

FOIA MARKER

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

Folder Title: [Biden] [2]				
Staff Office-Individual: Speechwriting-Orzulak, Paul				
Original OA/ID Number: 4022				
Row: 48	Section: 6	Shelf: 9	Position: 2	Stack: V

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
--------------------------	---------------	------	-------------

001. fax	Phone No. (Partial) (1 page)	01/20/2000	P6/b(6)
----------	------------------------------	------------	---------

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Speechwriting (Paul Orzulak)
OA/Box Number: 4022

FOLDER TITLE:

[Biden] [2]

2008-0702-F

jm193

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

1/20/00 5:30 p.m.
Orzulak

**NATIONAL SECURITY ADVISOR SAMUEL R. BERGER
REMARKS TO
CONSTITUENTS OF SENATOR JOE BIDEN
WILMINGTON, DELAWARE
JANUARY 24, 2000**

Thank you, Senator. It's an honor for me to be here today, and I want to thank you for inviting me. Please forgive me if I was a few minutes late. I was trying to leave for the speech, but members of my staff only wanted to talk about which actor would be playing them in tomorrow night's episode of "The West Wing." I have a beef with that show. In the cast, they have actors who portray the President, the Vice President, the Chief of Staff, the Deputy Chief of Staff, the Press Secretary, and even the speechwriter. But even though many of the episodes involve foreign policy decisions, no one has portrayed me.

It's probably just as well, considering how Hollywood has portrayed national security advisors in the past. A stuffed shirt in "the Peacemaker." An egomaniac killed off in "Air Force One." A calculating sell-out in "Clear and Present Danger." And just last week on television, as a zealot with really bad hair in "Murder at 1600." I can't imagine who was the model for these characters, but let me stress that each of these movies was in process before I assumed the job.

But one role I have been proud to play for more than a decade is friend of Joe Biden. When he was a young Senator serving his first term on the Foreign Relations Committee, I worked for Secretary of State Cyrus Vance. Our paths crossed a few times. [TRUE? STORIES?] You'll be happy to know that Joe Biden hasn't changed much the past 25 years: he's still the same low-key, soft-spoken guy he's always been.

It's been said that every generation of Americans has had at least one Senator who helped define and explain America's role in the world. In a way, what Arthur Vandenberg was to the 1950s; what William Fullbright was to the 1960s; what Ed Muskie and Scoop Jackson were to the 1970s; and what Nancy Kassebaum and Sam Nunn were to the 1980s; Joe Biden has been to the 1990s: a clear and consistent voice for American interests and American ideals.

~~In this day and age,~~ it's easy to be cynical about the world we live in today. It's easy to be cynical about decisions made by others, and then go your own way. But it's a lot harder to stand in the arena, to believe in a cause, and work day and night to convince others to believe in that cause, too. Joe Biden is one of the people who believes.

When the President took office seven years ago, Time Magazine asked the question: is the U.S. in an irreversible decline as the world's premier power? Today, nobody is asking that question. Just think about all the things America has done to build a better world. We've aided the remarkable transitions to free-market democracy in Eastern Europe; stopped ethnic wars in Bosnia and Kosovo; worked with Russia to deactivate thousands of nuclear missiles; helped broker historic peace agreements from Northern Ireland to the Middle East, Africa to South America; froze North Korea's missile program; and signed more than 270 trade agreements that have opened markets and raised living standards here at home.

compress

And every step along the way, Joe Biden has been our go-to guy in the Senate. He's been able to build coalitions, and make others believe in a cause, when few others thought it was possible. In particular, with the President, he led the fight to improve America's security by expanding NATO. He built a bipartisan coalition to approve ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention. His eloquence on the floor of the Senate helped provide the moral authority we needed to stop the killing in Bosnia and Kosovo. And he continues to be one of the world's leading voices on arms control. On nearly every issue that keeps us safe as Americans -- from the security of our borders to the safety of our streets -- Joe Biden is making a difference.

His leadership helped write an uplifting final chapter to the Century. In the 20th Century, millions of American men and women -- including more than 75,000 from Delaware -- worked to defeat fascism, contain communism, and sustain freedom when it was most imperiled.

Thanks to their sacrifice, we enter a new Century with liberty ascendant. Think about this: one hundred years ago, not a single country in the world recognized the right of all its citizens to choose their leaders and shape their destinies. Today, for the first time in history, more than half the world's people elect their own leaders. For the first time in history, the world's leading nations are not engaged in a deadly struggle for security or territory. (For the first time in history, America stands as the world's only superpower.) Never before have we had such an opportunity to move toward what generations have prayed for -- peace on Earth and a better life for all.

But this is not a world without dangers to us. We must not assume that because we are secure and at peace, that we don't need military strength -- or that because we are prosperous, we are immune from problems half a world away. Today, more than any time in our history, America has a responsibility to lead. We have a responsibility to those who came before us -- who sacrificed for liberty -- to be engaged in the world, to work with others to secure peace and prosperity where we can, to lead where we must, and to finish the fight for freedom. I believe -- we must do our part to answer the big questions that will shape the 21st Century.

One critical question is whether our former adversaries Russia and China will emerge as stable, prosperous democratic partners of the United States.

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, our engagement with a democratic Russia has produced concrete results -- the dismantlement of 5,000 former Soviet nuclear weapons, the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the Baltics, and Russia's role in ending the conflict in Kosovo. We all know that Russia is still struggling with demons that have bedeviled it for years: the legacy of totalitarianism, poverty, corruption, and conflict in the Caucasus. But the way President Yeltsin left office last month reflected just how much has changed. For the first time in their 1,000-year history, the Russian people now know that leaders can voluntarily transfer power.

Of course, we will continue to speak about the situation in Chechnya. We've made clear that Russia's ~~fight against terrorism is right~~ but its indiscriminate use of force is wrong. And it is inviting far more serious problems for itself that it can possibly solve. But we should not stop supporting those forces in Russia that are trying to strengthen the rule of law and build faith in democratic institutions. Russia is paying a price for its conduct in Chechnya; Russian democracy must not.

As for China, a sense of realism cautions us to be prepared for the possibility that this emerging power emerges as a threat. China is a country that has lifted hundreds of millions of its citizens

319 gr troops
the back of
early &
principled
voice
against
the
a warlike
in
Bosnia
Kosovo

America is
in a very
unique
position

only sp.
- world con
higher moral
values we

defended
- save people

resent that,
but must
look to us
to provide

leadership &
look to our

open society
as a model of

what it takes
to succeed in

a global
world

Partnership - should
be in
policy

constitutionally roles
out problem not still exist, including the risk

Russia

that doesn't mean

from poverty and expanded personal freedoms – but it is also a country whose progress is held back by resistance to political reforms vital to its growth and stability. We believe that we can protect our security and encourage the right kind of change in China by continuing a policy of principled, purposeful engagement. A good example is the recent agreement we signed to bring China into the World Trade Organization. As it stands now, our markets are open to China's goods and services. Our new agreement requires China to ~~now~~ open their markets in every sector from agriculture to telecommunications to automobiles. It will mean jobs and increased exports for American workers and American products. In the long run, the WTO will commit China – ~~for the first time~~ – to play by international rules. We want to see China on the inside, playing by the rules, rather than on the outside, denying them.

A second question is whether our security will be threatened by regional conflicts, especially those rooted in ethnic and religious tensions, that pose the risk of a wider war. With all its amazing advances, our modern world is still plagued by our oldest failing: fear of those who are different from us. In too many places, there are unscrupulous leaders all too willing to feed on that fear to preserve their own power. We have worked hard the past seven years to overcome those fears and help complete the job that so many Americans fought and died for – to build an undivided, democratic, peaceful Europe for the first time in history.

We should be proud of the men and women of our armed forces who turned the tide against ethnic cleansing in Kosovo. There is a great deal more to do to create a peaceful Europe: helping Kosovo through its first free election while continuing to clamp down on violence; bolstering the democratic opposition in Serbia; promoting investment in the Balkans; encouraging progress in the Cyprus talks and greater cooperation between Greece and Turkey; helping more new democracies get ready for membership in NATO. Some of this will require money and the steady support of people like Senator Biden. But if we're persistent, we may one day reach a time when no other American will be asked to fight and die in Europe.

We should also be proud of the role America has played to help bring the Middle East closer to peace than they have ever been before. Today, Israeli, Palestinian, and Syrian leaders all want peace, and recognize that this is a unique moment. We will have to work hard this year to succeed.

As you know, Israelis and Syrians met two times recently in Sheperdstown, West Virginia. The gaps between them right now are not so wide, but they are deeply entrenched. Each side has its own priorities – and each side wants those priorities dealt with first. It's aggravated by a real lack of trust between the two sides, which worsens every disagreement. We are working today to find a way to make sure both sides' needs are met. Soon, experts from the two countries will be coming to the U.S. for further discussions. We'll keep working for results. But let's keep this in perspective: this conflict has been a source of tension in the world for 50 years. We always knew this would be difficult. But we have never had a better chance to end it. I'm optimistic that we can make real progress this year.

A third question is whether terrorists and hostile nations will acquire the means to undermine our defenses, and force us to live in fear again.

Thankfully, the New Year's Eve Celebrations around the world passed without a terrorist attack. But just because we dodged a bullet doesn't mean there was no bullet to dodge. The last weeks of 1999 saw the largest US counter-terrorism operation in history. Terrorist cells were disrupted

That's why we've got to press our interests on issues like profit of dangerous weapons why we need to speak out clearly about denial of human rights But even as we defend our interests we should not isolate China from the global forces that are exposing its people to seek a better life. That's why we signed an agreement to bring China into WTO – As it stands now,

Make more general

Clinton - Arafat

incredible

All sides want to see needs met. POTUS will work as hard as he has to to get things done

obligate

+ incurs freedom of people

Palestina - make it more general

in eight countries and attacks were almost certainly prevented thanks to the good work of our law enforcement and intelligence agencies. We must continue to work with other nations to ~~destroy terrorist and criminal networks and target the havens that launder money.~~ *to meet threat with up refusal to be 10 km into*

Part of the challenge will be to make it more difficult for weapons of mass destruction and the missiles that can carry them to fall into the wrong hands. In Russia today, the average salary of a highly-trained weapons scientists is less than \$100 a month. For a small investment, we can help them turn that expertise to peaceful projects that help the world. Or, we can do nothing and pray that each and every one of them resists the temptation to market their expertise to those who wish us harm. Common sense says to help them. That's why we are working with Senator Biden to increase funding for threat reduction by two-thirds over the next five years.

It also means we must continue to work to restrain North Korea and Iran's missile programs, to prevent Iraq from threatening its neighbors; and to pursue terrorist and maintain pressure on those who shelter them, including the Taliban in Afghanistan. With Senator Biden's leadership, I hope we are also able to find common ground on the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

prevent hostile countries - Iraq, Iran, NK - from obh, w m d. - Cyber warfare

A fourth question is whether the stability of the 20th Century will be threatened by a growing gap between rich and poor. It is unacceptable that in a world with so many riches, more than one billion people live on less than one dollar a day. It is unacceptable that more than two billion people get sick every year - many of them children - because they don't have clean water to drink. It is unacceptable that more than three million African children have already died of AIDS. ~~In the next 100 years, the one war we all have to fight to win is the war to end global poverty.~~ *The President has expressed very strongly*

What can we do about this. On this is promote democracy good government so just a response to the needs of their people the good news is...

A large part of the answer is freedom. With the hopeful transitions to democracy in Nigeria and Indonesia, more people won the right to choose their leaders in 1999 than in 1989, the year the Berlin Wall fell. Now, the question remains: how do we shape globalization so that it spurs growth, lifts the poor as well as the rich, improves the dignity of labor, and strengthens the protection of the environment.

Another thing we can do is help other countries benefit from a global economy. My notes highlight 106.1 effort to

In various ways, the protesters in Seattle last month were raising that same question. But they offered a confusing answer. Many complained that the World Trade Organization is too powerful, yet argued, in effect, that the WTO should acquire new powers to impose and enforce labor and environmental standards around the world. All expressed solidarity with poor people in the developing world. (But it's hard to see how people living on a dollar a day will ever be able to live in dignity if we deny them the chance to sell the fruits of their labor and creativity beyond their own borders. There are practices such as forced labor and child labor that the world should not tolerate. But we must also understand that, for the poorest countries, trade means growth and growth means improved working conditions. We don't want a race to the bottom in the international economy, but neither do we want to keep the bottom down. What we want is a steady march to the top that leaves no one behind.) *allow to crush debt my nations have. By a concerted effort to fight AIDS, other diseases that in dev. world that we hold countries back.*

In his State of the Union Address later this week, the President will propose several initiatives that will help countries make the right choices and attack poverty at the root.

In the years ahead, we will face many other fundamental questions, and challenges we can hardly foresee, whether tragedies or hopeful breakthroughs. But as a result of the last several years, we look to that distant horizon from higher and more hopeful ground. Every day, we have a chance

→ we also have to expand standards. It's back to work.

to make real for the world what Delaware set into motion more than two centuries ago when it became the first state to ratify the liberties and protections that we hold so dear.

Sometimes, that history may seem long, but the cord that connects us to ages past is short. Think about it: Senator Biden serves in the Senate with Senator Strom Thurmond. Senator Thurmond, who first entered the Senate in 1954, served with Walter George, who entered in 1922; who served with Henry Cabot Lodge, who entered in 1893; who served with John Sherman, who entered in 1861; who served with Hannibal Hamlin, who entered in 1848; who served with William King, who entered in 1819, who served with Rufus King, who re-entered in 1813; who served with Joseph Anderson, who entered in 1797; who served with John Brown, who entered in 1792; who served with George Read, the first Senator from Delaware, who entered in 1789 – and signed both the United States Constitution and the Declaration of Independence. Through just ten people – starting and ending in Delaware -- we are directly connected to the two documents that have moved this nation and this world for two centuries.

Today, we are closer than we have ever been to turning the promise of that freedom call that began here in Delaware into a reality for more than half the world. Seven years after the question was asked “is the U.S. in an irreversable decline as the world’s premier power” – America has arrived at a moment when our strength and prosperity are unparalleled. For all the billions of people who came before us, it has been left to this generation to lead the world into a new millennium, to use our freedom wisely, to walk away from war and hatred, and to walk toward peace. When historians look back on this Century, let them say that is exactly what we did

Thank you.

* What the President has had to do is take advantage of that opportunity, to preserve this favorable moment & build on it. We've got a lot to be proud of

- put an end to intractable conflict
- expand trade
- support transitions to free market economies in Central Europe
- also by refining our national security strategy on new dangers - proliferation, narcoterrorism

↳ Along the way, we've had quite a few passionate discussions. Now people in both parties about what our proper role is. Undoubtedly, in a world without a single threat, so we should disengage from world — don't go — go along — we should for the proposition that we must lead — we benefit when nations come together. With Clinton's help, we've managed to sustain consensus for America's role in world (press club transition)

Question now: what do we do with this power — we look → what are the really big questions facing us — go into action.

Thank you, Joe. It's an honor for me to be here today, and I want to thank you for inviting me. Please forgive me if I was a few minutes late. I was trying to leave for the speech, but members of my staff only wanted to talk about which actor would be playing them in tomorrow night's episode of "The West Wing." I have a beef with that show. In the cast, they have actors who portray the President, the Vice President, the Chief of Staff, the Deputy Chief of Staff, the Press Secretary, the Speechwriter – and a few weeks ago, I'm told they even had as a character the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee. But even though half the episodes involve foreign policy decisions, no one has portrayed me.

Which is probably just as well, considering how Hollywood has portrayed national security advisors in the past. A stuffed shirt in "the Peacemaker." An egomaniac killed off in "Air Force One." A self-promoter in "Contact." And a zealot in "Murder at 1600," which was just on television last week. I can't imagine who was the model for these characters, but let me stress that each of these movies was in process before I assumed the job.

But one thing I have been proud to be the past two decades is a friend of Joe Biden. Senator Biden arrived in Washington at just about the same time. When he was a young Senator serving his first term for the people of Delaware, I was a young speechwriter working for Secretary of State Cyrus Vance. Our paths crossed a few times. [STORIES?] You'll be happy to know that Joe Biden hasn't changed much the past 25 years: he's still the same low-key, soft-spoken guy he's always been.

Even back then, it didn't take much to imagine that Joe would be playing the vital role he is playing today. Every generation of Americans had had at least one Senator who helped define and explain America's role in the world. Today, it's fair to say that what Arthur Vandenberg was to the 1950s; what William Fullbright was to the 1960s; what Ed Muskie and Scoop Jackson were to the 1970s; and what Nancy Kassebaum and Sam Nunn were to the 1980s; Joe Biden has been to the 1990s: a clear and consistent voice for American interests and American ideals.

In the Twentieth Century, millions of American boys and girls – including 75,000 from Delaware – worked to defeat facism, and contain communism, and sustain freedom when it was most imperiled. Thanks to America's leadership, we have begun a new Century with liberty ascendant. Today, for the first time in history, more than half the world's people elect their own leaders. For the first time in history, the world's leading nations are not engaged in a deadly struggle for security or territory. And for the first time in history, American power is unprecedented.

As Joe Biden has argued so eloquently, now, more than ever, America has a responsibility to lead. We have a responsibility to all those who came before us, who sacrificed for liberty, to finish the fight for freedom – to secure peace and prosperity where we can, to lead where we must, to defend our interests, and to stand up for what America stands for. Today, I want to talk for a few minutes about where that leadership is needed most, and where

Thank you, Joe. It's an honor for me to be here today, and I want to thank you for inviting me. Please forgive me if I was a few minutes late. I was trying to leave for the speech, but members of my staff only wanted to talk about which actor would be playing them in tomorrow night's episode of "The West Wing." I have a beef with that show. In the cast, they have actors who portray the President, the Vice President, the Chief of Staff, the Deputy Chief of Staff, the Press Secretary, the Speechwriter – and a few weeks ago, I'm told they even had as a character the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee. But even though half the episodes involve foreign policy decisions, no one has portrayed me.

Which is probably just as well, considering how Hollywood has portrayed national security advisors in the past. A stuffed shirt in "the Peacemaker." An egomaniac killed off in "Air Force One." A self-promoter in "Contact." And a zealot in "Murder at 1600," which was just on television last week. I can't imagine who was the model for these characters, but let me stress that each of these movies was in process before I assumed the job.

But one thing I have been proud to be the past two decades is a friend of Joe Biden. Senator Biden arrived in Washington at just about the same time. When he was a young Senator serving his first term for the people of Delaware, I was a young speechwriter working for Secretary of State Cyrus Vance. Our paths crossed a few times. [STORIES?] You'll be happy to know that Joe Biden hasn't changed much the past 25 years: he's still the same low-key, soft-spoken guy he's always been.

Even back then, it didn't take much to imagine that Joe would be playing the vital role he is playing today. Every generation of Americans had had at least one Senator who helped define and explain America's role in the world. Today, it's fair to say that what Arthur Vandenberg was to the 1950s; what William Fullbright was to the 1960s; what Ed Muskie and Scoop Jackson were to the 1970s; and what Nancy Kassebaum and Sam Nunn were to the 1980s; Joe Biden has been to the 1990s: a clear and consistent voice for American interests and American ideals.

In the Twentieth Century, millions of American boys and girls – including 75,000 from Delaware – worked to defeat facism, and contain communism, and sustain freedom when it was most imperiled. Thanks to America's leadership, we have begun a new Century with liberty ascendant. Today, for the first time in history, more than half the world's people elect their own leaders. For the first time in history, the world's leading nations are not engaged in a deadly struggle for security or territory. And for the first time in history, American power is unprecedented.

As Joe Biden has argued so eloquently, now, more than ever, America has a responsibility to lead. We have a responsibility to all those who came before us, who sacrificed for liberty, to finish the fight for freedom – to secure peace and prosperity where we can, to lead where we must, to defend our interests, and to stand up for what America stands for. Today, I want to talk for a few minutes about where that leadership is needed most, and where

Jen Palmeri → Schoner

Jim Kennedy

Orzulak, Paul K. (SPCHW)

224-3786

From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:

Halperin, David E. (SPCHW)
Wednesday, January 19, 2000 9:52 AM
Orzulak, Paul K. (SPCHW)
[UNCLASSIFIED]

Sarah Gigganheiner

Thank you, very much, Dick Solomon. I am grateful to you and to the U.S. Institute of Peace for having me here today. Please forgive me if I was a few minutes late. I was trying to leave for the speech, but members of my staff only wanted to talk about which actor played them in last night's episode of "The West Wing." No one played me, apparently, despite the fact that, as I understand it, the episode involved a foreign terrorist act. Maybe that's just as well, considering how Hollywood has presented national security advisers recently: A stuffed shirt in "The Peacemaker." An egomaniac killed off in "Air Force One." A self-promoter in "Contact." A zealot in "Murder at 1600." I can't imagine who the model was for these characters, but let me stress that each of these movies was in process before I assumed this job.

Patty Murray - healthcare LA
- 50 or 50

C:

Kick

Scoop Jackson
56-83
John Kennis
Sam Nunn

Arthur
- Vandenburg - 50s JFK - 50s
william
- Fullbright - 60s
- Muskie - 70s

Assimone

Lugar, Kassebaum
Church, Javits, Dicker,

- William Proxmire Mike Mansfield
- Howard Baker

Ed Muskie

Sam Nunn

- Dick Lugar

brian - Mckeon @ Foreign-rel.senate.gov
Lee Hamilton

www.senate.gov/foreign/minority/press/speeches.html

hennan The White Men - Chester Bowles

post-WWII generation

fax:

228-3612 - bio of Chip Bolen

I have known Senator Biden for more than 25 years. When he was a young Senator serving his first term for the people of Delaware, I was a young speechwriter working for Secretary of State Cyrus Vance. Our paths crossed a few times [STORIES?]. You'll be happy to know that Joe Biden hasn't changed much in the past 25 years: he's still the same low-key, soft-spoken guy he's always been. And he is still serving this state and this nation well.

For every generation of Americans, there has been at least one Senator who helped define and explain America's role in the world. What Arthur Vandenberg was to the 1950s; what William Fullbright was to the 1960s; what Ed Muskie and Scoop Jackson were to the 1970s; and what Nancy Kassebaum and Sam Nunn were to the 1980s; in many ways, Joe Biden has been to the 1990s.

Liveli Ly

Barbara Barclay

In Washington, Joe Biden is known for many things. He is the junior Senator from the state of Delaware, ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and former Chairman of the Judiciary Committee. But he is also known as the most famous Amtrak customer in our nation's capitol. Like so many other issues in which I have followed Joe Biden's lead, I decided to take the train here this evening.

Please forgive me if I am a few minutes late. As I was trying to leave for the speech, members of my staff only wanted to talk about which actor will play them in this week's episode of the West Wing. This show is a sore spot for me. In the cast, they have actors who portray the President, the Vice President, the Chief of Staff, the Deputy Chief of Staff, the Press Secretary, the Speechwriter – and I'm told, a few weeks ago, they even had an actor portray the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee. But so far, even though more than half of the episodes have involved foreign policy crises – no one has portrayed me.

Maybe that's just as well, considering how Hollywood has portrayed national security advisors in the past. A stuffed shirt in "the Peacemaker." An egomaniac killed off in "Air Force One." A self-promoter in "Contact." And a zealot in "Murder at 1600." I can't imagine who the model was for these characters, but let me stress that each of these moves was in process before I assumed the job.

24th
11:30-12
Noon-1
Monday

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. fax	Phone No. (Partial) (1 page)	01/20/2000	P6/b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Speechwriting (Paul Orzulak)
OA/Box Number: 4022

FOLDER TITLE:

[Biden] [2]

2008-0702-F

jm193

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

FAX TRANSMISSION

*Committee on Foreign Relations
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510
202-224-3953 (phone)
202-228-3612 (fax)*

To: Paul Orzulak
NSC

Date: January 20, 2000

Fax #: 456-9210

Pages: 5, including this cover sheet.

From: Brian McKeon
Minority Counsel

Subject: Biden draft remarks

Comments: Paul -- as promised, what follows is the draft of Sen. Biden's remarks for Monday's event. He intends to speak for just 5 minutes. I emphasize that they have not been seen by him yet, though I think he is to receive it this afternoon. If you can give us a sneak preview at your draft as well, that would be great.

As I mentioned, I'm in NY City tomorrow for our committee's field hearing on the UN, so if you need to get me urgently, call the main # here (224-3953) and they can track me down. Over the weekend, you can get me at home [001]

Thanks.

If there are problems with this transmission, please call 202-224-3953

*Remarks of Senator Joseph R. Biden, Jr.
Introduction of National Security Adviser Sandy Berger
Hotel du Pont, Wilmington, Delaware
January 24, 2000*

A decade ago, a scholar named Francis Fukayama wrote a provocative essay pronouncing the "end of history." The demise of the Soviet empire, Mr. Fukayama said, was not just the triumph of democratic capitalism over Marxist-Leninist communism.

It symbolized the end of history itself -- in the sense that the coming decades would witness no great ideological struggles.

The end of the Cold War did bring down the curtain on five decades of superpower struggle. But the struggle for freedom is far from finished.

Over the past decade alone, we have witnessed quite a bit of history:

- the struggle in Russia to create a democracy after centuries of misrule by the czars and commissars;
- the struggle in the Balkans against ethnic supremacy and genocide;
- the global struggle against terrorism -- criminal acts which are often committed in the name of religion;

-- the struggle to deal with an emerging great power in China, which permits free markets but denies political freedom to its people;

In our own country there has been a great debate between those who think our interests can be advanced in cooperation with other nations, and those who, like our first president, fear "entangling alliances."

This is a year of decision for the American people. They will choose a new President and a new Congress. Major decisions in domestic policy will probably await the outcome of the election.

But world events do not wait for elections, and foreign policy must go on right until noon on Inauguration Day.

It is interesting to recall that after the 1992 election, President Bush sent U.S. troops to Somalia, signed the second strategic arms reduction treaty with Russia, and signed the Chemical Weapons Convention.

Our guest today, Sandy Berger, will be at the President's side right until noon on inauguration day, just as he has been a witness to -- and a participant in -- the history of the past seven years.

He has been with President Clinton from the beginning, advising him during the 1992 presidential campaign, serving as Deputy National Security Adviser during the first term, and then moving up to National Security Adviser after the 1996 election. He could probably write a history of the Clinton Administration's foreign policy out of his memory.

Created in 1947, the job of National Security Adviser is designed to be an honest broker -- ensuring that the interests of the State Department, the Defense Department, and all the other relevant agencies are fully and fairly represented to the President when he makes a major national security decision.

In my view, Sandy Berger has been one of the best honest brokers to occupy the office.

I say this as a biased but close observer of Sandy Berger, whom I have known for two decades.

During the last three years, as the senior Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee, I have worked with Sandy closely on a number of major foreign policy issues, from the Chemical Weapons Convention to the expansion of the NATO alliance, to Bosnia and Kosovo, to the repayment of our dues to the United Nations.

I have been honored to have served with him, and although it may be presumptuous for me to say so, I think I am lucky enough to call him a friend.

4

I am greatly honored that he has agreed to travel here to Delaware today to share with us his perspective on American foreign policy in the coming year.

Please give a warm welcome to the National Security Adviser, Sandy Berger.

GLOBAL ECONOMY/INTERNATIONAL SECTION STATE OF THE UNION

As we work to master the possibilities of the new economy at home, we must also lead in shaping a global economy that extends our prosperity – and expresses our values. Americans are right to ask hard questions about globalization. but those who say we ought to drop out of the international economy, or put the brakes on trade, are simply wrong.

Trade has been a major force behind our economic growth. Exports create stable, high paying jobs. Imports bring us a wide variety of products -- and keep them affordable. Growth from trade is vital not just for us, but for the 1.3 billion people around the world who still live on less than a dollar a day. In an era of globalization, we have a profound interest in making opportunity truly global. [insert idea – which has the virtue of being accurate – that America benefits probably more than does any other country from global competition and open markets.]

We need to make sure trade is fair to Americans. First and foremost, this means enforcing our own trade rules, and protecting our workers, industries, and environment. But we don't want a world in which others cannot sell to us – because that means we cannot sell to them. We need to make the WTO more open and more responsive to real people – and remember that a global economy based on rules is far preferable to one with no rules at all.

When China joins the WTO this year, it will make China move in the all the directions we have aimed for: more open, more transparent, more rules based, more law abiding, and more fully integrated into the international rules of the game. The WTO agreement we reached with China lowers their tariffs, not ours. It provides for better protections against unfair trade practices than our workers now enjoy. It finally levels the playing field in US-China trade. But if we do not provide Permanent Normal Trade Relations status for China, every other country will enjoy WTO access to the Chinese market, and we will be left out. We need to make sure we benefit when China joins the WTO and agrees to live under the same trade rules we do. I therefore ask congress to pass Permanent Normal Trade Relations status for China. We must not miss this tremendous opportunity. This deal will not solve all our problems with China, or change the lives of its people overnight. But it is a giant step in the right direction. And it will give Americans great new opportunities in every sector of China's vast market.

Engagement in the global economy is an investment in our shared future. People here benefit most when people everywhere can look ahead with hope. That is why we pledged to do our part to reduce the debts that burden the world's poorest nations. I ask Congress to continue its support for this effort. I also ask you to finalize our trade initiatives for Africa and the Caribbean Basin – perhaps the most important effort ever to promote economic growth in those places. Building stronger trading partners will help America master the new economy is good for America. And it is the right thing to do.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

At a moment when American power is unprecedented, and the world is coming together around the ideals Americans have lived by and died for, we have a responsibility, to ourselves and to our partners around the world, to lead. Let's never forget the Americans who have struggled to give us this chance. Let's never forget that hundreds of millions of people live in peace today because of the Americans who rest in peace in graves marked and unmarked all across the world. We have come too far, sacrificed too much, to stop the world and get off now. We must continue to shape the world, doing our part to answer the big questions that will decide the character of the 21st century.

A central question is whether our security will be threatened by regional conflicts, especially those rooted in ethnic and religious tensions, that pose the risk of wider war. With all its amazing advances, our modern world is still bedeviled by our oldest failing – fear of those who are different from us. In too many places, that fear is exploited by unscrupulous leaders trying to cling to power or make brutal war on their neighbors.

America cannot prevent every conflict or stop every outrage. But when our interests and our values are at stake and we can make a difference, we must be peacemakers. For history teaches that all big wars start small, and when human beings anywhere are singled out for destruction because of who they are, it is our common humanity that suffers.

We should be proud that we have helped bring the Middle East closer than ever to comprehensive peace. [Update on Israel-Syria; essential that America does its share].

We should be proud of the role America played in bring peace to Northern Ireland... in helping to end the bloodletting in East Timor...in supporting efforts to end Africa's cruel wars.

And we should be proud of the men and women of our armed forces who turned the tide against ethnic cleansing in Kosovo. Thanks to them, a million innocent people are home. And instead of struggling to defeat something evil, we can focus on building something good: a Europe undivided, democratic and at peace for the first time in history.

[Recognize Mitchell and Kosovo soldier in box; need to stay the course.]

A second question is whether our former adversaries, Russia and China, emerge in the coming century as stable, prosperous, democratic partners of the United States.

Today, we cannot eliminate(?) the risk of a Russia weakened by the legacy of communism, by economic crisis, by a cruel and futile war in Chechnya. But never forget how much else has changed: 5,000 former Soviet nuclear weapons dismantled; Russian troops serving with us in the Balkans; a peaceful, constitutional transfer of power from one leader to another for the first time in a 1000 years of Russian history. Russia's long journey to democracy is profoundly important to our future. A generation from now, let no one say that we did not do our part to help.

As for China, we must engage with this rising power seriously and sensibly. ~~promote our interest with firmness, but not with fear.~~ So let us say clearly that China cannot buy its stability and stature at the expense of freedom. But let us not isolate encourage China ~~China's~~ from engagement with the global forces empowering its people to seek a better life. We want to see China on the inside, playing by the rules, not on the outside denying them, and we want to work with China to achieve this goal.

A third question for the new century is whether terrorists and hostile nations will acquire the means to undermine our defenses, and force us to live in fear again.

Thanks in part to the biggest counter-terrorism operation in our history, the millennial celebrations passed without a violent attack. But this age-old threat, magnified by modern tools of destruction, remains real.

We must work with other nations to destroy terrorist and criminal networks and to target the havens that launder their money. This year, I will propose a law giving America new tools to protect our financial system from money laundering.

A bigger challenge is to prevent terrorists and potential adversaries from acquiring deadly weapons. We can do that by working with Russia to keep nuclear weapons secure and continuing to reduce our arsenals. By restraining North Korea's nuclear and missile programs and Iran's, and continuing to prevent Iraq from threatening its neighbors. And by strengthening global standards against proliferation. That is why I am committed to working with the Senate on a bipartisan basis to rebuild a consensus for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

We are also developing a system to defend America against missile attack, while working to preserve the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty with Russia. And my ~~by~~ balanced budget devotes \$2 billion to defend America's cyberspace against hackers, criminals and potential adversaries.

A fourth ~~questions~~ is whether the stability of the 21st century would will be threatened by a growing gap between rich and poor. We just cannot accept a future in which part of humanity lives on the cutting edge of a new economy, while another lives on the edge of survival. It isn't right. And it isn't in our interest.

A large part of the answer is freedom. With the hopeful transitions to democracy in Nigeria and Indonesia, more people won the right to choose their leaders in 1999 than in 1989, the year the Berlin Wall fell. Yet even countries making all the right choices must sometimes struggle to deliver for their people.

We must stand by democracies like Colombia [I attended Columbia University – and it is no democracy!] fighting for their lives – and for our lives – against narcotics traffickers. I have proposed a two-year, \$1.6 billion package to help Colombia and I count on your support.

We must stand by impoverished nations held back by debt and fight the killer diseases that are stealing the future from developing nations. My budget calls for a new \$150 million

investment in the global fight against AIDS and other diseases. And I will call on our partners in the G-7 and around the world to join us in supporting a Millennium Trust fund that will say to private industry – if you develop vaccines for diseases like malaria, AIDS and TB, we will help pay for them, and we will lift millions of lives together.

The final questions are the most important of all: Will America continue to lead? How do we see ourselves and our role for the next century?

In the 20th century, America was thrust into position of global leadership by circumstance. Now we have to choose whether to shape the world. But it's really no choice at all, not if we want our children to know peace and prosperity and the promise of a better day. We can choose to see our role as a burden. I choose to see it as a blessing.

That's why we have reversed the decline in defense spending that began in 1985. We must continue to work together to keep our military the best trained, best equipped in the world. My budget invests in readiness and in 21st century weapons. And it raises salaries for our men and women in uniform.

We must also continue to fund the 1 percent of our budget that supports our international engagement and keeps our soldiers out of war. Last year, you worked with me to support our top international priorities and to resume paying our UN dues and arrears. Let's do it again this year. And let's remember that building the right kind of global community is vital for a strong, secure American community

It's no accident that the steps of the Supreme Court line up directly with the steps of the United States Senate -- because many of the debates heard in one chamber echo directly in the other. One example comes directly to mind. It was exactly 43 years ago today that a woman in Birmingham, Alabama was asked to sit in the back of a bus. Her name was Rosa Parks -- and her refusal helped spark the modern civil rights movement.

But that movement was also made possible by Brown versus Board of Education, which was heard in the chamber to the left of us in 1954; the Civil Rights Act, which passed the Senate in 1964; and the President who helped turn the promise of both into reality.

It reminds us that history is not just made by people, it *is* people. It's all of us. And the history of our nation is as heroic as we want it to be, as heroic as all of us here tonight are.

That is the great tradition we are carrying forward here tonight. In the weeks and months to come, may all of us be as heroic as the history that carried us here, as strong as the nation that bore us, and as proud as the people who sent us. And together, may we use the wisdom of the people who created this union, and the knowledge of the people who helped save it, as we work to create a more perfect union for a new century.

With God's help, we will. Thank you.

REMARKS FOR VICE PRESIDENT AL GORE
THE DINNER IN HONOR OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE
OF THE 106TH CONGRESS
Tuesday, December 1, 1998

As we gather tonight in the Great Hall of the Supreme Court, I want to take this opportunity to thank Chief Justice William Rehnquist, the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court Historical Society for making this wonderful -- and historic -- evening possible.

This evening marks a rare coming together of the three branches of our government. It is a tradition that stretches back more than 200 years -- but it's also a tradition that didn't get off on a very good foot.

Back in 1789, President George Washington was the first member of the Executive Branch to visit members of the United States Senate. The Senate was debating a proposed treaty with native Americans. The meeting went so badly that President Washington never returned to the Senate -- and never sought the Senate's advice in person again.

I stand before you tonight as one of the few people in national office who has made the large step down from the Senate to the post of Vice President. In doing so, I follow in the grand tradition of 21 other members who came before me -- including such memorable Vice Presidents as George Dallas, John C. Breckinridge, Hannibal Hamlin, and Thomas Hendricks.

As some of you may know, one of my predecessors traveled in the opposite direction. John C. Calhoun, who served as Vice President under John Quincy Adams and Andrew Jackson, resigned in 1832 to go home and represent South Carolina in the U.S. Senate. As most of you know, he subsequently lost that Senate seat to Strom Thurmond.

And then, of course, there was Thomas Riley Marshall, President Wilson's VP, who liked to tell the story of the two brothers -- one went to sea, and the other became Vice President. Neither was heard from again.

Marshall's most insightful moment may have come when he told the members of the press -- and I quote -- "The Vice President of the United States is like a man in a cataleptic state: he cannot speak; he cannot move; he suffers no pain; and yet he is perfectly conscious of everything that is going on around him."

Don't get me wrong -- that's clearly an exaggeration. Because like my predecessors, I am also President of the Senate. Of course, it's not a service I'm called to perform very often -- because I only vote when there's a tie. It reminds me of the time Evelyn (EVE-Lynn) Waugh (Woe) was asked why he recommended Randolph Churchill for membership in an exclusive club. He said, "I didn't recommend him because he's well-respected and brave -- I recommended him because he won't be here very much."

Even though I'm not here much, as President of the Senate, I get to experience a phenomenon not shared by members of the House, the Senate, and even the Supreme Court -- every time I vote, we win.

But there are some things the Senate and the Supreme Court have in common. For one, we sometimes get mistaken for one another. Justice Souter tells the story about the time he was mistaken for Justice Breyer. He was asked what he liked best about serving on the Supreme Court. He said: "working with Justice Souter."

Senator Bob Kerrey often tells me that he gets mistaken from time to time for Senator John Kerry. Fortunately, the Senate is a place where two people with the same name can serve for years to come. Many, many years to come.

Of course, even though we live in the electronic age, both the Senate and the Supreme Court use the same system of lights. Red means stop. Green means go. And yellow means go very fast.

That is something the new members of the Senate will learn quickly -- and it is my pleasure to welcome all of you here tonight. I appreciate you having taken this time out of your frenetic week of Senate orientation to be with us this evening. Having gone through it myself, I know you may be feeling a bit overwhelmed. Don't worry -- the pop quiz at the end of this week has no bearing on committee assignments.

You are entering a world of tradition -- some of which will perplex and annoy you. Mark Twain once said that the "U.S. Senate may not be the most refined and deliberative body in existence, but they have the most unique rules. Any member can call anybody in the world anything he can think of and they can't answer him, sue him, or fight him."

Senator Edward Brooke once observed that "if we in the Senate would stop calling each other "distinguished," we might have ten working days a year." Senator Cotton Norris once quipped that there are some days the Senate is in such a mood, "if someone introduced the Ten Commandments, they'd cut them down to eight."

But tonight, all of you are also entering another tradition: you are about to play a rich role in American history. The history of our nation may seem long, but the cord that connects this time to ages past is short. Think about it: Senator Thurmond, who first entered the Senate in 1954, served with Walter George, who entered in 1922, who served with Henry Cabot Lodge, who entered in 1893, who served with John Sherman, who entered in 1861, who served with Hannibal Hamlin, who entered in 1848, who served with William King, who entered in 1819, who served with Rufus King, who re-entered in 1813, who served with Joseph Anderson, who entered in 1797, who served with John Brown, who entered in 1792, who served with Robert Morris, who entered in 1789 -- and signed both the United States Constitution and the Declaration of Independence. Through just ten people, we are directly connected to the two documents that this nation is founded upon -- two documents that both of these chambers advance and defend today.

8/14/99 3:00 pm
Orzulak

**PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON
REMARKS TO THE
100TH ANNIVERSARY CONVENTION OF
THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI
AUGUST 16, 1999**

Rep. Ike Skelton; Rep. Dennis Moore; Governor Mel Carnahan; Secretary Togo West; Deputy Secretary Hershel Gober; Commander Tom Pouliot, distinguished guests and friends. It's an honor for me to be here today to help celebrate 100 proud-years of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

We meet less than 150 days from the beginning of one century and the end of what many have called the American Century. Lately, there have been a number of looks back at the people and personalities who have made this the American Century.

There are the leaders who led us through difficult times – like Franklin Roosevelt and George Marshall, to name just two. Inventors like the Wright Brothers, whose ideas changed the way we live. Moral forces like Martin Luther King and Eleanor Roosevelt, whose ideas changed the world. Scientists like Jonas Salk, whose discoveries have improved our lives; and even entertainers like Frank Sinatra who made our lives a lot more fun.

But if you ask, “who has been responsible for making this the American Century,” there is one answer that should be at the top of any list: America's service men and women.

Today, as we celebrate this centennial anniversary, let us never forget: millions of people in America and around the world sleep in peace because hundreds of thousands of Americans rest in peace under simple white crosses, crescents, and Stars of David. This nation and this world owe them a debt we can never repay.

It's no accident that the American Century is also the VFW Century. Because there is nobody more responsible for creating the peace and security we enjoy today than our veterans of foreign wars. Think how different this century would have been if Americans hadn't been there to help defeat fascism, contain communism and sustain freedom when it was imperiled. Over the past 100 years, America's service men and women have sacrificed whatever was necessary – not for territorial gain, not to dominate others – but to secure the rights and freedoms of others. You have been the bravest of the brave. And you have made this nation proud.

Thanks to you, we will soon begin a new century with liberty ascendant. Today, for the first time in history, more than half the world's people elect their own leaders. For the first time in history, the world's leading nations are not engaged in a deadly struggle for security or territory.

But this is not a world without dangers to us. There is still the potential for major regional wars that would threaten our security; a risk our former adversaries will not succeed in their transitions to democracy; a danger that nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons will fall into the wrong hands; a possibility that global financial vulnerabilities will overwhelm free societies. We must not assume that because we are secure and at peace, we don't need military strength or alliances -- or that because we are prosperous, we are immune from economic turmoil half a

world away. No less than any time in our history -- perhaps more -- America must be engaged in the world, working with others to secure peace and prosperity where we can, leading where we must, defending our interests, and standing up for what we believe.

That is what Kosovo was all about.

I want to thank you for the support the VFW gave us during the conflict in Kosovo. I know it wasn't an easy thing for you to do. We were still in the early stages of the longest and most difficult military campaign in the 50-year history of NATO. Critics were convinced that we couldn't possibly succeed. But you stood with us and with our men and women in uniform. America and NATO prevailed. And I am profoundly grateful for your support.

Many of you fought during World War II so that the world would not be dominated by tyrants who use racial and religious hatred to strengthen their grip on power and justify aggression and mass murder. Just think about the message that would have been sent to your grandchildren had we done nothing in Kosovo: that it's okay for innocent men, women and children to be singled out and systematically targeted for killing and mass expulsion by their government -- when we and others have the power to do something about it. Why? Simply because of their ethnic heritage or the way they worship God. We could not accept that in the middle of Europe, at NATO's doorstep, people could be driven from their homes, loaded on train cars, and have their history erased -- and the world would not hear, not see, and not act.

Instead, the century is ending with a powerful statement by 19 democracies that we will stand up for human life and human dignity. And we now have an opportunity to create what millions of Americans and our allies have fought so hard to secure: an undivided, democratic, peaceful Europe that shares our values, strengthens our economy, and helps us meet common aspirations.

We prevailed in Kosovo because our cause was just, our goals were clear, our alliance was strong, and our strategy was right. We also won because our men and women in uniform did our nation proud. In 78 days, we flew more than 37,000 support and strike sorties. Our air crews faced constant dangers, including surface-to-air missile attacks. Many times, our pilots avoided firing back because the Serb gunners were firing from heavily populated civilian areas. In the end, we had zero combat fatalities, and just two planes shot down. That is an astonishing record.

This is the same kind of professionalism that we see every day from our military men and women -- from the DMZ in Korea to the pilots who enforce the no-fly zones over Northern and Southern Iraq, where despite an increased challenge, they have effectively kept Saddam Hussein from threatening his neighbors, and the Kurds. We are grateful for their courage.

We remember, of course, our two Army airmen who died in a training exercise in Albania. We thank God that there weren't more casualties in Kosovo. But our success was no accident. It was the direct result of the skill and training of our fighting men and women, and the sophistication of our power when we are forced to use it. We must keep standing by their side. We must continue to live up to the pledge I made from the first day of our administration -- that our men and women in uniform will be the best-trained, best-prepared, best-equipped military in the world. That must never change. We must never become complacent: freedom is not free.

We must also recognize a simple truth: the troops of tomorrow will only be as good as our commitment to veterans today. Back in 1903, Theodore Roosevelt said, "a man who is good enough to shed his blood for his country is good enough to be given a square deal afterwards."

That's why, since I took office, I have continued to fight for the interests of our country's veterans. The White House doors have been open to veterans to help shape our policy for veterans. That is especially true when it comes to health care.

Early in our Administration, Hershel Gober recommended that we look for ways to bring health care closer to veterans who needed it. Since then, we have opened more than 600 outpatient clinics across the country, and have more planned over the next two years. We expect to treat 400,000 more veterans this year than we did last year. We've also confronted some long-neglected problems head-on. We reached out to more than 40,000 veterans who were exposed to Agent Orange, to tell them about the expanded benefits available to them. I have pressed hard for answers to the Gulf War Syndrome and proper care for those who suffer from it. And we are making a special effort to end something that I believe is simply unacceptable: homeless veterans. Let's work together to bring them back into the society that they helped defend.

We've made progress, but there is still more to do. As the Vice President announced last month, we will continue to work with the VFW and others to make sure that every veteran who needs it receives the high quality of care they deserve -- next year, and every year.

But I want to make another point to you today. Standing by our military means we must do more than prepare our people to fight wars; we must work with equal determination to prevent wars. That means we must pay attention not only to our military readiness, but to our diplomatic readiness as well. We know that if diplomacy is not backed by a real, credible threat of force, it can be empty and dangerous. But if we don't use diplomacy first to promote our interests -- if we rely on our military as our first and only line of defense -- it will almost certainly become our first and only line of defense. Our international engagement may cost money. But the costliest peace is cheaper than the cheapest war.

Ever since I became President, I have been working to convince the Congress of that basic truth. It has been a considerable challenge. Our international affairs programs -- which fund everything from resolving conflicts, to strengthening young democracies, to combating terrorism, to fighting dangerous drugs, to promoting American exports, to maintaining our embassies all around the world -- amount to less than one percent of the federal budget, and less than one fifteenth of our defense budget. But since 1985, I regret to say, these programs have been cut in half. This year, the House and Senate have passed spending bills that would cut our request for international affairs by another \$2 billion.

In other words, we are cutting the very programs that are designed to keep our soldiers out of war. Underfunding our arsenal for peace is just as risky as underfunding our arsenal for war. For if we continue to underfund our diplomacy, we will end up overusing our military. Problems we might have been able to resolve peacefully will turn into crises that we will only be able to resolve at the cost of life and treasure.

If this trend continues, there will be real consequences for important American interests. Let me mention just a few, beginning with our interest in peace and stability across the Atlantic.

Today, after our victory in Kosovo, we have an opportunity to invest in peace. The people of the Balkans have been crippled by conflict since the end of the Cold War. Today, we have a chance to integrate them into the mainstream of Europe. To do this, we don't need anything as ambitious as the Marshall Plan. We must insist that our European partners carry most of the load. And the

democratically elected leaders of the region understand that change must come from the inside-out more than the outside-in.

But I am determined to work with the Congress to ensure we do our part. For if we don't, and this effort fails, make no mistake -- there will be another bloody war that starts in the Balkans and spreads throughout Southeast Europe. And someday more young Americans may be asked to risk their lives to end it. If we succeed in winning the peace, we may see a 21st Century in which we don't have to send your children and grandchildren to fight in another European war. We owe it to you and to the men and women who fought in Kosovo to build that kind of future.

We also have a responsibility to protect the American people from the dangers they are most likely to face in the 21st century. The gravest of those dangers may not be that another country will launch a nuclear weapon at the United States. It is that weapons of mass destruction will fall into the hands of rogue states or terrorists.

We have worked to reduce that doomsday scenario. Since 1992, our support has helped deactivate almost 5,000 nuclear warheads in the former Soviet Union, to eliminate nuclear weapons from three former Soviet republics, to strengthen the security of weapons and materials at over 100 sites, to tighten Russia's export controls, and to purchase hundreds of tons of highly enriched uranium that could be used for nuclear bombs that end up in the wrong hands. We've done it with strong bipartisan support in Congress.

Today, the Russian economy is struggling. The average salary of a highly-trained weapons scientist in Russia is less than \$100 a month. For a small investment, we can help them turn that expertise to peaceful projects that help the world. Or, we can do nothing and pray that each and every one of them resists the temptation to market their expertise to those who wish us harm. Common sense says to help them. That's why in my State of the Union Address I proposed increasing funding for threat reduction by two-thirds over the next five years. I want to work with the Congress to make these investments in reducing the threats we face.

Another challenge is to create a durable and comprehensive peace in the region that every President since Richard Nixon has considered among the most dangerous in the world -- the Middle East. Today, we have a real opportunity, the best in many years, to achieve that goal once and for all. The new Israeli Prime Minister, Ehud Barak, has set forth an ambitious agenda to reach agreement within the next fifteen months and move the process beyond the setbacks of the past several years. Both Israelis and Palestinians are now determined to move forward. But the enemies of peace stand ready to strike to undercut this path.

That is why last fall, when the two sides made a commitment to peace at the Wye River talks, we made a commitment to them as well. As the United States has done since the Camp David Accords in the 1970's, we told the Israelis that we would help them minimize the risks of peace and lift the lives of the Palestinian people. And we told the Jordanians that we would help promote their safety and their well-being. I want to work with Congress to secure the funding we need to keep our word. This conflict has gone on too long, and we have an historic opportunity to end it. If Israelis and Palestinians and Jordanians do their part, we must do ours.

We also have an opportunity to move beyond a series of cruel conflicts in Africa. In the last three weeks, in efforts led by African countries themselves, we have seen signs that give us hope for the resolution of devastating conflicts; more than 70,000 lives lost in the war between Ethiopia and Eritria alone. We've also seen Africa's most populous country, Nigeria, hold a democratic

election and bring an end to 15 years of misrule. All of this is good news. It means that lives will be saved and people can live in dignity. It means that the largest untapped market for our products in the world – a continent of 700 million people that provides nearly as much oil to America as the Middle East -- will have a better chance to develop in freedom and in peace.

African countries are not looking to the United States to solve their problems or deploy our military. Rather, at a tiny fraction of the cost, they are asking us to support their own efforts to resolve conflicts, keep the peace, and build better lives for their people. These efforts don't make a lot of headlines. But the point is to avoid headlines – headlines about famine, refugee crises and genocide – and to replace them with stories about partnership and shared prosperity. Those are stories we can start writing now, and I want to work with Congress to get it done.

Finally there is the question of the United Nations. One of the great legacies to come out of our victory in World War II is an institution where nations can seek to resolve differences with words instead of weapons. Paying our dues to that organization is a legal and moral responsibility – and that ought to be reason enough to do so. If we fail to do so soon, the United States of America will lose its vote in the General Assembly. But obligation is not the only reason -- so is opportunity. The UN helps us mobilize the support of other nations for goals the American people cherish, from keeping the peace, to immunizing children, to caring for refugees, to combating the spread of deadly weapons. We have been working with growing success to make sure the UN is better run at a lower cost. Now we must do our part. Unless we want America to pay all the costs and take all the risks to solve all the world's problems, we must work with others and meet our obligations to the U.N.

The bottom line is this: our reputation as a nation was built by the sweat and sacrifice of Americans in uniform. Today, we have a unique opportunity and responsibility to advance those values in the world. But if we've only got one arrow in our quiver – our military – we will sacrifice the work of peace and increase the risk of war. We must do our part to keep this world on a stable path toward the democracy that all of you have put your lives on the line to defend.

That's how Harry Truman felt. Fifty years ago this week, he spoke to the VFW's Golden Jubilee Convention. Listen to his words. He said: "peace with freedom and justice cannot be bought cheaply. It can only be assured by the combined efforts of the multitudes of people throughout the world who want a secure peace. We must keep them our friends if the world is to be a decent place for our children and their grandchildren to live."

Let me close by telling you a story. One of the most memorable experiences of my Presidency was the visit I made to a refugee camp in Macedonia two months ago. I wish every one of you could have been there. As I walked through the camp, young children starting singing, "USA, USA, USA" thanking us for giving them a chance to reclaim their lives on their native land. It reminded me of the trip I took to Normandy five years ago, to mark the 50th anniversary of D-Day. Walking the beaches, we heard stories from our veterans of French citizens who came up to them, took their hands, and told them with tears in their eyes, "I was very young then. But we will always remember what you did for us, and we will never forget what it has meant to us."

It is my hope that in 50 years, some of our Kosovo veterans will return there, and the children from that refugee camp, who will be much older then, will take their hands, look them in the eye, and say, "50 years ago, I sang "USA" from my lips. Today, I sing it in my heart."

On behalf of a grateful nation and a grateful world, I want to say to every soldier, sailor, airman, Marine, and Coastguardsman; to every man and women who has fought bravely for our nation and brought dignity to the world -- thank you for a job well done. We are proud of you. And we will never forget.

#

each side has its own priority, - each
side wants its issue dealt with
first.

President William Jefferson Clinton
Foreign Policy Points for Cabinet Meeting

January 19, 2000

- 1999 a busy and successful year; sets the stage for an ambitious agenda for 2000. There are immediate opportunities to be seized this year, and long term challenges to address.
- Key priority will be dealing with regional conflicts that have the potential to spark wider war.
- All out effort this year to get comprehensive Middle East Peace. Believe all three leaders – Barak, Assad, Arafat -- want this and see unique moment, but we're going to have to work for every inch.
- Gaps right now between Israel and Syria are not so wide; but they are deeply entrenched and therefore hard to bridge. Aggravated by real lack of trust between the two sides which worsens every disagreement. Leads both to want to be satisfied they will get what they need at end of day.
- So procedural question of who goes first is in reality a surrogate for substantive question of whether each sides' needs will be addressed. Our challenge now is to devise a way to simultaneously address both sides' needs.

- Experts from the two countries will be coming to the U.S. soon to discuss with us separately their comments on our draft text.
- Always knew it would be difficult. But let's keep in perspective: this conflict has been a source of tension in the world for 50 years. Never had better chance to end it. I am optimistic real progress can be made this year.
- Would now like to ask Madeleine to give us an update.

Administration's efforts to preserve and enhance the readiness of our armed forces while pursuing long-term modernization and providing quality of life improvements for our troops. To better meet readiness challenges, the President proposed, and Congress passed, a fiscal year 2000 defense budget that increased military pay and retirement benefits, and significantly increased funding for readiness and modernization. The President also proposed a \$112 billion increase across fiscal years 2000 to 2005 -- the first long-term sustained increase in defense spending in over a decade.

The report also emphasizes that we must sustain our commitment to America's diplomacy. Every dollar we devote to preventing conflicts, promoting democracy, opening markets, and fighting disease and hunger brings a sure return in security and long-term savings. Working with Congress, we were able to provide enhanced funding for international affairs efforts and UN arrears, but we need to sustain our commitments in the years ahead.

The report previews the President's national security agenda for the coming year, including: forging a lasting peace in the Middle East; securing the peace in the Balkans and Northern Ireland; helping Russia strengthen its economy and fight corruption as it heads toward its first democratic transfer of power; furthering arms control through discussions with Russia on the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and deeper reductions in strategic nuclear weapons; implementing China's entry into the WTO and other global institutions while promoting freedom and human rights there; easing tensions between India and Pakistan; building on hopeful developments between Greece and Turkey to make progress in the Aegean, particularly on Cyprus; securing new energy routes from the Caspian Sea that will allow newly independent states in the Caucasus to prosper; supporting democratic transitions from Nigeria to Indonesia; helping Colombia defeat the drug traffickers who threaten its democracy; fighting weapons proliferation, terrorism and the nexus between them; restraining North Korea's and Iran's missile programs; maintaining vigilance against Iraq and working to bring about a change in regime; consolidating reforms to the world's financial architecture as the basis for sustained economic growth; advancing global trade; enacting legislation to promote trade with Africa and the Caribbean; pressing ahead with debt relief for countries fighting poverty and embracing good government; reversing global climate change.

#

Does the postponement represent a breakdown?

- Always knew it would be difficult.
- Gaps are not so wide; but they are deeply entrenched and therefore hard to bridge.
- Aggravated by real lack of trust between the two sides which worsens every disagreement. Leads both sides to want be satisfied they will get what they need at end of day.
- So procedural question of who goes first is in reality a surrogate for substantive question of whether each sides' needs will be addressed.
- Our challenge now is to devise a way to simultaneously address both sides' needs.
- Experts from two sides will be coming to the U.S. soon to discuss with us separately their comments on our draft text.
- We will then make a judgment on how best to proceed.

Do you expect they will come back to Shepherdstown at some point for high-level talks?

- That's a judgment we will have to make. Will proceed in a way we believe maximizes chances of success.

Are you confident an agreement will be reached?

- As I said, gaps are not wide, but deeply entrenched.
- Hopeful we can resolve their differences.

Looks like on Palestinian track as well, difficulties. Israelis are suggesting they will delay Framework Agreement.

- Important to note that during the past several weeks there has been intensive work on the Palestinian track. Illustrates our belief that should not neglect one track because of another.
- Israeli and Palestinian negotiators have been meeting and discussed their respective positions.

- Arafat and Barak met again last night and agreed that they would accelerate talks with aim of reaching a Framework Agreement.
- President will be seeing Arafat on Thursday to discuss where the parties stand and how best to proceed toward an agreement.
- Israelis and Palestinians will have to decide together whether they can meet the February 13th deadline or whether, by common agreement, they want to take more time.
- What is key is that they continue to work seriously and intensively.

But didn't Israel ask for a delay?

- Israelis and Palestinians have denied that such a request was made.
- Barak and Arafat agreed to accelerate talks.
- They will have to decide whether they can reach the February 13th deadline.

President William Jefferson Clinton
Foreign Policy Points for Cabinet Meeting
January 19, 2000

- 1999 a busy and successful year; sets the stage for an ambitious agenda for 2000. There are immediate opportunities to be seized this year, and long term challenges to address.
- Key priority will be dealing with regional conflicts that have the potential to spark wider war.
- All out effort this year to get comprehensive Middle East Peace. Believe all three leaders want this and see unique moment, but we're going to have to work for every inch. Keep in perspective: this conflict has been a source of tension in the world for 50 years. Never had better chance to end it. I am optimistic real progress can be made this year.
- Southeast Europe: Ease Greek-Turkish tensions, seek settlement this year on Cyprus. Stay course in Kosovo, move region towards Europe.
- South Asia: Last year, U.S. diplomacy averted potential war. But situation fragile and dangerous. Intend to visit region.
- Africa: Challenge this year is to implement peace agreements, especially Congo, aid in resolution of remaining conflicts, maintain focus on continent.
- Second priority -- continuing to encourage transformation of old adversaries. Russia -- elections, Chechnya. China PNTR -- team in place, must show why WTO membership not only in our economic interest, but best way to encourage China to play by global rules.
- Third priority -- threats from terrorists, outlaw nations, magnified by spread of new technology. Cyber security initiative; critical infrastructure. Prevent hostile countries from developing WMD. Difficult decision this year on NMD.
- Fourth priority -- long term challenge of sustaining global growth, while lifting poor and raising standards. Benefits to America of exports and imports, benefits to developing world. Need to enact Africa trade bill/CBI. Work hard this year to help nations overcome obstacles to full participation in global economy: debt and chronic disease.
- Fifth -- standing by new and troubled democracies. Nigeria, Indonesia. Colombia -- major effort this year to fight narcotics, shore up embattled democracy.
- Finally, overarching priority is maintaining Congressional support. Budget deal last year was a success -- on Middle East, UN dues, debt relief -- but fragile and incomplete. Must

keep working hard, so we end year with consensus that America must lead, backed by resources.

President William Jefferson Clinton
Foreign Policy Points for Cabinet Meeting

January 19, 2000

- 1999 a busy and successful year; sets the stage for an ambitious agenda for 2000. There are immediate opportunities to be seized this year, and long term challenges to address.
- Key priority will be dealing with regional conflicts that have the potential to spark wider war.
- All out effort this year to get comprehensive Middle East Peace. Believe all three leaders – Barak, Assad, Arafat -- want this and see unique moment, but we're going to have to work for every inch.
- Gaps right now between Israel and Syria are not so wide; but they are deeply entrenched and therefore hard to bridge. Aggravated by real lack of trust between the two sides which worsens every disagreement. Leads both to want to be satisfied they will get what they need at end of day.
- So procedural question of who goes first is in reality a surrogate for substantive question of whether each sides' needs will be addressed. Our challenge now is to devise a way to simultaneously address both sides' needs.

- Experts from the two countries will be coming to the U.S. soon to discuss with us separately their comments on our draft text.
- Always knew it would be difficult. But let's keep in perspective: this conflict has been a source of tension in the world for 50 years. Never had better chance to end it. I am optimistic real progress can be made this year.
- Would now like to ask Madeleine to give us an update.