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Mr. Secretary General, distinguished colleagues, and friends. I am privileged to serve as your President d'Honneur at our first formal meeting since we selected Willy Claes to succeed the brilliant and dedicated Manfred Woerner.

Secretary General Claes has taken charge at a time of historic opportunity and challenge for the Alliance. As we build European security for the 21st century, we are fortunate to have this statesman of strength and experience at NATO's helm.

The two greatest struggles of the 20th century, the battles against fascism and communism, are over. The fallen Iron Curtain has revealed a window of opportunity for open societies and open markets to prevail across a continent at peace.

It is important to recall that NATO played an essential role in bringing us to this hopeful point. For more than four decades it kept the peace, preserved our freedom, kindled hope in oppressed peoples, and finally helped bring the Cold War to an end -- a victory for all who love freedom.

For half a century, NATO also provided the foundation on which our nations built the greatest community of peace and prosperity the world has ever seen. It cemented close relations among former adversaries in Western Europe. It formed the core of our transatlantic community -- forging links that can never be broken. The ideals embodied in the Treaty of Washington -- democracy, liberty, and the rule of law -- proved no less powerful than the arsenals of this Alliance. Dean Acheson said it best: "the importance of NATO in the long run goes far beyond the creation of military strength.... Future hope lies in the development of a community of free peoples...."
But NATO was not just about yesterday. It is about today and tomorrow -- about Dean Acheson's "future hope."

First let me be clear about my own nation's conviction. American power and purpose are here in Europe to stay. This Alliance will continue to be the anchor of American engagement in Europe, the linchpin of transatlantic security. Through over four decades, under Democratic and Republican administrations, we have maintained a bipartisan commitment to a free, stable, secure, and prosperous Europe. Today, we are committed to keep 100,000 American troops on European soil as part of our continuing engagement.

As we meet today to continue to adapt this great Alliance, we are keenly aware that the end of the Cold War has brought not only opportunities, but serious challenges. The terrible conflict in Bosnia continues to resist resolution. It has challenged NATO and all the institutions that have dealt with it. Frankly, when this conflict emerged from the ashes of the Cold War, the international community was insufficiently prepared. The world ultimately turned to the United Nations to shoulder the principal responsibility.

For its part, NATO has done whatever has been asked of it by the United Nations. It has established a no-fly zone and prevented the conflict from becoming an air war. It has maintained the sanctions pressure, and it has been instrumental in preventing the spread of the conflict. Contrary to some reports, NATO has not ruled out the use of air power. NATO stands ready to use air power, when requested, pursuant to United Nations resolutions.

Now, our task continues to be to seek a peaceful negotiated end to the conflict, one that will preserve Bosnia's territorial integrity. We should renew our efforts to seek an immediate ceasefire and general cessation of hostilities. We should pursue with the parties the terms for a settlement, building on the Contact Group plan.

Let me stress one important fact: The crisis in Bosnia is about Bosnia and the former Yugoslavia. It does not diminish NATO's enduring importance. The Allies remain committed to NATO's irreplaceable role as the key to European security. There is no disagreement among us on this point.

The tragedy of the war and bloodshed in Bosnia does not diminish our responsibility to build a comprehensive European security architecture that consolidates stability, addresses today's conflicts, and prevents others from happening in the future. On the contrary, the tragedy in the former Yugoslavia underscores the urgency of that task.
Central to building a comprehensive security architecture for Europe is a measured process of NATO expansion, along with continued European integration and a determination to strengthen the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Yesterday's NATO helped to reconcile old adversaries, to embed free countries in strong and solid institutions, and to create an enduring sense of shared purpose in one another's security. Today's NATO must do the same -- with new countries but with an enduring purpose. This Alliance must preserve its core defensive role and adapt its military forces to meet the new demands of crisis management and peacekeeping. It must also help new Partners learn Western standards of cooperation and draw them into NATO's practical work of providing stability in Europe.

Last January at the NATO Summit, the Alliance committed itself to deepen our ties with Europe's emerging democracies when it approved President Clinton's proposal for a Partnership for Peace. In less than a year, the Partnership has come to life. Twenty-three nations, including Russia, have joined. Belarus has just announced its intention to become our twenty-fourth Partner. Tonight, NATO and Russia will agree on broad possibilities for cooperation, including Russia's program for the Partnership for Peace. Troops that for half-a-century faced against each other in the Cold War are now coming together in joint military exercises.

Our leaders also declared last January that the Alliance is open to new members. Today, we take an important step in the process that will lead to NATO expansion. I urge that we agree to begin now our internal deliberations on expansion and, in 1995, to discuss with Partners the obligations and implications of membership.

This process will be steady, deliberate, and transparent. I want to stress that expansion must not and will not dilute NATO. But NATO must, over time, be ready to include nations which are willing and able to assume the necessary Alliance obligations and commitments, and whose membership advances the goals of the Alliance and of broader European security. Expansion, when it comes, will occur in a manner that increases stability for all of Europe -- for members and non-members alike.

As we pursue NATO expansion, we must also strengthen other structures of security cooperation. No single institution has the mandate or the capability to meet every challenge in Europe. Our NATO Alliance must be complemented by other institutions that can address the full range of challenges facing Europe's future. We recognize an important role for European integration, supported by the European Union. There is also an important institution with untapped potential: the
Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. We must build on its unique strengths as a structure for conflict resolution and prevention and as an institution that embodies the ideal of an undivided Europe.

Speaking as your President d’Honneur, I say with confidence that the Alliance is prepared to take up both the challenges of the moment and the future. And speaking as a representative of President Clinton and the American people, I say with equal confidence that as we do so, the commitment of the United States to participate actively in maintaining the security, prosperity, and freedom of Europe remains unshakeable.

Thank you very much.

###
Mr. Secretary General, distinguished colleagues, and friends: I am pleased to join you at this very important meeting of the North Atlantic Council. Allow me also to salute once again our new Secretary General. He assumes his responsibilities at a defining moment in the history of NATO and of Europe.

These are times of great change in Europe. But America's interests in Europe have not changed. Neither have the basic principles guiding our engagement -- principles that have long commanded bipartisan support.

The first principle is that NATO is and will remain the anchor of America's engagement in Europe and the core of transatlantic security. The United States has enduring political, military, economic and cultural links to Europe that must and will be preserved.

A second core principle of American engagement remains our support for European integration and our partnership with the European Union. The United States has supported European integration from its inception. The EU remains a vital partner in trade, diplomacy, and increasingly in security, where we cooperate to combat proliferation and terrorism.

A capable European defense identity and effective cooperation between NATO and the Western European Union are critical elements of this relationship. Fortifying the European pillar of the Alliance contributes to European stability and to transatlantic burden-sharing. And it improves our collective capacity to act. I welcome the November 14 call by WEU ministers to accelerate work on the Combined Joint Task Force concept. CJTF offers a practical vehicle for making NATO assets and capabilities available to the WEU under certain circumstances.
A moment ago, I noted that America’s interests in Europe have not changed. What has changed in the last few years is that the sphere of political and economic freedom in Europe is wider than ever before. This leads me to the third core principle of our engagement: Breaking down the barriers that divide West from East will serve our collective interest in wider European stability. Our alliance of democracies can help consolidate democracy across an undivided Europe at peace. We can help design a comprehensive and inclusive architecture that enhances security and freedom for all.

Our strategy of integration offers tangible rewards. It will help promote stability in Europe’s eastern half, the region where two world wars and the Cold War began. It will strengthen the hand of forces committed to political, military, and economic reform. And it will help assure that no part of Europe will revert to a zone of great power competition or a sphere of influence and that no nation is left hanging in isolation.

The challenge we face today is not unlike the one we faced, and met, in Western Europe 50 years ago. After World War II, President Truman and Secretaries of State Marshall and Acheson understood that security and economic cooperation were essential to the defense of democracy. Within five years of D-Day, America and its Allies had launched the Marshall Plan, established NATO and the GATT, and laid the foundations for what became the EU and the OECD. These institutions helped us produce unparalleled peace and prosperity for half a century -- but only for half a continent.

Now five years have passed since the Berlin Wall fell. We must build a security community of all democratic nations in the Euro-Atlantic region -- one that endures where the Congress of Vienna, the Concert of Europe, and Versailles ultimately failed, and one that builds on the strength of our post-war success in Western Europe.

Developing the new European security architecture begins with reinforcing its foundation -- the Alliance that has preserved our liberty and prosperity for half a century. NATO has always been far more than a transitory response to a temporary threat. It has been a guarantor of European democracy and a force for European stability. The core values it champions -- democracy, liberty, and the rule of law -- are now ascendant around the world. For all these reasons, NATO’s benefits are clear to Europe’s new democracies.

Since the NATO Summit last January, we have taken remarkable strides to renew and invigorate the Alliance. We have achieved our historic goal of deepening ties with the new democracies to the east. In less than a year, the Partnership for Peace has evolved from a bare idea to a bold reality.
The United States considers the Partnership an integral and lasting part of the new European security architecture. That is why President Clinton indicated in July that he will ask Congress to designate $100 million in the coming fiscal year to advance the Partnership's goals. I am pleased to say that Congress has already authorized an additional $30 million to strengthen the Partnership's joint exercise program over the next year. I hope that other NATO members will soon announce comparable contributions and that we can coordinate our efforts to maximize the impact. But of course, it will fall mainly to Partners to ensure that the Partnership realizes its full potential.

The United States is seeking agreement on additional measures for next year. First, we urge putting exercise programs for 1995 and beyond on a 5-year planning cycle, and building toward progressively more complex and diverse training scenarios. Second, NATO must ensure sufficient funding for the Alliance's Partnership-related costs. Finally, we should strive to have a Partnership defense planning process established and operational by early 1995.

The Partnership is a critical tool in its own right. It is also the best path to membership for countries wishing to join the Alliance. As both President Clinton and Vice President Gore have emphasized, NATO must be open to expansion. An exclusionary policy would risk maintaining old lines of division across Europe -- or creating arbitrary new ones. The United States believes that Europe's institutional arrangements should be determined by the objective demands of the present, not by the tragedies of Europe's past.

The United States believes it is time to begin the process -- to begin deliberate consideration of the practical requirements for adding new members to the Alliance. It is imperative that we agree as an Alliance on our aims and our purpose in this historic evolution. The Washington Treaty is not a paper guarantee. New members will assume solemn obligations and responsibilities, just as we will extend our solemn commitments to them. This will require careful consideration and preparation.

We are deciding today that the Alliance begin its internal deliberations on expansion. A process has begun. It is also essential that we begin to present our views to interested Partners during 1995. I expect the next several months to be particularly intense, as we formulate a joint Allied presentation. We have already provided your governments with our initial thinking, and we would propose building on that to develop Allied consensus. I am personally committed to moving forward on this matter.
Our presentation to the Partners should explain the practical implications and obligations of NATO membership. Let us be clear: These initial exchanges are not intended to be the beginning of accession negotiations. Neither will they indicate that any Partner is necessarily a candidate for admission. But they will reflect our determination that the process for expansion be open and inclusive from the start.

The process of expansion should be steady, deliberate, and transparent. Each nation should be considered individually. No country outside of NATO will have a veto over any other. In our view, there are, however, certain fundamental requirements for membership that are reflected in the Washington Treaty. New members must be market democracies committed to responsible security policies and able to make a contribution to the Alliance.

As I noted earlier this morning, we cannot pursue NATO expansion in isolation. The new security architecture for Europe’s future must be supported by other strong pillars. No single institution has the mandate or the capability to meet every challenge in Europe.

The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe -- the CSCE -- has proven experience and untapped potential as an organization that can help ease tensions and prevent future conflicts. With its comprehensive membership and unique experience in preventive diplomacy, human rights protection, and dispute resolution, the CSCE can complement NATO’s essential role. To make it more effective, however, we need to refine its mission.

At the CSCE Summit in Budapest next week, the United States will work with our allies and partners to enhance the CSCE’s capabilities. President Clinton will urge his colleagues to approve his proposal to strengthen the role and structure of the organization. We hope to clarify the CSCE’s role in the European security architecture and improve its ability to prevent future Yugoslavias.

Our economic and security institutions are gradually breaking down the outdated frontiers of the Cold War. The security and prosperity of all of Europe is inextricably linked to the stable development of Europe’s emerging democracies in the East.

Our goal is the successful transformation of post-communist Europe into a community of sovereign, democratic states. A key component is the development of a democratic, market-oriented Russia. No less vital is the emergence of a stable, democratic, non-nuclear Ukraine and the realization of the promise of greater security embodied in the START-1 and START-2 agreements. In Budapest we will take a significant step forward.
when President Clinton joins President Yeltsin and Prime Minister Major in receiving Ukraine’s accession to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and signs security assurances for Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan. This action will pave the way for START-1 to enter into force.

We welcome democratic Russia in assuming a full role in the common effort of building new structures. We welcome the agreement we will sign tonight on the NATO-Russia Individual Partnership Program. It sends an unmistakable possible signal of our Alliance’s desire to include Russia in a cooperative approach to security in Europe.

At the same time, we will continue to pursue avenues for cooperation between NATO and Russia outside the Partnership for Peace. The United States welcomed the first meeting between an Alliance working group and Russia on the question of nuclear weapons dismantlement. We also support intensifying Russia’s cooperation with the G-7. And we are sponsoring Russia’s membership in the GATT and its successor, the World Trade Organization.

Integration will enhance Russia’s security in a wider Europe and expand Russia’s access to markets and capital. But it also carries obligations that all Western nations share. GATT membership will make Russia’s trade practices consistent with world standards. Expanded ties with NATO and the EU, along with strengthened CSCE principles, will strengthen Russian democracy and promote respect for the sovereignty of its neighbors.

Our support for Russian policies that adhere to these core principles will serve our vital interests and Europe’s -- especially the nations that so recently broke free from communist rule. By the same token, expanding Western institutions to Central Europe will benefit Russia.

In taking the steps I have outlined today, we will advance our shared interest in building a democratic, prosperous, integrated Europe at peace. These steps reflect the core principles of our engagement in Europe -- our unwavering commitment to NATO, our continued support for European integration, and our determination to enhance security and stability in the East. The United States understands that our leadership remains indispensable if we are to achieve these goals. And we are determined to provide it.

###
This was a good one... thus far very well received.

[Signature]

[Handwritten note]
STRONG FAMILIES, STRONG SCHOOLS

Today I am releasing a report which I have sent to the President entitled, "Strong Families, Strong Schools." This document gives new recognition to the power, the promise and the potential of the American family in our continuing efforts to improve American education. This is a timely report that follows in the footsteps of another recent report by Child Trends on the decline of parental involvement in schools as young people enter their teens.

In the last eleven years, ever since the National Commission on Excellence in Education released its report, "A Nation at Risk," an enormous amount of effort has been made to instill a new spirit of excellence in American education. This effort has taken many forms -- increasing graduation requirements, improving teacher competency and salaries, and updating curricula.

This is all to the good. As a nation, we have taken a strong step forward in teaching math and science. The number of young people taking the recommended core academic curriculum is up 30 percent. And, we have a blueprint for excellence in education in the Goals 2000 Act which was signed by the President last March. But it is my very strong belief that more sustained attention needs to be paid to that most vital of links -- the promise and potential of parents and other family members as the most important teachers of their children.

The American family is the rock on which a solid education can and must be built. I have seen examples all over this Nation where two-parent families, single parents, stepparents, grandparents, aunts and uncles are providing strong family support for their children to learn.

The Secretary may depart from his prepared remarks.
The research report I am releasing today tells us, in no uncertain terms, that the essential building block for learning is how the American family uses its strength and power to support and encourage young people to meet the high expectations now being demanded of them in the classroom.

This report, then, is both a call to arms against ignorance and low expectations -- a challenge to adult America to reconnect with our children's education -- and a summary of concrete examples to inspire parents to be part of their children's education in new and important ways.

This is why I am announcing the formation of a broad-based partnership led by the National Coalition for Parent Involvement in Education (NCPIE) to encourage and support American families as they seek to prepare their children for the Information Age that is now upon us. This common effort -- with each partner contributing in its own best way -- includes such organizations as the National PTA, the National Alliance of Business, the U.S. Catholic Conference, and the Boys and Girls Clubs of America.

Over the last six months, I and/or members of my staff have met with 125 different parent, religious, education, community-based and business groups on this important issue. While each group has its own distinctive strength and purpose, we are all committed to going in the same direction. There is a deep desire for partnership -- to coalesce around this vital issue and support families.

America needs to put its house in order -- to lower the deficit -- to stop the violence and despair of drugs -- to make sure our children go to school safely every day -- to assure Americans who play by the rules that there are rules and moral standards that we live by as a Nation.

To my mind, there is no more important place to begin putting our house in order than by recognizing that our children's expectations about the future are rooted in the day-to-day family activities that help children learn and develop good character. America needs to give up its get-it-now, live-for-today mentality and start looking down the road to make sure that we give all of our children the America they deserve.

Thirty years of research tells us that the starting point of American education is parent expectations and parental involvement with their children's education. This consistent finding applies to every family regardless of the parents' station in life, their income or their educational background. As this report indicates, three factors over which parents exercise authority -- daily attendance in school, reading material and literature in the home, and the amount of television a young person watches -- are some of the strongest indicators we have that home life makes a difference when it comes to learning.

Other important research needs to be highlighted. A child who grows up reading for
fun is a child who is on the road to success when it comes to learning. We know, for example, that children's success in school can be linked to reading to children and listening to them read.

Many years ago, the great American patriot Frederick Douglass was struck by the powerful recognition that to "teach a slave to read" was the "pathway from slavery to freedom." Listen to Douglass' powerful testimony: "I set out with high hope and fixed purpose, at whatever cost of trouble, to learn how to read."

My friends, we need that same type of zeal in the here and now to help families have the same high hope and fixed purpose. All the data we have tells us that children can learn to read to high standards if we work with families.

For America to read together, then something has to give. I, for one, want to suggest that the teenager who is perpetually glued to the tube is well on the way to having a very dull mind and a very dull -- and perhaps risky -- future. Television is part of our culture and anyone who has children knows its power to mesmerize, captivate, excite ..... and yes, teach as well. But I am concerned when report after report tells us that reading scores decline at all grade levels tested, when young people go into the "red zone" of danger and watch more than six hours of television on a weekday.

I believe that many parents feel overwhelmed by the all of the outside influences shaping the lives of their children. They feel that our popular culture, with its current emphasis on making fame a virtue and often for the strangest of reasons, undermines the values they want their children to have. They see so many of our young people growing up wild -- without any abiding sense of citizenship or sense that they have a stake in this country's future.

We need to get our priorities straight. Without a good education, a young person can grow up to be a tragic and unhappy figure. Ten years from now, imagine the problems and the inequity, indeed the crisis, as the six million additional children now flooding into our education system find themselves without the skills and knowledge they need to get ahead.

We've got to do better. As this report notes, there are several significant obstacles that interfere with parents in their efforts to improve their children's learning: the pressure of time, the unsettling disconnection between educators and families; the uncertainty that family members feel about how they can contribute; the inflexibility of the work schedule; the sheer drag of poverty; and language barriers. Let me speak directly to several of these concerns.

First of all -- time. I am known for telling parents and educators that the most important single change we need for American education is to find new ways to help
parents slow down their lives. Many parents and other family members are stretched to the limit -- juggling jobs, putting food on the table, getting their children to safe after-school programs -- doing all they can to keep body and soul together.

But I believe that we are missing something far deeper in all this rushing around. We are letting our children grow up, at times, almost alone -- and disconnected. The education of American children -- their moral development, their sense of citizenship, and academic growth -- is done in fits and starts. This is not how families want to raise their children.

The effort that so many parents make to guide their children's lives repeatedly comes up against the rush of modern living. The mismatch in how major American institutions -- from schools to businesses -- carve out time in the day-to-day life of the American family is -- to my mind -- a serious impediment to how our young people are growing up. We ask families to twist and turn -- to go through every possible contortion to fit into the structure and time needs of schools or businesses or other institutions -- instead of the other way around. It is my very strong belief that we really must rethink what we are doing and how we use our time.

The best business leaders recognize that the early investment families make on behalf of their children leads to the promise of a skilled and educated workforce in the future. This is why the business leadership of America has been in the forefront of improving education for many years now. Some of these businesses are already developing new ways that America's "time" can be used to help families and the learning process.

We must see the value in job-sharing, flextime, and release time for families -- to give attention to the children. Schools at the plant site, day care in the office, parents working at home without stigma or financial loss -- whatever it takes -- we need to use all of our ingenuity to find new ways to connect families to their children in these hectic times.

I also urge educators to give special attention to the recent report of the National Commission on Time and Learning called "Prisoners of Time," which speaks directly to how "time" is being taken away from academics during the American school day. I will be the first to tell you that we will not be able to be first in anything -- math or science or any other subject for that matter -- if only 41 percent of the school day is given over to the core academic subjects.

Finally, I want to encourage every American family to stop and take stock, to take a "time inventory" of how the family is using its time --if they haven't already done so -- as we begin the new school year. This may be one way every family can find that extra time for learning. I want to suggest seven good practices that may be helpful to parents and family members.
First, take a time inventory, as I said, to find the extra time you need so the family can learn together. Commit yourself to learning something with your children. I think you will be rewarded and find happiness and joy in the shared effort.

Second, commit yourself to high standards and set high expectations for your children - challenge them in every possible way to reach for their full potential.

Third, limit television viewing on a school night to a maximum of two hours even if that means that the remote control may have to disappear on occasion.

Fourth, read together. It is the starting point of all learning.

Fifth, make sure your children take the tough courses at school and schedule daily time to check homework.

Sixth, make sure your child goes to school every day and support community efforts to keep children safe and off the street late at night.

And seventh, set a good example and talk directly to your children, especially your teenagers, about the dangers of drugs and alcohol and the values you want your children to have. Such personal talks, however uncomfortable they make you feel, may save their lives.

This is homework in the true sense of the word. It is also preparation for life.

I want families all across America to know that we are all with you in this effort. The whole country is on your side. The President, Vice President and I will do all we can to promote these seven basic steps. You are not alone in your efforts to raise your children to follow the Golden Rule, to be good citizens and to learn the importance of what it means to be a proud American.

Now, I want to turn my attention to the unsettling reality that there is a disconnection between educators and parents that needs our attention. As I said in my "State of American Education" speech last February, too often parents and educators talk past one another. Many parents feel that their right to be involved in school policy -- to be full participants in the learning process -- is ignored, frustrated and sometimes even denied. They do not feel valued, and too often they find education jargon to be a putdown.

Kathryn Whitfill, the President of the National PTA, told a group of educators who were meeting at my office several weeks ago about how put off she felt walking into a school recently to be greeted by a sign that read, "Notice: Visitors Report to the Front Office." It was, to her mind, a cold, sterile greeting to any parent visiting the school.
with all the warmth of an unexpected legal notice.

This sign, as she related to a room full of nodding heads, was one small but vivid symbol that parents were less than welcome. There was nothing inviting ... nothing that suggested that parents were, in fact, the true owners of the school.

But I also know that there are countless schools and educators who have reached out to families and have been rewarded with higher test scores, active PTA's, volunteers, tutors, mentors, strong parent/community/school partnerships and "Security Dads" walking the halls.

James Comer, who has done so much to set the agenda for good parental involvement - Dorothy Rich of Megaskills -- Ernie Cortez, a MacArthur Fellow, who is making parent power work in Texas -- and Henry Levin, the leader of the Accelerated Schools initiative -- are just a few of the many educators who have seen the potential and promise of family involvement in education. All across this country, teachers are hungry for parents to connect up with them when it comes to educating their children.

This is why I urge educators everywhere to change those signs on the school door that give parents the cold shoulder. Listen with an open ear. Reach out to parents as partners. Be creative in using the new technology -- from voice mail, to homework hotlines, to CD-ROM programs that are educational and now on the market -- and even the old telephone -- to get parents more involved in the learning process.

Parents -- including those who have strong religious values -- must be at the table when it comes to public education. But they must also be willing to build bridges and not see public education as the enemy. I assure you that nothing will be gained by tearing down public education and making the public school classroom the Bosnia of America's competing factions. When a community is divided, the children always suffer. Good common sense should tell us that now is the time for quiet voices to be heard in the search for common ground.

It is my hope that families, religious and civic groups and schools can come together to create a moral climate that sustains a culture of learning. A culture of learning rooted in the great common tradition of basic American values of democracy, honesty, self-reliance, hard work, and respect for the civic responsibilities of all Americans to participate in our democracy.

We must save this generation of children -- we must not lose them. So I shall spend much of my efforts in the coming year working with everyone to promote this family involvement partnership for learning. I ask all Americans to please tune in -- to recognize that anything we do to connect with our children -- to give them a sense that their lives and their learning matter to us -- is good for our children and good for our
country.

Together, we can start a fire of changing attitudes -- from "getting by" to "getting on with it" -- to once again giving first attention to the future of our children. It is our duty as parents, relatives, guardians and caring adults to get involved in our children's education. It is our patriotic duty as Americans who believe in this nation's future to make sure our children are shown a preference in our decisions.

This is the right way to go for America.

Thank you.
THE WHITE HOUSE

Don,

I thought you might find the attached of interest... or

Deepest regards,

Obama

[Signature]
It has been nearly two years since Bill Clinton was elected President of the United States, and the transition between Administrations is now completed. Our transition in many ways mirrors the transition underway in world events which are having a tremendous effect on American foreign policy.

Although there is no longer a hegemonic power on Europe's borders, we still face what CIA director Jim Woolsey appropriately describes as a "a jungle filled with a bewildering variety of poisonous snakes". The stark and vivid lines which divided the world into two competing camps for nearly two generations have been blurred by the new and murky optics of disorder and disarray.

A quick canvass of the day's headlines more than confirms this point:

- A bloody and senseless war in the former Yugoslavia and mayhem in Cambodia, in Somalia, in Haiti;

- Spreading conflicts in the former Soviet Union, where the once unknown names of Abkhazia, Trans-Dneister, Ossetia, and Nagorno-Karabakh have emerged onto the scene with a vengeance;

- Reports of plutonium smuggled into Western Europe are increasing.

Clearly the end of the Cold War has not ended history -- nor has it ended threats to our security.

This is not the first time we have had to confront such new challenges. At the beginning of our republic and at the end of the Napoleonic Wars in Europe when our military policies and forces were dramatically overhauled to underwrite our new foreign policies; in the final years of the 19th century when the U.S. emerged as a world power; and fifty years ago when we had to design security structures to face the heavy burdens of the Cold War, America's civilian and military leaders have reshaped and retooled the nation's security resources to meet the requirements of the age.

And just as in 1784, 1815, 1898, and 1946, today, once again we are giving careful thought to how best to apply our nation's military and diplomatic tools to confront the uncertainties of a very new and complex period in world affairs.
Doing so, I would point out, requires and commands our full and sustained attention, for as we work to navigate a clear course through choppy international seas, there are few obvious beacons or buoys to guide us.

The only fixed point before us seems to be uncertainty, where disease, overpopulation, unprovoked crime, scarcity of resources, refugee migrations are becoming increasingly prominent fixtures of the new international landscape.

But even as the consequences of chaos loom large, so too do the traditional threats posed by ambitious and irresponsible nation-states. From the Middle East to Asia, challenges to democracy and law and order remain key concerns.

The question we face as an Administration is how best to organize ourselves to deal with these shifting dynamics of international politics -- be they the humanitarian or environmental consequences of “chaos” or more traditional threats to international order? How do we help predict and control the flow of what Vaclav Havel has called the “lava of post-communist surprises”?

Very early in his tenure Secretary Christopher focused our attention on these critical questions when he said that “America cannot careen from crisis to crisis. We must have a new diplomacy that can anticipate and prevent crises rather than simply managing them.”

It is this new diplomacy of preventive statecraft which I would like to discuss today, for in many ways crisis prevention has become a central tenet of the Administration’s foreign policy.

Both structurally and substantively, the Administration has made important progress to reorient the resources of government in order to more proactively address coming crises. Reinventing existing bureaucratic assumptions and structures is not a simple task. But major steps have been taken to transform the concept of preventive diplomacy from slogan to actual policy:

A quick tour of the work underway in the Administration provides clear examples:

- At the Agency for International Development, Director Brian Atwood and his team have been mobilizing the intellectual and physical resources of our nation to quickly respond to a massive famine likely to course through the Horn of Africa next year -- before it happens.

- At the White House, the path towards peace has once again passed through the South lawn where King Hussein of Jordan and Prime Minister Rabin of Israel ended a state of war -- before violence once again consumes the Middle East.

- At the Defense Department, Secretary Perry has honed with his staff a counter-proliferation initiative to prevent the Irans, Iraqs, and Libyas of the world from acquiring and using weapons of mass destruction -- before its too late.
• At the State Department -- in its new Global Affairs office headed by Tim Wirth -- our diplomats are hard at work preparing for America's visible participation in the upcoming Cairo Conference on population in order to ensure that family-based population planning efforts are embraced by the world community -- before our planet can no longer sustain its current pace of development.

• In Mogadishu as in Kigali, in Northern Iraq as in Goma, our military has been keeping watch, keeping the peace and keeping faith with fundamental American interests: saving lives and staving off hunger and disease, thirst and death -- before their toll becomes unimaginable.

• And in the late hours of last Friday at Geneva, our negotiators took new and important steps to ensure that North Korea will hew closer to the goals of nonproliferation -- before one of the world's gravest nuclear threats becomes unmanageable.

This new diplomacy of prevention is built upon the clear national interests that have been articulated by the President. At the very beginning of his Administration, the President established three "pillars" which undergird our nation's foreign policy.

Each of these pillars are rooted first and foremost in the soil of our geostrategic interests. But at the same time, each also nurture important and enduring American values.

Let me review each briefly, and explore how they contribute to our preventive statecraft agenda.

The first pillar is ensuring our nation's economic security and prosperity.

As the President has said time and again, we have to be strong at home if we are going to be strong abroad. Foreign policy and domestic policy are two sides of the same coin, for if we can't compete in the global economy, we'll pay for it at home.

That is why the President and his team have worked with great success to open more markets for American products, and to engage America increasingly in the international economic scene by ensuring passage of the Uruguay Round of GATT and the North American Free Trade Agreement.

At the recent G-7 summit in Naples, the President also stressed the need to think-through much more carefully how international economic institutions like the World Bank and the IMF can be revitalized in order to more effectively confront the challenges of the next century. Working with his counterparts, the President won agreement to make this important issue a major agenda item when the G-7 meets again in Halifax, Canada.

As we work to promote American prosperity at home, we also will work to promote democracy abroad. Why do we do so? There is an old maxim that democracies make more peaceful neighbors. And in fact, no democracy has ever declared war on another. But that is only half the story. It is also important to remember that democracies make better trading partners.
The inauguration of Nelson Mandela in South Africa, and the upcoming Summit of the America's in Miami which for the first time will convene all the democratic nations in our hemisphere in common cause both are testament to the strides that have been made to promote the development of liberal political institutions throughout the world.

Since taking office, the Administration also has taken major steps to protect the democratic gains that have been made in the nations of the former Warsaw Pact, lest its new governments fall and revert to totalitarianism once again. Doing so makes good sense, both strategically and economically. Not only are totalitarian regimes inherently more destabilizing, but defending against them simply costs more money.

On a different level, and much closer to home, where a recognizable democratic process is subverted by its enemies, as in Haiti, it ought to engage U.S. interests. That is why are working aggressively with the full support of the international community and the United Nations' Security Council to restore democracy and demand the removal Haiti's repressive de facto regime.

Our success stories in the name of democratic enlargement thus far are impressive. Just last month in Naples, the President gained the commitment of his counterparts to work to provide some $4 billion in assistance to promote democracy and economic reforms in the strategically important Ukraine if it continues to show progress in its commitment to put market reforms into place.

Also noticeably, the Department of Defense has taken the opportunity to put its special skills and resources to work by working with newly democratic states to establish civilian oversight and control of the military; by working with militaries in democratizing states to foster the transition from offensive to defensive military doctrine and organizations; by urging newly democratic nations to show restraint in military hardware modernization and avoidance of regional arms races; and by helping to convert defense related industries to civilian uses.

The primary purpose of our nation's armed forces of course will be to fight and win our nation's wars. But in this time of relative peace, our military has been reshaping many of its traditional roles and missions in highly creative and effective ways.

In Europe alone, even though our military's bilateral programs are still in their infancy, the US has already completed over 170 military exchanges with eleven countries of eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union.

The fruits of this and other work are now clear for all to see. At the direct urging of the President, just a couple of weeks ago, President Yeltsin announced he would withdraw the last of Russia's troops from Baltic soil -- in only a few days, the last vestiges of Russia's half century of military presence in Europe is about to come to an end.

The President's initiative to forge what he called a Partnership for Peace between NATO and the nations of the Eastern and Central Europe and the former Soviet Union is further advancing the cause of democracy and also transatlantic cooperation. In less than a year, some 21 nations of the
East have agreed to join the partnership. This fall, NATO and Eastern Europe troops will join forces in Poland to conduct historic joint peacekeeping exercises. Where these soldiers once faced each other at the Fulda Gap, now they will train to carry out together some of the Europe's thornier humanitarian and civic missions.

The third pillar of the President's foreign policy, and the one that in many respects is most fundamental is the unshakable commitment of this Administration to provide for America's security, both at home and abroad. During the campaign and since, the President has said that under his watch as Commander in Chief, our men and women in uniform will remain the best equipped, best trained, and best prepared fighting force in the world.

As I mentioned, the threats posed by the numerous regional, ethnic, and irredentist conflicts pockmarking the globe are clear and present. Our ability to prevent these conflicts from occurring, or limiting them once they do occur, is vastly enhanced by our ability to maintain a strong and visible overseas presence, to conduct peacekeeping and enforcement operations, and to engage effectively, responsively, and quickly in humanitarian missions.

I will explore each quickly, for the armed forces of the United States increasingly are key elements supporting our preventive statecraft efforts.

The maintenance of a vigorous forward presence across the globe is the best proof of the fact that the President is committed to remaining fully active and engaged on the world scene. Early on in the Administration, the President commissioned a sweeping bottom-up review of our military's requirements and resources in order to equip our military to be able to fight and win two nearly simultaneous regional conflicts. And that is precisely the goal we are committed to achieving. Earlier this month, an independent commission chaired by General Shy Meyer, the former Army chief of staff -- the man who invented the term "hollow army" -- recently issued a report on the state of readiness of our forces, and his conclusion is that we are on target.

But even as we remain poised and ready to prosecute war, we also are taking new and important strides to enforce and keep peace.

The President has made clear that the international community must be prepared to take on a broader role in peacekeeping, and we are pleased to see fresh efforts underway through the UN and NATO to do so. And just yesterday we were reminded of the important new steps we are taking in this direction. In a front-page story in the Washington Post, we read about the Army's peace operations training facility at Fort Polk, where our troops are learning to cope with such Post-Cold War world contingencies such as dealing with refugees, providing security for relief workers, terrorist sniping, and how to keep warring parties -- like those in Somalia and the Balkans -- apart, at bay, and at peace.

As we look forward to even more sustained UN involvement in peacekeeping operations, we must think-through carefully how the UN can better prepare itself to shoulder this burden. Fact finding, crisis monitoring and the development of effective early warning systems increasingly are
important tools of the peacekeeper, and we will continue to develop and provide these resources where and when we can, and we will encourage all member states of the UN to do so as well.

Another problem is the United Nations’ inability to provide initial troop lift, and sustained administrative and long-term logistical support to operations already underway. Much thought already have been given to these issues by Secretary General Boutros Ghali. But we need to continue to keep our focus on helping the UN so it can respond quickly to calls for intervention.

Planning for peacekeeping and other security related missions must also take into account the humanitarian dimension.

Where violence exists, there are crippled children, destroyed homes and villages, and as we have seen with such undistilled horror these past weeks in Rwanda, refugees.

And from natural disasters to man-made catastrophes, there are few signs the need for humanitarian missions will diminish any time soon. Once the sole province of non-governmental organizations, interest groups, and churches, this important task is now being supported by the militaries of the world.

We’ve already had successes in this area -- the massive and decisive response to the crisis in Goma and our continuing efforts to provide comfort to Iraq’s Kurds are stunning cases in point -- but we can do more -- not just because it is the right thing to do but because it is in our security and economic interests.

There are those who would criticize our involvement in humanitarian missions as a diversion from our major national security preoccupations.

In my view, this is a short-sighted view. While maintaining as a first priority the readiness and quality of our fighting forces, our challenge in the 1990s is to take advantage of opportunities to use assistance program, broadly defined, to enhance our own security.

This is an important point. Humanitarian assistance is not only moral, it is also a national security tool. It reflects a variety of concerns, to reduce demands on coalition forces, to maintain stability where possible, to prevent the spread of crisis where necessary, and to create new post-Cold War relationships between nations. It also, in a very practical sense, helps guarantee over flight and base rights and open access to areas where we need it most.

Still, in the longer term we will need to improve coordination and efficiency among multinational forces engaged in humanitarian relief work. It is essential that the Secretary-General be able to formulate appropriate policies, take speedy preventive action, and assist UN agencies in accelerating the provision of relief.

The United States is doing its part. Some 40% of the humanitarian assistance to the Rwanda’s refugees is being provided by the United States. Americans, after all, are a generous people. But
we hope to do more in years to come, and if necessary, we look forward to working more closely with the U.N. and with our allies in NATO in continued humanitarian assistance efforts.

Why do we care about doing more? Why should we engage our own resources, our materiel, our troops, our national stamina, and our attention to these new and difficult issues?

First, as I have said, because it is in our interests to do so.

Second, because it is the right thing to do.

And third, because the real danger to the world scene is not an overengaged United States, but our withdrawal from the game. And I would submit that the name of the game increasingly, as Secretary Christopher has pointed out, is targeting our resources and our creativity in the service of preventive statecraft.

If our global interests demand a relatively stable international environment, and if the resources available to various international organizations like the UN at present are not up to the task of keeping a lid on crises and dealing with unacceptable international behavior wherever and wherever they erupt, our best strategy is to continue to work collectively to take the necessary steps to head off trouble before it takes place.

Putting all of these pieces into place cannot be done overnight.

Still, many in America remain eager for instant results. In a society increasingly accustomed to the real time of c-drives and CNN, the demand for a bumper sticker foreign policy has become heavy indeed. Many forget that the efforts to change the torque of our nation's international affairs do not often lend themselves to simple or quick formulations. I would remind you that not far from this room it took such eminent thinkers as George Kennan and Paul Nitze more than two years after the end of World War II to define the concept of containment as the galvanizing idea for American foreign policy.

But unlike in the late forties, where the enemy Nitze or Kennan faced was both geographically and ideologically defined, today, we face threats that are much more nuanced. The fixed idea of Communism has, in a sense, been eclipsed by the quick silver of chaos.

In dealing with this new climate, patience must be a virtue. It will be steady steps -- not giant leaps - that will guide us to a safe and secure future: a future committed to the democratic development of our neighbors; a future in which the international community is ready to make and keep the peace; and a future in which we all are willing to commit resources to relieve human suffering around the world.

These are the foundations of the new world order -- one that our publics will support, our friends and adversaries will respect, and our governments will sustain.

###
To the President—

Though your and that of some interest.

Enjoy the vacation.

Sincerely,

Working for America's Workforce
On the eve of the second Labor Day of this Administration, there is much for America’s working men and women to celebrate. We are enjoying a robust jobs expansion, without any signs of inflationary dangers. The unemployment rate was down to 6.1 percent at last month’s reckoning. There are still a few hours left in August, and nobody -- including me -- knows what this month’s jobless rate will turn out to be. But what matters is the trend, and the trend is very good. Between last Labor Day and the end of July, the economy added over 2.5 million new jobs -- more than in the full four years of the Bush Administration. In the Clinton Administration so far, the economy has generated 4.1 million new jobs, 93 percent of them in the private sector. [Chart 1]

Comparing parallel points in the last recovery gives some perspective on this accomplishment, and the odds against which it was brought about. Private payrolls have grown by 4.2 percent in the past year and a half. Over the corresponding period of the much-vaunted Reagan recovery, private job growth was 3.9 percent. And this recovery has had to struggle against the anchor of debt left by the spending that fueled the last one -- the legacy of a profligate decade in which federal debt grew from $908 billion in 1980 to $3.2 trillion in 1990.

Not only are we delivering job growth while shrinking deficits, but through expanding the Earned Income Tax Credit we’re lowering taxes for 15 million working families with modest incomes. Only a tiny fraction of Americans -- the richest 1.2 percent, who are best able to shoulder an extra burden -- are paying slightly higher taxes. The dire forecasts that spending cuts would fail to materialize, or that a small tax increase on the fortunate few would bring the economy to its knees, have been proven dead wrong. The President’s plan has worked.

And yet our mission is just begun. Getting our fiscal house in order and
reigniting job growth were essential to repair the damage of the recent past, but they are only the prerequisites to our broader agenda -- reversing the economic divisions that have undermined our sense of common destiny, and laying the foundation for a new middle class.

Even though it has been a long time since the picture was so bright for the average American worker, the experience of the average worker is becoming less and less relevant. Some workers are surging ahead, others are treading water, and still others are sinking fast -- in the same economy, at the same time. The state of the American workforce, in short, is divided.

In the late 1960's, as my generation was joining the workforce, the vast majority of Americans were middle class, in reality as well as perception. Their status and prospects differed only moderately from the average. In an astonishingly short time, the old middle class has splintered. The erosion of a sense of shared prospects poses what may be our nation's most critical challenge of the post-Cold War era. Reversing this erosion, giving all Americans a reason to believe once more that hard work will lead to a better life, is this Administration's central objective.

Broad trends that have converged and accelerated since the middle 1970's have split the old middle class into three new groups: An underclass largely trapped in center cities, increasingly isolated from the core economy; an overclass of those who are positioned to profitably ride the waves of change; and in between, the largest group, an anxious class, most of whom hold jobs but who are justifiably uneasy about their own standing and fearful for their children's futures.

Despite the progress of the past year, this division still casts a shadow over the state of the American workforce on Labor Day 1994. Let me describe this picture in greater detail -- with the help of new data, much of it recently compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The fundamental fault line running through today's workforce is based on education and skills. Well-educated and skilled workers are prospering; those whose skills are out of date or out of sync with industrial change anxiously contemplate their prospects; those without education or skills drift further and further away from the economic mainstream. The notion that we're creating a bounty of bad jobs is a myth. Most new jobs are good jobs. The problem is that the jobs that remain for workers without skills or with the wrong skills are becoming grimmer and grimmer.

Skills have always mattered, to be sure, but they have not always been such potent determinants of economic destiny. As recently as 1979, a male college graduate earned 49 percent more than a similar man with only a high school diploma -- a sizable
difference, to be sure, but not too large for the two to share the label “middle class”. By 1992, however, the average male college graduate was earning 83 percent more than his high-school graduate counterpart, and the notion of common prospects had faded considerably. More recent data are not available, but there is no reason to believe this trend toward inequality has been reversed. [Chart 2] The picture for women is similar, if slightly less stark. At every level of education and training, the pattern holds: The higher the skill level, the higher the earnings. And the gap has been growing. [Chart 3]

There is a similar divergence in employee benefits. Employer-sponsored health coverage for workers with college degrees has declined only slightly, from 79 percent in 1979 to 76 percent in 1993. But rates for high school graduates have fallen from 68 percent to 60 percent over the same period, and for high-school dropouts, the 1979 rate - already low at 52 percent - has plummeted to 36 percent. This inequality is one reason why the Clinton Administration remains committed to comprehensive health care reform. [Chart 4] Similar divisions apply to employer-sponsored pension coverage. Nearly two-thirds of workers with college degrees are included in pension plans at work, but fewer than a quarter of high-school dropouts.

Not only the wages and benefits that workers can command, but also their chances for holding a job at all, are divided along lines linked to skills. This gap, too, is widening over time. In the 1970s, the average unemployment rate for people who had not completed high school was 7 percent. By the 1980s, this rate averaged 11 percent, and in 1993 it was over 12 percent. High school graduates have also seen their risk of joblessness trend upward. By contrast, the unemployment rate for workers with a college degree or better has held fairly steady at around 3 percent. [Chart 5] Over the most recent ten-year period for which data are available -- the period from 1983 to 1993 -- the number of jobs in sectors that typically require higher levels of education has grown by an annual average of 2.8 percent, while job growth in sectors requiring less education has been only 1 percent. [Chart 6] This shift in favor of skills shows up not just in the United States, but in other advanced countries as well. Over the same period jobs in high-skill sectors have grown rapidly in Canada, Japan, France, Germany, Italy, and the United Kingdom, while job growth in low-skill sectors has been slow or nonexistent, narrowing horizons for workers without adequate education and training. [Chart 7]

In a seeming paradox of today’s economic news, financial markets fret that unemployment is too low to contain inflation, even while 8 million willing American workers remain jobless. Part of the answer to the apparent contradiction is that markets for highly skilled labor are becoming tight in many parts of the economy, creating the conditions that can kindle inflation worries. But millions of less-skilled workers remain idle or underemployed. This wasted workforce is walled off by skill barriers from the
leading edges of the economy where capacity constraints loom. The best way to expand the economy's capacity and lower the level of unemployment needed to bridge inflation is to dismantle these walls by preparing underutilized workers for more productive work.

What lies behind these widening disparities within the workforce? Manufacturing jobs were once the gateway to the middle class, even for workers who started off without high-level skills. While it is a myth that international trade has robbed America of its manufacturing industries, technological changes have diminished the role of labor, especially unskilled labor, in the modern factory. And global trade and investment surely have hastened these technological changes. Even within manufacturing industries, a rising share of value is added before the assembly line begins (in the form of market research, design, and engineering) and after goods are produced (in the form of precision-scheduled delivery, customized installation, and maintenance).

Labor unions have long helped shore up wages and benefits even for workers without high-level skills. But today, only eleven percent of the private-sector workforce is represented by a union. Let there be no doubt: A revitalization of the labor movement would help reverse the erosion of the middle class. This Administration is committed to full enforcement of the laws guaranteeing workers' rights to form unions and bargain collectively.

But we cannot stop there. The forces unleashed by technology must be mastered, not merely buffered. As increasingly capable machines join ever more Americans at the workplace -- join them both as co-workers and as competitors -- the payoff to education and training has soared, and the penalty for lacking skills has stiffened.

The most striking change in the workplace has been the brisk arrival of the computer. [Chart 8] In 1984, about 23 percent of American workers used computers on the job. Last year, almost 47 percent did. And contrary to the myth that computer-literate youngsters are running circles around their technophobic elders, workers between 40 and 54 comprise the group most likely to work with computers. We're talking about my generation. Fully half of them use computers at the workplace, compared to around a third of workers between 18 and 24. Even workplace communication has been transformed, as one in ten workers now uses electronic mail to communicate with colleagues around the corner or around the world. Not long ago I arranged for 60 people at the Labor Department to report to me directly on an e-mail system piped into my home computer. I haven't had a peaceful evening since.

But the computer revolution has deepened the division of the American workforce. Two-thirds of college graduates use computers at work, but only one third of high school graduates, and fewer than one in ten high-school dropouts. [Chart 9] The vast majority of managerial, technical, and professional workers use computers. But
people in lower-paying, lower-skill occupations use them far less frequently. The information highway promises to speed some people to desirable destinations, but it may be leaving others stranded in the high-tech version of inner-city ghettos. Indeed, a recent study of census data found that fully five percent of America's households -- disproportionately poor, or minority, or single-parent families -- lack access to a telephone, the basic ticket of entry to the information web. Other data show that minority children are less likely to use computers at school or at home. As personal computers become standard equipment for learning at home, children who are disconnected from the system will fall further and further behind.

Yet the long-term data also affirm the potential for building a new middle class. The skill-based divisions of today's workforce are in some ways more readily overcome than the divisions based on race or gender that have haunted America throughout our history.

Even as we celebrate the 30th anniversary of the Civil Rights Act, the road to opportunity is often much rockier for people of color. Last month, the national unemployment rate for black Americans was over 11 percent, more than double the rate for white Americans. Today, black men hold only three out of every 100 managerial, professional, and technical jobs in the American economy. The median income for black males working full-time, full-year in 1992 was $22,400 -- just 72 percent of the median income for comparable white males.

Hispanic Americans seeking to join the middle class have confronted similar obstacles. Their unemployment rate tops 10 percent, and their earnings -- particularly for Hispanic men -- have been steadily eroding. And Hispanic workers are significantly less likely than their white counterparts to receive health insurance on the job.

Closing these gaps requires a long, painful process of national growth and healing to which we remain committed. But virtually every willing worker can expand his or her skills; indeed, information technology itself promises to vastly increase the productivity of learning as it makes top-flight teaching tools more widely available. In path-breaking training programs in the troubled heart of Detroit and the barrios of East Los Angeles, I have seen some of the country's most stigmatized young people learning some of the economy's most sought-after skills, earning themselves entree into the new middle class.

While visiting one such program, I talked with a young woman who said, "I used to hate math." But now her perspective had changed. "Math class -- once a blizzard of abstract equations -- had become a concrete way to build skills for a good job. Now," she told me, "I love geometry."
America has hope enough to go around. There is no fixed number of good jobs to be parceled out, nor any natural limit to the ingenuity of the human mind and the new products and services it can concoct. We already see emerging all around us examples of the sophisticated yet accessible work that can form the platform for a new middle class. Some of the most notable job growth has occurred among technicians, who defy the traditional categories of the old economy. Their ranks are predicted to grow by nearly 40 percent over the decade to come. Data released recently by the Bureau of Labor Statistics show the most rapid job growth in high-paying occupations, even within traditionally low-paying industries — hinting at the proliferation of new kinds of middle-class jobs throughout the economy.

In my travels throughout America, I've met workers who repair vending machines using hand-held computers to identify problems and communicate with the home office, or who manage sections of retail stores by periodically tapping PCs to monitor sales and replenish inventories. Skilled workers use computers to monitor manufacturing machinery, or to link other computers as they install and test complex communications networks, or they go online to research cases and statutes at law firms. Some technical workers drive trucks equipped with a computer and modem and make just-in-time deliveries. Others orchestrate sophisticated spreadsheet and graphics programs to create value in ways unimaginable a decade ago.

The technician jobs that will sustain the core of the new middle class usually require some education beyond high school, but they do not always demand a four-year college degree. Degrees from community colleges -- the unsung heroes of the new middle class -- are paying off, and their enrollments are rising. Men with community college degrees earn 26 percent more, on average, than men with only a high school diploma. Women who have graduated from community colleges earn 33 percent more than women with a high school degree alone.

The Clinton Administration's workforce agenda is anchored by the proven fact that skills matter, and they can be learned. The fruits of our commitment to creating a new middle class are already emerging. We have begun to combat the forces dividing America's workers with an armory of new approaches to lifelong learning. (Ironically, many of these accomplishments have been little noticed because of the bipartisan consensus supporting them. Bipartisanship summons less attention than ideological brawls.)

Consider: An additional 130,000 children each year can now be made ready to learn at school through Head Start. School systems throughout America have millions of dollars in new incentives to improve their performance. During the summer just ending, some 120,000 disadvantaged young people who otherwise would have been on the street instead combined jobs with classroom instruction. Over the next six years,
almost half a million young Americans will be entering youth apprenticeships during the last two years of high school, many of them receiving special skill training beyond high school.

Starting this fall, 20,000 young people will enter National Service, earning money that they can apply to a college education. The three and a half million people who take out education loans each year now have the option of repaying their loans as a percentage of future income. We’re delivering on our promise to make work pay -- offering tax relief for 15 million working families with modest incomes. We’ve begun transforming the old unemployment insurance system into a reemployment system, ensuring that this year alone an additional 150,000 Americans who have lost their jobs will get the skills or the job-search help they need to find new ones. (Community colleges are quietly evolving into a core component of the emerging reemployment system, as thousands of experienced workers who have lost their jobs are able to rejoin the middle class thanks to community-college training.)

And we remain committed to staying the course on health-care reform, not least because the workforce stakes are so high. Without delivering on the promise of health security, our mission of turning the anxious class into a new, more secure, more productive middle class cannot be completed.

American business also has a crucial role to play in building a new middle class. Skills learned on the job, or in a work-related setting, tend to be especially well-tailored to the requirements of the workplace. New data on work-related training -- even though they do not capture the vital but hard-to-measure effect of informal on-the-job training -- show that the impact of such training is of the same magnitude as more traditional schooling. In fact, men and women who graduate only from high school, but who have received work-related training, earn more than people who have attended some college but who have not received any additional training, and almost as much as college graduates who lack additional work-based training. [Chart 10]

A positive sign is the growing readiness on the part of labor unions to include training benefits in bargaining. A contract negotiated this year between Nynex and the Communications Workers of America encourages workers to earn a two-year technical degree. Employees can spend one paid day a week building their skills, with the guarantee of a $50-per-week raise upon graduation. Workers employed for five years or more qualify for up to two years of education leave, and up to $10,000 yearly for tuition.

Yet most companies are not yet doing enough training, and what training they do provide is not being directed to workers who need it most. Among young college graduates, about 35 percent now receive work-related training. That’s nearly double the
rate for high school graduates and more than four times the rate for high school dropouts. The workers most likely to receive training are white, male, well-educated, and working in high-paying occupations. This imbalance serves only to harden the divisions within the workforce.

The payoff to work-based training, and the inadequacy and uneven distribution of such training, highlights the need for a new social compact among American workers, business, and government. In its first year and a half, the Clinton Administration has delivered much of what business has sought in order to bolster its competitiveness — lower deficits, low inflation, more open world markets, promotion of American companies abroad. Now business needs to do its part in this new compact by bringing all workers along on the route to prosperity, investing aggressively in their skills and making them partners in productivity. For American businesses, this new social compact is an imperative not only of corporate citizenship, but also of their own long-term interests.

A constant theme of American history has been the challenge of forging unity out of diversity. Over and over, we have had to affirm our identity as one nation, even in the face of profound differences. We are at such a point once again. This time, though, the deepest divisions aren’t based on race or on national origin or on geography. They’re based on the ability of individuals to make their way in an increasingly turbulent economy. The overclass is doing fine, but questioning its connection to the rest of America. The underclass is isolated in marginal enclaves walled off from hope. The anxious class is being pulled and stretched — by the need to work two or more jobs to keep a family solvent, by uneasiness about health care, by the specter that today’s job will disappear tomorrow, and by fears that their kids will be denied the opportunity for a better life.

If unchecked, these divisions can corrode our society. Unlike the citizens of most other nations, Americans have always been bound together less by a shared past than by shared dreams of a better future. If we lose that common future, we lose the glue that holds our nation together. Even now, some aspiring demagogues, feeding on the fear and anger unleashed by the splintering of the old middle class, stoke the fires of hate on the airwaves, and conspire to conceal their own agendas behind the banners of fear and division. This Administration proudly claims these cynics as adversaries.

Nothing is more vital to fulfilling our nation’s defining promise than preparing all Americans for meaningful, productive working lives. This is no simple undertaking — especially with the most austere federal budget in a generation. But if we pledge our common efforts — business, labor, government at all levels — we can clear the path to opportunity for today’s working men and women and their children.
In this century's waning years, in the hopeful, fearful confusion of the Cold War's end, our most important mission is to restore hope to the anxious class and lift despair from the underclass, to affirm with conviction that the American dream of broadly-shared middle class prosperity still endures.

###
## CHART SUMMARY

1. Average monthly change in nonfarm payroll employment.

2. Ratio of average annual earnings of college graduates to high school graduates.

3. Annual average earnings of workers by gender and educational attainment.

4. Health care coverage rates under employer-sponsored plans by educational attainment.

5. Unemployment rates of persons 25 to 64 years of age by educational attainment.


8. Percent of workers who directly use a computer at work.


10. Average weekly earnings of full-time workers by educational attainment and training received, 1991.
Average monthly change in nonfarm payroll employment

Jobs (in thousands)

Source: Current Employment Statistics program
Ratio of average annual earnings of college graduates to high school graduates

Note: Workers 25 years and older, year round, full time. Data on educational attainment for 1992 are not directly comparable to those from prior years.

Source: Current Population Survey
Annual average earnings of workers by gender and educational attainment
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Source: Bureau of the Census, Current Population Survey
Note: Workers 25 years and older, working year round, full time. Data on educational attainment for 1991 and 1992 are not directly comparable to those from prior years.
Health care coverage rates under employer-sponsored plans by educational attainment

Percent of all wage and salary workers

Source: Current Population Survey
Unemployment rates of persons 25 to 64 years of age by educational attainment

Note: Data on educational attainment for 1992 are not directly comparable to those from prior years.

Source: Current Population Survey
Employment growth by higher and lower educational attainment sectors in the United States, 1983-93

Average annual percent change

Note: Higher educational attainment sectors are those in which 30% or more of the full-time workers had college degrees in 1985.

Source: Current Population Survey
Employment growth by higher and lower educational attainment sectors, 1983-93

Average annual percent change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Higher education sectors</th>
<th>Lower education sectors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For France, Germany, Italy, and the United Kingdom, the data are for 1983-91. Higher educational attainment sectors are those in which 30% or more of the full-time workers in the United States have college degrees.
Percent of workers who directly use a computer at work

Source: Current Population Survey
Computer use at work by educational attainment, 1993

Percent of employed persons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Current Population Survey
Average weekly earnings of full-time workers by educational attainment and training received, 1991

Dollars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No training</th>
<th>Skill improvement training</th>
<th>Qualifying training</th>
<th>Both types of training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>785</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Current Population Survey
Our country is to assume the safety of the people. We will continue. I am writing.
REMARKS BY SECRETARY BROWN
ANNOUNCEMENT OF WORLDPORT L.A. FOREIGN TRADE ZONE
JULY 10, 1994

Good morning. I'd like to thank all of you for getting up early enough to mark the creation of Foreign Trade Zone 202 with me. This new zone will help bring jobs and economic growth to the city of Los Angeles through its WORLDPORT LA 2020 program, by stimulating trade and investment opportunities here in Los Angeles. This zone will allow businesses in the area to import goods with duty free treatment if they are reexported and to defer their duties if they are brought into the country. In 1993, Greater Los Angeles exported $27.2 billion in goods and services, a better performance than 46 states. This new foreign trade zone encompasses both the seaports and airports of Los Angeles and will certainly improve their results. The Port of Los Angeles is the most active port in the U.S. and the largest on the West Coast. This new zone will help improve this port's competitiveness for exporting companies and will encourage trade and employment opportunities here. At the same time, it will supplement and enhance the Enterprise Zone program already in place here, as well as the Los Angeles Revitalization Zone.

This is part of an ongoing California effort. We are all aware of how much Los Angeles and California have suffered over the past few years. Natural disasters, the long recession and slowing of defense spending have devastated the local economy.

However, California is climbing back on its feet. The Clinton Administration has made enormous efforts to help Californians restructure and revitalize their economy. Our National Export Strategy, which promotes exports in order to stimulate economic growth, is targeted specifically at California, the largest exporting state in the country. We have liberalized export controls on computers and electronic equipment, smoothing the way for California's high tech industries to sell abroad. We are establishing a Minority Business Development Agency Megacenter here in Los Angeles, which will provide state-of-the-art management and technical assistance to start-up, existing and expanding minority businesses to ensure that economic growth takes place in every community. Yesterday, I announced the investment of $30 million
EXCERPT FROM INDIA TRIP TOAST

For the Secretary's trip to India, they asked me to dig up some culturally relevant remarks for toasts. Here is an excerpt from them.

When you consider the differences between our two countries, you might think there is no common ground. The contrast between the wise elder and the young giant seems enormous at first glance. India is a country whose history stretches back thousands of years, whose culture and customs once dominated continents and countries, and whose people speak of a Golden Age in an era that Americans are hard-pressed to imagine. On the other hand, for the United States, history has been less a lesson than a reminder of how much further there is to travel. Yet, we are not as different as you might think. In fact, certain experiences have influenced us both, causing similar developments and features in both our countries.

It would be impossible to understand American history without coming to grips with the influence of Britain. No less can be said of India. Both of our democracies took the democratic theories and ideals from Britain. Many of America's Founding fathers had as their core beliefs values they had learned there. George Washington, our first president, took his education and upbringing from England and used it to help create the New World. In India, Jawaharlal Nehru used his education at Cambridge University, the summit of British education, to help lead his country away from Britain's influence and develop India's independent future. And for both our nations, our seminal experience was the winning of independence from the British government. I always remember that the Boston Tea Party stemmed from the British taxing Indian tea coming to the United States.

We are both nations who derive our strength from our diversity. At the India-America conference at New Delhi in December 1949, the Indian Minister for Industry and Supply, the honorable Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee reminded us that "Unity in diversity has been the keynote of India's civilization". We have a similar motto in the United States - From Many, One. India's role as a cultural haven is similar to America's description as the Melting Pot - this is a crucial source of the vitality and originality of both our countries.

Our influences on each other have been no less important. Many of the lessons of India's long history and culture have been instructive for the United States. The Bhagavad Gita, the philosophical poem and the exemplary text of Hindu culture enthralled and inspired many American poets who were seen as embodying the uniquely American spirit. Ralph Waldo Emerson described the Gita in his journal in 1845; "It was the first of books; it was as if an empire spoke to us, nothing small or unworthy, but large, serene, consistent, the voice of an old intelligence which in another age and climate had pondered and thus disposed of the same questions which exercise us". Henry David Thoreau was equally overwhelmed. In Walden, while watching ice being cut from Walden Pond to be transported to India by New England merchants, he wrote "In the morning I bathe my intellect in the stupendous and cosmogonical philosophy of the Bhagavad-Gita, since whose composition years of the gods have elapsed, and
in comparison with which our modern world and its literature seem puny and trivial; and I doubt if that philosophy is not to be referred to a previous state of existence, so remote is its sublimity from our conceptions... The pure Walden water is mingled with the sacred water of the Ganges" (the holy Indian river).

But this current of mutual advancement has also flowed back to India. Indira Ghandi spoke of this in her visit to Washington D.C in 1966; "Friendship with America is not a new thing for us. Those of us who have been involved with the struggle for freedom have known from our earliest days your own struggle here. We have been taught the words of your leaders, of your past great Presidents, and above all we were linked in friendship which President Roosevelt showed us and the understanding which he showed during some of the most difficult days of our independence struggle. I have no doubt it was also this understanding and friendly advice given to the British Government which facilitated and accelerated our own freedom."

We in the United States realize that we are a young country. We grew to a level of overwhelming global influence and power without the long history that usually precedes it. For that reason, we have often looked abroad, to cultures far older than our own, for counsel and advice. There are many traces of Indian influence on American public life. Our most celebrated civil rights leader, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., wrote his doctoral thesis on the writings and teachings of Mohandas Ghandi, insisting that Ghandian nonviolence was the only way to reform American society. His *Letter From A Birmingham Jail* bore remarkably similar political consequences to Nehru's own *Glimpses of World History*, also written from a prison cell. A period of time in jail, said Nehru, was very constructive and he advised it for any aspiring author, or even an aspiring politician.

Our relations throughout the last fifty years have undergone enormous change, politically and economically. Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan spent two formative years in India as the U.S. Ambassador, which left its mark on him as he described India as "A great nation with great interests and even greater needs, by 1974 a nuclear power as well, it had for years assumed that its interests were very much involved with the United States, but more and more now sided with those who opposed us, both internally and abroad". Commenting on the economic ties, he wrote in his memoirs, "When I arrived in New Delhi (1973), I had asked the commercial attaché for a list of American businessmen in India. He answered that he didn't have a list, but could tell me who they were, for there were fewer than three dozen left" (pg 21). Much has changed since that time. Today, we estimate that there are some 200 U.S. firms with equity investments in India, and that U.S. companies operating in India employing roughly 60,000 to 70,000 people. In the same vein, John Kenneth Galbraith, another former U.S. Ambassador to India, reminisced about his time spent in India and meeting Prime Minister Nehru. He wrote of their first meeting, "I presented myself as the most amateur of diplomats. He (Nehru) proclaimed himself an amateur Prime Minister".
Good evening. I am delighted to be with you. Let me express my thanks to you all for coming together here tonight. This is an exciting time of change and challenge in our relations with Asia and the Pacific -- in every sense a sea-change in America's relations with the world.

In this country's history, there were many bold, restless and daring individuals who had no patience in retracing other's footsteps. To them was given the advice: "Go west, young man". The West was an area where the adventurous and entrepreneurial spirit could flourish and grow, where life and commerce was the art of the possible and diligence the tool for success. As we moved westward to the border of the Pacific Ocean, that sense of possibility led us to reach out across this ocean, to come into contact with other less familiar societies and cultures. We are met here in the West, the crucible of America's adventurous acumen to realize the importance and value of associating and cooperating with the nations of the Pacific, many of whose histories stretch back far further than our own.

The list of benefits from our relations with your countries is manifest in so many areas. From the cherry blossoms of Washington DC to the bustle of Little Saigon on the West Coast, the mark of the Pacific has been made across our country, enriching our intellects and aesthetics as well as our economy. But it is our shared beliefs, that sense of independence, that drive to challenge and overcome obstacles, that priority to improve our people's lives and secure the future for the sake of those to follow that are our most prized shared possession.

These shared beliefs are the underpinnings of our future cooperation and prosperity. We have gathered here in Seattle to mark the creation of a new order. The Cold War has been replaced by a Pacific Coalition, an alliance of nations committed to economic prosperity rather than military conflict. President Clinton has made this an overriding priority, calling the U.S. to
Why are we so dedicated to enlarging the scope of global cooperation and trade? The answer is simple. It is not simply a question of trade balances and bottom lines. Trade has never been an end, only a means to an end. President Clinton is focused on improving this country's domestic prosperity but he realizes that only a rising tide lifting all boats will carry the U.S. upwards. Without open, vital economies and high living standards around the world, there would be no demand for U.S. exports and no chance for economic growth. We must make room around the economic campfire so that every country can feel the warmth and enjoy the benefits.

If we do not undertake this task together, it is certain that we will all fail separately. The global economy is only now recovering from a prolonged recession and we cannot afford to risk its progress. If we stand by and watch this economic momentum fail, it is not clear that we can restart the process. In all of our countries, the twin trolls of protectionism and isolationism are lurking in the wings, waiting for us to lose our courage and take the easy way out. That is why the U.S. created the Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee, which I chair. Its job is to promote trade, not as a purely mechanical way to raise export levels but in a larger sense to send the American ideal of a better and improving life wherever we do business.

If economic growth is unequal, there will always be those who will withdraw and endanger the process. President Clinton is leading us into an era where the interests of good business and the needs of a good society can sit around a common table, investing in a prosperous future rather than fighting over scraps of a shrinking pie. However if we turn away from cooperation with each other, this will open the doors for national movements in each country to sabotage our joint achievements and prevent further progress towards our goal of better lives for all of our peoples. In the final analysis, we in the US cannot prosper and grow unless you join us on the path of peace and prosperity.

But this does not mean in any way that the US plans to give up its international role. We will maintain and build our global leadership by both harnessing and unleashing our national resources; by aiding business when appropriate and getting out of its way when necessary; by seeking market access and by offering it; by pursuing free trade and by understanding that we can only achieve it by being willing to fight for fair trade, by looking both to old allies and to the promise offered by new alliances, East, West, North and South.
There have been many successful ventures by American entrepreneurs in your countries and a number of them are here with us this evening. Their enterprises have been large and small, short- and long term but one thing is clear; American business has recognized the new reality of the Asian market and is aggressively pursuing partnerships there. The Clinton Administration has deemed it crucial that government work closely with business to improve their prospects abroad and I am proud to direct the government agency most responsible for assisting these commercial links. As American companies large and small increase their business with your countries and receive your products in return, each time a bilateral bargain is completed, our countries come closer together.

As we conclude our meetings here in Seattle, it behooves us to remember what is at stake. It is not merely the normalization of relations between countries, or discussions of our common futures; it is our joint claim to the economic leadership of this planet. The Pacific nations can together blaze a new trail of prosperity and vitality that all the world can follow, or we can separately seek our own destinies and let fall the mantle of leadership. When we leave here at week's end, we must take with us the realization that the global economy is being reshaped before our eyes and the question remains whether we shall play our full part.
REMARKS FOR SECRETARY BROWN
SITIC LUNCH IN SHANGHAI
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 31 1994

I would like to thank SITIC very much for inviting me here today. It is my honor as Secretary of Commerce to lead this Presidential Business Development Mission to China with the leaders of some of America's most vibrant companies, Governor Gaston Caperton and representatives from important federal trade agencies. With the world changing before our eyes, transforming conventional wisdom into outdated slogans, cooperation between the United States and China is crucial. This Mission will set the tone for a new era of U.S.-China relations, of much closer commercial cooperation, emphasizing shared goals and deepening bilateral ties.

No trip to China would be complete without a visit to Shanghai, a city of immense historical, cultural and commercial significance. Shanghai has an important place in U.S.-Chinese history. The 1972 communiqué normalizing relations between our two countries and establishing a framework for twenty years of consistent engagement and cooperation is today known as the Shanghai Communiqué. Again we have come to Shanghai to mark a new era in our relationship, establishing a framework for closer commercial partnership and practical involvement.

For many centuries the most economically dynamic of China's cities, Shanghai commands our attention as we look forward. With its new stock market, productive heavy industry and growing high tech sector, Shanghai is rapidly emerging as one of the world's most important economic centers.

I believe that the U.S. can help speed this emergence not only through trade and joint ventures but through training and exchange programs that increase the skills of Chinese managers and strengthen ties between U.S. and Chinese private companies. That we can speak not only of trade but of close cooperation in management training and personal development is evidence of how far U.S.-China relations have come.

Today, we look to the future: the future of U.S.-Chinese relations, the future of joint economic growth and the future of Shanghai. Our commercial relationship is returning to center stage, allowing us to build the trade and investment ties that bring economic benefits to the people of both nations and become the foundation of our political and cultural relationship. I am convinced that the path to common ground lies across the bridge of commercial partnership.

Our commercial relationship is clearly important as the post Cold War realities have taught us that our economic stability is inextricably bound up with our national security. Sustained U.S. economic growth is impossible without economic growth and stability for China, the biggest of the Big Emerging Markets. For this reason, we applaud China's efforts to lift her people's standard of living and we want to help in any way we can.
Providing these additional resources to promote American goods and services will increase U.S. involvement in Shanghai and will provide the opportunity for Chinese and U.S. companies to benefit from the experience and tenacity of some of our smaller firms.

Some twenty years ago, the Shanghai Communique normalized political relations between China and the United States. Today, we continue that journey into a new era of commercial partnership between our two countries. In 1972, our concern was coexistence. Today, we are cementing a mutually beneficial commercial partnership, joining hands at the head of the Yangtze dragon, striking out for uncharted waters. This mission and our trip to Shanghai are thus an acknowledgement that we are moving confidently towards a very promising future. The 21st century will turn on the success of our connection, the union of the historic power and the young giant, joining forces to welcome the future. The Shanghai Communiqué of 1972 began the pivotal association of our two countries. Twenty years from now, we may well look back on this trip as having a similar historic importance.

Thank you very much.