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MEMORANDUM TO DISTRIBUTION

FROM: DON BAER, ANTONY BLINKEN, DAVID LEAVY

SUBJECT: DENVER SUMMIT OF THE EIGHT TALKING POINTS

Attached are the official talking points for the Denver Summit of the Eight.
There are three broad story-lines developing around the Denver Summit.

The first is Russia and its integration into the world’s economic and political institutions. Russia’s participation in the Summit from the start as a quasi-full fledged member comes just after the historic NATO-Russia security pact and just before the Madrid Summit. President Clinton’s steady, consistent support for reform in Russia and his determination to help bring Russia more fully into the community of free market democracies -- as evidenced by Helsinki, Paris and Denver -- is bearing fruit.

The second story is the success of the American economy -- in its own right and in comparison to the economies of many of our Summit partners. Contrasted to Houston in 1990, or President Clinton’s first summit in Tokyo in 1993, as well as with the performance of most of the other Denver participants, the strength and vitality of the US economy are striking. The President has the right strategy for the global economy: cutting the budget deficit, investing in education and training for our people, and opening up the global marketplace to American goods and services. Instead of running away from the world or our responsibilities, we are shaping the forces of change and globalization to our advantage.

The third story is a result of the first two: Because of the President’s success abroad (e.g. dealing with Russia) and at home (e.g. building a strong economy) our partners once again look to our country and our economy for leadership to meet the new challenges and opportunities of integration and globalization. The President is using our leadership capital, at this Summit and beyond, to organize the community of democracies in laying a strong foundation for the 21st century -- preparing our people and our economies for the challenges of the global marketplace; meeting new transnational threats to our security; and integrating new partners into the community of free market democracies.
II. BROAD MESSAGE POINTS

The World Looks to America. Four years ago in Tokyo, our partners told us to get our own house in order. We did -- cutting the budget deficit by two-thirds, slashing unemployment, keeping inflation at a thirty year low, reclaiming our position as the world’s number one exporter. Now, our success is a role model -- and we can focus the community of democracies to meet the challenges of the 21st century.

Organizing America and our Partners to Make the Most of Integration and Globalization. These summits play a key role in coordinating the political and economic strength of the world’s leading open market democracies -- and shaping the forces of change that have a direct impact on people’s lives. At the Denver Summit we will:

- Continue to strengthen our economies and build a stable world financial system so America can thrive in the global economy;
- Increase cooperation to meet new, transnational threats to our common security like crime, drugs, terrorism, environmental decay and infectious diseases;
- Integrate new partners -- Russia and Africa -- more fully into the international system and lock in the gains of democracy and open markets.

America at the Pinnacle of Its Power -- and Responsibility. As America stands at the pinnacle of its power, it also stands at the pinnacle of its responsibility. By taking the lead in building new institutions and arrangements for the 21st century, President Clinton is rising to the responsibility to meet the challenges of our time.

III. SUMMIT GOALS

1. BUILDING STRONG ECONOMIES FOR THE 21ST CENTURY:

We will continue the work we began in Halifax to prepare our economies for the challenges of the 21st century global economy and to strengthen stability in the world’s emerging markets.

A. With Our Partners

Promoting Growth and Reducing Risks in the Global Economy
- Advance plan to reduce risks in global financial markets (e.g. Mexican Peso crisis) by building network to supervise global financial institutions and increasing cooperation among financial regulators.
- Encourage other countries to adopt our strategy of reducing deficits, investing in people and seeking export-led growth. To advance this effort, endorse Prime Minister’s Blair’s call for an international conference on jobs.
- To combat corruption, adopt international convention to criminalize bribery; increase efforts to fight money laundering; encourage open and accountable decision making.
B. At Home

Focus on Active Aging Populations:
- Invest in human capital through life-long learning to remove barriers and disincentives to continued labor force participation for "young seniors";
- Strengthen pension and health systems;
- Promote active aging through information exchanges and cross national research;
- Encourage collaborative biomedical, behavioral research to increase understanding of aging process.

Strengthening Small and Medium Sized Business
- Develop strategies to foster growth of small, medium business -- key source of job creation.

2. MEETING NEW TRANSTNATIONAL THREATS TO OUR SECURITY:
Since 1993, President Clinton has led his Summit partners in addressing transnational threats from international crime, drug trafficking, terrorism and weapons proliferation. In Denver, we will work to develop concrete follow-on actions to the steps we've already taken, and focus on two other global threats: damage to the environment and emerging infectious diseases like AIDS.

Global Security Threats
- Forge common approaches to combating money laundering and cyber-crime; increase cooperation on extradition to bring criminals to justice quickly, efficiently.
- Strengthen coordination to fight supply and demand related drug trafficking
- Push states to adopt international counter-terrorism conventions by 2000, including new convention to suppress terrorist bombing;
- Share technologies to detect and deter weapons of mass destruction;
- Develop means to deter terrorist attacks on electronic and computer infrastructure.
- Strengthen protection of public transportation against terrorist attacks.
- Establish network of law enforcement and nuclear security officials to prevent and respond to nuclear smuggling.

Infectious Diseases
- Provide investments necessary to accelerate AIDS vaccine research.
- Create global network to track and respond to outbreaks of infectious diseases.

Protecting Our Shared Environment
- Facilitate the transfer of environmentally sound technologies;
- Promote child survival and sustainable development by promoting clean water in the developing world;
- Take action to address atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gasses;
- Adopt environmental standards for Export Credit Agencies;
- Children's environmental health initiative.
- Advance efforts to reform U.N. environmental institutions.
3. INTEGRATING NEW PARTNERS INTO THE COMMUNITY OF FREE MARKET DEMOCRACIES:
Bringing Russia more fully into the world economy -- through the Summit process and OECD, WTO and Paris Club membership -- will help lock in gains of democracy and economic reform.
The Summit also will focus on developing a new partnership with Africa based on trade and investment, not simply aid, as a complement to American initiatives (Africa Trade & Investment legislation). We will support African economies that pursue reform, fight corruption, open markets and invest in people -- those that have are beginning to benefit from the global economy.

**Integrating Russia into Key International Financial Institutions**
- For the first time, Russia will take part in the Summit from the start.
- Seek agreement on conditions for Russia’s early participation as creditor in Paris Club.
- Support goal of early Russian accession to WTO and OECD.

**Partnership For Development on Africa:**
- Improve access to markets of industrialized nations for African countries;
- Strengthen assistance and enhance opportunities for economic growth in African countries committed to trade liberalization;
- Target assistance to sound public administration; more efficient legal and judicial systems; growth-oriented infrastructure development;
- Enhance food security;
- Establish information networks in Africa;
- Strengthen peacekeeping abilities and coordination.

**Democracy and Human Rights**
- Launch year-long effort, culminating in Birmingham Summit, to advance and coordinate democracy and human rights policies and programs. Cornerstone of President Clinton
- Establish ministerial working group that will meet regularly to advance these goals.
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May 22, 1997

MEMORANDUM TO: The Honorable Donald A. Baer
Director of Strategic Planning
The White House

FROM: Joyce Kravitz
Chief of Staff

SUBJECT: Denver Summit of the Eight Public Diplomacy Strategy

I am sure that this violates basic protocol but I wanted you to see our wish list for overseas press opportunities prior to the Denver summit. I thought it might help you in your planning to see what we think the President and Cabinet could do. With your support we could get these initiatives underway immediately. What do you think?
USIA Public Diplomacy Strategy for the Summit of the Eight, Denver, June 20-22

As host for the Denver Summit, the United States Government has a unique opportunity to set the tone of the proceedings and to promote its agenda priorities. Administration officials at the highest levels can get these messages across to foreign audiences in Summit and other key countries and their respective governments quickly, directly and without filters through a series of public diplomacy initiatives developed by USIA. With just one month to go, the time to begin these initiatives is now.

The focus of international public opinion on Russia vis-a-vis NATO should ease after the May 27 signing of the NATO-Russia Founding Act in Paris. With this crucial issue generally resolved, world attention will turn to the upcoming Summit, the important issues to be addressed in Denver, and the role the Russians will play. USIA estimates that as many as 3000 media representatives, some one-third international, will be in Denver to cover the Summit. The credentialed press corps are the world's leading interlocutors in explaining the Summit process to their readers and audiences throughout the world.

The President met with the international media to outline U.S. priorities in run-ups to both the 1993 and 1994 Summits. He has not met with the international media for a Summit scene-setter since that time (he had to cancel a planned session in 1995). With the Summit taking place in the U.S. this year, the world will be looking to him and his Administration to outline official USG positions. Since the amount of information on the Summit agenda has been limited thus far, the next few weeks offer a prime window of opportunity to articulate and build support for U.S. positions at Denver.

With concurrence from the relevant government agencies, our plan is to feature key Administration officials, e.g., the Vice President, Secretary Rubin, Secretary Albright, National Security Adviser Berger, Under Secretary Eizenstat, Under Secretary Wirth, Assistant Secretary Shattuck, and others, via our Worldnet television, digital video teleconferencing, VOA, Foreign Press Center, and electronic print programming capabilities. The intended audiences would be opinion-makers in Summit and other important nations, and through placement via mass media, the global community.

This series of interviews would be capped by a foreign press opportunity with the President just prior to the opening of the Summit.

Proposed Action Plan:

Week of June 2-6

Secretary Rubin to brief on the economic agenda of the Summit at the Washington Foreign Press Center. Q and A to follow. This would be the Secretary's first press event at the Washington FPC. We anticipate a capacity audience (over 75) of U.S.-based foreign print and electronic media representatives with mass audiences in the Summit
countries and worldwide. USIA media (VOA, Worldnet and the daily Washington File) would also cover.

Under Secretary Wirth to discuss the Summit's partnership for African development via a Worldnet interactive television dialogue. Audiences would be government officials, businesspeople, media and NGO representatives from such leading sub-Saharan nations such as South Africa, Tanzania, Kenya, and Senegal. Opportunity for Q and A. This session would showcase Summit efforts to focus global attention on the potential for development in Africa in the post-Cold War era.

Series of op-eds by Administration officials on U.S. Denver Summit priorities begins with placement in leading print media in Summit countries.

Fact sheets on U.S. perspectives on the Summit agenda placed on home pages, distributed to overseas media and other contacts.

Follow-up on Denver Summit outcomes as appropriate in summer-fall 1997 thematic electronic journals (economics, global issues, etc.).

Week of June 9-13

An interview opportunity with the Vice President for a select group of 15-20 international print and electronic media -- including participants from Latin America, the Middle East and East/South Asia -- on the overall Summit Agenda. Preferred venue would be the White House. USIA media to cover.

Secretary Albright to participate in a Worldnet television interactive dialogue with a key group of media representatives in Bonn, London, Ottawa, Moscow, Paris and Rome on the security and international affairs agenda of the Summit. After brief remarks by the Secretary, the program would be devoted to questions from interlocutors at the participating posts. The program would be carried live on satellite throughout Europe and the NIS, with anticipated broad placement.

NSC Adviser Berger to brief on the Summit’s security and international affairs agenda at the Washington FPC. We anticipate a large turnout for Berger’s first appearance at the FPC. Q and A to follow. USIA media would cover.

Under Secretary Eizenstat to participate in two digital video teleconferences with audiences of Japanese and Canadian/West European governmental, economic and media policy and opinion-makers, respectively, to discuss the Summit’s economic agenda. Anticipated broad media placement.

Assistant Secretary Shattuck (or Secretary Albright, if more appropriate) to participate in a Worldnet television discussion of the Democracy Initiative with President Vaclav Havel of the Czech Republic. President Havel has a global reputation as a champion of liberty.
and has led the Czech Republic in its successful transition to a democratic system of governance. Such a discussion, carried live on Worldnet satellite in Europe, would result in mass placement in the continent, the NIS and internationally. In addition, the Assistant Secretary could participate in a similar Worldnet television interactive dialogue -- with the opportunity for Q and A -- with publics in West European Summit nations, Canada and from a non-Summit European nation known for its support of democracy and human rights, such as the Netherlands or one of the Nordic states.

The Week of June 16-23

Before departure to Denver, an interview opportunity with the President for one print journalist and one electronic journalist (plus attendant camera crews) from each of the eight Summit Nations. The preferred venue would be the White House. We have attached a suggested list of preeminent U.S.-based foreign print journalists. They are:

Canada -- Mr. Graham Fraser, Globe and Mail (circ. 350,000-plus)
France -- Mr. Laurent Zecchini, Le Monde (circ. 500,000-plus)
Germany -- Ms. Carola Kaps, Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (circ. 400,000-plus)
Italy -- Mr. Mario Calvo-Platero, Il Sole 24 Ore (circ. 346,000)
Japan -- Mr. Shigeru Komago, Nihon Keizai Shim bun ("Nikkei), (circ. 3 million-plus)
Russia -- Mr. Vladimir Nadein, Izvestiya (circ. 630,000)
United Kingdom -- Ms. Patti Waldmeir, Financial Times (circ. 300,000-plus)

Electronic media from Summit nations (names forthcoming) which were scheduled to participate in the canceled 1995 session with the President include:

Canada -- CTV
France -- France TV 2
Germany -- ZDF
Italy -- RAI-1
Japan -- NHK
Russia -- NTV
United Kingdom -- BBC

Additional USIA Programming for the Denver Summit:

50 USIA staff who will be in Denver the week of June 16-23 to assist with the public affairs work of the Summit. We have established a Denver Summit website. Both the White House home page and the Denver Host Committee home page will link to this USIA-produced site. Administration statements and texts on Summit issues are being included in the daily Washington File publication which is read by overseas elites.
Our research operation has published polling results indicating how Americans, Japanese, West Europeans and Russians view Denver Summit issues, which we have attached. We are coordinating closely with the State Department's Bureau of Public Affairs to expedite State's issuance of talking points which will then be transmitted to overseas field posts. Besides the 50 USIA staff detailed to Denver, another 50 USIA staff in Washington will be working full-time on Summit issues the week of June 16-23.

Drafted:D/C:VSidabras
May 22, 1997
MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

CC: ERSKINE BOWLES, JOHN PODESTA AND SYLVIA MATHews

FROM: DON BAER AND VICTORIA RADD

SUBJECT: DENVER SUMMIT TOWN HALL MEETING

Background. As you know, we have been trying to develop plans for a town hall meeting in Denver, focused on international relations and your vision of American leadership in the world. Our original idea was for most of the questions to come from young people -- both in Denver and at satellite-linked sites around the world. To ensure full coverage, we wanted one of the networks to present the town hall. We now have a proposal, but there is divided opinion among your staff as to whether you should do this town hall meeting at this time; Erskine in particular is strongly against the idea. We wanted you to have a full understanding of the proposal's strengths and deficiencies so that you can make a final decision.

CNN proposal. CNN has proposed a plan that differs in several important respects from our original idea. (ABC had been interested, but is unable to do this now; they may be able to do so in the fall.) CNN wants an audience of about 250 people in Denver, selected by CNN and Gallup and tilted toward young people. They want Judy Woodruff to moderate and ask many of the questions; she would bring audience members into the discussion, but not as actively as in a straight town hall format. CNN does not want to satellite in participants from around the world other than their own correspondents (in Europe, Asia and perhaps Moscow). These correspondents would ask questions of their own and introduce questions submitted through the Internet by ordinary citizens in various countries. The CNN town hall meeting would be broadcast live from 4:00 to 5:30 p.m. MST on Thursday, June 19th, the day before the Summit begins.

Pros. This offer affords you the opportunity to speak to the American people about your foreign policy vision and its importance to their daily lives. It also enables you to use the bully pulpit to draw greater attention to the Denver Summit, the history that will be made there, and the issues you wish to highlight.

Cons. CNN's proposal allows for more aggressive questioning than we had originally intended. Although CNN maintains that at least 90% of the discussion will center on
foreign policy, they still leave room for very tough questions on that subject, plus a handful of questions outside that area. Also, your own preparation time would have to be extensive and could be difficult to squeeze in just before the Summit.

Staff views. Erskine sides against this proposal, mainly because of the difficulties of ensuring proper preparation time right before a major summit. Doug is strongly opposed to the proposal and Rahm leans against the proposal as well. Recognizing the potential pitfalls, Don still favors it because of the big opportunity it represents to discuss the future of international relations with the country. Sandy is very much in favor of going forward, because he believes the town meeting would help explain in real terms to the American people what the Summit is all about. Mike McCurry believes it is a close call, but leans in favor if we can obtain a guarantee that CNN’s correspondents will focus only on international questions, and that they will select an audience with an interest in international issues.

If we do not proceed with this town hall meeting, we would try to schedule a public event to show that America and its economy are now the envy of the world (focusing perhaps on Denver’s high-tech economy). This would provide a strong contrast between the 1997 Denver Summit (after 4 ½ years of your strong economic leadership) and the 1990 Houston Summit, at which time America did not have its own economic house in order.

Proceed with CNN town hall meeting

Schedule alternative event

Discuss
Memorandum

To: Ann Lewis
From: J Toscano and Dan Kerrigan
Date: May 20, 1997
Re: National Service and the Summit of the Eight

THE CONCEPT
On June 20-22, 1997 the annual G7 economic summit, "The Summit of the Eight," will be hosted by the United States in Denver, Colorado. The meeting has been known as the Group of Seven Economic Summit of Industrialized Nations, and it includes the United States, Japan, Britain, France, Germany, Italy and Canada. About 3,000 delegates and 5,000 journalists are expected in June for the 23rd annual summit meetings. While the primary news focus will be on international trade and economic issues and how they impact the G7 nations, there is an opportunity to create a significant sidebar story for the U.S. media on the value of national service in general and AmeriCorps in specific.

Since the launch of AmeriCorps in 1994, many countries have sent delegations to study AmeriCorps as a model for developing national service programs. This movement has accelerated with European military downsizing and the end of military conscription in many countries. In the past two years Corporation for National Service personnel have met with representatives of foreign governments from:
- of the G7 nations: Japan, Britain, France, Germany, Italy, and Canada
- Russia
- other nations: Argentina, Brazil, Catalonia, China, Eritrea, Hungary, Korea, Namibia, New Guinea, Romania, South Africa, Sweden, Taiwan R.O.C., and Thailand

THE PROPOSAL - THE EVENT
With the intense media concentration on this Summit of the Eight, we can create an event that highlights the value of national service as portrayed through AmeriCorps, that will get significant press coverage. Such an event, carefully crafted and orchestrated, can place high in the network news shows on the day we hold it, not unlike the AmeriCorps event at Nebinger Elementary School during the Presidents' Summit, which was the lead visual on two of the three major news networks the day it was held, and it can be a deep well for a number of print stories.

We can create an imaginative, visual site visit, where the President invites select foreign leaders to accompany him to see AmeriCorps in action. We recommend the AmeriCorps National Civilian Community Corps (NCCC) at Lowry Airbase.
NCCC is one of our premier AmeriCorps programs. It is run by former military officers and it is about 1,000 members strong. Corps members are based on downsized or closed military facilities in Denver, CO, San Diego, CA, and Charleston, SC; smaller bases are located at Virginia's Fort Belvoir and the Veterans' medical facility at Perry Point, Maryland. There are about 250 members at Denver's Lowry Airbase. Their term of service runs from October through July. Sidenote: they are involved in an America Reads summer program in the Denver schools this summer.

NCCC is modeled on FDR's Civilian Conservation Corps. Corps members are 18-24 years old, they work in teams of a dozen for the year, and they do much of their service in "spike" projects -- usually focused on the environment -- in communities all across America.

The legislation for NCCC was passed in 1991 as part of defense conversion and the lead sponsors were Senators Wofford, Warner, Domenici, Mikulski, Dole, and Boren. NCCC was folded into -- and launched with -- AmeriCorps in 1994. The current NCCC director is retired Lieutenant General Andrew Chambers, who commanded the Third Army -- the free world's largest -- in defense of Europe.
To: Ada Lewis

This is our meeting of the night public diplomacy strategy group that I sent to Sandy.

We are moving ahead with the plan. Anything you can do from your end would be appreciated.

Best,

[Signature]
The Honorable Samuel Berger  
Assistant to the President  
for National Security Affairs  
The White House

Dear Sandy:

As host of the Summit of the Eight in Denver, the Administration has a unique opportunity to set the tone of the proceedings and to promote its agenda priorities. To support these efforts, USIA has developed a series of public diplomacy initiatives to enable leading Administration officials to get their messages to key foreign audiences quickly, directly, and without filters. The time to begin these initiatives is now.

With concurrence from relevant government agencies, our plan is to feature high-ranking officials, such as the Vice President, Secretary Rubin, Secretary Albright, yourself and others, via our WORLDNET television, digital video teleconferencing, VOA, Foreign Press Center and electronic print programming capabilities. The intended audiences would be opinion-makers in Summit and other important nations and, through placement via mass media, the world community.

The centerpiece of this strategy is a scene-setter by the President for preeminent foreign press just prior to the opening of the Summit. The world will be looking to him and his Administration to outline official USG positions. We see this as a significant opportunity for the President to reach beyond foreign governments in order to communicate directly with overseas publics to build support for our foreign policy objectives.

Our foreign media strategy is enclosed for your information. With your support, we hope to initiate this public affairs strategy drawing upon the President and Administration leaders to articulate and advance U.S. goals for the Denver Summit.

Sincerely,

Joseph Duffey  
Director
USIA Public Diplomacy Strategy for the Summit of the Eight, Denver, June 20-22

As host for the Denver Summit, the United States Government has a unique opportunity to set the tone of the proceedings and to promote its agenda priorities. Administration officials at the highest levels can get these messages across to foreign audiences in Summit and other key countries and their respective governments quickly, directly and without filters through a series of public diplomacy initiatives developed by USIA. With just one month to go, the time to begin these initiatives is now.

The focus of international public opinion on Russia vis-a-vis NATO should ease now that the May 27 signing of the NATO-Russia Founding Act in Paris has taken place. With this crucial issue generally resolved, world attention will turn to the upcoming Summit, the important issues to be addressed in Denver, and the role the Russians will play. USIA estimates that as many as 3000 media representatives, some one-third international, will be in Denver to cover the Summit. The credentialed press corps are the world’s leading interlocutors in explaining the Summit process to their readers and audiences throughout the world.

The President met with the international media to outline U.S. priorities in run-ups to both the 1993 and 1994 Summits. He has not met with the international media for a Summit scene-setter since that time (he had to cancel a planned session in 1995). With the Summit taking place in the U.S. this year, the world will be looking to him and his Administration to outline official USG positions. Since the amount of information on the Summit agenda has been limited thus far, the next few weeks offer a prime window of opportunity to articulate and build support for U.S. positions at Denver.

With concurrence from the relevant government agencies, our plan is to feature key Administration officials, e.g., the Vice President, Secretary Rubin, Secretary Albright, National Security Adviser Berger, Under Secretary Eizenstat, Under Secretary Wirth, Assistant Secretary Shattuck, and others, via our WORLDNET television, digital video teleconferencing, VOA, Foreign Press Center, and electronic print programming capabilities. The intended audiences would be opinion-makers in Summit and other important nations, and through placement via mass media, the global community.

This series of interviews would be capped by a foreign press opportunity with the President just prior to the opening of the Summit.

Proposed Action Plan:

Week of June 2-6

   Secretary Rubin to brief on the economic agenda of the Summit at the Washington Foreign Press Center. Q and A to follow. This would be the Secretary’s first press event
at the Washington FPC. We anticipate a capacity audience (over 75) of U.S.-based foreign print and electronic media representatives with mass audiences in the Summit countries and worldwide. USIA media (VOA, WORLDNET and the daily Washington File) would also cover.

Under Secretary Wirth to discuss the Summit's partnership for African development via a WORLDNET interactive television dialogue. Audiences would be government officials, businesspeople, media and NGO representatives from such leading sub-Saharan nations as South Africa, Tanzania, Kenya, and Senegal. Opportunity for Q and A. This session would showcase Summit efforts to focus global attention on the potential for development in Africa in the post-Cold War era.

Series of op-eds by Administration officials on U.S. Denver Summit priorities begins with placement in leading print media in Summit countries.

Fact sheets on U.S. perspectives on the Summit agenda placed on home pages, distributed to overseas media and other contacts.

Follow-up on Denver Summit outcomes as appropriate in summer-fall 1997 thematic electronic journals (economics, global issues, etc.).

Week of June 9-13

An interview opportunity with the Vice President for a select group of 15-20 international print and electronic media -- including participants from Latin America, the Middle East and East/South Asia -- on the overall Summit Agenda. Preferred venue would be the White House. USIA media to cover.

Secretary Albright to participate in a WORLDNET television interactive dialogue with a key group of media representatives in Bonn, London, Ottawa, Moscow, Paris and Rome on the security and international affairs agenda of the Summit. After brief remarks by the Secretary, the program would be devoted to questions from interlocutors at the participating posts. The program would be carried live on satellite throughout Europe and the NIS, with anticipated broad placement.

NSC Adviser Berger to brief on the Summit's security and international affairs agenda at the Washington FPC. We anticipate a large turnout for Berger's first appearance at the FPC. Q and A to follow. USIA media to cover.

Under Secretary Eizenstat to participate in two digital video teleconferences with audiences of Japanese and Canadian/West European governmental, economic and media policy and opinion-makers, respectively, to discuss the Summit's economic agenda. Anticipated broad media placement.
Assistant Secretary Shattuck (or Secretary Albright, if more appropriate) to participate in a WORLDNET television discussion of the Democracy Initiative with President Vaclav Havel of the Czech Republic. President Havel has a global reputation as a champion of liberty and has led the Czech Republic in its successful transition to a democratic system of governance. Such a discussion, carried live on WORLDNET satellite in Europe, would result in mass placement in the continent, the NIS and internationally. In addition, the Assistant Secretary could participate in a similar WORLDNET television interactive dialogue—with the opportunity for Q and A—with publics in West European Summit nations, Canada, and from a non-Summit European nation known for its support of democracy and human rights, such as the Netherlands or one of the Nordic states.

The Week of June 16-23

Before departure to Denver, an interview opportunity with the President for one print journalist and one electronic journalist (plus attendant camera crews) from each of the eight Summit Nations. The preferred venue would be the White House. A suggested list of preeminent U.S.-based foreign print journalists includes:

Canada -- Mr. Graham Fraser, Globe and Mail (circ. 350,000-plus)
France -- Mr. Laurent Zecchini, Le Monde (circ. 500,000-plus)
Germany -- Ms. Carola Kaps, Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (circ. 400,000-plus)
Italy -- Mr. Mario Calvo-Platero, Il Sole 24 Ore (circ. 346,000)
Japan -- Mr. Shigeru Komago, Nihon Keizai Shimbun (“Nikkei”), (circ. 3 million-plus)
Russia -- Mr. Vladimir Nadein, Izvestiya (circ. 630,000)
United Kingdom -- Ms. Patti Waldmeir, Financial Times (circ. 300,000-plus)

Electronic media from Summit nations (names forthcoming) which were scheduled to participate in the canceled 1995 session with the President include:

Canada -- CTV
France -- France TV 2
Germany -- ZDF
Italy -- RAI-1
Japan -- NHK
Russia -- NTV
United Kingdom -- BBC
Additional USIA Programming for the Denver Summit:

50 USIA staff will be in Denver the week of June 16-23 to assist with the public affairs work of the Summit. We have established a Denver Summit website. Both the White House home page and the Denver Host Committee home page will link to this USIA-produced site. Administration statements and texts on Summit issues are being included in the daily Washington File publication which is read by overseas elites.

Our research operation has published polling results indicating how Americans, Japanese, West Europeans and Russians view Denver Summit issues, which we have attached. We are coordinating closely with the State Department’s Bureau of Public Affairs to expedite State’s issuance of talking points which will then be transmitted to overseas field posts. Besides the 50 USIA staff detailed to Denver, another 50 USIA staff in Washington will be working full-time on Summit issues the week of June 16-23.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Ann Pincus, Director
Office of Research and Media Reaction

FROM: R - Alvin Richman

SUBJECT: HOW AMERICANS RATE G7 SUMMIT ISSUES

SUMMARY -- About three-fourths of the American public give “top priority” ratings to certain foreign policy objectives bearing directly on U.S. domestic well being (e.g., halting the flow of illegal drugs into the U.S.) or serving U.S. “global interests” that we share with other countries (e.g., preventing nuclear arms proliferation, countering international terrorism). In contrast, barely a fourth of the public give top ratings to various “global altruism” objectives (e.g., promoting democracy, aiding developing nations) that are seen as benefitting primarily other countries.

Most Americans (73%) continue to have a favorable overall image of the United Nations. Nevertheless, a substantial proportion (roughly two-fifths) approves the U.S. linking payment of back dues it owes the United Nations to reforms of the U.N. requested by the U.S.

U.S. Public’s Core Values in Foreign Affairs

In-depth analyses of several major post-Cold War surveys on foreign affairs\(^1\) show Americans’ views on U.S. foreign policy goals consistently fall into four distinct attitude groups. These differ considerably in the priority accorded them by the public. The first three groups below contain items [in bold print] proposed for the upcoming G7 summit:

(1) U.S. “Domestic Issues” linked to foreign policy (countering illegal drugs and immigrants, protecting American jobs) have the highest ratings. About 75 percent of Americans on average view these issues as “very important” (Chicago Council survey) or as “a top priority” (Times Mirror Center survey).\(^2\)

\(^{1}\) The surveys were sponsored by the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations (10/94) and the Times Mirror Center (9/93 and 6/95).

\(^{2}\) The Chicago Council and Times Mirror surveys used differently-worded response categories, but obtained similar results for most of the foreign policy goals tested by both surveys.
(2) U.S. "Global Interests" (preventing nuclear proliferation, countering international terrorism, and improving the global environment) have the highest ratings among the three groups of strictly foreign policy issues. About 60-70 percent of Americans rate these concerns "very important." The foreign policy goal of "strengthening the United Nations" also falls into this category, but receives a lower rating than other objectives in this group (48% "very important" on the average).

(3) All measures of "Global Altruism" (promoting democracy and human rights abroad, aiding developing nations, "protecting weaker nations against foreign aggression") have experienced a decline in support since the end of the Cold War, and this group contains the lowest ratings by far. About 20-30 percent of the public considers these issues "very important." 

(4) Not represented on the proposed G7 agenda is a "Military Security" group of foreign policy objectives (e.g., defending our allies' security, maintaining U.S. military power). These rank about midway between U.S. "Global Interests" and "Global Altruism," with about 45 percent of the public on average perceiving the objectives in this group as "very important."

Attitudes toward the United Nations

The most recent poll on the United Nations (Time-CNN, Feb. 5-6, 1997) found nearly three-fourths of Americans (73%) have a favorable general opinion of the United Nations (21% "very favorable" and 52% "somewhat favorable"), while about one-fourth have an unfavorable image of the U.N. (16% "somewhat unfavorable" and 8% "very unfavorable"). The American public's esteem for the U.N. now is slightly below the high-point following the Persian Gulf war (77% favorable), but is higher than the levels that prevailed in the 1970's and 1980's (about 60% favorable on the average).

U.N. reforms and U.S. back dues – Two polls have asked questions about this issue, and in both cases question wording and the order in which the questions were asked appear to have biased their results – but in opposite directions. Presumably, public support for the U.S. linking payment of back dues to U.N. reforms lies between the results obtained on these two polls (i.e., between 28% and 47%):

---

3 The goal of "combating world hunger" also falls into this group, but receives a much higher rating than other objectives in this group (58% "very important").
(1) United Nations Association/Wirthlin Group, 4/96: The UNA first asked whether “U.N. member states” in general should be allowed to link dues payments owed the U.N. to reforms of the U.N. they think are needed. Only 13 percent responded affirmatively, compared to 78 percent who said U.N. members should not withhold dues payments as a way "to pressure" other members to agree to changes it believes are needed.” [Italics added] The UNA then asked about the U.S. specifically. Support for the U.S. linking its debt payment to U.N. reforms (28%) was higher than in the general case (13%); but it probably was deflated by the desire of some respondents to be consistent with the principle of non-linkage (endorsed by 78% of the respondents on the first question) in answering the second question:

“Regarding the United States in particular, some people say America’s large share of dues gives the United States special leverage over other U.N. member countries. Do you believe that the United States should always pay its full dues to the U.N. on schedule, or should the United States hold back its dues to pressure other members to agree to changes it believes are needed?” [Italics added]

U.S. should always pay its full dues on schedule 64%
U.S. should be able to hold back its dues 28%
Other responses (Volunteered), don’t know 8%

(2) Time-CNN/Yankelovich, 2/97: This poll mentioned a specific dollar amount that the U.S. currently owes the U.N., which probably had the effect of boosting support for withholding payment:

“As you may know, the United States currently owes the United Nations approximately one billion dollars in back dues. Do you think the United States should: (a) Pay the U.N. now what it owes in back dues because it is the U.S.’s obligation to pay its share of the U.N. budget; or (b) Not pay back dues to the U.N. until it carries out reforms that the U.S. has requested.”

U.S. should pay its back dues to the U.N. 41%
U.S. should link payment of back dues to U.N. reforms 47%
Other responses (Volunteered), don’t know 12%

For further information regarding this report contact:
Al Richman (202) 619-5140
Japan on the World Stage
Public’s Economic Worries At Home May Be a Constraint

Japanese Prime Minister Hashimoto takes to the G-7 in Denver a reputation as a strong, experienced player on the international stage. His own public at home has generally supported a more active international role for Japan, though primarily in areas such as environmental protection and foreign economic aid rather than in the more loaded political and security spheres. But after six years of recession, Japanese may be preoccupied with the fundamental economic and fiscal restructuring needed at home to secure their nation’s own economic future.

Key Findings

Results from a mid-April USIA-sponsored poll* show:

• The Japanese public perceives a still struggling economy and is beginning to sense the impending national burden of a graying population. People are concerned about their own retirement and their children’s future.

• There is a broad consensus that Japan can play a global environmental role, but much less agreement on other possible international roles. In fact, support for foreign aid has slipped. There is now majority support for dispatching Japan’s Self-Defense Forces (SDF) to assist in UN peacekeeping -- but not to places where there might still be fighting.

• At the Denver summit, the public thinks that environmental problems -- a perennial concern -- and economic growth should be the top priorities for the world leaders. International terrorism leads second tier concerns.

At Home: Economic Worries Now...

Japan’s estimated 3.6 percent growth in GDP last year was tops for the G-7, but weaknesses in the economy early this year underscored the fragility of Japan’s recovery. The Japanese public, for its part, remains largely unconvinced that Japan is on track to economic health:

• Most (81%) continue to see the economy in poor shape, although the proportion who say “very poor” has dropped (from 32% in January to 23%).

• Only 9 percent predict any improvement over the coming year, while 35 percent think things will get worse. Half (49%) believe conditions will remain about the same.

...And the Future Burden of a Graying Population

Recent news that last year saw the first -- and earlier-than-expected -- shrinkage of Japan’s "productive" population (age 15-64) has probably heightened concerns about the nation’s ability to support a rapidly graying citizenry. People are worried that the prosperous economy they have worked so hard to build may not work for them in their retirement -- or for their children.

* Face-to-face interviews were conducted April 10-13, 1997 among a representative national sample of 1,362 adults age 20 and over.
When asked to pick the two most important economic issues for the government (from a list of six):

- A majority (55%) choose "preparing for the welfare needs of Japan’s aging population" while 42 percent point to the health of financial institutions.

- Others think the most important issues are a slow economic growth rate or excessive government regulation of business.

Half (48%) think that the next generation will be worse off than Japanese are today. While a third think they will be about the same, few (6%) expect the next generation to be better off.

In the annual "Social Consciousness" poll fielded by the Prime Minister’s Office last December, a record 56 percent felt that their country was headed in a "bad direction," and the nation’s budget deficit emerged as the top reason given for this concern. In fact, Prime Minister Hashimoto has made fiscal reform a top priority with plans to balance the budget by the year 2003. Austerity measures include a review of the nation’s pension system and national health insurance reforms in an attempt to hold down the natural increases in spending resulting from Japan’s aging populace.

Public Sees Environment, Economy as Top Issues for Denver

The Japanese public thinks that environmental problems (picked by 55%) and promoting economic growth (35%) are the two most important issues for world leaders to talk about in Denver this summer.

With the hostage situation at the Japanese ambassador’s residence in Lima still unresolved at the time of the survey, terrorism leads second-tier concerns, including the value of the dollar, illegal drugs, and AIDS/HIV. One-in-ten pick strengthening rules to prevent corruption in international business.

The public seems to view the G-7 as an appropriate forum for Japan: a plurality think that Japan’s long term prosperity is more closely linked to the U.S. and Europe (46%) than to its East Asia trading partners (30%; 24% "don’t know"). However, the U.S. is perceived as the real key for Japan: last January, a USIA poll showed a plurality (43%) expected the U.S. to be Japan’s closest economic partner into the next century (vs. China, 28%; ASEAN, 11%; or Europe, 1%).
Japan’s International Role: After the Environment, What?

As a measure of the importance that Japanese place on the environment, a majority (57%) say protecting the environment should come first, even if it slows Japan’s economic growth. Only 11 percent say that economic growth should be given priority, although 27 percent volunteer that the environment and economic growth should be given equal priority.

In line with their environmentalism at home, a majority (62%) think that contributing to global environmental protection should be one of Japan’s most important international roles. Other roles — helping to prevent weapons proliferation, providing economic assistance to developing countries, and helping to boost global economic growth by reviving Japan’s own economy — are each picked by about a quarter.

Somewhat fewer see supporting democracy and human rights as one of the most important things Japan can do; fewer still think Japan’s contribution should be its Self-Defense Forces for UN peacekeeping.

The Prime Minister’s Office annual poll on foreign affairs fielded last October documented similar international priorities for Japan. Helping to solve global environmental problems (44%) was the top pick, followed by “helping to maintain world peace by contributing to the peaceful resolution of conflicts” (38%). Smaller minorities (roughly a quarter in each case) chose promoting the healthy development of the world economy, assisting developing countries, and protecting democracy and freedom.

Support for Foreign Aid Slips

Japan’s official development assistance (ODA) tripled between 1985 and 1995, and the country became the world’s top aid donor. But Japan’s ODA fell by an estimated 35 percent last year — largely due to a weakened yen — while outlays for this year were held to an increase of slightly over 2 percent, and next year may actually bring a cut. The foreign aid budget is no longer sacred in Japan, and this seems to suit the current public mood.

In the April USIA poll, fully three-quarters of the public say they favor providing economic assistance to poorer, less developed countries. But the proportion favoring aid drops to only 28 percent “if that meant there might be less money to spend on problems in our country.” “Hard core” support for foreign aid has decreased from measures taken in 1989 and 1991, at the height of Japan’s economic bubble. (See Table 4 below.)
4. Favor/Oppose Japan Providing Economic Assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1005)</td>
<td>(1006)</td>
<td>(1011)</td>
<td>(1012)</td>
<td>(1362)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly favor</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat favor</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Subtotal)</td>
<td>(79)</td>
<td>(82)</td>
<td>(85)</td>
<td>(82)</td>
<td>(77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly/Somewhat Oppose</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ASKED OF ALL THOSE WHO FAVOR FOREIGN AID:** Would you still favor assistance if that meant there might be less money to spend on problems in our country?

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would still favor</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would oppose</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

USIA Polls

The annual Prime Minister’s Office foreign affairs polls also show that support for *increases* in Japan’s foreign aid dropped sharply after 1991. Since then, pluralities have favored maintaining current levels of aid (in 1996: 47% favored the present level, 33% favored increases, and 15% wanted Japan to cut or eliminate its foreign aid).

The USIA poll shows that the public widely supports most of Japan’s foreign aid "principles" endorsed by the Cabinet in 1992:

- Three-fourths (78%) think it is important (39% say "very important") for Japan to consider a recipient country’s commitment to protecting the environment when deciding to give economic assistance.

- Three-fourths say it is important (33% "very important") to consider a country’s progress toward democracy and basic human rights.

- Seven-in-ten (including 21% "very important") think that Japan should consider a country’s development toward a free market economy.

- However, there is less consensus on considering a country’s level of weapons expenditures when deciding to give aid: half think it is important, while 29 percent do not.

Reflecting Japan’s traditional aid priorities, a majority (57%) think it is most important for Japan to give aid in Asia. However, the public picks Africa as next most important (24%), in line with Tokyo’s new commitment to Africa through the Asian-African Forum. Few see either Latin America (5%) or Eastern Europe (2%) as the top Japanese priority.
Terrorism Threat to Japanese

Polled shortly before the end to the hostage crisis in Lima, eight-in-ten see international terrorism as a threat to Japanese (43% say a "great threat"). According to a Yomiuri Shimbun telephone poll taken immediately after the hostage rescue, seven-in-ten believe that terrorist attacks on Japanese and Japanese businesses are likely to increase.

The Yomiuri poll also shows widespread public support in Japan for Peruvian President Fujimori's decision to use force (81%), and "understanding" for his decision not to inform Japan beforehand (19% think it was a reasonable decision; 61% consider it "unavoidable"). Although a majority (63%) favor negotiation to resolve similar incidents in the future, most would accede to the use of force if negotiations failed to produce results and the incident became protracted.

Despite last year's G-7 pledge on terrorism, the USIA poll shows that the Japanese public is largely uncertain about whether Japan, the U.S. and Europe are doing much to cooperate in fighting international terrorism: while 39 percent think they are cooperating at least a fair amount, 30 percent disagree and 30 percent are uncertain.

Increased Support for UN Peacekeeping, At Least for Non-Combat Roles

A willingness to send people -- to sweat, if not shed blood -- is one measure of the strength of the public's support for Japan's active involvement in world affairs. With experience in assisting UN peacekeeping in Cambodia, Mozambique and the Golan Heights now under the nation's belt, a majority (61% vs. 28%) back the dispatch of non-combat Self-Defense Force (SDF) units to assist in UN peacekeeping abroad. Past polls showed the public much more divided. However, public sentiment is virtually reversed when asked to consider sending armed SDF units to assist where there might still be fighting (61% are opposed; 28% in favor). In this case, opposition is only slightly less widespread now than in 1993, during the SDF's first dispatch abroad (an engineering battalion in Cambodia).
How the Poll Was Taken

Poll results are from a public opinion survey based on face-to-face interviews with a nationally representative sample of 1,362 Japanese age 20 and over, carried out April 10-13, 1997, by Chuo Chosa Sha as part of its monthly omnibus survey.

The questions were written by the USIA Office of Research. The Japanese translation was prepared by the contractor, and checked by USIS Tokyo and the Office of Research.

Nineteen times out of twenty, the results based on the sample used in this survey will differ by no more than 3 percentage points in either direction from what would be found if it were possible to interview every adult in the country.

In addition to sampling error, the practical difficulties of conducting a survey of public opinion may introduce other sources of error into the results.

Additional technical information on the methodology of the survey may be obtained from the analyst.
Publics Want Governments To Rein In Foreign Corruption

The communique issued following the G-7 finance ministers' April meeting in Washington stressed the "corrosive effects of bribery and corruption generally on the achievement of sustainable economic development, growth and stability."

Preliminary results from just-completed USIA surveys show that majorities in Britain, France, Germany and Japan support efforts to end foreign bribery's position as part of "business as usual."

KEY FINDING

- Solid majorities in Britain, France, Germany and Japan say that bribing local officials abroad is wrong and that their governments should do something to stop it.

Publics Opposed to Corruption in Business

Majorities in western Europe solidly oppose using bribery as part of standard business practice. Seven in ten in Britain and Germany and six in ten in France say that their governments should take steps to stop their countries' businesspeople from bribing local officials in order to win contracts. Sizable minorities in western Europe, however, believe that businesses should be permitted to "do whatever is necessary."

Public Opinion Toward Bribery

"As you may know, some companies doing business internationally occasionally win contracts by bribing local officials. Some people say that bribery is wrong and that the government should take steps to stop this country's businesspeople from bribing Third World officials. Others say that it is naive to think that bribery can be stopped in the Third World and that our companies have to do whatever is necessary to secure contracts. Which of these opinions is closer to your own?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Bribery is wrong</th>
<th>Companies have to do what is necessary</th>
<th>DK/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly, in Japan six in ten say bribery is wrong and should be stopped. While only one in ten find bribery of local officials in other countries acceptable, a large percentage of the public (26%) expresses no opinion on this issue.

Prepared by Anna E. Sweeney, R/EU (202-619-5144; reu@usia.gov), Issued by the Office of Research and Media Reaction, USIA. Based on preliminary results from USIA-commissioned telephone surveys of adults 18 years of age and older in Britain (NOP, 964), France (Louis Harris, 1001) and Germany (EMNID, 1005) conducted in mid-May 1997 and a survey in Japan (Chuo Chosa Sha, 1302 face to face interviews with adults age 20 and older) conducted in mid-April.
West Europeans Put Environment Ahead of Economic Growth

Environmental protection is a key European issue, but one potentially at odds with a top public concern -- the economy. USIA polls conducted in western Europe show publics concerned about the quality of the environment and desirous that something be done about it. Yet, the results suggest that the public may want to have their environmental “cake” and eat it too.

West Europeans are concerned about environmental quality and many if not most are willing to do something about it. Virtually all in Britain, France and Germany agree that environmental damage is a serious problem in their country -- two-thirds of each public agree strongly. Moreover, a majority in each country (just over half in France, two-thirds in Germany and three-fourths in Britain) would support higher taxes if the additional revenues were used to prevent environmental damage. As one would expect, support for environmental taxation is highest among those who feel environmental damage is a problem and lowest among the minority who disagree.

In choosing between the environment and the economy, West European publics tend to favor the environment. Asked if environmental protection should be given priority, even at the risk of inhibiting economic growth, solid majorities in Britain, France, Germany, Italy and Spain agree. Just half as many or fewer in each country feel economic growth should be given priority, even if the environment suffers to some extent. Believing environmental damage is a serious problem is an important factor in shaping public thinking on the tradeoff. Most of those concerned about environmental damage would do something about it even at the expense of the economy. Among those less concerned about environmental damage: in Germany as many favor the economy as favor the environment, while in Britain and France somewhat more would give priority to economic growth.

At least in part, the public willingness to pursue environmental protection at the expense of the economy appears to stem from a belief that society can do both. Majorities in Britain, France and Germany believe that high environmental standards are not at odds with competitiveness and economic growth, while far fewer feel that high environmental standards lead to the loss of jobs and slower economic growth. Half in each country believe both that environmental protection should be given priority over economic growth and that the two are compatible with each other.

Prepared by Mark Teare, Office of Research and Media Reaction, USIA (202-619-5104; reu@usia.gov). Based on USIA-commissioned surveys of adults in Britain (IRB Intl., 1010 interviews), France (Sofres, 1002), Germany (BASIS Research, 1200), Italy (Pragma, 1000) and Spain (Union Research, 1001) and conducted in May and June 1996. Not all questions were asked in Italy and Spain.
Governments Should Step in to End Bribery in Business, Say Many Europeans

Earlier this fall, U.S. Commerce secretary Mickey Kantor pledged that the Clinton administration would do its part to ensure that bribery and corruption are not ‘business as usual’ in international commerce [Financial Times, September 26]. Spring USIA surveys show that majorities in Britain, France and Germany agree with this stance, though significant minorities find bribery an acceptable business practice in the Third World.

Majorities believe that Bribery is Wrong
A majority in Britain, France and Germany think that using bribery as part of business practice should not be tolerated. When asked their opinion about business people who use bribes to secure contracts in Third World countries, six in ten or more among these publics think bribery is wrong and that their government should take steps to stop it. But significant minorities in all three countries disagree and think that companies have to do whatever is necessary to secure such contracts (see table).

Gender and Class Gap On This Issue
In all three countries, women and those who describe themselves as working class are more likely than others to condemn the practice of bribery. In France and Britain, those who identify themselves as left of center on the political spectrum are also more opposed to the practice of “greasing palms.” This subject may be more a “moral” issue in Britain, since those who are more religious tend to oppose this practice.

On the other hand, men in all three countries, and those on the right in Britain and France are more likely than others to turn a blind eye to such bribes. Age and education do not have much effect on either side of this issue.

European Opinion Toward Bribery

“As you may know, some companies doing business in the Third World occasionally win contracts by bribing local officials. Some people say that bribery is wrong and that the government should take steps to stop this country’s businesspeople from bribing Third World officials. Others say that it is naive to think that bribery can be stopped in the Third World and that our companies have to do whatever is necessary to secure contracts. Which of these opinions is closer to your own?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bribery is wrong</th>
<th>59%</th>
<th>61%</th>
<th>66%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Companies have to do whatever necessary</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no answer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compiled by the Office of Research and Media Reaction, USIA (202-619-5144; reu@usia.gov). Based on USIA-commissioned surveys of adults in Britain (IRB International, 1010 interviews), France (Sofres, 1002), and Germany (BASIS Research, 1200) conducted in May and June 1996.
Russians Still Want Democracy  
Poll Shows Reality Shortchanges Them

The Russian public continues to struggle with the gap between its democratic ideals and the implementation of those ideals in their own country. Disillusion with the current system stems from lack of progress on the rule of law and socio-economic difficulties.

**KEY FINDINGS**

- Two-thirds of the Russian public say that things in Russia today are going in the wrong direction (the same share as in the past year).

- Overwhelming majorities of Russians want to live in a society with a judicial system treating all equally and with free education and health care available to everyone. They also want their media free of censorship and regular elections that are "honest."

- Majorities or pluralities also believe that none of these features currently exists in Russia.

- Moreover, Russians lack confidence in nearly all political institutions and leaders, with only the Church, the armed forces, and the broadcast media receiving majority votes of confidence.

- Two-thirds feel that Boris Yeltsin should resign the presidency because of his precarious health (following heart surgery and a bout with pneumonia).

- Russians divide evenly when assessing how good a job Yeltsin has been doing in dealing with the United States: a third say good and a third say poor. But by a 5-1 majority (59%-12%) they feel that President Clinton is doing a good job rather than a poor job in dealing with Russia.

Prepared by: Steven A. Grant, R/RUC (202-619-5130)

These findings are based on a USIA-commissioned poll carried out March 22-April 4 by the Moscow-based firm CESSI. The representative national sample comprised 1,868 adults. The margin of sampling error is roughly 3 percent.
How Unsteady Is Russian Democracy?

Poll Confirms A Bumpy Reality

The Russian public continues to struggle with the gap between its democratic ideals and the implementation of those ideals in their own country. Disillusion with the current system stems especially from lack of progress on the rule of law.

KEY FINDINGS

- Overwhelming majorities of Russians want to live in a society with a judicial system treating all equally and with free education and health care available to everyone. They also want their media free of censorship and regular elections that are “honest.”

- Majorities or pluralities also believe that none of these features currently exists in Russia.

- Moreover, Russians lack confidence in nearly all political institutions and leaders, with only the Church, the armed forces, and the broadcast media receiving majority votes of confidence.

- Two-thirds feel that Boris Yeltsin should resign the presidency because of his precarious health (following heart surgery and a bout with pneumonia).

What Is Democracy in Russia?

A debate now rages -- in Russia and the West -- about how democratic Russia is today. The argument about Russian democracy turns in part around terms: what do Russians mean by “democracy”? Eight years of polling in Russia have shown that most of the Russian public prefer democracy in the form of social democracy -- a combination of social welfare and political freedoms, civil rights and state responsibilities. They see a need for stability and order as well as for liberty. (See “Is Russia Turning the Corner?” USIA Research Report R-7-96 [September 1996], especially pp. 7-9.)

These findings are based on a USIA-commissioned poll carried out March 22-April 4 by the Moscow-based firm CESSI. The representative national sample comprised 1,868 adults. The margin of sampling error is roughly 3 percent.
In this most recent survey, when asked in what kind of society they would like to live, Russians overwhelmingly choose two features as important: “a judicial system [which] treats everyone equally and punishes the guilty no matter who they are,” and “everyone receives free education and health care” (96% each). Slightly less favored are “mass media [which] are free to report news without government censorship” (88%) and “honest elections [which] are held regularly” (87%). Four-fifths (79%) also call important the “freedom to criticize the government openly” and the fact that “one can choose from several parties and candidates when voting.”

In judging to what extent these ideals actually exist in their own society, Russians are shrewd and candid. Three-fourths say that — among their top priorities — neither a judicial system which treats everyone equally (77%) nor free education and health care for all (74%) is now in place. They divide evenly on whether or not the media are free to report news without government censorship (37% say yes, 40% no). (Despite this, six in ten express confidence in Russian TV and radio.)

More believe that honest elections are not held regularly (45%) than feel they are (36%), and a fifth are unsure. At the same time, however, a huge majority (88%) affirm that they can now choose from several parties and candidates when voting. Six in ten (61%) also say that they now have the freedom to criticize the government openly.

**Ongoing Signals of Discontent**

Less reassuring is the public’s response to two other questions, one hypothetical and one very practical. The proportion of those saying that “restoring order in Russia is so important that they would support a dictatorship” has risen for the first time in a year and a half (to 35%, up from 20-25% in 1996 polls). There has been only a slight drop, however, in the share of those saying that “freedom is so important that they would oppose any dictatorship” (to 52%, about where it stood in 1995, but down from 56-58% last spring).

Similarly, 43 percent agree that “voting gives people like me some say about how the government runs things.” As last fall, half (51%) disagree.

On the other hand, 76 percent agree at least somewhat that “people should be free to say whatever they want, even if what they say increases tensions in society” (42% agree “completely”).

---

1It is probably no coincidence that Boris Yeltsin received 35 percent of the vote in the first, multicandidate round of the presidential election in June 1996. Only in the subsequent two-man runoff did his share go above half.
Confidence in Institutions and Leaders Remains Low

As was the case last October, Russians have little or no confidence in domestic political institutions. A majority lack confidence in the State Duma (or parliament; 74%), Council of Ministers (71%) and local government (58%), and in bodies enforcing law and justice, such as the Ministry of Interior (police; 67%) and the judicial system (71%). Half lack confidence in the Federal Security Service, a successor to the KGB, whereas a quarter (26%) express at least some confidence.

Some other institutions fare better. The Orthodox Church holds the confidence of a wide majority (64% to 24%); Russian broadcast media (59% to 37%) and the armed forces (57% to 34%) do almost as well; and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs receives mixed views (35% to 34%). Russian opinion also divides about Russian newspapers (43% to 45%).

All the top political leaders get votes of no confidence: two-thirds to three-fourths express lack of confidence in Yeltsin, Premier Viktor Chernomyrdin, and First Deputy Premier Anatolii Chubais. A majority (54%) also lack confidence in Communist Party leader Gennady Zyuganov. (A third have confidence -- the same proportion as votes cast for him in the first round of last year's presidential election.)

More lack confidence than have it in Duma Speaker Gennady Seleznev (42% to 17%), from the Communist faction, and in Interior Minister Anatoly Kulikov (50% to 16%). Russians divide over Defense Minister Igor Rodionov (34% to 29%) and Foreign Minister Yevgeny Primakov (31% to 28%). A third or more, however, have no opinion about each of these four.

Former presidential candidate and Security Council secretary Alexander Lebed has slipped from grace a bit since October: 45 percent express confidence in him but nearly as many (40%) do not (compared to 56%-33% last fall). Measured for the first time, confidence in Moscow Mayor Yuri Luzhkov stands at a Lebed-matching 45 percent but he is without the retired general's negatives -- only 25 percent express lack of confidence. Thirty percent offer no view of the mayor, still relatively new to the national political scene.

Is the Future of Russian Democracy Tied to Yeltsin?

Many defend Yeltsin's actions and policies because he represents, for them, the lesser of various evils -- a sort of "best hope" for democracy in Russia. If that is so, then democracy has an insecure future there. A majority (57%) say the government is doing a bad or very bad job in protecting citizens' political rights (a fifth say it is doing a good job). And about two-thirds (63%) feel that the President should resign, "in view of the state of [his] health," despite his apparent full recovery from heart surgery and a bout of pneumonia.
The public resoundingly rejects the idea of changing the Constitution to permit the upper house of parliament (the Federation Council) to elect an interim president should Yeltsin resign or become incapacitated. Instead, three-fourths insist that the next president should be elected by the people, as the Constitution now stipulates. Twelve percent say the Council should be allowed to elect an interim president; the same number offer no view.

If Yeltsin were unable to perform his official duties and new presidential elections were held, the two front-runners to succeed him remain Lebed (21%) and Zyuganov (19%). But both may be flagging. The hard-charging Luzhkov (11%) and erstwhile presidential candidate Grigory Yavlinsky (10%) already lead both Chernomyrdin (6%) and the fast-fading nationalist sensation-seeker Vladimir Zhirinovsky (4%). A fifth (18%) say they would vote for “none of the above,” and another tenth (12%) cannot say for now. Among contenders not mentioned in this poll but deserving some consideration -- based on recently-published Russian surveys -- is new deputy prime minister (and former governor of Nizhny Novgorod) Boris Nemtsov.

Russians’ steadfast belief in the tenets of an open, pluralistic society is remarkable. But the Yeltsin administration’s failure to make progress toward solving key issues of social justice — including wage and pension arrears, government corruption, and great disparities of wealth — may yet undermine that faith.

Prepared by: Steven A. Grant, R/RUC (202-619-5130)
Issued by the Office of Research and Media Reaction
DENVER TENTATIVE SCHEDULE OPTION #1  
(No Plenary Meetings with Ministers)

**Friday, June 20**
7:00 - 8:00 PM  
Joint Reception for Delegations (includes Ministers)

8:00 - 10:00 PM  
Leaders Dinner

**Saturday, June 21**
9:00 - 10:00 AM  
G-7 Leaders Meeting [only event without Yeltsin]

10:30 AM - 12:30 PM  
Morning Session on Economic & Social Issues  
(e.g., aging populations, job creation in small enterprises)

1:00 - 2:30 PM  
Leaders Lunch  
(begin global issues discussion -- environment)

3:00 - 5:00 PM  
Afternoon Session on Global Issues  
(emerging infectious diseases, crime, terrorism, nuclear safety, 
UN reform)

7:30 - 9:30 PM  
Leaders Dinner

TBD  
Entertainment

**Sunday, June 22**
10:00 - 11:30 AM  
Morning Session on Political Issues  
(e.g., Middle East, China, non-proliferation)

11:30 - 11:45 AM  
Group Photo of Leaders

12:00 - 1:30 PM  
Leaders Lunch  
(continue political discussion, democracy building)

TBD  
President Issues Communiqué & Press Conference
DENVER SCHEDULE OPTION #2
(Plenary Meetings with Ministers)
(Italics Indicate Differences from Option #1 Schedule)

Friday, June 20
7:00 - 8:00 PM  Joint Reception for Delegations
8:00 - 10:00 PM Leaders Dinner

Saturday, June 21
8:30 - 9:30 AM  G-7 Leaders Meeting [without Yeltsin]
9:30 - 10:00 AM  G-7 Finance Ministers Join Leaders [without Russians]
10:30 AM - 12:30 PM  Morning Session on Economic & Social Issues
                      (e.g., aging populations, job creation in small enterprises)
1:00 - 2:30 PM  Leaders Lunch
               (begin global issues discussion -- environment)
3:00 - 5:00 PM  Afternoon Session on Global Issues
                (emerging infectious diseases, crime, terrorism, nuclear safety, UN reform)
7:30 - 9:30 PM  Leaders Dinner
TBD  Entertainment

Sunday, June 22
9:15 - 10:00 AM  Plenary Session with Foreign Ministers on Political Issues
10:45 AM - 12:00 PM  Morning Session on Political Issues
                      (e.g., Middle East, China, non-proliferation)
12:15 PM - 12:30 PM  Group Photo of Leaders
12:30 PM - 2:00 PM  Leaders Lunch
TBD  President Issues Communique & Press Conference
Vicky, it is nice to have the opportunity to touch base again (I was Colorado Clinton/Gore State Director in 96). The purpose of this short memo is to follow-up on the conversation Governor Romer had with you last week concerning a project called “Western Governor’s University” – and an idea Governor Romer and Utah Governor Mike Leavitt have to hold a press briefing on WGU with other governors who are members of the Western Governor’s Association, during the week of the G-8 Denver Summit.

**ESSENTIAL BACKGROUND:** The Western Governors’ University (WGU) is a project that came out of the Western Governor’s Association. Essentially, it involves all of the Western governors (except California’s Wilson) as the board of directors for a “virtual university” that would operate via the internet as a fully accredited institution of higher learning across state boundaries. Participating institutions (universities, colleges, community colleges, etc.) would make courses available in a variety of ways (including interactive computer programs, mail, video, television), and not only open up more access to higher education, but also create new mechanisms for measuring the quality of education received by students. Students graduating from WGU would receive certification of competency in given fields.
WHY THE GOVERNORS THINK THIS HAS RELEVANCE FOR G-8:

As Governor Romer probably explained, the WGU, while still in its infancy, has caught the imagination of many in the higher education community. The Western governors have contributed state resources and corporate interests are also lining up to participate. IBM expects to have the technology in place for an internet navigator by January, and a course catalog is under development.

Governors Romer and Leavitt, the chief architects of WGU, believe that advances in technology are leading to major reforms in the way we educate and train our citizens – and that this trend is already well recognized in the private sector. Romer's argument is that the successful economies of the future will inevitably be based on the nexus between ideas and an educated citizenry – and that is why the WGU is worth talking about during the G-8 Summit.

WESTERN GOVERNORS MEETING PROPOSAL:

What Romer and Leavitt propose to do is hold a WGU board meeting with 15 western governors and a like number of high tech CEOs from the West, in conjunction with a press briefing on Friday, June 20 or Saturday, June 21 at some location in Denver that would be convenient for the press. Romer would make the pitch that cooperative projects like WGU are relevant to the discussions of the G-8 and underscore President Clinton's initiatives to strengthen education.

What Is Needed? With only a few weeks left to plan, we really need to begin the process of inviting Western governors to Colorado for the WGU meeting – and to put together the logistics of the meeting in a way that will complement, and not interfere with, the G-8.

We have the opportunity to treat this as a State of Colorado/WGA activity that is completely separate from the G-8, or we could proceed in a way that involves the White House more directly.
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Governor Romer has broached this with Harold Ickes and the purpose of this memo is not to go around Harold (who has been great), but rather, to follow-up on the Governor's conversation with you.

Vicky, we really need some guidance on whether the White House has policy or substantive concerns about this project—and whether Governors Romer and Leavitt can proceed to set up the meeting. We will, of course, be communicating with Harold and the G-8 staff on logistics and other concerns.

Please feel free to call me at 303/866-4567 or at my home number, (b)(6)

Thanks!

cc: Harold Ickes
    John Dill, Office of Business Development
    Mike Dino, Mayor Webb's Office/Denver Summit of the Eight
Education in a Tube

Two ‘virtual universities’ will operate over the Internet

Since the early 1990s, campuses like Cal State Dominguez Hills and UC Irvine have been supplementing traditional teaching methods with “distance learning” techniques like videoconference classes and e-mail tutorials. But not until this fall did we see ambitious plans for two large, accredited “virtual universities” whose main campus will be the Internet.

In September, 13 western states said they will open the Western Governors University by next June. Gov. Pete Wilson later announced that California, rather than join the WGU, will establish its own virtual university based on the state’s vast pool of academic and high-tech talent. At both institutions students will be able to attend on-line classes, download textbooks and meet with faculty via teleconference.

The WGU and California plans are now being breathlessly sold as the greatest educational innovations since Plato’s academy. That remains to be seen, but most educators agree that virtual universities have the potential to:

- Improve professional recertification programs. Physicists could be required to demonstrate proficiency by computerized exam.

- Broaden educational access. Adults who don’t have the time or money for night school could retool their skills to meet the needs of an ever-changing job market.

- Reduce operational costs. Since state governments might not have to build expensive new campuses to accommodate the predicted tidal wave of college applicants.

In an effort to lure as many public and private colleges as possible into the virtual university project, the Wilson administration is now circulating a proposal emphasizing that each campus would be free to devise its own approach. Sacramento needs to come up with greater incentives than free choice, however, because many colleges, having successfully experimented with distance learning on their own, are unlikely to join the project without some kind of financial reward in sight.

Equally important is the need to carefully assess which types of high-technology work best in which situation. For instance, Silicon Valley’s Academic Systems Corp. has demonstrated that students taking its computerized algebra course achieve higher rates of passage than those taught in conventional lecture halls.

On the other hand, Cal State’s Monterey Bay campus had to scale back its distance learning plans after faculty members complained, saying among other things that they had become deluged with e-mail.

The biggest challenge for both Sacramento and the WGU will be changing federal and state laws that prohibit the use of student loans to take out-of-state classes. If they take this and other challenges seriously, there’s no reason why a keyboard and cathode ray tube can’t represent an exciting new avenue in higher education.
Western governors want to expand dramatically the use of distance learning in higher education.

By Mary Lou Cooper

Western governors met last fall and planned to do it again with the Western Governors University. Photo by WM Corporation.

It won't have ivy-covered buildings. It won't have its own faculty. And it won't have a football team. But it will offer electronic education across state borders as early as fall 1997. It's called the Western Governors University, and it's the brainchild of Govs. Mike Leavitt, Republican, of Utah and Roy Romer, Democrat, of Colorado.

WGU will serve as an electronic clearinghouse for postsecondary education and will integrate courses from institutions and corporations throughout the West. Its classes are for college students, lifelong learners, high-school students and employees with specific training needs. Any student — anywhere, anytime — will be able to sit in front of a computer or TV screen and take courses from participating Western states. Students will access a "smart catalog" on the Internet that will describe various electronic course offerings. In addition, students will use the catalog to assess their skills and find courses for specific credentials or degrees.

Students will learn with the help of computers, videocassettes and CD-ROMs. Teachers will include university professors and industry experts. Student competence, not seat time, will determine who gets a degree or certificate. Local or regional centers in libraries or community colleges will provide "one-stop shopping," allowing students to access technology, obtain counseling and be tested for specific competencies.

Although distance learning isn't a new phenomenon, proponents say WGU is unique because it will integrate vast numbers of course offerings from Western states and because it will base all degrees or training certificates on competency. Initially, WGU will offer an associate of arts degree and workplace certification in electronic technology. Ultimately, WGU plans to offer a full menu of post-secondary education from technical training to four-year college degrees.

Western governors conceived the futuristic university at the June 1995 meeting of the Western Governors' Association. By the end of 1996, governors from Arizona, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, Utah, Washington and Wyoming committed to the plan.

Each governor signed the memorandum of understanding, obligating themselves to several tasks. Western governors will oversee the university, seek $100,000 each as start-up fund-
ing and help eliminate barriers to implementation.

Wyoming, Utah and Idaho already have kicked in $100,000, and Montana has provided partial funding. The legislatures of other Western states need to provide funds as well. And this money is just a down payment. It will cost an estimated $6 million to $10 million to get WCU off the drawing board and into cyberspace, additional funds are needed from corporations and foundations. Eventually, student fees will help cover operating costs.

Three Colorado-based groups are helping WGU make the transition from vision to reality. The Western Governors' Association drives policy and governance issues. The Western Cooperative for Educational Telecommunications, an arm of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, guides the development of the electronic catalog and student-support centers. The National Center for Higher Education Management Systems works with higher-education experts and industry to tackle the thorny matter of measuring student competency.

Getting started

Several factors motivated Western governors to create the university. Leavitt observed that Utah, Arizona and other states had plans for expensive distance-learning courses. He wanted to avoid duplication and increase student access to a wide variety of courses by cooperating across state borders. Romer saw WGU as an effective way for people to earn college degrees based on competency. Projections for enormous increases in college enrollment in the West and unmet needs for additional facilities, equipment and teachers also factored into the equation.

Though electronic education will widen course options for traditional students, WGU will not find its niche among college-bound high school graduates. In an unpublished article for IBM, Leavitt wrote: "This is not about eliminating those college experiences, those rites of passage."

LaVarr Webb, Leavitt's deputy for policy, said WGU's target markets will be lifelong learners and students who are trying to raise families and get a college degree at the same time. "In this technological age, everyone will have to be trained, retrained and retrained again," Webb said, "and traditional higher education does not meet this need very well."

Leavitt noted that the corporate job-training market alone is valued at more than $200 billion annually. "We sometimes view distance education too

WGU and the states

Sally Johnstone, director of the Western Cooperative for Educational Telecommunications at the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, briefed legislators on the Western Governors University at the 1996 Annual Meeting of The Council of State Governments WEST in Santa Fe, N.M., in November.

At the Nov. 22 meeting of the Western Governors' Association in San Antonio, Texas, Western governors agreed to:

- incorporate WGU as soon as practical and formalize governors from Western states as the Board of Trustees;
- locate WGU administrative offices in Utah and academic development functions in Colorado;
- request help from Western attorneys general to identify legal barriers to WGU;
- work to secure WGU accreditation; and
- retain a development director and a business plan consultant.

Signing a memorandum committing to move forward with the Western Governors University is Colorado Gov. Roy Romer. Looking on (l. to r.) are Nebraska Gov. Ben Nelson and Utah Gov. Mike Leavitt. Photo courtesy the Western Governors' Association.

The Council of State Governments 29
narrowly, as merely a way to save money," he wrote. "We should expand our vision and look for opportunities to make money."

Beyond technical questions

Though most Western governors support the idea, some others oppose WGU. Since state legislators must fund the initial planning for the university, some of them are grouching about the "unfortunate choice of name." When asked about the name, staff at the Western Governors' Association acknowledged that it has been a struggle. During its first six months, WGU was known informally as The Virtual University. Leavitt's staff report that Western governors ultimately named it after themselves as a symbol of commitment and credibility.

For some political figures, questions about WGU go beyond squabbles over its name. At a recent meeting of The Council of State Governments-WEST, Utah Rep. Jordan Tanner summed up the concerns of a number of state legislators. "As augmentation to higher education, it's fine," he said, "but we don't want a bunch of technocrats who haven't ever been on a college campus."

Kenneth Ashworth, Texas commissioner of higher education, wrote much harsher words about WGU in the Chronicle of Higher Education. "... (it) has enormous possibilities for harming higher education as we now know it in this country, particularly if it is largely controlled and organized to meet the demands of employers."

California Gov. Pete Wilson refused to sign the memorandum creating the university, but not because he thought the idea lacked merit. In a letter to the Western Governors' Association, Wilson said California planned to compete with WGU rather than join it. "California is uniquely positioned to become a leader in the development and distribution of college-level software, courses and programs... Further, the citizens of the West will be well-served by a friendly competition among a variety of institutions seeking to deliver courses and degrees through nontraditional means."

What happens next

In addition to securing $100,000 per state as pledged for start-up money for WGU, proponents must begin heavy private-sector fundraising. Identifying and removing legislative and regulatory barriers to WGU also will require serious attention from legislators and governors.

Other roadblocks for the planned university may exist, such as statutory restrictions on offering cross-border educational services. There also may be other differences between resident and nonresident tuition, public utility rates that discourage electronic hook-ups across state lines and state higher education financing policies that measure seat-time rather than competencies. Regional and national accrediting policies may devalue distance learning and federal financial-aid regulations may not recognize technology-delivered courses.

Despite these obstacles, Western governors clearly envision WGU as real, not virtual.

**Resources**

For more information about the Western Governors University, contact the Western Governors' Association at www.westgov.org/smart/wt/vu.html. If you aren't in cyberspace yet, contact WGA at (303) 623-9378. Ask for Rick Merritt. To request a copy of Gov. Leavitt's discussion on WGU, contact LaVarr Webb at (801) 538-1000. Ask for "The Western Governors' University: A Learning Enterprise for the CyberCentury."

---

**Linking Today's Opportunities With Tomorrow's Technology**

- Government, Business & Educational Systems
- Worldwide Coverage
- Turn Key, End to End Network Integration
- C & Ku Band Digital Satellite Time
- Digital Video, Audio & Data Equipment
- Comprehensive Network Management
- 24-hour Technical Operation Center
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FROM: Dan Tarullo

SUBJECT: Themes for Denver Summit

April 29, 1997

Attached is the latest iteration of a themes paper for the Denver Summit. We are not yet putting this out, and it will certainly be altered -- perhaps substantially -- in the next seven weeks. Still, I wanted everyone to see where we are headed.
OUTCOMES FOR DENVER SUMMIT

The preparatory work for the Denver Summit has developed the theme of taking steps in the international system and in our own societies to meet the challenges of the twenty-first century. This work divides into five key areas.

1. Bringing Russia More Completely into the International System
   - Shift to “Summit of the Eight” important symbolic step in efforts to support reform in Russia and integrate it into international system

2. Protecting Our Citizens From Global Threats
   - Consolidate U.S. leadership in developing cooperative efforts to fight international crime and terrorism, and to promote nuclear safety
   - Launch initiative for monitoring and responding to infectious diseases
   - Address global environmental problems

3. Promote Stability in the Global Financial System
   - Continue efforts begun at Halifax and Lyon to assure stability of new global financial system of massive, instantaneous transfers of funds
   - Strengthen cooperation among regulators of internationally active financial institutions
   - Provide assistance to strengthen banking supervision in developing countries

4. Helping Africa Prosper
   - Take steps to give Africa the same opportunities for growth in global economy that have led to prosperity for so many Asian and Latin American countries
   - Provide trade and investment incentives to sub-Saharan African countries to liberalize their economies and reduce aid dependence
   - Target assistance to meeting basic human needs and building institutions for effective democratic governance
   - Foster collective responses to conflicts that do occur

5. Addressing 21st Century Challenges in Our Own Economies
   - Develop strategies for responding to aging of our societies and adopting policies that promote “productive aging.”
   - Discuss ways to foster growth of new and young businesses that can be key sources for job creation