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From: Widmer, Edward L. (Ted)
Sent: Saturday, March 13, 1999 7:44 PM
To: @SDO-WHSR Senior Duty Officers
Cc: Hachigian, Nina L.
Subject: FW: Africa speech [UNCLASSIFIED]

Importance: High

please fax to Mr. Berger at home after checking with Nina. Thanks, Ted

-----Original Message-----
From: Widmer, Edward L. (Ted)
Sent: Saturday, March 13, 1999 7:39 PM
To: @NSA - Natl Security Advisor
Cc: Malinowski, Tomasz P.; Smith, Gayle E.; Barks-Ruggles, Erica
Subject: Africa speech [UNCLASSIFIED]
Importance: High

URGENT: FOR SRB/JS REVIEW.
Sandy: I apologize for the length -- I just received the long insert on debt relief (pp. 5-7), which I trimmed considerably before putting in the speech. It adds far more to the speech than I intended, but given the importance and confidentiality of the information, I didn't want to shorten it any further. If need be, I can jettison the front section on the '98 trip, and some paragraphs at the end. Thanks, Ted

[Signature]

My comments are so extensive I won't say much except this needs work. Remember: it's one audience is Africans: proud, suspicious of Americans. We promise much and deliver little, uncertain whether 'The Future' trip was a long photo-op or the beginning of a new era in US-African relations. I think this draft reinforces their suspicions to add down to them, and is generally (except on debt) wrong.

Cc: GAYLE S.
PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON
REMARKS TO AFRICA MINISTERIAL
STATE DEPARTMENT, WASHINGTON, D.C.
MARCH 16, 1999

[acknowledgments: Secretary General Annan, Secretary General Salim (Sa-LEEM), Minister Ouedraogo (wah-DRAY-go), Secretary Albright, Secretary Slater, Ambassador Barshevsky, Brian Atwood, distinguished ministers and officials from 46 African nations]

I am delighted address this historic gathering. We are honored by your presence. A year ago next week, I set out on a journey to Africa. Some pointed out it was the longest visit ever by a US President. I prefer to think of it as the first in a long series of visits by future Presidents. It was a personal journey, based on a lifelong interest in Africa, but it was more – I wanted to change the way Americans think about an enormous, diverse, complicated portion of the world. I wanted to replace the myopia of the past with a vision for the future. I wanted Africans to see Americans in a new light, too – as a kindred people, eager to build a new history. I wanted all of us to stop thinking about what has not been done, and turn instead to what we can do together.

A year later, we share hope and disappointment. Disappointment that war continues to tear at the heart of Africa. That the Congo, Sierra Leone, Angola and Sudan have not yet resolved conflicts. That Africa's oldest and newest countries, Ethiopia and Eritrea, are mired in a tragic dispute. That violence still steals innocent lives in the Great Lakes region. That many Africans are still ruled by leaders they did not choose. That Nairobi and Dar-es-Salaam became battlefields in a senseless terrorist campaign that killed thousands of African bystanders, along with Americans working hard to promote good relations with Africa.
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But there is hope, too. There is more than hope – there has been real achievement since my trip. The recent elections in Nigeria mean that Africa’s most populous country finally has a chance to realize its vast potential. Its transition may be fragile, but let’s not forget that just a year ago it was not even foreseen. This June, South Africa will transfer power from one democratic government to another for the first time. The lesson for America is clear – if we work in a principled partnership with Africans struggling for democracy, peace and a better life, the most daunting obstacles can and will be overcome, sometimes when we least expect it.

And we should not forget that today more than half of the sub-Saharan nations are governed by elected leaders. Many, such as Benin, Mali and Malawi have fully embraced open government and open markets. Quite a few have recorded strong economic growth, including Mozambique, which not long ago was crippled by civil war. Ghana’s economy has grown by about 5% a year since 1992. Africa has fifteen stock exchanges.

People like you are in the forefront of this change – leaders with sight and courage – eager to make the new century better than the last. You have a great responsibility – you are the architects of Africa’s future.

Today, I’d like to explore ways the US can help. During my trip, the partnership between Africa and the U.S. was defined across a wide spectrum. I announced that we would provide $120 million for an ambitious education program that we would support justice and reconciliation in Central Africa, regional peacekeeping units like the African Crisis Response Initiative, Radio Democracy for Africa, Food Security, Safe Skies and environmental protection.
Since my plane left Dakar, the work did not stop. In many ways, it began. Since then, we
have worked hard to put these programs in place. We have deepened our economic relationship,
though far more remains to be done. This conference presents an unparalleled opportunity to
raise our cooperation to the next level. It is remarkable in that eight members of my Cabinet will
engage with African counterparts over the next few days. They embody the full commitment of
this administration toward Africa—a commitment as wide as it is deep. We are here from the
White House, from the State Department, from USAID, from the Commerce Department, from
Labor, from Transportation and many offices in between. The message I hope Africa's leaders
will take home is: this is a partnership with substance. It is a relationship for the long haul. The
US is determined to work with Africa to build a better future. That future begins now.

Today, our most pressing task is to spur trade, investment and development in Africa. For all the
bridges we have built in the last decade, there is still division between the western world and
Africa. We are too separate and too unequal. We still do not share the same resources, the same
access to new ideas, the same opportunity to lift the lives of our people.

If we are going to widen that opportunity for Africa, we have to get beyond the tired old debate
between proponents of more aid and more trade. Clearly, on a continent where so many nations
are building democracy for the first time, and struggling to battle famine and disease, outside
assistance is vital. For millions of people around the world, it offers the best hope for children
who need school books and vaccines, for farmers who need roads to get crops to market, for
women and men who need a small loan to get their first business started, for voluntary groups
who need help so they can help others. But just as clearly, all the aid in the world cannot by
itself lift Africa to the heights it deserves to reach. For that to happen we must lift the barriers that isolate Africans and deter companies from investing in Africa’s future.

We must enhance assistance to Africa and leave here with a broad commitment to integrate Africa into the global economy. There is already an excellent plan on the table to do just that ... and I call on Congress to finally pass the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

This bill is an important first step in establishing a real economic partnership. It spurs trade. It provides immediate benefits to African nations revitalizing their economies, and offers incentives to others to do the same. It increases US assistance, targeting it where it will do the most good. It bolsters democracy and reinforces human rights and labor rights. It generates private investment. It offers reasonable rules and realistic hopes for everyone.

I know that some Americans have criticized the bill for doing too much – or too little. I believe it represents a strong and achievable step forward. There are many friends of Africa in Congress, and many strong opinions about how best to help Africa. I hope they will quickly find consensus – we cannot afford a house divided.

There is far more we can do that pass this bill – particularly engaging the private sector. Passing the Growth and Opportunity Act will send a clear signal to American companies that we are serious about doing business with Africa ... and that they can invest their resources with confidence. But our partnership cannot be a one-way street. To maintain a healthy investment climate, African leaders must also do their part. They must fight corruption, respect human
rights, and work with other nations to prevent conflict. African governments must invest more in the future, including better education and health care. Africa has always been rich in mineral resources. We are committed to helping Africans develop their far richer human resources.

This is no platitude – it represents hard experience and common sense. A population decimated by disease cannot work effectively. A population without first-rate schools cannot compete in a world economy driven by ideas. A paradox of the digital age is that computers have freed millions by giving access to limitless knowledge … but to use a computer, you have to be able to read, and you have to have enough money to buy one. That’s why the African Growth and Opportunity Act includes money for technical assistance, and why my education initiative supports internet access for schools and communities, in cities and small villages. That’s why our new Peace Corps volunteers are helping to wire schools to the information highway and link them to schoolrooms in the U.S.

There is another crucial way the U.S. can hasten Africa’s integration. I know that many of you have come here today to talk about an issue of global importance -- debt relief. In the last ten years, the United States has forgiven over $4 billion in debt owed by the world’s poorest countries. I recently announced in my fiscal year 2000 budget proposal to Congress a series of initiatives to accelerate the pace of reduction. But more remains to be done.

Today I am calling on the international community to take actions which, if fully implemented, could result in forgiving more than $100 billion in debt. Our goal is to ensure that no heavily indebted poor country, committed to the development of a sound economy and inclusive
democracy, is left with a debt burden that prevents it from devoting resources to meet its peoples' basic human needs. Our aim is to provide exceptional relief for countries making exceptional efforts to build working economies.

To achieve this goal, I am proposing that the G-20 agree at the Cologne Summit in June to make significant changes to the HIPC Initiative: First, a new focus on early debt forgiveness by international financial institutions, which now reduce debt only at the end of the HIPC program. Combined with forgiveness of cash flows by the Paris Club, this will substantially accelerate debt relief;

Second, the complete forgiveness of bilateral concessional loans;

Third, deeper debt reduction by the Paris Club, raising the amount to 90 percent and inclusion, when necessary, of post-cutoff date debt;

Fourth, deeper debt reduction by reducing target debt indicators for countries with strong records on governance and civil society;

Fifth, to help avoid the recurrence of debt problems, Western donor countries should commit to provide at least 90% of new development assistance on a grant basis to HIPC countries receiving debt reduction.
Sixth, new approaches to help countries emerging from conflict, which facilitate early engagement by the international financial institutions with resources to support reconstruction.

And seventh, coupled with other measures to meet the financial costs of this initiative, support for gold sales by the IMF and additional contributions to the World Bank’s Trust Fund.

What I am proposing is debt reduction that is truly comprehensive. It is demanding, but to put it simply – the more debtor nations take responsibility for pursuing sound economic policies, the more that creditor nations must be willing to do to provide relief.

One of the best days of my trip last year was the day I opened an investment center in Johannesburg named after Ron Brown – a true visionary who knew that peace, democracy and prosperity would grow in Africa with the right kind of support. In many ways, that day was the beginning of this conference, and this relief proposal. I cannot think of a better tribute to his memory than the fact we are here working on the issues he dedicated his life to.

Ron would be the first to admit that Africa’s transformation will not happen overnight. But look at Latin America in the last decade. Look at Asia in the last 50 years. In each case, the same formula worked. Peace, open markets, democracy, and hard work lifted hundreds of millions of people out of poverty and into a growing global middle class. It has nothing to do with latitude and longitude, or religion, or race. It has to do with sweat and elbow grease and an equal chance to get ahead.
There are a thousand reasons Africa and the United States should work together… reasons in
our past and future. It is right, and it is in our self-interest. For obvious reasons, Africa matters
to the 30 million Americans who trace their roots there. But it goes beyond any family tree.
Africa provides 13% of America’s oil, nearly as much as the Middle East, and that figure is
growing. Over 100,000 US jobs depend on exports to Africa; millions more will depend on them
when Africa achieves its potential. As Africa grows, it will need services and supplies from the
United States. Countries with modernizing economies need telephones, particularly satellite
phones that can leap over the expensive installation of a large infrastructure. They need
airplanes, and Boeing expects Africa to purchase over $30 billion in new aircraft over the next
20 years. They need computers and software.

Africa holds 700 million people, nearly a fifth of the world. Last year, our growing relationship
with this enormous market helped protect the US from the global financial crisis. While exports
were down elsewhere, US exports to Africa went up 8%—topping $6 billion. And as wise
investors have discovered, investments in Africa pay a phenomenal return. In 1997, the rate was
36%, compared to 16% in Asia, 14% around the world, and 11% in Europe.

Finally, I’d like to return to a straightforward truth that guides our relationship with all nations.
Countries that are stable, prosperous and peaceful are good partners. They help respond to
crises, instead of causing them. They respect the environment. They abide by international
standards of law. They protect consumers, and fair relations between employers and employees.
They honor women along with men. There are 46 African nations represented here today—each
is a nation that the United States wants to work with.
Africa is the oldest continent in a sense—the "cradle of humankind" [Darwin]. But it is a new continent, a continent of young people, looking toward the future, with high hopes for their role in it, and fears that these hopes will go unrealized. We cannot let them down. The Kanuri people say, "hope is the pillar of the world." The last decade proves that hope is stronger than despair . . . especially when it is followed by action. Action is our mandate at this conference. Let us move beyond words of praise for each other . . . let us do the things that need to be done.

For our part, that means debt relief, and passage of the African Growth and Opportunity Act. For your part, that means building the institutions that bring democracy and peace.

The 1990s began with a powerful symbol—a door opening, and a man walking out into the sunlight. For much of the 20th century, Nelson Mandela has stood for something much larger than himself: a continent’s aspirations to dignity and self-respect . . . and the soaring potential of the unfettered human spirit. In his speech to Congress nine years ago, he said, "we could not have known of your Declaration of Independence and not elected to join in the struggle to guarantee the people life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." I wonder if we Americans cannot believe in the words of our Declaration of Independence without resolving to do all we can to help you achieve these goals. At the end of a truly historic decade for Africa, the door is still opening wider. Let us take the steps necessary to walk through it—together.
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I'm delighted to speak before the American Muslim Council, and to discuss with you our vital relationship with the Muslim world – a relationship that has received too little attention among foreign policy elites. [FYI: Malley prefers “Moslem”; but the group spells it “Muslim” – my understanding is best pronunciation is muss (rhymes with puss) -lim]

I'm proud to speak with you today for a few reasons. First, as a general rule, I think it's important for the President's foreign policy advisers to meet representatives of ethnic and religious groups in the United States. You understand the immediate impact of our policy in foreign countries. Your approval of what we do – or at least, your clear understanding of our - strengthens our policy, broadens its support, and increases its likelihood of success.

One of the most positive forces for a principled, purposeful American foreign policy is the engagement of Americans with roots overseas.

I am also proud to speak to you because American Muslims are have a critically important role to play as a bridge between the United States and the Muslim world. Our relationship with the Islamic community is vital to all that we are trying to do, from Kosovo to the Middle East to Asia. We have come a long way toward deepening the relationship – but we have a long way still ahead.
From the time President Clinton took the oath of office, this Administration has reached out to Muslims. The President's respect for Islam proceeds from a basic grasp of two indisputable facts. One, that Muslims constitute a major part of the world community, and will play an extremely important role in shaping the world of the next century. Two, that Muslims are also rapidly redefining our own nation. Islam is the fastest growing religion in the United States, practiced by six million Americans.

The President and First Lady have acted on this belief in a number of ways. Foreign policy makers both here and at the State Department have increased meetings with Muslim groups. USIA has reached out to Muslim audiences through broadcasts and speaker programs. The First Lady has traveled extensively throughout the Muslim world, including her recent trip to Egypt, Tunisia and Morocco. Muslim chaplains have been appointed to the military. Two days ago, Dr. Laila Al-Marayati was announced as one of three Presidential appointments to the nine-member Commission on International Religious Freedom.

Importantly, the President has made a point to move beyond the old stereotypes of Islam, both in his aggressive search for peace in the Middle East, and in his public statements. Last September, he gave the keynote speech at the opening of the United Nations General Assembly. The thrust of the speech concerned terrorism – a problem many Americans link to Islam. The President stated what has always been our position – that we abhor terrorism and its pursuit of innocent victims. But he went to great lengths to say that "there is no contradiction between Islam and America." That, in fact, the more we try to work with Muslims, to understand their legitimate grievances, the more we can all work together to avoid terrorism in the future.
Since then, he has acted on those beliefs time and time again. The Wye agreement in October came about in no small measure because of the President’s insistence that Palestinians be treated as full partners. In November, he promised economic assistance to the Palestinian people at a conference on donors to the Middle East. Just last week, he wrote to Chairman Arafat and reaffirmed our support for the aspirations of the Palestinian people to determine their own future on their own land. We have also committed to bolster Jordan’s economy as it undergoes a transition to new leader.

More than any other issue, Kosovo has refuted the old claim that the West and Islam are locked in a clash of civilizations. What Kosovo proves, beyond a doubt, is that Western and Islamic nations can unite to fight evil and protect innocent people – no matter what their background. There is no clash of civilizations – just a clash of values between those who believe in a future of peace and prosperity and those who resort to violence and hatred. We are not fighting for Muslims against Orthodox Christians – we are fighting against the notion that at the end of the 20th century, people can be singled out for destruction and expulsion because of their faith or heritage. Two days ago, at Spangdahlem Air Base in Germany, the President said that kind of policy “makes life unbearable and civilization impossible.” That is why we have opposed violence against Kurds in Iraq, against Muslims in Bosnia, against Serbs in Krajina, and now against Albanians in Kosovo.

I heard some of the heart-rending stories of Kosovar refugees yesterday. (details?). These Kosovars affirmed our determination to restore decent lives to a people whose only crime is that they
want to enjoy their culture and their faith. We will not rest until Serb forces have withdrawn, the
refugees have returned home, and an international security force is in place to protect ethnic
Serbs and Albanians alike. Nineteen allies, from across Europe and North America, with
different political cultures and different relationships to the Balkans, are in complete agreement.

We must do right by the people of Kosovo, as we are to do right by the

generation before us who fought fascism and one generation of our
children who deserve a different future.

The Kosovo conflict has been agonizing for all parties involved—though we should remember it
took four years to build an allied consensus in Bosnia, after 250,000 people had died. We in the
Administration are working closely with Islamic nations to address the urgent needs of the
Kosovar refugees. The contributions have come from all over—generous shipments of food,
medicine and supplies from Egypt, Jordan, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates,
Quatar, Iran, Pakistan, Bangladesh. That generosity has stirred the world.

It's undeniable that stereotypes still endure. Images of America as anti-Muslim and anti-Arab
still provoke the Muslim world; images of Islam as a hotbed of fanaticism and terrorism remain
here, stoked by the occasional wildly inaccurate Hollywood film. There has been plenty of
misunderstanding and miscommunication on both sides. Now we must forge common cause for
the things we all care about in the future: peace, self-respect, and cooperation. That is the wave
of the future. It must include people from the entire world, irrespective of religion, nationality or
ethnic origin.

Many Islamic nations continue to doubt our intentions. But increasingly, they realize that the old
labels of hegemony and Great Satan do not stick. True, the United States strongly believes that
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governments and economies work better when individuals are allowed to make political and
economic decisions for themselves. But we have no interest in forcing the nations of the Islamic
world to absorb everything American. We do not want a world of replicas, but a planet where
people are free to create their own worlds.

As you know all too well, many Americans are also naïve about Islam. They think it is
monolithic and uniform, or confined to the Middle East, or absent from the United States. Of
course, none of these are true. The same woman who might be arrested for wearing a headscarf
in Turkey might be arrested for refusing to wear a veil in Afghanistan. Malaysia, Pakistan,
Uzbekistan, Algeria, and Senegal are worlds apart from each other. Even neighbors are very
different ... Jordan and Syria ... Syria and Iraq ... Iraq and Iran. Simplistic images lead to
simplistic policies – we need to deal with the world as it is.

To consider the nations of Islam, in all their diversity, is to contemplate the future of the world.
It is a future that could go in several directions. Those of us who are hopeful can see enormous
potential for Muslims everywhere. Despite huge challenges, and ongoing violence, Indonesia
has a chance to embrace democracy and economic reform this summer. Nigeria, a partly Muslim
nation, is also preparing for a historic transition. Morocco is making progress toward democracy.
In Iran, we see and hear the rising voices of reform. In Jordan, King Abdullah has acted quickly
to strengthen his nation's economy and improve its ties to the rest of the world. I look forward to
his visit here on May 18, when we will discuss all of these optimistic signs.
But those who are fearful can see plenty of reason to be worried. The nuclear tension between Pakistan and India began with religious rivalry. India continues to be contemptuous of the world community. Central Asia is a volatile realm of competing political and economic interests. In Algeria, violence continues to take its deadly toll. There are terrible penalties imposed upon women in Afghanistan. Democracy and pluralism remain in short supply in the Arab world. And let's face it: another century of poverty will breed another century of hatred and terrorism.

The way these places define their future, for better or worse, will determine much of the character of the next century. If we work hard to nurture the good developments, and to give problems the consideration they deserve, we can get rid of the clash of civilizations theory once and for all. In the process, we will help ourselves, and we will relearn a crucial lesson of our own history: people of different faiths have to coexist, even if they do not like everything about each other. That is one of the reasons Kosovo is so important. Because there are so many other people in other places struggling to learn that lesson. The more we unite there, the more we will unite everywhere.

I do not pretend for a moment to be an expert on the Koran, but I know that Islam, like all great religions, places a high value on the sense that each person is part of a larger community. That we are uplifted by our kindness to people we do not know. That we are ennobled by our respect for each other, no matter how dissimilar we appear on the surface. One of the most unforgettable moments of an unforgettable year was the funeral of King Hussein last winter. People of all nations came to pay respect. Muslim and non-Muslim alike, royalty and commoners [except no
women!]. It was a remarkable spectacle ... a mass of humanity, joined in bereavement for a life that had helped them to blur some of the boundaries they knew too well.

I cannot promise we will easily simulate that feeling anytime soon in the Middle East. The divisions run deep. But still, there is much we can do to improve the relationship between the United States and Islam, beginning here at home ... beginning today with an acknowledgment of this Administration's gratitude for all that the American Muslim Council has done and will continue to do.
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May day an era ended in the Middle East — an era stretching back to 1952? I like to believe that maybe, somehow, across the prevailing A different kind of era is beginning at the end of this year. The end of an era will bring new challenges, opportunities, and possibilities. The end of one era can present an opportunity for new beginnings for all nations. To re-strengthen the principles of how to begin a new time on earth with a How to resolve the hardest paradox we face: to become modern while drawing sustenance from our very old faith in something bigger than ourself.
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SAMUEL R. BERGER
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS
REMARKS AT CONVOCATION
CORNELL UNIVERSITY
ITHACA, NEW YORK
MAY 29, 1999

I. Intro

I am proud to be here as your Convocation speaker ... as a Cornell alumnus ... and especially as a proud parent. This is the first time I ever spent $120,000 [tk] for the privilege of giving a speech.

It is not easy to sit still on graduation day, or worse still, the day before graduation, and listen to a speaker exhort you to follow a few rules that sound perfectly obvious. You’ve made it this far, so presumably you’ve got a good sense of where you’re going. I know your time is precious today. If you’re like most Cornell students I remember, you have waited until the last possible minute to pay your phone bill, return your library books, say goodbye to your best friends, get a job, and most urgently, find a place to live other than your parents’ house. In this, as in so many things, your parents are behind you 100 percent.

Given these demands on your time, I will not speak too long. Nor will I pontificate about the great lessons of life. Nor will I repeat the lesson Gloria Steinem offered Cornell students this spring, when she urged you all to develop just “one new subversive organizing tactic” ... one new outrageous act of rebellion.
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My goals today are more modest. I'd like to talk about my own time at Cornell, and how it profoundly shaped my life. I'd like to compare that to what I know of your time, and add a little more on the future we share together.

The root of the word "pontificate" is the Latin word for bridge. The temptation is overwhelming to use the metaphor of a bridge to the new century. I intend to resist that temptation. Today, I'd like to do something truly historic. I'd like to be the first public speaker in 1999 to avoid using the words "new millennium." and not to mention that you are the last graduating class of the 20th century.... I'm glad I didn't say that.

So let me just say how exciting it is to be with you at the dawn of a new thousand-year period.

You stand at an important crossroads. Not merely the intersection of routes 13 and 79. You are the last Cornell class of the 20th century. True, your journey into adulthood will coincide with the new century now beginning. But you will always carry some of the 20th century with you.

Fifty years from now, when you come back to your reunion, the undergraduates will see you wearing your Class of ’99 hats, and say, “they are really old. They actually lived in the 20th century.”

From 1963-1967,

When I was a student here, the 21st century seemed impossibly far away. Stanley Kubrick’s film 2001: A Space Odyssey might as well have taken place ten thousand years later. Now 2001 is a number you might see on sweatshirts all around campus. We read George Orwell’s novel, 1984, and wondered, “will it happen in the distant future?” Now we read it and wonder, “why didn’t it happen in the distant past?”
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II. 1967

I’d like to embark on a different odyssey. An odyssey, like Homer’s, that starts and ends in Ithaca. I’d like to talk a little about the Cornell I graduated from 32 years ago.

There is a lot of 60s nostalgia out there today. Ads for the Gap, with people dancing the Watusi. Austin Powers. Sequels to Austin Powers. In fact, the last time I spoke with George Tenet, the Director of the CIA, I asked him to explain the title of “The Spy Who Shagged Me,” but neither of us had any idea what it meant.

Most of that nostalgia is hilarious... and way off the mark, especially to the extent it reinforces the stereotype of a generation obsessed with itself. I think it would be more honest to depict the 60s as they were — a time of great hopefulness, not just here in the United States, but around the world. A time of innocence and generosity when all of us, especially the young, felt that if Americans stood up for their principles, we could eliminate problems like racism and poverty at home, and if America stood up for its principles, we could end build lasting peace abroad, and bring the world closer together. Obviously, that was naive. But it was anything but self-centered.

Cornell was a very different university when I arrived here in the fall of 1963. John F. Kennedy was President, and most of us were deeply inspired by his call to serve the United States. The college was overwhelmingly white and male. [spring 1967; 9920 men, 2937 women]
At the time, the 60s felt very modern and fast-paced, but as we look back, it is astonishing to realize how much slower our society was. There was a single computer on campus; it occupied almost all of Rand Hall. It seemed impossibly large and complicated, yet it had roughly the computing power of a small laptop today. Only a third of American households had more than one TV set [today that figure is three quarters]. Almost all of them were black and white – although black wasn't especially needed, because you never saw a person of color on TV in any capacity. There were only three networks. Cable was something that connected your TV to the wall. The web was something hanging in a corner of the garage.

But an enormous amount of change took place in my four years here. I remember demonstrations on all subjects. One over Cornell's plan to raise tuition to $1700 a year. [Black art exhibition] was attempts to make America's reality consonant with America's rhetoric.

By the time we graduated, we inhabited a different Cornell and a different America. Kennedy's assassination deeply darkened the landscape. Riots in cities across the country signaled that not all Americans were sharing in the American Dream. Robert Kennedy was elected Senator from New York, and he inspired many of us by championing people trapped in the margins of society, whether ghetto dwellers or Appalachian farmers. But there were still bright days. It was clear to everyone that the original promise of the 1960s was competing against formidable obstacles. There were terrible racial divisions in America, and terrible disagreements about America's role in the world. We were engaged in a difficult Cold
War. Thoughtful people understood that it was necessary for America to promote freedom and resist communism—but they also wanted us to stay true to the values we were struggling for. The world was color-coded red and blue, but many of these questions were deeply gray. That led to too many arguments between people who shared deep hopes for America’s leadership in the world.

[more here on connections between present and 1967? use of force, etc.]

III. 1999

We are still wrestling with those questions. We always will. That is the price of our unique position of leadership in the world. But most would agree we have traveled a long distance to where we are today, the last three decades. Many people enjoy lamenting how much better things were in the past. I think that's nonsense. In the last decade, we have seen the fall of the Berlin Wall, and the end of the Cold War. Today, there are no nuclear weapons targeted at the United States. We have achieved meaningful progress toward peace in the Middle East and Northern Ireland. For the first time ever, more than half the world’s people elect their own governments.

And here, at a more local level, we see a university that is thriving and laying the foundation for more progress to come. You don’t need me to tell you how well Cornell is doing; all you have to do is look around at each other. Cornell has achieved done more to advance its own democracy in terms of race and gender than the most wide-eyed optimist would have thought possible in the 60s. [stats of gender—7177 male, 6420 female; minorities?]
Cornell is also becoming an international university. There are study abroad programs in Nepal, Rome, France, Spain, and the UK. The President of Taiwan, Lee Teng-hui, is an alumni, as we learned when a Cornell reunion nearly wrecked Sino-American relations a few years ago. Now that was a subversive organizing tactic, if I ever saw one.

The same changes that have transformed Cornell are working on universities and nations around the world. Throughout the 60s, we heard the cry of “integration” as a byword of the civil rights movement—our people together in racial and social justice here at home, a struggle. Today, a different kind of integration is transforming the world. Last year, during the President’s visit to China, I remember seeing a poster of Michael Jordan at Beijing University. During the President’s trip to Africa, we visited a tiny village in Uganda, where I saw a girl wearing Guess Jeans. Everywhere we go, including that village, the Internet provides a tether to the rest of the world. With a small mouseclick, the sum of human experience is at our fingertips. [I should know, because I invented the mouse one summer I was hanging around with the Vice President]

These are international phenomena, but they resulted from strong American leadership. They are triumphs of the imagination, but they are also spurs to economic prosperity, political reform and peace. Leaders can still make war on their people, but in the Information Age they can no longer hide the consequences from the world. Tyrannical governments can cling to power, but they cannot deny their people knowledge of alternative approaches. Nations that want to keep up know that the logic of progress requires open access to the same information everyone else has.
IV. The Future

Obviously, there are challenges facing all of you as well. But as your generation merges in the workplace with my own, I think we both have a lot to look forward to. Thirty-two years separate my graduation in 1967 from my daughter’s today. What will our world look like thirty-two years from today?

Let’s begin with the certainties. Cornell will be thriving. Many of you will be leaders of society. Strom Thurmond will be 127 years old.

Now, the uncertainties. Let’s consider a few scenarios.

First, information. The last decade has witnessed nothing short of a revolution. Certainly, the progress will continue. There will be more information than ever. The question is will there be more knowledge. Our ability to communicate is staggering. It only takes 18 months for the amount of English generated by the World Wide Web to match the 27 million books in the Library of Congress. New inventions will continue to transform economies. Cell phones may revolutionize the developing world by helping them skip the need to build telephone lines.

But our dependence on new forms of communication also creates the potential for mayhem. Electronic terrorism, computer hackers. Or, less sinister, the possibility of too much sameness. The number of languages cut in half.
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2) There may be better economic integration than ever. The American economy has never been stronger. The trend toward open trade may continue, with greater movement of people and goods across borders, and greater productivity as a result. For the first time in history, we may begin to eliminate the remaining pockets of poverty in the world, to give all people a chance to participate in global economy.

But there is also vivid potential for a world even more divided. A world of disintegration, not integration. The Internet may just increase the advantage of the developed countries, leaving regions like Africa even more behind. Greater disparities may create a permanent hostility toward rich nations, which will lead to constant political instability, and constant dilemmas about whether to intervene in areas that do not appear vital to the United States, precisely because they are not wealthy.

3) The environment. We have come far in this decade, and no leaders have ever discussed the environment more intelligently or eloquently than the President and Vice President. I hope that we will do the right thing and act on some of the dangers we know exist. Key system of arriving at and enforcing international agreements. New technology for fighting against pollution. Continued research.

Or, we could see more indifference, and more delays, and the beginnings of ecological disaster that could threaten all that humankind has built. The developing world holds the key, and we have to conceive smart strategies to show nations how to generate wealth while preserving the natural resources on which our wealth is ultimately based. China overpolluting.

4) Geopolitical: The world is becoming increasingly united, without the arbitrary divisions that made the 20th century unbearable for so many people. The United States has unquestioned preeminence, but our leadership depends on our ability to work with friends and allies. We can continue this progress, with more agreements in areas such as trade, non-proliferation and human rights, upheld by more nations, that bring all of us into a healthy community of interdependence.

We can see China and Russia live up to their potential, through sound economic decisions and deepening democracy. We can see a world in which Muslim nations coexist peacefully with their neighbors, where Africa becomes a place of investment and development. A world in which women receive the same respect and opportunities as men. A world in which the human rights articulated since the Declaration of Independence are extended far beyond America's borders, so that all people are free to shape their destiny.

Or, conversely, a world where none of those visions come true. A world where China and Russia are perennial sources of tension, long after the end of the Cold War. A world where religious divisions continue to divide nations, and the Middle East is a nightmare of competing factions. A world in which Africa remains mired in poverty, disease and violence. A world in which human rights only apply to people wealthy and healthy enough to enforce them.

It is too early to know which world we will see emerge from all these scenarios. But we know from history that the future is often defined in unexpected places, at unexpected times.
That is why the conflict in Kosovo is so important to all Americans – especially to class of
graduating seniors who will live the future we are trying to shape. Kosovo is a small province of
a small country, in the world’s smallest continent. But it is the biggest possible test of our values
and our vision for the future – your future. It forces us to answer our hardest questions. Do we
have the will to stand up against the evil that nearly plummeted the 20th century into darkness?
Can we build a coalition of democracies that is strong enough and determined enough to defend
what we believe in?

I believe we can answer those questions affirmatively. Our effort in Kosovo is something new
under the sun. This is not a fight for territory or a proxy fight against a great power. It is exactly
what it is: a struggle to restore dignity to a people under assault for no reason beside their
ethnicity and faith. That we will not tolerate on the doorstep of the NATO alliance the scenes of
systematic murder and rape and dislocation that our parents gave everything to fight against.
That we are united in saying no to violence and hatred as a path to personal power.

There are people around the world who believe that this conflict is a product of American
hegemony. But we’re not in Kosovo to tell others how to live their lives. We’re there simply to
protect the right of a people to keep living – period. And we are far from alone. NATO is 19
democratic nations, comprising 780 million people of every heritage, led by governments of
every stripe. Like the coalition that united to bring peace to Bosnia, it combines countries in
Europe that have been at odds for most of the last millennium. It is even supported by just about
every country in Southeastern Europe, including those with historic sympathies for Serbia.
If any of you ever go to Sarajevo, the capitol of Bosnia, you will see why this is so important. Just a few years ago, this city that was long a meeting places of cultures was under assault by forces that preached hatred and fought for the ugly cause of ethnic purity. And where once shots rang out, the loudest noise is the hubbub of conversation in the cafes. Across Bosnia, people your age, from nations as disparate as Malaysia and Egypt, Argentina and Canada, Russia and Germany, are working together to keep the peace. If our nations can come together again, to complete the same task in Kosovo, despite all the risks, despite all the obstacles, that’s a hopeful sign for the future.

The driving force of the wars of the 20th century was ethnic hatred and inflated nationalism, exploited by cynical leaders. Ethnic tension will always exist. It will not be eliminated simply because more nations have access to the Internet. But we absolutely can stop normal tensions from becoming abnormal conflicts. We have the ability to do that, and the will. We will prevail.

V. Conclusion. Advice.

I have sketched out a large number of scenarios, and a large number of paths the future will present. There will be other paths I cannot even conceive of now. My conclusion, of course, is that you will be the ones deciding which paths to walk. The decisions you make will shape the new century. The responsibilities will be on your shoulders, not mine.

To be honest, I am confident. I know what kind of education you received here over the last four years. The circumstances of your life will shift over and over again. But the intellectual and
moral framework you have acquired here will last a lifetime. The best education you can receive is one that never stops – that continues long after you leave here tomorrow. I feel that way about my time at Cornell. It has been with me every day of my life since 1967. I hope you will feel the same way.

I have been on a lot of trips with the President in the last few years, to China, Africa, Ireland, Central America. Everywhere we go, it is hard not to come away inspired by the energy and confidence of young people. Last year, the President gave a speech to the students of Beijing University. It was the keynote speech of the China trip, and it addressed many aspects of our occasionally difficult, but ultimately essential relationship with China. The President ended that speech with a quotation from the great Chinese educator Hu Shih, a member of the Cornell class of 1914: “the struggle for the individual freedom is the struggle for the nation’s freedom. The struggle for your own character is the struggle for the nation’s character.”

I hope you will remember that. I hope some of you will think of your country, and find that you will serve your country – or countries – in other ways. By teaching well, by healing people, by devising new businesses that bring people happiness. I hope you will also realize that all of us are elevated by our contribution to the common good. That can mean a lawyer doing pro bono work. It can mean a banker thinking of ways to bring investment to the inner city. It can mean something as simple as being a good parent. If you remember nothing else I say, I hope you will reflect on the people in your lives who helped you get this far, and steal a moment to thank them tomorrow. Graduation is your day – but it’s a big day for them, too.

COPY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE</th>
<th>SUBJECT/TITLE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>RESTRICTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001. email</td>
<td>Antony J. Blinken to National Security Advisor; re: SRB Dartmouth Speech (2 pages)</td>
<td>10/02/1998</td>
<td>P5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COLLECTION:**
Clinton Presidential Records  
National Security Council  
Ted Widmer (Speechwriting)  
OA.Box Number: 2188

**FOLDER TITLE:**
Berger - Dartmouth [2]

**RESTRICTION CODES**

- Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]
  
  - P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
  - P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
  - P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
  - P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
  - P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
  - P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

  C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

- Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]
  
  - b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
  - b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
  - b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
  - b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
  - b(5) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
  - b(6) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
  - b(7) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
  - b(8) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning rights [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.
Sandy -- in discussing speech ideas with David L., David H. and Ted, we've come up with the following food for thought. [Note that the organizers are interested in a speech on U.S.-Russia policy -- not a good idea in our view since MKA has just done hers and not sure we have much to add 10 days later]. Please let us know your thinking:

**In the News Issues**

1. **Kosovo.** You speak at Dartmouth on 10/16 -- thus, a decent chance it will coincide with possible NATO action re. Kosovo. Would be hard not to say something if operations ongoing. That said, if you give Kosovo speech next week, may be a little redundant to do another one a week later.

2. **MEPP.** Bibi-Arafat summit will begin the Monday after your speech. Good opportunity to preview and shape expectations. Could also be captured in a broader Middle East speech spelling out our interests and policies in the region (Iran/Iraq; terrorism; energy etc...) Update/revisit of dual containment?

**"Big Think" Speech**

1. **One of the themes we have weaved in and out of speeches in different ways and places** (e.g. Latin America, Russia, UN '97) is notion that we have reached a critical testing point in democratic and free market revolution. Within past 15 years, people in FSU, CEE, Latin America and parts of Africa made a fundamental choice for democracy and free markets -- a choice we had been urging them to make for 50 years. But now, crisis in confidence in that choice because of perception democracy nad free markets not delivering for people. Danger is that if we don't figure out ways to share burdens and benefits of this change, people will question fundamental choice. More benign version is that first choice was the fundamentals -- democracy and free markets. Now, we're at hard/more detailed part -- 2nd generation reforms needed to make basic choice work. A speech painting this big picture and discussing U.S. responsibilities would be interesting.

2. **Future of Arms Control/Non-Pro.** Something we don't get enough credit for and where there is still work to be done (e.g. CTBT -- which needs every bit of help we can give it at the highest levels -- and non-proliferation agenda.) Also an opportunity to make case on KEDO. This used to be a campus favorite -- would be worthwhile reminding people how important issue remains, and the real progress we have made.

3. **Making Peace Around the World.** In many places long torn by violence, peace has made real progress -- Bosnia, N. Ireland, Central America, Mozambique. What's America's role in advancing peace and reconciliation? What lessons have we learned from our efforts? Would be a way to tie into issues in the news (Kosovo; MEPP).
4. **Challenges to a Bipartisan Foreign Policy.** A way to do death by a thousand cuts, focusing on sanctions proliferation, underfunding of international affairs account, congressional micromanagement...

5. **How Politics Pollute Policy.** Your retrospective on the China satellite fiasco, wherein a policy started by Reagan/Bush and supported by broad bi-partisan majorities in Congress to make US business more competitive by transferring licensing jurisdiction to Commerce was reversed as a result of political hysteria, resulting in decreased competitiveness, increased taxes on business, and no national security benefits (and arguably, a national security detriment). JUST KIDDING -- but a good op-ed, someday.

Regardless of topic, you might want to weave in a message for students -- Washington is still a place where idealistic and energetic people can make a difference.
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Scott-Perez, Marilyn L.

From: Widmer, Edward L. (Ted)  
Sent: Friday, August 28, 1998 4:45 PM  
To: @NSA - Natl Security Advisor  
Cc: @PLANNING - Strat Plan & Comm; @INTECON - Economic Affairs; @EUROPE - European Affairs  
Subject: Gateway speech [UNCLASSIFIED]

Nina: Here is speech you requested. Some text added [in bold] to allay Sandy's concern about pandering. Also, Ira Magaziner added a few thoughts. I think the additions improve it, but it is now longer. Comments to Widmer.

Ted—

This one needs work. Through about p 4, quite nice. Then, goes down, becomes rather boring. I think. Reads like you incorporated lots of people's inputs and lost focus, line of thought. There's a very good speech here screaming to get out; this draft tries to do too much. Goes on too long, can't really tell you what it's about except Ireland's doing well, here's a Widmer speech, 7 pages, not Treaty of Maastricht.
It is wonderful to return to Dublin and to once again exercise the freedom of the city you kindly conferred upon me three years ago. I now feel emboldened to speak to you, “Dub-to-Dub.”

A recent poll of American intellectuals decided that the best English-language novel of the century was a book set in Dublin, but written in Trieste and Zurich, and first published in New York and Paris. Joyce’s *Ulysses* was the product of many cultures, but remains a deeply Irish work.

Near the beginning of *Ulysses*, Stephen Dedalus complains that “history is a nightmare from which I am trying to awake.” That was not an uncommon sentiment in the aftermath of World War One and the divisive struggle to create a modern Ireland. But today, history is anything but a nightmare. Here in Ireland, a new and vibrant history is rapidly unfolding, spreading glad tidings across Europe and the Atlantic. In a sense, one odyssey has ended, with a new one beginning. And like *Ulysses*, the new Ireland is drawing strength from many far-flung sources.

Much of Ireland’s new history will be shaped by the Good Friday peace agreement, an extraordinary step forward by any measure. A step forward not only for the Irish people, North
and South, but for all people divided by conflict ... and united by the hope that words can lead to peace. Words have always been important to the Irish, and with the new century looming up before us, I'd like to add a few of my own about Ireland's exciting future and the role Americans can play in it.

Today's Ireland is an expansive place (a place of big ideas and unfettered imagination), with a confident outlook on the world. An old proverb says, "however long the road, there comes a turning." Ireland is dramatically at such a turning point. Over the course of the 1990s, this society has changed in profound ways that once seemed unimaginable. Not too long ago, Ireland was a relatively poor European nation, not exactly known for "cutting edge technologies" - unless that term could be applied to instruments for sheep-shearing.

Now, after wise government decisions to build an infrastructure and attract investment, Ireland is a far wealthier nation. As you have embraced change, you have inevitably redefined your relationship with Europe and outside world, paying more attention to people and places far from Ireland's shores. The world - and Ireland - are better places for this attention.

Ireland has become far more than an island ... it is connected in countless ways to the community of nations. Dublin is a technological and financial capital of the new Europe. Innovative companies - especially in the information sector - are transforming the way the Irish interact and communicate with other nations. Nowhere is Ireland more international than here at Gateway 2000.
This company is already speaking the language of the future. Here, the 21st century is palpable. You can see it in the switchboards lighting up. You can hear it in the sound of voices, speaking all the languages of Europe ... speaking in the harmony of shared aspirations. Through communications and commerce, you are helping to draw people together from all around the continent."

Because of Gateway 2000, Dell, Intel, Digital, and other companies like them, Ireland is today a nation of links. Not merely the links of Ballybunion — though I look forward to seeing them soon enough. The links you are forging between people of all nationalities. Your own historic links with Britain and the United States. And the links you are helping build between others -- for Dublin is becoming a major telecommunications center for Europe. Here you connect people and businesses in every combination ... a German housewife and a French computer company ... a Czech businessman and a Swedish investor ... people all around Europe, of all ages, learning to do business on the Internet. Ireland is at the hub of this invisible commerce — and you are a natural gateway for future Internet commerce between Europe and America.

In centuries past, we judged the stature of a nation by the strength of its armies, the size of its population, the sweep of its territory or the abundance of its natural resources. This was not always fair or logical — a place with no coal like Ireland was at a disadvantage in the early years of the Industrial Revolution. But time has a way of correcting these oversights. In the twenty-first century, prosperity will depend on something the Irish have in abundance: a capacity to imagine, a capacity to innovate, a capacity to create and exchange ideas, a capacity for...
knowledge. In short, Ireland’s strength will emanate from Ireland’s people. By these standards, Ireland is already a very wealthy nation.

Few places are changing as quickly. Ireland is online and on the move. Growth has been phenomenal for over ten years. Last year, growth was 7.7%. Prices are only rising about 1.5%. Unemployment is at a 20-year low. Ireland is second only to the US in exporting software. This year the Irish government may post a surplus of $1.7 billion. The Celtic Tiger is roaring [note: Irish pronounce with a hard C].

Because of figures like this, a lot of Irish eyes are smiling today. And the good news is affecting everyone. Irish women have never been as well represented in public life as they are today. Young people are staying in Ireland, committed to a future here. You are investing in education, ensuring that your progress continues. Small businesses are springing up alongside big ones. Europeans are flocking here to find opportunity. There are probably more foreigners here than at any time since the Vikings arrived in Ireland in the 9th century. And your new foreign guests are a little more respectful of their beautiful surroundings. Ireland no longer looks to the rest of the world … the world is looking this way.

Now a new challenge is before Ireland. To take what you have done and go further. To build more wealth for all your citizens. To continue the partnership that has worked so well between government and business. To maintain the infrastructure already in place and to create new companies, building in new directions. Though you have come far, Ireland still ranks in the middle of most economic categories for European nations. It’s
time to turn it up a notch. You have an opportunity to lead Europe into a new information age. It’s time to seize it.

Tip O’Neill, a great Irish-American known in your country as well as mine, said that all politics are local. It pains me to contradict him before this audience. But his idea has changed. In the information age, “local” has a new meaning. To an unprecedented degree, even local issues now depend on factors beyond our borders. The price of food, our tax rate, the way we receive the news ... all these basic political facts are now part of an interconnected world.

America welcomes Ireland’s progress and international outlook. We want to do all we can to support it. Because an interconnected Europe is a Europe that will grow peacefully. An Ireland that is wired is an Ireland that will stand at the forefront of new initiatives to promote growth, avert conflict, protect the environment and encourage education. You are learning what we, too, are learning ... that a healthy, self-sustaining economy does not come at the expense of nature, or a degraded work force. A strong modern economy thrives on education, innovation and a respect for earth’s bounty. An enlightened population is our surest investment in the future.

We are on the verge of a technological and economic revolution. Fifteen years ago, phone conversations traveled over copper wires. Today, a glass fiber as thin as human hair can transmit millions of pages of information every second. The number of calculations performed by personal computers is growing at a stunning rate.
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All these advances are combined with the Internet, creating the potential for the kind of economic sea change that happens once a century. When I visited Dublin three years ago, there were only three million people connected to the Internet. Today, there are over 120 million. Sometime in the next decade, it will be over a billion.

As our tools are reinvented, our lives are reinvented with them. Information industries are driving the growth of the U.S. economy, employing over 7 million people at wages that are 2/3 higher than average. Internet commerce will exceed $300 billion between businesses alone in the year 2002. When it comes to consumers, the sky is the limit. Even old-fashioned business like book-selling are affected. Two years ago, in their first year of operations, Amazon sold $16 million worth of books online. Last year, it was $150 million. This year it will exceed $600 million. There are many roads on the Internet – they will lead many people to prosperity in the new century.

Ireland is showing real vision in this area. Today I am proud to announce that we have signed an agreement to promote the growth of electronic commerce in our two countries. We have agreed to reduce unnecessary regulatory barriers, to refrain from imposing customs duties to keep taxes to a minimum, and to create a stable and predictable environment for doing business electronically. We are creating the architecture for one of the most important areas of business activity in the century before us.

New technologies are dramatically adding to the booming business that goes on every day between Irish and American companies. There are already 470 American companies in Ireland.
many in the technology sector, and the number is growing quickly. These companies are spawns. The grass is growing greener on both sides of the Atlantic.

As we do more and more business together, I expect the historic relationship between Ireland and America will evolve yet again. Two hundred years ago, Irish men and women left for America after a failed revolution. A hundred and fifty years ago, they left after famine darkened the landscape. In those days, America was a last hope for Irish families, and once they left, they almost never returned to their native shore. The Irish diaspora wonderfully enriched America—but at Ireland’s expense.

Today, it is different. Nowadays, a new Irish diaspora is sending young people out in the world—but they are returning to enrich Ireland after acquiring vital experience abroad. Irish and Americans study in each other’s schools, they start companies together, and our college football teams sometimes get bigger crowds here than they do in the U.S. Young Irish men and women travel freely around Europe and the U.S., acquiring new ideas and experiences before returning home. These ideas and experiences will be the seedbed of new entrepreneurial activity in the century ahead.

Obviously, the future will contain challenges along with opportunities. One will be to spread the benefits of wealth around the entire society, and not just those with a modem or a mobile phone. Another will be to welcome the foreigners who will keep coming to Ireland for jobs as long as the economy remains strong. Rapid change can create conflict ... between different nationalities ... between young and old ... between
races. Many parts of Europe and the outside world still need to be brought in to the larger economic community, just as Ireland once was. But I am confident Ireland will prove equal to the tasks ahead.

Let me add one last point, in the wake of the terrorist bombings that rocked Nairobi, Dar-es-Salaam and Omagh last month. The United States and Ireland have both learned an important lesson. Prosperity reinforces peace, just as peace reinforces prosperity. You have learned that at home, and you are teaching others by your courageous work abroad. A forward and outward-looking Ireland is joining us with the hard work of suppressing conflict around the world. The Irish have long championed human rights—and you have given the world a stalwart advocate in Mary Robinson.

We are also cooperating in tangible ways on the ground. Ireland and the U.S. have been steadfast partners in the fight to prevent war and terrorism in other countries. Few nations have contributed more generously to peacekeeping missions. Since UN peacekeeping began in 1958, 75 Irish soldiers have given their lives. Today, American and Irish peacekeepers are working shoulder to shoulder in Bosnia and the Middle East. The challenges of the next century require our continued cooperation. As we learned this summer, all nations are vulnerable to terrorism—and ultimately, all must join the fight to end random violence and build a safer world.

Many challenges remain ... but even as the Irish embrace new opportunities, the best things about Ireland will remain constant. The affection of family and friends. The sound of laughter. The power of words and language. More than anything, the love of life.
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In 1914, with Ireland and Europe on the verge of changing forever, Yeats wrote, "in dreams begins responsibility." That line sums up the brilliant imagination that has taken you to this point, and the hard work that will sustain your progress into the future.

I commend all those who have given up something for the larger cause of peace, and who denounced the recent outrage at Omagh in no uncertain terms ... the Taoiseach, Bertie Ahern ... President McAleese ... the leaders of the parties ... Prime Minister Blair and Secretary Mowlam. I especially thank the people of Ireland and Northern Ireland, who spoke out emphatically with their voices and votes. You exercised the highest privilege of democracy ... the right to speak one's mind. All of you served notice ... it is time to end this story of violence with a definitive full stop.

The Irish may be famous dreamers. But you are realists as well. I know you will uphold the responsibilities that accompany peace and progress. That you will work hard to keep the peace you have given so much for. That you will continue sending peacekeepers around the world. And that you will help us do all we can to bring others into the new world of the twenty-first century ... in Africa ... in Asia ... on every continent. It doesn't take a literary expert to see that a page has turned in Ireland. As we set out together to build the new world of the 21st century, let us write the best chapter yet in the ongoing story of Ireland and America.

###
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A few thoughts on public diplomacy for the upcoming week and the opportunities we have to leverage the NATO summit in a forceful and strategic way. The following suggestions are intended to calibrate our public message by varying degrees this week:

- When taking a step back to look at the forest, it seems that the substantive crux in solving the immediate crisis--Milosevic's acceptance of an international security presence--has not received the proper public attention. While the military and diplomatic efforts need to focus on his acquiescence to this key point, there may be an opportunity publicly to focus more sharply on the nature of the security force. It would be peaceful, it would be multi-national, it would include non-NATO countries, it would have a UN mandate, it would demilitarize Kosovo, it would protect Serb minority rights. We should take the opening to shine a benign light on exactly what we mean by an international security force and demystify the concept, make clear the nature of the mission and its non-hostile intent. Having the President and others talk more substantively about what we mean by "securing the peace" will focus the intense heat of the media on exploring the issue and would raise the stakes and public pressure on both Moscow and Belgrade to accept. We should move this core issue to a more leading role in the public debate and begin to "tenderize" the environment.

- One of the constant refrains from critics is this notion that "now that we are in this conflict we have to do whatever it takes to win" and that somehow the President is not prepared to win because he won't prepare for ground forces. This is nonsense and we should not be exposed to this argument. Of course we are going to win and we have a plan to do it. In response, we need to shift our rhetoric a few degrees--not our objectives--towards more forcibly and definitively declaring that NATO and the United States will prevail, will win, will succeed. This means that when we talk about the conflict we need to say more directly that the refugees will return to their homes, they will have security, they will have self-government. Because the fact of the matter is: 1) under either scenario these goals will be achieved; and 2). NATO could never accept anything less anyway--so we might as well get the short term public benefit from being more solid and declarative in the outcome because raised expectations will have to be met by the Alliance one way or the other.

- There is public resonance in the "moving from confrontation to integration" theme when talking about dealing with Southern Europe over the long-term. As we set up the NATO summit this weekend, this notion has to be one of our core messages in framing a broader vision.

- While not resolved by any means, the humanitarian crisis in the frontline states has stabilized. NATO and UNHCR's rapid response to the refugee exodus has alleviated the immediate sense of disaster. This is a success. We should begin to acknowledge these efforts as progress and compliment those involved in making a major impact in saving many, many lives in the short term as we deal with the refugees over the long term.
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Congressional Talking Points

- Seriously concerned about continuing violence and human suffering in Kosovo. Milosevic continues to use security forces to terrorize the civilian population. He has driven a quarter million Kosovars from their homes.

- UNHCR, international monitors and others who have visited the region, including Bob Dole, report that many are living in the mountains without shelter and with inadequate food, water and sanitation. As winter approaches, there could be a massive civilian loss of life with huge flows of refugees to neighboring states.

- Cannot allow another humanitarian disaster in the Balkans. Not only for humanitarian reasons, but because of the risks that it could undermine our accomplishments in Bosnia, further destabilize Albania and ignite a broader conflict in the Balkans. These risks are a threat to US interests in the security of Europe and in the credibility of NATO as a regional security organization.

- We and our allies are taking steps to help the humanitarian situation, including the President's recent commitment of $20 million in additional emergency assistance. At the same time, our negotiator, Ambassador Hill, has made some progress in moving towards a political settlement.

- But there are limits to what can be achieved with a purely humanitarian and diplomatic approach. The prolonged and brutal operations by FRY security forces have undercut relief efforts and deterred many Kosovar Albanians from returning to their homes. A durable political settlement is difficult to negotiate as long as Milosevic thinks that a military solution is possible.

- Since the spring, Milosevic has repeatedly ignored stern warnings from the international community, whether the UN, the Contact Group or NATO. As we learned in Bosnia, only a credible threat of force, if not the actual use of force, is likely to get Milosevic's attention and force him to change his behavior.

- Last week the UN and NATO each took steps that help to lay the political and military groundwork for the use of force. The UNSC adopted Resolution 1199 which affirms the growing threat
to peace and security in the region and spells out specific steps that we expect of Milosevic. NATO endorsed these demands and began the process of formally generating aircraft necessary to conduct a full range of air operations should Milosevic fail to comply.

- We and our allies do not want to use force. But, if Milosevic gives us no other choice, the objective in doing so would be straightforward: to compel him to take concrete steps to avert a humanitarian catastrophe and to initiate serious negotiations toward a political settlement.

- Next two weeks are crucial. We will be watching Milosevic’s reaction to the UN and NATO decisions, and we will be consulting with our allies about next steps. Absent concrete signs of compliance from Milosevic, NATO will need to finalize its military preparations and request allies to commit the necessary air forces.

- Any operation would be undertaken by NATO, with broad participation by allies. The operation would have robust ROE, adequate measures to protect our own forces and be conducted under the command of SACEUR, Gen Wes Clark, US Army.

- Of course Milosevic might try to ignore an initial use of force by NATO. That is why NATO planning provides for a phased escalation to wider air strikes. There will be no “pin pricks”.

- Meanwhile, we are increasing international pressure on Milosevic to comply. Contact Group ambassadors have seen him to reinforce the UNSC demands, and Ambassador Hill is pressing forward with his efforts toward a political settlement.

- We have provided update briefings to Congress, and we will keep Members apprised of developments as this process moves forward.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE</th>
<th>SUBJECT/TITLE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>RESTRICTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>002. speech</td>
<td>re: President William Jefferson Clinton - Memorial Day Remarks - Arlington National Cemetery (with extensive revisions by POTUS) (18 pages)</td>
<td>05/31/1999</td>
<td>P5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COLLECTION:**
Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Ted Widmer (Speechwriting)
OA/Box Number: 2190

**FOLDER TITLE:**
Memorial Day [2]

**RESTRICTION CODES**

- **P1** National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- **P2** Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- **P3** Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- **P4** Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- **P5** Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- **P6** Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

- **b(1)** National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- **b(2)** Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- **b(3)** Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- **b(4)** Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- **b(6)** Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- **b(7)** Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- **b(8)** Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- **b(9)** Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning geologic or geophysical cells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Privacy Act- [44 U.S.C. 552(b)]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jimmie Purvis
2006-0471-F
jp2547

COPY
PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON
MEMORIAL DAY REMARKS
ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY
MAY 25, 1998

COPY

Copied

Capps
[Acknowledgments: Secretary Dalton; Secretary West; General Shelton; General McCaffrey; Major General Robert Foley (Commander of the Military District of Washington); Superintendent John Metzler (Superintendent of Arlington National Cemetery); Chaplain Cooper (Captain George Cooper, USN); veterans; members of the armed forces; friends and families; fellow Americans]
We gather today on sacred ground for a sacred purpose. As spring turns to summer, as Americans around the nation take a day to enjoy friends and family, we come to Arlington Cemetery to remember how much was given so we could enjoy these precious gifts. We come to express our profound respect for those who are not here, but gave all for us to be here ... in this place, in this moment ... peaceful, prosperous and free.

Memorial Day began with our most deadly conflict, the Civil War. To this day, the children of Gettysburg spread flowers over the graves of those who fell there.
But the debt we owe our veterans and fallen heroes goes back well before the War Between the States. It goes back to the very origin of America, when people from all lands came to this continent to forge a new kind of society. A society where people enjoyed the freedom to pursue their highest aspirations... where life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness were the birthright of all Americans... where war was undertaken only when these ideals were severely threatened. Those ideals shaped us then... and they shape us today.
At the beginning of our history, and until the present day, we have learned this hard truth: freedom must be defended. But nothing is more worthy of defending. From the American Revolution onward, from Concord to Khe Sanh [kay san] to Kuwait, America’s men and women have always stood up for their country. And let me say how proud I am that we now have a beautiful monument to the 1.8 million servicewomen who have served our nation: the Women in Military Service for America Memorial, dedicated here at Arlington last October.
Thanks to these heroes, our nation has grown into something extraordinary. We are more than a large nation, or a strong nation, or a populous nation. The United States is today a force for peace around the world ... bringing parties together ... promoting new solutions to old problems ... setting an example for other friends of freedom as they, too, seek something better.
We have much to be grateful for today. Our nation is peace, prosperity, and the spreading power of our original idea: at peace. Our prosperity has never been greater. And for the first time in history, a majority of the world’s people live under governments of their own choosing. In a thousand different languages, people are saying “yes” to democracy and a new era of international cooperation. Around the world, people are struggling to overcome ancient animosities by embracing the idea that if we are all equal in God’s eyes, then what we have in common must be more important than differences of politics, race, or religion. Today we are especially grateful for the overwhelming vote for peace in Northern Ireland and the Irish Republic.
As we anticipate a better future, Memorial Day also invites us to remember the past. Let us recall two events from fifty years ago, a time when democracy was imperiled. I was just in Berlin, where we commemorated the airlift that supplied two and a half million people for eleven harrowing months in 1948 and 1949. Those were difficult days for freedom. But Americans never soared higher. I'd like to salute the men and women who participated in that remarkable humanitarian effort, a reminder that the will for freedom can always find a way.
And fifty years ago, our armed forces helped promote democracy at home, too. In the summer of 1948, President Truman ordered the integration of America's armed forces because he felt strongly that anyone willing to risk their life for their country should enjoy the full rights of citizenship. Today, U.S. troops set a shining example of how well different people can work together as one. As we ask other nations to resolve internal differences ... as we continue the work of resolving ours ... we depend on the powerful message of hope that comes from our multi-racial, multi-ethnic military. You meet every challenge with flying colors, a model for the world.
When we think of the heroes buried here at Arlington,
we realize how far we have come as a nation. The
tale we have become
entire story of America is written in these hills. Each
headstone is a page from our history. George
Washington is part of the history of this hallowed
ground. There are graves from the Revolution, the
Civil War and every conflict since then.

Many of the most famous American names are
engraved on these stones. And there are thousands
American and their families only to
here at Arlington, whose names are not familiar to
anyone but their families and loved ones.
On each of these white tablets is a name, a date of birth, and a date of death. The name of a state ... a religious symbol ... perhaps a few details about rank and service. There is an immense grandeur in these simple facts. They do not tell us much ... but they tell us everything. For each stone stands for a person who once lived in this nation and believed the idea of America was worth fighting for. We must never lose sight of these unsung heroes. They are a part of America’s greatness. America’s greatness.
And then there are those who have no names. Eleven days ago a Vietnam veteran was removed from the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. It was the right course of action. There is a chance we can restore his name and bring comfort to his family, and we must seize it. Whatever happens, we must always remember. But if that place in Arlington is now empty, our hearts and memories will never be. We will never stop praying for the unknown soldiers in Vietnam, Korea and other theaters where Americans lie, far away from home, missing in action, but still with us in spirit. They may be unaccounted for, but we must be accountable for their memory.
We take great comfort in something Chaplain Leo Joseph O’Keeffe reminded us of at the ceremony on May 14: that if some names are unknown to us on earth, all names are known to God in heaven. I ask Americans to join me in a moment of remembrance at 3 o’clock today Eastern Daylight Time, to honor the known and unknown who gave their all for our nation.

I would like to thank the veterans who are here today, from all the parts of the United States, for giving us all the cause to be here today. Without your sacrifice, we would not be standing in the sunlight today. You cast a giant shadow.
And ladies and gentlemen, during that moment, let us give special thanks. Because today is a historic Memorial Day. Last December, we negotiated an agreement with North Korea that we would send five teams to their country to search for Americans. This morning, at 0200, the remains of two soldiers believed to be Americans were repatriated to the U.N. Command Honor Guard at Panmunjom, on the DMZ. They are coming home this Memorial Day.
The children here will spend most of their lives in the next century. The youngest among us will not even remember the 20th century. It is possible they will glimpse the 22nd century. My hope is that they will

For them we must do our duty to enhance freedom, look back on us as a people who discharged our duties and opportunity at home, to strengthen the bonds of our own well and responsibly.

Union as we grow more direct, to advance the causes of humanity here, property around the world.
Just as America's bravest men and women fought two World Wars and a Cold War to give us the freedom we enjoy, so we must keep fighting to make the world better for people we do not yet know and may never know. We must strengthen freedom by maintaining America's leading role in the world. To abdicate responsibility now would be to renounce the sacrifice of ten generations of Americans.

Yet too often today we hear voices urging us to abandon our obligations to the multinational organizations we helped to create, and to our better for bailing an unwinnable conglomeration of alliances that were never made for action in our own interest but now is being held in a semblance of usefulness in achieving our objectives.

At the same time, our American way of life is threatened. We must strengthen the treaty lines for people who want to share the burdens of leadership, for we cannot do it alone.

So, yes, but we must also lead by example under
We protected the freedom our ancestors passed to us,
and held it in safekeeping for those who will come here
long after us. We helped make their century— the 21st
century—a century of peace. By never giving up the
struggle, we made possible a new chapter in our
country's history, and we extended the glory of the
patriots who lie here, missing from our lives, but
eternally present in our memories and the living spirit
of America.

My fellow Americans, we are surrounded by those
our Founders pledged their lives, their fortunes,
their sacred honor.

Let us express our love to a future worthy of their sacrifice.
PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON

MEMORIAL DAY REMARKS

ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY

MAY 31, 1999
Every Memorial Day, we gather in Arlington to honor our war dead and to remember the extraordinary sacrifice by which this nation secured its freedom.

Today marks the final Memorial Day of the century, a century that saw too many white stones added to these gentle hills. But it was also a century that saw Americans triumph on one field of endeavor after another. A hundred years ago, the United States was strong, but untested. Today, the entire world knows...
America has been tested again and again, coming what we can do. Our military is the finest in the world. Our people have never been more prosperous.

But we have never been defined merely by what we possess. More important by far is what we believe and what we are prepared to do to defend those beliefs. Americans are a realistic people—but at the heart of our achievement is a confidence rooted in optimism and a faith in our common humanity. We believe that people are worthy of the astonishing abilities God has given to us. We believe that people owe each other a decent respect for the opinions that guide them and the rights that protect them. We believe that much is expected from those to whom
much has been given. That faith precedes our strength—it is the source of our strength.

If the 20th century saw too much violence, it also saw progress in the war against war. Thanks to our brave men and women in uniform, our nation has never been more secure. The Cold War is now another chapter in our history books. The world powers that fought this century's world wars are cooperating as never before. As those wars recede from our living memory, they seem closer to our earlier past, and to a yearning for freedom that traces all the way back to our Revolution that gave birth to a new nation, based
on the radical premise that people could and should govern themselves, and endorsed by the God given us to liberty.

That... History beckons us on Memorial Day. Nowhere is our past more present than here at Arlington. On this day of this place, previous battles become as vivid as they described the truth of principle etched from the white rows set in this green landscape. From Concord to Corregidor, from Korea to Khe Sanh, from Kuwait to Kosovo, our entire history is written in this ground. Only eleven days ago, a young man from Ohio, Chief Warrant Officer David Gibbs, was laid to rest here after his helicopter crashed in a training exercise on May 5 in Albania. Chief Warrant
Officer Kevin Reichert died in the same crash. We pay tribute to two brave American who gave their lives in service to their nation’s highest ideals.

Many of the most famous American names are engraved on the stones that line these hills: John Pershing, George Marshall and Omar Bradley are here. Another veteran of the second world war, John F. Kennedy, lies not far from us. And countless veterans of other struggles: great explorers [Robert Peary]; brave astronauts who gave their lives to increase our knowledge of the heavens; Medgar Evers, who landed at Normandy on D-Day and then
fought for civil rights at home. Familiar names like Joe Louis, Earl Warren, Abner Doubleday and Audie Murphy. All different – all American.

We are the oldest constitutional democracy in the world. But we must never lose sight of how quickly we have come to be where we are. One of the great Americans buried here is the Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr. He served until the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and his opinions still affect us every day. But as a boy, he shook hands with a veteran of the American Revolution. As a young man, he fought in the front
lines of the Civil War, where he was visited by
President Lincoln, not far from here.

The President, wearing his stovepipe hat, began to
attract Confederate fire until Holmes shouted these
immortal words: “Get down, you fool!” Lincoln
replied, “I’m glad you know how to talk to a civilian.”

Justice Holmes also saw World War and Depression.
He watched the United States assume the mantle of
world leadership. And he never forgot that this
responsibility began with the humble soldiers and
sailors and airmen who have always stepped forward
for our democracy. As he said on Memorial Day in 1895, war reminds us that “our comfortable routine is no eternal necessity of things.”

That not a single freedom we enjoy would be safe without men and women ready, at great cost and peril, to protect it. That not one of our “birthrights” would be available at birth if it were not for the courageous generations before our time who defined these rights and defended them against all adversaries.

We did not become a great nation just because this land was generous to the people who settled it –
though it was. We did not become a great nation just because the people who fled here were resourceful—though they were.

We became a great nation because every time our beliefs and ideals have been threatened, Americans have stepped forward to defend them. From our biggest cities to our smallest towns, patriotic citizens have done what had to be done to advance a dream that began on the fourth of July in 1776.

If today is a day for history, it is also a day to look into the future. Today, there is a new challenge before us
in Kosovo. It is a small province in a small country.

But it is a big test of what we believe in. Our belief in human dignity.

Our desire to bequeath to our children a world where young people do not brutalize other young people because of their heritage and faith. Our interest in building a lasting peace in an undivided free Europe, and in preserving our alliance for free democracies of our 18 NATO allies.

It would be easy to look the other way, to pretend we do not see the hundreds of thousands of innocent men and women and children driven from their homes, and the thousands singled out for death along the way.

We could simply accept what the Serbian leaders tell
We saw it all before in Bosnia, for four long years, until us—that these people do not exist, that they are figments of our imagination. But looking the other way is not the American way.

We did not arrive at this summit of influence by sitting on our hands when our allies needed us, and when our values and interests were at stake.

Europe has seen great progress in the last ten years. More people than ever before live in freedom, united by a commitment to law, and shared beliefs about how governments should treat their citizens. Those beliefs were articulated in our nation’s founding documents.

They were embraced fifty years ago, by nearly all
-nations, in the Universal Declaration of Human
的权利。它们都被联合国
-50 years, they have been defended
by NATO.
-But these beliefs are still taking root in the Balkans,
and Europe's progress is imperiled by a regime that
threatens human dignity and contradicts the new
- Europe struggling to emerge. Ten years ago, the
Communist
Berlin wall fell, ending a cruel and arbitrary division
of Europe, unveiling the wounds of human being's lives. After 2005, the CIVIL War between people. That same year, Slobodan Milosevic became the
be assaults on peace, freedom, prosperity,
eated new divisions by stripping away the rights of

to guarantee them. It went to war against Muslims and
Kosovars. That is why the nations of the world
- Bosnia, leaving tens of millions of refugees and a
crime of genocide, mass murder, and a
condemn Mr. Milosevic and his war crimes. Not only
remembrance of war, but of religion, cultural identity
are 19 NATO allies standing strong. But from every
crisis, and the United Nations in the quest for an
Europe, the dream of

for Kosovo, the world has spoken NO.

Not only the 19 NATO allies. But people on every continent.
continent, help is pouring forth. Arabs and Israelis are sending assistance. Protestants and Catholics from Northern Ireland. Greeks and Turks. Africans – Asians – Latin Americans – even those whose lives have been battered by hurricanes and other disasters.

Our objectives in Kosovo are clear and constant. Of course, it will take time to realize our aims. Today with the memory of Rhine crossings and other disasters, we remember that no great evil was ever overcome without sacrifice or cost. But Americans back up their beliefs. And though we always strive to solve problems peacefully, when we fight, we fight to prevail. We will not rest until we
The President has seen

have secured our aims. The Kosovars will go home. The Serbian forces will withdraw. An international

force will deploy to protect all the people of Kosovo.

And afterwards, we will build democracy and

prosperity in Southeastern Europe, so that our vision

of a united, peaceful Europe is at last complete.

In the days and nights ahead, I ask all Americans to

remember our brave pilots and crews flying over

Serbia. To keep their families in our thoughts. And to

do all we can to relieve the dire suffering of the

Kosovo people. Even those who escaped will be

struggling with what happened to them for a long
time. This afternoon, I ask all Americans to reflect on these thoughts in a moment of remembrance at 3 o'clock, Eastern Daylight Time.

In this amphitheater, it is hard not to be moved by the still-unfolding story of America. Not only because of the white rows that surround us — but because of all of you, the living symbols of American valor — members of the armed forces, veterans of every war fought this century, the families who gave you the strength to who gave their lives for freedom, the living symbols of the families who gave you the strength to fight, and the children who will take our nation to new heights in the new century. — If you want to know why this is a great country, all you have to do is look around you. It is fitting that we are standing up to
ethnic cleansing with a multi-ethnic military that

embody the strength of diversity. You inspire the

world with your respect for each other.

You pass every test with the same flying colors – red,

white and blue.

Then, too, lie in this peace, those and in places

enacted and unachieved. The word will forever belong

to you. And in the bright new century ahead, those who live

free, with pride and with out fear of their heritage and faith.

As we leave this cemetery today, and prepare to leave

this century, let us honor the simple purpose of

Memorial Day, and of the white stones that serve as

memorials every day. For all our achievement, we did

not get where we are without an effort and a price. As

we race toward a future that invites and implores us,
we must never become too busy to remember those
who gave their lives to give us everything.

Americans will do great things in this century, and go
to extraordinary places. Let us never forget to
remember where we have been, and who helped us get
there.
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Ted--

Thanks for sending this my way. I'm somewhat jammed for time, so I'll keep the comments short.

The writing is really good. But I think there are some problems of emphasis. Above all, it seems like this is more a celebration of Truman, his recognition of Israel and even American Zionism than of Israel itself. There isn't a paragraph devoted to Israel's accomplishments, and paying tribute is what Sandy will want to do and what the crowd will want to hear. The real courage wasn't Truman's; it was the Israelis' -- and they paid for it with staggering casualties and the threat of annihilation in their war of independence and for decades thereafter. It's their day, not his.

I understand the desire to link the US and Israel, but I think the rhetorical strategy should be: 1) Israel has defied all the odds (military, economic, geographic, climatological, you name it) 2) America has stood by Israel's side, from Harry Truman's recognition (or before, if you want to talk about American Zionism) to the days when American Jews collected everything from funds to scrap metal for the infant state to the Six Day War to Nixon's extraordinary '73 airlift to the present day, when we are collaborating to stop terrorists from raining missiles into Israel's north or bombers from doing their grisly work on Jerusalem buses and to preserving Israel's qualitative military edge. 3) America will continue to stand by Israel's side in the search for peace.

On smaller stuff: I would avoid saying that we don't see eye to eye sometimes or that the alliance will last forever. And while I agree that the commonality of ideals is important -- rights, freedom, diversity, open expression -- one thing that needs mention is that the creation of the State of Israel gave the Jews a land of their own, to live in safely, for the first time in 2000 years. That is the core issue, which is not identical with the American agenda.

---Original Message---
From: Widmer, Edward L.
Sent: Monday, April 27, 1998 5:30 PM
To: Widmer, Edward L.
Cc: Blinken, Antony J.
Subject: RE: SRB Israel remarks [UNCLASSIFIED]

Dan—these will probably be cut some, but I wanted you to see them. << File: srbisrael.doc >>
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I had a very good discussion of readiness issues/concerns/strategies with Hamre. Defense believes POTUS should make a pointed readiness pitch as part of his remarks at the Truman commissioning Saturday and notes that Cohen (who precedes him in the speaking order) can set this up by laying out a lot of the specifics. Bottom-line is POTUS should go beyond just recommitting the Administration to maintain high readiness standards. Hamre/Bodner/Tyre recommend POTUS specifically call on Congress to approve -- before they depart for their summer recess -- the $1 billion readiness reprogramming package that has been up there for a month but which none of the four approving committees has yet to act on (SAC-D, HAC-D, SASC, HCONS). They also suggest he express his thanks to Congress for approving the FY98 Bosnia money as a non-offset emergency supplemental and emphasize the crucial importance to readiness of its approving the $1.9B needed for FY99 for Bosnia on the same terms. This need not be partisan or protracted, but would be an effective reminder that Congress needs to do its part, too, if we're to maintain readiness, and perhaps "make news" by challenging Congress to act now. They like the draft of the proposed POTUS reply to Lott and hope he'll have a venue to give longer remarks along those lines soon. They understand that any discussion of topline relief is properly an FY2000 budget consideration, not FY99. Lastly, they are still mulling over my suggestion that once we've secured approval of the currently pending readiness reprogramming package, we bundle all the funding ($200+ million) from the DoD line-item vetoed projects and submit that as a new "readiness reprogramming package." That step, if approved, should not be launched however until all 4 committees have approved the $1B package the POTUS would reference in this speech, so we'd save that for a Ft. Bragg or Ft. "x" "readiness event."

If you (Sandy) approve, Rod/Joe will work with Ted/Tony to expand the current very abbreviated "readiness para."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE</th>
<th>SUBJECT/TITLE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>RESTRICTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001. speech</td>
<td>re: President William Jefferson Clinton - Speech to Grand National Assembly - Ankara, Turkey (10 pages)</td>
<td>11/15/1999</td>
<td>P5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COLLECTION:**
Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Ted Widmer (Speechwriting)
OA/Box Number: 2191

**FOLDER TITLE:**
Turkey - Assembly

**RESTRICTION CODES**

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]
- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

- C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]
- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(5) Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(b)(5) of the PRA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Jimmie Purvis
2006-0471-F
jp2549
[President Demirel, PM Ecevit, Speaker Akbulut [OCK-ba-lute], distinguished members]

I am delighted to be in Ankara, and proud to begin the longest trip ever to Turkey by a President of the United States. I am honored to appear before this body, the repository of Turkish sovereignty, which as the words behind me affirm, “belongs unconditionally, and without exceptions, to the people.” I have come to pay my respects to a vital strategic partner of the United States, and to speak with you about my vision for our common future.

Like America, Turkey is a diverse democracy at a crossroads of the world. It has a secular government, and a people who cherish their rich religious inheritance. It is proud of its history, but in no way confined by it. Turkey boasts an old civilization, but it is a young country, founded in this century, pulsing with the energy of a new generation eager to make its mark.

We are far from identical, but time and again, our people have converged in common cause. In 1863, the first American college outside the United States, Robert College, opened its doors to the youth of Turkey. It was the only foreign institution allowed along the Bosporus – precisely because America had never encroached upon Turkish sovereignty. I am proud that Prime Minister Ecevit is an alumnus of that institution that owes its origin to both our countries.

Earlier in this century, the great founder of the Turkish Republic, Kemal Ataturk, captured America’s imagination with his bold reforms. He was called “a second George Washington” by
Halide Edib Adavar [H-a-lee-DAY Eh-deep A-h-duh-VAR; female colleague of Ataturk's]. He appeared on the cover of Time magazine. He corresponded with our Congress. And we moved our embassy here to Ankara, this city in the heart of Anatolia, the capital of a new republic built to serve all its citizens. In 1927, in a six-day speech before this body, Ataturk surveyed Turkey’s relations with the countries of the world, and paid us what I think was a compliment when he said: America is “more acceptable than the rest.” My speech today will be a little shorter.

Twenty years later, President Truman committed America’s resources to protect Turkey’s integrity at the dawn of the Cold War. But the Truman Doctrine did far more than that. It laid the basis for the Marshall Plan, for NATO and for America’s post-war engagement with the rest of the world. It sealed our partnership ... our alliance. Over fifty years, that alliance has stood the test of time, and passed every other test from Korea to Kuwait to Kosovo. On behalf of all Americans, I thank you for half a century of solidarity, trust, and mutual respect.

Since the Cold War ended, we have discovered something wonderful: Our relationship is not simply as important as it was when we confronted the Soviet Union. It is more important. Together, we are adapting NATO to the demands of the 21st century. We are partners for peace in the Balkans, in the Caucasus, in the Middle East. We are developing new sources of energy that will help the whole region. Last year our trade was over 6 billion dollars. It has risen 50% in the last five years. Thanks to the vision of your former President, Turgut Ozal [Ter-gut Oh-ZAHL] and the dynamism of the Turkish people, Turkey has become an engine of regional growth. In the months ahead, we will together launch new projects worth billions of dollars, mostly in the energy sector, bringing jobs and electricity to Turkey and bringing our countries even closer.
This Assembly has already taken bold steps to define the new century. Between June and September you passed a remarkable sixty-nine laws. That's a record I cannot wait to tell the American Congress about. But it's not just the quantity of these laws, it's their quality.

Landmark legislation on social security. An international arbitration law. Banking reform. These laws took courage and vision. Now I understand you face a difficult budget decision that requires the same courage and vision. The United States strongly supports an IMF standby agreement, and we will do all we can to help make it a reality.

The millennium offers a rare chance to reflect upon our journey from different origins to the convergence we celebrate today. Some Americans enjoy calling the 20th century the American Century – an immodest phrase coined in 1941 by a presumptuous journalist [Henry Luce], before the century was even halfway done. It's true that Americans are enormously proud of all we have accomplished in the past hundred years. But I think Turkey's transformation over this period, and its impact on the world, rivals that of any nation on earth.

Before coming to the Assembly, I paid my respects at the gravesite of a man who ranks as one of the most important leaders of this century. In a sense, we are all here today because of Kemal Ataturk – because he chose Ankara to be the capital, and because he pledged Turkey's future to the democracy symbolized by this proud assembly. It serves no purpose for me to tell you about a figure you know so well. But it strikes me that his greatness is heightened when we remember that he did much of what he did with no help from the western powers – indeed, against the opposition of most of them, as they tried to carve up Turkey, and reduce it to a rump
state. It is heightened still when we recall that Ataturk responded not by closing Turkey up, but by opening it to the world.

For better and worse, the events of that time, when the Ottoman empire disintegrated and a new Turkey rose, have shaped the history of this entire century. From the ruins of that empire, from Bulgaria to Albania to Israel to Arabia to Turkey itself, new nations and new hopes would be born. But old hatreds die harder. And a century of conflict erupted from the turmoil of shifting borders and unrealized ambitions: beginning with the First Balkan War and World War One all the way to today's struggles in the Middle East and the former Yugoslavia. In all these ways, Turkey's past is a key to understanding the 20th century. But just as clearly, Turkey's future will be critical to shaping a new century – shaping it for the better. I want to speak today about why that is true and what we can do together to realize the future we want.

Since people have been able to draw maps, they have pointed out the immutable fact of Turkey's geography – that Asia Minor is a bridge between continents. Less than a kilometer separates Europe from Asia at the nearest point along the Bosporus – and in reality, there is no separation at all, thanks to the bridges you have built, to the commerce that spans Turkey every day, and to the communications revolution that links all parts of the world instantaneously. Turkey's ability to bridge East and West is all the more important when another fact of Turkey's geography is considered: You are almost entirely surrounded by neighbors who are either actively hostile to democracy and peace, or struggling, against great obstacles, to build democracy and peace.

To the southeast, Iran is witnessing a remarkable debate between proponents of a closed and open society, while Iraq continues to repress its people, threaten its neighbors and seek weapons...
of mass destruction. I thank Turkey for its support of Operation Northern Watch, which allows us to deter Saddam's aggression while protecting the people of northern Iraq. To the south, the Middle East is still roiled with violence, but blessed with a historic opportunity to build a comprehensive peace. And Turkey is a force for that peace, through its ties to Israel and the Arab states.

To the northwest lie the Balkans, where in the last decade seven new democracies have been born – and four wars have claimed hundreds of thousands of innocent lives. Turkish forces in NATO helped to end those wars, and thus to end this century with a powerful affirmation of human dignity and human rights. And today, we are working side-by-side for an enduring peace.

To the east, twelve independent nations have emerged from the ruins of the Soviet empire. There is no more important challenge in the world today than helping them to develop as stable, democratic societies. Turkey has been a leader in meeting this challenge, reaching out in particular to nations with shared ties of language, culture and history. But there is still much to be done. We must keep working to resolve the conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh. We must secure the region's energy resources in a way that protects the Bosporus, helps newly free states to stand on their feet, and powers Turkey and Europe's future growth. We must help Russia complete its democratic revolution. We must be clear with Russia that its fight against terrorism is right but that its use of indiscriminate force against civilians is wrong, likely to exacerbate the very tensions Russia wants to resolve. We'll have a chance to address all these challenges when nearly a third of the world's nations gather at the OSCE summit in Istanbul this week. The setting will be fitting indeed, because from every direction, people look to Turkey.
When we step back, it is possible to see two very different futures over the next generation. Without too much trouble a pessimist might foresee a dark future indeed: a Middle East with a shattered peace process ... Saddam’s aggression unchecked ... collapsed democracy in the Caucasus and Central Asia ... extremism and terror spreading across the region ... more violence in the Balkans ... military coups ... and unstoppable nuclear tensions in Pakistan and India.

But if Turkey plays its rightful role at the crossroads of the world, at the meeting place of three great faiths, it is possible to see a brighter future. A future of conflicts resolved and prosperity on the rise. A future in which nations live at peace with their neighbors, and prosperity grows through local initiative and foreign investment. A future in which people are free to pursue their faith and proclaim their heritage ... in which women are treated as equals ... in which nations see no contradiction between preserving traditions and participating in the life of the world. A future of growing respect for the human rights that protect our differences and our common humanity.

And specifically, a future in which nations that happen to be Muslim are increasingly partners with nations that happen not to be Muslim, acting in concert, in ways large and small, to realize the hopes of their people. I hope that the next time an American president addresses a nation with a Muslim tradition, he will be able to say that the progress of Indonesia and Nigeria and Morocco – all very different nations – has helped all of us put the lie to the tired claim of a clash of civilizations. As Ataturk said seventy-five years ago, “countries vary, but civilization is one.” John F. Kennedy said the same thing in Berlin when he affirmed: “freedom is indivisible.”
All told, there are billions of people around the region and the world whose future depends on
the decisions made in this room over the next twenty-five years. Each has a stake in Turkey’s
success in defining itself as a strong, secular, modern nation; proud of its traditions, and fully a
part of Europe. That will require hard work and vision. But you have done much of it already ...
through Ozal’s reforms ... through the actions of this Assembly ... and through the thousands of
way in which the Turkish people are daily forging an energetic, responsive civil society.

The future we want to build together begins with Turkey’s progress in deepening democracy at
home. Nobody wants this progress more than the people of Turkey themselves. You have
created momentum: in edicts against torture, in a new law that protects the rights of political
parties, in the achievements and vitality of this Assembly. And with the easing of terrorism,
avenues are opening for Kurdish citizens of Turkey to reclaim that most basic of birthrights – a
normal life. But there is still more to be done to realize the promise of the universal declaration
of human rights, articulated at the very moment we entered into close relations a half-century
ago. That will be the most significant sign of Turkey’s confidence as it looks to the new century
and the most meaningful measure of its success.

We raise these issues not because we believe America or Europe or anyone else has the right to
shape your destiny for you. Only you have that right. That’s what democracy is all about. We
raise these issues because for all the reasons I have mentioned, we have a profound interest in
Turkey’s success. The lesson of our troubled century is that when writers and journalists freely
express themselves, they not only exercise a fundamental right, they fuel the exchange of ideas
essential to economic growth. When peaceful outlets exist to express normal human differences,
peace is preserved. When people can celebrate their culture and faith in ways that do not infringe upon the rights of others, moderates do not become extremists, and extremists do not become heroes. We believe in something that was never said more clearly than by the founder of the Turkish Republic: “sovereignty should not be built on fear.”

A second way to shape the future lies in reducing tensions in the Aegean. It will require hard work on the part of both Turkey and Greece. I appreciate how much history lies behind this difficult relationship. But people are beginning to see the possibilities that can be created by building a new and better history. Prime Minister Ecevit’s government has taken tremendous strides in that direction. I agree with something he once said to me: there is just as much history and geography uniting you as there is dividing you.

Greece is also taking risks for peace, and recognizing as never before that Turkey’s destiny lies in Europe. You came together to promote stability in the Balkans. And the people of both nations were movingly joined again when tragedy struck in the form of earthquakes, first in August, and then horribly again last week. Every person who lost a loved one or a home to those earthquakes knows that these were not merely Turkish or Greek tragedies: they were human tragedies, and the world will never forget the humanity each nation displayed toward the other.

We must also work hard to reach a just settlement in Cyprus. We understand your concern for the Turkish Cypriot community, just as we understand the feeling people in Greece have for Greek Cypriots. But will the interests of the Turkish Cypriots in northern Cyprus truly be served if they remain alone and apart, with a standard of living one third as high as the south? As I told...
Prime Minister Ecevit at the White House, there can be no return to the insecurity before 1974. Every Cypriot must live in security. But every Cypriot also deserves our best efforts to resolve this problem in a way that allows them to move forward together – with security and prosperity – toward a united Europe. I am convinced we can achieve a settlement that does that.

Finally, the future we want to build together will require foresight on the part of our other allies in Europe. The foresight to see that our vision of a Europe that is undivided, democratic and at peace for the first time in history will never be complete until it embraces Turkey. The United States is not a member of the European Union. But ever since we came to Europe’s defense by coming to Turkey’s defense after World War II, we have encouraged European integration to move further and faster. I have consistently urged this, and I am pleased to see signs today that there will be a place in the EU for Turkey when Turkey is ready to join.

There are still those who see Europe in narrower terms. Their Europe might stop at this mountain range, or that body of water, or much worse, where people start to worship God in a certain way. That way of thinking is anathema to those who know that Europe is an idea as much as a place. The idea that people can find strength in diversity – diversity of opinions, cultures, and faiths. The idea that people can be united without being uniform. And if the community we loosely refer to as “the west” is an idea, it has no fixed eastern frontiers. It stretches as far as the frontiers of freedom will go.

Ten years ago this month, a wall tumbled in Berlin and a curtain lifted across Europe. The best way to celebrate that anniversary is to rekindle that feeling of liberation for a new generation. The
The best way to complete the unity glimpsed in 1989 is to integrate all of southeastern Europe into the idea of Europe. That means democracy in Serbia, peace in the Aegean, and a fully democratic Turkey, fully in the European community.

Let me end by going back to the beginning – the beginning of the new century we share so much hope for. It is a time of great optimism for both our countries. We have much to be proud of.

But we must never forget that Turkey is built on the ruins of civilizations that were once every bit as optimistic as we are. To avoid their fate, we must back up our words with concrete deeds.

We must acknowledge the challenges still before us. And we must never relinquish the confidence that brought us everything in the century that now turns into history.

Turkey has come so far, over so many barriers, in so short a time. It was only sixty-one years ago this week that Ataturk died. Prime Minister Ecevit was one of the schoolchildren who filed into the palace to pay their respects to a fallen leader. All of you are the youth he advised in his most unselfish mandate, near the end: to continue to think for yourselves, to always reexamine your beliefs, and to reshape democracy, generation after generation after generation.

What Turkey has generated in this century is a living example of what all people can do to claim a better destiny for themselves. A new century lies untested before us. It is an enormous opportunity. Turkey is fully equal to it. By deepening the democratic revolution embodied by and still emanating from this chamber, Turkey can do more than serve its citizens well. By your example, and by your exertion, Turkey can truly inspire the world.
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At the opening of the fifty-third session of the General Assembly, the world looks very different than it did a short year ago.

There is much to celebrate ... peace has come to Northern Ireland after 29 years ... Bosnia just held its freest elections ever ... around the world, more people determine their destiny than at any moment in human history. The people of our 185 countries are communicating as never before. In every dialect of every language, the world's citizens are speaking, listening, and being to each other as never before.

Fifty years have elapsed since our predecessors signed one of the great documents of the 20th century ... the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. We know those rights are not yet as universal as they should be ... yet we take pride that they are better understood and better practiced today than they ever have been. The men and women who created that document would applaud our progress ... and they would urge us to make the next fifty years even better.

But as every person in this room knows, the promise of our time is attended by real peril. In the last year, we have confronted a host of new challenges ... some that are familiar ... others that are not. Ethnic, racial religious and tribal hatreds that are fueling dangerous conflicts,
from Africa to Europe to the Middle East. Economic dislocation that fosters doubt and even despair among those left behind in the global economy. The aggressive acts of rogue states, bent on acquiring weapons of mass destruction and dominating their neighborhoods. And still, despite all our progress, the wanton violence of terrorist attacks.

Last month's bombings in Africa and Northern Ireland suggest that terrorism is not fading away with the other problems of the 20th century ... it is as rampant and reckless as ever. In some places, it is on the rise. In all of our countries, it violates a sacred human right ... specifically, the right enumerated in Article 3 of the Universal Declaration ... "Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person."

Here at the UN, at international summits around the world, and on many occasions in the United States, I have addressed this subject in detail, describing what we have done, what we are doing and what we must yet do to combat terror. Today, my task is somewhat different. Here, in this great forum, I want to talk about why we should care about this problem — why you should care — and why together, we must put the fight against terrorism at the top of our common agenda as a community of nations.

I. Terrorism is Our Common Problem

Terrorism is obviously a matter of profound concern to my nation. In the last fifteen years, Americans have been targeted over and over again. In Beirut, where Marines lay asleep in their barracks, part of mission to bring peace to the Middle East. In Saudi Arabia, where soldiers were helping a different peace take hold in the Persian Gulf. Even here in New York City, in one of
our most public buildings, where people were going about the business of their daily lives. And most recently, on August 7, in Nairobi and Dar-es-Salaam... where people who... building bridges between nations... people very much like you... were killed for no reason at all.

The American people understand that we are targets of terrorism because we have unique leadership responsibilities in the world, because we act to advance peace and freedom, and because we stand tough against terrorism. Americans believe as one that to change any of that—to pull back our diplomats and troops from the world's trouble spots, to turn our backs on those taking risks for peace, to weaken our opposition to terrorism—would be to give terrorism a victory it cannot and will not have. It will never happen.

But let me clear up a grave misconception. We are not the only ones who are vulnerable. Terrorism is not just, or even mostly, an American problem. It is a clear and present danger to tolerant societies and innocent people everywhere. No one represented in this room is immune. Not the people of Nairobi and Dar-es-Salaam, who died in massive, tragic, out of proportion to our own losses. For every American killed, roughly 20 Africans were murdered and 500 were injured... innocent people going about their business on a busy morning.

Not the people of Omagh, Northern Ireland... Catholics and Protestants both... mostly women and children... out shopping together when their future was snuffed out by a fringe group clinging to the past.
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Not the people of Japan who were poisoned by a nerve gas released in the Tokyo subway.

Not the people of Argentina, who died when a car bomb decimated a seven-story building housing Jewish groups.

Not the people of Kashmir and Sri Lanka, killed by ancient animosities.

Not the Palestinians and Israelis, who die year after year, side by side.

Not the people of Algeria enduring a nightmare of unfathomable terror with no clear origin or end in sight.

Not one of these victims was an American. But every one was a son or daughter ... a husband or wife ... a father or mother. Every one was a human being whose humanity was extinguished by someone else's aimless hatred. And every death left a circle of people whose lives will never be the same.

II. The Danger is Growing

And so, this is our common problem. And it is a growing problem. Some try to argue the number of deaths from terrorism is small ... sometimes less than the number of people killed by lightning every year. But that misses the point in several dangerous ways.
Terrorism has a new face in the 1990s. A revolution in information and technology is bringing us all closer together, improving our lives in countless tangible ways. But terrorists have taken advantage of this openness to acquire dangerous knowledge ... including how to obtain access to weapons of mass destruction, sometimes even powerful chemical weapons like the sarin gas used in the Tokyo subway. An attack that might once have claimed a dozen victims now threatens tens of thousands. The new technology of terror and its increasing availability bring us all into the category of possible victim.

Every bomb ... every bomb threat ... leaves far more damage in its wake than we can immediately measure. Beyond the physical damage of each attack, there is a disproportionate residue of psychological damage slow to heal. Each explosion has an insidious effect on the institutions we are trying so hard to build in this body ... representative governments ... civil societies ... free markets. In every corner of the world, people are struggling to build better futures based on trust and good faith. How many investments in the Middle East have been killed after bombs blew up? How many businesses will not be created in Kenya and Tanzania and the Palestinian cities ... places that need attention and investment? How many talented men and women will refuse to play public roles out of a fear of martyrdom? The question is not only how many lives were lost in each of these terrorist attacks ... the question is how many better lives were not created in their aftermath?

Around the world, in places where terrorism has created fear, there is that much less hope for the future. Hope feeds on confidence. Terrorism saps this confidence. It encourages people and
nations to remain cloistered. It darkens our dreams. It impoverishes our imagination. It makes the future smaller.

III. Explanation

To understand the persistence of terrorism, we must try to understand its sources. In places where peace is making progress, terrorism is often an act of desperation by the enemies of peace.

Out of synch with history. The Omagh bombing came near the conclusion of a successful peace process — one of the best developments of the last quarter-century. The Africa bombings came at a time of new hope for Africa ... and a dawning realization by the rest of the world that Africa's 700 million people have been ignored for too long. And in the Middle East, the closer we get to a lasting peace, the more the enemies of peace respond with terror.

We must recognize that progress is exactly what threatens those who are drawn to terrorism. As people have coalesced around the shared understanding that cooperation is greater than conflict: ... that what unites them is greater than their differences, a small but significant minority has... externalize that progress. In their fear of the future, they have fled to the past. When people start using the medieval language of the Crusades to describe an unholy war on America, their thinking is closer to the last millennium than the next one.

Elsewhere, profound and sometimes inequitable changes in the world economy, combined with the absence of true democracy, has created whole classes of disenfranchised, susceptible to the siren call of terrorism. These places are the crucibles of discontent. The most recent UN Human Development Report suggests that the gulf is widening between the world's haves and have-nots.
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have-nots. We have the means to do more. We have to work harder at treating the sources of despair before they turn into the poison of hatred. We have to continue to take the fight to poverty and injustice. We must see to it that every child born into the new century comes into a world of hope, not a world where possibilities are foreclosed. Martin Luther King wrote, "the only revolutionary ... is a man who has nothing to lose." We need to show people they have everything to gain by renouncing violence and embracing cooperation.

This is not just an American responsibility, or a western responsibility. It is a world responsibility. Developing nations have an obligation to spread new wealth fairly, to create new opportunities, to build new, open economies. Developed nations have an obligation to help developing nations stay on the path of prosperity while sharing burdens and benefits responsibly.

Some believe that terrorism's principal fault line centers on a clash of civilizations -- and specifically a conflict between Western values and Islam. They are wrong. Yes, we have seen false prophets distort the words of their faith to justify cold-blooded murder. They cloak their attacks in the mantle of religion and would have the world believe the United States is somehow mighty for itself, the merciful, grants a license to the enemy of Islam.

Nothing could be further from the truth. We have enormous respect for a great religion that encompasses the entire globe.

The people of the United States need some facts. X% of world's people. X% of American people need some quote, historical reference that suggests knowledge of Islam. We don't demonstrate respect here; gain credit of otherwise premise section sounds like 'Americans just are misunderstood rich.
To worship the faith of our choosing. To build a better life than our parents knew — and to pass
on even brighter possibilities to our children.

Let me say clearly ... there is no conflict between Islam and America. A quarter of the
world is Muslim, from Indonesia to Africa to my own country. The United States is proud of the
fact the Islam is one of our fastest-growing religions. There will always be cultural distinctions
between nations and peoples. But the United States intends to maintain a course of friendship
and respect toward the Muslim world. For too long, we have been separated by mistrust and
mistaken impressions. Every river has a crossing place. It’s time to find it — working on
both sides. Let us remember the wise counsel of Mohammed, “rewards for prayers said by
people assembled together are twice those said at home.”

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

IV. Common Obligations

I have explained why terrorism is at the top of the American agenda, and why it should be at the
top of the world’s agenda. Now, we need to consider the concrete steps we can take to seize
back our destiny. We are always stronger when we act — especially when we act together. As a
community of nations, we have common obligations ... to give terrorists no support ... no
sanctuary ... no financial assistance. To act together to take the fight to terrorism. And to
combat the conditions that breed violence and despair.
My country is working hard to do its part. Our intelligence and law enforcement communities are vigorously tracking terrorist networks around the world, in cooperation with other governments. Some of those responsible for the embassy bombings have been brought to justice.

I am also asking Congress to provide emergency funding to repair our embassies, to improve our embassy security, and expand the worldwide fight against terrorism. [PLACEHOLDER—efforts to build democracy, promote development, fight inequities] But no matter how much the United States can do, our progress will be limited without the cooperation of the rest of the world.

All of us need to think in new terms … seeing terrorism not as a clash of cultures, but as a clash between the forces of the past and the forces of the future … between those who tear down and those who build up … between chaos and community.

It will not be easy. But I think a new century is worth a new effort. Six years ago, no one thought we could bring urban crime under control in this country. But we did – and a new generation of Americans are rediscovering what it means to be free – free to walk the streets of this and other cities without fear, free to talk with people of different races and religions, free to explore new horizons.

In my country, after the Oklahoma City bombing, we learned that tragedy could renew our sense of community. We can relearn that lesson on the international stage. Every nation here will be strengthened by joining the fight to control terrorism. To build mutual confidence and common faith in the future. To give new meaning to the words of the universal declaration we signed.
fifty years ago. As we pursue these ends, the United States will work with anyone who wants to join us. We have seen peace happen in Northern Ireland. We are seeing it happen slowly in Bosnia. We will work for it in the Middle East, in Algeria, in Kashmir and every other place where terror tries to destroy hope. Let us work to solve a problem that crosses all our borders.

Nearly 50 years ago, as the finishing touches were put on a document that became the cornerstone of human rights, the cornerstone of this building was laid. Eleanor Roosevelt attended the celebration, in between writing articles to promote the document she had helped to draft. One of them was titled “Making Human Rights Come Alive.” She finished the article by repeating the words she repeated to herself when she became frustrated by her colleagues from other nations, as they were drafting the document: “We have a difficult job because all of our failures are seen. At the same time, our successes are seen and, for that reason, I hope we are going to be strong enough, and imaginative enough, and take the future with enough spirit of adventure so that we will live in it with joy and never grow hopeless.”

I like that optimism. Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt never stopped working to fight the demons of fear and doubt. They embodied confidence, courage and security – and millions took their cue from that confidence.

At the end of the century, let us strive to recreate the confidence of the half-century. The 1940s were as harrowing a time as any this century ... but world leaders rose to every challenge. Let us revive the courage of those days ... the courage to try new solutions, to stand up for what we
believe in, to accept our differences and build on our agreements. Let us summon a common faith in the future. Let us think not as 185 countries, but as one United Nations.

###

it's love dislocation: news, physical.

keep a sense of place

global village had not threaten real places
only change our ability to speak,

as books once did

+ telephones.

diff. endings

FOR: lean not an option

world a small place

ER on confidence

DHR hand: diff. languages

COPY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE</th>
<th>SUBJECT/TITLE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>RESTRICTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001. email</td>
<td>Daniel Benjamin to Antony Blinken et al; re: UNGA (1 page)</td>
<td>09/18/1998</td>
<td>P5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COLLECTION:**
- Clinton Presidential Records
- National Security Council
- Ted Widmer (Speechwriting)
- OA/Box Number: 2192

**FOLDER TITLE:**
UN General Assembly (UNGA) [3]

**RESTRICTION CODES**

**Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]**
- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

- Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.
- PRM. Personal record missing defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(c).
- RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

**Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]**
- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(5) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(5) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning ethical [(b)(9) of the FOIA]
Yes, lots of good writing. My fear, however, is that the speech recapitulates many of the terrorism themes that we have developed over the years -- which shouldn't be abandoned -- without adding the note or theme that will be disarming (as it were) or thoughtful to those who are really on the other side of the divide. I've put in mine and Steve's comments in the text. The larger notes/themes I would suggest are:

1) An acknowledgment that there is the strong perception of a clash of civilizations -- this is what radical Islamists say, there are real reasons why they think this and these arguments to be confronted. Just denying it won't do. Our answer is that there is no such preordained clash -- and the developed nations need to work hard to show that is true. Our fundamental values are the same: We want peace and security...we want the same kind of good life for our children...growing prosperity to stave off want and help fulfill our dreams. This is what lies at the heart of our belief in freedom and free markets. The President has said in the U.S. before that many are justly uneasy with our popular culture. He can say it here to and emphasize that this is not all there is to America -- there is also a desire to build good and decent lives in peace. The strong feeling in this directorate is that this recognition of the anger that is out there is where POTUS can really make a difference in this speech. (I think you should modify in this regard the riff on the open hand versus the clenched fist -- that is the fundamental divide; we should see the purpose of this speech as keeping open those hands that are slowly closing.)

2) A stronger recognition that the responsibility to remove the poverty and anger that lead to terror is a common one that carries obligations for us all. A couple of short sentences about needing to do more to bridge the gulf does not answer the mail here. POTUS should say something to the effect of: We have the means to take the battle to terrorists wherever they may be. And while air strikes and extraditions may put some terrorists out of business, we must all recognize that we won't be able to declare victory over terror until the poverty and injustice that breeds terror is overcome. That requires that every one of our nations works to ensure that fundamental needs are met, freedom and justice are the birthright of all, and children come into a world of hope, not possibilities foreclosed. The point is that terrorism cannot be separated out from all other social ills. This is essential to get the thoughtful speech SRB wants.

---Original Message---

From: Blinken, Antony J.
Sent: Friday, September 18, 1998 1:12 PM
To: Widmer, Edward L. (Ted); Benjamin, Daniel; Schwartz, Eric P.; Simon, Steven N.
Subject: PRIORITY FW: UNGA [UNCLASSIFIED]
Importance: High

Ted -- lots of good writing. Obviously too long (I've made some cuts) and while basically structure is there, needs to be sharpened and topic sentences need to be stronger, i.e. chip away the rock from the diamond. [Danny/Steve: if you have time would appreciate a hard look from you] As discussed, after intro, you should have four sections, which I've noted in text:

I. Terrorism is Common Problem
   1. Targets Americans
   2. Targets non-Americans even more. No one immune.

II. Terrorism is growing problem (despite fact lightening kills more)
   1. Technology of terror getting more lethal, sophisticated, and more readily available bc. of info revolution.
   2. Insidious in that saps at confidence in democratic institutions and hope. Danger totally disproportionate to physical damage done.

III. What are Causes?
   1. Enemies of peace and progress grow desperate as peace, progress come nearer.
   2. Those left behind by progress/global economy or who are treated unfairly become susceptible to siren call of terror.
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Widmer, Edward L. (Ted)

From: Pimentel, Betsy J.
Sent: Thursday, June 10, 1999 12:41 PM
To: von Lipsey, Roderick K.; Widmer, Edward L. (Ted); @DEFENSE - Defense Policy
Subject: RE: Whiteman [UNCLASSIFIED]

Ted -
Other thoughts on the airpower aspects of this:

- Support of airpower as the only military forces engaged has been controversial
- But, airpower's flexibility inherent in the reach and response of air power enabled the NATO coalition to achieve it's goals
- Wisdom of previous generations in investing in stealth and precision technology as well as military efforts to integrate space forces into all operations paid off in this campaign

Whiteman is working on operational details and local color for the speech.

----Original Message----
From: von Lipsey, Roderick K.
Sent: Thursday, June 10, 1999 10:25 AM
To: Widmer, Edward L (Ted); @DEFENSE - Defense Policy
Subject: RE: Whiteman [UNCLASSIFIED]

Ted, some thoughts.

We need to make sure (as you have done) that a clear distinction remains articulated between the military objectives of Allied Force and the refugee crisis caused by Milo's actions. DOD is very sensitive to the perception that their mission (to influence the decision making of the Serb leadership and to erode the VJ's capacity for sustaining the conflict) was blurred by the administration's and the press' focus on what was happening with respect to the Kosovars and what we were doing to stop the atrocities in Kosovo. A nuance, but an important one to the military. That's partly why the Pentagon was so mute on the air war up until very recently.

Next, this is likely to be the "victory lap." That said, the Air Force will be ecstatic, but we need to make some strong references to the "other" participants in the air campaign. For example, the Navy TLAMs from ships in the Adriatic did much of the heavy lifting to make the initial environment more safe for the air campaign by targeting the command and control and integrated air defenses; the Navy and Marine Corps electronic warfare aircraft jammed the radars that would otherwise have been much more effective against the "stealth" aircraft operating in and around the FRY. These were herculean efforts -- at a tempo that far outstrips anything seen in decades.

Whiteman being a bomber base, of course, will focus the limelight on the Air Force strategic bombers. Need to also remember to throw a bone to the Air Force Tactical Air, Strategic Lift and Refueling forces without which the B-2s would not have reached the targets (air superiority fighters, fighter escorts, and strategic tankers were required for every mission -- and none of those would have been in position to support them without a herculean airlift effort by the cargo haulers flying the C-5s, C-17s and C-141s around the clock).

And finally, the tough (and un-glamous) work now begins. The Army and Marine Corps, who have been on the ground building refugee camps and moving life-saving supplies to these camps, will now pick up the bulk of the task in Kosovo -- which is likely to be just as dangerous and will result in casualties -- whether it's from accidents on bad roads, or mines, or unexploded ordnance.

May be worth some time adding some of these points to what is a very nice speech.

-Rod

----Original Message----
From: Widmer, Edward L. (Ted)
Sent: Wednesday, June 09, 1999 9:23PM
To: @DEFENSE - Defense Policy
Cc: @SPEECH - NSC Speechwriters
Subject: Whiteman [UNCLASSIFIED]

one more question: assuming this is finally on for sure, if you could give me a point of contact at the base, that would be great. Thanks.

----Original Message-----
From: Widmer, Edward L. (Ted)
Sent: Wednesday, June 09, 1999 8:53 PM
To: @DEFENSE - Defense Policy
Subject: FW: Whiteman [UNCLASSIFIED]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE</th>
<th>SUBJECT/TITLE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>RESTRICTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001. speech</td>
<td>re: President William Jefferson Clinton Remarks to Base Community</td>
<td>06/10/1999</td>
<td>P6/b(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whiteman AFB, Missouri - with handwritten notes (partial) (1 page)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002. email</td>
<td>Robert Bell to Samuel Berger; re: Look-Ahead Calendar (1 page)</td>
<td>06/04/1999</td>
<td>P1/b(1), P5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003. email</td>
<td>Roderick K. Von Lipsey to Edward Widmer; re: Whiteman (1 page)</td>
<td>06/10/1999</td>
<td>P5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Ted, some thoughts.

We need to make sure (as you have done) that a clear distinction remains articulated between the military objectives of Allied Force and the refugee crisis caused by Milo's actions. DOD is very sensitive to the perception that their mission (to influence the decision making of the Serb leadership and to erode the VJ's capacity for sustaining the conflict) was blurred by the administration's and the press' focus on what was happening with respect to the Kosovars and what we were doing to stop the atrocities in Kosovo. A nuance, but an important one to the military. That's partly why the Pentagon was so mute on the air war up until very recently.

Next, this is likely to be the "victory lap." That said, the Air Force will be ecstatic, but we need to make some strong references to the "other" participants in the air campaign. For example, the Navy TLAMs from ships in the Adriatic did much of the heavy lifting to make the initial environment more safe for the air campaign by targeting the command and control and integrated air defenses. The Navy and Marine Corps electronic warfare aircraft jammed the radars that would otherwise have been much more effective against the "stealth" aircraft operating in and around the FRY. These were herculean efforts -- at a tempo that far outstrips anything seen in decades.

Whiteman being a bomber base, of course, will focus the limelight on the Air Force strategic bombers. Need to also remember to throw a bone to the Air Force Tactical Air, Strategic Lift and Refueling forces without which the B-2s would not have reached the targets (air superiority fighters, fighter escorts, and strategic tankers were required for every mission -- and none of those would have been in position to support them without a herculean airlift effort by the cargo haulers flying the C-5s, C-17s and C-141s around the clock).

And finally, the tough (and un-glamorous) work now begins. The Army and Marine Corps, who have been on the ground building refugee camps and moving life-saving supplies to these camps, will now pick up the bulk of the task in Kosovo -- which is likely to be just as dangerous and will result in casualties -- whether it's from accidents on bad roads, or mines, or unexploded ordnance.

May be worth some time adding some of these points to what is a very nice speech.

-Rod

--- Original Message ---
From: Widmer, Edward L. (Ted)  
Sent: Wednesday, June 09, 1999 9:23PM  
To: @DEFENSE - Defense Policy  
Subject: FW: Whiteman [UNCLASSIFIED]

one more question: assuming this is finally on for sure, if you could give me a point of contact at the base, that would be great. Thanks.

--- Original Message ---
From: Widmer, Edward L. (Ted)  
Sent: Wednesday, June 09, 1999 8:53 PM  
To: @DEFENSE - Defense Policy  
Cc: @SPEECH - NSC Speechwriters  
Subject: Whiteman [UNCLASSIFIED]

please check tonight or early am, so I can send to Sandy as early tomorrow as possible. Sorry for short fuse. Also, could you think about specific operational details that would appeal to the crowd, and fill in a couple TKs, and add the people who need to be acknowledged at the front? Thanks a million. << File: Whiteman.doc >>

COPY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE</th>
<th>SUBJECT/TITLE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>RESTRICTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samuel Berger, Stephanie Streett, Ann Lewis, &amp; Sid Blumenthal to POTUS; re: Rolling out Your 1998 National Security Agenda (5 pages)</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>P5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: SAMUEL BERGER
       STEPHANIE STREETT
       ANN LEWIS
       SID BLUMENTHAL

SUBJECT: Rolling Out Your 1998 National Security Agenda

Purpose

Approve a rollout strategy for your 1998 national security agenda.

Background

In last year's State of the Union, you set an ambitious second term agenda to keep American leadership strong -- and to make sure we enter the 21st century as the world's leading force for security, peace, freedom and prosperity. Over the past year, there has been much progress in meeting that agenda: building an undivided, peaceful Europe; forging a stable Asia-Pacific community; opening the global economy to American goods and services; remaining an unrelenting force for peace and freedom; moving against new transnational security threats; and giving ourselves the strong military and fully funded diplomacy we need to meet these objectives.

The NSC Staff and State Department soon will complete a planning exercise to review and refine our objectives for 1998 and beyond, based on your second term agenda. We should use the State of the Union and the weeks that follow to launch a national conversation about America's leadership role in the world and highlight our key goals for 1998 -- notably Senate ratification of NATO enlargement; Congressional support for a follow-on security presence in Bosnia; Senate ratification of the CTBT; aggressive preventive action to counter emerging 21st century threats (e.g., biological weapons; critical infrastructure protection); forward movement on our free trade agenda; and full funding for our military, diplomacy and international institutions.

cc: Vice President
    Chief of Staff
More broadly, you have an opportunity to re-define America's role in an increasingly integrated, technologically sophisticated era. As the first post-post-Cold War president, with an innate feel for the Information Age (its upsides and its downsides) you are uniquely placed to explain and articulate the international community's common challenge -- to lock in and expand the gains of democracy and free markets while resisting their enemies -- and how we are meeting that challenge by shaping the forces of change to our advantage. In short, as we pursue and explain specific objectives, we also should help the American people understand how the seemingly disparate pieces of our foreign policy come together in a "global" vision.

Between now and the end of February, there are several opportunities for you, the Vice President, First Lady and the senior members of the foreign policy team to address the 1998 agenda and engage the American public in a dialogue about the leadership opportunities and responsibilities we have for the 21st century.

**Presidential Events**

**State of the Union** (January 27). You can use the foreign policy section of the speech to describe the security challenges of the 21st century and then show how we are meeting them with a new security strategy. The core elements of our foreign policy -- security alliances like NATO; arms control regimes like CTBT; free trade agreements like the ITA; international coalitions to support peace and to fight rogue regimes, terror, crime, and drugs; binding international commitments on the environment and human rights -- each advance a distinct mission but also serve a common purpose: to secure and strengthen democracy, peace and free markets while turning back their enemies. Within this framework, you will want to highlight a few key initiatives for '98 that will require legislative action: NATO; Bosnia; CTBT; a comprehensive anti-BW program (if ready); and funding for the U.N./IMF and the military. You may also want to foreshadow your trips to Africa, Southeast Asia and China and, depending on the state of play, send a strong message on Iraq.

**CINCs Conference** (January 29). This year your meeting with the CINCs will be at Fort McNair, home of the National Defense University (NDU). Coming off of the State of the Union, you could conclude your meeting with the CINCs with a talk to students at NDU. This would be an ideal opportunity to explain in more detail your 1998 foreign policy agenda -- emphasizing Bosnia, CTBT and emerging 21st century threats -- and highlight the fundamental role our armed forces will play in achieving it.
NATO Ratification Event (early February). In your December press conference, you promised to seek the Senate's advice and consent to enlargement promptly upon its return. We do not recommend using the CINCs conference for this notification, in order to avoid over-emphasizing the military aspects of enlargement, which might be misconstrued in Russia and elsewhere. We propose a kick-off event at the Mellon Auditorium (where the original treaty was signed in 1949) to send the protocols of accession up Pennsylvania Avenue, to energize supporters of enlargement, and to underscore your leadership on what promises to be one of our signal foreign policy achievements.

CTBT – Critical Infrastructure Events in California (late February). You can take advantage of a scheduled trip to Northern California to advance two important items on our agenda -- CTBT and critical infrastructure -- by speaking at one event: a conference on critical infrastructure co-hosted by Lawrence Livermore labs and Stanford University. The Lawrence Livermore connection would allow you to highlight the success of our Stockpile Stewardship program (through which we maintain the safety, security and reliability of our nuclear weapons without testing) and call for prompt Senate passage of CTBT. More broadly, you could use the occasion to call for strong preventive action on emerging security threats (in particular potential vulnerabilities in our critical infrastructure). The timing of this conference is excellent with respect to our general schedule for announcing our new policy on critical infrastructure. We will have completed our review and a Presidential policy statement would be appropriate. Just as we are closing the door on a danger that has bedeviled us for the past fifty years (nuclear weapons) we are dealing with the emerging dangers of the next fifty years (weapons proliferation; cyber-terrorism etc...)

Senior Administration Officials

In the week following the State of the Union, Madeline, Bill Cohen and I plan to launch a two-day national conversation on America's leadership opportunities and responsibilities in the 21st century.

The concept would be built around:

ABC Town Hall: The cornerstone of our national conversation would be a two day campaign style swing by the three of us through several American cities. In each, we would conduct a
“town hall” meeting to talk about your agenda in human terms and underscore how the line between foreign and domestic policy has blurred and what happens overseas affects the daily lives of the American people.

The concept would also have the following elements:

• Congressional Participation: We would hope to have bipartisan Congressional participation either traveling with the ABC party or hosting or participating in one or more of the town halls.

• Local Heroes: Depending on the cities selected, the events would bring local heroes from the surrounding communities to be honored for their service to American leadership. Heroes would include military veterans, prominent ethnic American leaders, NGO organizers, local Peace Corps alumni, international relations professors, sister-school organizers, international businessmen, environmental activists, etc.

• Opposing Views: The program would also offer contrasting views to our own including advocates of such policies as nationalism, protectionism and isolationism.

• NIGHTLINE: As part of the tour we would approach NIGHTLINE about hosting a special edition of their broadcast, either by conducting a town hall or by traveling on the plane for a broadcast of the day's events and follow-on interviews.

• Local Media: The trip will be designed to have the maximum impact with regional and local media. We will reach out and offer access and interviews to as much local press as possible.

• Non-Traditional Secretaries: American Leadership Day would also call upon Cabinet Secretaries not normally associated with traditional foreign policy to participate in their own events (i.e., Secretary Shalala on the spread of infectious diseases and global health issues; Secretary Glickman on the importance of food inspections on foreign produce and the opportunities in the global marketplace for American agriculture products).

• Assistant Secretaries: Complimentary to the main attraction of the ABC tour, we would mobilize a number of Deputy, Under and Assistant Secretaries from State,
Defense, USTR, Commerce and Treasury to fan out across the country to deliver remarks, take questions and answers, and grant local television and radio interviews. This effort would all be part of our two-day blitz.

- **Internet Town Hall:** Senior members of the Cabinet could also participate in a “Internet Town Hall” sponsored by the GLOBE program and reaching more than 1,000 schools nationwide in an effort to broaden the scope of the effort.

**Other Options:**

**White House Conference on Foreign Policy hosted by Vice President.**

- The Vice President could convene bipartisan conference of eminent former officials from past administrations (including Secretaries of State, Defense, Treasury, etc.) for a one day conference. Based on the successful Climate Change conference, the event could be hosted or sponsored by the Baker School of International Relations, the Carter Center or the JFK School at Harvard. We could organize panels and discussion groups about American leadership in the world.

**The First Lady and Mrs. Blair Town Hall.**

- Joint appearance by the two First Ladies at a college or high school answering questions from students about international relations.

If you agree with this strategy, we will work on specific scheduling possibilities.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That you approve this rollout strategy for your national security agenda for 1998.

Approve ______________

Disapprove ____________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE</th>
<th>SUBJECT/TITLE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>RESTRICTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>002a. note</td>
<td>re: Handwritten Note - Sandy Berger to Ted Widmer; re: Speech to Africans</td>
<td>06/13/1999</td>
<td>P5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002b. speech</td>
<td>re: President William Jefferson Clinton - Remarks to Africa Ministerial - State Department - Washington, D.C. (with extensive comments by Sandy Berger)</td>
<td>03/16/1999</td>
<td>P5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: SANDY BERGER
       GENE SPERLING
       JACK LEW

SUBJECT: Announcement of New Debt Policy at U.S.-Africa Ministerial

You have indicated strong interest in making international debt policy for the poorest countries more flexible and more generous. Treasury has been working to develop a number of proposals to advance those objectives, while maintaining incentives to ensure that debt relief would be directed towards those countries that are most committed to using the resources in ways that will meet basic human needs and create the foundations for sustainable development (see attached memo). Together, these proposals would cover nine more countries than are currently eligible for HIPC relief and reduce a further $70 billion in debt burdens. They will put us in a forward-leaning posture relative to most of the G-7, although they do not go as far as some of the proposals suggested by NGOs and the UK in selected areas.

There is general agreement among your advisors that you should unveil most of the key elements of this new approach in your speech at the U.S.-Africa Ministerial on Tuesday. However, for one key proposal involving new eligibility criteria, where we believe Congressional, diplomatic and NGO consultations are necessary to ensure a positive reaction and additional analysis is needed, we recommend that you note the need for revisiting current policy but stop short of detailing new proposals.

Elements of a New Debt Policy

The proposals are outlined in detail in the attached memo from Secretary Rubin. Taken together, they advance the goal of ensuring that countries committed to economic reform and good governance would not be hampered in their efforts to advance basic human needs and lay the foundations for sustainable development by large debt burdens. Strong reformers would now qualify for full debt service relief early in their reform efforts and deeper and broader debt reduction. In addition, exceptional performers with good governance records would qualify for additional debt reduction. The specific proposals that you could announce on Tuesday include:

- Early Cash Flow Relief: One of the chief criticisms of the current approach is that qualifying countries must establish a 6-year track record before benefiting from debt reduction. In response, the UK and some NGOs have proposed accelerating this time frame to 3 years. Treasury recommends instead providing complete relief from debt servicing obligations on IFI debt between years 3 and 6. This approach delivers the same cash flow benefits without giving up the leverage associated with future debt stock.
reduction. The U.S. and other governments already provide such cash flow relief on bilateral debt.

- **Broader and Deeper Debt Reduction**: We would propose (1) complete forgiveness of all bilateral concessional debt rather than the current policy of rescheduling (which France, Japan, and Germany traditionally have preferred); (2) deepening reduction of bilateral non-concessional debt from the current 80 percent target to 90 percent; and (3) broadening the debt eligible for reduction by including more recent debt that had been excluded by previously established “cutoff” dates (sometimes going back to the early 1980s). This provides deep debt relief but stops short of the comprehensive forgiveness advocated by some NGOs, which would discourage future private lending and provide no incentives for fundamental policy reform.

- **Greater Assistance on a Grant Basis**: We would recommend that at least 90 percent of new official development assistance be provided on a grant basis to avoid increasing future debt burdens. We, along with Canada and the UK, already follow this approach. Japan, France and Italy may be reluctant to follow our lead.

- **Assisting Post-Conflict Countries**: Countries emerging from conflict are often in greatest need of debt relief, but have not built the reform track record necessary for HIPC. To meet their needs, we would propose full relief of bilateral debt service obligations and exceptional concessional financing from the IFIs.

In addition, Treasury has proposed that countries who meet certain civil society and good governance criteria receive extraordinary reductions of debt burdens. Debt reductions for these countries would target debt-to-export ratios of 150 percent, compared with the current target of 200 percent, and debt-to-government-revenues ratios of 250 percent, compared with the current target of 280 percent. While the UK and some NGOs have proposed instituting these lower target ratios for all HIPC-eligible countries, Treasury’s approach would have the advantage of introducing good governance as a special criterion. While there is general agreement among your advisers on making deeper debt reduction available for extraordinary performers, we recommend that we take more time to develop this proposal, both to build support among NGOs, beneficiary countries and the Hill, and to ensure that we understand the implications of different targets for country eligibility and budgetary costs.

The direct budget costs to the United States of reducing the $3.3 billion in bilateral debt outstanding would be at most $190 million spread over several fiscal years; the actual amount will be substantially lower since countries accounting for over half of the budgetary costs will not be eligible in the foreseeable future due to ongoing internal conflicts. The costs of meeting the IFI share would be about $6 billion more than under the current policy. Only part of this gap would be covered by Treasury’s proposals — including the sale of 10 million ounces of IMF gold (twice the amount currently contemplated by the G-7) and use of a special IMF reserve account. As with the original HIPC program, we would have to identify additional resources as we go.
March 14, 1999

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT
THE VICE PRESIDENT

FROM: Robert E. Rubin
Lawrence Summers

SUBJECT: New Debt Initiative

We have put together a proposal for a new international initiative to reduce the debt burden of the poorest developing countries that will put you in a leadership position among the G-7, but at the same time is responsible.

This approach substantially advances the proposals put forth by the Vice President at Davos and outlined in the FY2000 budget. The new initiative would provide more relief, more quickly to a broader range of highly indebted poor countries that have strong reform programs, would expand the amount of debt forgiven by an estimated $70 billion and bring in nine more countries than are eligible under the current program. Adding this to the $32 billion in debt reduction potentially available under the current program, would increase the total debt to be forgiven for all potentially-eligible countries by all creditors to as much as $102 billion. The details are outlined in the attached note.

The President will be speaking at the US - Africa Ministerial next week, and could unveil this strategy in detail at this gathering or present it in a more general thematic manner only at that time.

Broad Objectives

In outlining this proposal, you would call on the international community to commit to work towards the time when no nation that is committed to economic reform and to building the institutions necessary for effective and accountable government is left with an unsustainable debt burden that unduly constrains it from devoting resources to satisfy the basic needs of its people.

This new initiative would preserve the underlying principle of reciprocal responsibility in the current program, with relief targeted to performance. The program would offer two tiers of treatment — more generous treatment than is available under the current program for all eligible countries and exceptional treatment for countries that meet strong governance standards and commit to devote the resources saved to meeting basic human needs. And, in contrast to the current HIPC framework, we would seek to put greater emphasis on early and substantial cash relief, in addition to deeper debt reduction.
This approach does not embrace proposals for complete debt forgiveness or general moratoria, which we believe would impair the capacity of these countries to attract the private capital flow that is critical to long-term development and could encourage countries to engage in imprudent borrowing and maintain poor policies in the hope that their debts would not have to be repaid.

Key Elements

To meet these objectives, the international community would move beyond the current outlines of the HIPC program to adopt the following approach, which combines proposals that provide more generous treatment for all countries that meet the existing HIPC performance criteria, with measures that would provide exceptional treatment for exceptional performance:

- **Front loaded relief**
  - A new focus on early debt service relief by the international financial institutions, which under the current program only provide debt stock reduction at the end of the program.
  - An immediate increase in the debt eligible for cash flow relief from government creditors by shifting the "cutoff" dates that define what debt is included. The Paris Club of creditor countries specifies the debts eligible for reduction or rescheduling at a point in time, which in many cases goes back to the early-to-mid-1980s, and excludes newer debts.

- **Deeper debt reduction**
  - Complete forgiveness of bilateral concessional loans, rather than rescheduling as is done at present.
  - Deeper reductions in bilateral non-concessional debt (from up to 80 percent to 90 percent across the board).
  - Expanding the debt eligible for reduction by shifting "cutoff" dates, as above, which would leave less debt outstanding after forgiveness.

- **Exceptional relief with targeted support for basic human needs**
  - Deeper debt reductions for countries that have strong records on governance and civil society reforms and commit to devote the resources saved to meet basic human needs. It will be important, but difficult to find a mechanism for making these determinations in a relatively objective manner that is not vulnerable to politicization.
Innovative approaches, such as debt for nature swaps, that channel resources from debt service into local currency investments to support environmental protection, education, or other needs.

Avoiding future debt problems

- A commitment to provide at least 90 percent of new official development assistance to HIPC countries on a grant basis.

Post conflict

- New approaches to help countries emerging from protracted domestic conflict that facilitate early engagement by the IFIs with resources to support reconstruction and also to ensure that new aid flows are not diverted to paying-off old debt owed to the same donors that are supplying assistance.

New Financing

- Support for IMF gold sales, the World Bank's HIPC Trust Fund and other approaches to meet the financial costs of this initiatives.

Financial Costs

The financial costs of these proposals are sensitive to assumptions about which countries would actually meet the performance criteria under the program.

The direct budget costs to the United States of reducing the estimated $3.3 billion in bilateral debt outstanding to all countries that meet the economic and financial criteria for HIPC eligibility would be about $190 million spread over several fiscal years. Realistically, however, many of the countries that meet the economic and financial criteria for HIPC eligibility would not meet the performance criteria. Liberia, Somalia, and Sudan, for example, account for almost half the budgetary costs, but have reform records that would disqualify them from HIPC treatment. Other countries, such as Democratic Republic of the Congo (ex-Zaire) are included in base costs, but are not likely to come forward for debt relief anytime soon.

The other G-7 and Paris Club creditors would face substantially higher costs, because they have generally forgiven less bilateral debt than we have, and have providing a substantially higher proportion of development assistance flows in recent years in the form of loans rather than grants.

The costs of meeting the IFI share of this initiative would be substantial, about $6 billion more than under the current program. Our IMF financing proposals, including the use of interest earnings on the proceeds of up to 10 million ounces of IMF gold and use of a special reserve account, would meet only part of this gap. We are in the process of exploring other proposals, but are unlikely to be able to identify ways to close the full gap up front.
Because countries will become eligible only gradually and because not all countries are likely to qualify, we believe it is reasonable to go ahead without having fully identified how to meet the IFI portion of the program. The first HIPC program was launched in 1996 despite a very large financing gap.

**Alternative Approaches**

The proposals outlined above would put us out in front of most of the G-7. However, there are several alternative approaches offered by the NGO community and parts of the G-7 that are not part of our proposal and that we do not believe we should support.

- **Acceleration.** The UK and others have proposed accelerating from six to three years the point at which eligible countries get debt reduction. We believe it makes sense to preserve the current framework, which provides for acceleration on a case by case basis, because of the importance of preserving the incentive for a sustained record of performance. By providing more substantial up front or “interim” cash flow relief, we can offer the same financial benefit without undermining the incentive for sustained performance offered by withholding debt reduction until the end of the period.

- **Deeper reduction with less conditionality.** Some have proposed offering deeper reduction to all HIPC countries. Our approach, in contrast, provides a combination of greater relief for all eligible countries with more exceptional treatment for those that have better governance records and commit to devote the resources saved from debt service to meeting basic human needs. This might be criticized by some of the beneficiary countries and part of the NGO community and members of Congress as less generous and more intrusive, but it is likely to be welcomed by much of the NGO community, because of the emphasis on devoting increased resources to basic human needs.

- **Comprehensive forgiveness or general moratoria.** Our approach offers significantly more generous financial relief than is available under the current program without offering comprehensive forgiveness or general moratoria. As we have discussed before, we believe complete forgiveness, particularly of the non-concessional debt, could be counterproductive by discouraging future private capital flows to these countries. If we were to signal indiscriminate relief of debt obligations regardless of a country’s capacity to pay, we will undermine the incentives any country has to perform and reduce the willingness of private investors to lend to those governments. It is important to maintain the principle that borrowers should honor their obligations or new credit will not flow. Debt forgiveness cannot be viewed as a right or an entitlement.
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MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: Lawrence H. Summers

SUBJECT: Core Themes for Ongoing United States Engagement with Russia

You asked me to forward to you my thoughts on the core themes of our public and private engagement with Russia in the coming months.

Clearly, as Strobe’s recent memo to you highlighted, we must continue to stand by the principle upon which your Russian policy has rested since 1993. The United States has an enormous strategic stake in a peaceful democratic transition in Russia and we must seize every realistic opportunity to make a difference – even as we recognize the enormity of the obstacles in Russia’s path and the limits on our capacity to help.

It will, however, be critical going forward that we not appear insensitive to the pain that Russians have suffered or to the policy implications of the developments of the past year.

- Russia is not making economic policy progress and, in a climate of intense pre-election maneuvering, the government is not credibly committed to a reformist agenda.

- Longstanding problems of corruption and abusive concentration of economic power seem to be getting worse not better.

- Largely as a result of these factors, market-oriented reform, for the moment, lacks a solid constituency in Russia – and United States domestic support for helping Russia has eroded.

Our hard-headedness needs to be reflected in our public discussion of Russia as well as in the substantive direction of our policy of engagement. We should not promise too much for the future nor claim too much for the past.

Key points to make publicly:

- Russia is today a very different country than it was a decade ago, in ways of profound importance to the national security of the United States.

- To be sure, there are many respects in which Russia’s transition has not proceeded as either we or the Russian people would have hoped. But disappointment cannot give way to
disengagement. Events in Europe earlier in this century teach a powerful lesson about the consequences of isolating fallen great powers in periods of internal turmoil.

- We have an enormous stake in Russia's becoming a stable market democracy, and we will continue to support that outcome in every way feasible. But Russia will shape its own destiny. We cannot want change more than the Russians themselves do.

- Recent events have once again underlined why conditionality of international support needs always to be applied vigorously to ensure that money flowing into a country does not flow right back out again – and that the net result of our efforts is not just a higher level of official debt.

- This has informed our support for a rescheduling of Russia's bilateral debt that is limited both in scope and duration. It is also reflected in the terms of the recent IMF program, which safeguards IMF resources by providing funds in the form of Special Drawing Rights, paid into an account in the United States, which can be used only to repay Russian obligations to the Fund. The program also requires Russia to provide an adequate accounting of various practices at the central bank as well as the July 1998 IMF disbursement.

- Bilateral and multilateral support for Russia in the future will be shaped by the same kind of realism.

Key elements of policy going forward:

- Setting the realistic aspiration of maintaining a minimum level of stability in Russia.

- Conditioning further IMF tranches on there being effective safeguards that lending will not be misappropriated, a satisfactory accounting of relevant central bank activities, and genuine broad-based implementation of reforms, not just commitments.

- With respect to future bilateral and multilateral efforts in Russia:

  - Condemning corruption and actively supporting measures that reduce its influence in Russia and potential impact on the United States.

  - Supporting steps that will encourage the development of democratic institutions and a functioning rule of law.

  - Finding nontraditional routes for our engagement that focus more directly on those leaders and parts of the country that are most receptive to positive economic and political change – the young especially.