REPORT ON THE NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY OF THE UNITED STATES—MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING THE RECESS—PM 23

Under the authority of the order of January 4, 1994, the Secretary of the Senate, on March 1, 1995, during the recess of the Senate, received the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 603 of the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986, I am transmitting a report on the National Security Strategy of the United States.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 28, 1995.*

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING THE RECESS—PM 24

Under the authority of the order of January 4, 1994, the Secretary of the Senate, on March 1, 1995, during the recess of the Senate, received the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the requirements of section 657 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95–91; 42 U.S.C. 7267), I transmit herewith the 13th Annual Report of the Department of Energy, which covers the years 1992 and 1993.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 1, 1995.*

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

AN INVESTMENT IN AFRICA

• Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, as the Congress begins to debate the foreign aid budget this year, U.S. assistance and involvement in Africa is once again in question.

It would be a grave mistake for the United States to disengage completely from Africa, particularly at this point. As the success stories of South Africa, Namibia, Mozambique, and other African nations in transition tell, there is potential for great gains in Africa—both politically and economically. At the same time, even recent history demonstrates that if we ignore Africa, conflicts and problems can explode into political, economic, and humanitarian disasters for which we all pay the price.

On this note, I commend to my colleagues an article which appeared in the New York Times this weekend entitled, ''In Africa, West Can Pay Now or Later.'' It charts several reasons for international involvement in Africa in the global context, and documents some reasons for U.S. investment in the continent.

Though some would like to write off Africa as irrelevant to U.S. interests, it is impossible to argue that what happens in a continent of close to 1 billion people has no effect on us. An investment in Africa of money, diplomacy, and attention today will help develop political stability, which in turn will yield economic benefits for Africans and international trading partners: Together political and economic developments will help reduce the number and level of tragedies we have witnessed in Africa.

Reducing the Federal deficit is in our national interest and should be our top priority. But a wholesale abandonment of U.S. investment in regions of the world such as Africa is not in the U.S. interest. We need to make sensible decisions about necessary U.S. investments. In the long run, our populations, the environment, universal human rights, and international markets will benefit greatly from a relatively small investment today.

I ask that the text of the article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 26, 1995]

IN AFRICA, WEST CAN PAY NOW, OR LATER

(By Howard W. French)

ABIDJAN, IVORY COAST.—Having struggled across the Sahara, 250,000 starving Sudanese refugees assemble on the Moroccan coast, hoping to cross the Straits of Gibraltar to Europe. As an armada of camera crews film them, the refugee's leader launches this challenge to European Union coastal guards who would stop them: ''All we ask of you is, watch us die.''

The event is pure fiction, the final scene of a 1990 BBC television drama. But development experts say it neatly illustrates a stark choice looming for the industrialized world: Pitch in more energetically to bring Africa into the global economic fold, or wait and watch as the continent decends into a quickening spiral of disaster.

AN EXPLODING POPULATION

With its population due to double to about 1.2 billion in less than 30 years, and expected to reach 2 billion by 2050, an Africa is crisis could well become the desperate stage for a mass emigration the likes of which have never been seen.

Despite such warnings, however, the West seems to have grown only more indifferent to Africa's fortunes. Some American congressmen have recently likened aid to the continent to throwing money into a rathole; Britain has said it will cut its contributions to Africa through the European Union, and even France is grappling with ways to reduce obligations to its former possessions.

In response, frustrated development experts and new democratic leaders in Africa have argued that would be far cheaper to help the continent out of its problems now than to rescue it later.

To get a sense of scale, it helps to look at two examples where extremely rapid population growth rates—well over 3 percent a year—are expected by United Nations statisticians between now and the year 2000. They are Nigeria, which in the early 1990's had 116 million people and a gross national product per capita of only $350, and Kenya, which had 25 million people and produced just $340 per person.

Nevertheless, the experts on Africa recognize that in an era of austerity at home, arguments about investing abroad today to prevent crisis tomorrow have limited appeal. They now argue that traditional aid grants are not necessarily the answer. ''The most effective thing that could be done for Africa right now doesn't involve new money, but systematic debt relief,'' said Thomas Callaghy of the University of Pennsylvania. ''You could write off all of Africa's debts tomorrow, and it wouldn't affect international financial markets.'' But then, ''When you look at what has just happened in Mexico you realize just how hard a thing this is to sell politically.''

If Africa's approaching peril is not enough to motivate the West to act with greater generosity, many hope that old-fashioned appeals to profit might. Whether it was spices or gold or slaves or vast quantities of gems and minerals, the continent has always been a rich, if risky, El Dorado for the venturesome outsider.

WHY DO INVESTORS HESITATE BEFORE AFRICA'S NEW OPPORTUNITIES?

Following Ghana's independence, Kwame Nkrumah, its first president and a pioneer of the continent's ultimately disastrous fling with socialism, defined the historical problem, noting the ''paradox'' that Africa's ''earth is rich, yet the products that come from above and below the soil continue to enrich, not Africans predominantly, but groups and individuals who operate to Africa's impoverishment.''

Now, throughout much of the continent, several years of dramatic efforts to remove barriers to trade and investment, trim bureaucracies and rejoin the global economy have mostly swept away the legacy of three decades of Mr. Nkrumah's brand of socialism. Ghana and Uganda are prominent examples, and investment in South Africa can at last be viewed as an investment in the continent as a whole.

Because of these changes, Africa's riches are again up for grabs. But so far, the international business community has largely disappointed the development experts. Mali, for example, can't find a partner to help finance a new power company, even though companies from the United States, Australia and Canada rush to explore for gold and diamonds and oil there. Their hope is for the kind of quick extraction of wealth that led to the continent's early disenchantment with capitalism.

If Africa still requires a more cooperative form of economic involvement, development experts say, it is because the years under socialism did little to alleviate deep social problems that include an undereducated population whose needs grow faster than weak governments can possibly cope with, poor roads and communications, a lack of managerial expertise, and most of all a shortage of capital.

So Africa is in a bind: major foreign private investment in productive new industries is unlikely unless these problems are solved first, but the only sources of help to fix them is overseas.

''People cling to the myth that if only these countries would get their policies right, everything would be okay,'' said James Gustave Speth, the administrator of the United Nations Development Program. ''There is no reason to believe that Africa can't make it, but right now this is a continent that is bleeding and without substantial outside help, there is no hope.''

In addition to cutting debt burden, economists say the West should drop barriers to