

FOIA MARKER

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

Folder Title:
[China] [Folder 3]

Staff Office-Individual:
Speechwriting-Orzulak, Paul

Original OA/ID Number:
4022

Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:	Stack:
48	6	9	2	V

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. statement	re: Draft President William Jefferson Clinton remarks to Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies on China (13 pages)	03/06/2000	P5
002a. note	re: Content of speech (1 page)	03/06/2000	P5
002b. statement	re: Draft President William Jefferson Clinton remarks to Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies on China (14 pages)	03/06/2000	P5

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[China] [Folder 3]

2008-0702-F

jm610

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]

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. statement	re: Draft President William Jefferson Clinton remarks to Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies on China (13 pages)	03/06/2000	P5

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[China] [Folder 3]

2008-0702-F

jm610

RESTRICTION CODES

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

- 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.

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

- 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]

3/6/00 1:00 p.m.
Orzulak

Suggested Malinowski
cuts: 6:30 Monday

**PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON
REMARKS TO JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF ADVANCED INTERNATIONAL STUDIES
ON CHINA
WASHINGTON, DC
FEBRUARY 8, 2000**

I want to thank Johns Hopkins University and the School of Advanced International Studies for the opportunity to come here today and talk about China. For the past decade or so, this school has had a unique exchange program with Nanking University. Some of you have traveled to China to learn a little bit more about that country, and some Chinese students have come here to learn more about us. So this is a good place to talk about a decision America has to make this year that could forever change not only our relationship with China, but China itself.

Last fall, as many of you know, we signed an agreement to bring China into the World Trade Organization on terms that will dramatically open its market to American products. If China concludes similar agreements with other countries, it will join the WTO. The immediate question for us is: are we as a country going to embrace that choice and are we going to benefit from it economically? For that to happen, we must grant China Permanent Normal Trade Relations status. And today, I am submitting legislation to the Congress that will do just that.

Now, every great debate introduces new terms to the American public, and the debate over China's entry into the WTO is no different. It's not hard to imagine most Americans flipping through channels, hearing the words "Permanent Normal Trade Relations," and flipping to something else. But I'm going to work as hard as I can to make the American people understand why this is so important, ~~and why Congress should grant China PNTR~~. Because I believe with all my heart that this agreement represents the most significant step in our relationship with China since President Nixon first went to China nearly three decades ago.

For a long time now, Americans have debated our relationship with China, partly because our perceptions of China keep changing.

In the early 1900s, most Americans saw China either through the eyes of traders seeking open markets, or missionaries seeking open hearts. During World War II, China was our ally. During the Korean War, it was our adversary. When I was growing up, it was a question mark – who lost China? During the Cold War, it was a counterweight. Now, in some people's eyes it's a caricature: either the next great capitalist tiger with the biggest market in the world, or the world's last great communist dragon and a threat to peace and stability in Asia -- the land of a billion prisoners, or the land of a billion customers.

And all these changing perceptions of China have only begun to reflect the profound changes within China itself – the falling dynasties, foreign invasions, civil wars, cruel famines, reigns of terror, a communist revolution, an industrial revolution, and now a market revolution.

But through all this upheaval, there has been one constant: our interests. For 30 years, eEvery American President ~~for the past 30 years~~, without regard to party, has worked for a China that contributes to the stability, not the instability of Asia; that is open to our products ~~and businesses~~; that upholds the rule of law at home and plays by the rules of the road around the world. We make no apologies for it. We are a nation that cherishes liberty and believes that if people are free to make their own choices, the world will be a safer and more prosperous place. We are also a nation that has fought three wars in Asia in the 20th Century, and have a huge~~tremendous~~ stake in how China evolves.

If we had a crystal ball, we could see exactly what China will look like in 20 years. But we don't. Every nation defines its greatness in different ways, and every nation makes its own choices. We don't know what choices China will make. But we do have control over the

choices that we make. We can give China a chance to be a good partner, and work to move it in the right direction. Or we can turn our backs, and almost certainly move it in the wrong direction. This WTO agreement will move China in the right direction, and advance every goal we have worked for in China the past 30 years. Let me tell you how.

First let's understand from the beginning: this is not a trade agreement, in any traditional sense. Usually, when we sign trade agreements, we have to weigh the benefits of opening another country's markets against the dislocations that can take place when we open our market. But this is not a two-way agreement, this is the trade equivalent of a one-way street. It requires China to open its market to our products and services, but all we agree to do is maintain the market access that we already give to China. It does not change our laws or our tariffs one bit.

~~I don't believe there can be any question that this is in America's economic interests. Over the past seven years, we have worked hard to open markets around the world to American products. It's a question of simple arithmetic.~~ We are a country with 22 percent of the world's income and four percent of the world's population. If we're going to continue to prosper in the 21st Century, we had better be selling something to somebody somewhere else.

~~W~~With more than a billion people -- fully one-fifth of the world's population -- China clearly represents the biggest potential market in the world. Under this agreement, Chinese tariffs in every sector, from telecommunications to automobiles to agriculture, will fall by half or more in five years. For the first time, our companies will be able to sell and distribute products in China made by workers here at home without transferring technology in manufacturing. For the first time, China will agree to play by the same trading rules we do. It's going to mean a lot more jobs for America. Meanwhile, we'll get two new safeguards against surges of imports which would threaten to throw a lot of Americans out of work in a short period of time.

That's what happens if we pass PNTR. If we don't pass it, we would lose the full benefits of China's WTO membership. Our companies would be shut off from one-fifth of the world – while our European, Japanese, and other competitors would be happy to rush in and fill the gap. ~~In other words, they would be the beneficiaries of the benefits we negotiated.~~

So on purely economic grounds, this agreement is a no-brainer. Most of its critics don't even question that. Critics are more likely to point to the threats China made on Taiwan a few weeks ago, and say we shouldn't strengthen it. Or they point to the human rights abuses documented in the report our State Department issued, and say we shouldn't reward it. Or they point to ~~stories about~~ China's nuclear weapons program, and say we shouldn't empower it. And most of all of ~~thei~~ rose concerns are absolutely legitimate.

Those of us who support permanent Normal Trade Relations are under no illusion about the government in Beijing. It is a one-party state that does not tolerate opposition. ~~It denies basic freedoms to its citizens.~~ It denies the most basic rights of free speech and religious expression. Its record on labor and environmental rights leaves a lot to be desired. The question is not whether we support it or whether we ignore it. The question is, how do we change it?

This is not about economic rights versus human rights, or economic security versus national security. That is a false choice. ~~We're not trying to promote one over the other, we are trying to promote both. Membership in the WTO won't create a free society in China overnight. But over the long haul, we believe it's going to move China much further in the right direction than simply taking our ball and going home.~~ To understand why, it's important to understand why China is willing to do all of this in the first place. Why they are doing this is at least as important as what they are doing.

Over the past 20 years, China has made a lot of progress in building a new economy, lifting

more than 200 million people out of absolute poverty. It is linking so many people through its wireless communications network that it is adding the equivalent of a new Baby Bell every year.

But its system is still plagued by corruption. Only one-third of its economy is private enterprise. And nearly 60 percent of its investment and 80 percent of all business lending is directed toward state-owned dinosaurs that are least likely to survive in the global economy. Most of China's economy today still operates under the old theory that if they had just shoveled coal into the furnaces faster, the Titanic would have stayed afloat.

Meanwhile, its workforce is increasing by 12 million each year. At least 100 million people in China are still looking for work. And economic growth has slowed just when it needs to be rising to create new jobs. It's ironic: many Americans are concerned about the danger a strong and successful China could pose to us in the 21st century. But the danger of a weak China, beset by internal chaos and disintegration is just as real, and China's leaders know it. ~~They understand that China cannot maintain stability or ensure prosperity by maintaining the status quo.~~

So China's leaders face a dilemma: they realize that if they open China's antiquated market to global competition, they risk unleashing forces beyond their control – ~~namely~~, unemployment, social unrest, and demands for freedom. But they have also concluded that without competition ~~from the outside~~, China will not be able to attract investment or build world-class industries that can survive in the global economy.

With this agreement, China has chosen to embrace change, despite the risk it entails. The question for America is: do we really want to reject that choice? I think that would be a mistake of historic proportions. This is a choice we need to embrace, for our own good and the common good of the world.

For starters, having China in a rules-based trading system increases the chance that it will follow the rules of the road more broadly when interacting with the world

When I see this debate about China going on in our country, I try to remind people that the Chinese are engaged in the same kind of debate about us. Not just China's leaders, but many of China's people believe Americans don't want their country to assume its rightful place in the world. They are deeply ambivalent about the role China should play in the world.

~~Let's not forget: there is a reason China built the Great Wall. It has endured centuries of invasions and occupations; it has tried for most of its history to keep the world and its influences out.~~ By joining the WTO, they've made a clear choice -- to overcome a great wall of suspicion and insecurity and reach out to the rest of the world. Again, I ask: if they're willing to reach out to the world, do we really want to slap that hand away?

Under this agreement, some of China's most important decisions, for the first time, will be subject to the review of an international body. For the first time, China is conceding that governments cannot behave arbitrarily at home or abroad. Opponents say that it doesn't matter because China will just break its promises. But if China does, we're still better off ~~in a better position~~, because it won't be able to blame U.S. bullying. Its actions will be subject to judgments passed by 135 nations.

I'll say this again: everything I have learned about human nature in my life, plus everything I have learned about China as President, convinces me that we have a far greater chance of influencing its actions if we bring it into a common endeavor than if we shut it out.

But the change this agreement can bring from the outside-in is nothing compared to the change it can bring from the inside-out. By joining the WTO, China is slashing the tariffs that enable

~~protect~~ its state owned industries to survive. It is importing not just our products but one of our most cherished principles – economic freedom. Think about what that principle has meant to us over the years -- not just greater wealth, but individual initiative, individual creativity, the liberation of individual human potential. We know that once individuals are given the ability to dream, they demand a greater say in their own destiny. It is completely the opposite of the culture that communism imposed on China's people. Just imagine where it could take them.

A decade ago, China's best and brightest college students sought jobs in the government, in large state-owned firms or universities. More and more, the best and brightest are either starting their own companies or choosing to work for foreign-owned companies – where they generally get higher pay, more respect, and a better work environment. Think about what that means. For the first time, China is moving toward becoming a society where people have a chance to get ahead based on what they know rather than who they know.

But there is something even more revolutionary at work here. By taking this step, China is taking the command and control out of communism. It is speeding a process that is removing government from vast areas of its people's lives.

~~Let's not forget what communism is.~~ In the past, virtually every Chinese citizen woke up in the morning in an apartment or house owned by their government, went to work in a factory or farm run by their government, read newspapers dictated by their government. Their state-run workplaces also operated the schools where they sent their kids, the clinics where they got health care, the stores where they bought their food.

That system was a big source of the Communist Party's power. The few benefits it provided were a big source of the legitimacy it commanded. Now people are leaving those firms, and when China is in the WTO, they will leave them faster. The Chinese government will no longer

be everyone's employer, landlord, shopkeeper and nanny rolled into one. It will have fewer instruments of day-to-day repression, fewer opportunities to buy the loyalty of its people. ~~And that may lead to profound change.~~

A few weeks ago, the Washington Post had a good story about the impact of these changes on the Shenyang province of China. Since 1949, most of the people of Shenyang have worked in massive state-run industries that provided cradle-to-grave services. But as these old factories and mills shut down, people are losing their old jobs. Under the old rules, they weren't allowed to travel anywhere to find a new job. But jobs are so scarce that the government has had to lift the travel restrictions, and let the people of Shenyang look for work.

Last September, Beijing announced that it was going to be awarding bonus checks to Chinese citizens to celebrate China's 50th anniversary under communism. But Shenyang didn't have the money to pay, which sparked a massive protest. So to ease tensions, the local government decided to give ~~its~~ people a say in how the province was run by. ~~On a limited basis, they are giving people the right to vote~~ing for candidates in local elections. It's not exactly democracy, because the Party still puts up the candidates, and decides who can vote. But it's a first step ~~toward greater political freedom.~~ And it's not just happening in Shenyang. Local elections are now held in the vast majority of the country's 900,000 villages.

When asked why, one Party official in Shenyang said: "This is the beginning of a process. We realized that in order to improve social control, we have got to let the masses have a say." The gamble they are taking is that they are going to be able to put the genie of freedom back in the bottle. And if that sounds familiar, it should, because it's the same risk that communist leaders from Poland to Russia to Nicaragua took a decade ago. It was a gamble they all lost. Because as Earl Warren once said: "liberty is the most contagious force in the world."

Think about what all this could mean in one other area: communication. Today, China's tariffs on information technology products average 13 percent. When China joins the WTO, those tariffs will disappear by 2005. For the first time, China will open its telecom market to cutting-edge American firms. ~~By doing so, it~~ That will help bring the information revolution to cities and towns across China, making -

~~This will help make~~ the tools of communication cheaper, better, more reliable, and more widely available. It means that Chinese citizens won't have to go to a government- entity to get a telephone and telephone services. It means that when a U.S. firm installs an intra-office e-mail in its China office, its Chinese employees will ~~can~~ be put in daily touch not only with their colleagues in China, but with thousands of employees here in the U.S.

~~The magnitude of this defies measurement.~~ In the past year, the number of Internet addresses in China quadrupled from two million to nine million. This year, the number is expected to grow to 20 million. Now, project that rate of growth onto a country that has 1.2 billion people. Think about how much the Internet has changed America -- and we are already an open society. Imagine how much it could change China.

~~Chinese citizens will increasingly be able to communicate with each other in real time, in ways and in such volume that no amount of censorship and monitoring can control. If they're no longer dependent on the state for information, they'll be able to share ideas with each other or the outside world. As they see how other people across the world live, I believe they will seek a greater voice in shaping their own lives.~~

There is no question that some in China's leadership are nervous about the Internet and trying to control its content. Well, good luck. In this information age, cracking down on the Internet is like trying to nail Jello to the wall. That the government is pushing back only proves that the

changes China is undergoing are real and threaten the status quo. This is not an argument for slowing down the effort to bring China into the world – it's an argument for accelerating it.

I think China is going to learn what every other nation is learning as we embrace this knowledge-based economy: you can't expect people to be innovative economically while being stifled politically. Bringing China into the WTO doesn't guarantee it will choose political reform. But accelerating ~~the process of~~ economic change will force China to confront that choice sooner, and it will make the imperative for the right choice far stronger. And again, if China is willing to take this risk, how could we possibly turn our backs?

This is not to say that this agreement will alone accomplish the goals of our policy toward China. Nobody who supports it, for example, believes that bringing China into the WTO is, by itself, a human rights policy for the United States. That's why we sanctioned China as a "country of particular concern" under the International Religious Freedom Act last year. It is why we are once again sponsoring a resolution in the UN Human Rights Commission condemning China's human rights record. We will continue to press China to respect global norms on non-proliferation. And we reject the use of force as a means to resolve the Taiwan question. We will continue to make absolutely clear that the issues between Beijing and Taiwan must be resolved peacefully and with the assent of the people of Taiwan.

In other words, we must and will continue to defend our interests and our ideals with candor and consistency. But we will not change our policies in a way that isolates China from the global forces empowering its people to build a better future.

Shutting China out would be a gift from heaven to the hard-liners in its government who don't want their country to be part of the world. Keep in mind: These are the same people most eager to settle differences with Taiwan by force. The same people most threatened by our alliances

with Japan and South Korea. The same people who would like to keep the Chinese military in the business of selling dangerous technologies around the world. The same people whose first instinct in the face of opposition is to throw people in prison camps.

Shutting China out wouldn't free a single prisoner in China, or create a single job in America, or reassure a single American ally in Asia. It would simply empower the most rigid, anti-democratic elements in the Chinese government. It would leave China an insecure, hostile, brooding presence on the world stage. It would leave the Chinese people with less access to information, less contact with the democratic world, more resistance from their government to outside ideas. It would delay the day of change in China and leave the whole world less secure. ~~That would be a tragic mistake.~~

It's very interesting to me that the people with the greatest interest in seeing China change agree with that. The people of Taiwan agree. Despite all the tensions they have had with Beijing, they are doing everything they can to cement their economic ties with the mainland. The people of Hong Kong agree. I recently received a letter from Martin Lee, the leader of Hong Kong's Democratic Party. He has spent his life struggling for free elections and free expression for his people. And he wrote to me that this agreement "represents the best long-term hope for China to become a member of good standing of the international community . . . We fear that should ratification fail . . . ~~there is a risk not only of economic back-pedaling and a slowing of the reform process, but also that the economic chill would affect Hong Kong and China's neighbors in the region. Clearly, any hope for the political and legal reform process would also recede.~~"

Most of the evangelicals I know who have missions in China also want China in the WTO because they know that it will encourage freedom of thought and more contact with the outside world. Even people who have paid the greatest price under Chinese repression agree. Ren Wending is one of the fathers of the Chinese human rights movement. In the late 1970s, he was

thrown in prison for founding the China Human Rights League. In the 1980s, he helped lead the demonstrations at Tiananmen Square. In the 1990s, he was thrown in prison again. ~~He has endured intimidation, threats to his family, and threats to his life.~~ Yet, he says of this deal: “before, the sky was black, now it is light. This can be a new beginning.”

For these people, fighting for freedom in China is not an academic exercise, it is their life's work. How can any of us who care about human rights in China possibly substitute our judgement for theirs?

If you believe in a future of greater openness and freedom for the people of China; you should be for this agreement. If you believe in a future of greater prosperity for the American people, you should be for this agreement. If you believe in a future of peace and security for Asia and the world, you should be for this agreement. This is the right thing to do. It is a historic opportunity. And I am going to work as hard as I can to convince Congress and the American people that America should lead the world in embracing it. Thank you.

3/6/00 1:00 p.m.

~~Orzulak~~ 8:00 p.m.

Orzulak/ Shesol edits

**PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON
REMARKS TO JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF ADVANCED INTERNATIONAL STUDIES
ON CHINA
WASHINGTON, DC
FEBRUARY 8, 2000**

I want to thank Johns Hopkins University and the School of Advanced International Studies for the opportunity to come here today and talk about China. For the past decade or so, this school has had a unique exchange program with Nanking University. Some of you have traveled to China to learn a little bit more about that country, and some Chinese students have come here to learn more about us. So this is a good place to talk about a decision America has to make this year that could forever change not only our relationship with China, but China itself.

OK
Last fall, as many of you know, ~~we~~ America signed an agreement to bring China into the World Trade Organization on terms that will dramatically open its market to American products. If China concludes similar agreements with other countries, it will join the WTO. The immediate question for us is: are we as a country going to embrace that choice and are we going to benefit from it economically? For that to happen, ~~we must grant China~~ the Congress must establish Permanent Normal Trade Relations status. ~~And today, with China.~~ Today, I am submitting legislation ~~to the Congress that will~~ that would do just that.

changed
~~Now, every great debate introduces new terms to the American public, and the debate over China's entry into the WTO is no different. It's not hard to imagine most Americans flipping through channels, hearing the words "Permanent Normal Trade Relations," and flipping to something else. But I'm going to work as hard as I can to make the American people understand why this is so important, and why Congress should grant China PNTR. Because I believe with all~~

~~my heart that~~ this agreement represents the most significant step in our relationship with China since President Nixon first went to China nearly three decades ago. [?]

~~For a long time now, Americans have debated our relationship with China, partly because our perceptions of China keep changing. I don't expect it to happy without a healthy debate. We have some important questions to ask and answer, as we try to get a clearer picture of the changes in China, and bring our own changing perceptions into clearer focus.~~

In the early 1900s, most Americans saw China either through the eyes of traders seeking open markets, or missionaries seeking open hearts. During World War II, China was our ally. During the Korean War, it was our adversary. ~~When I was growing up, it was a question mark — who lost China?~~ During the Cold War, it was a counterweight. Now, in some people's eyes, it's a caricature: either the next great capitalist tiger with the biggest market in the world, or the world's last great communist dragon and a threat to peace and stability in Asia -- the land of a billion prisoners, or the land of a billion customers.

~~And all these~~ Our changing perceptions of China have only begun to reflect are reflections of the profound changes within China itself — the falling that nation has undergone — the fallen dynasties, foreign invasions, civil wars, cruel famines, and reigns of terror, terror; a communist revolution, an industrial revolution, and now a market revolution.

~~But through~~ Through all this upheaval, there has been one constant: ~~our interests.~~ America's stake, our profound national interest, in the outcome. Every American President for the past 30 years, without regard to party, has worked for a China that contributes to the stability, ~~not the instability~~ of Asia; that is open to our products and businesses; that upholds the rule of law at home and plays by the rules of the road around the world. We make no apologies for it. We are a nation that has fought three wars in Asia in the 20th Century. Moreover, we are a nation that

cherishes liberty and believes that if people are free to make their own choices, the world will be a safer and more prosperous place.

~~place. We are also a nation that has fought three wars in Asia in the 20th Century, and have a tremendous stake in~~

Now, the path China takes is China's choice. But America, too, has a choice – the U.S. Congress has a choice – and it is the choice between hope and fear. We can act on our belief that China can, someday, be a good partner; or we can act on our suspicion that it never will. We can work to move China in the right direction; or turn our backs and almost certainly send it in the wrong direction.

how China evolves.

~~If we had a crystal ball, we could see exactly what China will look like in 20 years. But we don't. Every nation defines its greatness in different ways, and every nation makes its own choices. We don't know what choices China will make. But we do have control over the choices that we make. We can give China a chance to be a good partner, and work to move it in the right direction. Or we can turn our backs, and almost certainly move it in the wrong direction.~~ I believe our choice is clear. This WTO agreement will move China in the right direction, and advance every goal we Americans have worked for in China the past 30 years. Let me tell you how.

~~First let's understand from the beginning: this is not a trade agreement, in any traditional sense. Usually, when we sign trade agreements, we have to weigh the benefits of opening another country's markets against the dislocations that can take place when we open our market. But this is not a two-way agreement, this is the trade equivalent of a one-way street. It requires China to open its market to our products and services, but all we agree to do is maintain the market access that we already give to China. It does not change our laws or our tariffs one bit. As a trade~~

agreement, it's an enormous opportunity for America. It's the kind every country wishes for or works toward, the kind you get maybe once in a generation.

~~I don't believe there can be any question that this is in America's economic interests.~~ Over the past seven years, we have worked hard to open markets around the world to American products. It's a question of simple arithmetic. We are a country with 22 percent of the world's income and four percent of the world's population. If we're going to continue to prosper in the 21st Century, we had better be selling something to somebody somewhere else.

And where better than China? With more than a billion people – fully one-fifth of the world's population -- China clearly represents the biggest potential market in the world. Under this agreement, America will gain unprecedented access to this massive, untapped market, while granting China no new access to our own. Chinese tariffs in every sector, from telecommunications to automobiles to agriculture, will fall by half or more in five years. For the first time, our companies will be able to sell and distribute products in China made by workers here at home in America – without transferring technology or operations to China. We'll be able to export products without in manufacturing-exporting jobs. For the first time, China will agree to play by the same trading rules we do. It's going to mean a lot more jobs for America. Meanwhile, we'll get new safeguards against surges of imports and maintain the strongest possible protections against dumping products.

~~which would threaten to throw a lot of Americans out of work in a short period of time.~~

~~That's what happens if we pass PNTR. If we don't pass it, we would lose the full benefits of China's WTO membership. Our companies would be shut off from one fifth of the world while our European, Japanese, and other competitors would be happy to rush in and fill the gap. In other words, they would be the beneficiaries~~

The agreement our team has negotiated is a blockbuster for American business, American investors, American workers, American farmers. If the Congress passes PNTR, then we reap the rewards. If the Congress rejects it, then our competitors do. ~~Keep this in mind. China's going to grow no matter what we do. If we don't sell our products to China, some other country will be happy to. So if we turn our backs on this opportunity – if we unilaterally disarm as a global trading power – well, we're going to spend the next twenty years regretting it. We're going to spend the next twenty years wondering why we ever handed over all the benefits we negotiated; and gave up the competitive edge we've earned, to Europe, Japan, and others.~~
of the benefits we negotiated.

COMPRO

So on purely economic grounds, this agreement is a no-brainer. Most of its critics don't even question that. Critics are more likely to point to the threats China made on Taiwan a few weeks ago, ~~and say we shouldn't strengthen it. Or they point to the human rights abuses documented in the report our State Department issued, and say we shouldn't reward it. Or they point to stories about China's nuclear weapons program, and say we shouldn't empower it.~~ And all of those concerns are absolutely legitimate, valid.

no

Those of us who support ~~permanent~~ Permanent Normal Trade Relations are under no illusion about the government in Beijing. It is a one-party state that does not tolerate opposition. ~~It denies basic~~ fundamental freedoms to its citizens. It denies the most basic rights of free speech and religious expression. Its record on labor and environmental rights is a long litany of abuse.

~~leaves a lot to be desired. The~~ **But let me be very clear: the question is not whether we support it or whether we ignore it, approve or disapprove of conditions in China. The question is, how do we change it?** is whether we will do what we can to improve them.

what can we do

This is not about economic rights versus human rights, or economic security versus national security. That is a false choice. We're not trying to promote one over the other, we are trying to

promote both. Membership in the WTO won't create a free society in China overnight. But over ~~the long haul,~~time, we believe it's going to move China much further in the right direction ~~than simply taking our ball and going home~~. To understand why, it's important to understand why China is willing to do all of this in the first place. Why they are doing this is at least as important as what they are doing.

Over the past 20 years, China has made a lot of progress in building a new economy, lifting more than 200 million people out of absolute poverty. It is linking so many people through its wireless communications network that it is adding the equivalent of a new Baby Bell every year.

But its system is still plagued by corruption. Only one-third of its economy is private enterprise. And nearly 60 percent of its investment and 80 percent of all business lending is directed toward state-owned dinosaurs that are least likely to survive in the global economy. Most of China's economy today still operates under the old theory that if they had just shoveled coal into the furnaces faster, the Titanic would have stayed afloat.

Meanwhile, its workforce is increasing by 12 million each year. At least 100 million people in China are still looking for work. And economic growth has slowed just when it needs to be rising to create new jobs. It's ironic: many Americans are concerned about the danger a strong and successful China could pose to us in the 21st century. But the danger of a weak China, beset by internal chaos and disintegration is just as real, and China's leaders know it. They understand that China cannot maintain stability or ensure prosperity by maintaining the status quo.

~~So China's leaders face a dilemma: they realize that if they open China's antiquated market to global competition, they risk unleashing forces beyond their control — namely, unemployment, social unrest, and demands for freedom. But they have also concluded~~ They know that without

competition or investment from the outside, China will not be able to build or
~~attract investment or build~~ world-class industries that can survive in the global economy.

With this agreement, China has chosen reform, despite its risks. That is China's choice.

But again, I return to our own: Do we want to be play a constructive role in ~~those~~ reforms?

Or simply stand aside, ~~as skeptics~~, and ~~perhaps~~ make failure a self-fulfilling prophecy?

~~to embrace change, despite the risk it entails. The question for America is: do we really want to~~
~~reject that choice?~~

I think that would be a mistake of historic proportions. This is a choice we ~~need to~~ must embrace,
 for our own good and the ~~common~~ good of the world.

~~For starters, having China in a rules-based trading system increases the chance that it will follow~~
~~the rules of the road more broadly when interacting with the world~~

~~When I see this debate about China going on in our country, I try to remind people that the~~
~~Chinese are engaged in the same kind of debate about us. Not just China's leaders, but many of~~
~~China's people believe Americans don't want their country to assume its rightful place in the~~
~~world. They are deeply ambivalent about the role China should play in the world.~~

~~Let's not forget: there is a reason China~~ It was China, let's remember, that built the Great Wall.

It has endured centuries of invasions and occupations; it has tried for most of its history to keep

~~the world and its influences out.~~ By joining the WTO, they've made a clear choice -- to

overcome a great wall of suspicion and insecurity and reach out to the rest of the world. Again, I
 ask: if they're willing to reach out to the world, do we really want to slap that hand away?

OK I'll say this again: everything I have ever learned about human nature, and everything I have learned about China, convinces me that we have a far greater chance of influencing China's actions if we bring it into a common endeavor than if we shut it out.

OK Under this agreement, some of China's most important decisions, for the first time, will be subject to the review of an international body. For the first time, China is conceding that governments cannot behave arbitrarily at home or abroad. Opponents say that ~~it doesn't matter because~~ matter: China will just break its promises. But if China does, we're still in a better position, because it won't be able to blame U.S. bullying. Its actions will be subject to judgments passed by 135 nations.

OK I'll say this again: ~~everything I have learned about human nature in my life, plus everything I have learned about China as President, convinces me that we have a far greater chance of influencing its actions if we bring it into a common endeavor than if we shut it out.~~

OK But the change this agreement can bring from the outside-in is nothing compared to the change it can bring from the inside-out. By joining the WTO, China is slashing the tariffs that protect its ~~state-owned industries~~ state-owned industries. It is importing not just our products but one of our most cherished principles – economic freedom. ~~Think about~~ The more ~~what that principle has meant to us over the years – not just greater wealth, but individual initiative, individual creativity, the liberation of individual human potential. We know that once individuals are given the ability to dream,~~ China liberalizes its economy, the more fully it liberates the human potential of its people – their initiative, their imagination, their spirit of enterprise. When individuals have the power not just to dream but to realize their dreams, they demand a greater say in their own destiny. It is completely the opposite of the culture that communism imposed on China's people. Just imagine where it could take them.

OK
~~A decade ago, More and more, China's best and brightest college students sought jobs in the government, in large state-owned firms or universities. More and more, the best and brightest are either starting their own companies or choosing to work for~~ are seeking jobs not with the state but with foreign-owned companies – where they generally get higher pay, more respect, and a better work environment. ~~Think about what that means. For That, or they're starting their own companies. In fits and starts, and for the first time, China is moving toward becoming~~ may become a society where people ~~have a chance to get ahead based on what they know rather than~~ who they know. *standards*

But there is something even more revolutionary at work here. By taking this step, China is taking the command and control out of communism. ~~It is speeding a process that is removing government from vast areas of its people's lives.~~ *ND*

~~Let's not forget what~~ how communism is works. In the past, virtually every Chinese citizen woke up in the morning in an apartment or house owned by their government, went to work in a factory or farm run by their government, read newspapers dictated by their government. ~~Their state-run~~ State-run workplaces also operated the schools where they sent their kids, the clinics where they got health care, the stores where they bought their food.

OK *ND* *OK*
~~(That system was a big source of the Communist Party's power. The few benefits it provided were a big source of the legitimacy it commanded. Now people are leaving those firms, and when China is in joins the WTO, they will leave them faster. The Chinese government will no longer be everyone's employer, landlord, shopkeeper and nanny rolled into one. It will have fewer instruments of day to day repression, fewer opportunities~~ means to buy the loyalty of its people. And that may lead to profound change.

A few weeks ago, the Washington Post had a good story about the impact of these changes on the Shenyang province of China. Since 1949, most of the people of Shenyang have worked in massive state-run industries that provided cradle-to-grave services. But as these old factories and mills shut down, people are losing their old jobs. Under the old rules, they weren't allowed to travel anywhere to find a new job. But jobs are so scarce that the government has had to lift the travel restrictions, and let the people of Shenyang look for work.

Last September, Beijing announced that it was going to be awarding bonus checks to Chinese citizens to celebrate China's 50th anniversary under communism. But Shenyang didn't have the money to pay, which sparked a massive protest. So to ease tensions, To ease the tensions caused by economic change, the local government decided to give ^{OK} its people a say in how the province ^{OK} was run. On a limited basis, they are giving people ^{OK} citizens now have the right to vote for candidates in local elections ^{OK} in local elections. It's not exactly democracy, because the Party still puts up the candidates, and decides who can vote. But it's a first step toward greater political freedom. And it's not just happening in Shenyang. Local elections are now held in the vast majority of the country's 900,000 villages.

When asked why, one Party official in Shenyang said: "This is the beginning of a process. We realized that in order to improve social control, we have got to let the masses have a say." The gamble they are taking is that they are going to be able to put the genie of freedom back in the bottle. And if that sounds familiar, it should, because it's the same risk that that's because it was spoken a decade ago by communist leaders from Poland to Russia to Nicaragua took a decade ago. Nicaragua. It was a gamble they all lost. Because as Earl Warren once said: "liberty each made with their people. And, in every case, the state lost and the people won. As Earl Warren said: "Liberty is the most contagious force in the world."

~~Think about what all this could mean in one other area: communication. Today, China's tariffs on information technology products average 13 percent. When China joins the WTO, those tariffs will disappear by 2005. For the first time, China will open its telecom market to cutting-edge American firms. By doing so, it will help bring the information revolution to cities and towns across China.~~

~~This will help make the tools of communication cheaper, better, more reliable, and more widely available. It means that Chinese citizens won't have to go to a government entity to get a telephone and telephone services. It means that when a U.S. firm installs an intra-office e-mail in its China office, its Chinese employees can be put in daily touch not only with their colleagues in China, but with thousands of employees here in the U.S.~~

~~The magnitude of this defies~~How will it spread, in this new century? The answer is obvious: in an information age, liberty is carried by cell phone; it is conducted by cable modem. China's information infrastructure is growing fast, by orders of magnitude that defy measurement. In the past year, the number of Internet addresses in China quadrupled from two million to nine million. This year, the number is expected to grow to 20 million. Now, project that rate of growth onto a country that has 1.2 billion people.

And when China joins the WTO, eliminating its tariffs on information technology products, the tools of communication will only become cheaper, better, and more widely available. This will allow the citizens of China to communicate with each other – to share ideas and information – in ways that no government can control. people. It will connect Chinese citizens to one another and

the world outside. Think about how much the Internet has changed America -- and we are already an open society. Imagine how much it could change China.

~~Chinese citizens will increasingly be able to communicate with each other in real time, in ways and in such volume that no amount of censorship and monitoring can control. If they're no longer dependent on the state for information, they'll be able to share ideas with each other or the outside world. As they see how other people across the world live, I believe they will seek a greater voice in shaping their own lives.~~

There is no question that some in China's leadership are nervous about the Internet and trying to control its content. Well, good luck. In this information age, China has been cracking down on the Internet is like trying to nail Jello to the wall. That the government is pushing back only proves that the changes China is undergoing are real and Internet, pushing back, trying to fit the genie back into the bottle. Well, it won't fit. In China today, the one-party state is still powerful; but with one click of a mouse, a Chinese child can find new freedoms that are even more powerful.

~~threaten the status quo. This is not an argument for slowing down the effort to bring China into the world -- it's an argument for accelerating it.~~

I think China is going to learn what every other nation is learning as we embrace this knowledge-based economy: you can't expect people to be innovative economically while being stifled politically. Bringing China into the WTO doesn't guarantee it will choose political reform. But accelerating the process of economic change will force China to confront that choice sooner, and it will make the imperative for the right choice far stronger. And again, if China is willing to take this risk, how could we possibly turn our backs?

OK

10

This is not to say that this agreement will alone accomplish the goals of our policy toward China. Nobody who supports it, for example, believes that bringing China into the WTO is, by itself, a human rights policy for the United States. That's why we sanctioned China as a "country of particular concern" under the International Religious Freedom Act last year. It is why we are once again sponsoring a resolution in the UN Human Rights Commission condemning China's human rights record. We will continue to press China to respect global norms on non-proliferation. And we will continue to reject the use of force as a means to resolve the Taiwan question. ~~We will continue~~ question, and to make absolutely clear that the issues between Beijing and Taiwan must be resolved peacefully and with the assent of the people of Taiwan.

OK

In other words, we must and will continue to defend our interests and our ideals with candor and consistency. But we ~~will not change our policies in a way that isolates China from the global forces~~ cannot do so by isolating China from the very forces that may change it, the very forces already empowering its people to build a better future.

~~Shutting China out would be a gift from heaven to the hard liners in its government who don't want their country to be part of the world. Keep in mind: These are the same people most eager to settle differences with Taiwan by force. The same people most threatened by our alliances with Japan and South Korea. The same people who would like to keep the Chinese military in the business of selling dangerous technologies around the world. The same people whose first instinct in the face of opposition is to throw people in prison camps.~~

ND

~~Shutting China out wouldn't~~ Isolating China won't free a single prisoner in China, there, or create a single job in America, here, or reassure a single American ally in Asia. It would simply empower the most rigid, anti-democratic elements in the Chinese government. It would leave China an insecure, hostile, brooding presence on the world stage. It would leave the Chinese

ND

people with less access to information, less contact with the democratic world, more resistance from their government to outside ideas, democratic peoples and ideas, and make them more reliant on their government. It would delay the day of change in China and leave the whole world less secure. That would be a tragic mistake.

~~It's very interesting to me~~ I find it encouraging that the people with the greatest interest in seeing China change agree with that. The people of Taiwan agree. Despite all the tensions they have had with Beijing, they are doing everything they can to cement their economic ties with the mainland. The people of Hong Kong agree. I recently received a letter from Martin Lee, the leader of Hong Kong's Democratic Party. He has spent his life struggling for free elections and free expression for his people. And he wrote to me that this agreement "represents the best long-term hope for China to become a member of good standing of the international community . . . We fear that should ratification fail . . . there is a risk not only of economic back-pedaling and a slowing of the reform process, but also that the economic chill would affect Hong Kong and China's neighbors in the region. Clearly, any hope for the political and legal reform process would also recede."

~~Most~~ We are all concerned by religious repression in China. Yet most of the evangelicals I know who have missions in China there also want China in the WTO because they know that it will encourage freedom of thought and more contact with the outside world. Even people who have paid the greatest price under Chinese repression agree. Ren Wending is one of the fathers of the Chinese human rights movement. In the late 1970s, he was thrown in prison for founding the China Human Rights League. In the 1980s, he helped lead the demonstrations at Tiananmen Square. In the 1990s, he was thrown in prison again. [He has endured intimidation, threats to his family, and threats to his life.] Yet, he says of this deal: "before, the sky was black, now it is light. This can be a new beginning."

For these people, fighting for freedom in China is not an academic exercise, it is their life's work. How can any of us who care about human rights in China possibly substitute our judgement for theirs?

| yes

If you believe in a future of greater openness and freedom for the people of China; you should be for this agreement. If you believe in a future of greater prosperity for the American people, you should be for this agreement. If you believe in a future of peace and security for Asia and the world, you should be for this agreement. This is the right thing to do. It is a historic opportunity. And I am going to work as hard as I can to convince Congress and the American people that America should embrace it, and lead the world in embracing it to do the same. Thank you.

OK
|

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

FAX COVER SHEET

**NATIONAL
SECURITY
COUNCIL**

17th & Penn, N.W.
Washington, D.C.
20504

Did you get a complete,
clear transmission? If not,
please call:

(202) 456-9378

From: Paul Orzulak

To: Stephanie Flanders

Agency: Treasury

Fax Number: 622-4358 0073

Date/Time: 3/6/00 5:00 p.m.

No. of pages to follow: 12

**Message: Here's a draft of the President's Remarks
on China to SAIS on Wednesday. Jeff Shesol said
you had called. Please get changes to me at 456-
9378, or fax to 456-9210. Thanks.**

3/6/00 1:00 p.m.

Orzulak

**PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON
REMARKS TO JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF ADVANCED INTERNATIONAL STUDIES
ON CHINA
WASHINGTON, DC
MARCH 8, 2000**

I want to thank Johns Hopkins University and the School of Advanced International Studies for the opportunity to come here today and talk about China. For the past decade or so, this school has had a unique exchange program with Nanking University. Some of you have traveled to China to learn a little bit more about that country, and some Chinese students have come here to learn more about us. So this is a good place to talk about a decision America has to make this year that could forever change not only our relationship with China, but China itself.

Last fall, as many of you know, we signed an agreement to bring China into the World Trade Organization on terms that will dramatically open its market to American products. If China concludes similar agreements with other countries, it will join the WTO. The immediate question for us is: are we as a country going to embrace that choice and are we going to benefit from it economically? For that to happen, we must grant China Permanent Normal Trade Relations status. And today, I am submitting legislation to the Congress that will do just that.

Now, every great debate introduces new terms to the American public, and the debate over China's entry into the WTO is no different. It's not hard to imagine most Americans flipping through channels, hearing the words "Permanent Normal Trade Relations," and flipping to something else. But I'm going to work as hard as I can to make the American people understand why this is so important, and why Congress should grant China PNTR. Because I believe with all my heart that this agreement represents the most significant step in our relationship with China since President Nixon first went to China nearly three decades ago.

For a long time now, Americans have debated our relationship with China, partly because our perceptions of China keep changing.

In the early 1900s, most Americans saw China either through the eyes of traders seeking open markets, or missionaries seeking open hearts. During World War II, China was our ally. During the Korean War, it was our adversary. When I was growing up, it was a question mark – who lost China? During the Cold War, it was a counterweight. Now, in some people's eyes it's a caricature: either the next great capitalist tiger with the biggest market in the world, or the world's last great communist dragon and a threat to peace and stability in Asia -- the land of a billion prisoners, or the land of a billion customers.

And all these changing perceptions of China have only begun to reflect the profound changes within China itself – the falling dynasties, foreign invasions, civil wars, cruel famines, reigns of terror, a communist revolution, an industrial revolution, and now a market revolution.

But through all this upheaval, there has been one constant: our interests. Every American President for the past 30 years, without regard to party, has worked for a China that contributes to the stability, not the instability of Asia; that is open to our products and businesses; that upholds the rule of law at home and plays by the rules of the road around the world. We make no apologies for it. We are a nation that cherishes liberty and believes that if people are free to make their own choices, the world will be a safer and more prosperous place. We are also a nation that has fought three wars in Asia in the 20th Century, and have a tremendous stake in how China evolves.

If we had a crystal ball, we could see exactly what China will look like in 20 years. But we don't. Every nation defines its greatness in different ways, and every nation makes its own choices. We don't know what choices China will make. But we do have control over the

choices that we make. We can give China a chance to be a good partner, and work to move it in the right direction. Or we can turn our backs, and almost certainly move it in the wrong direction. This WTO agreement will move China in the right direction, and advance every goal we have worked for in China the past 30 years. Let me tell you how.

First let's understand from the beginning: this is not a trade agreement, in any traditional sense. Usually, when we sign trade agreements, we have to weigh the benefits of opening another country's markets against the dislocations that can take place when we open our market. But this is not a two-way agreement, this is the trade equivalent of a one-way street. It requires China to open its market to our products and services, but all we agree to do is maintain the market access that we already give to China. It does not change our laws or our tariffs one bit.

I don't believe there can be any question that this is in America's economic interests. Over the past seven years, we have worked hard to open markets around the world to American products. It's a question of simple arithmetic. We are a country with 22 percent of the world's income and four percent of the world's population. If we're going to continue to prosper in the 21st Century, we had better be selling something to somebody somewhere else.

With more than a billion people -- fully one-fifth of the world's population -- China clearly represents the biggest potential market in the world. Under this agreement, Chinese tariffs in every sector, from telecommunications to automobiles to agriculture, will fall by half or more in five years. For the first time, our companies will be able to sell and distribute products in China made by workers here at home without transferring technology in manufacturing. For the first time, China will agree to play by the same trading rules we do. It's going to mean a lot more jobs for America. Meanwhile, we'll get two new safeguards against surges of imports which would threaten to throw a lot of Americans out of work in a short period of time.

That's what happens if we pass PNTR. If we don't pass it, we would lose the full benefits of China's WTO membership. Our companies would be shut-off from one-fifth of the world – while our European, Japanese, and other competitors would be happy to rush in and fill the gap. In other words, they would be the beneficiaries of the benefits we negotiated.

So on purely economic grounds, this agreement is a no-brainer. Most of its critics don't even question that. Critics are more likely to point to the threats China made on Taiwan a few weeks ago, and say we shouldn't strengthen it. Or they point to the human rights abuses documented in the report our State Department issued, and say we shouldn't reward it. Or they point to stories about China's nuclear weapons program, and say we shouldn't empower it. And all of those concerns are absolutely legitimate.

Those of us who support permanent Normal Trade Relations are under no illusion about the government in Beijing. It is a one-party state that does not tolerate opposition. It denies basic freedoms to its citizens. It denies the most basic rights of free speech and religious expression. Its record on labor and environmental rights leaves a lot to be desired. The question is not whether we support it or whether we ignore it. The question is, how do we change it?

This is not about economic rights versus human rights, or economic security versus national security. That is a false choice. We're not trying to promote one over the other, we are trying to promote both. Membership in the WTO won't create a free society in China overnight. But over the long haul, we believe it's going to move China much further in the right direction than simply taking our ball and going home. To understand why, it's important to understand why China is willing to do all of this in the first place. Why they are doing this is at least as important as what they are doing.

Over the past 20 years, China has made a lot of progress in building a new economy, lifting more than 200 million people out of absolute poverty. It is linking so many people through its

wireless communications network that is adding the equivalent of a new Baby Bell every year.

But its system is still plagued by corruption. Only one-third of its economy is private enterprise. And nearly 60 percent of its investment and 80 percent of all business lending is directed toward state-owned dinosaurs that are least likely to survive in the global economy. Most of China's economy today still operates under the old theory that if they had just shoveled coal into the furnaces faster, the Titanic would have stayed afloat.

Meanwhile, its workforce is increasing by 12 million each year. At least 100 million people in China are still looking for work. And economic growth has slowed just when it needs to be rising to create new jobs. It's ironic: many Americans are concerned about the danger a strong and successful China could pose to us in the 21st century. But the danger of a weak China, beset by internal chaos and disintegration is just as real, and China's leaders know it. They understand that China cannot maintain stability or ensure prosperity by maintaining the status quo.

So China's leaders face a dilemma: they realize that if they open China's antiquated market to global competition, they risk unleashing forces beyond their control – namely, unemployment, social unrest, and demands for freedom. But they have also concluded that without competition from the outside, China will not be able to attract investment or build world-class industries that can survive in the global economy.

With this agreement, China has chosen to embrace change, despite the risk it entails. The question for America is: do we really want to reject that choice? I think that would be a mistake of historic proportions. This is a choice we need to embrace, for our own good and the common good of the world.

For starters, having China in a rules-based trading system increases the chance that it will follow

the rules of the road more broadly when interacting with the world

When I see this debate about China going on in our country, I try to remind people that the Chinese are engaged in the same kind of debate about us. Not just China's leaders, but many of China's people believe Americans don't want their country to assume its rightful place in the world. They are deeply ambivalent about the role China should play in the world.

Let's not forget: there is a reason China built the Great Wall. It has endured centuries of invasions and occupations; it has tried for most of its history to keep the world and its influences out. By joining the WTO, they've made a clear choice -- to overcome a great wall of suspicion and insecurity and reach out to the rest of the world. Again, I ask: if they're willing to reach out to the world, do we really want to slap that hand away?

Under this agreement, some of China's most important decisions, for the first time, will be subject to the review of an international body. For the first time, China is conceding that governments cannot behave arbitrarily at home or abroad. Opponents say that it doesn't matter because China will just break its promises. But if China does, we're still in a better position, because it won't be able to blame U.S. bullying. Its actions will be subject to judgments passed by 135 nations.

I'll say this again: everything I have learned about human nature in my life, plus everything I have learned about China as President, convinces me that we have a far greater chance of influencing its actions if we bring it into a common endeavor than if we shut it out.

But the change this agreement can bring from the outside-in is nothing compared to the change it can bring from the inside-out. By joining the WTO, China is slashing the tariffs that protect its state owned industries. It is importing not just our products but one of our most cherished

principles – economic freedom. Think about what that principle has meant to us over the years - not just greater wealth, but individual initiative, individual creativity, the liberation of individual human potential. We know that once individuals are given the ability to dream, they demand a greater say in their own destiny. It is completely the opposite of the culture that communism imposed on China's people. Just imagine where it could take them.

A decade ago, China's best and brightest college students sought jobs in the government, in large state-owned firms or universities. More and more, the best and brightest are either starting their own companies or choosing to work for foreign-owned companies – where they generally get higher pay, more respect, and a better work environment. Think about what that means. For the first time, China is moving toward becoming a society where people have a chance to get ahead based on what they know rather than who they know.

But there is something even more revolutionary at work here. By taking this step, China is taking the command and control out of communism. It is speeding a process that is removing government from vast areas of its people's lives.

Let's not forget what communism is. In the past, virtually every Chinese citizen woke up in the morning in an apartment or house owned by their government, went to work in a factory or farm run by their government, read newspapers dictated by their government. Their state-run workplaces also operated the schools where they sent their kids, the clinics where they got health care, the stores where they bought their food.

That system was a big source of the Communist Party's power. The few benefits it provided were a big source of the legitimacy it commanded. Now people are leaving those firms, and when China is in the WTO, they will leave them faster. The Chinese government will no longer be everyone's employer, landlord, shopkeeper and nanny rolled into one. It will have fewer

instruments of day-to-day repression, fewer opportunities to buy the loyalty of its people. And that may lead to profound change.

A few weeks ago, the Washington Post had a good story about the impact of these changes on the Shenyang province of China. Since 1949, most of the people of Shenyang have worked in massive state-run industries that provided cradle-to-grave services. But as these old factories and mills shut down, people are losing their old jobs. Under the old rules, they weren't allowed to travel anywhere to find a new job. But jobs are so scarce that the government has had to lift the travel restrictions, and let the people of Shenyang look for work.

Last September, Beijing announced that it was going to be awarding bonus checks to Chinese citizens to celebrate China's 50th anniversary under communism. But Shenyang didn't have the money to pay, which sparked a massive protest. So to ease tensions, the local government decided to give its people a say in how the province was run. On a limited basis, they are giving people the right to vote for candidates in local elections. It's not exactly democracy, because the Party still puts up the candidates, and decides who can vote. But it's a first step toward greater political freedom. And it's not just happening in Shenyang. Local elections are now held in the vast majority of the country's 900,000 villages.

When asked why, one Party official in Shenyang said: "This is the beginning of a process. We realized that in order to improve social control, we have got to let the masses have a say." The gamble they are taking is that they are going to be able to put the genie of freedom back in the bottle. And if that sounds familiar, it should, because it's the same risk that communist leaders from Poland to Russia to Nicaragua took a decade ago. It was a gamble they all lost. Because as Earl Warren once said: "liberty is the most contagious force in the world."

Think about what all this could mean in one other area: communication. Today, China's tariffs

on information technology products average 13 percent. When China joins the WTO, those tariffs will disappear by 2005. For the first time, China will open its telecom market to cutting-edge American firms. By doing so, it will help bring the information revolution to cities and towns across China.

This will help make the tools of communication cheaper, better, more reliable, and more widely available. It means that Chinese citizens won't have to go to a government- entity to get a telephone and telephone services. It means that when a U.S. firm installs an intra-office e-mail in its China office, its Chinese employees can be put in daily touch not only with their colleagues in China, but with thousands of employees here in the U.S.

The magnitude of this defies measurement. In the past year, the number of Internet addresses in China quadrupled from two million to nine million. This year, the number is expected to grow to 20 million. Now, project that rate of growth onto a country that has 1.2 billion people. Think about how much the Internet has changed America -- and we are already an open society.

Imagine how much it could change China.

Chinese citizens will increasingly be able to communicate with each other in real time, in ways and in such volume that no amount of censorship and monitoring can control. If they're no longer dependent on the state for information, they'll be able to share ideas with each other or the outside world. As they see how other people across the world live, I believe they will seek a greater voice in shaping their own lives.

There is no question that some in China's leadership are nervous about the Internet and trying to control its content. Well, good luck. In this information age, cracking down on the Internet is like trying to nail Jello to the wall. That the government is pushing back only proves that the changes China is undergoing are real and threaten the status quo. This is not an argument for

slowing down the effort to bring China into the world – it's an argument for accelerating it.

I think China is going to learn what every other nation is learning as we embrace this knowledge-based economy: you can't expect people to be innovative economically while being stifled politically. Bringing China into the WTO doesn't guarantee it will choose political reform. But accelerating the process of economic change will force China to confront that choice sooner, and it will make the imperative for the right choice far stronger. And again, if China is willing to take this risk, how could we possibly turn our backs?

This is not to say that this agreement will alone accomplish the goals of our policy toward China. Nobody who supports it, for example, believes that bringing China into the WTO is, by itself, a human rights policy for the United States. That's why we sanctioned China as a "country of particular concern" under the International Religious Freedom Act last year. It is why we are once again sponsoring a resolution in the UN Human Rights Commission condemning China's human rights record. We will continue to press China to respect global norms on non-proliferation. And we reject the use of force as a means to resolve the Taiwan question. We will continue to make absolutely clear that the issues between Beijing and Taiwan must be resolved peacefully and with the assent of the people of Taiwan.

In other words, we must and will continue to defend our interests and our ideals with candor and consistency. But we will not change our policies in a way that isolates China from the global forces empowering its people to build a better future.

Shutting China out would be a gift from heaven to the hard-liners in its government who don't want their country to be part of the world. Keep in mind: These are the same people most eager to settle differences with Taiwan by force. The same people most threatened by our alliances with Japan and South Korea. The same people who would like to keep the Chinese military in

the business of selling dangerous technologies around the world. The same people whose first instinct in the face of opposition is to throw people in prison camps.

Shutting China out wouldn't free a single prisoner in China, or create a single job in America, or reassure a single American ally in Asia. It would simply empower the most rigid, anti-democratic elements in the Chinese government. It would leave China an insecure, hostile, brooding presence on the world stage. It would leave the Chinese people with less access to information, less contact with the democratic world, more resistance from their government to outside ideas. It would delay the day of change in China and leave the whole world less secure. That would be a tragic mistake.

It's very interesting to me that the people with the greatest interest in seeing China change agree with that. The people of Taiwan agree. Despite all the tensions they have had with Beijing, they are doing everything they can to cement their economic ties with the mainland. The people of Hong Kong agree. I recently received a letter from Martin Lee, the leader of Hong Kong's Democratic Party. He has spent his life struggling for free elections and free expression for his people. And he wrote to me that this agreement "represents the best long-term hope for China to become a member of good standing of the international community . . . We fear that should ratification fail . . . there is a risk not only of economic back-pedaling and a slowing of the reform process, but also that the economic chill would affect Hong Kong and China's neighbors in the region. Clearly, any hope for the political and legal reform process would also recede."

Most of the evangelicals I know who have missions in China also want China in the WTO because they know that it will encourage freedom of thought and more contact with the outside world. Even people who have paid the greatest price under Chinese repression agree. Ren Wending is one of the fathers of the Chinese human rights movement. In the late 1970s, he was thrown in prison for founding the China Human Rights League. In the 1980s, he helped lead the

demonstrations at Tiananmen Square. In the 1990s, he was thrown in prison again. [He has endured intimidation, threats to his family, and threats to his life.] Yet, he says of this deal: “before, the sky was black, now it is light. This can be a new beginning.”

For these people, fighting for freedom in China is not an academic exercise, it is their life's work. How can any of us who care about human rights in China possibly substitute our judgement for theirs?

If you believe in a future of greater openness and freedom for the people of China, you should be for this agreement. If you believe in a future of greater prosperity for the American people, you should be for this agreement. If you believe in a future of peace and security for Asia and the world, you should be for this agreement. This is the right thing to do. It is a historic opportunity. And I am going to work as hard as I can to convince Congress and the American people that America should lead the world in embracing it. Thank you.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002a. note	re: Content of speech (1 page)	03/06/2000	P5

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[China] [Folder 3]

2008-0702-F

jm610

RESTRICTION CODES

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

- 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.

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

- 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]

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002b. statement	re: Draft President William Jefferson Clinton remarks to Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies on China (14 pages)	03/06/2000	P5

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[China] [Folder 3]

2008-0702-F

jm610

RESTRICTION CODES

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

- 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.

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

- 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]

3/6/00 1:00 p.m.
~~Orzulak~~ 8:00 p.m.
Orzulak/ Shesol edits

**PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON
REMARKS TO JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF ADVANCED INTERNATIONAL STUDIES
ON CHINA
WASHINGTON, DC
FEBRUARY 8, 2000**

I want to thank Johns Hopkins University and the School of Advanced International Studies for the opportunity to come here today and talk about China. For the past decade or so, this school has had a unique exchange program with Nanking University. Some of you have traveled to China to learn a little bit more about that country, and some Chinese students have come here to learn more about us. So this is a good place to talk about a decision America has to make this year that could forever change not only our relationship with China, but China itself.

Last fall, as many of you know, ~~we~~ America signed an agreement to bring China into the World Trade Organization on terms that will dramatically open its market to American products. If China concludes similar agreements with other countries, it will join the WTO. The immediate question for us is: are we as a country going to embrace that choice and are we going to benefit from it economically? For that to happen, ~~we must grant China~~ the Congress must establish Permanent Normal Trade Relations status. And today, with China. Today, I am submitting legislation ~~to the Congress that will~~ that would do just that.

~~Now, every great debate introduces new terms to the American public, and the debate over China's entry into the WTO is no different. It's not hard to imagine most Americans flipping through channels, hearing the words "Permanent Normal Trade Relations," and flipping to something else. But I'm going to work as hard as I can to make the American people understand why this is so important, and why Congress should grant China PNTR. Because I believe with all~~

~~my heart that~~ this agreement represents the most significant step in our relationship with China since President Nixon first went to China nearly three decades ago. [?]

~~For a long time now, Americans have debated our relationship with China, partly because our perceptions of China keep changing. I don't expect it to happy without a healthy debate. We have some important questions to ask and answer, as we try to get a clearer picture of the changes in China, and bring our own changing perceptions into clearer focus.~~

In the early 1900s, most Americans saw China either through the eyes of traders seeking open markets, or missionaries seeking open hearts. During World War II, China was our ally. During the Korean War, it was our adversary. ~~When I was growing up, it was a question mark — who lost China?~~ During the Cold War, it was a counterweight. Now, in some people's eyes, it's a caricature: either the next great capitalist tiger with the biggest market in the world, or the world's last great communist dragon and a threat to peace and stability in Asia -- the land of a billion prisoners, or the land of a billion customers.

~~And all these~~ Our changing perceptions of China ~~have only begun to reflect~~ are reflections of the profound changes ~~within China itself — the falling~~ that nation has undergone — the fallen dynasties, foreign invasions, civil wars, cruel famines, and reigns of terror; a communist revolution, an industrial revolution, and now a market revolution.

~~But through~~ Through all this upheaval, there has been one constant: ~~our interests~~ America's stake, our profound national interest, in the outcome. Every American President for the past 30 years, without regard to party, has worked for a China that contributes to the stability, ~~not the~~ instability of Asia; that is open to our products and businesses; that upholds the rule of law at home and plays by the rules of the road around the world. We make no apologies for it. We are a nation that has fought three wars in Asia in the 20th Century. Moreover, we are a nation that

cherishes liberty and believes that if people are free to make their own choices, the world will be a safer and more prosperous place.

~~place. We are also a nation that has fought three wars in Asia in the 20th Century, and have a tremendous stake in~~

Now, the path China takes is China's choice. But America, too, has a choice – the U.S. Congress has a choice – and it is the choice between hope and fear. We can act on our belief that China can, someday, be a good partner; or we can act on our suspicion that it never will. We can work to move China in the right direction; or turn our backs and almost certainly send it in the wrong direction.

~~how China evolves.~~

Combine

If we had a crystal ball, we could see exactly what China will look like in 20 years. But we don't. Every nation defines its greatness in different ways, and every nation makes its own choices. We don't know what choices China will make. But we do have control over the choices that we make. We can give China a chance to be a good partner, and work to move it in the right direction. Or we can turn our backs, and almost certainly move it in the wrong direction. I believe our choice is clear. This WTO agreement will move China in the right direction, and advance every goal ~~we~~ Americans have worked for in China the past 30 years. Let me tell you how.

First let's understand from the beginning: ~~this is not a trade agreement, in any traditional sense. Usually, when we sign trade agreements, we have to weigh the benefits of opening another country's markets against the dislocations that can take place when we open our market. But this is not a two-way agreement, this is the trade equivalent of a one-way street. It requires China to open its market to our products and services, but all we agree to do is maintain the market access that we already give to China. It does not change our laws or our tariffs one bit.~~ As a trade

agreement, it's an enormous opportunity for America. It's the kind every country wishes for
or works toward, the kind you get maybe once in a generation.

✓ I don't believe there can be any question that this is in America's economic interests. Over the
 past seven years, we have worked hard to open markets around the world to American products.
 It's a question of simple arithmetic. We are a country with 22 percent of the world's income and
 four percent of the world's population. If we're going to continue to prosper in the 21st Century,
 we had better be selling something to somebody somewhere else.

And where better than China? With more than a billion people – fully one-fifth of the world's
 population -- China clearly represents the biggest potential market in the world. Under this
 agreement, America will gain unprecedented access to this massive, untapped market, while ✓
granting China no new access to our own. Chinese tariffs in every sector, from
 telecommunications to automobiles to agriculture, will fall by half or more in five years. For the
 first time, our companies will be able to sell and distribute products in China made by workers
 here at home in America – without transferring technology or operations to China. We'll be able ✓
to export products without in manufacturing-exporting jobs. For the first time, China will agree
 to play by the same trading rules we do. It's going to mean a lot more jobs for America.
 Meanwhile, we'll get two new safeguards against surges of imports and maintain the strongest ✓
possible protections against dumping products.
~~which would threaten to throw a lot of Americans out of work in a short period of time.~~

~~That's what happens if we pass PNTR. If we don't pass it, we would lose the full benefits of~~ ✓
~~China's WTO membership. Our companies would be shut off from one-fifth of the world~~
~~while our European, Japanese, and other competitors would be happy to rush in and fill the gap.~~
~~In other words, they would be the beneficiaries~~

⁵ home run

The agreement our team has negotiated is a ~~blockbuster~~ for American business, American investors, American workers, American farmers. If the Congress passes PNTR, then we reap the rewards. If the Congress rejects it, then our competitors do. Keep this in mind: ~~China's going to grow no matter what we do.~~ If we don't sell our products to China, some other country will be happy to. So if we turn our backs on this opportunity – ~~if we unilaterally disarm as a global trading power – well,~~ we're going to spend the next twenty years regretting it. We're going to spend the next twenty years wondering why we ever handed over all the benefits we negotiated, and gave up the competitive edge we've earned, to Europe, Japan, and others.
~~of the benefits we negotiated.~~

X So on purely economic grounds, this agreement is a no-brainer. Most of its critics don't even question that. Critics are more likely to point to the threats China made on Taiwan a few weeks ago, and say we shouldn't strengthen it. Or they point to the human rights abuses documented in the report our State Department issued, and say we shouldn't reward it. Or they point to stories about China's nuclear weapons program, and say we shouldn't empower it. And all of those concerns are absolutely ~~legitimate.~~ valid.

J Those of us who support ~~permanent~~ Permanent Normal Trade Relations are under no illusion about the government in Beijing. It is a one-party state that does not tolerate opposition. It denies ~~basic~~ fundamental freedoms to its citizens. It denies the most basic rights of free speech and religious expression. Its record on labor and environmental rights is a long litany of abuse.

leaves a lot to be desired. The But let me be very clear: the question is not whether we support it or whether we ignore it, approve or disapprove of conditions in China. The question is, how do we change it? ~~is whether we will do what we can to improve them.~~ ^{what can we do to}

This is not about economic rights versus human rights, or economic security versus national security. That is a false choice. We're not trying to promote one over the other, we are trying to

promote both. Membership in the WTO won't create a free society in China overnight. But over the long haul, time, we believe it's going to move China much further in the right direction than simply taking our ball and going home. To understand why, it's important to understand why China is willing to do all of this in the first place. Why they are doing this is at least as important as what they are doing.

Over the past 20 years, China has made a lot of progress in building a new economy, lifting more than 200 million people out of absolute poverty. It is linking so many people through its wireless communications network that it is adding the equivalent of a new Baby Bell every year.

But its system is still plagued by corruption. Only one-third of its economy is private enterprise. And nearly 60 percent of its investment and 80 percent of all business lending is directed toward state-owned dinosaurs that are least likely to survive in the global economy. Most of China's economy today still operates under the old theory that if they had just shoveled coal into the furnaces faster, the Titanic would have stayed afloat.

Meanwhile, its workforce is increasing by 12 million each year. At least 100 million people in China are still looking for work. And economic growth has slowed just when it needs to be rising to create new jobs. It's ironic: many Americans are concerned about the danger a strong and successful China could pose to us in the 21st century. But the danger of a weak China, beset by internal chaos and disintegration is just as real, and China's leaders know it. They understand that China cannot maintain stability or ensure prosperity by maintaining the status quo.

~~So China's leaders face a dilemma: they realize that if they open China's antiquated market to global competition, they risk unleashing forces beyond their control — namely, unemployment, social unrest, and demands for freedom. But they have also concluded~~ They know that without

competition or investment from the outside, China will not be able to build or attract investment or build world-class industries that can survive in the global economy.

With this agreement, China has chosen reform, despite its risks. That is China's choice.

But again, I return to our own: Do we want to be play a constructive role in those reforms?

Or simply stand aside ^{and reject them} ~~as skeptics~~, and perhaps make failure a self-fulfilling prophecy?

~~to embrace change, despite the risk it entails. The question for America is: do we really want to reject that choice?~~

I think that would be a mistake of historic proportions. This is a choice we ~~need to~~ must embrace, for our own good and the ~~common~~ good of the world.

~~For starters, having China in a rules-based trading system increases the chance that it will follow the rules of the road more broadly when interacting with the world~~

~~When I see this debate about China going on in our country, I try to remind people that the Chinese are engaged in the same kind of debate about us. Not just China's leaders, but many of China's people believe Americans don't want their country to assume its rightful place in the world. They are deeply ambivalent about the role China should play in the world.~~

~~Let's not forget: there is a reason China~~ It was China, let's remember, that built the Great Wall.

It has endured centuries of invasions and occupations; it has tried for most of its history to keep the world ~~and its influences~~ out. By joining the WTO, they've made a clear choice -- to overcome a great wall of suspicion and insecurity and reach out to the rest of the world. Again, I ask: if they're willing to reach out to the world, do we really want to slap that hand away?

Require For U.S. do we want to

encouraging

do we want to play a constructive look

OK

no

I'll say this again: everything I have ever learned about human nature, and everything I have learned about China, convinces me that we have a far greater chance of influencing China's actions if we bring it into a common endeavor than if we shut it out.

Under this agreement, some of China's most important decisions, for the first time, will be subject to the review of an international body. For the first time, China is conceding that governments cannot behave arbitrarily at home or abroad. Opponents say that ~~it doesn't matter because~~ matter; China will just break its promises. But if China does, we're still in a better position, because it won't be able to blame U.S. bullying. Its actions will be subject to judgments passed by 135 nations.

~~I'll say this again: everything I have learned about human nature in my life, plus everything I have learned about China as President, convinces me that we have a far greater chance of influencing its actions if we bring it into a common endeavor than if we shut it out.~~

But the change this agreement can bring from the outside-in is nothing compared to the change it can bring from the inside-out. By joining the WTO, China is slashing the tariffs that protect its ~~state-owned industries~~ state-owned industries. It is importing not just our products but one of our most cherished principles – economic freedom. ~~Think about~~ The more what that principle has meant to us over the years – not just greater wealth, but individual initiative, individual creativity, the liberation of individual human potential. We know that once individuals are given ~~the ability to dream,~~ China liberalizes its economy, the more fully it liberates the human potential of its people – their initiative, their imagination, their spirit of enterprise. When individuals have the power not just to dream but to realize their dreams, they demand a greater say in their own destiny. It is completely the opposite of the culture that communism imposed on China's people. Just imagine where it could take them.

~~A decade ago, More and more, China's best and brightest college students sought jobs in the government, in large state-owned firms or universities. More and more, the best and brightest are either starting their own companies or choosing to work for~~ are seeking jobs not with the state but with foreign-owned companies – where they generally get higher pay, more respect, and a better work environment. Think about what that means. For That, or they're starting their own companies. In fits and starts, and for the first time, China is moving toward becoming become a society where people have a chance to get ahead based on what they know rather than who they know.

add point in standard - Acceptance when we join WTO - really encourage it, because it will raise standards & expectations

But there is something even more revolutionary at work here. By taking this step, China is taking the command and control out of communism. ~~It is speeding a process that is removing government from vast areas of its people's lives.~~

Let's not forget ~~what~~ how communism ~~is~~ works. In the past, virtually every Chinese citizen woke up in the morning in an apartment or house owned by their government, went to work in a factory or farm run by their government, read newspapers dictated by their government. ~~Their~~ State-run workplaces also operated the schools where they sent their kids, the clinics where they got health care, the stores where they bought their food.

~~That system was a big source of the Communist Party's power. The few benefits it provided were a big source of the legitimacy it commanded. Now people are leaving those firms, and when China is in~~ joins the WTO, they will leave them faster. The Chinese government will no longer be everyone's employer, landlord, shopkeeper and nanny ~~rolled into one~~. It will have fewer instruments of ~~day-to-day~~ repression, fewer ~~opportunities~~ means to buy the loyalty of its people. And that may lead to profound change.

A few weeks ago, the Washington Post had a good story about the impact of these changes on the Shenyang province of China. Since 1949, most of the people of Shenyang have worked in massive state-run industries that provided cradle to grave services. But as these old factories and mills shut down, people are losing their old jobs. Under the old rules, they weren't allowed to travel anywhere to find a new job. But jobs are so scarce that the government has had to lift the travel restrictions, and let the people of Shenyang look for work.

Last September, Beijing announced that it was going to be awarding bonus checks to Chinese citizens to celebrate China's 50th anniversary under communism. But Shenyang didn't have the money to pay, which sparked a massive protest. So to ease tensions, To ease the tensions caused by economic change, the local government decided to give has given its people a say in how the province was run. On a limited basis, they are giving people citizens now have the right to vote for candidates in local elections in local elections. It's not exactly democracy, because the Party still puts up the candidates, and decides who can vote. But it's a first step toward greater political freedom. And it's not just happening in Shenyang. Local elections are now held in the vast majority of the country's 900,000 villages.

When asked why, one Party official in Shenyang said: "This is the beginning of a process. We realized that in order to improve social control, we have got to let the masses have a say." The gamble they are taking is that they are going to be able to put the genie of freedom back in the bottle. And if that sounds familiar, it should, because it's the same risk that that's because it was spoken a decade ago by communist leaders from Poland to Russia to Nicaragua took a decade ago. Nicaragua. It was a gamble they all lost. Because as Earl Warren once said: "liberty each made with their people. And, in every case, the state lost and the people won. As Earl Warren said: "Liberty is the most contagious force in the world."

Think about what all this could mean in one other area: communication. Today, China's tariffs on information technology products average 13 percent. When China joins the WTO, those tariffs will disappear by 2005. For the first time, China will open its telecom market to cutting-edge American firms. By doing so, it will help bring the information revolution to cities and towns across China.

This will help make the tools of communication cheaper, better, more reliable, and more widely available. It means that Chinese citizens won't have to go to a government entity to get a telephone and telephone services. It means that when a U.S. firm installs an intra-office e-mail in its China office, its Chinese employees can be put in daily touch not only with their colleagues in China, but with thousands of employees here in the U.S.

The magnitude of this ~~defies~~ ^{input} How will it spread, in this new century? The answer is obvious: in an information age, liberty is carried by cell phone; it is conducted by cable modem. China's information infrastructure is growing fast, by orders of magnitude that defy measurement. In the past year, the number of Internet addresses in China quadrupled from two million to nine million. This year, the number is expected to grow to 20 million. Now, project that rate of growth onto a country that has 1.2 billion people.

And when China joins the WTO, eliminating its tariffs on information technology products, the tools of communication will only become cheaper, better, and more widely available. This will allow the citizens of China to communicate with each other – to share ideas and information – in ways that no government can control. ~~people~~ It will connect Chinese citizens to one another and

the world outside. Think about how much the Internet has changed America -- and we are already an open society. Imagine how much it could change China.

UNet - don't have infrastructure - v. cheap

~~Chinese citizens will increasingly be able to communicate with each other in real time, in ways and in such volume that no amount of censorship and monitoring can control. If they're no longer dependent on the state for information, they'll be able to share ideas with each other or the outside world. As they see how other people across the world live, I believe they will seek a greater voice in shaping their own lives.~~

~~There is no question that some in China's leadership are nervous about the Internet and trying to control its content. Well, good luck. In this information age, China has been cracking down on the Internet is like trying to nail Jello to the wall. That the government is pushing back only proves that the changes China is undergoing are real and Internet, pushing back, trying to fit the genie back into the bottle. Well, it won't fit. In China today, the one-party state is still powerful; but with one click of a mouse, a Chinese child can find new freedoms that are even more powerful.~~

~~threaten the status quo. This is not an argument for slowing down the effort to bring China into the world -- it's an argument for accelerating it.~~

I think China is going to learn what every other nation is learning as we embrace this knowledge-based economy: you can't expect people to be innovative economically while being stifled politically. Bringing China into the WTO doesn't guarantee it will choose political reform. But accelerating the process of economic change will force China to confront that choice sooner, and it will make the imperative for the right choice far stronger. And again, if China is willing to take this risk, how could we possibly turn our backs?

This is not to say that this agreement will alone accomplish the goals of our policy toward China. Nobody who supports it, for example, believes that bringing China into the WTO is, by itself, a human rights policy for the United States. That's why we sanctioned China as a "country of particular concern" under the International Religious Freedom Act last year. It is why we are once again sponsoring a resolution in the UN Human Rights Commission condemning China's human rights record. We will continue to press China to respect global norms on non-proliferation. And we will continue to reject the use of force as a means to resolve the Taiwan question. ~~We will continue~~ question, and to make absolutely clear that the issues between Beijing and Taiwan ~~must~~ be resolved peacefully and with the assent of the people of Taiwan.

In other words, we must and will continue to defend our interests and our ideals with candor and consistency. But we ~~will not change our policies in a way that isolates China from the global forces~~ cannot do so by isolating China from the very forces that may change it, the very forces already empowering its people to build a better future.

~~Shutting China out would be a gift from heaven to the hard liners in its government who don't want their country to be part of the world. Keep in mind: These are the same people most eager to settle differences with Taiwan by force. The same people most threatened by our alliances with Japan and South Korea. The same people who would like to keep the Chinese military in the business of selling dangerous technologies around the world. The same people whose first instinct in the face of opposition is to throw people in prison camps.~~

~~Shutting China out wouldn't~~ Isolating China won't free a single prisoner in China, ~~there,~~ or create a single job in America, ~~here,~~ or reassure a single American ally in Asia. It would simply empower the most rigid, anti-democratic elements in the Chinese government. It would leave China an insecure, hostile, brooding presence on the world stage. It would leave the Chinese

people with less access to information, less contact with the democratic world, more resistance from their government to outside ideas, democratic peoples and ideas, and make them more reliant on their government. It would delay the day of change in China and leave the whole world less secure. That would be a tragic mistake.

It's very interesting to me I find it encouraging that the people with the greatest interest in seeing China change agree with that. The people of Taiwan agree. Despite all the tensions they have had with Beijing, they are doing everything they can to cement their economic ties with the mainland. The people of Hong Kong agree. I recently received a letter from Martin Lee, the leader of Hong Kong's Democratic Party. He has spent his life struggling for free elections and free expression for his people. And he wrote to me that this agreement "represents the best long-term hope for China to become a member of good standing of the international community . . . We fear that should ratification fail . . . there is a risk not only of economic back-pedaling and a slowing of the reform process, but also that the economic chill would affect Hong Kong and China's neighbors in the region. Clearly, any hope for the political and legal reform process would also recede."

~~Most~~ We are all concerned by religious repression in China. Yet most of the evangelicals I know who have missions in China ~~there~~ also want China in the WTO because they know that it will encourage freedom of thought and more contact with the outside world. Even people who have paid the greatest price under Chinese repression agree. Ren Wending is one of the fathers of the Chinese human rights movement. In the late 1970s, he was thrown in prison for founding the China Human Rights League. In the 1980s, he helped lead the demonstrations at Tiananmen Square. In the 1990s, he was thrown in prison again. [He has endured intimidation, threats to his family, and threats to his life.] Yet, he says of this deal: "before, the sky was black, now it is light. This can be a new beginning."

For these people, fighting for freedom in China is not an academic exercise, it is their life's work. How can any of us who care about human rights in China possibly substitute our judgement for theirs?

If you believe in a future of greater openness and freedom for the people of China; you should be for this agreement. If you believe in a future of greater prosperity for the American people, you should be for this agreement. If you believe in a future of peace and security for Asia and the world, you should be for this agreement. This is the right thing to do. It is a historic opportunity. And I am going to work as hard as I can to convince Congress and the American people that America should embrace it, and lead the world in embracing it to do the same. Thank you.

