World War II. And economic weakness leads to weakness elsewhere: by undermining the democratic promise; by sowing the seeds of radical revolution; by strengthening the appeal of profits from trafficking in drugs; and by driving tens of thousands northward each year in search of opportunity.

We have much to gain by helping Latin America to get back on its feet. Beginning with Mexico, our most important Latin neighbor, where recession has cost 200,000 U.S. jobs.

The Latin American debt crisis, as a whole, has caused a forty percent decline in our exports to the region. That means \$14 billion less in sales of American agricultural and manufactured goods each

year; thousands of lost jobs for American workers and millions of dollars in lost income for American farmers.

The next President must sit down with the leaders of Latin America, with the international banks, with commercial lenders, and with private voluntary organizations to:

- \* increase capital for multilateral lending institutions, not just from the United States, but from Canada and Japan and Europe;
- \* see that the burden of debt relief is shared fairly by borrowers and lenders;
- \* ensure that debt service payments will not drain Latin American countries of the resources necessary to allow investment and growth;
- \* seek increased trade by bringing down tariff and non-tariff barriers—between North and South America, between our hemisphere and Asia and Europe and Africa; and
- \* see that foreign aid dollars are directed to where they will do the most good.

If Latin American democracies are to grow, they must have access to foreign capital, they must have easier access to foreign markets, and they must be challenged to create opportunity not just for some, but for all their people.

**But no program of economic development will succeed in an atmosphere of civil or regional violence.** And today, violence is disrupting the economic life of much of Central America.

As the Americas' strongest and most powerful nation, it is our responsibility to respond firmly and forcefully to any serious military threat from the Soviet Union.

But regional peace and security are not solely a U.S. concern; and they are not solely a U.S. responsibility.

That is why forty years ago we helped write the Rio Treaty and the Charter of the Organization of American States. Those treaties provide a solid foundation for regional security. Under our Constitution, those treaties are the law of our land. **And those treaties explicitly prohibit what we are now doing in Nicaragua.**

U.S. aid to the contras must end. For contra aid is not a lever that will foster democratic change in Nicaragua; it is, instead, a wedge separating the United States from our democratic neighbors.

That's why our neighbors have been trying to get us to pay attention to the Contadora process for the past five years and start the talking in Central America.

The United States should enthusiastically support this agree-

ment, for its goals are our goals; a cease-fire, an end to outside intervention, a halt to militarization, progress towards democracy and respect for human rights.

**This agreement is only a framework for peace; it is not peace, itself. But it is a serious document that makes demands and imposes obligations that can and must be met—by Nicaragua, by guerrilla groups, by outside powers and by every government in the region. And we should seize the opportunity to help translate this plan's promise into the reality of peace and security for Central America.**

Our nation has a responsibility to help everyone in this hemisphere realize the dream of freedom.

We should use our aid dollars to help civilian leaders, especially in Central America, to establish control over their military, to build strong democratic institutions and to translate the democratic promise into a better life for their people.

We should expand our scholarship program for Latin American students; we should expand Peace Corps involvement in the region; and we should initiate a Pan-American exchange program—a two-way exchange of students and teachers and tradesmen and professionals and farmers and just plain citizens—to build a partnership among the Americas that will go deeper and grow stronger than ties based simply on government to government relations.

**And we should restore America's leadership in the struggle to increase respect throughout the world for basic human rights.**

We cannot impose respect for human rights, but we can place strict conditions on our military and economic aid; we can support the Inter-American Commission and the Inter-American Court on Human Rights; and the International Court of Justice; we can encourage and protect human rights monitors; we can speak up for the silenced; we can insist on liberty for the unjustly imprisoned; and we can demand—even during civil conflict—that international humanitarian standards be observed.

Our nation is strongest when we meet the standards we set for others—not when we mine harbors, teach political assassination, or break the laws of our country to conduct a secret war.

We need leadership in the White House that understands that. Leadership that understands what Mexican writer Carlos Fuentes meant when he said that “the great weakness of the Soviet Union is that they are surrounded by satellites, and not by friends.”

Our friendship with the people of Latin America can be one of



our greatest strengths. If we work together. If we respect each other. If we respect the law. If we work together to produce the kind of sustained economic growth that will create opportunity for all the people of this hemisphere.

#### 4. Toward Peace and Justice in South Africa.

Apartheid is wrong. In the context of the late 20th Century, it is the equivalent of slavery. Yet the South African government's token "reforms" have left the apartheid system firmly entrenched, as it continues to deny the vast majority of its citizens the most fundamental political, economic and human rights.

South Africa also persists in its determined efforts to destabilize the governments and economies of many of its African neighbors. Despite international condemnation, it continues its illegal occupation of Namibia, defying world calls for free democratic elections to determine the future of that state.

To Namibia's north, the United States remains the only member of the United Nations—except for South Africa—not to recognize the Angolan government, while Angolan rebels, supported by the U.S. and South Africa, threaten American-owned oil refineries guarded by Cuban soldiers! And while the Reagan Administration insists that the Cubans leave Angola as a condition of South Africa leaving Namibia, our military aid to the UNITA rebels in Angola only prolongs the Cuban presence and the Namibian stalemate.

Throughout my public life, I've opposed apartheid and supported the cause of human rights and self-determination in Southern Africa. I'm proud that Massachusetts was one of the very first states in the nation to terminate its pension fund investments in South Africa.

I believe America can play a meaningful role in promoting the cause of peace and human rights in Southern Africa. But we must make our opposition to apartheid crystal clear. And we must take firm measures to demonstrate the depth of our concerns for the future of the entire region.

As President, I will:

- \* Promote democracy and human rights in South Africa by strongly asserting U.S. support for rapid and peaceful change, and by using tougher economic and diplomatic pressure in support of such change. We must stop sending mixed signals to the South African government

and the oppressed majority, and start affirming—by word and deed—our total disapproval of the continuation of apartheid in that country.

\* Encourage the development of non-racial leadership committed to a peaceful transition to political and social equality in South Africa. Leaders like Archbishop Tutu and Allan Boesak deserve our support in their struggle for human rights for people of all races in South Africa.

\* Toughen U.S. economic sanctions against South Africa and seek multilateral agreement with our allies for a more comprehensive trade embargo against that country, in the absence of agreement by the South African government to enter into prompt and meaningful negotiations for the abolition of apartheid and the creation of a non-racial South Africa.

\* Support the holding of internationally-sponsored, all-party negotiations for the abolition of apartheid and the creation of a constitutional, non-racial democracy committed to respect for political and economic rights of all South Africans—talks that include the African National Congress.

\* Call for the immediate release of Nelson Mandela, Walter Sisulu and other political prisoners, and for the unbanning of the African National Congress.

\* Strongly support international efforts to pressure South Africa to withdraw from Namibia, and to bring about free elections in that state.

\* Stop U.S. aid to the UNITA rebels in Angola, recognize the Angolan government, and work towards creating conditions that will lead to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola and improved relations between Angola and the West.

\* Assist South Africa's neighbors, such as Botswana, Zambia, Zimbabwe and Mozambique, to attain greater economic independence from South Africa, and to become less vulnerable to South Africa's military and economic pressure, and support the efforts of the Southern African Development Coordination Conference (SADCC) to improve the lives of the 65 million Africans who live in its member states.

Change is coming in South Africa. The question is whether it will be peaceful and controlled or bloody and cataclysmic. We must not stand idly by while South Africa drifts toward chaos and bloodshed. We must do all we can to bring change to South Africa that is rapid and peaceful, and that provides for all peoples of that country,

and its neighbors, those fundamental human rights and protections that America seeks for all the peoples of the world.

### 5. Statement on World Hunger.

The next President of the United States must help to shape a foreign policy that reflects the fundamental decency and values of the American People.

In the next ten minutes, 300 children in the less-developed countries will die of preventable disease or hunger. Ten million Africans in fifteen countries are on the edge of starvation—in a continent that once could feed itself. The images of human tragedy—the stick-thin legs and hollow eyes and swollen stomachs of our fellow human beings rise up before us and challenge us as a nation and as a caring people.

We can do a lot more to help the African people than we have during the past seven years. The current Administration has militarized American foreign aid; it has imitated the approach traditionally taken by the Soviet Union; it has helped to beat ploughshares into swords throughout the less-developed world.

So while we supply arms that feed the civil war in Angola, which is one of the poorest countries in the world, the Soviet Union is selling millions in weapons to Ethiopia, the poorest country in the world.

And while African children are dying, more money is being spent on the military in that continent than on health and education combined.

As President, I will:

- \* do all I can to see that the children of this world have the chance to survive and grow; and that their parents are given the help they need to live with each other, not the weapons they might use to destroy each other.
- \* work with Congress to see that our foreign aid dollars are invested to help to meet real needs. No more lining the pockets of dictators; no more helping the Somozas and the Duvaliers and the Marcoses. No more shipping sophisticated arms to countries while their people starve to death.
- \* propose to Mr. Gorbachev that on the day we sign an agreement making deep cuts in strategic arms, we should create an **International Humanitarian Relief Fund**, and each of us should put up a half billion dollars a year of what we save in weapons expenditures to fight famine and poverty and disease throughout the developing world.

- \* go to the international community and sign a plan to stop the sale of advanced military equipment to countries that lack the resources to care for their own people.
- \* do everything I can to help the people of Africa feed themselves.

Seventy percent of the African people are subsistence farmers. They are handicapped not by a lack of will, but by a lack of training, a lack of credit, and—above all—by the lack of fair prices for the food they grow. African farmers—like American farmers—need, and deserve, a living wage.

They won't get that if prices are driven down by the dumping of American and European food commodities; they won't get it if African governments continue to subsidize urban consumers at the expense of their farmers; they won't get it if international lenders encourage governments to rip up farmland to plant export crops to increase foreign exchange.

And they won't get it if we accept the argument of some that for our farmers to survive, the farmers of Africa and elsewhere in the developing world must be put out of business. We know from our own history that agriculture is the engine that drives a strong economy; and we know that strong economic partners will create new customers for a whole range of American goods and services—agricultural and industrial alike.

If we are to help the people of Africa to build their economies, we must work with our European allies to end the trade wars and the dumping of farm products that depress food prices around the world.

And we must help them to think small, in the best sense of the word. They must nurture the grassroots. They must invest in people; in locally-designed, locally-supported projects that will create opportunity from the bottom up; projects whose benefits won't disappear the minute the so-called experts leave town.

The International Fund for Agricultural Development is an example of the kind of approach we should encourage. Since 1974, the Fund has combined the petrodollars of OPEC with the resources of the industrialized nations to provide training and credit to fifteen million families, most in Africa, mostly small farmers and rural ranchers.

We should help Africans to help themselves, not just because of our interest in potential new markets; not just because of our interest in political stability in the developing world; but because of something that lies in the soul of the American character and at the heart of the American dream.

John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson **did not accept the inevitability of hunger in America**. They did something about it. Now, we need a President for the 1990's who will not accept the inevitability of hunger anywhere.

#### 6. Peace and Security in the Middle East and Persian Gulf.

The next President of the United States must restore strong and active American leadership to the search for peace and security in the Middle East and Persian Gulf.

Strong American leadership is essential because we have vital economic and security interests that are threatened by violence and unrest in the region; and because we have a long-standing moral commitment to the survival and prosperity of a democratic Israel, and to a peaceful future for all the inhabitants of the region.

##### *A. The United States and Israel.*

America's relationship with Israel remains the linchpin of our moral and security interests in the Middle East. It is a relationship built on something that goes beyond issues of political and military strategy to the shared values and friendship of our two peoples. That friendship has not—and will not—always produce agreement; but it has generated an enduring and unbreakable bond between our two countries that is of immeasurable value to both.

Israel is a democracy sorely tested economically by the need to defend its borders against hostile neighbors; and sorely tested politically by ongoing turmoil and unrest throughout the Middle East.

As President, I will strengthen America's strategic relationship with Israel; maintain generous levels of economic and military assistance to both Israel and Egypt; promote increased trade and economic cooperation among our three countries; and oppose any arms sale that would endanger the security of Israel or its people, including the sale of new types of advanced military equipment to nations that have refused to participate in the peace process.

##### *B. Peace in the Middle East.*

The next President must do what the current President has not. He must be deeply and personally engaged in the effort to see that all the peoples of the Middle East—Israeli and Arab alike—are at long last given the opportunity to live in a world that is at peace, with the chance to build a bright future for themselves and for their children.

Ten years ago, President Jimmy Carter sat down at Camp David with Prime Minister Menachem Begin of Israel and President Anwar Sadat of Egypt. Together, through the Camp David Accords, they laid the foundation for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East—a peace based on mutual security and respect.

*C. Gaza and the West Bank—Tragedy and Opportunity.*

Sadly, the agenda of Camp David remains uncompleted. And the recent unrest in Gaza and the West Bank is the tragic result of the failure to make progress on the next step in the peace process—to resolve the status of the territories.

The Israeli authorities have a legitimate right to restore order in response to violent demonstrations and attacks on their security personnel. Any such action must always be undertaken with the greatest possible restraint. In several instances, however, Israeli personnel have used excessive force, and the Israeli government has acknowledged that some of its policies were inappropriate to respond to the disorder. There is now an even more urgent need for both sides to work together to end the violence and to get the peace process moving again.

Tragedy has produced a unique opportunity to return to the unfinished business of Camp David. Those Accords set forth the basic principles for establishing a self-governing authority in the territories and for negotiations to determine their ultimate status, to be conducted among Israel, its Arab neighbors and elected representatives of the inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza. The Reagan Administration seems at long last to understand the urgency of going forward, and has begun to develop a proposal that is consistent with these principles.

Camp David makes clear that these negotiations must be based on the principles of UN Resolutions 242 and 338, which include a recognition of Israel's right to exist within secure borders, and must also, in the words of the Accord, recognize "the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and their just requirements."

As President, I will build on the foundation of Camp David by:

- \* making clear America's continued and unshakeable commitment to Israeli security;
- \* helping to improve relations between Israel and Egypt under Hosni Mubarak, a close friend and ally of the United States;
- \* encouraging direct negotiations between Israel and Jordan, which

include responsible representatives of the inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza;

\* using our political and diplomatic leverage to persuade leaders both in the Arab world and elsewhere that recognizing Israel's right to exist within secure borders is an essential precondition to serious progress toward peace.

One way we can encourage progress in the Middle East is to promote joint economic projects among the nations that are willing to participate constructively in the peace process. We should work with leaders in the region to devise cooperative approaches to shared problems of water and electric power; to increase trade; to improve farming techniques; and to provide the building blocks for a growing and diversified regional economy that will create opportunity and a better standard of living for Arabs and Jews alike.

The next President must understand that a stable peace agreement in the Middle East can only emerge from changing circumstances and attitudes within the region; it cannot be imposed by outside powers—including the United States—and it **must not** be imposed by force. Direct negotiations are essential. If the Palestine Liberation Organization is to have a place at the bargaining table, that group must renounce terrorism (both in word and deed), unequivocally recognize the right of Israel to exist, and accept the letter and spirit of UN Resolution 242 and 338.

#### *D. Terrorism.*

As President, I will work with our allies and I will press the Soviet Union to work with us, to end the plague of terrorism that threatens both our allies and our own citizens in the Middle East and Persian Gulf. We must **never again make concessions** to terrorists. We must **never again sell arms** to terrorists. We must apply strong and effective international sanctions against any government that sponsors or supports terrorist activity. And we must be willing to use force, where circumstances require, to respond to or prevent terrorist attacks, and to apprehend those who have committed acts of terrorism against our people.

#### *E. The Soviet Union.*

The next President will have an opportunity to test the willingness of the Soviet Union to play a more constructive role in the Middle East and Persian Gulf than it has in the past. Mr. Gorbachev is

seeking to increase Soviet diplomatic, economic and military influence throughout the region. That is all the more reason why we must move quickly to end the confusion about American policy and goals that has existed since the current Administration took office.

The next President must challenge the Soviets to **use their influence with Syria** to end that country's obstructionist approach to the peace process. He must press the Soviet Union to **re-establish full diplomatic relations** with Israel and to **cease the Soviet Union's support for resolutions seeking to expel Israel from the United Nations**. And he must insist that the Soviets meet their international legal obligations to **permit Soviet Jews and other persecuted minorities to emigrate** to other lands if they so choose, and to practice freely their faith and transmit their culture if they do not.

#### *F. The War in the Persian Gulf.*

Finally, the next President must do all he can in cooperation with the international community to stop the bloody and senseless war between Iran and Iraq. More than one million men, women and children have been killed or crippled or maimed in this war, which has now been raging for seven years—longer than World War II. And instead of working together to stop the war, the international community—including every permanent member of the U.N. Security Council—has been standing on the sidelines, selling arms to the combatants, making profits off this war.

Last July, the Security Council voted to **demand a cease-fire** in the war; a demand that Iran has refused to honor. We need now to move beyond that demand to **an international arms embargo** and to **strict economic sanctions** that will make it impossible for the war to continue. And we need an **international naval force** in the Persian Gulf that will protect the **right of freedom of the seas**.

#### *G. American Interests, American Values.*

There is no dispute, among Republicans or Democrats, that the United States has vital interests in the Middle East and Persian Gulf, and that those interests must be protected. A **bi-partisan, national energy policy** aimed at reducing our dependence on oil from that region is essential, and as President, I will develop and carry out such a policy. But our long term interest in the region is certain to remain because of our commitment to Israel, because of our allies' continued



reliance on Middle East oil, and because of our stake in a healthy and growing world economy.

The next President must restore purpose and values and strength to American foreign policy. He must inspire our people; work with our allies; test our traditional adversaries; and revive the spirit of activism and optimism with which our nation has historically approached challenges abroad.

That's the kind of President we need. And—with your help—that's the kind of President I intend to be.

*Michael Dukakis*