ARMS Email System
RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Raymond F. Hopkins ("Raymond F. Hopkins" <rhopkin1@swarthmore.edu> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:26-FEB-1998 13:29:29.00

SUBJECT: Key U.S. House panel passes Africa trade bill(fwd)

TO: Mark R. Hopkins (CN=Mark R. Hopkins/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Dear Mark,

Here is some more info....Hope it is helpful, at least at the

margin. Love, Dad

> WASHINGTON, Feb 25 (Reuters) - A key House of
>Representatives panel on Wednesday passed with strong bipartisan
>support the first major U.S. initiative to boost trade and
>investment with Africa.
> The legislation, which among other things would give greater
>duty-free access to U.S. markets for more products from
>sub-Saharan Africa, passed the House Ways and Means unanimously
>by voice vote.
> It passed after members addressed concerns by U.S. textile
>manufacturers about possible illegal transshipments of textiles
>by other countries through Africa to avoid U.S. import quotas.
> Supporters of the legislation, which would also promote an
>effort to negotiate free trade agreements with African
>countries, said it was a first step to expand economic growth in
>the continent through commerce rather than traditional direct

>financial aid.

> "Traditional foreign aid has not led to the level of
>economic development and improved living standards that we would
>like to see on the African continent," said Rep. Phil Crane of
>Illinois. Crane heads the Ways and Means subcommittee on trade
>and was a main sponsor of the legislation.

> "Active participation in the global marketplace is essential
>to stimulating Africa's economy," Crane added. "With a combined
>population of nearly 600 million people, sub-Saharan Africa
>should become a major export market for U.S. goods and
>services."

> With fast track trade negotiation legislation increasingly
>unlikely to pass Congress this year, the Africa trade bill is
>likely to be President Bill Clinton's biggest legislative
>achievement on the trade front this year.

> The lack of fast track authority, which allows the president
>to negotiate international trade agreements that cannot be
>altered by Congress, will also likely hamper efforts to
>negotiate free trade agreements with African countries.

> Administration officials say trading partners are reluctant
>to put their best offers forward when they know any agreement
>would be subject to the amendment process in Congress.

> U.S. Trade Representative Charlene Barshefsky, who spoke
>before the Ways and Means panel on Wednesday in support of the
>trade bill, said it will help provide a foundation to expand
>trade and accelerate economic reforms in the region.

> "The strong bi-partisan vote in favor of Africa trade

>legislation sends a clear signal that the Congress shares the
>President's desire to help move the region toward greater
>economic and political stability," Barshefsky said in a
>statement.
>	The Africa trade legislation could go to the full House for
>a vote within the next few weeks where it is expected to win
>easy passage. But it is not clear whether the bill could pass
>the Senate in time for Clinton's visit to Africa in late March.
>He is scheduled to visit Ghana, Uganda, South Africa, Botswana
>and Senegal.
>	The bill's benefits would go to countries that take steps to
>establish market-based economies and have acceptable human
>rights records.
>	It also expands the U.S. General System of Preference
>program, which allows some goods from developing countries to
>enter the United States duty free, to all imports from eligible
>countries.
>	It would also establish a U.S.-Africa economic forum for
>high-level meetings on economic and trade matters and directs
>the president to develop a plan to negotiate free trade
>agreements with African countries, but does not provide any fast
>track authority to pass them through Congress.
>	U.S. textile manufacturers objected to the bill saying that
>it would encourage more illegal transshipment of textiles
>through Africa. In testimony to Congress last month the American
>Textile Manufacturers Institute said eight sub-Saharan nations
>already have been identified as transshipment routes for goods

>produced elsewhere to avoid U.S. import quotas.

> In answer to those concerns, the committee passed an

>amendment that would strengthen customs procedures and

>enforcement against illegal textile and apparel transshipments.

>-=-=-

>

Raymond F. Hopkins Phone: (O) 610-328-8093; (H) 610-544-3503; (Fax) 610-328-8442. Address: Richter Professor of Political Science, 500 College Ave., Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa. 19081-1397

ARMS Email System
RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Robert E. Baldwin ("Robert E. Baldwin" <rebaldwi@facstaff.wisc.edu> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-APR-1998 03:47:22.00

SUBJECT: Re: Fast - Track

TO: Mark R. Hopkins (CN=Mark R. Hopkins/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Mark,

I am including the note as part of this email message.

HOW CAN WE EXPLAIN THE FAILURE OF FAST-TRACK IN

THE HOUSE?

Robert E. Baldwin, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Christopher S. Magee, Michigan State University

1. In the 1993 House vote on NAFTA, 108 Democrats or 42% of voting Democrats and 126 or 71% of voting Republicans voted in favor of NAFTA. NAFTA was approved by a margin of 34 votes, with 234 voting in favor of the bill and 200 (including one Independent) voting against the bill.

2. Given the shift in the composition of the House from 257 Democrats, 177 Republicans and 1 Independent in 1993 to 203 Democrats, 237 Republicans, and

1 Independent in late 1997, Fast-Track 1997 would have passed by a margin

of

65 votes if these percentages of favorable votes by party affiliation had continued to hold in 1997. With the same percentage distribution of "yes" and "no" votes, 253 (85 Democrats and 168 Republicans) would have voted to extend fast-track authority and 188 (118 Democrats, 69 Republicans and 1 Independent) would have voted to deny the president this authority.

3. A poll conducted by the National Journal's Congressional Daily the day before the Fast-Track 1997 bill was withdrawn (together with information from various Administration and Congressional sources) indicates that only 43 Democrats or 21% of Democrat members plus between 160-170 or 68%-72% of Republican members or a total of between 202-212 House members would have voted for Fast-Track 1997. Thus, if these percentages had held at the time of the actual vote, the vote to approve Fast-Track 1997 would have fallen short of the 218 votes necessary for House approval by between 6 and 16 votes.

4. The striking feature about the projected Fast-Track 1997 vote is the sharp fall in the support of House Democrats for further free trade agreements from 42% to 21% between 1993 and 1997. Support by House Republicans for such agreements remained constant between these years at about 70%.

5. The decline in Democrat support for further regional free trade agreements can be explained in part by a compositional shift among House Democrats in favor of those in the party that tend to oppose such agreements. Whereas 54% of the Democrats who were in the House in 1993 but were no longer House members in 1997 voted for NAFTA in 1993, only 30% of

the Democrats who were House members in both 1993 and 1996 voted for NAFTA. Support for further trade liberalization also eroded among this latter group between 1993 and 1997. Only 20% of Democrats who were members of the House in both 1993 and 1997 reported they would vote in favor of Fast-Track 1997 -- a fall of 10 percentage points compared with their support for NAFTA. In addition, only 23% of new Democrat members, i.e., Democrats who were House members in 1997 but not in 1993, planned to vote in favor of Fast-Track 1997.

6. In view of our earlier finding that PAC contributions from both organized labor and business interest groups significantly influenced the voting of House members on NAFTA in 1993 and GATT in 1994 (e.g., the greater PAC contributions from labor, the more likely a member was to vote against these bills, whereas the greater PAC contributions from business, the more likely a member was to vote in favor of these measures), one possible explanation for the voting shift might be that changes in the magnitude and distribution among House members of PAC contributions by labor and business between 1994 and 1997 brought about the decline in support for trade liberalization among Democrats.

While we still find the magnitude of PAC contributions from organized labor

and business to be statistically significant explanatory variables in the projected Fast-Track vote, we do not find any statistical support for the hypothesis that changes in PAC spending accounts for the significant change in voting patterns on extending free trade agreements between 1993 and 1997.

Our analysis of those House members who participated in the NAFTA vote and

who also stated how they expected to vote on Fast-Track 1997 shows the influence of additional labor and business PAC contributions on voting behavior to be about the same under the Fast-Track vote as under the NAFTA vote. Utilizing these estimates of the effect an additional $1,000 of contributions from labor and business on the probability of a "yes" or "no" vote, we find that the changes in labor and business PAC contributions to members between 1993 and 1997 result in a net change in the predicted House vote on Fast-Track 1997 by only one vote (an additional vote in favor of Fast-Track 1997).

7. As with the earlier analysis of NAFTA and GATT, the ratings of members by various interest groups are significantly related to voting by members on

Fast-Track 1997, e.g., the higher a member's rating by the AFL-CIO and the American Conservative Union the more likely the member is to vote against Fast-Track 1997, while the higher a member's rating by the Chamber of Commerce and American Security Council the more likely the person is to vote in favor of Fast-Track 1997. However, the impact of differences in these ratings on voting behavior is about the same under the projected fast-track vote and the NAFTA vote.

8. Differences between the perceived economic effects of Fast-Track 1997 and NAFTA appear to be the major explanatory factor accounting for the difference in voting behavior on these measures. For example, in the Fast-Track 1997 vote, the higher the employment in a member's district of workers in industries for which the U.S. is a net importer the more likely was the member to state that he planned to vote against Fast-Track. This variable was not significant in influencing the votes of Democrats or Republicans on NAFTA, thus suggesting a greater current concern for the possible unfavorable employment effects of further trade liberalization on a member's constituents. Similarly, the higher the proportion of workers in a member's district with less than a high school education the more likely was the member to state that he planned to vote against Fast-Track 1997. Again, this relationship was not statistically significant in the NAFTA vote, and it suggests an increased concern among members, especially Democrats, about the possible unfavorable effects of further trade liberalization on the less skilled, low wage groups in the economy. Thus, changes among Democrat members in the perceived economic effects of further free trade agreements

on their constituents rather than changes in campaign contributions or in political ideology seem to be the main reason for the erosion of political support for further free trade agreements.

Footnotes:

1.In late 1997 there were four vacancies due to resignations or death.

2. The various explanatory factors in our statistical model accurately predict 88% of the votes that individual members planned to cast on Fast-Track 1997.

Bob

At 03:16 PM 4/7/1998 -0400, you wrote:

>Just a quick follow-up: the people at tech support said that there wasn't

>any way to read the file. They suggested using the "Save As" feature in

>Word Perfect and then selecting file type as "Word Perfect for Windows

>6.1".

>

>Thanks,

>Mark

>

>

>

Robert E. Baldwin phone 608-263-7397

Department of Economics fax 608-233-8284

Social Science Building

1180 Observatory Drive

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Madison, WI 53706-1393

ARMS Email System
RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Tim Brennan, Policy Sciences ("Tim Brennan, Policy Sciences" <BRENNAN@UMBC2.UMBC.EDU> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:22-JUN-1998 17:11:14.00

SUBJECT: FYI - Tim (Web material? Food for thought?)

TO: brennan (brennan@rff.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Charles F. Stone (CN=Charles F. Stone/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
From: IN%"lists@BENTON.ORG" 22-JUN-1998 12:08:19.66

To: IN%"BENTON-COMPOLICY@CDINET.COM"

CC:

Subj:

Return-path: <owner-benton-compolicy@CDINET.COM>

Received: from periplum.cdinet.com (periplum.cdinet.com)

by UMBC2.UMBC.EDU (PMDF V5.0-6 #1) id <01IYJBP6QHLS0022JJ@UMBC2.UMBC.EDU>;

Mon, 22 Jun 1998 12:08:13 -0500 (EST)

Received: from periplum (periplum [198.77.80.2])

by periplum.cdinet.com (8.7.3/8.6.9) with ESMTP id MAA16668; Mon,

22 Jun 1998 12:02:53 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from CDINET.COM by CDINET.COM (LISTSERV-TCP/IP release 1.8c)

with spool id 19029 for BENTON-COMPOLICY@CDINET.COM; Mon,

22 Jun 1998 11:36:52 -0400

Received: from smtp.enteract.com (thor.enteract.com [206.54.252.9])

by periplum.cdinet.com (8.7.3/8.6.9) with SMTP id LAA15517 for

<benton-compolicy@cdinet.com>; Mon, 22 Jun 1998 11:36:50 -0400 (EDT)

Received: (qmail 8668 invoked from network); Mon, 22 Jun 1998 15:35:56

+0000

Received: from isaiah-20.d.enteract.com (HELO taglang.enteract.com)

(206.54.253.99) by thor.enteract.com with SMTP; Mon, 22 Jun 1998 15:35:56

+0000

Date: Mon, 22 Jun 1998 11:36:50 -0400

From: Kevin Taglang <kevint@BENTON.ORG>

Sender: The Benton Communications Policy Mailing List

<BENTON-COMPOLICY@CDINET.COM>

X-Sender: taglang@pop.enteract.com

To: BENTON-COMPOLICY@CDINET.COM

Reply-to: lists@BENTON.ORG

Message-id: <199806221536.LAA15517@periplum.cdinet.com>

MIME-version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.1.2

Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Approved-By: Kevin Taglang <kevint@BENTON.ORG>

Comments: To: upforgrabs-l@cdinet.com

Posted for Peter Hart, <PHart@FAIR.org>

****

June 18, 1998

FAIR Press Release

NEW STUDY CHALLENGES "LIBERAL MEDIA" CLAIM:

ON ECONOMICS, JOURNALISTS MORE CONSERVATIVE THAN PUBLIC

(read the full report at
http://www.fair.org/reports/journalist-survey.html)

A new survey of 141 journalists indicates that the Washington press corps is more conservative than the general public on a range of economic issues from taxes to trade to health care to Social Security. The survey -- conducted for FAIR by Professor David Croteau of Virginia Commonwealth University -- reveals that while most national journalists identify themselves as "centrists," their views on bread-and-butter issues are often to the right of public opinion.

In a questionnaire targeted primarily at America's most powerful news outlets, journalists were asked policy questions modeled on ones mainstream polling firms had previously asked of the general public. Among the findings:

STATE OF THE ECONOMY: The Washington press corps is far more bullish than the public: Only 5% of the surveyed journalists said that economic conditions today in the U.S. are "fair" or "poor" -- compared to 34% of the general public who chose "only fair" or "poor" in a recent nationwide poll. Most of the journalists declared household incomes at $100,000 or more, with 31% at $150,000 or more. (The median U.S. household income is roughly $36,000.)

CORPORATE POWER: Washington journalists are more conservative than the public on the question of concentrated corporate power. Asked whether "a few large corporations" have "too much power," journalists were much more evenly divided than the public, with 57% to 43% responding affirmatively. Nationwide polls have consistently found the public to be quite one-sided on the question, with 77% (vs. 18%) responding in the affirmative in a 1995 poll.

TAXING THE WEALTHY: The general public appears to be more populist than the press corps on taxation. Asked about President Clinton's 1993 economic plan, journalists responded fairly evenly as to whether the plan "went too far" (14%) or "not far enough" (18%) in raising taxes on the rich. This contrasts with the results of a similar 1993 poll question in which 72% of the public chose "not far enough" and only 15% chose "too far."

TRADE TREATIES: As fervent free-traders, most of the Washington press corps are strongly at odds with the American public. Most polls reveal a public that is negative or dubious about NAFTA's impact on the U.S. But in overwhelming numbers (65% vs. 8%), journalists assess NAFTA as having had a positive impact.

Also, the public opposes giving the President "fast-track" authority to negotiate new trade treaties almost as vehemently (67% opposed in a recent poll) as the surveyed journalists support "fast track" (71% in favor).

ECONOMIC PRIORITIES: Asked to prioritize various issues for the President and Congress, journalists and the public are often at odds.

On entitlements, journalists overwhelmingly chose "reform entitlements," by slowing growth in Medicare and Social Security, as one of the top few priorities. In contrast, most of the public chose "protect Medicare and Social Security against major cuts."

On NAFTA expansion, 24% of journalists chose expansion of NAFTA to other Latin American countries as one of the top few priorities, but only 7 % of the public did. It was actually put "toward bottom of list" by 44% of the public.

On health care, only 32 % of journalists chose "require that employers provide health insurance to employees" as one of the top few priorities, while 47% of the public did.

GUARANTEED MEDICAL CARE: The general public is more emphatic that it is Washington's responsibility to guarantee medical care for all people without health insurance. While journalists were somewhat split on this proposition (43% pro, 35% con), the public supported it in a 1996 poll by a 2-to-1 majority (64% to 29%).

ENVIRONMENT: The only survey question in which journalists appeared to the left of the public asked respondents to choose whether stricter environmental laws "cost too many jobs and hurt the economy" or "are worth the cost." Journalists responded 79%-21% in favor of "worth the cost"; in a 1996 poll, the public also heavily favored that option, but by a lesser majority (63% to 30%).

"I'M A CENTRIST": When asked to characterize their political orientation on social issues as "left," "center" or "right," 57% of surveyed journalists chose center, 30% left and 9% right. When asked to characterize their orientation on economic issues, 64% of the journalists chose center, 19% right and 11% left.

"There appear to be very few national journalists," concluded Croteau, "with left views on economic questions like corporate power and trade -- issues that may well matter more to media owners and advertisers than social issues like gay rights and affirmative action."

In the debate over media bias, FAIR has always argued that journalists' private views are less important than their public performance - for example, who they rely on as sources and experts. "While this survey deflates the conservative caricature of a leftist press corps," said FAIR executive director Jeff Cohen, "it should not be used to reinforce the notion that journalists' views are the primary factor in news bias. The studies that best illuminate bias are FAIR's content examinations of Nightline, PBS's NewsHour, NPR and major dailies."

TAKE ACTION: Contact your local news outlets and ask them to cover the study, which is available in its entirety on FAIR's web site (http://www.fair.org/reports/journalist-survey.html).

Whenever you see news articles or discussions about media that assume a "liberal bias," please bring this study immediately to the attention of that news outlet.

It's standard on the talk show circuit to take the claims of a "liberal media" at face value. This study deflates that myth. With the work of local media activists around the country, we can work to retire this old canard once and for all.

To join the Benton Communications Policy Mailing List, email the following command in the body of a message to listserv@cdinet.com

subscribe benton-compolicy YourFirstName YourLastName

If at any time you would like to unsubscribe from the Benton Communications Policy Mailing List, email the following command in the body of a message to listserv@cdinet.com

signoff benton-compolicy

If you have any problems with the listserv or any questions about the postings, please direct them to benton@benton.org.