

**First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton
Foreign Policy Association Dinner
New York, NY
October 19, 1998**

Thank you very much. I am very honored and delighted to be with all of you this evening. I want to thank Bill for that kind introduction. Being called a public entrepreneur is one of the nicest names I have ever been given and I will cherish that. This is sort of a small-world story. Bill is married, as some of you know. His wife Jane is the sister of a man I went to high school with and, if you won't let it out of this room, who I had a great crush on for a long time. So it is a special pleasure to be introduced by him and to sit between him and Cy Vance.

I want to thank Paul Ford and Noel Lateef and the FDA staff. I also want to thank the West Point Band which I enjoyed hearing this evening. I know we are joined by a great many public-spirited citizens and dignitaries. But I would like to mention that among us this evening are Sir Jeremy Greenstock, President of the Security Council, and Louise Frechette, the Deputy Secretary General of the United Nations, and I am delighted both of them are here as well.

This is a special occasion for me personally, but also for the Foreign Policy Association as it celebrates 80 years of service to the people of our country. It has stood for engagement in the world for all of those 80 years. When I was listening to the video and watching Tom Brokaw talk about the beginnings of the Association, I recalled reading, in preparation for coming here, that the 19 brave individuals who decided to form it back in 1918 first called themselves the "Committee On Nothing At All," because they weren't exactly sure how to proceed.

The United States, up until then, had not been known for its engagement around the world and they were not sure how to go about supporting the League of Nations. They then named themselves the League of Pre-Nations Association to build public support for the League. While they may not have won at that first battle, they did begin to understand the importance of citizens being part of the foreign policy decision-making apparatus in our country.

So today we celebrate those 80 years, and we remember all of the people, starting in 1918, who understood what all of you here tonight understand -- that in a democracy, all of us need to be aware of our role in the world and, particularly as citizens of the United States as we end this 20th century, we need to know more about what is happening around the world, and we need to lend our voices to the discussions and debates that are occurring.

I want to thank you for inviting me to this gathering and I want to thank you in advance for the honor that you will bestow upon me later in the evening. I looked at the list of people who have received this award, I am greatly honored to join their ranks.

I want to speak tonight about what you have done, why it has always been important, and why I would argue it is even more important today. I don't need to tell this group that we are living in a complicated and confusing time in international relations. The fact that we call this period in which we are living the Post Cold War Era is only one indication that while we know

where we no longer are, we don't yet know where we are or where we are heading.

The world has changed so rapidly in less than a decade that we have had little time to catch our breath, let alone change our strategies and institutions to meet the new challenges ahead. As Albert Einstein, quoted in the most recent edition of the Foreign Policy Forum, once said, "The world we have created today has problems which can not be solved by thinking the way we thought when we created them."

As often happens in a time of rapid change, there is a natural inclination to draw inward a bit and pull back from the obligations around us while we take stock -- to think that maybe there isn't much we can accomplish and we should just attend to business at home. Yet every day we see how profoundly interconnected -- even interdependent -- we are in this new era of globalization. We only have to think of the current international economic crisis, or the extraordinary boom in worldwide communications, to realize how intertwined our destinies have become.

Whether we are pessimistic or optimistic about the forces of globalization, those forces are here to stay. They are a fact. We cannot stop the clock. We can't do away with computers, or cut off the Internet, or prevent jet travel from occurring, or stop the mass media from bringing messages of different cultural ideas to remote parts of the world. But what we can do, and what this Association has been doing for so long, is to help ourselves and help our fellow citizens understand the stakes we have in building the stable, prosperous, democratic world that we all want and that the United States must take a lead in creating.

I have been privileged in the last several years to travel around the world, both with my husband and on my own. I have been in many places where I have seen first-hand the newly emerging democracies begin to take hold, find their footing, stumble, regain their footing, and try to go forward. I have been exposed to so many different people who look to the United States for leadership and are bewildered by what they sometimes see as the mixed messages coming from our government, our media and our society.

And yet I have also been heartened by how resilient the forces of democracy seem to be. I recently returned, just last week, from a trip to Bulgaria and the Czech Republic. In both of those countries, whether I was meeting with university students or political leaders, talking with women entrepreneurs in a local bakery or just walking the streets and talking to citizens, I saw first-hand how both of those societies are responding to the tremendous challenges they face.

In Bulgaria I met with the new political leadership that has taken hold and is attempting to reverse the stumbles of the first years of freedom. In the Czech Republic I met both with the President and the Prime Minister as they are attempting to continue the forward progress that they have made and consolidate it further.

I saw in the eyes of many people the optimism and determination that comes with freedom and responsibility. And yet I know how important it is that the United States has been engaged in those two countries.

I could pick many countries for these examples. Through a USAID program in Bulgaria, for example, we are working with entrepreneurs, teaching them basic business techniques, helping them start businesses, helping to provide loans and credit that would enable them to get businesses up and going. These women entrepreneurs explained to me in great detail that these programs were one of the reasons they were able to be successful.

The American College and the American High School that for many years educated Bulgarians and then was closed because of the communist takeover and not reopened until 1990, is now educating a new generation of Bulgarian students for the new future that awaits them. Over and over again, I was thanked for American help and American expertise, not only from our government, but from business and academia and labor groups and non-profit organizations who had been there and been engaged.

In the Czech Republic, when I was there a few years ago, I met with people just beginning to form non-governmental organizations who were finding their way in a newly constructed civil society. They didn't really know much about how to fill that space between the government and the economy that we call civil society. And they were worried that they wouldn't be able to do it.

And then, upon this return visit, I met with some of the same people who told me with great pride of what they had accomplished on behalf of the arts and culture and health and medical research, and so many other issues. They were finding their legs and they thanked me, and asked me to thank the many Americans who had helped them.

Next door in Slovakia, when I had visited just a few years ago, I saw just how dangerously close that country was to falling back into authoritarianism because of its leadership. When I met there with the non-governmental organizations, the leaders came despite threats and intimidation from the government at the time. They were told not to meet with me, not to be open with me, not to tell me the truth about what they were trying to do to reverse environmental degradation -- to teach people how to be voters and citizens in a newly free country.

All of us were worried about what would happen in Slovakia. But because of the determination of the people and, again, because of many Americans in both private, professional and public capacities who spent time democracy-building and working with NGO's and working with students, the government was just turned out in free elections. And there was a great sense of accomplishment among the Slovaks with whom I met in the Czech Republic because they had seen first-hand what they could do to make democracy work for them. And again they thanked me and asked me to thank Americans for that engagement that helped them understand how to take back their own destiny.

When my plane landed back at home last week, I could see that once again the Congress was engaged in the debate that they had at the very end of this session about how to allocate our nation's resources. And behind all that discussion about appropriations, there are some very important values. Just how will we be engaged? Would we take on the responsibility that has

fallen to us.

The situation was touch-and-go, as many of you know who followed this debate. There was reluctance to fund our basic responsibilities. But finally, when the dust settled, the President and the Administration were able to see some real accomplishments. Significant progress was made toward the President's goal after very hard and long struggles.

First and foremost the Administration won the full \$18 billion it had been requesting to replenish the IMF. It also got increased funds for the export-import bank in the amount of \$109 million. That is an important symbolic as well as real statement about our role in helping to stem the global financial crisis.

More assistance will be going to the newly independent states -- a very important American priority. We also saw increases in AID development funds -- up \$70 million over last year's commitment. And there were dramatic gains in funding for the African and Asian development banks. They will come at critical times for these regions.

We also won more funding for the Peace Corps, another important symbol of American engagement. Yet our nation's foreign policy agenda also suffered losses. Once again, Congress refused to pay our debts to the United Nations, whose work is essential to peace and stability in our world. That issue of paying our UN arrears remains entangled in the issue of family planning overseas. I respect those who in good faith are against family planning. But that is not an issue to be entangled with whether or not we fulfill our obligations to the United Nations. We should not and we cannot continue to fail to pay our dues because of this unrelated issue. It should be unacceptable to all Americans, of any political persuasion, that the richest and most powerful country in the world is the number one debtor to the United Nations.

We also suffered another defeat. Not one dime went to the United Nations International Family Planning Program. I don't know how we could best make this argument persuasively with those who, for both political and personal reasons, oppose family planning and use it to undermine our capacity to pay our arrears to the United Nations. But I have personally been in clinics all over the world, where family planning is not only helping women gain authority and dignity in their own lives, but is actually decreasing the abortion rate. So this is an argument that has no inherent logic to it. By refusing to fund decent family planning services, we force women to fall back on abortion as the family planning choice. So I would hope that the Congress, when they reconvene, will once again visit this issue.

There are accomplishments in this budget as well as losses, but overall we have to recognize that development assistance is at some of the lowest levels since World War II. In real dollar terms, USAID's budget is 30 percent lower than it was in 1982. The agency has had to cut its staff by one-third. And total foreign affairs spending is down 43 percent from 1982 in real dollars.

Now I have seen, as many of you have, how there can be a real difference made in the lives of people with a relatively small amount of assistance. We obviously are putting our major

focus on increasing trade and investment, but assistance often goes hand-in-hand in making trade and investment successful and in creating a climate in which that can thrive.

I have seen from Nicaragua to Uganda how small loans, for example, subsidized and backed by our government through USAID or the non-for-profit sector, encouraged by our government, have transformed the lives of poor women and improved the living standards of entire communities.

I have met, in places like Bolivia, with expectant mothers learning how to care for themselves and their babies in primary health care centers run by an NGO with government support, again because of the help we provided. And in many of the newly independent states I have seen how the difficult transition to free-markets and democracy has been supported as well by our development efforts. But the other side of the coin is that I have seen what happens when we have not come forward. When we have not exercised the leadership that we should.

And so here we are at the end of this century, at the beginning of a new one -- even a new millennium -- and we're having to ask ourselves what is America's role, how best can we define it, how, going back to the roots of FPA to those 19 great individuals, would we explain our mission today. We have to first recognize, as my husband has said on several occasions, that the United States can not pretend to be an island of prosperity in the global economy. We have to demonstrate to ourselves, to Congress, and to the world, that we are not only engaged because we care about the rest of the world, but we are engaged because it is in our interests to do so. There are great benefits that we derive from working on multi-lateral efforts like peace-keeping. And we have to make sure that the ideals that we profess here at home are put into practice around the world as well.

It's one of the great paradoxes of our foreign policy situation that we know that the American people, in poll after poll, are far more supportive of engagement than their representatives in Congress would have us believe. I have seen the research surveys and studied the data, and if Americans are asked whether they want to help people overseas or support international organizations like the United Nations, in great numbers they answer "yes."

They also believe that we are already doing far more than we are. They think that foreign assistance is the single largest item in the federal budget. While in fact, economic and humanitarian assistance abroad makes up less than one-half of one percent of the federal budget. And the United States lags behind all other industrialized nations when foreign assistance spending is considered as a percentage of GNP.

So how do we explain this paradox of an American public that supports an effective engagement, yet believes we are already spending far more than we are in bringing that about? Well, one of the roles that the FDA has always had is to get the facts to the American public. To do away with the misperceptions, to clear the air, and to try to get a clear channel to people so that the discussion about what we should be doing and what our responsibilities are can be carried out accurately. The work that you have done in the past has been very important to that effort, but we have a lot of work ahead of us. We need to do much more to try to make sure that

those numbers of Americans who intuitively know we should be engaged and leading and cooperating with other nations, and working with organizations like the United Nations, get the facts straight, so that they then can interact with and discuss with their representatives why they support many of the programs that I have referred to this evening.

We have to raise the interest that Americans have to a newer and higher level of intensity and commitment. Because what so often happens is that although Americans do support such issues as paying our dues to the United Nations, the constituency that speaks for such Americans is woefully small and silent. There is not a great outpouring or concern about paying our U.N. dues whenever the issue comes up in Congress. All those people, those American citizens, who care about this issue are not organized and their voices are not being heard in a way that affects policy. So we have an opportunity -- the Association as well as the rest of the country. We have an opportunity to explain clearly the advantages of engagement around the world. We have an opportunity to talk about the commercial and economic advantages of opening up markets, creating jobs, advancing Americans' economic well-being. We have an opportunity to talk about how foreign assistance is critical to combating global problems that directly threaten the interests of Americans -- whether it is the spread of infectious diseases, air and water and land pollution, global climate change, population growth or the flight of refugees.

We have such an opportunity today, and I believe the time has never been better. So what is it we can tell our fellow citizens? Well first, I would make the argument that we have a great stake in what happens around the world, for both national security and economic reasons. You have discussed many important issue decisions in the Great Decisions Program, and I would urge that we do everything we can to expand the impact and the reach of that program, and that we spawn as many imitators and others as we possibly can to try to create much more interest in, activity around, and discussion of foreign policy objectives and reasons for our involvement.

I think we also have to humanize -- even personalize -- our foreign assistance and foreign relations stories. It sometimes causes eyes to glaze over if we start talking about the issues around the world in abstract ways. But I have found that if we can put into stories, symbolic stories, about why we are involved in certain places around the world, we can catch Americans' attention.

When I talk, for example, about the USAID program called "Lessons Without Borders," Americans are amazed that things we learned overseas we are now bringing home to help our own citizens. Two examples: We have really pioneered micro-credit around the world, building on the example of the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh. We have many organizations working with USAID to provide these small loans and extend credit to many people who are credit-worthy but without any collateral. One of those groups, called FINCA, I have seen from Nicaragua to Uganda, working miracles on behalf of credit and the way that it not only builds family incomes, but self-confidence, and creates citizens out of people who before didn't understand their role in a democracy.

We are now bringing those lessons home to America. I recently met with lower-income Americans in inner-city Washington, D.C., who felt they had been left out of the mainstream of

economic life here at home. No bank would lend them money to start their businesses or expand their small home operation. They didn't know where to turn. The only places they could have gone were the loan sharks, and they weren't going to do that. So FINCA, a group that only dealt with the poorest of the poor before, is now working with Americans to help them get the credit and build their businesses as well. I've also visited neighborhoods in places like Baltimore, Md., where grassroots strategies to immunize children that were pioneered in places like Nairobi, Kenya, are being used. And we've seen incredible increases in child immunization rates. And we know that bringing those lessons home of how to reach hard-to-reach families to make sure they immunize their children is something we would never have pioneered in the United States alone, but we took our development assistance and learned from it.

In addition to humanizing those kinds of lessons without borders, I think we need to put a human face on a lot of the dilemmas that we confront around the world today. Just a few quick examples: On my last trip, before this one with my husband, to Russia, I traveled beyond Novosibirsk to one of the closed academic centers in Russia. And I made a speech at the university there in front of people who just a few years ago were among the highest status citizens in the former Soviet Union. They were applied mathematicians and physicists, some of the people who had created the space program and built the great industrial machine of the Soviet Union. Now, of course, many of them no longer had much work to do. They were uncertain about this new world that they're a part of. Many of them had advocated for democracy, and now they didn't know what it had brought to them.

I sat down with three generations of a family: the grandfather, an applied mathematician, and the grandmother, a research librarian; the two daughters, now both teachers of English; and the two grandsons, as well as the son-in-law. We sat in their apartment and we talked about how they saw Russia today. The grandfather was very pessimistic. He said, "It's just not what I expected at all. I thought democracy would bring great opportunity. I don't see that happening. And never before did I have to worry about things like my bicycle being stolen. Now it's been stolen twice." One of the daughters interrupted and said, "Daddy, don't you remember what it was like before? We had to get up at 2:00 in the morning to stand in line for butter. It is so much better now. We have so many more opportunities." And the grandfather said, "But, my bike gets stolen."

In this conversation that I witnessed and participated in, you could see the fault lines in what is happening in Russia as clearly, and perhaps for me, more persuasively, than anything I had read in the mass media as I try to follow all of the financial and political challenges. How do we create an environment in a country that had to change so fast and change so much? Where people feel that they can invest in the future and it will get better for them and their children.

The same in Africa, where in so many different settings I have seen people struggling to understand democracy, and being stymied in some respects, and being very hopeful in others. But I was particularly pleased to see again that where we are helping people to understand democracy, it is working. In a village in Senegal I watched as women performed for me the skit that they perform in their village and other villages to explain what democracy is all about. They act out people speaking up. They act out people voting. And they took on a very difficult

challenge as a result of their education about democracy. They took on the challenge of ending female circumcision in their village, going against ancient tradition and custom. But they have learned their lessons well, from a USAID-sponsored grantee, who had empowered them to make sure their voices could be heard. And when I came back to Senegal with my husband, I learned that out of that small village had grown a movement. Where some of the men who had been enlisted on their behalf began traveling to other villages, where the skit was performed for more people, and where all of a sudden the president of the country was petitioned to pass a law ending that custom.

So I have seen both ends of the dilemmas of democracy. And I would like to have more Americans understand what is happening in those personal terms. Because I think if more Americans could see what I have seen, they would not only come away gratified and pleased by what the accomplishments we have been able to help others make on their behalf have meant to them, but more willing to support the kind of grassroots engagement that builds relationships and creates a real bedrock for democracy in country after country.

I also believe that if we were able to humanize the foreign policy issues better than we have in recent times, we would have much more response from the Congress, because they would also begin to understand it. Remember, we have 100 members of the House of Representatives who have never had a passport. We have the majority leader of the House of Representatives saying, "Why does one need a passport? I left the country to go to Europe once in 1982, and that was enough for me." So unless we can break through that kind of ideological wall with stories, with human interests, with things people can understand, our task will be harder than it needs to be.

So I guess we will have to think about the challenges we face in order to make sure that the work of this Association does all that it can do to give us the support we need. We have, certainly, some very good examples from the past. One of my favorites is what happened around the Marshall Plan. Leaders like Harry Truman and George Marshall not only had the vision to devise the plan, but they understood how difficult it would be to sell the plan. And they therefore enlisted literally hundreds of Americans, from business executives to academics to religious leaders, to go and speak in every small town and college campus they could reach to talk about what was at stake. And out of that great commitment to public education at the end of World War II -- not only came the Marshall Plan, but support for U.S. leadership.

As we began to create the structure that we now look to to lead us into the future -- the United Nations, the World Bank, the IMF and NATO -- certainly we're going to have to take a hard look again at whether or not we have the structures and institutions we need and whether they are functioning as well as they should. In order to bring that about, we need something comparable in terms of a public education effort.

So I would challenge first the Congress to live up to their commitments, to pay our debts, to maintain support for international lending institutions, to boost funding for programs like AID, and to understand how important it is to support rhetorically America's engagement in the world, and to reach out to America's citizens to be part of that engagement.

I would challenge business leaders to be sure that they support America's leadership around the world. I have found, unfortunately, that there has been a drop-off in elite opinion support for foreign engagement. Many business leaders today spend more time traveling around the world than their predecessors did a generation ago, but they speak up less on behalf of what we need to do to maintain our engagement, and they are not involved in helping to educate their peers or supporting programs in Congress.

I would challenge the media to increase its coverage of foreign affairs which has fallen off so dramatically in recent years. It is difficult for us to point fingers at Americans if they don't know what is going on unless it is a crisis or a humanitarian disaster. Churches and humanitarian groups, non-governmental organizations, foundations and others, have to do more to make sure their work is leveraged and linked. There are lessons all of us can learn from what many have been doing abroad for many years, and now is the time to share those lessons, and try to make more of them to reach even more Americans as well as doing the work that is being done.

Most of all, I think we have to reach out to young people. We have to be sure that they understand what is at stake in American engagement. And I want to commend the Association's Great Decisions Program, which since 1954 has done so much to attract the interests of all citizens, but especially young people. I recently read a letter from a student who had participated in the program, and she wrote that, I quote, "I continue to regard the Great Decisions Program as one of the few opportunities an undergraduate has to have a meaningful impact on foreign policy, both by educating others about contemporary issues, and encouraging good citizenship through the promotion of discussion."

More than 50 years ago, when Eleanor Roosevelt was pressing her case for the United Nations, she spoke to a high school forum here in New York City. She urged students to learn more about the languages and cultures of other nations, but also to work on the problems and conflicts right here in their own neighborhoods. "What we do at home in our communities," she said, "builds the kind of nation we have and the kind of influence that nation is going to have" in the international arena. We have to pay attention to that good advice as well. We have to model living together peacefully, respecting our diversity, being open to new ideas, if that is what we hope and expect the rest of the world to do as well.

We celebrate this year the 50th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. And we face unparalleled opportunities to share the world's prosperity and growth, and to continue the march of human rights and democracy around the globe. Like those who first decided to create this remarkable organization, we may not always know how to proceed. But if we stick to our founding principles, educate ourselves and engage the interest of Americans in debating our new role in the world, then I am convinced America will once again rise to the challenge, that our leadership in the world will remain firm and confident in the 21st century, and that America's best days will be ahead of us because we will have learned how to be global neighbors in our new global neighborhood. Thank you very much.

FIRST LADY HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
REMARKS TO
FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION DINNER
NEW YORK CITY
OCTOBER 19, 1998

Thank you, Bill (Donaldson), for that kind introduction. ...What a small world it is. (Apparently his wife's brother escorted you to your senior prom. Her name is Jane Phillips.) It's a great pleasure to be here tonight -- particularly for this special occasion, as we commemorate the Foreign Policy Association's 80th year of service to the people of this nation -- and to the cause of engagement in the world. I've heard that the nineteen brave individuals who decided to form this organization back in 1918 called themselves "the Committee on Nothing At All" -- because they weren't sure exactly how to proceed. They just knew they wanted to build public support for the League of Nations. While they may not have won that first battle -- they succeeded in creating this remarkable institution, whose achievements in educating and engaging the American people in world affairs we celebrate here tonight.

I want to thank your president, Noel Lateef and your chair, Paul Ford for inviting me to join this distinguished gathering -- which includes so many foreign policy luminaries - including our former Secretary of State, Cyrus Vance; diplomats from the United Nations; and leading members of the media. I also want to thank the Association -- in advance -- for the great honor you are bestowing on me this evening.

For eighty years, this Association has taken on the invaluable role of encouraging public debate on the foreign policy issues of the day -- from the founding of the United Nations to the challenges of today's global economy . And you have done so not by holding small gatherings of policy elites here in New York or DC -- but by reaching out to schools and churches and women's clubs and communities across the country -- and engaging ordinary citizens in these critical discussions.

Today, I would imagine your job is more challenging -- and complicated -- than ever. The fact that we call this period we're living in the post-Cold War era, is only one indication that while we know we are no longer where we were -- we don't yet know where we are. The world is changing so rapidly that we have little time to catch our breath, let alone change our strategies and institutions to meet the new challenges ahead. As Albert Einstein is quoted as saying in your most recent Foreign Policy Forum magazine -- "The world we have created today has problems which cannot be solved by thinking the way we thought when we created them."

As often happens in a time of rapid change, there's a natural inclination to draw inward a bit -- and pull back from the obligations around us. To think that maybe there is not much we can accomplish in the world, that we should just attend to our business here at home.

Yet everyday, we see how profoundly interconnected -- and I would say interdependent -- we are in this new era of globalization. We only have to look at the extraordinary boom in worldwide communications -- or the current international economic crisis -- to realize how intertwined our destinies have become. Some are pessimistic about how the forces of globalization will change us. Others -- more accurately I believe -- are optimistic.

In either case, globalization is not something we can accept or reject. It's a fact. We can't turn back the clock, doing away with computers, cutting off the Internet, stopping jet travel, or preventing the mass media from bringing messages of different cultural ideas to remote parts of the world. But what we can do is what this Association has been doing for so long -- helping American citizens understand the stakes we have in building the stable, democratic world that we all want -- and that we must take the lead in creating.

I have just returned from a remarkable trip to Bulgaria and the Czech Republic, and I wish you could have all been with me. No matter where I went in Sophia or Prague -- whether it was visiting with university students, meeting with political leaders, or talking to the owner of a local bakery -- I saw firsthand the enormous challenges those citizens are facing in rebuilding their communities after years of communist authoritarian rule and economic decline. But more importantly, I saw the determination and optimism in their eyes as they begin that long struggle back to democracy and freedom. And as I have seen in so many countries -- from South Africa to Northern Ireland -- I saw the extraordinary opportunities we have -- as a nation -- to support these efforts to strengthen democracy, and lift up the lives of ordinary citizens.

When my plane landed back home at the end of last week -- the Congress was engaged -- as all of you know -- in the annual debate over how to allocate our nation's resources. And in deciding to what extent we will work with the people of nations around the world as they seek to expand democratic freedoms, strengthen families, and stabilize their economies.

While this Congress at first slashed hundreds of millions out of the original foreign operations request -- we made significant progress last week toward many of our goals -- but only after a very long, hard struggle. First and foremost, the Administration won the full \$18 billion it has been requesting for the IMF. We are now doing our part to help stem this global financial crisis, but other nations, especially other leading economies -- must do theirs. More support will be going to the newly independent states -- another top Administration priority. We also succeeded in pushing AID development funds \$50 million over last year's budget. There were dramatic gains in funding for the African Development Bank -- which will come at a critical time for that continent. We even won more than last year's funding for the Peace Corps -- that while less than we wanted -- will get us closer to meeting the President's goal of 10,000 volunteers by 2000.

Yet our foreign policy agenda suffered grave losses as well. Once again, Congress has refused to pay our debts to the United Nations, whose work is so essential to peace and stability in our world. The issue of paying our UN arrears remains entangled in the issue of family planning overseas. I respect the deeply held views of both sides. But we cannot continue to fail to pay our dues because of this unrelated issue. It's an outrage that the richest and most powerful country in the world is the number one debtor to the United Nations. Another defeat. Not one dime went to the UN's international family planning program.

So while we have clearly won some gains in this year's budget battle -- we must also recognize that at a time when there is so much that we could accomplish -- that overall development assistance is at some of the lowest levels since World War II. In real dollar terms, USAID's budget is 30 percent lower than in 1982. The agency has cut staff by one-third. Total foreign affairs spending is down 43 percent from 1982 in real terms.

Over the past five and a half years, I've seen first hand how America's programs overseas -- even at these diminished levels -- have helped to fuel and further progress, and made a real difference in the lives of ordinary citizens. From Nicaragua to Uganda, I've seen how small loans, subsidized and backed by our government through AID, or our not-for-profit-sector, have transformed the lives of poor women, and improved the living standards of an entire community. In Bolivia, I've met with expectant mothers learning how to care for themselves and their babies in a primary health center, run by an NGO with government support, again because of help we provided. And in many of the newly independent states, I've seen how the difficult transition to free markets and democracy have been supported as well by our efforts.

But I have also seen what happens when we have not come forward with aid to help democracy flourish, and provide opportunities for people. When we have not exercised the leadership role we could have played.

If we want to consolidate the important victories that are now possible after the end of the Cold War, and not pretend, as my husband has said, that we can be an “island of prosperity”. If we want to demonstrate to this Congress that this is the worst possible time to withdraw our involvement or attention from the world. If we want to persuade our elected leaders that unilateral action is not the only tool of foreign policy -- and that there are great benefits to working on multilateral efforts like peace-keeping. If we want to restore our leadership around the world, and ensure the ideals that we profess here at home are reflected in our policies abroad. Then what needs to be done, I believe, is not just the government’s or Congress’s responsibility. It is up to all of us.

We know, on the one hand, that the American people are far more in favor of engagement than conventional wisdom would have us believe. In public opinion poll after public opinion poll, Americans are asked if they want to help people overseas, or if they support international institutions like the United Nations. And in great numbers, they answer "Yes." But polls also show that Americans think that foreign assistance is the single largest item in the federal budget -- and that we are doing more than our fair share. While in fact economic and humanitarian assistance abroad makes up less than one half of one percent of the federal budget, and the United States lags behind all other industrialized nations when foreign assistance spending is considered a percentage of the GNP.

So we have this unusual paradox of an American public that wants to see good work being done -- and done effectively -- around the world. Yet believes we are already spending more than we actually are. But we must do more than clear up these misperceptions if we are to succeed in building strong, bi-partisan support for American engagement and leadership.

The American people's intuitive response to our responsibilities abroad is the right one. We must now raise that interest to a new, higher level of intensity and commitment -- so we can more effectively counter the vocal minority who continue to press for policies of isolation.

Today, we have a critical challenge and opportunity to help Americans make the connections -- as this Association does so well -- between what happens overseas and our own stability and security here at home. That foreign assistance creates new economic markets overseas, creating US jobs, and advancing American economic well being. That foreign assistance is critical in combating global problems that directly threaten the interests of American citizens; like the spread of infectious diseases; air and water pollution; global climate change; or the flight of refugees. That foreign assistance has the potential to keep humanitarian crises from developing into wars that would cause far greater harm -- and demand US military involvement.

Let's also do a better job of publicizing the lessons we have learned from our work overseas that we are bringing back home -- and applying in our own communities.

A micro credit group known as FINCA that I've seen transform the lives of women in small villages in Africa has helped us start similar efforts here in this country. I've met with lower-income Americans in Washington, DC, who felt they were out of the mainstream of economic life of our country -- and who needed credit and technical assistance to help them start a small business, and become self sufficient. That's what FINCA has helped shown us how to do.

I've visited some of the poorest neighborhoods in Baltimore, Maryland, where grassroots strategies pioneered in Nairobi, Kenya are now being used by community health workers in Baltimore to improve childhood immunization rates. As a result, immunization rates have soared -- thanks to this AID-support effort called "Lessons Without Borders."

One of America's greatest gifts to the world is our sense of optimism and hope, matched by a commitment to providing the tools of opportunity that will enable people to solve their own problems, and build their own lives. I believe we have within our vision what needs to be done -- if we have the will to do it.

Today, I believe we have a very real opportunity to reorder our priorities -- and engage public and congressional support -- much like we did at the end of World War II. Back then, leaders like Harry Truman and George Marshall had the vision to look beyond the wartime devastation and the underlying hostilities to a Europe in which regional cooperation would transcend adversarial boundaries and traditional rivalries. They believed that large scale economic cooperation would facilitate not only postwar recovery but also long term prosperity and international peace. It was US leadership that was instrumental in creating the United Nations, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and NATO.

They understood back then that it wasn't enough to mobilize the government. They needed to lead a major campaign to educate the public, mobilize key constituencies, and persuade reluctant partners to make sure this great achievement would take place. These policies were far from popular, and I've been reading about how leaders in government, and business, civil organizations and religious institutions were enlisted to go from town to town -- speaking -- like the Association has done for so many years -- to people where they live and work -- to bring their case to the American people. And that is what we must do today.

Tonight -- I want to challenge all of us to do more.

I challenge the Congress to live up to their commitments -- to once and for all pay our debts to the United Nations; to maintain support for international lending institutions like the IMF -- and to boost funding to programs like AID -- which are doing such invaluable work in promoting democracy, freedom, and stability around the world.

I challenge business leaders to educate themselves and others in international trade to understand the connection between expanding people's political and economic rights and the fostering of dynamic markets in developing countries. And to work for those policies.

I challenge the media -- many of whom are here this evening -- to increase your coverage of foreign affairs, which has fallen off so dramatically in recent years -- so that Americans gain a greater understanding of the world around them, and the connection international events have on our daily lives here at home.

I challenge churches, and humanitarian groups, and non governmental organizations to continue and expand their invaluable work -- whether it's promoting sister city programs and cultural and political exchanges; helping to bring the lessons we have learned overseas back to our communities here at home; or encouraging even small scale efforts like the little UNICEF boxes we used to carry around with us on Halloween.

Most of all, I challenge all of us to work harder to engage our young people in these vital issues. Because they are the ones who will shape the future that we all care so much about. And here, I want to commend the Association's Great Decisions program which has done so much to attract the interest of our young people in international affairs. I've read a letter from one of the college students who participated in the program. She wrote: "I continue to regard the Great Decisions programs as one of the few opportunities an undergraduate has to have a meaningful impact on foreign policy, both by educating others about contemporary issues, and encouraging 'good citizenship' through promotion of discussion." She's applying to be a Rhodes Scholar, concentrating on post-Cold War strategic issues, and I hope she gets the chance. Programs like these that educate and challenge our

young people are essential if we want them to build a democratic, freedom-loving world.

More than fifty years ago, when Eleanor Roosevelt was pressing her case for the United Nations -- she spoke to a high school forum here in New York city. She urged the students to learn more about the languages and cultures of other nations, but also to work out the problems and conflicts they were having in their own lives and neighborhoods. "What we do, at home, in our community," she said, "builds the kind of a nation we have, and the kind of influence that nation is going to have" in the international arena. That simple lesson, I believe, still holds true today. We can only hope to help mend the divisions, and lift up the lives of ordinary citizens in nations around the world -- if we learn to how to live together in peace and understanding here, in this most diverse of all nations.

As we celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, we face unparalleled opportunities to share the world's prosperity and growth, and to continue the march of human rights and democracy around the globe. Like those who first decided to create this remarkable organization eighty years ago, we too face a future of uncertainty. But if we stick to our founding principles, educate ourselves, and engage the interest of all Americans in debating our new role in the world, then I'm convinced that America's best days are ahead of us, and that America's leadership in the world will stand firm and confident in the 21st century.

Thank you.

12/10/97 REVISE

**FIRST LADY HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
50TH ANNIVERSARY OF UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS
THE UNITED NATIONS
DECEMBER 10, 1997**

Acknowledgments: From advance.

The year-long commemoration we begin today is not just a commemoration of the universality of human rights -- it is a celebration of the United Nations. I am especially pleased that we are able to gather this morning in the Economic and Social Council, which at its first session in February of 1946 established the Commission on Human Rights.

Forty-nine winters ago, the world acknowledged a new, common standard for human dignity -- a code for the peoples of the world to live by.

One of the people who labored to create that code was Eleanor Roosevelt, then the United States Representative to the U.N. Commission on Human Rights. The place was Paris. The delegates who came together to craft the language hailed from countries as diverse as Lebanon, Chile, France, China and Ukraine. And the dream was the Universal Declaration of Human Rights -- the first international agreement on the rights of humankind.

Some of humanity's bravest lessons emerge only after the deepest tragedies. This Declaration took shape in a world ravaged by the horrors of militarism and fascism. In the wake of the most violent revelation of the depths to which human beings can dehumanize one another, the world as a whole was ready at last to accept an agreed-upon standard for human rights.

Let me read a passage from that document: "Disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind...The advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want have been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people. Therefore, the General Assembly proclaims this Universal Declaration of human rights as a common standard of achievement for all people and nations."

The document goes on to state what should be obvious, but too often is not: "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act toward one another in a spirit of brotherhood."

How radically idealistic an act it was at first for the nations of the world to ascribe publicly to this Declaration. That act did not, however, take place in a vacuum. It was a response to evil -- and I use that word deliberately.

Those who study the Holocaust know that the Nazis were able to pursue their crimes precisely because they were able progressively to constrict the circle of those defined as human. From the moment they came to power they proceeded, step-by-step, to dehumanize, through laws and propaganda, the mentally ill, the infirm, Gypsies, homosexuals, Jews -- those whom they identified as "life unworthy of life."

This dark, cold region of the human soul -- where people withdraw first understanding, then empathy, and finally even the designation of personhood, from another human-being -- is not, of course, unique to Nazi Germany. This human vice, this ability to dehumanize, has been witnessed in all times and places. And it is precisely this vice that the Declaration sets itself up to resist.

Thankfully, in the half-century since the birth of the Declaration, we have as a global people managed progressively to **expand** the circle of full human dignity.

Because of this document, individuals and nations alike have a standard by which to measure fundamental rights. Many of the countries that have emerged in the last 50 years have drawn inspiration from the Declaration in their Constitutions. Courts of law look to the Declaration; it has laid the groundwork for the world's war crimes tribunals; and it has prompted governments to set up their own commissions devoted to safeguarding basic liberties.

At the United Nations Conference on Human Rights in Vienna in 1993, it was the power of the Declaration that inspired the establishment of a High Commissioner on Human Rights. And let me add how lucky the U.N. -- and indeed the world is -- that Mary Robinson fills that post. At the United Nations 4th World Conference on Women in 1995, it was the strength of this Declaration that enabled us to say, for all the world to hear, that human rights are women's rights and that women's rights are human rights.

And yet. And yet in spite of this half century of progress, we have not expanded the circle of human dignity far enough.

There are still too many of our fellow men and women excluded from the fundamental rights proclaimed in the Declaration; too many whom we have hardened our hearts against -- those whose human suffering we fail fully to see; to hear; and to feel.

Any look back at history shows that every nation has had its blind spots that have kept people out of the promised circle of full humanity. Take the example of my own country. We in the United States have had our own difficult experiences with the selective or unequal application of the rights established in the American Constitution. Even the Founding Fathers, whose ideas of human dignity were so far ahead of their time -- proclaiming that "all men are created equal" in the Declaration of Independence -- inscribed slavery in the Constitution. It has taken most of our 220 years, some of them bloody, few of them easy, to extend the benefits of citizenship to African Americans, those without property -- and women. Eleanor Roosevelt herself was 35 years old before she could vote.

Even today, we circumscribe the circle through what we choose not to see. Black South Africans describe what it was like to work all day in white environments in which one was literally not seen. In the Balkans, people have willed themselves not to see the humanity of those whose heritage is different from their own. We ourselves in the industrialized world often choose not to see the child labor that goes into our beautiful carpets or our comfortable shoes.

And in too many places today, what we fail to see are the injustices done to women.

We choose not to see the injustice of legal systems around the world that continue to treat women as less than complete citizens. In too many places, female heirs receive less inheritance than male heirs. Inequitable divorce laws compel women to remain in cruel marriages. And courts of law require the testimony of two women to equal that of a solitary man.

Our vision is limited in other areas, as well. We choose not to see the contribution of women to the economic lives of our countries. In too many places, women are discriminated against for bank loans, first jobs, and promotions. They are denied pay equal to that of men -- or any pay at all. And they live disproportionately in poverty, making up 70 percent of the world's poor.

We also circumscribe the circle through what we choose not to hear. Freedom and equality for all depend first on whether a citizen truly has a voice.

It is telling that even in the drafting of the Universal Declaration there was a debate about women's voices. The initial version of the first article stated, "All men are created equal." It took women members of the Commission, led by Mrs. Hansa Mehta of India, to point out that "all men" might be interpreted to exclude women. Only after long debate was the language changed to say, "All human beings are born free and equal."

Today, we still choose not to hear the voices of many women. In too many places, women are blocked from participating in the political lives of their countries. Just nine days ago in Sudan, 36 women were arrested while attempting to deliver a petition to the U.N. office there in protest of human rights violations in their country. They were arrested, fined, and at least one woman received 40 lashes.

In too many places, girls and women never even learn to project their voices. Two-thirds of the 130 million children out of school are girls. Two-thirds of the 96 million people worldwide who can neither read nor write are women. Even now, the Taliban in Afghanistan are blocking girls from attending school. Not only that -- they are blocking those, like Emma Bonino, European Union Commissioner for Humanitarian Affairs, who would speak out on behalf of this injustice.

Freedom of speech and freedom of the press -- the rights to petition the government and to assemble -- all these are essential. But think how much weaker these rights are in a nation where the majority of young women are illiterate? Rights on paper that are not protected and implemented are not really rights at all.

We further circumscribe the circle of human rights through what we choose not to feel. As Eleanor Roosevelt put it, “When will our conscience grow so tender that we will act to prevent human misery rather than avenge it?” In too many places, the suffering of women is defined as trivial; explained away as a “cultural phenomenon.” Perhaps it is for this reason that women do not receive proper health care, including access to family planning. Perhaps that is why genital cutting, which in some countries more than 90 percent of women have undergone, continues.

Perhaps that is why domestic and sexual violence remain the most serious, under-reported and widespread human rights violations in the world. In almost every country in the world, domestic violence is one of the leading causes of injury to women. In my country, 30 percent of female murder victims are killed by a current or former partner. As Secretary of State Madeleine Albright has said, domestic violence can never again be dismissed, as it so often has, as part of a country’s norm, or as a set of private assumptions about family life. Let us say it so loudly that the entire world can hear us: We do not believe that violence against women is simply cultural; we believe it is simply criminal.

And perhaps that is why rape and sexual assault continue to be tactics of war. It is the cruelest injustice, I should add, that so many wars end not in peace for women and their families, but in refugee crises that trap women and children in lives that go from bad to worse. Women and children make up 80 percent of the world's 23 million refugees.

The full enfranchisement of the rights of women is unfinished business in this turbulent century.

What meaning can the language of freedom and human rights have for a young woman forced into prostitution and trafficked in the commercial sex trade? What meaning can it have for women forced into involuntary servitude as sweatshop workers or domestic servants? What meaning can it have for a woman forced to bear a child or forced to abort one? What about the very ingrained practices that undermine the growth and development of girls from their very first years -- such as the common practice of feeding them last or less?

As I have been privileged to travel around the world, I have met countless women who know nothing of this Declaration and its promises, but are eloquent in their belief that they deserve respect and better treatment in their families, workplaces and societies.

And yet, some critics continue to dismiss women's sufferings as minor. Are they? In 1958, Eleanor Roosevelt wrote, "Where do human rights begin? In small places, close to home -- so close and so small that they cannot be seen on any maps of the world. Yet they are the world of the individual persons; the neighborhood he lives in...; the factory, farm, or office where he works. Such are the places where every man, woman, and child seeks equal justice, equal opportunity, equal dignity without discrimination. Unless these rights have meaning there, they have little meaning anywhere."

Other critics dismiss human rights violations as harmless. A report released this week by the Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict proves otherwise. According to the report, "An upsurge of egregious human rights violations is almost always a powerful warning of dire events to come, including massive refugee flows and civil wars."

Still others say that human rights are a Western luxury -- not inalienable, but alien. But I believe -- and the women I've listened to believe -- that human rights are as essential to life as air or water, and that they are felt, beyond culture and tradition, as innate. The women I have met do not feel that human rights are a foreign concept invented by theorists. Rather, they know, in spite of everything they are told by culture and tradition, in their very hearts and souls, that these are God-given rights that they were born with as surely as they were born into the human family.

For if they are not innate, how have people throughout history known to fight for them so valiantly?

Paradoxically, the proof of universality lies with the perpetrators of human rights violations themselves. Why have those who have dishonored humanity run to cover their tracks were it not for the knowledge that wrong had been done? The Nazis tried to hide their concentration camps. Communism kept its terrors in the shadow of the Iron Curtain. Scores of bodies are hidden in the hard ground of Bosnia and in the deep forests of Rwanda. Throughout my hemisphere, people and ideas have "disappeared."

Why go to the trouble?

Because human rights transcend individual regimes and customs. The beliefs inscribed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights were not invented 50 years ago. They are not the work of a single culture or country. They have been with us forever, from civilization's first light. Sophocles wrote about them 2,500 years ago when he had Antigone declare that there were ethical laws higher than the laws of Theban kings. P.C. Chang, who helped draft the Universal Declaration, pointed out that Confucius articulated them in ancient China. The belief that we must respect our neighbors as we would respect ourselves resides at the core of the teachings of all the major faiths of the world.

The principles inscribed in the document whose birth we mark today are not constructed but revealed; every great religion exposed and taught their truths.

If I were to tear up this declaration, its values would abide.

If I were to burn this document, its meaning would remain.

If I were to forbid someone from hearing its words, they would still ring as loud as ever in the hearts of men and women.

It is because every era has its blind spots that we must see our own unfinished business -- now, while we stand at the threshold of a new millennium. We must rededicate ourselves to completing the circle of human rights once and for all. We must challenge ourselves to see more sharply, to hear more clearly, to feel more fully.

And we must do something else. We must support democracies -- new and old -- that work to fulfill the aspirations of this Declaration. As the President said last night, "Democracy, the rule of law, civil society -- those things are the best guarantees of human rights over the long run."

It is time for us as a global community to commit ourselves once and for all: We have run out of excuses not to. Here we are, at the very close of the 20th century, a century that has been scorched by war time and time again. If the history of this century teaches us anything, it is that whenever the dignity of any individual or group is compromised by the derogation of who they are, of some essential attribute they possess, then we will leave ourselves open to nightmares.

Conversely, if the century has a lesson for us that is redeeming, it is that by extending the circle of citizenship and human dignity to include everyone -- without exception -- then we have the basis for new worlds of hope to flourish.

So let us walk toward these worlds. And let us do so knowing that the path will never be easy. These rights are eternal, but so, too, is the struggle to attain them. Though the darkness in the human heart may recede, it will never go away. It must be with realistic eyes that we look toward human rights. And it must be with clean hands and open hearts that in this -- the 50th anniversary of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights -- we rededicate ourselves to their fulfillment.

Thank you.

**STATEMENT BY MME. FENG CUI,
HEAD OF THE CHINESE DELEGATION, AT THE 42ND
SESSION OF THE COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN
ON AGENDA ITEM 3, FOLLOW-UP TO THE FOURTH
WORLD CONFERENCE ON WOMEN**

New York, March 2, 1998

Madam Chairperson,

First of all, on behalf of the Chinese delegation, please allow me to extend our warm congratulations to you and other members of the Bureau on your election. The Chinese delegation will cooperate closely with you and make our contributions to this Session. At the same time, I'd like to thank Mrs. Angela King, Special Adviser to the UN Secretary General on Gender Issues for her introductory statement.

Madam Chairperson,

Beijing Declaration and the Platform for Action adopted at the FWCW has a far-reaching and important influence on the advancement of women and the promotion and protection of women's rights and interests throughout the world. The principles, objectives and actions to be taken identified by the Conference have greatly mobilized all governments and people. In order to carry out the follow-up of FWCW, the international community is taking practical measures to safeguard women's rights and interests and promote the realization of women's human rights in terms of legislation, mechanism and resources.

Recalling the history of 50 years since the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948, we are much inspired at the progress achieved in promoting women's human rights. The concept of equality between women and men has become a strong call for action of the international community. Women's rights to subsistence and to development have been universally recognized and have drawn great attention. Unprecedented improvement has been made in women's status, dignity and rights in the fields of politics, economy, society, culture and family.

The substantial results of FWCW are not only a milestone of this historical process, but have also pointed out directions and tasks to be carried out in women's movement at the turn of the century.

Madam Chairperson,

China is a developing country. During its economic development, China attaches importance to the protection of human rights, especially

women and children's rights. For a long time, China has been exerting unremitting efforts on the improvement of the status of women, protecting women's human rights and promoting gender equality in respects of legislation, institution and policy formulation. Historical changes have taken place in the situation of Chinese women's human rights. Now, Chinese women, as masters of the state and society, have gained equal legal status with men in their political, economic, social, cultural and family life. They widely participate in social development and have become an important force in China's reform and opening-up and modernization drive. Their human rights are guaranteed by law and are widely respected by the whole society. Equality between women and men is being realized in every aspect of social life. After FWCW, the Chinese government and non-governmental organizations began to implement the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, and took some new initiatives in line with the eleven objectives set in the Program for the Development of Chinese Women in political participation, employment, labor protection, and the protection of rights and interests. The Law on the Protection of the Rights and Interests of Women was promulgated in 1992. A series of regulations on the protection of women's rights were further defined in the Criminal Procedural Law and the Criminal Law revised respectively in 1996 and 1997. For instance, some more explicit and comprehensive provisions on the protection of the personal freedom and dignity of women and the right to health of the girl-child were stipulated in these two laws. Apart from this, the Special Group on Women and Children's Affairs under the Legislative Commission of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress, together with the Ministry of Civil Affairs, has organized specialists, scholars, legal and women workers to revise the current Marriage Law. After the revision, the Law will be renamed as Marriage and Family Law, whose focus will be extended from marriage to marriage-based family. There will be some substantial changes in its contents. This is aimed to further protect women's human rights, eliminate domestic violence, promote gender equality, advocate democracy and strengthen people's sense of family responsibility.

Legal reform
at Baidu
women's law
about 7
min

Madam Chairperson,

✕ ✕ ✕
The Chinese government has always been attaching importance to international cooperation in the field of human rights and actively participating in many UN human rights activities. China has acceded to 17 international human rights conventions, including Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Convention on the Rights of the Child and Equal Remuneration Convention. China is serious in fulfilling all its legal obligations contained in the conventions it has acceded to by taking domestic legal, judicial and administrative measures. In October 1997, the Chinese government signed the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. At present, relevant departments are going through legal procedures in accordance with regulations in the Constitutions and other laws for its ratification by the National People's Congress as early as possible.

Good pt to
make
give China
credit
held to
commitments

Madam Chairperson,

Since ratifying the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women in 1980, the Chinese government has seriously kept her commitment to the international community by implementing the Convention conscientiously and has submitted three national reports so far. We hope that those who have not yet ratified or acceded to the Convention will take immediate actions and make greater efforts for the cause of women of their own countries and the whole world. Now, an optional protocol to the Convention is being drafted. A serious and cautious attitude is required towards the drafting of this legal instrument which is importance, complicated and involves various aspects, so as to enable it to serve the protection and promotion of women's human rights.

Madam Chairperson,

✕ ✕ ✕
Clear requirements are set out in the Platform for Action regarding the four themes to be discussed under the agenda of this Session. While reviewing the progress achieved, we must see that development and progress are unbalanced. There is still a long way to go from realizing the objectives set in the Platform for Action. This shows that the promotion

and protection of women's human rights is an arduous and complicated task. All governments should intensify their efforts. Today, the principle of universality of human rights has been recognized by all states including China. We have all along believed that this principle should be applied in light of the specific conditions of each country. Measures taken by countries to promote and protect women's human rights should be made fit into the situation of each respective country as they differ in historical background, cultural tradition and level of economic and social development. Therefore, we should strengthen the exchange of ideas and cooperation, promote mutual respect and friendly dialogue when deliberating these themes. The protection of women's human rights is not an isolated issue. The international community, developed countries in particular, should assist developing countries in their economic development, raising people's living standard, improving subsistence environment and do something substantial for the promotion and protection of women and children's rights so as to realize the goals and objectives set in the Platform for Action.

] NO

Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Address the
underlines
principle of
universality
of h.r.

Government can garner resources. Civil society can reach down to engage all members of society. The movement's theme - "think globally, act locally" - is more relevant than ever.

There is a growing awareness that attitudes as well as behaviour - both of individuals and of institutions - must change to take account of the real rights and real needs of women.

Let us not forget that the progress we make is measurable, and it will be measured. Future generations will hold us accountable. They will look for concrete signs that Beijing, in 1995, was followed by real action. Let us not disappoint them. Let us not disappoint ourselves. Together we must follow our words with our deeds. We must take up the cause of the world's women.

Statement by Chen Muhua, Vice-Chairperson of the Standing
Committee of the National People's Congress of China and
President of the Conference

First of all, please allow me to express my gratitude for your trust in electing me President of the Fourth World Conference on Women. While extremely honoured, I am fully aware of the tremendous responsibility associated with the post. To live up to your trust, I will do my utmost to cooperate with delegates from all countries and the United Nations Secretariat to make the Conference a complete success. In the meantime, I am looking forward to your support and guidance.

In 1985, as head of the delegation of China, I attended the third World Conference on Women, in Nairobi, where I joined delegates from other countries in discussing ways to advance the status of women and, together, we produced a very important document - the Nairobi Forward-looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women. For me, the experience was most exciting.

Today, 10 years later, on the eve of the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations and with the approach of a new century, we are gathered here in Beijing to draft the Beijing Declaration and Programme of Action, aimed at accelerating the implementation of the Nairobi Strategies with a view to realizing our common objective of gender equality.

Enormous changes have taken place over the past 10 years in the world in which we live. While peace and development remain the two common tasks facing the whole world, the advancement of the status of women has become a key objective. While peace, stability and economic development underlie the advancement of the status of women, equal status and participation of women are an important guarantee for maintaining peace and achieving development. Therefore, when planning our strategy for the future, we must bear in mind the theme of the Conference and also our common goal: Action for Equality, Development and Peace.

It is reassuring that thanks to the joint efforts of the United Nations, national Governments and non-governmental organizations, gratifying progress has been made in promoting gender equality and women are playing an increasingly important role in various fields of social life. The important role of women and their rights have been reaffirmed and stressed in recent years at such major international meetings as the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, the World Conference on Human Rights, the International Conference on Population and Development and the World Summit for Social Development. It

is evident that women are crying out for an improvement in their status; the times demand it; humanity aspires to it.

Although progress has been made, we must not lose sight of the stark reality facing us: the various objectives set forth in the Nairobi Strategies have not yet been realized; the number of women in poverty is increasing worldwide and a large number of women and children are still fighting a losing battle against hunger; the illiteracy rate of women remains far higher than that of men as large numbers of girls are forced to drop out of school for various reasons; many women, having no access to basic health care, remain vulnerable to the threat of diseases; in some regions, women and children have become the largest group of victims of constant armed conflicts; violence against women, including domestic violence, still exists. More often than not, women's rights, instead of being respected, are violated and trampled on. All these are serious obstacles to the advancement of the status of women worldwide.

Our mission at this Conference is both noble and arduous. I hope that all participants will seek common ground while putting aside differences, unite as one and cooperate closely to turn the theme of this Conference - Action for Equality, Development and Peace - into reality.

In five years, we will enter the twenty-first century. Everyone present at the Conference, including myself, shoulders an important historic task. Women from all countries and regions of the world are watching us earnestly, hoping that the international community and national Governments will make a solemn commitment and translate it into concrete actions so that this Conference will help accelerate the improvement of the status of women the world over. Let us work together to live up to the ardent expectations of the entire world.

Statement by Gertrude Mongella, Secretary-General
of the Fourth World Conference on Women

At long long last, we are here in Beijing participating in the Fourth World Conference on Women - a conference that is phenomenal in several respects. It has generated much interest and debate globally, among men and women, old and young, from country to country. It has brought together the largest gathering of persons ever to attend any other United Nations conference on any subject. All the indications point to a social revolution in the making!

This Conference has been characterized by an intensive preparatory process involving national, regional and international debates and consultations among Governments and non-governmental bodies. At every stage, a step towards consensus-building has been taken. We are now faced with a final test of our commitment for action - our Platform for Action.

This Platform is a global tapestry woven by women, men and youth with strands from all nations, races and religions alike. It has been carefully, objectively and caringly embroidered through the various consultations, conferences and meetings organized at the national, regional and international levels. The Platform is a document for the world; but for women, it is their document since it embodies the aspirations, hopes and actions that will guide us all into the twenty-first century. In fact, the Platform is for everyone. There can be no spectators, no side-liners, no abstainers, for this is the crucial social agenda that affects all humanity.

Statement by Chen Muhua, President of the Fourth World
Conference on Women

Two weeks ago, when I was unanimously elected President of this Conference, I was deeply honoured, but I was also keenly aware of my tremendous responsibility. Today I am delighted and thrilled because our hard work of the past two weeks and all our cooperative efforts have made the Fourth World Conference on Women a resounding success and have brought it to a triumphant conclusion.

Women around the world have been following the Beijing Conference closely, and people in every country have placed tremendous hope in us. And I think we can say that we have not let them down.

The success of the Conference shows that raising the status of women not only gives women a greater voice but is also demanded by the times: it is the common hope of all humankind.

The success of the Conference is indicative of the shared political will and commitment of the world's Governments and the international community to promote gender equality and to strive for equality, development and peace.

The success of the Conference is the result of close cooperation and joint efforts by all participants. The Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action are the crystallization of all our hard work.

The Fourth World Conference on Women will be regarded by the entire world as a well-organized United Nations conference on an unprecedented scale, and as a milestone in the annals of the world-wide women's movement. It will undoubtedly give a strong impetus to the efforts of the United Nations to promote gender equality and social development. Like the documents adopted by the three previous women's conferences, the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action adopted by the Conference will provide guidance to Governments and the international community in their efforts to promote gender equality, and like the recent major United Nations conferences on environment and development, population, and social development, they will become key documents in the field of global social development.

In my work as President of the Conference, I have enjoyed the positive support and close cooperation of the other officers of the Conference and members of the Main Committee, all delegations, the United Nations Secretariat and all Conference participants as well as non-governmental organizations. I should like to express my heartfelt gratitude to all of them.

Let us continue to maintain this spirit of solidarity and cooperation as we redouble our efforts to enhance the status of women around the world. Once the Conference is over, let us adopt effective measures, turn our resolve into action and make the potential into the actual. Let us join hands to achieve equality, development and peace, to ensure a happy life for future generations and to work together for an even better twenty-first century.

FIRST LADY HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
REMARKS AT FIRST ANNUAL ARTHUR LIMAN MEMORIAL
LECTURE
PARK AVENUE SYNAGOGUE, NEW YORK
OCTOBER 18, 1998

716
767
5236

Thank you. I want to thank Ellen, Lewis, Emily, Douglas, and the entire Liman family. Rabbi Lincoln, members of the Park Avenue Synagogue, and other friends and distinguished guests: I am delighted to join all of you for the First Annual Arthur Liman Memorial Lecture.

I know, of course, that some of you made the ultimate sacrifice to be here...seeing as how the World Series **mistakenly** scheduled their second game at the same time as this lecture. So, along with the honor of delivering the Arthur Limon lecture, I have been given strict instructions to break in, whenever necessary, with up-to-the minute commentary on the Yankees game.

I am especially pleased to be here at this magnificent synagogue, where, for generations, the Limans and other New York families have come together not only to worship, but to feed the hungry, lift up Russian Immigrants in need, and, ultimately, serve the entire community.

Which is what Arthur always did.

In his extraordinary autobiography which just came out, Lawyer, Arthur talks about a story he heard Robert Kennedy tell. Kennedy is visiting with a group of students at an urban university. Pointing out the window at a slum, he asks the young people, "What are you going to do about that?" The next day, the group buys curtains. As Arthur said, "That was not Kennedy's answer to the problem." And it certainly wasn't his.

For those, like my husband and me, who attended Yale Law School after Arthur Liman, he served as a glowing example of how we could use the tool of law to pursue justice, freedom, and human rights for those too often ignored. He showed us how, as lawyers and human beings we could take the words inscribed over the highest court in the land: Equal Justice Under the Law -- and make them come alive, whether he was serving under the spotlight of the Iran-Contra Hearings or out of the limelight trying to make the legal profession look more like America.

As he wrote in his book, being a lawyer, “means defending the rights of the helpless, not just the mighty.” For him, it meant defending poor people without a voice, citizens struggling with drug addiction and AIDS, prisoners at Attica and elsewhere.

And, it meant doing it with courage and commitment, passion and perseverance...and, yes, humor. I’m told that years ago, he even offered to represent Bob Rubin’s son, Philip, when the 6 year old boy was told to sit outside his schoolroom for *allegedly* disrespecting the teacher.

I know Arthur would be proud of all the extraordinary ways he is being honored today -- from Yale’s new endowed chair to Legal Action Center’s Policy Institute to this lecture series. Because, I know that more than anything, he would want us not to just talk about him, but to finish the work he so courageously began.

And so, one way each of us can honor him today is by following the Bible’s simple instruction “Justice, Justice, you shall pursue,” and continuing Arthur’s unyielding pursuit of justice at places like the Legal Aid Society.

I will never forget when I first started at the University of Arkansas being introduced to a legendary judge. The lawyer introducing me said, “Well judge, this is the new lady law professor. She is going to teach criminal law and run a legal aid clinic.” The judge looked at me and said, “Well, I don’t have any use for either lady law professors or legal aid clinics.”

Unfortunately, there have been too many in Congress over the years who share that opinion about Legal Services (and, probably about women law professors as well). Which is why I’m so pleased, after years of fighting for its very survival, the President fought for and recently won an increase in the Legal Services Corporation budget. [for a total of \$300 million]. Is that progress? Absolutely. But, is it enough? No. We will be back next year...and the President won’t give up until the Legal Services Corporation has the funding it needs to fulfill its vital mission.

But, I believe there is another very important way that each of us can honor Arthur Liman's legacy. And that is by taking the lessons and values he taught us all: an optimism that we can create a better future...a strong commitment to civic duty...a passion about protecting the most vulnerable...and applying those lessons to meet the greatest challenges of our time. Which is what I hope to do tonight.

I want to talk about a topic that's in the news a lot, but is too often misunderstood, or considered someone else's problem -- and that is globalization. I know there are a lot of reactions to this fairly long word. It's the kind of word lawyers get accused of using. It has as many definitions as the people who use it.

Certainly, the increases in technology, the changes in the economy, the effects of rapid transportation and communication on our everyday lives all make us more interconnected and interdependent than perhaps we have ever been. And as with any great sweeping change at any point in history, there are those who are the great proponents of globalization, whether they can define it or not. And those who are the great opponents, whether they can define it or not

And what I hope is that we can take a page from Arthur Liman's play book. That we can reject the naysayers...and come together across the lines that too often divide to not only define the problem, but solve it in a way that improves our common humanity.

It is particularly appropriate that we would do this on the brink of the Millennium, which is something my husband and I have done a lot of thinking about. We know it will come whether we think about it or not. We know that, when the ball drops in Times Square, it will be accompanied by great parties. We know there will be entrepreneurs who will produce products like Millennium toothpaste and Millennium candy.

But, we also wanted to encourage Americans to take this time to think about the kind of history, culture, indeed world, we want to leave for the next generation.

We have adopted a theme for our discussions about the Millennium; honor the past, imagine the future. And if one thinks about those two aspects of this theme, clearly by honoring the past, we cannot shut our eyes to it. We don't do ourselves any service if we don't acknowledge the great violence and division and disappointment that came with this century as well as the progress. And it also gives us the opportunity to imagine a future where we could summon the political will and provide the opportunity for all individuals to participate in shaping their own destinies.

Now there are always pessimists who rear their heads during these moments in history. I went back and read a little bit about the first Millennium's end -- especially about the Myth of Panic Terror, where people supposedly gave away their possessions and hid in churches in Europe waiting for the end of the world.

I even read about a rather controversial monk named Raul Glaber, who lived in the 10th century. He had quite a checkered past -- he was expelled from a number of monasteries, but he always had an audience. There were always people who were ready to believe the worst about themselves and their futures. The earth did not implode as he predicted.

And, although there were great pockets of fear as there are during times of transition, we also saw the spread of literacy, the emergence of craftsmen's guilds, new universities and religious orders started. We saw positive changes that, coming out of the so-called Dark Ages, set the tone for the future.

Today, we stand at the end of a very different time, but we face some of the same issues that go to the root of how we define ourselves as human beings, our relations to each other, and whether we will summon the will required to create a better world in the future. There is much to be optimistic about and much to be pessimistic about.

But clearly, whether one is able to define globalization or not, it is here to stay. There is no turning back the clock. No doing away with computers, cutting off the internet, stopping jet travel, preventing the mass media from connecting us to remote ideas and cultures with the click of a remote control.

So, our challenge, is to ask ourselves some tough questions about how we will harness these permanent forces of globalization to deal with the important issues that have always confronted humanity...and ensure, as Arthur always did, that we don't leave the most vulnerable behind?

Will the global economy lead to growth and stability for nations? Will it lift up the lives and opportunities for all citizens in the world, or only those of us lucky enough to be in this beautiful synagogue, who have the skills to navigate our way through this new world?

Will it inspire a race to the bottom? Will we deplete our natural resources? Will we see our unique cultures uprooted by a one-dimensional consumer culture? Our spirituality replaced by an obsessive materialism?

Will it help us to humanize ourselves and each other? Learn from one another? Or will it drive us further apart? allowing us to retreat inward? Will the fear of the unknown, which is always there when we think about the future, be transformed into a plague of racism, nativism, and xenophobia?

If you stop for a minute and think about how our popular culture imagines the future, it is not a pretty sight. Most of the recent movies demonstrate our innate fear about what is to come. Apocalyptic visions, which usually begin or end with Washington D.C. getting blown up. Whole cities that can only survive under domes because we've depleted our natural resources. Human life as we know it totally wiped out.

Where is our popular image of a new world that we hope to create?

The fact is, globalization in and of itself is neither a good nor an evil. It offers us tremendous opportunities, if only we take the responsibility to address our problems. As with every age, we have to take the world as we've been given it, not too optimistically or pessimistically, but realistically.

And we have to create conditions in which democratic governments give all citizens a stake in their future. In which free markets benefit all people, and not just a privileged few. And in which a vibrant civil society fosters free and active citizens, who will, after all, ultimately determine the common fate in the next Millennium.

I often think of society with a very simple metaphor: as a three-legged stool. One leg is government, another is the economy and the third is civil society. Obviously, we cannot sit on the stool if there is only one leg or two legs. And we cannot sit on it if one leg is longer or shorter than the other two. Rather, we need three strong legs and a balance among them. They have to support each other.

And so if we think about the challenges that confront us, it is simple for me to think about what needs to be done to make sure each of those three institutions are strong enough to support society in the years to come.

How will we enable government to meet challenges such as runaway economies and global capitalism? How will redo institutions like the IMF and the World Bank, to create new financial architectures to replace what was established more than 50 years ago at Bretton Woods?

We know that government is an essential part of strong societies that enable people to reach their God-given potential. And yet in many parts of the world, particularly here, we have had a continued assault on government, as though the abolition or weakening of government will foster human enterprise and freedom.

That is, I believe a mistaken notion that hopefully will finally be put to rest as we end this century. We need strong and active governments, neither oppressive nor weak, but able to address the problems of citizens.

Similarly, with the economy, there are those who are great critics of the free markets and those who are great advocates. Either position probably overstates both the capacity of the market and its defects. We are trying to create some of the rules and regulations that will enable us to enjoy the benefits without suffering from its excesses. There is a lot of work on that front.

And clearly, there are many tough questions posed by how we best structure and create governmental and economic institutions that will pave the way for a better tomorrow.

But I wish to concentrate for a minute on the third leg of the stool. That of civil society, the ethic of citizenship that Arthur Liman taught us. That space between on the one hand, government...and on the other, the economy. It is within that space that life is lived. It is the families who love and sustain us; the religious institutions that lift us up, the voluntary associations that allow us to contribute, the art and culture that make our spirits soar. And most important, civil society is the training ground that transforms people into citizens.

Economic opportunity can provide jobs and income, but it alone cannot create the work ethic that capitalism requires. It can create consumers and producers of goods, not citizens. Governments alone cannot create citizens either. Only civil society can do this important job.

As I have traveled around the world, I have seen how critical this component is, for us to imagine a future of hope. I have seen what happens to people whose spirits have been crushed, whose economies have been driven into the ground, whose governments have oppressed their freedoms.

And yet I have seen how their determination and support for one another can lift them up to rebuild their lives and families. When we think about the challenges that confront us, we must make it clear that nurturing civil society, creating opportunities for people to become citizens in today's world, is essential.

There cannot be a strong, sustainable global economy without a strong global society. And there are some simple rules about how one creates citizens -- simple to describe and very difficult to execute.

We have to invest in all people -- and value all people -- by providing them with education, health care, credit and other tools of opportunity.

I am heartened by the fact that the Congress answered the President's call to put 100,000 more teachers in our schools. We cannot be satisfied unless we are doing more to better educate children -- boys and girls -- here and all over the world -- and prepare them to be citizens, to take their rightful place in their societies.

We cannot be satisfied until we have knocked down all the barriers of law and tradition and ignorance that stop women from being respected as members of their families, communities, and nations. When we hear about what the Taliban is doing to women in Afghanistan, where girls can't go to school, where women can't work or leave the house alone, where women doctors can't practice and male doctors can't touch women patients, when we hear about these violations of humanity, we must stand up and speak out to stop them.

And it also means investing in people's dreams and hopes by making it possible for them to create their own jobs and businesses. Not leaving them out of the great sweep of the global economy that pays little attention to what happens at the micro level.

I have met literally thousands of people here and around the world whose lives have been transformed, who now have a stake in their future, who better understand their roles as citizens in a democracy because of something as simple as a loan of \$15.00 or \$50.00 or \$100. I remember one woman in Santiago, who after receiving a small loan to buy a large sewing machine told me, "I feel like a caged bird set free."

We also have to ensure that people learn about their rights and responsibilities as citizens and then be encouraged to exercise them.

In Senegal, for example, I visited a village where they were learning about democracy by performing skits for one another. Where people would stand up and make speeches and others in the village would critique them. Where they would act out going to vote. Now that might sound very basic, but it gave those people their first understanding of what it meant to be a citizen of a democracy.

We have to take the abstract discussion of democracy, take the applause we give when people make the transition to democracy...and distill it into practical advice and lessons to be used in our everyday lives.

We also have to make it possible for us to learn to treat our diversity as a source of strength.

We can look at the Albanian families sick and malnourished in the mountains of Kosovo. We can look at the heinous act of bigotry and violence that killed that young boy in Wyoming. Certainly, we have seen here and in too many places around the world where old hatreds die hard.

We have seen too many times if people don't feel a stake in their futures, if the economy isn't working for them, if they don't have the space of civil society to give their life meaning, then they too often turn against one another. They often begin to blame the other for whatever it is that they find lacking in their own lives. Whether that other is a minority group, religious, racial or ethnic group, we have seen the results of too much blaming of the other in this century.

And yet when people defy history, we know they can begin to rewrite it. Recently, I spoke at a conference for women in Belfast. We brought together both Protestant and Catholic women who were doubly burdened by the sectarian hatred that had ripped apart their communities and by their status as women.

But, they wanted to make real the peace they had lived for, died for, dreamed for, and finally voted for. And so they began to make their voices heard...to learn new tools of citizenship...and take their rightful place in the economic, social, and political future of Northern Ireland

We also have to ensure that we do all we can to protect our natural resources and cultural treasures and we require citizens to do that.

Citizens living in our rain forests, on the edges of our savannahs, and our wetlands have to feel that they too have a stake in protecting what is best about our earth. They have to have the opportunity and ability to save our monuments, parks, religions, languages, and culture which tell the story of who we are as individuals and nations.

There is much to be done, but I am an optimist. I believe we have great opportunities ahead of us if only we will seize them. If only we will be prepared to do what is necessary at the global level to deal with our government and economic issues, as hard as that may be. And then to do at the local level what Arthur Liman always did -- to nurture civil society and citizens.

Each of us in this synagogue, and around the city and world has an obligation to carry on his legacy, to make sure that we really are all our brothers' and sisters' keepers.

We know today that we have global neighbors, but haven't yet decided if we want to build a global neighborhood. When we care about a toxic spill or terrorist attack, or an economic downturn or a civil war in another nation, it is not just because it may affect us down the road, but because we must recognize that in a very fundamental way, we are more interdependent than at any point in human history.

So that brings me back to where I started. When we imagine the future over the next few years and into the next century and Millennium, what is it that we will see?

In one of the movies I referred to that swept the world, Independence Day, we needed to cooperate to fend off an alien attack. And certainly in the theater in which I saw it, there were great cheers as people of all different races and backgrounds and societies around the globe came together as human beings to save ourselves.

We certainly don't expect it to come to that, but in a very real way, unless we do come together, we will not meet the challenges we face at the end of this very difficult century. We have done a lot in the last 50 years to build democracy, to give more people a chance to reach their God-given potential.

But if we are going to fulfill our potential at the beginning of this new century, then globalization however one defines it cannot be a substitute for humanization.

It is up to all of us to ensure that the global economy does not divide us from one another -- or drive some down in life and others up. It is up to all of us to ensure that it is the engine that we harness to create a strong global society in which all people are given a chance to imagine a future better than their past.

[In closing, I am reminded of a story that Martin London told at Arthur's memorial service. Arthur, his son Douglas, and a certain Congressman (who may be a Senator soon), Chuck Shumer were in a small boat when they encountered some large breaking waves. They decided to try to go through them. The waves crashed over them, temporarily turning their boat into a submarine, sweeping all their belongings overboard...and all told costing thousands of dollars to repair. But they got out safely. When he heard the story, Martin said, "Arthur, what a horrible story. You must have been frightened out of your wits." And Arthur looked up smiling and said, "Marty it was great." It was great.

I hope all of us think about that story every time challenges seem insurmountable, and the forces of nature seem beyond our control. I hope all of us imagine how Arthur would ask us to take responsibility to steer with courage and warmth, commitment and idealism. How he would ask us to look out for the most vulnerable among us who are too often tossed aside. How instead of sitting paralyzed in fear, he would ask us to roll up our sleeves and find a way, together, to get to the other side safely. And how, he might even want us to look back on all we had done...and simply say, "It was great."] Thank you very much.

LEADERSHIP

What is at stake?

- o America is a global power whose citizens have interests around the world. To protect those interests, we must keep America strong while working with others to maintain peace, encourage economic growth, promote democracy and increase respect for the rule of law.

What is the U.S. doing?

Trans-Atlantic Partnership

- o In Europe, we are striving to build a continent that is fully united, stable, and free. To this end, we are working with NATO and non-NATO democracies alike to implement peace in Bosnia, restore and enhance autonomy in Kosovo, and to create a framework for future security cooperation that includes an expanded NATO. We are also cooperating with the EU to increase trade and supporting the integration of a democratic Russia into Western institutions.

Promoting Mutual Security and Prosperity in Asia

- o We are maintaining our military presence and our diplomatic engagement in this economically dynamic region and are working with our Japanese partners to pursue regional and global economic, security, and political goals.
- o To facilitate its full emergence as an active and responsible member of the international community, we are engaging China across the broad range of our interests, including trade, regional security, non-proliferation, and human rights.
- o We are implementing our agreement with the DPRK freezing its nuclear program. The U.S. and the ROK have brokered a Four Party Meeting (ROK, DPRK, U.S. and PRC) aimed at a permanent peace in Korea.

Preventive Defense through the Control of Deadly Arms

- o The U.S. is working with the international community to halt the spread of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). We are taking the lead to prevent states such as Iran, Iraq, and Libya from threatening world security.
- o We helped negotiate the indefinite extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and the CTBT (which bans all nuclear explosions). We worked with Congress to ratify the Chemical Weapons Convention.
- o U.S. leadership and resources have helped eliminate nuclear weapons from Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan, and are helping Russia dismantle its nuclear arsenal.

Vigorous Diplomacy in Support of Peace

- o The U.S.-brokered agreement in Bosnia ended Europe's deadliest conflict since WWII. U.S. efforts stopped the war from spreading, saved countless lives, and reenergized NATO.
- o U.S. leadership for a just, lasting, and comprehensive peace between Israel and her Arab neighbors is essential to American security. We helped negotiate historic peace agreements between Israel and Jordan, as well as between Israel and the Palestinians, including the recent redeployment of Israeli troops from Hebron.

Leadership for a Global Economy

- o Through successful negotiation and ratification of NAFTA and the WTO as well as bilateral agreements, we created American jobs, reduced trade barriers, and protected the safety of our workers and our environment.
- o We have strengthened the APEC forum, launched the New Transatlantic Agenda with the EU, and laid the foundation for a Free Trade Area of the Americas.

Promoting Freedom and Extending the Rule of Law

- o U.S. policies promote our most cherished values of freedom, respect for the individual, and the rule of law. Our assistance programs support the emergence of civil societies around the world.
- o We are strong supporters of the International War Crimes Tribunal's efforts to hold accountable those responsible for atrocities committed in Bosnia and Rwanda.
- o We are expanding global cooperation in the fight against international crime, drug trafficking, and terrorism.

The Environmental Mainstream

- o Secretary Albright is committed to integrating environmental issues into our foreign policy and using environmental diplomacy to promote our strategic goals such as sustainable development, reducing greenhouse gases, and helping our environmental industries capture more of a \$400 billion global market.

Contact: S/P: WWoodward x7-9943 10/9/98

DEMOCRACY

What is at stake? What is the U.S. interest?

- o Liberal democracy is the best guarantor of universally recognized human rights, and in particular of the universal and fundamental right of all people to have a meaningful say in their government. Moreover, history demonstrates, and -- current experience confirms -- that democracies are far superior to authoritarian systems in producing long-term economic growth and social and political stability. Therefore, in supporting the global spread of democracy, the United States is not only benefiting others but simultaneously promoting American values, fostering American prosperity, and ensuring American security.

What is the U.S. doing?

- o The United States promotes democracy through our diplomacy and programs, both bilaterally and multilaterally. We support the liberalization of authoritarian systems as well as the consolidation of new democracies. From supporting democratic transitions in Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic, to building democracy in Bosnia, to assisting nascent and as yet uncertain transitions in Nigeria and Indonesia, our commitments span the globe. Our annual democracy-promotion budget is approximately \$1 billion. This budget funds programs in the State Department, USAID, USIA, the Justice Department, and the Defense Department.
- o Writing new constitutions and holding elections are critical steps in the process of democratization. But genuine democracy also requires the creation of institutions to protect human rights and the rule of law, including respect for the rights of minorities.
- o These fundamental goals can be fostered only through the development of an informed citizenry; a free press; an active civil society, including NGOs, trade unions, and political parties that reflect a broad spectrum of interests; an independent judiciary; and effective, transparent, and politically accountable executive and legislative bodies at all levels of governance.

Contact: DRL: DYang x7-1180 S/P: JLevitsky x7-1965 10/9/98

NARCOTICS

What's at stake? What is the U.S. interest?

- o Drug trafficking and abuse cause enormous social, health and financial damage in the U.S. and societies abroad.
- o Powerful trafficking mafias attack and corrupt officials and institutions, spawn violence, and distort economic and political systems, putting democratic stability at risk.

What are we doing?

- o Congress appropriated \$230 million for international crime and drug control in 1998. The funds help foreign countries strengthen counternarcotics law enforcement and judicial capabilities, combat money laundering, eradicate illicit crops, interdict drug shipments, and reduce drug demand.
- o In an annual certification process, we identify key drug producing and transit countries and scrutinize their anti-drug efforts and cooperation. Aid is tied to performance.
 - In 1998, we denied certification to Afghanistan, Burma, Iran, and Nigeria. Colombia, Cambodia, Paraguay, and Pakistan each received national interest certifications.
 - The 40% decrease in coca cultivation in Peru, the largest in a decade, was offset by an increase in Colombia. We are shifting our focus accordingly by building on our success in Peru and Bolivia while expanding eradication efforts in Colombia. Cutting off the traffickers' supply of raw materials will cut through the heart of the drug trade.
- o We engage the international financial institutions in drug control efforts, encouraging them to factor anti-drug efforts into their lending decisions.
- o We work with other governments to dismantle criminal groups and target drug kingpins, not just subordinates. For example, all living leaders of the Cali mafia are in jail, and other kingpins from Peru, Mexico, and Thailand have been brought to justice.
- o The UN Special Session on Drugs, attended by 30 heads of state, adopted concrete action plans to combat narcotics production, trafficking and abuse.
- o Operation Casablanca, a major recent investigation of money laundering operations, also raised sensitive issues for the Mexican government, causing a mutual re-evaluation of information-sharing on law enforcement operations.

INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

What's at stake? What is the U.S. interest?

- o As was tragically demonstrated by the U.S. embassy bombings in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam, official representatives and private citizens of the United States and other democracies are prime targets of terrorists because our policies, values, and culture are opposed by many terrorist groups.
- o As in Kenya and Tanzania, the heaviest casualties are often among the citizens of host countries. The brutal disregard for innocent human life shown by terrorists must strengthen international resolve to combat terrorism.

What are we doing?

- o We are engaged in a long term struggle against terrorism in order to protect U.S. lives and hold terrorists accountable. Our policy is: no deals with terrorists; pressure states that sponsor or harbor them; and bring terrorists to justice.
- o Once conclusive evidence showed that terrorist financier Osama Bin Laden was responsible for the embassy bombings in Africa, President Clinton ordered military strikes against a terrorist training camp in Afghanistan, where Bin Laden resides, and a chemical weapons plant in Sudan associated with Bin Laden's terrorist network. Suspects in the Nairobi bombing have been brought to this country to stand trial.
- o The UN Security Council unanimously endorsed a U.S.-U.K. proposal for two Libyan suspects in the Pan Am 103 bombing to be tried by a Scottish court and judges, in the Netherlands.
- o We formally designated 30 foreign terrorist organizations under a recent law banning provision of funds or other material support to them and denying their members access to the U.S. The U.S. works with friendly nations to change the behavior of seven state sponsors of terrorism: Iran, Iraq, Libya, Syria, North Korea, Cuba, and Sudan.
- o We collaborate to apprehend terrorists, however long it takes. We captured, tried, and convicted the World Trade Center bombers, and their ringleader was sentenced to 240 years in prison. The perpetrator of the 1993 CIA headquarters murders has also been apprehended, brought to the U.S., and convicted.
- o Counter-terrorism experts from the G-8 work together on explosives detection, protection of public transportation, strengthened terrorism response teams, curbed terrorist use of counterfeit travel documents, improved security for major international events, and cooperation to counter potential chemical and biological attacks.
- o This year the U.S. signed a new UN convention on terrorist bombings, which we took the lead in negotiating.

UN PEACEKEEPING

What is at stake? What is the U.S. interest?

- o UN peacekeeping protects U.S. interests by helping prevent and resolve conflicts before they directly threaten our national security.
- o Working through the UN allows us to share the risks and costs with others. It gives us a valuable alternative to either acting alone or doing nothing at all.

What are we doing?

- o We are using our authority in the Security Council to make UN peacekeeping operations better disciplined and more effective. This has led to fewer new operations and better management of existing ones.
- o We -- and the UN -- now ask the tough questions before we act. As a permanent member of the Security Council, we have substantial influence over UN decisions on peacekeeping, including the ability to veto operations we don't support.
- o About 630 of the 14,570 UN peacekeepers around the world are American.
- o We are working with other member states to revise peacekeeping dues. As of October 1, 1995, we pay 25% of UN peacekeeping costs, as funds become available.

Where are we on paying for peacekeeping?

- o The U.S. owes the UN over \$650 million in unpaid peacekeeping bills (over \$900 million as the UN calculates it). Most of these arrears date from 1995, when Congress appropriated less than half the money to pay our bills in full. Congress failed to authorize funding for our UN peacekeeping arrears in FY98. Payment of arrears is a top U.S. priority. Our aim is to gain Congressional agreement enabling us to start paying arrears this year.
- o Because of shortfalls in peacekeeping payments, the UN has had to limit reimbursements to governments that provide troops, equipment, goods and services. Current and future UN peacekeeping operations could be jeopardized if we and other countries do not pay our debts.

What about putting U.S. troops under UN command?

- o As Commander-in-Chief, the President never gives up his command authority over U.S. troops. The President must retain the flexibility to allow temporary foreign operational control of our troops when it serves U.S. interests.

U.S. IN THE UNITED NATIONS

What is at stake? What is the U.S. interest?

- o American leadership is at stake. The UN provides us military, political, and economic options that benefit Americans in the form of a safer, more prosperous world, at an annual cost of less than \$6 per person.

What are we doing?

- o We work through the UN for international peace, security, environmental protection, economic prosperity, and humanitarian assistance. UN-affiliated organizations provide numerous direct benefits to the American public and business community in areas such as international air travel safety, disease control, global telecommunications, and copyright protection.
- o U.S. priorities for the 53rd UNGA include furthering international cooperation against weapons proliferation and terrorism, continued progress on UN reform, and maintaining UN budget discipline.

What is the UN's financial status?

- o The UN is owed nearly \$3 billion by member states for the regular budget and peacekeeping; the U.S. owes the most. The UN has taken emergency measures to make ends meet, including suspension of most payments to governments for peacekeeping troops and equipment.
- o We are extremely disappointed that the legislation passed by Congress to enable the U.S. to pay its UN arrears included extraneous provisions on international family planning that are completely unacceptable to the Administration. We intend to keep working for an acceptable solution.
- o The U.S. will face possible loss of its UNGA vote owing to the accumulation of arrears later this year. However, current projections indicate that the U.S. should narrowly avoid a loss of its vote as a result of dues payments made in the first quarter of 1999.
- o UN reform remains a top U.S. priority. We continue to work for greater UN budget discipline, as well as management and program improvements.
- o Progress is occurring. The UN has cut its budget and staff, established an inspector general's office, and strengthened peacekeeping staff and administration. UNSYG Annan's reform initiatives, endorsed by the General Assembly, are for the most part in line with U.S. goals for UN reform and will substantially improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the UN system.

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

What's at stake? What is the U.S. interest?

- o Environmental degradation, caused by overfishing of the oceans, build-up of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, release of chemical pollutants, or destruction of tropical rainforests, can undermine the health and welfare of U.S. citizens, and compromise our national security, economic, and humanitarian interests abroad.
- o Environmental problems are often at the heart of the political and economic challenges we face around the world. For example, in Russia and central Europe, environmental disasters left over from the Soviet era shorten lives and impede reform. In central Africa, rapid population growth combined with the competition for scarce resources fuels conflict and poverty.
- o We would not be doing our jobs as peacemakers and as democracy-builders if we were not also good stewards of the environment.

What is the U.S. doing?

- o Globally, we are pursuing five environmental priorities: the problems of **climate change** (see climate change megatalker), **toxic chemicals**, **species extinction**, **deforestation**, and **marine degradation**. We have made many important advances, including agreements to phase out the remaining substances that damage the stratospheric ozone layer and to ban ocean dumping of low-level radioactive waste. We have started a process for reducing greenhouse gases, instituted successful programs to protect coral reefs and coastal areas from land-based pollution, and worked to stem trade in endangered species.
- o We have also added a regional approach to our bilateral and multilateral environmental efforts. Countries, especially in the developing world, face a series of complicated and inter-related transboundary environmental challenges that are best addressed regionally rather than through global or individual efforts. These issues (**air quality**, **water and energy resources**, **land use**, and **urban/industrial growth**) can either contribute to political and economic tensions, or be a source of potential regional cooperation and integration.
- o Only when countries and regions have begun to tackle their immediate problems will they be free to devote time and resources to the long-term global challenges. To help them address these issues, we are working with them bilaterally through our science and technology cooperation agreements, and through our regional environmental offices.

GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

What's at stake? What's the U.S. interest?

- o There is clear, compelling scientific evidence that the precipitous rise in greenhouse gas emissions due to human activity is changing the global climate. If the trend does not change, scientists predict that the planet's temperature will increase by 2-6 degrees Fahrenheit by 2100 and that sea levels will rise two feet or more.
- o These changes in the climate will mean more coastal flooding; an increase in heat waves and heat-related deaths; more frequent and intense floods, storms and droughts; and the spread of infectious diseases such as cholera and malaria.

What are we doing?

- o On December 11, 1997, the U.S. and 160 other nations concluded negotiations on future emissions reductions at the Climate Change conference in Kyoto, Japan. The parties unanimously endorsed an agreement, the Kyoto Protocol.
- o The Kyoto Protocol marks an historic breakthrough for the world's industrial nations in establishing a legally binding and flexible framework for tackling the problem of global warming. The Protocol sets emissions targets for developed countries to be achieved by the 2008-2012 timeframe. For the U.S., the target is 7% below 1990 emissions levels for all greenhouse gases, compared to 8% cuts for the EU, and 6% for Japan.
- o In addition, the Protocol approved U.S.-pioneered, market-based mechanisms that reduce the cost of compliance, encouraging greater reductions.
- o The Protocol also approved a framework for another market based mechanism, international emissions trading. Negotiators hope to finalize the design of this system at the next climate conference in Buenos Aires. Once operational, developed countries will be permitted to trade in emissions credits.
- o Although developing countries undertook a role in joint implementation, the Administration is disappointed that the Protocol does not include a mechanism for more meaningful developing country participation. The U.S. will continue to press for a greater role for developing countries.

GLOBAL POPULATION ISSUES

What's at stake? What is the U.S. interest?

- o Today, the world's population is more than 5.8 billion, with about 88 million people (or the size of a Mexico or Nigeria) being added each year.
- o Our population policy is a critical element of the Department's strategy for sustainable development, which integrates goals for population and health with those of protecting the environment, building democracy, and encouraging broad-based economic growth.
- o Economic and social progress in other countries can be undermined by rapid population growth, which reduces the quality and availability of public health services, education, and contributes to environmental degradation.

What are we doing?

- o Helping couples and individuals to determine freely and responsibly the number and spacing of their children, and addressing related reproductive health needs, are the core objectives of our international population programs.
- o The Department of State provides policy coordination and leadership on international population policies, in close collaboration with other U.S. government agencies.
- o USAID is the primary implementing agency responsible for assisting developing countries with comprehensive population and development programs. No U.S. funds are used to pay for abortion as a method of family planning or to motivate a person to practice abortion.
- o The U.S. works through many multilateral organizations in support of stabilizing world population growth. The largest, the UN Population Fund (UNFPA), funds reproductive health and development activities throughout the developing world.
- o Through the assistance of the U.S. and other donors, some countries such as Thailand, Tunisia, Indonesia, Morocco and South Korea have seen dramatic improvements in the quality and availability of family planning services, increases in contraceptive use, and declining fertility.

Contact: PRM/POP: MPollack x6-3029 10/9/98

FY 99 INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS BUDGET REQUEST

What's at stake? What is the U.S. interest?

- o From FY 1995 to FY 1997, America's international program resources were reduced in real terms by over 14 percent. A year ago, the Administration proposed a new agenda for enhancing America's international leadership through federal government sponsored and supported programs. The FY 1998 budget for these programs was \$19.451 billion; Congress approved over \$750 million less.
- o The President proposed a bold FY 1999 resource request to maintain America's investment in international affairs programs that protect America's national interests. The \$19.6 billion request represents about one percent of the federal budget, less than \$1 billion more than the FY 1998 appropriation.
- o Designed to balance limited resources with growing policy demands, the FY 1999 budget would accomplish broad-ranging activities with our global allies and developing nations through multilateral and bilateral assistance.

What will we do with this budget?

- o The FY99 budget will foster and maintain the influence of American leadership in the world. This is necessary to ensure security to all Americans; to retain its high standard of living; to promote a healthy environment; and to keep safe those who travel or conduct business overseas.
- o The budget for U.S. government international affairs agencies is constructed by the Secretary of State at the direction of the President to support these primary national interests:
 - To secure peace, including halting the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction;
 - To expand exports in open markets to benefit American business;
 - To protect American citizens abroad and secure our borders;
 - To combat international terrorism and crime
 - To support democracy and uphold human rights;
 - To provide humanitarian relief in crises; and
 - To protect our global environment and human health
- o The FY 1999 budget proposes infrastructure modernization, repair, and security upgrades to our embassies and posts overseas. A supplemental budget request in the aftermath of crises in Africa reinforces these security efforts.
- o Congress is presently considering the FY 1999 legislation that cuts back the international affairs budget by as much as \$1.5 billion from the amount the Secretary proposed to ensure America's national interests are protected.

Contact: S/RPP: DDawson x7-3437 10/9/98

TRADE & ECONOMIC PROSPERITY

What's at stake? What is the U.S. interest?

- o An open and fair global trading system is essential to maintaining and advancing American prosperity in today's global economy. Exports of goods and services are equal to nine percent of our GDP of about \$8 trillion.
- o Trade creates jobs for Americans. One study found that firms that export experienced nearly 20% faster employment growth than those that do not export.
- o Erecting barriers to imports would mean higher prices, reduced choice and inevitable retaliation against U.S. exports.

What are we doing?

- o Since 1993, the U.S. has negotiated over 200 trade agreements to open foreign markets to U.S. goods and services. As the economic crisis impacts on a variety of our trading partners we are actively engaged in staving off protectionist measures and market controls that would hurt U.S. interests.

-- In February, we concluded a Basic Telecommunication Agreement in the WTO. Seventy countries, comprising 93% of world telecommunications revenue, agreed on market access and national treatment commitments for a broad range of local, long distance, and international services.

- o The U.S. is once again the world's largest exporter. Roughly one-quarter of our economic growth over the past four years has come from exports. Our merchandise exports rose about 40 percent over the five-year period ending in 1996.

-- In our own hemisphere, NAFTA has been very successful at expanding our export markets. Our goods exports to Mexico were at a record \$71.4 billion in 1997. Exports to Canada were \$150.1 billion. While the global economic crisis is having a negative impact on these markets at the present time, we expect vibrant growth of these trading relationships to resume.

- o Ensuring America's prosperity is at the top of the State Department's agenda. Our Embassies and Consulates provide advice to U.S. business, press to open markets, and work to enforce existing trade agreements.
- o We are aggressively using our trade agreements to level the playing field for U.S. exporters. The U.S. has brought over 23 cases to the WTO since January 1995 - far more than any other WTO member - in order to ensure that trading partners live up to their obligations under the WTO agreements.

ISLAMIC ACTIVISM

What is at stake? What is the U.S. interest?

- o The United States enjoys peaceful and cooperative relations with the vast majority of the world's 1 billion Muslims and their governments, from Morocco to Malaysia and Indonesia. Millions of Americans, too, are Muslims. As the President and the Secretary have emphasized, the recent U.S. military strikes against terrorist facilities in Afghanistan and Sudan are directed only against the murderers of innocent men, women, and children. Such terrorists, and U.S. actions in self-defense against them, have nothing to do with Islam or any other religion.
- o Events in the Muslim world and our relations with Muslim states have a direct effect on a number of important U.S. goals, including the Middle East peace process.

What is the U.S. doing?

- o We do not accept that there is a clash of civilizations pitting the West against Islam. We respect Islam as one of the world's great religions. In Muslim and non-Muslim countries alike, the real distinction is between moderation and extremism.
- o We seek good relations with all nations that share our interest in peace, including those that adhere to Islam. The U.S. also supports Muslim desires for responsive government and human rights. We have urged Algeria's government, for example, to talk with all who reject violence; and have urged Afghanistan's Taliban to respect the rights of both men and women there.
- o We oppose Islamists who try to impose their will by force, and we believe most Muslims agree with us. The Sudanese regime, for example, has few friends.

Terrorism

- o Violent extremists are a tiny minority in the Muslim world, but they pose a serious threat to American interests.
- o Such extremists claimed responsibility for the June 1996 Al-Khobar bombing near Dhahran and the August 1998 bombings of our embassies in West Africa. Recent U.S. retaliation for these bombings was directed at the terrorist camps in Afghanistan used by the perpetrators of these heinous acts.
- o The vast majority of Muslims abhor violence. The Organization of the Islamic Conference, representing over 50 countries with large Muslim populations, has condemned terrorism.
- o Muslim governments increasingly are cooperating to apply the rule of law to extremists. Pakistan, Jordan, and Egypt, and many others have all helped apprehend suspects in terrorist incidents against U.S.

TURKEY/SYRIA

What is at stake? What is the U.S. interest?

- o We seek to prevent the escalation of tensions that would have wide-ranging ramifications for the entire Middle East, the Middle East peace process, and broader U.S. interests in that region.

What is the U.S. doing?

- o We support efforts by Egyptian President Mubarak to broker a peaceful solution to the matter.
- o We continue to call on both sides to resolve their differences peacefully.
- o We have long urged Syria to cease its support of the PKK. The U.S. has designated the PKK as a foreign terrorist organization under the 1996 Antiterrorism and Death Penalty Act.

Contact: S/P: HBarkey x7-1178

RELATIONS WITH THE EUROPEAN UNION (EU)

What is at stake? What is the U.S. interest?

- o The EU is our largest investment partner and our second largest trading partner. The 1995 New Transatlantic Agenda (NTA) provides a framework for U.S.-EU joint action on over 150 specific issues. It reinforces our bilateral relations with member states and offers a flexible vehicle for engaging the EU as a whole. The NTA sets out four key goals for joint action: promoting peace and democracy; addressing global challenges; expanding transatlantic economic relations; and building closer ties between people on both sides of the Atlantic.

Accomplishments of the Past Six Months and Future Plans

- o Diplomatic Cooperation: At the May 1998 Summit, the U.S. and EU reached an understanding that will deter investments in illegally expropriated property, including in Cuba. We also achieved an understanding on common efforts to combat the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and terrorism, particularly in Iran, and to promote cooperation on Caspian energy. We are working together on Bosnia, Kosovo, nuclear safety in northwest Russia, reform in Ukraine, humanitarian needs in Africa, cooperation with Turkey, civil society in Slovakia and Belarus, and the Middle East Peace Process.
- o Eliminating Transatlantic and Global Economic Barriers: Through the Transatlantic Economic Partnership (TEP), we are working to liberalize transatlantic commerce, while maintaining world-class labor, environmental, and product safety standards. We also seek to develop global principles for electronic commerce. We are working on the accessions of China, Russia, and Latvia to the WTO; implementation of mutual recognition agreements and conclusion of new ones covering high technology and industrial trade; and cooperation with the Transatlantic Business Dialogue (TABD).
- o Fighting Crime and Drugs; Promoting Health and Environment: The U.S. and EU are expanding cooperation on law enforcement, counternarcotics, environmental degradation, and health issues. Specific areas of cooperation include: implementing the Kyoto Climate Change Protocol; opening new Regional Environmental Centers in the Newly Independent States; completion of an exchange of Europol and U.S. law enforcement officials; and fighting narcotraffickers in the Caribbean and trafficking in women in Central Asia and the NIS.
- o Building Bridges Across the Atlantic: The U.S. and EU have given Democracy and Civil Society Awards to reformers in Europe's young democracies. We are implementing a Science and Technology Agreement to promote cooperation between our scientists. And we will hold a "Bridging the Atlantic" conference with NGOs in Austria this month.

FUTURE OF NATO

What's at stake? What is the U.S. interest?

- o More than a defense pact, NATO remains the key political and security link between North America and Europe.

What are we doing?

- o The U.S. is committed to maintaining roughly 100,000 troops in Europe; Alliance forces safeguard our vital interests. At the July 1997 Summit in Madrid, the NATO states agreed to create a new, larger NATO, internally restructured, equipped for new roles and missions, and open to new members and deeper partnerships.

NATO Enlargement

- o A larger NATO can help erase the outdated divisions of the Cold War, ensure stable relations among its members, and improve the ability of Europe and America to confront common challenges. At Madrid, NATO members invited Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary to join. Accession protocols were signed in December, and in April the U.S. Senate voted 80-19 in favor. We hope the new members will join by April 1999 at the next NATO Summit in Washington. Even after the first aspirants join, NATO will remain open to others.

NATO-Russia

- o In May 1997 Russia and NATO signed the "Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security", enshrining a deeper partnership, including a Permanent Joint Council, enabling NATO and Russia to consult, cooperate, and (where possible) take joint action. The Founding Act is an historic step toward a partnership between Russia and NATO, while preserving NATO's integrity. Russia has a voice -- but not a veto -- in NATO matters, and works with -- but not within -- the Alliance.

Partnership for Peace (PfP) / Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC)

- o In May 1997, NATO and its Partners created the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, a new political framework for PfP, NATO's cooperative military program with non-members. The EAPC allows NATO and its Partners to consult and confront common challenges.
- o An independent, democratic, and stable Ukraine is one of the key factors for ensuring stability in Central and Eastern Europe and the continent as a whole. The NATO-Ukraine Charter provides a framework for developing a distinctive partnership between Ukraine and the Alliance that will contribute to a peaceful, secure, undivided, and prosperous Europe.

Is NATO relevant to Europe's new security challenges?

- o Yes. NATO has revised its strategy and restructured its force posture. Its peacekeeping role in Bosnia demonstrates NATO's commitment to assume new security tasks.

RUSSIA: SUPPORT FOR REFORM

What's at stake? What is the U.S. interest?

- o The emergence of new Russia is an opportunity for cooperative, mutually beneficial relations and to integrate Russia into the global mainstream. It is a long and difficult process, but we are committed to help Russia move along this path.
- o Our nations share enduring interests: non-proliferation; a stable and peaceful Europe; bilateral arms control. We face common security challenges -- terrorism and ethnic conflict. Russia's success in its transformation will enhance both nations' ability to meet the challenges of the next century.

Russian Economic Crisis

- o Primakov's government has pledged to continue market reforms. Its policy is still not clear. As Secretary Albright said in Chicago on Oct. 2, "we cannot say with confidence that Russia will emerge from its difficulties any time soon. Nor should we assume the worst, for there are still plenty of people in Russia who will fight against turning back the clock." We will work with Russia to advance common interests. How much we can do together will depend in the months ahead on the choices the Russians and their leaders make themselves.

What is the U.S. doing?

- o Our engagement with Russia has produced significant results. We are making deep cuts in our nuclear arsenals; Russian troops have left the Baltic states; Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine are now non-nuclear states. Russian and U.S. soldiers are serving side-by-side in Bosnia.
- o Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin, along with the other NATO heads of state, are building a new relationship between Russia and NATO. The NATO-Russia Founding Act will institutionalize cooperation to meet the military and security challenges of the next century. Through the Permanent Joint Council, Russia has a voice (but not a veto) in NATO deliberations; the PJC serves as a venue for discussion on issues of mutual concern.
- o President Clinton's trip to Moscow in September produced important results for our national security -- agreements on plutonium disposition, missile launches, and early warning. These agreements will enhance the security of all Americans.

Isn't Russia acting like a competitor, not a partner?

- o Obviously, the U.S. and Russia have differences over a variety of issues, such as Iraq and Russian cooperation with Iran. We will continue to play an active role in seeking Russian adherence to international norms, including respect for its neighbors.

ARMS CONTROL & NON-PROLIFERATION OBJECTIVES

What's at stake? What are U.S. interests?

- o Proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and destabilizing conventional arms pose a serious danger to U.S. and international security.

What are we doing?

- o The Clinton Administration has compiled a record of solid achievement in undoing the daunting legacy of Cold War arms competition and in confronting new and enduring security challenges. For the first time, no Russian or Chinese missiles are pointed at America, and no American missiles are pointed at Russia or China. Other accomplishments include:
 - Securing indefinite extension of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty;
 - Ensuring removal of all nuclear weapons from the territory of other former Soviet republics to Russia for dismantlement;
 - Concluding the U.S.-DPRK Agreed Framework to shut down North Korea's nuclear program;
 - Concluding the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to ban nuclear test explosions;
 - Working with New Independent States to help secure bomb-usable nuclear material ;
 - Ratifying as an original party the Chemical Weapons Convention banning the use, production, and stockpiling of poison gas;
 - Leading the establishment of the Wassenaar Arrangement to prevent destabilizing build-ups of weapons and sensitive technologies in regions of tension.

What are our next priorities?

- Securing Senate approval of the CTBT early next year.
- Ensuring approval of START II by the Russian Duma and, following ratification, engaging in negotiations with Moscow on deeper reductions and verified warhead dismantlement;
- Strengthening the Biological Weapons Convention;
- Negotiating a Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty;
- Concluding a framework agreement with Russia by 2000 to make "excess" U.S. and Russian plutonium permanently unusable for weapons;
- Improving the international community's capacity to prevent humanitarian crises due to destabilizing flows of small arms through establishment of an international center on conflict and small arms;
- Negotiating an agreement to control the transfer of shoulder-fired missiles, which pose a growing danger to civil aviation.

START II/III and the ABM Treaty

What's at stake? What are U.S. interests?

- o President Clinton has expressed the hope that during the next century "the roles and risks of nuclear weapons can be even further reduced, and ultimately eliminated." START II and III will be concrete steps in that direction.

What are we doing?

- o At their meeting in Helsinki in March 1997, Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin reached agreements designed to promote the ratification of START II by Russia and lead to early negotiations on further reductions in nuclear forces.
- o In response to Russian concerns over START II costs, the Presidents agreed to extend the START II deadline for physically destroying the missiles slated for elimination to December 31, 2007. At the same time, they agreed that these systems would be deactivated by December 31, 2003, so that the fundamental benefits of START II will be achieved in roughly the original timeframe.
- o The Presidents also reached an understanding on the elements of a demarcation agreement on higher-velocity theater missile defense (TMD) systems, allowing for TMD while preventing the undermining or circumvention of the ABM Treaty. The viability of the ABM Treaty is central to the continued process of strategic arms reduction.
- o START III negotiations will establish lower levels of 2,000-2,500 strategic nuclear warheads for each country, which represent an 80 percent reduction from Cold War levels.

What are our next priorities?

- o Once the Duma approves the START II Treaty, we will begin START III negotiations for deeper cuts and seek Senate approval of the START II Protocol and the ABM Treaty-related agreements.

Contact: PM/SPN: JStacy/FDeSimone; S/P: LFeinstein x7-3599 10/9/98

NUCLEAR TESTS IN SOUTH ASIA

What's at stake? What's in the U.S. interest?

- o Indian and Pakistani nuclear tests in May threaten stability in the region, are inconsistent with global nonproliferation norms, and set back global arms control and disarmament efforts.

What are we doing?

- o President Clinton has welcomed the announcement of the Pakistani and Indian prime ministers at the UN General Assembly in September that their governments would move toward adherence to the Comprehensive Test Ban treaty within a year. We also welcome their agreement to begin talks in Geneva on a treaty to halt the production of fissile material, the basic building blocks of nuclear weapons.
- o In June, Secretary Albright met with the foreign ministers of Britain, China, France and Russia to coordinate the international community's response to the tests. They agreed on thirteen benchmarks for India and Pakistan, and pledged to cooperate closely to prevent a nuclear and missile arms race on the Subcontinent and to bolster the international non-proliferation regime. In addition to adherence to the CTBT and participation in talks on the Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty (FMCT), the ministers called on India and Pakistan to cease production of fissile material pending negotiation of the FMCT, refrain from weaponizing or deploying nuclear weapons or ballistic missiles capable of delivering them, and refrain from further provocative acts. The ministers reaffirmed the goal of adherence by all countries to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty without modification.
- o The UN Security Council and the G-8 ministers endorsed these principles and benchmarks. In addition, the G-8 ministers agreed to work for the postponement of consideration of loans by the international financial institutions to India and Pakistan, other than loans for "basic human needs."
- o Nations such as Argentina, Brazil, Ukraine, and South Africa that could have gone nuclear but aborted their programs and signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty as non-nuclear weapon states have joined with the G-8 in a special task force to express their grave concern about the May tests.
- o The tests triggered U.S. sanctions, which remain in place, and the President has postponed a long-planned trip to the region. The President and Secretary Albright tasked Deputy Secretary Strobe Talbott to work with the Indians and Pakistanis. We have made some tentative progress, but a lot of tough work remains. The President is still ready to make the visit to South Asia when we have made further, significant progress with our respective security concerns and more latitude exists for using his visit to strengthen our relationships.

CONVENTIONAL ARMS TRANSFER POLICY

What is at stake? What are U.S. interests?

- o Unconstrained or irresponsible arms transfers are destabilizing to regional peace and security and potentially threatening to U.S. military and allied forces.

What is our message?

- o Our conventional arms transfer policy supports arms transfers that meet the legitimate defense requirements of our friends and allies and serve our national security and foreign policy interests.
- o U.S. policy promotes international responsibility and transparency in arms and technology transfers. The United States has the world's most open review process for weapons exports. Our decisions, subject to congressional review, take into account such factors as regional stability, interoperability and burdensharing, prevention of armed aggression, human rights concerns, foreign availability, and support for democracy.

What is the U.S. doing?

- o We led efforts to establish the Wassenaar Arrangement, the first international regime addressing both conventional weapons exports and sensitive dual-use technologies.
- o We work with suppliers bilaterally and through the multilateral channels, such as Wassenaar, to promote responsible arms export policies.
- o Last month at the United Nations, Secretary Albright announced a U.S. Initiative on Conflict and Small Arms to address humanitarian concerns arising from dangerous flows of firearms to regions of conflict. Last year, working with Mexico and our other partners in the Organization of American States, we concluded the first ever convention against illicit firearms trafficking. Secretary Albright has called for the conclusion of a global agreement against illicit firearms trafficking by 1999.
- o We have called for negotiation of an international agreement to place tighter controls on the export of shoulder-fired anti-aircraft missiles -- MANPADS -- which threaten civil aviation.

Contact: PM/ATEC:GStirling x7-0397; S/P:LFeinstein x7-3599 10/9/98

LANDMINES

What is the U.S. interest? What is at stake?

- o Thousands each year are maimed or killed by APL's left behind when armed conflicts end. Uncleared mines can hinder refugee repatriation, economic development, and political stability.
- o Since December 1997, some 129 nations have signed the Ottawa Convention banning all use, production, and export of APLs.

What is our message?

- o The President has reaffirmed his commitment to the elimination of anti-personnel landmines, while meeting our security obligations.
- o The U.S. will sign the Ottawa Convention by 2006 if we succeed in identifying and fielding suitable alternatives to our APLs and mixed anti-tank munitions. Recently, the fortieth state ratified the Ottawa Convention, triggering the six-month countdown for entry into force.
- o Our security obligations do not permit us to sign the Ottawa Convention at this time, although we appreciate the contribution of the Ottawa Process and its supporters. We are undertaking a series of unilateral steps to pursue alternatives to anti-personnel landmines, and are continuing to play a leading role in international demining efforts.

What are we doing?

- o Last May, the U.S. hosted an international conference on Global Humanitarian Demining, part of the "Demining 2010 Initiative", which brought together 21 countries, as well as international, regional, and non-governmental organizations to discuss strengthening coordination of humanitarian demining actions and raising public and private resources for such efforts.
- o The United States has expanded its humanitarian demining program, already the world's largest and most advanced, including intensified development of mine detection and removal technology.
- o We are undertaking independent steps in support of the goal of eliminating anti-personnel landmines, such as:
 - Maintaining the U.S. ban on the sale and export of anti-personnel landmines and working to put this policy into law;
 - Pursuing a global transfer ban in the Conference on Disarmament;
 - Ending the use of all anti-personnel landmines outside Korea by 2003; seeking to have alternatives ready for Korea by 2006; and pursuing alternatives to mixed anti-tank munitions, also prohibited by the convention.

THE COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY

What's at stake? What are U.S. interests?

- o The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), endorsed by four former chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and now ratified by Britain and France, will advance our nuclear nonproliferation and arms control objectives and strengthen international security.
- o The CTBT will constrain the development of more sophisticated and powerful nuclear weapons, and give us a powerful new tool in the fight against nuclear proliferation.
- o The United States currently observes a moratorium on nuclear explosive testing. This agreement will hold other nations to the same standard.

What are we doing?

- o In the fall of 1997, the President submitted the CTBT to the Senate for its approval. Timely Senate action has become more important since the nuclear tests last May in South Asia. The President has urged the Senate to give its advice and consent to ratification as early as possible next year.
- o As an essential safeguard to accompany the CTBT, we have instituted a stockpile stewardship program to maintain a safe and reliable nuclear deterrent.

Can a CTBT Be Verified?

- o The CTBT provides for a comprehensive verification system, including an international monitoring system, on-site inspections, consultations, and confidence-building measures. Combined with U.S. national monitoring capabilities and our diplomatic efforts, these measures, will give us the ability to effectively verify the CTBT.
- o Nothing is 100 percent certain, and attempts to evade a treaty's provisions are always possible. Planned improvements in U.S. national technical capabilities and the addition of international sensors mandated by the treaty will further strengthen our ability to monitor compliance.

When Will This Agreement Enter into Force?

- o The CTBT will enter into force after 44 countries with nuclear power or research reactors become parties to the agreement. All in this group except India, Pakistan, and North Korea have signed. At the UN General Assembly in September, the Pakistani and Indian Prime Ministers announced that they would move toward CTBT adherence by September 1999, when states that have approved the agreement may convene a special conference to promote the CTBT's early entry into force.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(New York, New York)

For Immediate Release

September 21, 1998

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO THE OPENING SESSION
OF THE 53RD UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

United Nations
New York, New York

11:13 A.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. Mr. President, Mr. Secretary General, the delegates of this 53rd session of the General Assembly, let me begin by thanking you for your very kind and generous welcome and by noting that at the opening of this General Assembly the world has much to celebrate.

Peace has come to Northern Ireland after 29 long years. Bosnia has just held its freest elections ever. The United Nations is actively mediating crises before they explode into war all around the world. And today more people determine their own destiny than at any previous moment in history.

We celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, with those rights more widely embraced than ever before. On every continent people are leading lives of integrity and self-respect, and a great deal of credit for that belongs to the United Nations.

Still, as every person in this room knows, the promise of our time is attended by perils. Global economic turmoil today threatens to undermine confidence in free markets and democracy. Those of us who benefit particularly from this economy have a special responsibility to do more to minimize the turmoil and extend the benefits of global markets to all citizens. And the United States is determined to do that.

We still are bedeviled by ethnic, racial, religious and tribal hatreds; by the spread of weapons of mass destruction; by

the almost frantic effort of too many states to acquire such weapons; and, despite all efforts to contain it, terrorism is not fading away with the end of the 20th century. It is a continuing defiance of Article 3 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which says, "Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person."

Here at the U.N., at international summits around the world, and on many occasions in the United States, I have had the opportunity to address this subject in detail, to describe what we have done, what we are doing, and what we must yet do to combat terror. Today, I would like to talk to you about why all nations must put the fight against terrorism at the top of our agenda.

Obviously this is a matter of profound concern to us. In the last 15 years our citizens have been targeted over and over again -- in Beirut, over Lockerbie, in Saudi Arabia, at home in Oklahoma City by one of our own citizens, and even here in New York in one of our most public buildings, and most recently on August 7th in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam, where Americans who devoted their lives to building bridges between nations, people very much like all of you, died in a campaign of hatred against the United States.

Because we are blessed to be a wealthy nation with a powerful military and a worldwide presence active in promoting peace and security, we are often a target. We love our country for its dedication to political and religious freedom, to economic opportunity, to respect for the rights of the individual. But we know many people see us as a symbol of a system and values they reject, and often they find it expedient to blame us for problems with deep roots elsewhere.

But we are no threat to any peaceful nation, and we believe the best way to disprove these claims is to continue our work for peace and prosperity around the world. For us to pull back from the world's trouble spots, to turn our backs on those taking risks for peace, to weaken our own opposition to terrorism, would hand the enemies of peace a victory they must never have.

Still, it is a grave misconception to see terrorism as only, or even mostly, an American problem. Indeed, it is a clear and present danger to tolerant and open societies and innocent people everywhere. No one in this room, nor the people you represent, are immune.

Certainly not the people of Nairobi and Dar es Salaam. For every American killed there, roughly 20 Africans were murdered and 500 more injured -- innocent people going about their business on a busy morning. Not the people of Omagh in Northern Ireland, where the wounded and killed were Catholics and Protestants alike, mostly children and women, and two of them pregnant, people out shopping together, when their future was snuffed out by a fringe group clinging to the past.

Not the people of Japan who were poisoned by sarin gas in the Tokyo subway. Not the people of Argentina who died when a car bomb decimated a Jewish community center in Buenos Aires. Not the people of Kashmir and Sri Lanka killed by ancient animosities that cry out for resolution. Not the Palestinians and Israelis who still die year after year for all the progress toward peace. Not the people of Algeria enduring the nightmare of unfathomable terror with still no end in sight. Not the people of Egypt, who nearly lost a second President to assassination. Not the people of Turkey, Colombia, Albania, Russia, Iran, Indonesia, and countless other nations where innocent people have been victimized by terror.

Now, none of these victims are American, but every one was a son or a daughter, a husband or wife, a father or mother, a human life extinguished by someone else's hatred, leaving a circle of people whose lives will never be the same. Terror has become the world's problem. Some argue, of course, that the problem is overblown, saying that the number of deaths from terrorism is comparatively small, sometimes less than the number of people killed by lightning in a single year. I believe that misses the point in several ways.

First, terrorism has a new face in the 1990s. Today terrorists take advantage of greater openness and the explosion of information and weapons technology. The new technologies of terror and their increasing availability, along with the increasing mobility of terrorists, raise chilling prospects of vulnerability to chemical, biological, and other kinds of attacks, bringing each of us into the category of possible victim. This is a threat to all humankind.

Beyond the physical damage of each attack, there is an even greater residue of psychological damage -- hard to measure, but slow to heal. Every bomb, every bomb threat has an insidious effect on free and open institutions, the kinds of institutions all of you in this body are working so hard to build.

Each time an innocent man or woman or child is killed, it makes the future more hazardous for the rest of us. For each violent act saps the confidence that is so crucial to peace and prosperity. In every corner of the world, with the active support of U.N. agencies, people are struggling to build better futures, based on bonds of trust connecting them to their fellow citizens and with partners and investors from around the world.

The glimpse of growing prosperity in Northern Ireland was a crucial factor in the Good Friday Agreement. But that took confidence -- confidence that cannot be bought in times of violence. We can measure each attack and the grisly statistics of dead and wounded, but what are the wounds we cannot measure?

In the Middle East, in Asia, in South America, how many agreements have been thwarted after bombs blew up? How many businesses will never be created in places crying out for investments of time and money? How many talented young people in countries represented here have turned their backs on public service?

The question is not only how many lives have been lost in each attack, but how many futures were lost in their aftermath. There is no justification for killing innocents. Ideology, religion, and politics, even deprivation and righteous grievance do not justify it. We must seek to understand the roiled waters in which terror occurs; of course we must.

Often, in my own experience, I have seen where peace is making progress, terror is a desperate act to turn back the tide of history. The Omagh bombing came as peace was succeeding in Northern Ireland. In the Middle East, whenever we get close to another step toward peace, its enemies respond with terror. We must not let this stall our momentum.

The bridging of ancient hatreds is, after all, a leap of faith, a break with the past, and thus a frightening threat to those who cannot let go of their own hatred. Because they fear the future, in these cases terrorists seek to blow the peacemakers back into the past.

We must also acknowledge that there are economic sources of this rage as well. Poverty, inequality, masses of disenfranchised young people are fertile fields for the siren call of the terrorists and their claims of advancing social justice. But depravation cannot justify destruction, nor can inequity ever atone for murder. The killing of innocents is not a social program.

Nevertheless, our resolute opposition to terrorism does not mean we can ever be indifferent to the conditions that foster it. The most recent U.N. human development report suggests the gulf is widening between the world's haves and have-nots. We must work harder to treat the sources of despair before they turn into the poison of hatred. Dr. Martin Luther King once wrote that the only revolutionary is a man who has nothing to lose. We must show people they have everything to gain by embracing cooperation and renouncing violence. This is not simply an American or a Western responsibility; it is the world's responsibility.

Developing nations have an obligation to spread new wealth fairly, to create new opportunities, to build new open economies. Developed nations have an obligation to help developing nations stay on the path of prosperity and -- and -- to spur global economic growth. A week ago I outlined ways we can build a stronger international economy to benefit not only all nations, but all citizens within them.

Some people believe that terrorism's principal fault line centers on what they see as an inevitable clash of civilizations. It is an issue that deserves a lot of debate in this great hall. Specifically, many believe there is an inevitable clash between Western civilization and Western values, and Islamic civilizations and values. I believe this view is terribly wrong. False prophets may use and abuse any religion to justify whatever political objectives they have -- even cold-blooded murder. Some may have the world believe that almighty God himself, the merciful, grants a license to kill. But that is not our understanding of Islam.

A quarter of the world's population is Muslim -- from Africa to Middle East to Asia and to the United States, where Islam is one of our fastest growing faiths. There are over 1,200 mosques and Islamic centers in the United States, and the number is rapidly increasing. The 6 million Americans who worship there will tell you there is no inherent clash between Islam and America. Americans respect and honor Islam.

As I talked to Muslim leaders in my country and around the world, I see again that we share the same hopes and aspirations: to live in peace and security, to provide for our children, to follow the faith of our choosing, to build a better life than our parents knew and pass on brighter possibilities to our own children. Of course, we are not identical. There are important

differences that cross race and culture and religion which demand understanding and deserve respect.

But every river has a crossing place. Even as we struggle here in America, like the United Nations, to reconcile all Americans to each other and to find greater unity in our increasing diversity, we will remain on a course of friendship and respect for the Muslim world. We will continue to look for common values, common interests, and common endeavors. I agree very much with the spirit expressed by these words of Mohammed: rewards for prayers by people assembled together are twice those said at home.

When it comes to terrorism there should be no dividing line between Muslims and Jews, Protestants and Catholics, Serbs and Albanians, developed societies and emerging countries. The only dividing line is between those who practice, support, or tolerate terror, and those who understand that it is murder, plain and simple.

If terrorism is at the top of the American agenda -- and should be at the top of the world's agenda -- what, then, are the concrete steps we can take together to protect our common destiny. What are our common obligations? At least, I believe they are these: to give terrorists no support, no sanctuary, no financial assistance; to bring pressure on states that do; to act together to step up extradition and prosecution; to sign the Global Anti-Terror Conventions; to strengthen the Biological Weapons and Chemical Convention; to enforce the Chemical Weapons Convention; to promote stronger domestic laws and control the manufacture and export of explosives; to raise international standards for airport security; to combat the conditions that spread violence and despair.

We are working to do our part. Our intelligence and law enforcement communities are tracking terrorist networks in cooperation with other governments. Some of those we believe responsible for the recent bombing of our embassies have been brought to justice. Early this week I will ask our Congress to provide emergency funding to repair our embassies, to improve security, to expand the worldwide fight against terrorism, to help our friends in Kenya and Tanzania with the wounds they have suffered.

But no matter how much each of us does alone, our progress will be limited without our common efforts. We also will do our part to address the sources of despair and alienation through the Agency for International Development in Africa, in Asia, in

Latin America, in Eastern Europe, in Haiti and elsewhere. We will continue our strong support for the U.N. Development Program, the U.N. High Commissioners for Human Rights and Refugees, UNICEF, the World Bank, the World Food Program.

We also recognize the critical role these agencies play and the importance of all countries, including the United States, in paying their fair share.

In closing, let me urge all of us to think in new terms on terrorism, to see it not as a clash of cultures or political action by other means, or a divine calling, but a clash between the forces of the past and the forces of the future, between those who tear down and those who build up, between hope and fear, chaos and community.

The fight will not be easy. But every nation will be strengthened in joining it, in working to give real meaning to the words of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights we signed 50 years ago. It is very, very important that we do this together.

Eleanor Roosevelt was one of the authors of the Universal Declaration. She said in one of her many speeches in support of the United Nations, when it was just beginning, "All agreements and all peace are built on confidence. You cannot have peace and you cannot get on with other people in the world unless you have confidence in them."

It is not necessary that we solve all the world's problems to have confidence in one another. It is not necessary that we agree on all the world's issues to have confidence in one another. It is not even necessary that we understand every single difference among us to have confidence in one another. But it is necessary that we affirm our belief in the primacy of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, and, therefore, that together we say terror is not a way to tomorrow, it is only a throwback to yesterday. And together -- together -- we can meet it and overcome its threats, its injuries, and its fears with confidence.

Thank you very much. (Applause.)

END

11:37 A.M. EDT

Draft 10/16/98 5 pm
Waldman/Shih

PRESIDENT WILLIAM J. CLINTON
RADIO ADDRESS ON THE INTERNATIONAL ECONOMY
THE WHITE HOUSE
October 17, 1998

Good morning. This week, we reached bipartisan agreement on a balanced budget that invests in our people. I am proud of the results: 100,000 new teachers; new protections for the environment; aid for farmers. We maintained fiscal discipline by setting aside the surplus until we save Social Security. And, this new budget will help strengthen our economy by meeting our commitment to the International Monetary Fund, the IMF. Let me tell you why this is so important.

America's economy is the strongest in a generation. We have a balanced budget and nearly 17 million new jobs. Unemployment has been below five percent for more than a year ... inflation is at historic lows ... and after stagnating for decades, wages are rising at twice the rate of inflation.

More than ever, this economic strength rests upon the strength of an increasingly interdependent world economy. Much of our recent growth has come from expanded exports. But over the past year, the world's financial markets have been in turmoil. Already, countries around the world are having a harder time affording American goods, from wheat to apples, computer chips to jumbo jets. We must act to promote our prosperity and protect our people at this critical moment. This week, we did.

A month ago, at the Council on Foreign Relations, I said that the balance of risks had shifted, from inflation to slowdown -- and all nations must work together to promote growth. Through the IMF, nations join together to help economically troubled countries that are willing to help themselves. That is why I worked hard with Democratic and Republican members of Congress to meet our commitment to strengthening the IMF.

Our \$18 billion contribution will leverage \$90 billion in international resources -- expanding the IMF's reserves by 40%. A newly strengthened IMF can enhance confidence and help stabilize the world economy. Now, the challenge we face is to bring the IMF's new force to bear on the task restoring growth around the world.

With these new funds, we will be able to press forward in our efforts to make the IMF more accountable, more focused on growth, and better equipped to address the economic crises of the 21st Century. And we will ensure that U.S. resources are used prudently to advance America's interests in a strong world economy.

By funding the IMF and keeping our economy sound and strong, the United States is

doing our part. But other nations, especially the other leading economies, must do their part as well. Europe must continue to promote growth-oriented economic policies and keep its markets open.

And Japan, the world's second largest economy and by far the largest in Asia, faces the most important task of all. The United States values our strong partnership with Japan -- our political, our security, our economic partnership. But now the health of Asia's economy and, indeed, the world's depends upon Japan. It must spur economic growth, open and deregulate its economy, and take immediate and effective steps to strengthen its financial system. I welcome the legislation recently secured by Prime Minister Obuchi to repair Japan's troubled banking system. Now it is critical to avoid further delay by moving quickly and effectively to implement these reforms.

At the same time, we will continue to promote global growth and strengthen the world financial system. I am working with other nations to make it possible for nations with strong economic policies to obtain 'precautionary' lines of credit, so they can act quickly if the economic crisis heads their way. And we are working with other nations to modernize our financial institutions so we are better able to meet the economic challenges of the 21st Century.

When he led the effort to create the IMF, President Franklin Roosevelt said that it "spelled the difference between a world caught again in the maelstrom of panic and economic warfare, or a world in which nations strive for a better life through mutual trust, cooperation and assistance." This week, we have strengthened the IMF's ability to make that difference. When America acts, and America leads, we can build a stronger, more prosperous economy -- for our people, and for the world. Thanks for listening.

REMARKS BY FIRST LADY HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON

THE CENTER FOR NATIONAL POLICY

WASHINGTON, D.C.

SEPTEMBER 17, 1998

I would like to thank my friend, Secretary Albright, for those kind words. It's a pleasure to be here with so many of my friends who care so much about this country, and who have worked so hard, in both public and private life, to make it live up to its ideals. Thank you to the President of the Center for National Policy, Maureen (Mo) Steinbruner; Co-chairs of the Center Mike Barnes and Joyce Ladner; the two people who helped put together this wonderful dinner -- Ruth Harkin and "Mack" McClarty -- who has played such an invaluable role in shaping our policies toward Latin America. I'm also pleased to join members of Congress -- including Representative Lee Hamilton -- last year's recipient of the Edmund S. Muskie Distinguished Public Service Award; members of the Diplomatic corps; and the many guests and friends of the Center. I'm especially pleased to see Jane Muskie and other members of the Muskie family here this evening.

I join all of you tonight in mourning the loss of a great friend of the Center's and all of us -- Kirk O'Donnell. In the rough and tumble world of politics, his life exemplified the spirit of public service and private principle. We all know what great gifts he brought to making this Center the vibrant, active, and effective force that it is today -- and we will miss him greatly. Our thoughts and prayers are with his family and friends tonight.

I want to say a word about my friend, Secretary of State Madeleine Albright -- who is committed to defending the rights not just of Americans but of citizens around the world. Not only has Madeleine Albright broken many a glass ceiling -- by virtue of her own gender -- she's brokered many a peace, by virtue of her remarkable skills and tenacity. She's opened doors -- so that others can follow -- and she has opened minds, so others can change. I've had the enormous pleasure of traveling and working with her over the years, and have benefitted greatly from her wisdom, her humor -- and most of all, her friendship. Thank you, Madeleine, for all you have done.

First, I want to thank the Center, and all of you, for the great honor you have given me here tonight. Ed Muskie's life reflected a deep commitment to the principles of freedom and justice -- here at home and overseas. And he carried out his many responsibilities with great fairness, warmth, and intelligence. Whether he walked the backroads of Maine, or the corridors of power, he represented the best of America: our optimism that we can create a better future; the spirit of public service; and a deep commitment to forge bipartisan support for our national and international objectives. He was a highly respected leader and treasured friend of the Center's -- and I thank you for honoring me in his memory.

Tonight, I want to talk about a topic that was always close to Ed Muskie's heart -- the need to more fully engage the American people in our nation's foreign policy. Some of you might well be asking -- what did that film which you just saw -- where I was shown talking with women about their concerns in distant villages around the world -- have to do with our foreign policy?

My answer is that efforts to advance the status of women worldwide -- whether it's raising their level of education or ensuring safe motherhood or helping women gain greater economic independence -- must never be seen as "soft issues" -- or "side issues." They are as essential to the prosperity and stability of our global community as are the investments we make in open markets and trade. They are -- in fact - - at the core of our foreign policy objectives -- and the very progress of all nations.

Three years ago, in Beijing, I joined Secretary Albright at the 4th World UN Conference on Women. And the most powerful message that came out of that conference was that the progress of a country depends on women having equal access to life's basic tools of opportunity. And that no nation can move forward until all its citizens are able to participate fully in the political, social, and economic life of their country.

Over the past six years, I've seen first hand how America's programs overseas have helped further that progress -- by lifting up the lives of ordinary people in nations around the world -- particularly the lives of women.

From Nicaragua to Uganda, I've seen how a small loan to women villagers -- sometimes only a few dollars, can transform the lives of women and their families, and dramatically improve the resources and income of an entire community. One woman in Bangladesh told me about how she borrowed money to buy a milk cow -- and by selling the milk from that cow -- she bought another. And as the proud owner of two cows -- she was able to buy a rickshaw for her husband, so that he could become a taxi driver in their village. And I'm heartened by the increased interest among nations and non governmental agencies to promote these micro-credit opportunities.

In Bolivia, I met with expectant mothers at a primary health center run by an NGO with support from the government. They had created a safe place for very poor women to come and get health care. The women -- with their ruddy faces and bowler hats -- were receiving prenatal check ups and having their infants immunized. They were also learning about family planning, and how to space births so that they -- and their children -- would more likely survive -- and be able to lead a better life.

In Senegal, I visited a small village where education for girls, and women's adult literacy programs, had become a top priority. They saw how those efforts were the first steps in helping the village understand how it could work together to create more prosperity -- and how it could take five hectares of barren land, and turn it into an oasis of green -- growing products that could not only support the village, but be sold in the marketplace as well. When you educate a girl today, you help create a leader for tomorrow -- a leader within the family and the community. It's the single greatest investment any nation can make in its future.

When we work to stop the trafficking of women and end the brutal practice of female genital mutilation; when we work to promote women to elected office, and enable them to gain greater economic independence -- we advance the future of other nations -- and our own interests as well.

Today, we face unparalleled opportunities to share the world's prosperity and growth -- and continue the march of democracy around the world. Yet powerful global forces threaten to destroy the gains being made. The bombings of the U.S. Embassies in Tanzania and Kenya, where the lives of so many Americans and Africans were tragically lost. The global financial crisis -- which is pushing millions of people back under the yoke of poverty, and affecting the pocketbooks and stock markets of people from Argentina to Japan. These are grim reminders of the down side of our interconnected and interdependent world. They demonstrate once again how events in one corner of the globe impact the lives and fortunes of us all -- for better and for worse.

We are at a critical moment in world affairs. While more and more nations across the globe have made the fundamental choice in favor of democracy and free trade -- the leaders of those nations are engaged in perhaps an even more difficult job: to translate those new found freedoms into tangible benefits for ordinary citizens. We must have the resources to support those efforts in such fragile times, so that people don't question their commitment to freedom -- and slide back toward more repressive or corrupt regimes.

Yet at this time when American leadership -- and American foreign assistance -- are more critical than ever -- we continue to see a decreasing amount of attention being paid to our role in the world -- and diminishing support for international aid. There's a real -- and disturbing -- disconnect. As Under secretary of State for Political Affairs, Thomas Pickering, told me yesterday, we're moving backward, not forward -- and even the smallest amounts of aid are unavailable to meet these pressing needs.

Much is at risk. The peaceful -- yet incomplete -- transition of the newly independent states in Eastern Europe to stable, market democracies is vital to growth of that region -- and our national security. Yet the USAID assistance programs that would help those countries push for market reforms and support democratic forces are in danger of being cut. We cannot allow Congress to decimate this program.

In Africa, we're investing in the rule of law to help prevent future genocide on that continent -- and supporting Radio Democracy, which will help strengthen fledgling democracies in that region. We cannot allow Congressional cuts to weaken those efforts.

Through AID's International Disaster Assistance funds, we respond to natural and manmade disasters worldwide -- helping to suppress raging fires in Mexico, feeding starving children in Sudan, and promoting ethnic reconciliation on Bosnia. We cannot allow Congressional cuts to jeopardize this program.

This is no time to withdraw our involvement -- or attention. It's time to act. If we care -- as we do -- about opening foreign markets for American goods and services -- and if we want to help stabilize the financial crisis that is wrecking havoc in our world -- then Congress must fully fund the International Monetary Fund -- including the President's request for an additional \$18 billion.

If we care -- as we do -- about making our country secure in the face of new post-cold war threats, then we must pay our debts to the United Nations. Unfortunately, that issue has become entangled in an unrelated one -- family planning overseas. I respect the deeply held views of both sides. But we cannot continue to fail to pay our dues because of this unrelated issue. It's an outrage that the richest and most powerful country in the world is the number one debtor to the United Nations.

If we care -- as we do -- about expanding and sustaining the world's community of democracies, and strengthening our own security -- then we must fully fund the Foreign Operations budget -- and the many foreign assistance programs -- some of which I've mentioned this evening -- that give citizens the tools to improve their lives.

And if we care -- as we do -- that women around the world make up 70% of the poor and two thirds of those who can't read or write -- then we must support investments in lifelines like microcredit and education. And we must join the rest of the world and ratify the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women. Despite the fact that our government signed this treaty almost two decades ago, and despite its proven track record as an effective tool to improve women's rights -- the United States stands alone among industrialized democracies in not ratifying it.

Today, I believe we have a very real opportunity to right our priorities -- and engage public and Congressional support -- much like we did at the end of World War II. Back then, leaders such as Harry Truman and George Marshall had the vision to look beyond the wartime devastation and the underlying hostilities to a Europe in which regional cooperation would transcend adversarial boundaries and traditional rivalries. They believed that large-scale economic cooperation would facilitate not only postwar recovery but also long-term prosperity and international peace. And US leadership was instrumental in the creation of the United Nations, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and NATO.

They understood back then that it wasn't enough to mobilize the government. They needed to lead a major campaign to educate the public, mobilize key constituencies, and persuade reluctant partners to make sure this great achievement would taken place. I've been reading about what a concerted, national effort that was -- and how leaders in government, and business, civic organizations, and religious institutions were enlisted to go from town to town -- speaking to rotary clubs and civic groups -- to bring their message home.

And that is what we must all do today -- to convince Americans -
- including members of Congress -- that our foreign policy not only
improves lives and strengthens the forces of freedom overseas -- but that
it directly affects the quality of life here at home -- including our jobs,
our pocketbooks, and our security. Above all, we must demonstrate that
if we are to maintain a strong, open, and democratic society here in
America -- we must promote those same values and opportunities
among citizens around the globe.

From what I understand from recent polls, Americans are far more
interested in these issues than they are given credit for. Here's the good
news: the overwhelming majority of Americans -- 86% -- believe we
should be involved overseas -- and they support international efforts like
the United Nations and foreign aid. Here's the bad news: That support is
often overshadowed by the fear that we are doing too much -- more than
our fair share. Yet when asked, many citizens believed our
commitments are far greater than they actually are. And as a result --
when a member of Congress votes against foreign aid -- the phones in
many of their offices remain silent. Their constituents don't call.

In other words, our work to more fully engage Americans won't be easy. And it's up to all of us -- academics; business leaders; foundations; the media; civic organizations -- to first clear up the misperceptions about foreign aid -- it actually makes up less than 1% of our total budget -- the lowest percentage -- in fact -- of any industrialized nation. And second, to help make the benefits of our investments overseas real -- and meaningful -- to the lives of ordinary citizens.

One of the ways we can do that is to show how much we learn from each other. I wish others could have joined me a few years ago, when I have visited a poor inner city neighborhood in Baltimore, Maryland, where grassroots strategies pioneered in Nairobi, Kenya, are now being used by community health workers in Baltimore to improve childhood immunization rates. And as a result, those immunization rates have soared. Thanks to an AID-sponsored effort -- "Lessons Without borders" -- we're helping to spreading the word about effective programs overseas -- like the one in Nairobi -- to communities here at home.

I wish others could have joined me, when I visited programs in this country -- including in this city -- that help women -- on the model of a lending bank in India, to acquire the same skills and the same access to credit that transformed lives many, many miles away. Today, this Administration -- through the Small Business Administration -- is making more loans than ever to women. And it's making a difference in the lives of families and communities across America.

Our leadership overseas -- and our efforts to empower citizens in their own communities -- are commitments that should matter to everyone. Yesterday afternoon, I met with a group of distinguished, committed Americans -- including a former secretary of state -- foundation heads, and experienced leaders from both inside and outside of government, to help think through how we can mobilize public engagement -- and build bipartisan Congressional support -- for our nation's foreign policy agenda.

We talked about the need to create a new way of explaining our commitments overseas, at a time when the boundaries between national and foreign interests continue to blur. As one of our top foreign policy advisors noted -- we're going from a familiar paradigm to a paradox. For the past fifty years, our foreign policy was based on dealing with one single monolithic threat to freedom -- communism. And that challenge was what fueled funding not only for our defense and foreign policy -- but for our investments in education, and roads, and other national priorities. Today, with the end of the Cold War -- we must articulate a new vision for ourselves and the world -- even as the old maps have been erased -- and the new ones not yet drawn.

And we must grapple with the paradox that while we are more interdependent than ever -- and the need for strong American leadership is greater than ever -- that the public's attention and engagement is turning away.

What better place to begin thinking creatively about how to build and strengthen bipartisan support for American foreign policy than here -- at the Center for National Policy -- and the people in this room. I hope tonight -- in honor of Ed Muskie's legacy -- that we will redouble our efforts to meet this -- perhaps the greatest challenge facing us in the 21st century.

We recognize that everyone must be part of this advocacy effort. But there is one priority I hope we can all agreed upon -- and that's to do a better job of engaging our young people in these vital issues.

They are the ones who could help build a world where we are as concerned about violence against women in their own homes as we are about outside terrorist threats; a world where we value basic freedoms of speech, and religion, and association as much as we treasure the benefits of the free market; a world where we recognize that by lifting up the lives of women and children in the poorest villages in the world, that we, as Americans, will be closer to fulfilling our own extraordinary potential -- as individuals, and as a nation.

I look forward to working with all of you to bring us closer to that day.

Thank you.