

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records

Subgroup/Office of Origin: Speechwriting

Series/Staff Member: Terry Edmonds

Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 24673

FolderID:

Folder Title:
Public Opinion

Stack:

S

Row:

0

Section:

0

Shelf:

0

Position:

0

— CLOSE HOLD —

**Survey of Public Opinion
December 7, 2000
Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates**

N=700 conducted 12/5-12/6

The mood of the country remains positive a month after the election, although resolving who will be President is now seen as the most important issue facing the country in both closed and open-ended questions. The disputed results have also begun to have some negative impact on Gore's and Lieberman's favorability numbers, while Bush is up five points to 58%.

By staying largely above the fray, President Clinton's numbers remain strong. Similarly, HRC's favorable is moving up significantly nationally.

Mood of the Country

Tracking:

	10/12	10/25	10/30	11/9	12/6
Country: Right/Wrong Track	53/31	52/34	56/29	48/37	52/34
Economy: Right/Wrong Track	66/23	71/20	73/20	72/20	66/25
President Clinton	53/46	51/47	55/44	56/41	58/41
Al Gore	62/35	55/43	57/41	58/39	55/42
George W. Bush	57/40	56/41	57/41	53/43	58/39
Joe Lieberman	62/19	60/21	--	60/20	54/27
Dick Cheney	61/23	57/27	--	61/23	58/26
Hillary Clinton	50/45	51/47	--	53/42	56/41
Clinton Job Approval	62/37	65/33	62/36	65/33	70/28
Strongly Approve	30	31	31	35	37

Most Important Issue (Open End)

- Resolving who will be president -16%**
- Education -13%
- Morality/Family Values -7%
- Health Care -5%
- Preserving Social Security and Medicare -4%
- Economy/Jobs -3%
- Abortion -2%

Which of the following issues is the most important issue facing the country?	All
Resolving the presidential election	18
Education	16
Moral Decline	14
Preserving Medicare and Social Security	13
Keeping the economy strong	12
Healthcare	11
Guns and youth violence	7
Taxes	4
Don't know	3
Foreign affairs	2

Who did you vote for?	All	11/9
Gore / Lieberman	39	42
Bush / Cheney	39	42
Nader / LaDuke	4	3
Buchanan / Foster	1	0

If you had voted, who would you have voted for?	All	11/9	Dem	Rep	Inc
Gore / Lieberman	43	43	84	0	30
Bush / Cheney	41	34	9	100	45
Nader / LaDuke	4	4	0	0	9
Buchanan / Foster	0	0	0	0	0

As usual, the longer Congress is in effect in recess the better they do. With Gore and Bush in the spotlight rather than the Congress, ratings for Republicans and Democrats in Congress are quite high. Congressional Democrats are beginning to show signs of benefiting from their less partisan-sounding approach to governing in the split new Congress.

Congressional Approval

	9/28	10/12	10/25	10/30	12/6
Congressional Republicans	45/45	47/40	42/44	49/41	50/38
Congressional Democrats	52/37	52/37	47/39	52/38	62/29

Budget

But the voters are not very concerned about the budget – and they would just as soon have the decisions made by the next president and spending kept the same. This is quite different from what we have seen in the past. Democrats have won over women while Republicans have won over men, paralleling what came out of the Presidential race.

41/35% trust Democrats in Congress/Republicans in Congress to handle the budget.

Dem	Rep	Ind	Female	Male
81/5	9/82	32/27	47/27	34/43

Parts of the federal budget, which was due at the end of September, have not been passed. Congress has passed continuing resolutions to keep the government running since then.

If President Clinton and the Republicans cannot agree on a budget and the government shuts down, 32/43% would blame President Clinton/Republicans in Congress.

Dem	Rep	Ind	Female	Male
15/69	55/11	30/44	32/49	31/36

However, Delay's ultimatum does muddy the waters enough to split blame between President Clinton and the Republicans.

Some Republican leaders say that if President Clinton insists on increased spending, he will have to shut down the government to get it because they will only agree to keep spending at current levels.

Given this, if there were a government shutdown, 42/40% would blame President Clinton/Republicans in Congress.

Dem	Rep	Ind	Female	Male
20/70	66/16	43/32	40/41	45/38

President Clinton says it is important that our budget fund our important national priorities such as education and healthcare and raise the minimum wage. Republicans in Congress say the President should agree to keep spending at current levels and let the next President finish the budget. 44/46% think we should fund our important national priorities/keep spending at current levels.

Dem	Rep	Ind	Female	Male
50/44	37/58	43/40	45/41	43/52

Senate Makeup

The Democrats in Congress are positioned to push for a larger role in the decision making in the Senate. This is a fight worth making for the Senate Democrats and one that would have considerable public support based on these finding. The public is looking for bi-partisanship, and Senate Democrats can appeal to that sentiment with a message that bipartisanship starts with a fair organization of the Senate that requires Democrats to work together.

75/23% are aware/not aware that the Senate is evenly divided with 50 Democratic and 50 Republican senators.

Dem	Rep	Ind	Female	Male
50/44	37/58	43/40	45/41	43/52

Given this, 15% think Republicans should control a majority of the seats on Senate committee, while 75% think they should be evenly split between Democrats and Republicans.

Dem	Rep	Ind	Female	Male
1/98	28/58	19/67	11/80	20/70

Suppose Governor George W. Bush becomes President, thus Dick Cheney becomes Vice President, serving as President of the Senate. This would give the Republicans a 51 to 50 advantage. Given this, 23% think Republicans should control a majority of the seats on Senate committee, while 72% think they should be evenly split between Democrats and Republicans.

Dem	Rep	Ind	Female	Male
12/87	45/48	17/74	17/77	29/66

Clinton Post-WH

Six in ten credit President Clinton for preparing America for the 21st century, and overwhelmingly say the area he has helped the most in is the economy. Given this, it only makes sense that President Clinton give a speech on the New Economy and the new challenges and opportunities it presents. It is important for us to summarize the major accomplishments of the administration in a way that has big implications for the future of the country – it is not that the administration took a number of incremental steps in different areas – it is that the administration set whole new directions for the country. President Clinton returned the presidency to activism – a presidency that would seek to meet the needs of our changing society. If FDR stood for the then novel proposition that government must be involved in the economic direction of the country; and Reagan stood for the proposition that a good day for the President was one in which he did nothing; President Clinton stood for the idea that a president needed to get involved in enabling the country and its citizens to make the most of the great changes going on – globalization, the spread of technology and its implications, the crisis in aging, the new needs of our educational system, and the increasing diversity of its people. Under Reagan/Bush the country had been falling behind in the modern world; under Clinton, the country was again established as a leader in all of these areas, and was now genuinely prepared for the 21st Century.

The voters are lacking a clear sense of this outside of the economy.

60/36% think President Clinton helped prepare America for the 21st Century.

Dem	Rep	Ind	Male	Female
86/11	31/66	58/37	57/42	62/31

In What area did President Clinton help the most?	All	Dem	Rep	Ind	Male	Female
Economy	48	56	34	51	45	50
Welfare	12	10	14	11	12	11
Education	11	16	7	10	11	12
Technology	8	8	11	6	10	6
Crime	5	5	7	3	6	5

What do you think was President Clinton's greatest accomplishment? (OPEN END)	
The economy / a stronger / better economy	18
He stayed in office / didn't resign / didn't get impeached	6
Foreign affairs / relations / policies	4
Other specific issues:	4
General Negative: Disgraced the White House / Being impeached	4
The budget / balancing the budget	3
Education / getting more teachers	3
Welfare / getting people off welfare / welfare to work plan	3
General Positive: Good / He did things, etc...	3
Job opportunities / unemployment is down	2
Reducing the deficit	2
Middle east	2
Healthcare	2
Getting out of trouble / Not going to jail	2
Others	12
Don't know / no response	23

Part of what the President has uniquely been able to do is to bring together Democrats and Republicans to solutions to problems like balancing the budget and they are looking for him to leave his successor a roadmap for doing the same. They – and the election returns mandate – a new era of bi-partisanship as the next administration tackles issues like education and Medicare reform.

What area do you think President Clinton can give America the best advice on for the future?	All	Dem	Rep	Ind	Male	Female
Republicans and Democrats working together	23	25	23	20	19	26
The global economy	16	20	14	14	18	14
The economy	14	19	10	11	12	16
Education	13	9	10	17	12	13
Race relations	11	11	12	12	14	9
The spread of technology	5	6	5	4	6	4

Almost every poll shows that education is where they would like to see people making charitable contributions to focus their efforts. This certainly suggests that the President after office should form or join an educational foundation to keep pressing for the federal, state and local governments to do what is right. Race is another area which people see the President as uniquely qualified to keep making a lasting contribution. Overseas, the issue of world hunger – the basic issue that Bill Gates raised – that so many people live on \$1 dollar a day around the world is something that people believe that President can do some good. Clearly they want their ex-presidents to be very much above the fray. They will surely read his memoirs, but they won't be very happy about that as the President's main post-office activity.

Now I am going to read you a list of some issues President Clinton might focus his efforts on when he leaves the White House. For each, tell me if it makes you more or less favorable towards President Clinton.	Much more fav	More Less fav	Dem	Rep	Ind	Male	Fem
Reforming and improving our education system	53	77/20	90/6	62/35	78/20	76/21	78/19
Improving Race relations	50	83/14	95/3	75/22	80/16	79/17	86/11
World Hunger	48	76/19	85/14	68/23	75/19	73/19	78/19
Expanding health care coverage	47	73/21	92/2	52/43	72/20	70/23	76/18
Creating economic growth in areas that have been left behind by the current prosperity	46	77/18	94/2	67/25	71/27	72/22	83/13
Improving the environment	44	75/22	98/3	52/42	75/22	71/26	79/17
International AIDS/HIV	41	74/18	93/7	59/29	72/20	70/23	78/13
Helping solve conflicts abroad	35	63/31	77/19	50/43	63/30	58/37	68/26
Reforming campaign finance	34	59/33	69/25	46/46	61/33	58/36	60/31
Expanding the understanding among nations in the new global world	29	68/24	85/8	54/36	63/30	63/28	72/21
Working to bring third way politics to democracies around the world	27	62/29	77/16	50/43	59/30	64/28	60/31
Writing his memoirs about his presidency	18	37/52	56/35	19/69	36/53	39/46	36/58
Running for a new office like Senator from Arkansas	14	31/61	50/41	20/76	24/66	28/63	34/59

Speech

We can give a series of wrap-up speeches, but none of them is likely to have the same impact as a final State of the Union. If Bush is the President, I think that there merits are quite high for us to put everything into a major State-of-the-Union laying out in broad terms the accomplishments, the needs of the country in the 21st Century and appealing to unity and bi-partisanship.

48/45% think President Clinton should give a series of several major speeches summing up his record as President on key issues and discussing what needs to be done to further America's progress in these areas. President Eisenhower gave a similar set of speeches.

Dem	Rep	Ind	Male	Female
65/28	29/66	47/46	47/49	49/42

Some Presidents such as Eisenhower and Johnson have given a State of the Union address before they leave office. Others like Reagan and Bush have not. 54/43% think that President Clinton should give a State of the Union address before he leaves office.

Dem	Rep	Ind	Male	Female
75/22	36/60	50/48	52/48	55/40

The top two speech ideas are on the New Economy and the challenges of taking greater personal and civic responsibility.

Now I am going to read you a list of some topics President Clinton might address in these speeches and ask you if it would make you more or less favorable if President Clinton gave a speech on the topic.	Much more fav	More/ Less fav	Dem	Rep	Ind	Male	Fem
The challenges of the new economy – doing what is needed to make sure no American worker or community is left behind and making sure everyone has the tools they need to succeed technologically.	45	73/24	93/6	58/37	68/30	67/30	79/19
At a time when Americans have greater responsibilities at work and at home we need to remember the responsibilities we have to our communities and our nation. We need to encourage our children to be active in civic endeavors as a part of	41	75/23	89/9	61/37	74/25	72/27	79/20

learning and growing and use our dedication to our communities to strengthen our ties to each other.							
A speech that says America is not only better off economically but that our nation has become a better place to live and work. Progress has been made on moving people from welfare to work, crime is down, education has become a national priority and the environment is stronger even as the economy grows at a record pace.	40	67/30	94/5	48/50	59/36	59/37	74/23
The issue of race relations in American society – the progress we have made and the work that still needs to be done to ensure that we have racial equality for all Americans.	40	69/28	87/9	51/47	69/29	65/30	73/26
A speech outlining the major threats to the environment in the next half-century, including polluted air and water, the loss of forests, and global warming, and steps we should consider to address these threats	38	65/32	83/14	41/58	69/28	61/36	68/28
The increasing globalization of the economy, and the need for America's leadership as a force not only for open trade, but for labor rights and environmental protection around the world.	35	67/30	86/14	50/46	63/33	65/32	69/27
A review of our security interests in the world, our role as both a peacekeeper and a peacemaker, our changing relationships with Russia and China, and the new challenges to America's security in a global, information age.	34	66/29	79/20	54/39	65/30	64/31	69/26

Race: Death Penalty, Felons right to vote

A majority of Americans recognize that America has yet to eliminate racial discrimination and achieve true equality. Americans believe society is still segregated, and that laws against discrimination are not being adequately enforced. They believe the greatest bias occurs with the police, but the greatest segregation is in the workplace.

This underscores that a strong statement of the continuing problem of race in America can have vast resonance. If the Kerner commission's picture of two Americas stuck such a cord, so today most Americans readily agree that we have not solved that basic problem in our everyday life – and that the police and courts system are far from colorblind.

Where do you think the greatest racial bias exists today?	All	Dem	Rep	Ind	Male	Fem	Black	White
With the police	29	28	32	25	29	28	30	28
In the justice system	17	22	14	17	18	17	28	15
On the job	15	10	19	17	17	14	26	15
In housing	11	10	10	12	11	10	3	12
In education	10	11	10	9	9	11	7	11

Given that people are satisfied economically, these are surprisingly high numbers:

38/54% think laws against discrimination are being enforced adequately.

Dem	Rep	Ind	Male	Female	Blacks	White
31/59	53/40	35/58	42/52	35/56	13/82	43/49

39/53% believe society today is basically desegregated/is it still very segregated.

Dem	Rep	Ind	Male	Female	Blacks	White
33/61	44/49	43/47	38/54	40/52	19/72	42/50

In what areas is it still segregated? (OPEN END)	
Employment / jobs / workplace / getting work	14
Housing	10
Education / schools / colleges	10
Everywhere / every day	6
In people / society / in people's minds	5
South / southern states	5
Nowhere / there is none	5
Communities / neighborhoods	3
Justice system	3
Economy	2
Cities / big cities	2
Between races	2
Other	16
Don't know / no response	17

32/59% think police and the justice system are basically fair to people of all / they treat people differently based on race.

Dem	Rep	Ind	Male	Female	Blacks	Whites
22/69	42/48	34/57	37/56	27/62	11/87	35/54

Seven in ten think leaving the Presidency with a strong message on living with diversity would be the right thing for President Clinton to do.

70/24% think it would be right/wrong for the president to focus on the need for us to learn to live with greater diversity as an important message to leave us with at the end of his presidency.

Dem	Rep	Ind	Male	Female	Blacks	Whites
82/13	55/38	69/24	67/27	72/22	94/3	73/17

There is strong support for many of President Clinton's potential messages on race, including the necessity of re-learning how to be a successful melting pot and the fact that certain new minorities – not just blacks – still lag far behind the rest of us.

For each of these, tell me if you think it is important for the President to stress in his race report or not important	Very imp	Imp/Not Imp	Dem	Rep	Ind	Black	White
That today we have so many growing different races that we have to learn again how to be a successful melting pot in the 21 st century	60	83/15	88/10	73/24	86/13	91/6	81/17
That minorities like the American Indian are still way behind others in terms of education, health, and poverty	58	81/16	87/11	76/21	79/17	88/10	81/16
That our justice system is not as color blind as it needs to be	50	78/18	86/11	61/34	84/12	98/2	75/20
That we are still very much a segregated society even after we have torn down the legal barriers to segregation	46	78/20	91/8	60/36	80/19	98/0	75/23
That blacks still are behind whites in terms of education and income	45	78/18	90/6	66/30	77/17	97/3	76/20
That we still need to continue affirmative action in some form until the differences in races are overcome	39	67/31	85/14	47/51	68/29	94/3	63/35

Specific Proposals: There is also clear support for a series of proposals from the cop on the beat to earning the vote to take the racial tinge out of the justice system.

Here are some specifics that the President could propose in the ACE report. Tell me for each one if you favor or oppose them.	Strongly Support	Support	Oppose	Dem	Rep	Ind	Black	White
New rules on the death penalty to make sure that everyone has proper legal representation, DNA testing at their disposal and that it is not used in a discriminatory fashion	68	88/9	90/7	82/13	90/8	92/8	90/10	
Restructuring our justice system from top to bottom to be fairer and more color blind – starting with banning racial profiling by the police and ending with fairer sentencing guidelines and safeguards on the death penalty.	48	76/19	83/11	64/30	79/18	93/5	95/0	
National law to ban racial profiling	46	67/24	77/11	53/39	69/24	88/8	86/9	
A legal process for convicted felons who have served their time to regain their vote	28	54/41	70/25	39/59	49/43	82/16	54/36	

A majority support restoring voting rights for felons once they are out of jail, and seven in ten support some sort of legal process for felons to regain the right to vote.

55/38% support/oppose allowing convicted felons the right to vote once they are out of jail.

55% support (30% strongly, 25% somewhat)

38% oppose (25% strongly, 13% somewhat)

Dem	Rep	Ind	Female	Male	Blacks	Whites
66/26	40/56	55/38	57/34	53/43	81/17	51/42

Suppose people who had served their time in jail could then petition the court to regain their right to vote, or take a citizenship type to restore their right to vote.

70/25% would support/oppose this plan.

70% support (36% strongly, 34% somewhat)

25% oppose (15% strongly, 10% somewhat)

Dem	Rep	Ind	Female	Male	Blacks	Whites
79/15	57/38	73/23	72/23	69/27	91/9	67/27

With argumentation, six in ten support restoring voting rights.

32% say that once you have committed a felony, it is only fair that you forfeit your right to vote as one cost of violating the law. **60%** say once felons have done time, they already have enough challenges facing them in re-entering society, and should be allowed the right to vote like other American citizens.

Dem	Rep	Ind	Female	Male	Blacks	Whites
22/71	47/48	31/59	29/63	36/58	10/88	35/56

Six in ten support the death penalty, but nearly seven in ten support the temporary hold on federal executions.

61/29% favor/oppose the death penalty.

Dem	Rep	Ind	Female	Male	Blacks	Whites
50/38	77/17	61/27	55/31	67/26	27/58	67/24

There is currently a temporary hold on all federal executions while a national commission can determine whether the death penalty is being imposed fairly. **67/27%** favor/oppose this temporary hold.

Dem	Rep	Ind	Female	Male	Blacks	Whites
74/21	54/39	69/25	74/18	60/36	80/15	65/29

Election

Half of Americans have been following the Presidential election very closely in Florida, and 84% overall say they have been following it. Nearly six in ten, including 61% of Independents, and 29% of Democrats, think Al Gore should concede.

Al Gore's communications strategy the last two weeks has been fundamentally flawed – the public doesn't want to hear him say how he won the election – they would have wanted him to 1) stay in the background like Bush or 2) do things related to them and their problems. Less would have been better than the hour by hour comments on how he won. This could all change with some favorable rulings, but unlike the President in the impeachment fight, Gore has been losing the battle of public opinion here.

84/15% have/ have not been closely following the situation with the Presidential election in Florida.

84% have been following (49% very, 35% somewhat)

15% have not been following (10% not very, 5% not at all)

Dem	Rep	Ind	Female	Male
86/12	89/11	79/18	82/16	85/13

58/38% think Al Gore should concede the election to George W. Bush, or should he not concede yet.

Dem	Rep	Ind	Female	Male
29/66	88/10	61/35	53/43	63/33

A majority think Bush is reacting better – a large shift in public opinion from the week after the election when it was nearly evenly split.

29/52% think Al Gore/George W. Bush is reacting better to the difficult situation. (35/39% on 11/11)

Dem	Rep	Ind	Female	Male
55/24	8/82	22/53	33/50	24/55

Approval of President Clinton's handling of the situation is 70%, up from 55% immediately after the election.

70/16% approve/disapprove of the way President Clinton has handled the situation so far. (55/17% on 11/11)

70% approve (40% strongly, 30% somewhat)

16% disapprove (9% strongly, 7% somewhat)

Dem	Rep	Ind	Female	Male
81/11	55/27	72/13	70/16	69/16

Half of Americans think Gore should be speaking more or the same amount as he is now, and 45% think he should be speaking less.

11/45/39% think that Al Gore should be speaking more/less/same as now about his challenge to the election.

Dem	Rep	Ind	Female	Male
19/21/56	6/7/1/20	8/47/38	11/44/40	11/47/39

Nearly eight in ten were aware of the court rulings, and a description of the rulings increased the number who think Gore should concede slightly, to 60%.

77/21% heard about yesterday's court rulings.

Dem	Rep	Ind	Female	Male
74/23	78/21	79/19	75/22	79/21

There has been a dramatic shift in public opinion over the past month. On Nov. 11, 75% agreed that we needed to recount to achieve fairness. 43% now hold that view, and a majority think Gore should concede.

51% say Gore should concede the election now rather than fighting over the results. They say we need a sense of finality for George W. Bush to be able to start forming his administration. 43% say it is most important that we achieve fairness, ensure that every vote was counted properly, and take whatever time is necessary to do so, since the inauguration of the next President is not until January. (19/75% on 11/11)

Dem	Rep	Ind	Female	Male
24/72	82/13	51/41	48/47	54/40

Voters say the effects of the election are likely to balance out in the end, with neither party gaining a substantial advantage based on it.

The situation with the Presidential election makes 20% more likely, 18% less likely, and 58% say it has no impact on whether to vote for a Democrat in the future.

Dem	Rep	Ind	Female	Male
46/2/49	6/44/45	9/13/73	22/15/60	18/22/55

The situation with the Presidential election makes 17% more likely, 17% less likely, and 61% say it has no impact on whether to vote for a Republican in the future.

Dem	Rep	Ind	Female	Male
5/38/54	40/4/54	12/11/71	15/19/63	20/15/59

December 12, 2000

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: JEFF SHESOL
TOM MALINOWSKI

SUBJECT: UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK ADDRESS

Attached is a draft of your Thursday speech. It reflects significant input at every stage from Sandy Berger, John Podesta and Gene Sperling.

We have coined the phrase "closing the globalization gap" to describe your development agenda, and to act as a sort of mission statement. We point this out because there is, as yet, no consensus on the best term to use: Gene, for example, prefers "global gap" or "global divide," lest you imply that "globalization" is inherently a divisive force. We will keep working to find a better phrase, if there is one, to encompass your agenda.

Thank you. We look forward to hearing your thoughts on the speech.

nothing today
D

Draft 12/12/00 11:30pm
Shesol/ Malinowski

**PRESIDENT WILLIAM J. CLINTON
REMARKS ON CLOSING THE GLOBALIZATION GAP
WARWICK UNIVERSITY
COVENTRY, UNITED KINGDOM
December 14, 2000**

Acknowledgments: PM Tony Blair, Sir Shridath Ramphal, Chancellor, Warwick U.; Sir Brian Follett, Vice Chancellor, & Lady Follett; Lord Skidelsky; Caitlin McKenzie, Pres., Student Union; Ambassadors & others TK

I have come to Warwick to talk about a central reality of our time – the revolution that is transforming my nation, your nation, and the entire world. It is transforming our lives; tearing down barriers; building new networks among nations, peoples, and cultures.

We have a simple term for this sweeping process: globalization. Economies are growing more integrated, nations becoming more interdependent. What happens anywhere is felt, in a flash, everywhere, from Coventry to Kansas to Cambodia. Today, farmers in Nebraska understand that a currency crisis in Asia has a very real effect on their own livelihoods. Famine in Africa and images of suffering are instantly seen by the rest of the world. Trade, telecommunications, information technology – they are bringing us closer, and making the world smaller, than ever before.

That, I believe, is a good thing. For most people in countries like the United States and Britain, it is helping to create almost unprecedented prosperity; and, along with it, the chance to meet some of the fundamental, long-term challenges we face. In developing countries, too, it brings the promise of a better future. More people have been lifted out of poverty in the past few decades than at any time in world history. Life expectancy in developing countries is up; infant mortality is down; and according to the United Nations' Human Development Index – which

measures a decent standard of living, a good education, and a long and healthy life – the gap between rich and poor countries actually has declined since 1970.

And yet: there is a globalization gap that remains far too wide. As we begin the 21st Century, half of the world's people struggle to survive on less than two dollars a day. Nearly one billion live in chronic hunger... almost a billion of the world's adults cannot read... and half the children in the poorest countries are not in school. While some of us walk on the cutting edge of the global economy, others live on the razor's edge of survival. And one of the consequences is a rapidly growing population – expected to increase by [50 percent] by the middle of this century -- concentrated in the countries least capable of sustaining it.

We must embrace a grand vision: to close the globalization gap. It is among the central challenges of the new century and a moral imperative of the highest order. At the core of our national characters is a belief in the inherent dignity and equality of all humankind. We know perfectly well how children live and die in the poorest countries, and how little it would take to make a difference in their lives. In a global, information age, we no longer have the excuse of ignorance. We can still choose not to act. But we can no longer choose not to know.

The Cold War is no longer a preoccupation. We face an array of serious challenges to our security and well-being; but no overriding struggle for survival diverts us from aiding the survival of hundreds of millions of people in the developing world. Nor do we have the old excuse that harsh realities a world away are without real consequence for our own people. We have seen how abject poverty accelerates turmoil and conflict; how it creates recruits for terrorists and those who incite ethnic and religious hatred; how it fuels a violent rejection of the economic and social order on which our future depends.

It's not just that nations crippled by debt or disease or inadequate education cannot compete – they can combust. To dismiss global development as a “soft” issue is to be blind to hard truths. In a world that's increasingly connected, the vast disparities between rich and poor are unsustainable. Global poverty is a powder keg – and could be ignited by our indifference.

Fortunately, the opposite is also true. I've just come from Ireland, and I think it's no surprise that Ireland is making progress toward peace just as it's becoming the fastest growing economy in Europe.

How shall we meet this challenge? Too often, we are presented with a false choice. Some maintain that free markets, alone, will close whatever gap might exist; that the forces of change should be left completely unfettered. Others believe we should build walls, insisting that we can isolate our nations from the forces – the instabilities and inequalities – many people fear.

This is a choice between two extremes; and we are right to reject it. Open markets, however essential, are insufficient: they can help reduce poverty, but will not end it. And as the city of Coventry knows, there was a time when walls stood strong against would-be invaders; but they never really kept the world locked out. And that, on measure, has been a good thing.

So let us reject this false choice. Let us work to embrace the forces of global change so that they can benefit all peoples in all nations – so that they spur growth and lift lives everywhere in the world. Through trade and the new tools of technology, and by investing in people through education and health care, prosperity can be shared more widely, potential realized more fully, and opportunities created and seized in every country on the globe.

I have worked hard, and so has Prime Minister Blair, to raise these tough issues to the top of the global agenda. They have been a serious part of the dialogue at the most recent G-8

summits. Together, we are building a new development agenda for a new century. Today, I want to explore and expand that vision. I want to be clear-eyed about the challenges before us; and equally candid about the solutions. Underlying them all is this basic belief: if we want the global economy to embody shared values, then our efforts must reflect shared responsibility.

That means all nations – from the richest to the poorest – must unlock more of our resources and our untapped reservoirs of national will. That goes for governments and for businesses, for multilateral and non-governmental organizations, for religious leaders and civil society. We all must work together, more fully and comprehensively than before, and must make the tough choices we have not always been willing to make.

Trade

We must first make clear that open markets and rules-based trade are proven engines of economic growth. We know that countries that have opened their economies to the world have also opened their doors to opportunity and hope for their people. From the early 1970s to the early 1990s, developing countries that chose growth through trade grew at least twice as fast as those who kept their doors closed and their tariffs high.

Consider this: if the wealthiest countries ended our agricultural subsidies, leveling the playing field for the world's farmers, that act alone could increase the income of developing countries by \$20 billion a year. That's why I disagree with some of the anti-globalization protestors. When they say we should expand our economies without trampling on our values, they're right. But when they suggest that poor countries should somehow be "saved" from development by keeping the doors of trade closed, that's a recipe for perpetuating poverty, not ending it.

Our imperative is clear. We need to open our markets if we're going to give the world's poorest workers the chance to grow and prosper. Still, none of us should underestimate the size of this challenge. We have to build a new consensus on trade. We have to answer those who fear that the burden of opening markets will fall mainly on them, whether farmers in Europe or textile workers in America, whose concerns fuel powerful political resistance to the idea of open trade. Leaders like myself have to do better in making the case not just how exports create jobs, but how imports increase innovation and competition, as well as savings for hard pressed families. And we must work to improve education and job training so that all our people have the skills and confidence to compete in the global economy.

We must also ask developing countries to be less resistant to our concern for human rights, labor, and the environment – to our goal that spirited economic competition that does not become a race to the bottom. At the same time, we must work harder to convince developing countries that our concerns are honorable, and not a pretext for protectionism.

Both the United States and Europe have to work harder to build that consensus for trade. In America, for example, we devote too little of our wealth to development assistance. But on a per capita basis, America also spends nearly 40 percent more than Europeans on imports from developing countries. Recently, we passed landmark trade agreements with Africa and the Caribbean Basin that will make a real difference in those countries. If America matches your generosity, and Europe matches our openness, think how much growth we could spur. Think how many lives we could lift from despair.

Debt Relief

At the same time, we must acknowledge that trade alone cannot lift nations from poverty. Many of the poorest developing countries are crippled by the burden of crushing debt – draining

resources that could be used to meet the most basic human needs, from clean water to schools to shelter. For too long, the world was paralyzed by this problem – divided between those who felt that any debt forgiveness would hurt the credit-worthiness of developing countries, and those who demanded outright cancellation of debt with no conditions.

Last year, at the G-7 Summit in Cologne, the world's wealthiest nations began to build a new consensus – responding to a remarkable coalition among religious faiths, businesses and non-governmental groups, and political parties in all our countries. We acknowledged that debt relief was critical; but also that relief without reform was of little help at all. And so we have struck a global social contract. We pledged enhanced debt relief to countries that put forward plans to spend their savings where they ought to be spent – on reducing poverty.

This, we know, can make a dramatic difference. Uganda, for example, has already used its savings to double primary school enrollment. With America paying its fair share, Bolivia will now save \$77 million and use it on health and education. Honduras will offer its children nine years of schooling instead of six.

The question before us is how to move forward. I believe we must strengthen this global social contract. The developed world must make greater efforts – as we did in the United States when we called for 100 percent bilateral debt relief for the least developed countries – and take steps to include more countries in our initiative.

But let me be clear: we are not going to make progress by lowering our standards to add more countries to the list. The best way to build support is to show success. That starts with good governance. Democracy is not just about elections; it is also about what happens after an election. Developing countries have to root out corruption... open their budget process... and show their people an honest accounting of where resources are being spent. If we have a moral

obligation to provide debt relief, then we have a further moral obligation to make sure our resources reach the people who need them most – the very poorest people on this planet.

Health & HIV/AIDS

The poorer they are, of course, the less healthy they are. The obstacles to good health in the developing world are many and of great magnitude. There is the obvious fact of malnutrition, and the fact that so many women still lack access to family planning and basic health services -- around the world, one woman dies every minute of every day from complications due to childbirth. There is the fact that 1.5 billion people lack access to safe, clean drinking water. There is also the growing danger of a changing climate. What does that have to do with health and poverty? If temperatures keep rising, developing countries in tropical regions will be hurt most as disease spreads and crops are devastated.

Today, infectious diseases are responsible for one in four deaths in the world. Diseases like malaria, tuberculosis, and diarrheal diseases kill 8 million children a year. Already, in South Africa, Botswana, and Zimbabwe, half of all 15-year olds are expected to die of AIDS. That is the human cost. The economic toll is also staggering: over the next decade, AIDS will cut the GDP of some African countries by 20 percent. And the epidemic has no natural boundaries -- the fastest growing rate of infection today is in Russia and the former Soviet Union.

We need to attack AIDS in the United States and Britain; we need to stop the disease from spreading in places like Russia and India where it can still be contained. But let us not forget that the number one health crisis in the world today is AIDS in Africa. And if the world doesn't do more about it, it will be our collective shame.

Developing countries themselves hold a critical part of the answer. However limited their resources, they must make treatment and prevention a priority. And whatever their cultural beliefs, they must be honest about the ways AIDS spreads and how it can be prevented. Talking about AIDS is tough, but it is far easier to tell your children the facts of life than to watch them learn the facts of death. In China – a country with enough resources to teach all its children to read – only 4 percent of adults know how AIDS is transmitted. Uganda, on the other hand, has cut the rate of infection by half.

But the bulk of new investment will have to come from the developed world. In the last few years, Britain and the United States have gotten off to a good start. And yet the difference between what the world provides and what the world needs for treatment and prevention of AIDS, malaria and TB is \$6 billion a year. That sounds like a lot of money. But think about this: America's fair share, about \$1.5 billion more than what we already spend, would be about the same as what our government spends each year on office supplies. It's about what the people of Britain spend each year buying blue jeans.

Government alone can't meet these health needs; but thus far, neither has the market. Drug companies have little incentive to develop medicines for people who can't pay for them. Only 10 percent of all biomedical research is devoted to diseases that overwhelmingly affect the poorest countries. That's why America has sharply increased its investment in vaccine research; boosted funding for buying vaccines, so that companies know there will be a guaranteed market; and proposed a tax credit to help provide for future vaccines. We should expand that approach to the development of drugs; and keep pressing pharmaceutical companies to make life-saving treatments affordable to all.

Universal Basic Education

One of the best health programs, the best economic development plans, the best anti-poverty strategies, is a good education. Each additional year spent in school increases wages by 10 to 20 percent. A primary education boosts a farmer's output by about 8 percent. And the education of girls is especially critical. Studies show that literate girls have significantly smaller and healthier families. More than that, imagine if all children, on every continent, had the tools to fulfill their God-given potential. Imagine the prospects for peace and democracy in a world that is more literate and better skilled.

We are making progress. In the past decade, primary enrollments have increased at twice the rate of the 1980s. Still, unfortunately, more than 100 million children receive no schooling at all. Sixty percent are girls. Almost half of all African children and one-quarter of those in South and West Asia are being denied this fundamental right, this basic root of all opportunity.

Just this year, [180] nations joined to set a goal of providing basic education to every child – to girls and boys alike – in every country by 2015. Few of our other efforts will be successful if we fail to reach this goal. What it will take is now known to us all. It's going to take a commitment by developing countries to propose specific plans and realistic budgets... to get their children out of the fields and factories... and to remove the fees and other obstacles that keep them out of the classrooms.

It's going to take a similar effort by the wealthier nations. One promising example is America's \$300 million global school lunch initiative – using a nutritious meal as an incentive for parents to send their kids to school. But all of us – from the U.S. to the World Bank to the developing world – need to do more. No strong national plan should ever be allowed to fail for lack of resources.

Digital Divide

Finally, we must close the global digital divide. Today, a person in South Asia is 700 times less likely to have access to the Internet as a person in the United States. It's estimated that in 2010, in the Asia-Pacific, the top eight economies will have 72 percent of their population on line, while the bottom eleven will have less than 4 percent. If that happens, the global economy really will resemble a world-wide web – a bunch of interlocking strands with great big holes in-between.

Now, it's fair to ask: Are computers really an answer for people who are starving or cannot read? Is e-commerce an answer for villages that lack electricity? Of course not – the fight against poverty begins with the basics. But we seek far more than basic survival. There shouldn't be a choice between Pentium and penicillin. That's another false debate. We shouldn't patronize poor people by saying they don't need 21st Century tools and skills.

Last March, I visited a village in one of the poorest states in India. A women's co-op there has set up one computer that provides them with life-saving information on child and maternal health. Meanwhile, in mountain villages in Bolivia, some are selling rugs to New York department stores over the Internet instead of growing coca for the drug trade. Some of the greatest innovations of the digital age are coming from centers of excellence in South Asia like Hyderabad, which is becoming known as Cyberabad. Imagine the innovations that would enrich all our lives if there were a thousand more Cyberabads in the developing world – if we unleashed the potential of half of humanity.

This is just the beginning. Developing countries need to pass laws and regulations that permit the greatest possible access at the least possible cost. And in the developed world, governments need to work with corporations and NGOs to provide equipment and expertise.

That's the goal of the new Digital Opportunity Task Force, or DOT Force, which America proposed and the G-8 has embraced.

Conclusion

I said earlier that our shared values will only be realized by stepping up to our shared responsibility. Leaders – who set national priorities – have to face these problems, not deny them, or delegate them entirely to the World Bank or the United Nations. NGOs – who deserve credit for raising the world's awareness, need to show they can also find practical paths to progress. And multi-national corporations – who have done much to create jobs and generate growth – have an enlightened self-interest in being partners for a cleaner environment, for a healthier workforce, for the freedom of association and the rights of workers to organize.

We know that the struggle for basic human dignity is as old as humanity itself. But the persistence of poverty and suffering in the world is not proof that this struggle is futile. It is merely proof that the struggle is difficult. I am enough of a realist to know that it will always be hard to close this divide. But I am enough of an optimist to believe we have an opportunity to succeed today as never before in human history. There is no great debate about the solutions – we know what must be done. Many of us are enjoying extraordinary good fortune – we can afford to do what is required. Surely, we can use the new opportunities of this global age to defeat the age-old scourge of human deprivation. And we must, if “globalism” is to have any meaning for most of humanity.

If we make these tough choices – as nations, as businesses, as international institutions – then we can build a global economy that leaves no one behind, carrying all countries into a century that, we hope, will be marked by peace and prosperity. We have before us as great an opportunity as the world has seen. Let us work together to seize it. Thank you.

December 12, 2000

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: JEFF SHESOL
TOM MALINOWSKI

SUBJECT: UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK ADDRESS

Attached is a draft of your Thursday speech. It reflects significant input at every stage from Sandy Berger, John Podesta and Gene Sperling.

We have coined the phrase "closing the globalization gap" to describe your development agenda, and to act as a sort of mission statement. We point this out because there is, as yet, no consensus on the best term to use: Gene, for example, prefers "global gap" or "global divide," lest you imply that "globalization" is inherently a divisive force. We will keep working to find a better phrase, if there is one, to encompass your agenda.

Thank you. We look forward to hearing your thoughts on the speech.

Draft 12/12/00 11:30pm
Shesol/ Malinowski

**PRESIDENT WILLIAM J. CLINTON
REMARKS ON CLOSING THE GLOBALIZATION GAP
WARWICK UNIVERSITY
COVENTRY, UNITED KINGDOM
December 14, 2000**

Acknowledgments: PM Tony Blair; Sir Shridath Ramphal, Chancellor, Warwick U.; Sir Brian Follett, Vice Chancellor, & Lady Follett; Lord Skidelsky; Caitlin McKenzie, Pres., Student Union; Ambassadors & others TK

I have come to Warwick to talk about a central reality of our time – the revolution that is transforming my nation, your nation, and the entire world. It is transforming our lives; tearing down barriers; building new networks among nations, peoples, and cultures.

We have a simple term for this sweeping process: globalization. Economies are growing more integrated, nations becoming more interdependent. What happens anywhere is felt, in a flash, everywhere, from Coventry to Kansas to Cambodia. Today, farmers in Nebraska understand that a currency crisis in Asia has a very real effect on their own livelihoods. Famine in Africa and images of suffering are instantly seen by the rest of the world. Trade, telecommunications, information technology – they are bringing us closer, and making the world smaller, than ever before.

That, I believe, is a good thing. For most people in countries like the United States and Britain, it is helping to create almost unprecedented prosperity; and, along with it, the chance to meet some of the fundamental, long-term challenges we face. In developing countries, too, it brings the promise of a better future. More people have been lifted out of poverty in the past few decades than at any time in world history. Life expectancy in developing countries is up; infant mortality is down; and according to the United Nations' Human Development Index – which

measures a decent standard of living, a good education, and a long and healthy life – the gap between rich and poor countries actually has declined since 1970.

And yet: there is a globalization gap that remains far too wide. As we begin the 21st Century, half of the world's people struggle to survive on less than two dollars a day. Nearly one billion live in chronic hunger... almost a billion of the world's adults cannot read... and half the children in the poorest countries are not in school. While some of us walk on the cutting edge of the global economy, others live on the razor's edge of survival. And one of the consequences is a rapidly growing population -- expected to increase by [50 percent] by the middle of this century -- concentrated in the countries least capable of sustaining it.

We must embrace a grand vision: to close the globalization gap. It is among the central challenges of the new century and a moral imperative of the highest order. At the core of our national characters is a belief in the inherent dignity and equality of all humankind. We know perfectly well how children live and die in the poorest countries, and how little it would take to make a difference in their lives. In a global, information age, we no longer have the excuse of ignorance. We can still choose not to act. But we can no longer choose not to know.

The Cold War is no longer a preoccupation. We face an array of serious challenges to our security and well-being; but no overriding struggle for survival diverts us from aiding the survival of hundreds of millions of people in the developing world. Nor do we have the old excuse that harsh realities a world away are without real consequence for our own people. We have seen how abject poverty accelerates turmoil and conflict; how it creates recruits for terrorists and those who incite ethnic and religious hatred; how it fuels a violent rejection of the economic and social order on which our future depends.

It's not just that nations crippled by debt or disease or inadequate education cannot compete – they can combust. To dismiss global development as a “soft” issue is to be blind to hard truths. In a world that's increasingly connected, the vast disparities between rich and poor are unsustainable. Global poverty is a powder keg – and could be ignited by our indifference.

Fortunately, the opposite is also true. I've just come from Ireland, and I think it's no surprise that Ireland is making progress toward peace just as it's becoming the fastest growing economy in Europe.

How shall we meet this challenge? Too often, we are presented with a false choice. Some maintain that free markets, alone, will close whatever gap might exist; that the forces of change should be left completely unfettered. Others believe we should build walls, insisting that we can isolate our nations from the forces – the instabilities and inequalities – many people fear.

This is a choice between two extremes; and we are right to reject it. Open markets, however essential, are insufficient: they can help reduce poverty, but will not end it. And as the city of Coventry knows, there was a time when walls stood strong against would-be invaders; but they never really kept the world locked out. And that, on measure, has been a good thing.

So let us reject this false choice. Let us work to embrace the forces of global change so that they can benefit all peoples in all nations – so that they spur growth and lift lives everywhere in the world. Through trade and the new tools of technology, and by investing in people through education and health care, prosperity can be shared more widely, potential realized more fully, and opportunities created and seized in every country on the globe.

I have worked hard, and so has Prime Minister Blair, to raise these tough issues to the top of the global agenda. They have been a serious part of the dialogue at the most recent G-8

summits. Together, we are building a new development agenda for a new century. Today, I want to explore and expand that vision. I want to be clear-eyed about the challenges before us; and equally candid about the solutions. Underlying them all is this basic belief: if we want the global economy to embody shared values, then our efforts must reflect shared responsibility.

That means all nations – from the richest to the poorest – must unlock more of our resources and our untapped reservoirs of national will. That goes for governments and for businesses, for multilateral and non-governmental organizations, for religious leaders and civil society. We all must work together, more fully and comprehensively than before, and must make the tough choices we have not always been willing to make.

Trade

We must first make clear that open markets and rules-based trade are proven engines of economic growth. We know that countries that have opened their economies to the world have also opened their doors to opportunity and hope for their people. From the early 1970s to the early 1990s, developing countries that chose growth through trade grew at least twice as fast as those who kept their doors closed and their tariffs high.

Consider this: if the wealthiest countries ended our agricultural subsidies, leveling the playing field for the world's farmers, that act alone could increase the income of developing countries by \$20 billion a year. That's why I disagree with some of the anti-globalization protestors. When they say we should expand our economies without trampling on our values, they're right. But when they suggest that poor countries should somehow be "saved" from development by keeping the doors of trade closed, that's a recipe for perpetuating poverty, not ending it.

Our imperative is clear. We need to open our markets if we're going to give the world's poorest workers the chance to grow and prosper. Still, none of us should underestimate the size of this challenge. We have to build a new consensus on trade. We have to answer those who fear that the burden of opening markets will fall mainly on them, whether farmers in Europe or textile workers in America, whose concerns fuel powerful political resistance to the idea of open trade. Leaders like myself have to do better in making the case not just how exports create jobs, but how imports increase innovation and competition, as well as savings for hard pressed families. And we must work to improve education and job training so that all our people have the skills and confidence to compete in the global economy.

We must also ask developing countries to be less resistant to our concern for human rights, labor, and the environment – to our goal that spirited economic competition that does not become a race to the bottom. At the same time, we must work harder to convince developing countries that our concerns are honorable, and not a pretext for protectionism.

Both the United States and Europe have to work harder to build that consensus for trade. In America, for example, we devote too little of our wealth to development assistance. But on a per capita basis, America also spends nearly 40 percent more than Europeans on imports from developing countries. Recently, we passed landmark trade agreements with Africa and the Caribbean Basin that will make a real difference in those countries. If America matches your generosity, and Europe matches our openness, think how much growth we could spur. Think how many lives we could lift from despair.

Debt Relief

At the same time, we must acknowledge that trade alone cannot lift nations from poverty. Many of the poorest developing countries are crippled by the burden of crushing debt – draining

resources that could be used to meet the most basic human needs, from clean water to schools to shelter. For too long, the world was paralyzed by this problem – divided between those who felt that any debt forgiveness would hurt the credit-worthiness of developing countries, and those who demanded outright cancellation of debt with no conditions.

Last year, at the G-7 Summit in Cologne, the world's wealthiest nations began to build a new consensus – responding to a remarkable coalition among religious faiths, businesses and non-governmental groups, and political parties in all our countries. We acknowledged that debt relief was critical; but also that relief without reform was of little help at all. And so we have struck a global social contract. We pledged enhanced debt relief to countries that put forward plans to spend their savings where they ought to be spent – on reducing poverty.

This, we know, can make a dramatic difference. Uganda, for example, has already used its savings to double primary school enrollment. With America paying its fair share, Bolivia will now save \$77 million and use it on health and education. Honduras will offer its children nine years of schooling instead of six.

The question before us is how to move forward. I believe we must strengthen this global social contract. The developed world must make greater efforts – as we did in the United States when we called for 100 percent bilateral debt relief for the least developed countries – and take steps to include more countries in our initiative.

But let me be clear: we are not going to make progress by lowering our standards to add more countries to the list. The best way to build support is to show success. That starts with good governance. Democracy is not just about elections; it is also about what happens after an election. Developing countries have to root out corruption... open their budget process... and show their people an honest accounting of where resources are being spent. If we have a moral

obligation to provide debt relief, then we have a further moral obligation to make sure our resources reach the people who need them most – the very poorest people on this planet.

Health & HIV/AIDS

The poorer they are, of course, the less healthy they are. The obstacles to good health in the developing world are many and of great magnitude. There is the obvious fact of malnutrition, and the fact that so many women still lack access to family planning and basic health services -- around the world, one woman dies every minute of every day from complications due to childbirth. There is the fact that 1.5 billion people lack access to safe, clean drinking water. There is also the growing danger of a changing climate. What does that have to do with health and poverty? If temperatures keep rising, developing countries in tropical regions will be hurt most as disease spreads and crops are devastated.

Today, infectious diseases are responsible for one in four deaths in the world. Diseases like malaria, tuberculosis, and diarrheal diseases kill 8 million children a year. Already, in South Africa, Botswana, and Zimbabwe, half of all 15-year olds are expected to die of AIDS. That is the human cost. The economic toll is also staggering: over the next decade, AIDS will cut the GDP of some African countries by 20 percent. And the epidemic has no natural boundaries -- the fastest growing rate of infection today is in Russia and the former Soviet Union.

We need to attack AIDS in the United States and Britain; we need to stop the disease from spreading in places like Russia and India where it can still be contained. But let us not forget that the number one health crisis in the world today is AIDS in Africa. And if the world doesn't do more about it, it will be our collective shame.

Developing countries themselves hold a critical part of the answer. However limited their resources, they must make treatment and prevention a priority. And whatever their cultural beliefs, they must be honest about the ways AIDS spreads and how it can be prevented. Talking about AIDS is tough, but it is far easier to tell your children the facts of life than to watch them learn the facts of death. In China – a country with enough resources to teach all its children to read – only 4 percent of adults know how AIDS is transmitted. Uganda, on the other hand, has cut the rate of infection by half.

But the bulk of new investment will have to come from the developed world. In the last few years, Britain and the United States have gotten off to a good start. And yet the difference between what the world provides and what the world needs for treatment and prevention of AIDS, malaria and TB is \$6 billion a year. That sounds like a lot of money. But think about this: America's fair share, about \$1.5 billion more than what we already spend, would be about the same as what our government spends each year on office supplies. It's about what the people of Britain spend each year buying blue jeans.

Government alone can't meet these health needs; but thus far, neither has the market. Drug companies have little incentive to develop medicines for people who can't pay for them. Only 10 percent of all biomedical research is devoted to diseases that overwhelmingly affect the poorest countries. That's why America has sharply increased its investment in vaccine research; boosted funding for buying vaccines, so that companies know there will be a guaranteed market; and proposed a tax credit to help provide for future vaccines. We should expand that approach to the development of drugs; and keep pressing pharmaceutical companies to make life-saving treatments affordable to all.

Universal Basic Education

One of the best health programs, the best economic development plans, the best anti-poverty strategies, is a good education. Each additional year spent in school increases wages by 10 to 20 percent. A primary education boosts a farmer's output by about 8 percent. And the education of girls is especially critical. Studies show that literate girls have significantly smaller and healthier families. More than that, imagine if all children, on every continent, had the tools to fulfill their God-given potential. Imagine the prospects for peace and democracy in a world that is more literate and better skilled.

We are making progress. In the past decade, primary enrollments have increased at twice the rate of the 1980s. Still, unfortunately, more than 100 million children receive no schooling at all. Sixty percent are girls. Almost half of all African children and one-quarter of those in South and West Asia are being denied this fundamental right, this basic root of all opportunity.

Just this year, [180] nations joined to set a goal of providing basic education to every child – to girls and boys alike – in every country by 2015. Few of our other efforts will be successful if we fail to reach this goal. What it will take is now known to us all. It's going to take a commitment by developing countries to propose specific plans and realistic budgets... to get their children out of the fields and factories... and to remove the fees and other obstacles that keep them out of the classrooms.

It's going to take a similar effort by the wealthier nations. One promising example is America's \$300 million global school lunch initiative – using a nutritious meal as an incentive for parents to send their kids to school. But all of us – from the U.S. to the World Bank to the developing world – need to do more. No strong national plan should ever be allowed to fail for lack of resources.

Digital Divide

Finally, we must close the global digital divide. Today, a person in South Asia is 700 times less likely to have access to the Internet as a person in the United States. It's estimated that in 2010, in the Asia-Pacific, the top eight economies will have 72 percent of their population on line, while the bottom eleven will have less than 4 percent. If that happens, the global economy really will resemble a world-wide web – a bunch of interlocking strands with great big holes in-between.

Now, it's fair to ask: Are computers really an answer for people who are starving or cannot read? Is e-commerce is an answer for villages that lack e-lectricity? Of course not – the fight against poverty begins with the basics. But we seek far more than basic survival. There shouldn't be a choice between Pentium and penicillin. That's another false debate. We shouldn't patronize poor people by saying they don't need 21st Century tools and skills.

Last March, I visited a village in one of the poorest states in India. A women's co-op there has set up one computer that provides them with life-saving information on child and maternal health. Meanwhile, in mountain villages in Bolivia, some are selling rugs to New York department stores over the Internet instead of growing coca for the drug trade. Some of the greatest innovations of the digital age are coming from centers of excellence in South Asia like Hyderabad, which is becoming known as Cyberabad. Imagine the innovations that would enrich all our lives if there were a thousand more Cyberabads in the developing world – if we unleashed the potential of half of humanity.

This is just the beginning. Developing countries need to pass laws and regulations that permit the greatest possible access at the least possible cost. And in the developed world, governments need to work with corporations and NGOs to provide equipment and expertise.

That's the goal of the new Digital Opportunity Task Force, or DOT Force, which America proposed and the G-8 has embraced.

Conclusion

I said earlier that our shared values will only be realized by stepping up to our shared responsibility. Leaders – who set national priorities – have to face these problems, not deny them, or delegate them entirely to the World Bank or the United Nations. NGOs – who deserve credit for raising the world's awareness, need to show they can also find practical paths to progress. And multi-national corporations – who have done much to create jobs and generate growth – have an enlightened self-interest in being partners for a cleaner environment, for a healthier workforce, for the freedom of association and the rights of workers to organize.

We know that the struggle for basic human dignity is as old as humanity itself. But the persistence of poverty and suffering in the world is not proof that this struggle is futile. It is merely proof that the struggle is difficult. I am enough of a realist to know that it will always be hard to close this divide. But I am enough of an optimist to believe we have an opportunity to succeed today as never before in human history. There is no great debate about the solutions – we know what must be done. Many of us are enjoying extraordinary good fortune – we can afford to do what is required. Surely, we can use the new opportunities of this global age to defeat the age-old scourge of human deprivation. And we must, if “globalism” is to have any meaning for most of humanity.

If we make these tough choices – as nations, as businesses, as international institutions – then we can build a global economy that leaves no one behind, carrying all countries into a century that, we hope, will be marked by peace and prosperity. We have before us as great an opportunity as the world has seen. Let us work together to seize it. Thank you.