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obviously not verbatim; you need to work with Eric on language. Sorry for any confusion.

---Original Message---
From: Helweg, M. Diana
Sent: Wednesday, January 21, 1998 12:34 PM
To: Schwartz, Eric P.; Blinken, Antony J.
Cc: @DEMOCRACY - Dem/Human Affairs; @PLANNING - Strat Plan & Comm; @NSA - Natl Security Advisor
Subject: FW: World Forum on Democracy [UNCLASSIFIED]

Tony -- Jim asked that I forward this to you for possible inclusion in the State of the Union. He understands the difficulty of getting things into the speech at this point, but also thinks that it is a good idea to include this. Thanks.

In addition, could we get the most recent version of the entire speech for Jim and Sandy? Thanks.

Diana

---Original Message---
From: Schwartz, Eric P.
Sent: Wednesday, January 14, 1998 5:01 PM
To: @NSA - Natl Security Advisor
Subject: World Forum on Democracy [UNCLASSIFIED]
Importance: High

Please pass to JS.

Jim:

Attached is a two-pager on the World Forum on Democracy.

I hope it gives you what you need. I've provided a notional speech paragraph on the WFD, as well as Qs and As on the issues I thought to be most important for your purposes.

I haven't shared it with others at NSC, but can do so if you ask.

Please call if you need more.

Eric

<< File: World Forum on Democracy.doc >>
World Forum on Democracy (WFD)

Notional Comments regarding WFD:

Our peace and security is enhanced when governments around the world respect human rights and reflect the will of their people, and we are doing our part to promote democracy - from supporting conflict resolution and justice in Central Africa, to promoting the rule of law in China, to aiding democratic transitions in Central and Eastern Europe. We've made great progress, as more than half the world's people now live under governments of their own choosing. At the same time, democracy's roots are still fragile in many countries and there is much more we can do. To this end, I warmly welcome a new citizen's initiative to establish a World Forum on Democracy where government leaders, the business community and non-governmental groups from around the world will meet to strengthen our common efforts at assisting the newest members of the democratic community - to help consolidate recent gains and to secure the common yearnings of so many to be free. I look forward to participating in the first such Forum, planned for Washington in December 1998.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

What is the Freedom House proposal? Freedom House envisions a foundation-funded, biennial conference of world leaders, academics, policy analysts and NGOs involved in democracy promotion. The goals of the conference would be to "place democracy promotion and the strengthening of new democracies at the center of the international agenda." The success of the Conference would be measured by whether it stimulated, or contributed to --

- the creation of additional NED-like foundations in other countries,
- primary and secondary school curricula dealing with democratic values,
- book and broadcasting programs in closed societies,
- increased business/government cooperation on these issues,
- greater coordination of donor efforts, etc.
Who would determine participation? A U.S.-based eminent persons group (pulled together by Freedom House) would assemble an international committee, which would invite participants.

How much would it cost, and what is the level of foundation interest? Freedom House estimates it would cost about $2 million. At this point, Freedom House has obtained some $200,000 in seed money, from private donors as well as the Rockefeller Brothers' Fund and the Smith Richardson Foundation. Freedom House, which has had conversations with other funders, is quite confident it can raise the money.

How much of the President's time would be required? Possibly 2-4 hours.

Where would it be held? The first meeting would be held in either Washington, DC, or Charlottesville - University of Virginia is quite interested in hosting. If Charlottesville would make the President's participation impossible, the venue would be Washington.

When? Freedom House is tentatively planning for December 1998, though we expect they would be flexible.

Would the President's participation this year imply a commitment to participate in future years? No, according to Freedom House.

How do we avoid having the President associated with aspects of the Conference with which we may not be comfortable - e.g., a final communique with which we do not completely agree; a panel session that includes sharp discussion of egregious abuses in a country with which we have cordial relations? Freedom House argues, reasonably, that any consensus document would be quite anodyne, given the number and diversity of participants. To be sure, there might be aspects of the Conference with which the USG is not completely comfortable, but that issue is manageable - especially if we consult closely with the organizers (which they are eager to do).

How many would participate? Freedom House estimates about 500 people.
Over the past half century, the American people have agreed that with vast territory, great power and democratic values comes a responsibility to lead. Now, on the brink of a new century, the ideas we Americans have struggled for -- that people have a right to control their own lives and pursue their own dreams in peace, security and liberty -- are, more and more, a daily reality for people around the world. As a result, the American people today are more secure and more prosperous than ever before -- and we are blessed with an extraordinary opportunity and corresponding responsibility to build a new era of peace.

But today’s possibilities are not tomorrow’s guarantees. The forces of global integration are a great tide of opportunity for millions around the world. But too many people still fear change because they bear its burdens without reaping its benefits. They are susceptible to the poisoned appeals of extreme nationalism and to racial and religious hatreds. The superpower stand-off that dominated our lives for fifty years has ended. But conflicts between nations that pose the threat of wider war persist. And we remain vulnerable to the reckless acts of rogue states and to an unholy axis of new threats: terrorism, international crime and drug trafficking. These 21st century predators feed on the vast power of technology and the free flow of information, ideas and people we cherish.

To seize these opportunities and meet these challenges, American leadership is crafting a new security strategy for the 21st century. By adapting old institutions to new demands... old thinking for new times... we are laying a solid foundation for America’s security. Strong security
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Each of these initiatives advances a distinct American interest. Each also serves a common purpose -- to strengthen democracy, peace and free markets while turning back their enemies. Forged by American diplomacy ... backed where necessary by American force ... this network of new arrangements is a Berlin Wall for the 21st Century, protecting those who play by the rules, while isolating those who do not.

Putting this strategy into place is a long term project. But to advance it, there are steps we must take together -- this year. First, in a few days, I will transmit to the Senate for its advice and consent the documents that will make three of Europe's new democracies -- Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic -- the newest members of NATO.

NATO is at the very heart of Europe's transformation into a continent undivided, peaceful and democratic. For fifty years, the alliance kept America and Western Europe secure -- not once has one of its members been attacked in Europe. Now, NATO is extending the frontiers of security and freedom by taking in new members, working with new partners, and cooperating closely with Russia and Ukraine. We can build a future in which Europe never again unleashes the kind of horrors we have seen in this century. The next step is up to the men and women in
this chamber. America has led the way in transforming NATO for the 21st century. We should say yes to its historic enlargement.

Second, I will ask this Congress to continue its support for our troops in Bosnia. For four years, Bosnia was mired in the deep freeze of destruction. Now, it has begun to thaw and grow anew in the sunlight of peace.

I sent our soldiers to Bosnia when the parties to the war made a commitment in Dayton to end the suffering and the slaughter. I sent them because we have a profound interest in preventing another brutal war from spreading in the heart of Europe. With soldiers from [TK] countries, they have done a remarkable job silencing the guns, separating the armies and securing the peace. And civilian organizations, working hand-in-hand with the Bosnians, have made a good start at rebuilding Bosnia’s roads and factories, restarting its economy, holding democratic elections, returning refugees to their homes and bringing war criminals to justice.

The progress is unmistakable. But it is not yet irreversible. To take firm root, Bosnia’s fragile peace still needs the secure environment only an international military force can provide. That is why I have agreed in principle that American troops should take part in a follow-on security force when the current NATO mission ends in June. If we turn our backs on Bosnia now, its people almost certainly will fall back into a war every bit as bloody as the one we stopped. But if we stay and finish the job, a lasting peace is possible. Our troops have done right by Bosnia... and by America. Now, we should do right by them. Give them the support they deserve.
Third, I ask Congress to join me in pursuing the most ambitious agenda to dismantle and fight the threat of weapons of mass destruction since the atom was split.

This year, the longest sought prize in arms control history, first proposed by President Eisenhower in 195X, is within our reach: the comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty. By banning all nuclear tests for all time, we can help prevent the nuclear states from producing more advanced and dangerous weapons and make it more difficult for non-nuclear states to develop these devices of destruction. That is why the last five Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff -- General John Shalikashvili, General Colin Powell, Admiral Bill Crowe, General John Vessey and General David Jones -- support this treaty. And so I ask the Senate: before this session of Congress is over, ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Even as we lift the nuclear threat that has hung over our heads for fifty years, we can see the contours of a new cloud of fear -- increasingly interconnected rogue states, terrorists and organized criminals armed with chemical and biological weapons.

Since the end of the Gulf War, international weapons inspectors have been trying to find and destroy Iraq’s nuclear, chemical and biological weapons program. They destroyed more weapons of mass destruction potential over the past six and half years than was destroyed during the Gulf War. That is why Saddam Hussein evicted the inspectors from Iraq. And that is why the international community, led by the United States, insisted that they return to work. The inspectors are back on the job. Now, we must see to it that they carry on their mission fully, freely and without interference.
I am determined to give America and the international community every possible tool to fight emerging threats to our security -- and put us ahead of the curve. Last year, the Senate ratified the Chemical Weapons Convention -- a giant step forward in protecting our soldiers and citizens from poison gas attack. Now, I call on you to pass the implementing legislation that will put this treaty into force. Rogue states and terrorists don’t go slow. We shouldn’t either.

There are also steps we should take to prevent an even more lethal threat: the use of disease as a weapon of war and terrorism. Biotechnology is booming -- a boon for health, agriculture and many other fields. But as a result, the knowledge and materials needed to make biological weapons are spreading around the world. Under the right circumstances, a thimble full of anthrax or botulinum could kill millions by slow asphyxiation.

Already, we are strengthening our ability to respond to a biological weapons attack and protecting our troops with vaccinations. But as with any disease, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Our first priority should be to stop countries from acquiring biological weapons in the first place. The Biological Weapons Convention, which entered into force 25 years ago, commits 109 countries not to develop, produce or possess biological weapons. But it lacks tough inspections to enforce these commitments. Tonight, I am announcing my determination to secure a strong, international inspection system that will detect and deter cheating. And I will ask the Senate to approve any changes we secure to the treaty -- after full consideration but with full speed.
Each of these initiatives is a key part of America's new security strategy. But not one of them would be possible with the world's finest fighting force and a fully funded diplomacy that lie at the heart of our foreign policy.

After five years as President, there is one thing I know with absolute certainty: give our men and women in uniform a mission and they deliver. We must make it our mission to deliver for them. My FY '99 budget will allow us to maintain a large force structure... keep our troops well-trained and ready... improve their quality of life... and pay for the 21st century technology they need to dominate the battlefields of the future. By giving the budget your support, you will give America's soldiers our support. They earn it every day.

Last year, I was pleased that we finally reversed the downward spiral in funding for America's international relations programs. But I was deeply disappointed that we missed an opportunity to make good on our debt to the United Nations and the International Monetary Fund. At the very moment UN weapons inspectors were braving the dangers of Iraq to protect our children... and the IMF was working to stem the spread of Asia's financial problems, our failure to pass comprehensive, bipartisan legislation pulled the rug out from under our influence with these organizations -- and our credibility around the world. When America gives its word, America should keep its word.

I will resubmit legislation to fund our full participation in the UN and the international financial institutions. We need not face the future alone. By working with the rest of the world, we can leverage our influence and share the risks and costs of leadership. That makes sense for America. Being a deadbeat does not. Let's put this problem behind us once and for all.
In the months ahead, I will pursue our security strategy with partners -- new and old -- around the world. I will go to Africa, where a new day of democracy and free markets is dawning -- and where Congress can do its part by passing the Africa Trade and Investment Bill. In Chile, I will join 34 [TK] other leaders in our Hemisphere for the second Summit of the Americas, continuing our work to make this region a stronghold for freedom and prosperity. In Birmingham, England, at the Summit of the Eight, we will focus on fighting high tech international crime and other emerging threats. In India and Pakistan, I'll work to strengthen our partnerships with two of the world's largest democracies. And in China, I will strive to deepen America’s engagement with one quarter of the world’s population -- expanding our areas of cooperation and dealing directly with our differences.

Everywhere I travel on behalf of our country, I meet people who look up to America for the power of our example and the example of our power. I wish the American people could see our nation as so much of the world sees us: a force for peace and freedom… for security and prosperity. A nation with the will to advance progress… and the way to get the job done.

Leadership can weigh heavily on us at times. But we should embrace this responsibility because with it comes an opportunity: to shape a future more peaceful, prosperous and secure than the past. That is our chance and our challenge in the world. We should seize it.
Overall FY 99 Defense budget request is $258.5 billion.

- That is up 2.7% from $251.6 bil requested in FY 98, and up 1.3% from the amount actually appropriated for FY-98.

- The FY 99 Defense budget request includes $48.7 billion for procurement, up $2.5 billion from FY-98 request, and projects reaching the QDR goal of $60 billion by FY 2001. This is newsworthy.

- For your background, the FY 99 request for procurement is $1.3 billion less than was actually appropriated for procurement in FY-98.

- The FY 99 Defense budget request proposes a 3.1% pay raise for military personnel. That is a nice data point to mention in the context of supporting the quality of life of military personnel.

- For comparison, the FY 98 raise was 2.8%.

I'll send some comments on readiness shortly.

Joe Bouchard
Don: As you put together our coherent NSC strategy for our part of the SOU, please be advised that I have discussed with Tony my "bid" for a very small, but essential, piece of the foreign policy section -- a bid that is limited to just two -
count 'em, two - key sentences that would take up less than 30 seconds yet will immeasurable help POTUS achieve one
of his true "legacy" goals as President: ratification of the CTB. The sentences are:

"I ask the Senate this session to give its advice and consent to the CTB Treaty - the longest-sought, hardest-
fought prize in the history of arms control. And tonight I am very pleased to announce that ratification of this landmark
treaty is supported by all of the last five Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff: General John Shalikashvili, General Colin
Powell, Admiral Bill Crowe, General John Vessey, and General David Jones." [applause, standing ovation by Democrats,
worried looks by conservative Republicans.]

The second "home run" sentence is almost within our grasp. If nailed down, 30 seconds gets us a very long way toward
our ratification goal. Only 30 seconds. Not a bad deal or too much to ask, eh?

Don -- re. SOU memo plus 30 days -- sorry, I just have not been able to get to it yet with press of even more
urgent business. Will try tonight and in any event will get you something tomorrow.

Thanks.

Nicole;

While I understand SS's desire to combine; there may be policy reasons for not doing the NATO
announcement at the CINCs tadoo since the Russians may see the venue as confirmation that NATO
enlargement was a military thing all along, even though we've said it is not. We need to discuss this
with SRB and should ask SS not to lock it in until we get Sandy's thought.

---Original Message---
From: Bell, Robert G.
Sent: Thursday, January 08, 1998 12:21 PM
To: Kerrick, Donald L.; Blinken, Antony J.; Elkon, Nicole L.; Leavy, David C.; @EXECSEC - Executive Secretary; @PLANNING - Strat Plan & Comm
Cc: @DEFENSE - Defense Policy; @NSA - Natl Security Advisor
Subject: RE: short term scheduling meeting [UNCLASSIFIED]
Rob;

We need to discuss this at the mtg Sandy asked you to set up today.

Tony/Dave;

How's the memo coming laying out our SOU plus 30 days strategy?

-----Original Message-----
From: Leavy, David C.  
Sent: Wednesday, January 07, 1998 2:51 PM 
To: Elkon, Nicole L., @EXECSEC - Executive Secretary; @PLANNING - Strat Plan & Comm 
Subject: RE: short term scheduling meeting [UNCLASSIFIED]

Thanks. Two thoughts--I would argue for, if possible, to have a stand alone NATO event. I think there is significant benefit to associating the President has much as possible with this issue as we get near a successful conclusion (it will be a winner might as well milk it as much as possible). If we can't get another event this month, the VFW could be a good venue for a NATO message (or maybe Iraq depending...)

-----Original Message-----
From: Elkon, Nicole L.  
Sent: Wednesday, January 07, 1998 2:46PM 
To: @EXECSEC - Executive Secretary; @PLANNING - Strat Plan & Comm 
Subject: short term scheduling meeting [UNCLASSIFIED]

Two items from today's short term scheduling meeting:

(1) Stephanie confirmed we were moving forward with the NATO Enlargement announcement event being done in conjunction with the CINCs meeting on January 29.

(2) The VFW Annual Washington Conference is being held on March 3 at the Washington Sheraton. POTUS attendance is pending. Anne Lewis thought this could be a good venue for a foreign policy message.

Tony/Dave - any thoughts??
21st Century Campus, because you really are an embodiment of the future America has to make. (Applause.)

Ladies and gentlemen, before I make the few remarks I'd like to make on this issue, I think it is appropriate, since it's my first appearance of the week, to just give you a brief update on the situation in Iraq. Even when I was walking through here a number of people asked me about it.

First, it's important that you understand what is at stake here. Since the end of the Gulf War, for six years, inspectors, under the authority of the United Nations, have been trying to find and destroy Saddam Hussein's capacity to threaten his neighbors and potentially others around the world with nuclear or biological or chemical weapons. They have found and destroyed more weapons of mass destruction potential in the last six years -- these quiet inspectors who no one knows -- they have destroyed more of this potential than was destroyed in the entire Gulf War, with all of the air attacks.

What they are doing matters. It matters to you, to your children and to the future, because this is a challenge we must face not just in Iraq, but throughout the world. We must not allow the 21st century to go forward under a cloud of fear that terrorists, organized criminals, drug traffickers will terrorize people with chemical and biological weapons the way the nuclear threat hung over the heads of the whole world through the last half of this century. That is what is at issue.

In his defiance of international community, Saddam Hussein has forced the withdrawal of the inspectors. Now, I am trying to settle this issue peacefully. But our diplomatic efforts must be backed by our strong military capability. We cannot rule out any options. But the bottom line is, we have to understand this. It is essential that those inspectors go back to work. The safety of the children of the world depends upon it. And I ask for your support. (Applause.)

I told Russ Meyer this morning that before I got my present job I spent a lot of time flying around the farmland and the mountains of Arkansas in Cessna airplanes. And it occurs to me that for a long time now Cessna has helped a lot of people take to the air in your planes. Today, we come to celebrate Cessna's efforts to help people fly higher all by themselves. And it is a truly remarkable thing.
FAX TRANSMITTAL

DATE: January 7, 1998
TO: Tony Blinken

MESSAGE: Here is an insert on NATO enlargement drafted by me and Tom Malinowski. It includes a paragraph on General Shalikashvili if we can get him into the gala.
Insert on NATO Enlargement for the State of the Union Address

[At very top of foreign policy section:]

[After usual sentence: ...but as we address these challenges in our own country, we must also exert our leadership beyond our shores, because increasingly, as we stand as the indispensable nation, on the brink of the threshold to a new century of opportunity and hope, the line between our domestic and foreign challenges has evaporated, and in an era of breathtaking change, when the world is shrinking, and people, information, capital and the quintuple dangers of drugs, weapons of mass destruction, terrorism, environmental degradation and financial instability traverse the world at dizzying speeds, we cannot hope to be strong at home unless we are also strong abroad...]

Nothing has done more in our lifetimes to improve our world and our prospects for security than the transforming events that ended the Cold War: the fall of the Berlin Wall and the liberation of Central Europe; the collapse of the Soviet empire and rise of a democratic Russia that is now our partners in so many common endeavors; the agreements we have reached to reduce conventional and nuclear weapons; the reunification of Germany and the end to division and armed confrontation across the heart of Europe. Our generation has no higher challenge than to strengthen these foundations of peace so that Europe will never again unleash the kind of horrors it has inflicted on itself and on us during this century.

The keystone of our security efforts in Europe is NATO -- the most successful Alliance in history. And one of the great achievements of American foreign policy in this decade, beginning with the work of my predecessor, is the revitalization of that institution and the community of values it represents. Those efforts will culminate a little over a year from now, when I will join NATO's other leaders for our next summit here in Washington, on the 50th anniversary of the Alliance’s creation.

That summit will present the world with the face of a new and better Europe. For, with your consent, sitting at that table will be the leaders of three, proud, new democracies, whose people were excluded for too long against their will from the transatlantic community of free nations -- the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland.

For these nations, this will be a giant step in their journey to freedom -- a journey that began in shipyards and factories and universities as they sought the right to speak the truth and elect their own leaders -- a journey that continues today as these prosperous democracies exercise their right to choose their associations in Europe and the world.

For us, the enlargement of NATO means that the area of Europe where wars do not happen is about to get a little bit larger, and the likelihood that American lives and interests will be endangered is about to get a little bit smaller. It means that we are about to gain three highly-qualified new allies, who have already proven their readiness to
shoulder the common burdens of security -- from the troops they have contributed to Desert Storm and Bosnia, to their agreement last month to pay their full share of NATO’s common expenses. In short, the addition to the Alliance of these states and others that will follow will make America safer, NATO stronger, and Europe more stable and united.

In a few days, I will transmit to the Senate for its advice and consent the documents that will make these nations America's next allies. Members of both parties in the Congress have already done so much to inform and advance our decisions on this question. Now, after all our consultations and deliberations, I ask you to make the United States among the first members of the Alliance to ratify the enlargement of NATO.

[If there is one American who embodies this new alliance, it is our just-retired Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Born in Poland, carried to the United States by parents fleeing the violence and oppression of the second World War, he spent a lifetime serving the military of his new country, rose to its position of highest responsibility, guided our armed forces through the changes that followed the Cold War, and played an instrumental role in reshaping NATO for this new era, including the creation of its Partnership for Peace program and, now, its enlargement. And tonight, I would like us all to join in acknowledging our debt to General John Shalikashvili.]
SPEECHES  

November 26, 1996

THE HONORABLE JOHN D. HOLUM, DIRECTOR  
U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY  
REMARKS TO THE FOURTH REVIEW CONFERENCE OF  
THE BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION, GENEVA,  
SWITZERLAND (AS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY)

Mr. Chairman, the United States congratulates you on your election, and pledges its cooperation in the vital work that lies before us.

In recent years the international community has made major strides against the threats of nuclear and chemical weapons. But we have yet to exploit new opportunities to address more effectively, in a legally binding way, the threat of biological weapons.

It is time this gap was closed.

Biological weapons are immensely destructive. In the right environment they can multiply, and so self-perpetuate. And they can naturally mutate, frustrating protective measures. Chemical weapons, for all their horrors, become less lethal as they are dispersed and diluted. But even the tiniest quantities of disease organisms can be lethal. For example, botulinum toxin has been described as 3 million times more potent than the chemical nerve agent sarin.

And these are truly loathsome instruments of war and terror. Anthrax, for instance, takes three excruciating days to destroy the membranes of the lungs and intestines.

Botulinum toxin annihilates by slow asphyxiation, as the cells of the victim's breathing muscles die from within.

Small wonder that the international community has placed such organisms out of bounds, even in combat. That was done in the 1972 Convention not only because these are weapons of mass destruction, but because they are infinitely cruel -- intrinsically weapons of terror. And this truth must inform all we do here to strengthen the Convention and review its operation.

The United States unilaterally renounced all uses for biological and toxin weapons and destroyed its offensive stockpile before the Convention's effective date in 1975.

After more than twenty years under that global norm, the threat of biological warfare remains all too real.

In 1992, for example, President Yeltsin publicly and bravely acknowledged and then renounced the massive offensive biological weapons program Russia had inherited from the Soviet Union. The challenge to demonstrate full eradication of that program still remains.

Through UNSCOM and other sources, we have learned in disturbing detail about the scope, ambition, and persistence of Saddam Hussein's biological weapons program in Iraq. Iraq's successive "full, final and complete" disclosures -- each one proving the dishonesty of its predecessors -- give good cause to treat the Iraqi program as an active menace.

Overall, the United States believes that twice as many countries now have or are actively pursuing offensive biological weapons capabilities as when the Convention went into force.
And behind our specific concerns is a broader reality. The potential for biological programs is spreading. Biotechnology is booming -- a boon for health, agriculture, the environment and a host of other fields. But it also means BW-relevant knowledge, equipment, and materials are more accessible, often at declining costs, and are available in ever more facilities worldwide. The result is a burgeoning global BW potential.

Meanwhile, we know terrorists are targeting civilians with weapons of mass destruction. The Aum Shinrikyo cult crossed that fateful threshold last year in the Tokyo subway, with sarin gas. The same fanatics were working on biological weapons. We have had at least one close call last year, when a hate group member in Ohio acquired a sample of Yersinia pestis, the bubonic plague bacterium -- but was caught before he could use it.

The chilling truth is that biological weapons are a threat to people in every land -- however secure or remote it might seem.

How, then, shall we respond? Let us begin with the principle, "first, do no harm." The international community must not abide any change that would, whether by intent or inadvertence, weaken the Convention.

That would be the effect, for example, of interpreting Article I to state the Convention's basic undertaking by way of definitions, lists or other objective criteria. The international community has been well served by the descriptive, non-exhaustive approach of Article I -- a coat that has grown with its wearer. Here, more precision would mean less confidence in compliance, for the threat can evolve in unpredictable ways. Would anyone seriously argue that the next Ebola, for instance, could be allowed in weapons under the Convention, so long as the new organism came to our attention after the definition was fixed?

Some would weaken the Convention by twisting Article III into a mandate to let all equipment and material transfers presumptively run free to States Parties. But surely we know, based on experience, that membership in a regime is no guarantee of compliance. The Article III prohibition on proliferant transfers and assistance is and must remain absolute. Its duty of vigilance cannot be suspended as to members, but rather demands constant attention as to all.

Some, under the banner of "nondiscrimination," have sought to make Article X a vehicle for the worldwide obliteration not only of export controls, but intellectual property rights as well. But Article X encourages scientific exchange and cooperation; it does not rule out restrictions on trade.

The fact is that scientific cooperation and trade are both faring well under Article X. The United States and other States Parties have many well-known programs of biotechnology assistance and cooperation. And last year, while the United States approved well over $250 million in export license applications relevant to the Convention, we denied applications worth a grand total of $2.443. In contrast, if Article X became the means for expropriating biotechnology and pharmaceutical companies' hard-won proprietary advances, such progress would promptly dry up -- and would be available for neither assistance nor trade. Article X must remain the friend of scientific advance, not become its enemy.

Beyond preventing the Convention's erosion, the looming danger obliges us to make it stronger and more effective.

One straightforward way is to extend the Convention's reach. Some 140 States Parties is far short of universality. We must do better. Indeed, there is every reason for the BWC to rival the NPT, or the UN
itself, in membership. All states that have not signed and ratified should do so promptly.

We can also strengthen the Convention through broader application of the voluntary confidence-building measures adopted at the last two Review Conferences. Only about half of the States Parties have ever submitted any information to the UN Secretariat in New York pursuant to the CBMs. The final report of this Review Conference should reaffirm the CBMs and call on all States Parties to take part.

The Convention will become stronger as parties implement Article IV, enacting its prohibitions into their domestic criminal law. Each State's law enforcement apparatus should be used to enforce the Convention against anyone under its jurisdiction -- including terrorists -- who might flout it.

I can attest that this works. The United States has three Federal statutes related to the Convention, including a 1989 law that criminalizes Convention violations. The potential terrorist episode in the United States I just described was thwarted precisely because of those laws. The supplier of the plague bacteria promptly notified the authorities, who were able to stymie the customer's plans. New regulations will add even greater certainty to the monitoring of such transactions.

Few states have fulfilled the obligation of Article IV. But consider that enactment of such legislation is a sovereign act, immediately available without the need to await international consensus.

Of course, the most potent vehicle for strengthening the Convention is the Ad Hoc Group, established independently more than two years ago by a Special Conference of States Parties.

The Ad Hoc Group is a means to take up tools that were unavailable when the Convention was negotiated two and one-half decades ago. Then, on-site inspection was too controversial, and the Convention as signed provides no specific mechanisms to address compliance concerns other than recourse to the United Nations Security Council.

But now, on-site inspections have become an accepted and essential part of modern arms control regimes, and their enforcement is taken more seriously. The Ad Hoc Group thus can bring the Convention into the 1990s, through a legally binding compliance protocol that provides for new off-site and on-site activities.

The protocol should strengthen compliance by making certain national information declarations mandatory -- a matter already debated thoroughly.

The Ad Hoc Group should also build upon the voluntary confidence building measures I mentioned earlier. Meanwhile, of course, today's voluntary CBMs should remain in force.

As to on-site work, the Ad Hoc Group is considering various kinds of field and facility investigations. The United States believes the protocol must, at a minimum, include all cases of concern about compliance with the Convention. This would include, for example, investigations in all cases presenting credible evidence of BW development or production.

What about the pace of this work? The Ad Hoc Group itself recently decided upon a more rigorous approach, to intensify its efforts with a view toward completing its work as soon as possible before the Fifth Review Conference in 2001.

But let me suggest that in light of the mounting BW danger, such a timetable is still inappropriately relaxed. Certainly arduous work remains in translating concepts into protocol language, and completing
needed procedural and logistical elements. But most of the States Parties here today could identify and write down the essential elements for a protocol.

President Clinton's September address to the United Nations called for completion of the Protocol by 1998 — a goal shared by the European Union. Progress to date makes that goal realistic.

Some countries object to Ad Hoc Group sessions in parallel with those of the Conference on Disarmament. I am eager to hear their ideas on how work on the fissile material cutoff treaty can become unblocked, so our CD delegations can do more than tread water. But even if that happens, it need not impede work on the BWC protocol. For the Ad Hoc Group is quite specialized — its experts are typically not those working on other arms control negotiations. And in any case, this work deserves due priority.

We should resolve here that a protocol cannot await the next century. Rather, the final report of this Review Conference should: (1) urge the Ad Hoc Group to further intensify negotiations in 1997, even if that may entail some overlap with the CD calendar; (2) set a target date of 1998 for completion of a legally binding protocol; and (3) call for the convening promptly thereafter of a Special Conference of States Parties to consider the draft instrument.

Conclusion

Mr. Chairman, it is tellingly descriptive that biological warfare dates back to the Dark Ages — when the bodies of Tartar soldiers who had succumbed to the plague were thrown over the walls of the besieged city of Kaffa in 1346. Just so uniquely perverse is the conduct outlawed by the Biological Weapons Convention: taking diseases that all humanity has labored to banish, and deliberately fashioning them into instruments of terror and war.

Now we face tyrants and terrorists who would return us to the Dark Ages. Today's outlaws share their predecessors' ancient depravity. But the means at their disposal are frighteningly modern.

Arms control and science have given us means no less modern to combat them. But we must marshall great will and wisdom to do so. The choices we make here will be fateful.

We can wait for tragedy — for biological weapons to surpass what other weapons have done in Tokyo, Oklahoma City, or the Gulf War.

We can haggle — playing international politics as usual and subordinating security to barter.

Or we can act — first, with prudence, to protect the Convention; then with boldness and statesmanship, to make it stronger.

I know we will choose this third path — not just to renounce these weapons, but finally to banish them from the earth.

For this is what we long ago pledged to one another — and what we owe to those we represent. This is the path that will at once confirm our common humanity, and make all nations and people more secure.
Of all the new security threats we face, the ghastliest is biological weapons - the potential use of disease as a weapon of war and terrorism. We are already committing substantial resources to strengthen our civil defense and the protection of our forces from this threat. [More details from Bell/Clark.]

As with any disease, however, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Our first priority is to establish the most effective international means to prevent countries from acquiring biological weapons in the first place. The Biological Weapons Convention, established in 1972, commits 109 (tk) countries not to develop, produce, or possess biological weapons, but it lacks any inspections to enforce these commitments.

This flaw must be corrected urgently. The U.S. will lead the way to achieve international agreement on a comprehensive proposal for an effective protocol to the BWC that requires full declarations and establishes a strong inspection regime to deter and detect cheating. At the same time, this inspection protocol must provide appropriate protections for legitimate defense proprietary information. I am appointing my senior arms control advisor to undertake this mission, in consultation with U.S. industry and our allies and partners around the world.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Sandy Berger, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, NSC
FROM: J. Brian Atwood, Administrator, U.S. Agency for International Development

SUBJECT: State of the Union Address

This year's State of the Union provides the President with an excellent opportunity to stress the relevance of our foreign assistance programs to U.S. national interests, and to emphasize areas of particular importance to this Administration in the foreign affairs arena. Following are examples of assistance issues the President could highlight in the State of the Union.

The Importance of International Development Cooperation

Suggested language:

"Our efforts to aid the Asian economies highlights the stake our nation has in global stability and economic growth. The International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and other international financial institutions are instruments that serve this vital American interest. Our bilateral development cooperation programs are equally vital.

In the past four years we have transformed our bilateral aid program to assure that it is serving America's interests as well as our national values. We no longer have a "foreign aid" program. Working with the Congress, we have created a program of international cooperation that places the United States in a leadership role in working with other industrial nations to protect ourselves against global threats and to open new..."
opportunities for the American people. In the process we are creating new markets for American exports; protecting Americans against environmental and disease threats that know no borders; providing vital family planning services on a voluntary basis to those who want an alternative to large families or a choice other than abortion; and we are working to reduce the extreme poverty, malnutrition and human suffering that produces refugee flows, social conflict and instability.

Our program of international development cooperation reflects both our interests and our values. It is the right mix of humanitarianism and pragmatism. And it is still about one-half of one percent of the federal budget."

Family Planning

If we wish to highlight the consequences of linking this issue to other vital matters, I would suggest the following:

"Congress should move promptly to approve the IMF replenishment and the payment of our UN arrears. Both matters are vital to our national interests, to our economy and to our ability to maintain our international leadership. Remarkably, both these vital issues remain unresolved because some members wish to pass highly restrictive prohibitions on our international family planning programs -- restrictions that would be unconstitutional in the United States.

Let me be clear: there is no link between these vital IMF and UN funds and international family planning programs. I urge the Congress to stop holding these important measures hostage.

Our family planning programs have always had bipartisan support. These programs strengthen families, improve women's health and save children around the globe. These programs, which are entirely voluntary, prevent the loss of life for hundreds of thousands of mothers and children by better spacing births and improving immunizations and prenatal care. The record is clear: family planning and health services reduce unintended pregnancies and directly reduce the number of abortions around the world."

Microenterprise

One of the most popular aid programs on the Hill is the microenterprise lending program. Suggested language:

"As Governor of Arkansas, I became involved in looking for ways to create economic opportunity in poor parts of my state. Little did I know that some of the most powerful lessons in
combatting poverty would come from overseas. I had heard about the exciting economic work being done through our foreign assistance programs called 'microenterprise loans.' Through our own aid programs, microenterprise was providing very small loans -- often only a few hundred dollars -- to individual entrepreneurs, enabling them to start up very small businesses and generate an income. I am pleased to say that last year, our programs in microenterprise helped more than a million families in the developing world gain access to small loans.

The main beneficiaries of these programs are low-income women and their families, many of whom live in grinding poverty. Perhaps the most striking aspect of microenterprise is that repayment rates for these loans to poor customers have consistently been as good, or better, than the repayment rates most commercial banks enjoy with far wealthier clients.

These may be small loans, but they have been demonstrated to have a powerful impact on turning lives around. Both Hillary and I have witnessed first hand how much difference a small loan can make to families struggling to improve their own lives. These microenterprise programs can work in the United States as well. We have worked with the Department of Treasury and the Small Business Administration to expand these loans that help America's small entrepreneurs flourish. The Small Business Administration's Microloan Program -- a public-private partnership which has already awarded $70 million in grants to nonprofit organizations -- is showing that good ideas from abroad can work right here at home. Because of the promise that microcredit holds in the United States, I have requested substantial increases in federal funding for the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund."

Global Climate Change

Suggested language:

"Following our success at the negotiating table in Kyoto, we are organizing to assist developing countries in the effort to avoid or mitigate the worst effects of global climate change by encouraging energy efficiency, renewable energy and clean technology. By encouraging the use of such "green friendly" technologies in developing countries, we are also helping to create a new and dynamic market for boosting America's exports in a field where the U.S. has a strong competitive advantage."
World Hunger

Suggested language:

"At the World Food Summit last year, our nation joined the international community in a commitment to reduce the number of people suffering from malnutrition by one-half. Today 800 million people, mostly children, survive on the margins with less than the minimum requisite caloric intake each day. This is a goal we can reach through international cooperation and with a modest contribution to a global food security effort.

We should start to meet this international goal by committing ourselves to the elimination of hunger right here in America." (Agriculture can supply language re our domestic goal).
MEMORANDUM

TO: Tony Blinken, NSC
FROM: John Norris, USAID
SUBJECT: State of the Union Address

What follows are some possible suggestions for areas that could be highlighted in the President’s State of the Union address. Brian will be sending a formal memo to the NSC on the subject, but I thought this advance copy could be of use. Thanks.

A New Era in Cooperation

In May of 1996, 21 industrial nations -- including the United States -- agreed to work together to help improve conditions in the developing world. We agreed that by the year 2005, we can end the gender discrimination that blocks girls from receiving even a basic education in many poor countries. These 21 nations also agreed that by 2015, extreme poverty can be cut in half, infant mortality rates can reduced by two-thirds, global malnutrition can be halved, the numbers of mothers who die giving birth can be cut by 75 percent and that family planning services should be available to all who want them.

These are ambitious goals, but they are eminently worthy and achievable targets. We can achieve these goals and save the lives of hundreds of thousands of people because we are working together with other nations, each making modest contributions that are making the world a far better place and a far safer place for our children.
Microenterprise

As Governor of Arkansas, I became involved in looking for ways to create economic opportunity in poor parts of my state. I had heard about the exciting work being done through our foreign assistance programs and by organizations like the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh and the South Shore Bank in Chicago called "microenterprise loans." Microenterprise programs provide very small loans -- often only a couple hundred dollars -- to individual entrepreneurs enabling them to expand their income. The main beneficiaries of these programs are low-income women and their families. Perhaps the most striking aspect of the microenterprise programs -- whether they be in Little Rock or Bangladesh -- is that repayment rates for these small loans to poor customers have consistently been as good, or better, than the repayment rates most commercial banks enjoy with far wealthier clients.

These may be small loans, but they have been demonstrated to have a powerful impact on turning communities around. I have continued to look for ways to apply microcredit in America, taking the best of the principles and values that it represented, but making sure that it could be put into practice in different settings.

We have been working with the Department of Treasury and the Small Business Administration to expand these loans that help America's small entrepreneurs flourish. The Small Business Administration's Microloan Program -- a public-private partnership which has already awarded $70 million in grants to nonprofit organizations with nearly half of the loans granted going to women -- is showing that good ideas from abroad can work right here at home. These loans range from $125 to $25,000.

Because of the promise that microcredit holds in the United States, I requested substantial increases in federal funding for the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund.

Family Planning

I ask the Congress to move ahead with passing the IMF replenishment and our U.N. arrears... These issues have been stalled by an effort to pass highly restrictive prohibitions -- restrictions that would be unconstitutional in the United States -- on our international family planning programs. Our efforts in family planning tremendously helps families and improves women's health around the globe. These programs are entirely voluntary and they are preventing the loss of life for hundreds of thousands of mothers and children by better spacing births and through improving immunizations, prenatal care and providing for safe deliveries. It is clear: family planning and health
services reduce unintended pregnancies and directly reduce the number of abortions around the world.

Global Climate Change

Following our success at the negotiating table in Kyoto, our foreign aid program is responding just as you in the Congress would hope - by getting developing countries to participate in the effort to avoid or mitigate the worst effects of global climate change by encouraging energy efficiency, renewable energy and clean technology. By encouraging the use of such "green friendly" technologies in developing countries, we are also helping to create a new and dynamic market for boosting America's exports in a field where it has a strong competitive advantage.
From: Bell, Robert G.
Sent: Thursday, January 08, 1998 12:39 PM
To: @KERRICK
Cc: @DEFENSE - Defense Policy; @PLANNING - Strat Plan & Comm
Subject: FW: 99 Budget [UNCLASSIFIED]

Don: fyi. (the two sentences on CTB that I "need" as per my previous e-mail were wearing my Senior Director for Arms Control hat; this e-mail is the two sentences I "need" wearing my Senior Director for Defense Policy hat.)

---Original Message---
From: Bell, Robert G.
Sent: Thursday, January 08, 1998 12:36 PM
To: Bouchard, Joseph F.; Leavy, David C.
Subject: RE: 99 Budget [UNCLASSIFIED]

I believe there must/must be two sentences in SOU re US military: one reaffirming our commitment to keep our armed forces as the best in the world; a second calling attention to Major General Day (USMC-ret.) in the gallery (who would have received the Medal of Honor from POTUS the week before) as emblematic of the extraordinary qualities of the men and women who serve our Nation in uniform. There will be a standing ovation.

---Original Message---
From: Bouchard, Joseph F.
Sent: Thursday, January 08, 1998 10:48 AM
To: Leavy, David C.
Cc: Bell, Robert G.
Subject: RE: 99 Budget [UNCLASSIFIED]

David, I put in your box in 379 a copy of the draft OMB write-up of the Defense section of the FY-99 President's Budget. I highlighted what's "new" in it. If the Defense budget is mentioned in the State of the Union address, it must include a statement that readiness remains the top defense priority. It should mention that the FY-99 budget implements the QDR (that comes through clearly in the draft OMB write-up). Please feel free to call me if you'd like to discuss further.

Joe Bouchard

---Original Message---
From: Leavy, David C.
Sent: Tuesday, January 06, 1998 11:34 AM
To: @DEFENSE - Defense Policy
Cc: @PLANNING - Strat Plan & Comm
Subject: 99 Budget [UNCLASSIFIED]

Bob-as part of our planning efforts for the coming year and for the run-up to the State of the Union and budget release we wanted to get a sense of what potential news nuggets were included in the defense budget. For example, are there any new areas of expenditure that should be highlighted prior to the release of the budget? Are there any new programs or initiatives that could be packaged/folded into a larger message? thanks
Input on emerging infectious diseases for State of the Union

Our Administration is taking on a major challenge to the health of Americans and the global community: emerging infectious diseases. To address these new threats -- including Ebola, antibiotic-resistant bacteria, and the new 'bird flu' in Hong Kong -- we have: stepped up disease surveillance by increasing CDC funding; strengthened NIH research and training; and have seen a significant increase in international development assistance through USAID. We are working with our international partners to establish a global surveillance and response system that will help us detect and respond quickly to infectious disease outbreaks, whether of natural or terrorist origin.

We have placed a special emphasis on emerging threats to the safety of our food supply, such as the deadly new strain of E. coli that has tainted meat and produce. As a result of our strengthened efforts through CDC, we were able to halt the spread of E. coli O157:H7 in ground beef in Colorado, possibly averting a public health catastrophe.

While we have made significant advances, we must not let down our guard. Therefore, my 1999 budget will call for a $71 million increase for food safety programs at USDA, FDA, and CDC.

Our accomplishments in the fight against emerging infectious diseases are largely due to the extraordinary dedication of Dr. David Satcher, Director of the CDC and my nominee for Surgeon General.

Tony suggested language that OSTP will be forwarding via Jeff Smith
Emerging infectious diseases progress report from Jack Gibbons. You issued a directive last June to the National Science and Technology Council (NSTC) calling for actions in four areas: developing a global surveillance network; enhancing research and training; engaging our international partners; and improving public outreach. David Satcher and an OSTP Director chaired the effort. The NSTC report details the "significant advances" made toward these objectives: increased CDC funding; strengthened NIH research and training; and increased international development assistance through USAID. "Our end goal is to be able to protect ourselves and the global community from emerging pathogens."
MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: JOHN H. GIBBONS

SUBJECT: Emerging Infectious Diseases: Progress Report

I am pleased to present you with the first annual progress report on the implementation of your June 12, 1996, directive on emerging infectious diseases. Emerging infectious diseases, such as Ebola, drug-resistant tuberculosis, and HIV/AIDS, are now responsible for one third of all deaths globally and represent an increasing threat to the health of U.S. citizens and the global community. The recent outbreak of the ‘bird flu’ in Hong Kong demonstrates the potential danger of these new disease threats. And, unfortunately, it is obvious that biological agents are appealing military and terrorist weapons.

To combat these threats, your directive, PDD/NSTC-7, called for action in four key areas: developing a global surveillance network; enhancing research and training; engaging our international partners; and improving public outreach. To meet these challenges, I asked David Satcher, Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and Kerri-Ann Jones, my Associate Director for National Security and International Affairs, to co-chair a Task Force on emerging infectious diseases, and charged them with implementing your policy.

In the past year, we have made significant advances toward achieving these objectives. Domestically, we increased CDC’s funding for emerging infections activities within the National Center for Infectious Diseases, which includes grants to state and local health departments. This increase enabled CDC and the Colorado state health department to catch the recent outbreak of the deadly E. coli O157:H7 bacteria in ground beef. We have strengthened research and training through the National Institutes of Health, including the establishment of four new Hepatitis C Cooperative Research Centers and three new Emerging Virus Groups to study hantaviruses and other emerging viral threats. We have strengthened our development assistance efforts through a new program at USAID. Finally, we have engaged our international partners through the G-8, APEC, and key bilateral fora.

I am proud of the interagency work that has moved this policy. However, the challenges ahead demand our continued vigilance -- both in terms of our investments and our scientific capacity. Our end goal is to ensure that we are able to protect ourselves and the global community from these emerging pathogens, regardless of their origin.
NATIONAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COUNCIL

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL SCIENCE, ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY

EMERGING INFECTIOUS DISEASE TASK FORCE

PDD/NSTC-7 ANNUAL REPORT

DECEMBER 19, 1997
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Executive Summary

In June 1996, President Clinton directed the Federal agencies to begin a coordinated national response to the growing threat of infectious diseases, both at home and abroad, through policy directive, PDD/NSTC-7. This Directive calls for action in four key areas: developing a global surveillance and response network; enhancing research and training; engaging our international partners; and strengthening public outreach. To implement this policy, the National Science and Technology Council’s Committee on International Science, Engineering and Technology (CISET) formed a Task Force on Emerging Infectious Diseases, which is co-chaired by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy. The EID Task Force is composed of nearly two dozen agencies and has become an effective model of interagency coordination. This report summarizes the accomplishments of the Task Force during its first year.

The Task Force members have made significant advances toward achieving the objectives of the President’s policy directive. Domestically, we have bolstered disease surveillance at the national, state, and local levels — our major line of defense against emerging infectious diseases. CDC’s recent accomplishments include the establishment of agreements with twenty-two states and localities to strengthen national disease surveillance and outbreak response; the creation of three provider-based electronic networks to study disease syndromes; and the strengthening of cooperative programs with state and local health departments to create real-time, on-line capacity to compare strains of the food-borne pathogens, Salmonella and *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 bacteria. This system, which includes Colorado, was responsible for catching the recent outbreak of *E. coli* O157:H7 in ground beef.

We have also strengthened research and training through the National Institutes of Health, including the establishment of four new Hepatitis C Cooperative Research Centers and three new Emerging Virus Groups to study hantaviruses and other emerging viral threats. In addition, NIH’s National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) has committed $3 million for a new extramural research program on emerging diseases; and NIH’s Fogarty International Center (FIC), in close cooperation with NIAID, has launched a $1.8 million program to provide training for scientists in developing countries in the field of emerging infectious disease research. Furthermore, NIH has launched a Multilateral Initiative on Malaria and has committed over $1 million for a program to be established through WHO to strengthen research capacity within Africa for improved malaria control.

Another key accomplishment of the EID Task Force has been the expansion of U.S. agency missions and mandates to more effectively address these challenges. The actions being taken include the creation of a Department of Defense (DoD) Surveillance and Response System for Infectious Diseases; the establishment of a DoD Internet-based Central Communications Hub; and the expansion of DoD’s overseas laboratory capabilities and epidemiology training.

Internationally, the Task Force members have engaged our partners through APEC, the G-8, the
U.S.-Japan Common Agenda, the U.S.-E.U. New Transatlantic Agenda, the U.S.-Russia Commission on Economic and Technological Cooperation, the U.S.-South Africa Binational Commission, and other bilateral and multilateral fora. At the recent Denver Summit of the Eight, the U.S. presented a major infectious disease initiative, which included a commitment from the Heads of State to develop a global surveillance system; strengthen capacity in developing countries; and coordinate international response to outbreaks.

Our development assistance program has also played a key role in the EID Task Force. USAID continues to take important steps to strengthen basic public health infrastructures and in-country capacity to combat infectious diseases, especially those related to child survival, reproductive health, and HIV/AIDS prevention. The EID Task Force members continue to coordinate with the World Health Organization to make best use of the available resources.

The EID Task Force members have made significant progress toward the implementation of President Clinton’s EID policy. Many challenges remain, however. Through the coordinated efforts of the Task Force, the private sector, and the academic, NGO, and international communities, we will continue to work to eliminate the threat of emerging infectious diseases and to protect the health and well-being of our citizens.
I. Introduction

In June 1996, President Clinton directed the Federal agencies to begin a coordinated national response to the growing threat of infectious diseases, both at home and abroad, through policy directive, PDD/NSTC-7. This Directive calls for action in four key areas: developing a global surveillance and response network; enhancing research and training; engaging our international partners; and strengthening public outreach. To implement this policy, the National Science and Technology Council’s Committee on International Science, Engineering and Technology (CISET) formed a Task Force on Emerging Infectious Diseases, which is co-chaired by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy.

The EID Task Force is composed of nearly two dozen agencies and is comprised of five working groups: 1) Surveillance and Response; 2) Research and Training; 3) Capacity Development; 4) Legislation and Mandates; and 5) Outreach. In addition, an ad hoc Working Group on Bioterrorism has been created to address potential terrorist use of biological agents.

Since the release of PDD/NSTC-7, the EID Task Force members have made significant progress in implementing the President’s policy. This report summarizes these accomplishments.

II. Surveillance and Response

a. Federal and State laboratory and epidemiologic response capabilities

In the United States, the network of state and local health departments is a major line of defense against emerging infectious diseases. The network operates the national notifiable disease system and conducts local disease surveillance and investigations. CDC has established three programs to strengthen this network:

- **Epidemiologic and Laboratory Capacity Cooperative Agreements (ELCs).** These agreements provide state and large local health departments with technical tools, training, and financial resources to maintain and strengthen national notifiable disease systems, conduct disease surveillance, diagnose diseases, and investigate outbreaks. By the end of FY 1997, CDC will have entered into ELC agreements with twenty-two states and localities. By 2003, CDC plans to involve fifty state health departments, as well as large local health departments and territorial health agencies.

- **Emerging Infections Programs (EIPs).** The EIPs conduct population-based surveillance and research that goes beyond the routine functions of local health departments to address the most important issues in infectious diseases and public health. EIP projects include establishing active surveillance for invasive bacterial diseases and food borne pathogens (FoodNet) and participating in emergency outbreak responses. FoodNet is a collaborative
effort of CDC, USDA, FDA, and the EIP sites. To date, EIPs have been formed with the state health departments of California, Connecticut, Minnesota, Oregon, Georgia, New York, and Maryland.

- **Provider-based Sentinel Networks.** Three provider-based networks have been formed to study specific conditions and syndromes.

  - **Emergency Department Sentinel Network for Emerging Infections (EMERGEncy ID NET)** is a network of academically affiliated emergency medicine departments, which operate emergency departments at eleven hospitals in large U.S. cities. The network monitors a number of syndromes, including bloody diarrhea, illnesses that follow exposure to animals, first-time seizures, prolonged febrile illness in immigrants and travelers, and hemolytic uremic syndrome following infection with *Escherichia coli O157:H7*.

  - **Infectious Diseases Society of America (IDSA) Emerging Infections Network (IDSA EIN)** is a network of over 150 infectious disease clinicians that: enhances communications and health education among its members; collaborates in research projects; and provides assistance in case-finding during outbreak investigations.

  - **The Sentinel Network of Travel Medicine Clinics (GeoSentinel)** is composed of eleven travel medicine clinics: nine in the United States, one in Canada, and one in Germany. The network monitors schistosomiasis, dengue, hepatitis, and persistent fever of unknown origin. The data are analyzed by CDC and used to develop travel advisories and recommendations for health-care providers. In the future, it may help track the spread of diseases from place to place when outbreaks occur.

The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) Infectious Disease Program has developed the Emerging Pathogens Initiative (EPI), an automated national VA surveillance system designed to track emerging pathogens in VA health care facilities worldwide. The monthly report provides data for a number of pathogens and diseases, including vancomycin-resistant enterococcus, penicillin-resistant pneumococcus, *E. coli O157:H7*, and certain diseases of military important, such as malaria.

**b. Electronic Network for Surveillance and Response**

The prompt detection of domestic outbreaks depends on the flow of reliable, laboratory-confirmed surveillance data, from doctors and diagnostic laboratories to local and state health departments, and from state health departments to CDC. Many states are beginning to use electronic systems to integrate laboratory and epidemiologic information and transmit state-wide data to county health departments and other reporting sites.
• Standards. CDC, the Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists, and the Association of State and Territorial Public Health Laboratory Directors are working with state and local health departments to set standards for laboratory-based reporting of infectious diseases.

• Molecular Fingerprinting. CDC is working with selected state health departments and FDA to develop the online capacity to compare strains of *Salmonella* and *E. coli* O157:H7 bacteria, using the technique called "molecular fingerprinting." Whenever a food borne outbreak of *Salmonella* or *E. coli* occurs in the U.S., the health departments should be able to fingerprint local organisms to determine the extent of the outbreak and implement control measures. FDA is developing fingerprinting for additional foodborne pathogens.

III. Research

The EID Task Force members have committed significant resources to EID research. Examples of major new research programs follow.

• Malaria Research. The NIH is working with partner agencies in France, the UK, the European Community, and with the WHO, the Wellcome Trust, African scientists, and others to develop a strengthened research effort on malaria. NIH has committed over $1 million for a program to be established through WHO to strengthen research capacity within Africa for improved malaria control. In addition, NIH’s National Institute for Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) has implemented projects in FY 1997 to establish a repository of malaria research reagents and to expand efforts to sequence the genomes of malaria parasites.

USAID has committed approximately $2 million per year for the development and testing of malaria vaccines. USAID’s particular focus is vaccine formulations most suitable for prevention of malaria mortality among children in developing countries.

• Neurocysticercosis Research. NIH and CDC are jointly conducting an epidemiologic survey of neurocysticercosis in the U.S.

• VA Research Program. The VA Research Service has instituted an investigator-instigated research program in emerging pathogens.

• Laboratory Networks. NIH supported a one-time, one-year supplemental award to permit investigators to develop “emerging diseases laboratory networks through travel, reagent exchanges and virtual networks” and to expand existing international programs focusing on emerging diseases.
Support for Extramural Research. As a follow-up to its Research Agenda for Emerging Infectious Diseases, NIH published a new program announcement on "Expanded Research on Emerging Diseases," which will receive $3 million in FY 1997.

International Training and Research. The NIH's Fogarty International Center (FIC), working in partnership with NIH's National Institute for Allergenic and Infectious Diseases (NIAID), will make the first awards under its International Training and Research in Emerging Infectious Diseases Program in FY 1997. This 5-year program, with annual funding of more than $1.8 million, aims to provide training and research opportunities to developing country partners of U.S. scientists in the field of emerging infectious disease research.

Better Vaccines Against Childhood Bacterial Diseases. In collaboration with the international Childhood Vaccine Initiative, USAID supports the development and testing of vaccines against the major bacterial causes of pneumonia and meningitis in children, as well as the improvement of other important childhood vaccine formulations and the systems and tools for the delivery of the vaccines in developing countries. USAID provided nearly $1 million in FY 1997 for these activities.

NIAID continues to emphasize vaccine research and development. In FY 1997, NIAID committed approximately $2.7 million to a major effort in streptococcus research and approximately $2 million for providing tuberculosis research materials to the scientific community.

Diagnostics. USAID is providing $300,000 in FY 1997 for the development of new or improved diagnostics suitable for safe and inexpensive use in developing countries, especially in field situations. Some of the specific infectious disease diagnostics being addressed are HIV, malaria, chlamydia, gonorrhea, and syphilis.

Disease Prevention Research. USAID has committed nearly $2 million in FY 1997 to the prevention of infectious diseases through behavioral research. Areas of investigation include: the use of safe-water, sanitation, hand washing, and food protection to decrease diarrheal diseases; the use of insecticide-impregnated bednets to decrease malaria transmission; the reduction of domestic smoke pollution to decrease respiratory infections; and the reduction of sexual behaviors that carry high-risk for transmission of HIV and sexually transmitted diseases (STDs).

NIAID continues to focus on research efforts for the development of effective methods of disease prevention, including the development of new vaccines, therapeutics, and behavioral interventions. In FY 1997, NIAID committed over $1 million to the establishment of clinical trial units for STDs. In addition, NIAID committed approximately $1 million to research on the development of new vaccines for fungal diseases and improved vaccines for measles.
USAID supports research into care-seeking behavior, such as parental recognition of respiratory infection severity and dehydration in their children; health care provider behavior related to quality assurance in health-care delivery, such as following effective diagnostic and treatment protocols for infectious diseases; and inappropriate drug prescription and sale by providers, and poor patient compliance in the use of antibiotics.

- **Social Marketing.** USAID supports social marketing research on how market forces can be harnessed to promote healthful behavior change. For example, the social marketing of condoms for HIV and STD prevention is part of extensive, multi-country commitments for which USAID spends several million dollars annually.

- **Antibiotic Resistance.** Working with Harvard University, Johns Hopkins University, WHO, INCLEN, and other organizations, USAID has supported the development of a 3-5 year international research agenda on issues important to reducing pneumonia mortality among children, with special attention to the increasing problems associated with resistance to the commonly-used antibiotics.

NIAID issued a program announcement soliciting research on the genetics of drug resistance, development of new diagnostic tools, and development of alternative treatments.

- **Importance of Micronutrients (Vitamin A and Zinc) in Susceptibility/Resistance to Infectious Diseases.** USAID is continuing its role as the leading donor in researching the roles of Vitamin A in dramatic reductions of infectious disease mortality in developing countries, and in implementing national programs to improve Vitamin A nutritional status among all at-risk children. In addition, USAID is providing $500,000 to support a newly developing body of research on the role(s) of zinc in resistance of children to infectious diseases in developing countries.

- **Agriculture and Public Health.** In 1996, USDA established an Emerging Pathogens Division to address issues at the interface of agriculture and public health. Activities include coordinating interagency surveillance, response and research needs related to *Salmonella Typhimurium* DT 104, an emerging, multi-drug resistant food borne pathogen of international concern.

- **Links between environmental change and infectious diseases.** NASA, NIH, CDC, and NOAA are collaborating on the application of changes in the spatial and temporal patterns of infectious diseases. NASA and NOAA are also organizing a series of workshops on applying environmental data to improve human health. NASA is currently in the process of organizing two more workshops – one on the Malaria in Africa Initiative and a second on the evaluation of future remote sensing systems for surveillance of infectious diseases.
Interagency Research Partnership in Infectious Diseases (IntRePID). NASA is leading an interagency effort to develop a joint resource for the study of arthropod-borne infectious diseases. Participating agencies included the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research (WRAIR), Department of Infectious Diseases; the Naval Medical Research Institute (NMRI), Department of Infectious Diseases; the CDC Division of Vector Borne Infectious Diseases; the USDA Agricultural Research Service Center for Medical Agricultural and Veterinary Entomology (CMAVE); and the Department of State. University participants include the Johns Hopkins School of Public Health and the University of Michigan School of Public Health. IntRePID activities to date include the following:

- Prototype study on the links between climate change and Dengue Fever. Using a thirty five year dengue data set, research is underway to study dengue in relation to a variety of weather and climatic conditions, including El Niño.

- Survey of international researchers: Working in conjunction with ProMed and the University of Michigan, NASA completed an international survey of researchers in Summer 1997. The purpose of the survey was to identify what tools, technologies, data sets, and resources will enable research into the study of climate change and human health.

- Technology Assessment: NASA is leading an interagency survey of federal resources, specifically intelligent technologies and tools that can enable the study, modeling, and prediction of infectious disease.

- Development of Online Data Distribution Resource and Archive: IntRePID is developing an online resource to archive, maintain, and distribute data sets, tools, and documents for research into climate change and human health. This resource is intended to include some training materials, to have pointers to researchers and leading activities in the field, and to link with other surveillance systems as they come online.

Cross-Country Investigation of Climate and Encephalitis. NASA has undertaken a study with researchers at four universities to investigate how encephalitis might be affected by climate and weather conditions, and how these impacts may differ regionally throughout the U.S. Participating institutions will include University of California at Davis, Rutgers University, the University of Michigan, and the University of Florida. Additional participants are likely to include the state mosquito control organizations of the associated universities.

USGCRP Working Group on Climate Change and Human Health. NASA and NIEHS are co-chairing the USGCRP subgroup on climate change and human health. A key element will be meeting with interdisciplinary researchers to identify human health risk areas, as well as to inventory federal resources of the participating organizations.
• NASA, NIH, and CDC Memoranda of Understanding. NASA has signed memoranda of understanding with NIH and CDC to support collaborative research, education, and training, in the application of remote sensing technologies to study the spatial and temporal patterns of infectious disease. To date, NASA has supported studies to apply remote sensing to a number of infectious diseases including malaria, filariasis, schistosomiasis, leishmaniasis, cholera, ebola, encephalitis, hantavirus, Lyme disease, yellow fever, and diarrheal diseases.

IV. Coordination with the Private Sector

The EID Task Force members are working to promote public and private sector cooperation to ensure the availability of the drugs, vaccines, and diagnostic tests needed to combat infectious diseases and infectious disease emergencies. These efforts include:

• Product Availability. FDA is leading an effort to develop a procedures manual on product availability to provide contact information on medical products (drugs, vaccines, diagnostic tests, antisera, etc.) that may be needed during emergencies. The CISET Product Availability Group is working with domestic companies through U.S. pharmaceutical and device associations and with international industry associations and WHO.

• International Harmonization. FDA is leading international harmonization efforts, such as the International Conference on Harmonization, which includes the pharmaceutical manufacturers and regulatory bodies of the U.S., Japan, and the EU.

• Vaccine Supply. CDC, FDA, and USAID collaborated with drug manufacturers to address the shortage of vaccines for use in controlling meningitis outbreaks in Sub-Saharan Africa during the 1996-97 winter season.

• Pandemic Influenza. A number of CISET Task Force members are participating in the Interagency Group for Influenza Pandemic Preparedness and Emergency Response (GRIPPE), which is working with state and local health departments, pharmaceutical companies, and health care delivery organizations to further develop the national plan for pandemic influenza.

V. Training of Health Care Providers

• Expanding training. NIH and CDC sent a letter in August 1997 to medical and microbiology associations and other professional organizations urging them to focus training and certification programs on emerging infectious diseases. In March 1998, NIH, FDA and CDC will sponsor a satellite meeting focused on training needs at the
CDC’s International Conference on Emerging Infectious Diseases.

- **Judicious use of Antibiotics.** In collaboration with the American Association of Pediatrics Committee on Infectious Diseases and the American Association of Family Physicians, CDC has prepared material for physicians on the judicious use of antibiotics in treating common pediatric respiratory infections. CDC has also developed a complementary set of materials aimed at consumers.

- **Laboratory Fellowship Program.** CDC and the Association of State and Territorial Public Health Laboratory Directors have developed a laboratory fellowship program for students at the BA, MS, and PhD levels.

VI. **Screening and Quarantine**

Approximately one million legal immigrants and refugees are admitted to the U.S. each year, many from high-risk countries. At the same time, international travel by U.S. citizens has increased substantially, rising from 20 million to 40 million in the past decade. Half of these travelers visit tropical locations, putting them at risk for diseases they would not normally encounter. In response to this trend, the EID Task Force Working Group on Quarantine and Containment is developing a plan to improve the detection and containment of emerging infectious diseases imported into the United States, which will be completed by early 1998.

- **Detection and Control at U.S. Ports of Entry.** A CDC-led implementation working group, which includes representation from federal, state, and local health departments, held its first meeting in August 1997, to develop strategies for disease detection and control at U.S. ports of entry. Next, regional meetings will be held around the country to develop protocols for managing disease threats at particular ports of entry.

- **Review of Regulations.** CDC’s Division of Quarantine has begun to review and prioritize regulations, focusing initially on imported disease risk from animals and other vectors.

- **Refugee and Migrant Groups.** The Division of Quarantine is currently developing a protocol for managing infectious diseases in refugee and migrant groups entering the United States and is evaluating the relevance and adequacy of the immigrant and refugee medical screening requirements.

The Division of Quarantine is also developing standardized recommendations and guidelines for the selection of panel physicians and laboratories responsible for conducting immigrant/refugee medical examinations.

- **Communicating Health Information.** Representatives from universities, travel clinics, and the International Society of Travel Medicine met with CDC in June 1997 to begin drafting a plan to improve communication of health information related to international travel. The plan will include involvement by airlines and cruise ship companies, as well
as by state and local public health groups.

CDC's Division of Quarantine is developing a system for communicating with local health departments about the health risks associated with immigrants and refugees.

- GeoSentinel. GeoSentinel—a surveillance network of travel medicine clinics—is now in place. Representatives of the clinics met in June 1997 to review progress made to date and to work on further improvements. See paragraph on page 5.

VII. Updated Agency Missions and Mandates

Nearly two dozen agencies participate in the EID Task Force and contribute to the government-wide effort to combat the threat of emerging infectious diseases. Several of these agencies have changed or are in the process of changing their missions or mandates in order to make best use of their resources and expertise. A brief description of new or expanded missions and mandates follows.

a. CDC

- Over the past year, the EID Task Force has sought to expand CDC's mandate to allow surveillance and response activities to epidemics overseas. The two principal agencies involved in this issue, HHS and USAID, have been engaged in a discussion of two possible approaches: a narrow mechanism to give CDC authority under the Foreign Assistance Act, and a broader approach to build greater ability to respond to EID outbreaks. The EID Task Force continues to pursue these two approaches.

b. NIH

- NIH, the lead U.S. agency for biomedical and behavioral research, will expand its resources in research and research training in emerging infectious diseases. NIH activities are aimed at improving the understanding of the biology of infectious agents, developing diagnostics to detect them, and developing and testing drugs, vaccines, and other interventions to treat and prevent infections. NIH supports research capacity strengthening through its programs that link U.S. laboratories with those in developing countries for training or research purposes.

c. USAID

- In FY 1998, USAID established emerging infectious diseases as a strategic objective in health and will develop new programs to address malaria, tuberculosis, antimicrobial resistance and EID surveillance needs. USAID will continue to work bilaterally and regionally with more than 50 countries to develop in-country capacity to combat infectious diseases, especially those related to child survival, reproductive health, and
HIV/AIDS prevention.

d. **DOD**

- **Surveillance and Response System.** DOD's Surveillance and Response System for Infectious Diseases was created to give senior leadership a system wide view of emerging infections. It will incorporate large surveillance databases that contain detailed information on infectious illnesses in U.S. troops, including data on demographics, hospitalization, reportable diseases; and deployment screening. The mission of DOD's overseas laboratories has been expanded to include a surveillance role, and the corps of epidemiologists has been expanded. Communication with other federal agencies on emerging infectious diseases is provided through public and private web servers.

- **Central Communications Hub.** DOD has established an Internet-based Central Communications Hub at Walter Reed Army Institute of Research for emerging infectious diseases. It will include a private web server for an intranet chat line to link the overseas laboratories in Cairo, Nairobi, Jakarta, Bangkok, Lima, and Rio de Janeiro with Service hubs that perform surveillance of reportable diseases among U.S. troops. By Summer 1997, the Communications Hub will include a public web site that allows users to search for information in several DOD databases, which will lay the groundwork for automatic reporting of bacterial resistance patterns and certain reportable diseases. Fifteen new billets are being created to train military epidemiologists at DOD's overseas laboratories and the Central Communications Hub.


- **Overseas Laboratories.** The overseas laboratories have received funding to encourage collaborations with research colleagues from other U.S. agencies or other nations. The funding covers the costs of providing desks, laboratory space, and secretarial assistance to visiting scientists.

- **Ensuring Availability of Diagnostic Capabilities.** Operational funding has been given to DOD's overseas labs to purchase equipment and reagents for laboratory support of host nations to assist them in diagnosing the causes of outbreaks.

- **Scientific Exchanges.** DOD is supporting exchanges of scientists, including two CDC epidemiologists, at several overseas labs.

e. **NASA**

- Since the mid-1980s, NASA has sponsored studies directed at using remote sensing
technologies to monitor and predict the patterns of infectious disease in time and space. The approach is based on the identification and monitoring of environmental, entomological, and epidemiological factors that affect the patterns of disease transmission risk. The results of several studies indicate that remote sensing data can be used to predict the spatial and temporal patterns of infectious disease and that this information can be used to map disease transmission risk and direct control measures.

- Currently, the Office of Mission to Planet Earth supports basic research and education; and training is supported through the Center for Health Applications of Aerospace-Related Technologies. These programs support basic research and provide education, training, and technology transfer in the application of remote sensing technologies to studies of infectious disease. This is accomplished through: interagency agreements with the NIH and CDC; joint research activities with U.S. and foreign university and agency investigators; and training of foreign investigators through the Third World Foundation fellowship program.

- NASA is dedicated to significantly improving the use of its diverse observing systems, data, and information about the Earth to support research on the environment, climate change, and human health. NASA is working with scientists to determine how the best products from NASA’s 1997 Earth Observing System missions, and its future missions, can be applied to provide value-added services and to develop joint products with other organizations to facilitate the study, understanding, and predictions of vector-borne and infectious disease and other human health issues.

VIII. Bioterrorism

The EID Task Force is working in coordination with the National Security Council to respond to Section 1443 of the FY 1997 Defense Authorization bill. The EID Task Force formed an Ad Hoc Working Group comprised of the intelligence, security, public health, and law enforcement communities to focus on surveillance for terrorist use of biological agents. The Ad Hoc Working Group met in September 1997 and has initiated a report on the costs and benefits of national and international surveillance and response to incidences of criminal or terrorist uses of biological agents.

IX. International Activities

The challenges presented by EIDs far outstrip the means of any one country or international organization. Therefore, the U.S. has developed a sustained effort to enlist support from other nations and international bodies, as follows:

a. International Outreach
The Department of State has established an Emerging Infectious Diseases and HIV/AIDS Program under the Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs.

In 1996, the Department of State cabled all ambassadors requesting that they raise awareness of emerging infectious diseases in each country.

b. Multilateral Initiatives

- **Denver Summit (G-8).** As a result of a U.S. proposal, the Eight (G-7 + Russia) pledged to work together to reduce the threat of EIDs by cooperating in three areas: 1) coordinating international response to outbreaks; 2) developing a global surveillance network; and 3) building capacity for surveillance, response, and research in developing countries.

- **New Transatlantic Agenda (U.S.-European Union).** Principal activities under the New Transatlantic Agenda include:
  - Exchanging *Salmonella* surveillance data among EU countries and the U.S.
  - Feasibility study on establishing a global *Salmonella* database.
  - Training exchanges and joint investigations between the EU's EPIET and the U.S. Epidemiology Intelligence Service (EIS).
  - Meeting hosted by EU in May 1997, in collaboration with WHO, to set standards for global surveillance of antimicrobial resistance. This includes common case definitions, reporting formats, and reporting intervals to facilitate the exchange of information.
  - Developing a resource inventory of EU domestic and international activities in cooperation with the U.S. This inventory includes organizations, institutions, and available technical experts responsible for monitoring and controlling communicable diseases. The focus is also on coordinating and evaluating results of assessments for local and national capacity of infectious disease surveillance in developing African countries.
  - Developing a "white paper" on clinical research training in emerging infectious diseases. This was discussed at a U.S.-E.U. meeting in Luxembourg, September 22-23, 1997.
  - Colloquium on Ebola virus research held September 4-7, 1996 in Antwerp. (See Appendix I.)
  - International conference on malaria held in Dakar in January 1997.

- **Asian-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC).** The U.S. introduced the first-ever health initiative, one related to EIDs, into APEC through the Science and Technology Ministerial in 1995. The first project involved the development and application of a self-assessment survey to evaluate each economy's capabilities to address EIDs and identify strengths and areas that need improvement. Support for this area of cooperation was
echoed at the Science and Technology Ministerial in 1996, and a workshop was held in the autumn of 1997 to draft a framework for cooperation and self-action.

c. **Bilateral Initiatives**

**U.S.-South Africa Binational Commission.**

- CDC is in the early stages of providing in-country training in surveillance and applied epidemiology within the new government structure, expanding the public health infrastructure to include the entire country.

- Representatives from South Africa participated in CDC’s annual Distance Learning Conference, which focuses on technology aspects of distance learning, such as computer- and satellite-based technologies.

- NIAID organized with partners in South Africa a consultation consisting of seminars, site visits, and a grantsmanship workshop in key areas identified by South African investigators, including HIV/AIDS, TB, malaria, arboviruses, and antimicrobial drug resistance. As a result, Secretary Shalala announced that NIAID will develop a special relationship with South Africa on EIDs and HIV/AIDS.

- HHS will collaborate with the South African Department of Health to establish a new school of public health in South Africa.

**U.S.-Russia Commission on Economic and Technological Cooperation**

- CDC, FDA, and USAID are collaborating on preventing HIV/AIDS and assisting in outbreak response and vaccine quality control to diphtheria in the Russian Federation.

- Complementary to activities formally addressed under this agreement, CDC and FDA have provided U.S.-based and in-country training in applied epidemiology and regulatory quality control to approximately 90 Russians since 1993.

- NIH co-sponsored and co-organized a U.S.-Russia Workshop on EIDs held in St. Petersburg, Russia on December 8-11, 1996, on HIV/AIDS, hemorrhagic fevers, insect borne viruses, and vaccine-preventable viral conditions. At least twelve applications on EIDs were submitted for Civilian Research and Development Foundation funding as a result of the workshop, of which five were funded. In addition, the Ministry of Science subsequently announced the establishment and funding of an EIDS Vaccine Initiative (“Vaccines for Future Generations”).

**U.S.-Japan Common Agenda.**

- The U.S. and Japan agreed to collaborate in four key areas: (1) dengue and dengue
hemorrhagic fever (DHF); (2) antimicrobial resistance; (3) acute respiratory infections (ARIs); and (4) *E. coli* O157:H7 and related foodborne pathogens.

- International conferences on EID research and science policy were held in Tokyo in July 1996, Bangkok in March 1997, and Baltimore in June 1997.

- A team from CDC and FDA participated in a cooperative investigation of an outbreak of *E. coli* O157:H7 in Tokyo during the summer of 1996.

- The Japanese Ministry of Health assigned a staff member to serve as an EIS officer at CDC in 1997.

- NIH continues to co-organize and participate in the U.S.-Japan Cooperative Medical Sciences Program, which sponsors annual scientific conferences in the areas of acute respiratory diseases, tuberculosis, diarrheal diseases, hepatitis, parasitic diseases, and others.

**Central Asia Initiatives.**

- USAID has provided assistance to all 5 republics within Central Asia to strengthen national immunization and disease control programs. Specific activities and results to date in Kyrgyzstan include the reduced incidence of diphtheria by 40% (from 545 cases in 1995 to 328 cases in 1996) and no new polio cases reported in 1996. Future efforts focus on increasing capacity for infectious disease surveillance information, control, and management, with particular emphasis on TB, hepatitis, and STDs.

- In Ukraine, USAID provided 32 million doses of diphtheria vaccine in 1994 and is continuing to assist the Ministry of Health to control the diphtheria epidemic. As a result, in part, of these efforts, diphtheria incidence nationwide in 1996 was dramatically below 1995 levels.

**Other Overseas Capacity Strengthening Activities.**

- **Training in the NIS.** In the Newly Independent States (NIS), USAID and CDC have improved national surveillance capacity through training and technical assistance. Accomplishments to date include the publishing of epidemiological surveillance bulletins in eight republics and training of 180 public health officials, representing eleven republics, in applied epidemiology and scientific communications.

- **Controlling Hospital-based Infections in the NIS.** In the NIS, the USAID/American International Health Alliance's medical partnerships program is improving hospital-based infection control policies and procedures, which will result in decreased nosocomial infections. AIHA is also assisting the NIS Ministries of Health to develop national infection control programs, basic infection controls courses for health professionals,
training of trainers models, and standardized protocols for infection control surveys.

- **EID Conference in Bangkok, Thailand.** NIAID co-sponsored and co-organized with the International Medical Center of Japan an international conference on Emerging Infectious Diseases held in Bangkok, Thailand in March 1997, which focused on dengue, antibiotic resistance, and enterohemorrhagic *E. coli* in the Asia-Pacific basin. See previous page.

- **Malaria Conference in Dakar, Senegal.** The FIC and NIAID, co-organized and co-sponsored with European partners and African scientists an International Conference on Malaria in Africa, held in Dakar, Senegal on January 6-9, 1997. The conference resulted in a set of recommendations aimed at stimulating collaborative malaria research efforts between Northern and Southern scientists. A follow-on meeting of representatives from science agencies, development agencies, pharmaceutical companies, the African scientific community and others was held in July 1997 in the Hague. See page 16.

- **International Conference on Improving Use of Medicines (ICIUM).** USAID supported the first ICIUM conference in April 1997 in Malaysia, in collaboration with INCLEN and other organizations. Some 272 attendees from forty-six different countries deliberated on points of common interest for making more effective use of pharmaceutical resources, especially related to antimicrobials, in developing countries.

- **Country self-assessments.** EID Task Force members developed a standardized questionnaire for countries to use to assess their own current priorities, capacity and needs, and thus as a basis for planning their own focused capacity strengthening activities. This tool was distributed on a pilot basis to all countries/economies within APEC plus South Africa and Vietnam. Specific progress includes: collaboration with the Philippines and Vietnam in epidemiology training and laboratory based surveillance; the establishment by CDC-Rockefeller of a Public Health School Without Walls in Vietnam; and collaborations with Bangladesh related to *E. coli* and cholera.

- **Internet resources.** Based on EID self-assessments completed by eight countries, CDC developed a notebook of Internet resources related to the six highest priority diseases (TB, HIV/AIDS, dengue, malaria, hepatitis, STDs), in key capacity development categories for each: clinical, laboratory, treatment/therapy, epidemiology/surveillance, control/prevention. More than fifty notebooks have been distributed to overseas collaborators. An APEC Emerging Infections Network was also established in 1997.

- **Field Epidemiology Training Programs.** In late June 1997, CDC and WHO convened a meeting of worldwide FETP directors to begin to strengthen networking of these national epidemiology training programs in support of ERED activities. An FETP Secretariat will be established to institutionalize this important network.

- **Ebola Diagnosis.** The FIC, through an administrative supplement to Yale University and to U.C. Berkeley, has provided training in Ebola virus diagnosis and research for
scientists from Central African Republic, Cote d'Ivoire, and Gabon.

- **Regional Capacity Building.** A collaborative effort began at U.S. Naval Medical Research Unit No. 3 (NAMRU-3) in Cairo to conduct special research projects and to help build regional capacity to monitor and respond to emerging infectious diseases. CDC has placed an expert at NAMRU-3 to collaborate on these activities. NIAID provided grant supplements to several projects, including its International Collaborations for Infectious Diseases Research, to expand collaborative research on emerging diseases in developing countries.

- **Meningitis Epidemiology.** Provision of instructors and educational materials for WHO/AFRO-sponsored training courses in meningitis epidemiology, in Nigeria, Niger, Chad, Burkina Faso, and Mali, in December 1996. (NIH, CDC, USAID)

- **Laboratory Training on Diagnosis of Meningitis.** Provision of instructors and educational materials for WHO/EMRO-sponsored laboratory training courses on diagnosis of meningitis, in seven of the most populated EMRO countries, in early 1997. (NIH, CDC, USAID)

- **USAID provides support to several WHO programs related to infectious diseases.** This includes support for global programs on acute respiratory infections, children's vaccine development, diarrheal diseases, TB, malaria, and onchocerciasis.

- USAID also collaborates with and supports UNICEF on many fronts for the prevention and control of childhood infectious diseases, and USAID provides a substantial portion of the financing and other support for UNAIDS and the WHO GPA for the prevention of HIV transmission.

d. **Coordination with WHO**

- **International Health Regulations.** In 1996, U.S. health experts met with their international counterparts at WHO to draft a plan of action for revising the International Health Guidelines (IHR), basing them on disease syndromes rather than on specific diseases.

- **Networking the WHO Collaborating Centers.** The EID Task Force members collaborated with WHO, PAHO, and the National Council for International Health (NCIH) to help strengthen networking among similar WHO Collaborating Centres worldwide (e.g., network of polio reference laboratories, network of applied epidemiology training programs).

- **Regional Inventories of resources.** Inventories of resources for combating infectious diseases were completed by the Pan American Health Organization (WHO/PAHO), the Southeast Asia Regional Office (WHO/SEARO), the Eastern Mediterranean Regional Office (WHO/EMRO) and the Western Pacific Regional Office (WHO/WEPRO) in 1996.
Other joint activities with WHO:

(CDC support for specific WHO Collaborating Centres is attached as Appendix II.)

- Through the Gorgas Institute at the Univ. of Alabama, USAID will support WHO/PAHO’s program for the surveillance and study of pneumococcal pathogens in Latin America. The information will greatly enhance knowledge about increasing antibiotic resistance, as well as options for the development of effective vaccines for controlling pneumococcal pneumonia, meningitis, and other illnesses.

- Strengthening of twenty-two U.S.-based WHO Collaborating Centers (WHOCCs), which help diagnose diseases and control outbreaks around the world (see appendix). A new WHOCC on Control of Epidemic Meningitis was established at CDC in 1996, and a Center on Clostridium botulinum has been proposed.

- Demonstration project on meningococcal disease in Sub-Saharan Africa. This project was initiated in Summer 1996, to improve detection and control of meningitis epidemics, and as of June 1997, significant progress has been reported.

- Procedures manual on the availability of emergency medical products (see above).

- Setting of standards for global surveillance of antimicrobial resistance. WHO is revising its program to monitor antimicrobial resistance [now called Antimicrobial Resistance Monitoring (ARM)]. In addition, CDC is working with WHO/EMC to assess the diagnostic proficiency of the laboratories that use WHONET to track the spread of drug-resistant microbes. WHO/EMRO has also established an industry working group on antimicrobial resistance. At the group's request, WHO/EMC is planning to set up a strain bank to provide bacterial strains and laboratory reagents that are not commercially available.

- FDA provided technical leadership and expertise in setting standards for vaccines and other biological products.

- Planning of projects on global communications and regional S&R centers. The CISET agencies are providing support and assistance to WHO/EMC in its current efforts to improve global health communications (see above) and build regional centers for surveillance and control of infectious diseases. WHO/EMC is sponsoring the development of sub-regional teams, or “hubs”, for disease surveillance, outbreak control, training in laboratory diagnostics, and epidemiological and operational research.

- CDC has assigned an expert on Arboviruses and Hemorrhagic Fever to WHO to help develop capacity to respond to outbreaks in these disease areas.
• The Abidjan-based WHO/AFRO-USAID-EU program's mission is to improve responses to epidemic outbreaks in western Africa, including the control of yellow fever, cholera, meningitis, and measles.

• The Harare-based WHO/AFRO-USAID-CDC project involves surveillance for cholera, dysentery, and other diarrheal diseases in southern Africa.

• FDA collaborates with FAO in giving training on detection and control of foodborne pathogens in several countries.
Appendix I

Selected Workshops and Conferences.

- In the Fall of 1996, NIH sponsored a workshop on human ehrlichiosis.

- In September 1996, NIH, CDC, OIRH/DHHS, USAMRIID, WHO, and the Institute of Tropical Medicine in Antwerp sponsored a major scientific meeting in Antwerp on the Ebola virus, filoviruses, and lessons learned from Kikwit.

- CDC, along with its French counterparts, sponsored the 2nd annual workshop on "Molecular Epidemiology and Evolutionary Genetics of Pathogenic Microorganisms" in Montpelier, France, May 26-28, 1997.

- NIH, State, and international partners co-sponsored a U.S.-Mexico-Canada Research Development Workshop on Emerging Infectious Diseases in September, 1997. The workshop focused on improving research cooperation on this topic among the NAFTA partners.

- NIAID, in cooperation with the Embassy of Italy and visiting Italian scientists at NIH, held a conference in May 1997 to consider critical areas for research cooperation on emerging infectious diseases.

- NIAID convened a workshop on drug resistance in Staphylococcus aureus in response to recent isolation of strains with reduced vancomycin susceptibility; experts from CDC and FDA participated in discussions about research needs in this area.

- NASA, CDC, DOD, and NIH participated in the American Society of Microbiologists meeting to define a research agenda on climate variability and human health.

- In September 1997, NASA participated in an international workshop on disease surveillance and monitoring in Rostock, Germany. As an outcome of this meeting, NASA is now working with WHO's Paris-based FluNet, providing climate data sets to assist in modeling relationships between weather parameters and the migration of influenza across Europe.

- Working with the Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene, NASA is developing data sets for a conference-long training session at the European Congress on Tropical Medicine planned for September 1998 in Liverpool. NASA plans to maximize the use of remote sensing products from its 1997 and 1998 missions for the study of climate change and human health.

- The Electric Power Research Institute commissioned a workshop on "Climate Change and Vector Borne and Infectious Diseases" in September 1997, cosponsored by NASA,
NIAID, NIEHS, and DOE, to identify major research gaps and to outline a major research agenda to provide a sound scientific basis for public policy debates and decisions.

- FDA conducted workshops and a public meeting on Cyclospora cayetanensis foodborne outbreaks and research.
Appendix II

Enhancement of the Surveillance and Response Capacities at WHO Collaborating Centers

In 1996, CDC conducted a review of the thirty WHO Collaborating Centers located within the National Center for Infectious Diseases. Based on this evaluation, a total of $800,000 was provided to strengthen fourteen of the Centers. The program was expanded in 1997, with $2,000,000 allocated to strengthen eight additional Centers, to expand high-priority activities, and to foster collaboration with other Centers around the world.

Projects funded in 1996-1997 include:

WHO Collaborating Center for Arthropod-Borne Viruses, Western Hemisphere. Partial support for expanded production and distribution of reagents for arthropod-borne viruses; re-development of laboratory surveillance for Venezuelan equine encephalitis (VEE) in sentinel laboratories in Central America; re-establish expertise in arbovirology in the areas of diagnosis, surveillance, epidemiology and entomology with the Uganda Virus Research Institute.

WHO Collaborating Center for Leptospirosis. Provide basic terms of reference for surveillance and diagnosis of Leptospirosis, diagnostic development, reagent production and technical transfer.

WHO Collaborating Center for Malaria Control in Africa. Study of multi-drug resistant malaria and testing newly-developed drugs and new drug combinations; production and distribution of the sporozoite ELISA reagents.

WHO Collaborating Center for Research and Reagents for Human Immunoglobulin Subclasses. Implement a tracking and monitoring system for reagents and other collaborating center services.

WHO Collaborating Center for Mycoses in North America. Provide basic terms of reference for diagnostics and specimen tracking systems for mycoses.

WHO Collaborating Center for Surveillance, Epidemiology and Control of Influenza. Update influenza reagent kit with Influenza A subtyping monoclonal antibodies and ensure worldwide availability.

WHO Collaborating Center for Reference and Research on Plague Control. Develop capacity to provide rapid sample analyses for plague surveillance and outbreak investigations and support molecular epidemiology and training activities. Conduct collaborative research and training on plague prevention in China.

WHO Collaborating Center for Reference and Research on Rabies. Update and maintain lyssavirus collection; produce and distribute reagents including monoclonal antibodies.
WHO Collaborating Center for Evaluating and Testing New Insecticides. Provide technical support for chemical and biological assays used in evaluating compounds in current and new delivery modes for use in malaria strategies. Investigate discriminating dosages for five pyrethroid insecticides using laboratory maintained vectors to establish a base line for pyrethroid resistance.

WHO Collaborating Center for Antimicrobial Resistance. Provide quality control and proficiency testing strains to participants in the global WHONET surveillance system.

WHO Collaborating Center for Research, Training, and Eradication of Dracunculiasis. Stop dracunculiasis transmission in Chad, Senegal, Cameroon, and Yemen by the end of 1997 and reduce to less than 100 cases in Mauritania and Ethiopia.

WHO Collaborating Center for Rickettsia and Rickettsial Diseases. Update rickettsial culture collection, produce and distribute reagents and form a network of collaborators through training of international investigators for rickettsial diagnosis.

WHO Collaborating Center for Shigella. Transfer sustainable technology and expertise for Shigella to southern Africa region.

WHO Collaborating Center for Respiratory Viruses Other than Influenza. Provide support for antigenic characterization of group A and B RSV and sequencing studies of para-influenza type 3.

WHO Collaborating Center for Viral Hemorrhagic Fevers. Produce viral hemorrhagic fever reagent and further develop and distribute immunological and molecular approaches to identify viral causes of fatal illness.


WHO Collaborating Center for Measles Virus Diagnostics. Transfer the capability to perform the capture IgM EIA virus isolation to at least those African laboratories involved in Polio eradication.

WHO Collaborating Center for Foodborne Disease Surveillance. Develop, produce and distribute reagents for a new food-borne disease laboratory network. Establish a national network and database for molecular subtyping of E. coli 0157:H7 isolates.

WHO Collaborating Center for Prevention and Control of Epidemic Meningitis. Develop a sustainable, national and sub-regional laboratory capacity for neisseria meningitides in Sub-Saharan Africa.
Collaborating Center for Vibrio cholerae 01 and 0139. Meet basic terms of reference for diagnostics, susceptibility testing and molecular and subtyping assays for Vibrio cholerae 01 and 0139.

WHO Collaborating Center for Clostridium botulinum (Proposed). Meet basic terms of reference for diagnostics, toxicity testing, reagents and antitoxin testing for Clostridium botulinum.

WHO Collaborating Center for Control and Elimination of Lymphatic Filariasis. Study distribution and magnitude of Lymphatic Filariasis problem in Americas and establish and coordinate rapid assessment, control and laboratory training activities.

WHO Collaborating Center for Cysticercosis. Meet basic terms of reference for WHO Collaborating Center for Cysticercosis by providing reference sera from humans and pigs infected with different stages of the disease and provide reference diagnostic tests including standardized conjugates and antigen.
Fast Track -- 10/6 Rhetoric...

Elevate the Debate

• This is a vote about America's future: Will we continue to lead the world or will we cede leadership to others. In the post Cold War era trade is increasingly important in defining strategic relationships

• The trade agenda immediately in front of us requires fast track. We go to APEC in two weeks to expand the ITA and launch negotiations in other areas where the U.S. leads the world. We need fast track to move ahead in all of them. At the WTO, we have negotiations ahead in services and agriculture that require fast track.

• This is a vote about America's national interest and our role in the world. A “no” vote does not protect one job and does nothing to protect the environment or raise labor standards. It gives our competitors an “E-ticket” to march ahead in defining preferential trade agreements in their interest and against our interest.

Comments that summarize the debate...

The debate has skewed what fast track is really about: In the real world, this is about whether America sets the rules for trade [on terms favorable to U.S. workers and companies], or goes to the sidelines. It is that simple.

This is a debate between those that see a strong America, [an economy as strong as it's been in more than twenty years, low unemployment, and high growth], and those who see an America in decline in spite of all the evidence. It is a battle of hope and drive, versus fear and retreat.

Critics of this legislation are more than willing to make “the perfect” labor and environmental goals the enemy of progress on trade, labor, and environmental concerns. Opponents would hold America's trade agenda hostage to environmental and labor objectives that are unattainable. The end result of their strategy is oh-for-three. [It is uncontestable that that this Administration has done more than any other to advance labor and environmental objectives as part of the trade agenda].

About the trade agenda...

We have sought broad, future-oriented goals in legislation [consistent with prior fast track mandates]. The reason is simple: We have an entrepreneurial trade agenda that
is focused on those areas where we are the most competitive economy in the world.

Fast track is a make it here, sell it there strategy. Our market is already open. Without fast track, we are telling the rest of the world to go ahead without us. It makes no sense. Defeating fast track is unilateral economic disarmament.

**Gephardt comments...**

**G:** "Trade has benefitted the fortunate few..."

**A:** Reality: Trade is lower prices, more choices, and more opportunity for consumers and workers. America is just 4% of the world's population, the only way we lose is if we are not in the game. [quote actually references disparity between industrialized and developing world]

**G:** "Republicans rejected a Democratic amendment that would have simply allowed the President to negotiate on labor and environmental issues..."

**A:** The fast track proposal in Congress gives the President every tool he needs [to continue to make progress on labor and environmental issues]. The opponents prescription is unworkable and unrealistic. It is a poison pill in trade negotiations that would only steer our trading partners to Japan, Europe, and even Canada. We lose the business and we lose any chance of progress on other issues.

**G:** These fast track proposals won't ensure that trade will build a bridge to the future...

**A:** The opponents are seeking a tunnel to the past. The global economy is here. We are the most competitive economy in the world. We can neither run nor hide from the global economy. Fast track is a tool to compete. All the opponents offer is retreat.

**G:** The benefits of more open trade have not trickled down to middle class citizens and workers struggling to get into the middle class.

**A:** Trade brings growth and economic expansion. At home, history shows us that whenever we turn away from the world -- from Smoot-Hawley to the recession of '91 -- our workers and families suffer most. Abroad, the most dramatic expansion of the middle class is occurring in countries that are opening their markets and committing to American-style deregulation. Why would we turn back now?

**G:** A central component of our trade policy must be the enforcement of workers rights/environmental laws.

**A:** The bills in Congress meet this goal with clearly enforceable measures. We have specifically targeted child labor practices. If the goal is really to elevate workplace conditions and living standards, disengaging on trade is the worst possible solution. Who takes the place of the United States? [We have done more to advance this
agenda in five years than ever before.]

G: Let's understand that as the Administration has touted the more than 200 separate trade agreements that have been signed, only 2 were reached with the benefit of fast track authority.

A: The trade agenda ahead of us is an entrepreneurial agenda to make new markets for American goods and services. The trade agenda immediately ahead of us requires fast track authority. We cannot stand still or the rest of the world will pass by. There is almost no product in the world today made in only one place. Moving ahead without fast track is as the President said, "an America last" strategy.

G: NAFTA, NAFTA, NAFTA...

A: Not one of the issues from the trade gap to the border environment to immigration would be better today without NAFTA. There is not one issue where we would be better off today without NAFTA. NAFTA is a foundation for progress on a range of concerns with Mexico.
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Tony, This is the e-mail I mentioned. I'll send you some numbers ASAP.

Joe Bouchard

-----Original Message-----
From: Bell, Robert G.
Sent: Thursday, January 08, 1998 1:40 PM
To: Bouchard, Joseph F.; Leavy, David C.
Subject: RE: 99 Budget [UNCLASSIFIED]

I think the main thematic point POTUS/we need to get across to Congress this year can be captured in one sentence (albeit a long one):

Congress MUST approve our proposals for far-reaching business practice and acquisition system reforms AND additional base closings IF we are to produce the SAVINGS we must have to (a) maintain a force structure large enough to underpin our strategy of global engagement, (b) continue to give high-priority to readiness, training, and quality of life improvements and (c) procure the modernized weapons systems and equipment necessary to "transform" and "revolutionize" our military for the 21st century.

-----Original Message-----
From: Bouchard, Joseph F.
Sent: Thursday, January 08, 1998 10:48 AM
To: Leavy, David C.
Cc: Bell, Robert G.
Subject: RE: 99 Budget [UNCLASSIFIED]

David, I put in your box in 379 a copy of the draft OMB write-up of the Defense section of the FY-99 President's Budget. I highlighted what's "new" in it. If the Defense budget is mentioned in the State of the Union address, it must include a statement that readiness remains the top defense priority. It should mention that the FY-99 budget implements the QDR (that comes through clearly in the draft OMB write-up). Please feel free to call me if you'd like to discuss further.

Joe Bouchard

-----Original Message-----
From: Leavy, David C.
Sent: Tuesday, January 06, 1998 11:34 AM
To: @DEFENSE - Defense Policy
Cc: @PLANNING - Strat Plan & Comm
Subject: 99 Budget [UNCLASSIFIED]

Bob-as part of our planning efforts for the coming year and for the run-up to the State of the Union and budget release we wanted to get a sense of what potential news nuggets were included in the defense budget. For example, are there any new areas of expenditure that should be highlighted prior to the release of the budget? Are there any new programs or initiatives that could be packaged/folded into a larger message? thanks
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NATO Enlargement.
It is my goal to help build an undivided, democratic, and peaceful Europe. Toward that end, the enlargement of NATO to new members has been one of my top foreign policy objectives.

The enlargement of NATO is in the national security interest of the United States. Our security is inextricably linked with Europe; history has proven that an unstable Europe can cost American lives. Through enlargement, NATO can do for Europe's East what it did for the West: control local rivalries, strengthen democracy against future threats, and create the conditions for prosperity to flourish.

We will not allow enlargement to dilute the military effectiveness of the Alliance. From day one, an enlarged NATO will be able to meet its Article V commitment of collective defense. Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic will not just be consumers of security by the United States, but producers of a more secure Europe.

Adding new members to NATO involves amending the North Atlantic Treaty, with the advice and consent of the Senate. But to properly implement this important initiative we must have the support of both houses of Congress, and of the American people. For if the expansion of security guarantees to new allies is to be meaningful, it must represent an expression of informed national will. I ask for your support.

Bosnia. [rev. 98-01-13]
In Bosnia, progress toward peace and stability has been substantial—the terrible fighting has been halted for more than two years there are signs of recovery in the war-devastated economy, several rounds of peaceful elections have been held, there are areas of refugee return and more individuals indicted for war crimes are facing justice before the International Tribunal in the Hague.

The US-led Stabilization Force in Bosnia continues to demonstrate the highly effective cooperation among the NATO allies, Partnership-For-Peace members, Russia, and other countries that will be so fundamental to the post-Cold War world.

Our focus now must be on how we can shape a follow-on security presence in Bosnia that will build upon our accomplishments and take us further down the path to a self-sustaining peace. We have a long term political and economic commitment to Bosnia because it is in the best interests of the United States to do so. It is imperative that we stay the course to give the
people of Bosnia -- especially the children -- the opportunity for a bright future.

Iraq.
In Iraq, Saddam Hussein continues to be a threat. He must be prevented from being able to threaten his neighbors and the world community with weapons of mass destruction. Let me be clear: we have no quarrel with the Iraqi people; indeed, we favor more food-for-oil. But we will insist that the UN Special Commission have the free access they need to verify that Saddam is keeping the commitments he has made to the world community. We will not accept SH defying measures implementing the ban on WMD. We support diplomatic resolution of the issues that have arisen, but we are prepared to use military force if, by his defiance of measures directed against weapons of mass destruction, Saddam makes that necessary.

QDR.
The Defense Department's Quadrennial Defense Review provided the blueprint we need to maintain America's unsurpassed military capabilities. During that review our defense leaders highlighted a fundamental challenge for the Nation: to be capable of shaping the security environment and responding to the full spectrum of crisis in the near term while at the same time transforming our military forces to meet the challenges of an uncertain future. I remain committed to a strong defense and believe the decisions reached in the Quadrennial Defense Review put us on the right path to meet both our current and future security challenges.

Information Assurance. [rev 1/13]
In the information age we must have confidence that our information will be both secure and available when needed. When conducting electronic commerce we also need to know with whom we are dealing, for there are risks out on the networks. The Administration is moving aggressively to address these risks, which are intimately linked to issues such as critical infrastructure protection, electronic commerce, and future advances in information technology. However, government cannot do it all. Only a cooperative approach by the public and private sectors can reconcile the many competing interests to provide the security required today and tomorrow. We have made significant progress towards a balanced policy that supports the interests of individuals, business, public safety and national security, but more remains to be done. Later this year I will introduce an integrated program to protect our critical national infrastructures, and hope to see the Congress pass supporting legislation during this session.
Tony –

Per our conversation, please find attached suggested foreign policy subjects/themes for the State of the Union.

I'll let you know if Secretary Albright or others have any additional comments.
State Department Recommendations for the State of the Union
Subjects and Themes

Subjects:

Essential to include:

1) East Asia financial crisis
2) Iraq
3) Middle East
4) Bosnia
5) NATO enlargement
6) UN arrears
7) Weapons of Mass Destruction
8) Fast Track

Worthwhile to include:

1) China
2) Russia
3) Central Asia
4) Global threats, including drugs, terror, environment

Suggested Themes for Selected Issues.

General:

Increasingly, today, Americans live global lives.

We compete in a global workplace and do business in a global market.

We travel further and more often than any prior generation.

We see advanced technology creating not only new wonders, but new dangers as national borders become less important.

We are finding new opportunities in the fast-paced, high-skilled economy of the future, and new challenges in the global threats of terror, proliferation, pollution, disease and transnational crime.

We are learning that what happens today "over there"—on the far side of the globe—can affect the quality of our lives "back here" in sudden and unpredictable ways.
Most Americans do not think of the United States as just another country. We want America to be strong and respected. And we want that strength and respect to carry throughout the world and to continue as far as the mind can imagine.

Considering all this, one thing should be clear. The success or failure of American foreign policy is not only relevant to our lives; it will be a determining factor in the quality of our lives.

The purposes of that policy are enduring: to ensure that our country is safe, free and prosperous. This century has taught us that we can best achieve these goals by working with others on behalf of peace, liberty and economic growth across the globe—a connection that will grow in importance in the new century.

Today, America’s leadership is extending the frontiers of peace—by adapting NATO, implementing the Dayton accords, reducing the chance that nuclear weapons will fall into the wrong hands and encouraging reconciliation on the Korean Peninsula.

America’s leadership is extending the frontiers of prosperity—by keeping our own fiscal house in order, working to spur reform and rebuild confidence in the shaken economies of East Asia, and helping others find the path to prosperity through open markets and free enterprise.

And America’s leadership is extending the frontiers of freedom by lending a hand to new democracies and encouraging every nation on every continent to place their faith in democratic principles.

Around the world, we are striving with others to see that the forces of change that affect us all end up bringing us all closer together around basic principles of democracy, open markets, law and a commitment to peace.

Financial Crisis.

In the new year, we will be working, as a matter of highest priority, with the IMF, the private sector and governments in East Asia to restore confidence and encourage reforms in the troubled economies there. Because U.S. exports to the region support millions of good American jobs, we have a strong commercial interest in limiting the slowdown in Asia-Pacific economic growth. We also have a strong security interest, for this region is home to some of our closest allies—including Japan and the Republic of Korea. The goal of our efforts is complete recovery—as soon as possible.
Iraq.

In the Gulf, we must--and we will--maintain our vigilance, because for seven years, through two Presidencies and four Congresses, our bipartisan message to Saddam Hussein has not changed: meet your obligations and the UN sanctions will be lifted; fail to do so and sanctions will remain; but, in any event, be sure of this, you will never again threaten Iraq’s neighbors with aggression or the world with weapons of mass destruction.
Middle East.

Because it is in our interests, and because it is right, we will strive to make this fiftieth year of modern Israel's existence a year in which decisive steps towards lasting peace are made. We know by now that security and peace are not separable; and that the only path to a decent future for Israelis, Palestinians and Arabs alike is the path of peace. (update based on meetings).

Bosnia.

I will also be asking your support this year for a continued effort, in partnership with more than two dozen other countries, to implement the Dayton accords in Bosnia. Shortly before Christmas, I went there with former Senator Dole and some of you to visit our troops and to talk frankly with local leaders.

We found a nation that remains deeply divided, but which has also made great strides since the days of siege and savagery. Slowly, the infrastructure of peace is taking shape and the psychology of reconciliation is taking hold.

The Bosnian people and their partners have a broad agenda for the coming year--to strengthen multi-ethnic institutions that are now beginning to function, assist refugees who are now returning home, help local economies that are now starting to recover, and back the War Crimes Tribunal which has now begun to make its presence felt in the cause of justice and the pursuit of truth. As the elements of a new Bosnia come together, the evidence is strong, that if we persevere, progress towards a lasting peace will be sustained.

But if we withdraw now, as some urge, the confidence we are building would erode, the fragile institutions of democracy would collapse, and a return to war would be likely. That is why we must allow our mission to determine the timetable, not the other way around.

To give up on Bosnia now would be to throw away the progress Americans have helped Bosnians to achieve and squander the sacrifices our armed forces, diplomats and private citizens have made. It would abandon those throughout the country who believe in tolerance, democracy and respect for human rights; it would rob another generation of Bosnian children of the chance to be children; and it would give a green light to criminals, dictators and apostles of hate.

Quitting is not the American way. We should continue to help Bosnians as long as our help is needed, our allies and friends are doing their share, and Bosnians are striving to help themselves. That is the right thing to do. And it is the smart thing--for it is the
only way to ensure that when our troops leave Bosnia, they leave for good.

NATO Enlargement.

(recommended language provided separately by Jeremy Rosner)

United Nations Arrears.

I ask you tonight to make 1998 the year we make good on the debts we owe to the United Nations and other international organizations. Currently, we are $1 billion behind in our payments. This hurts America and it places a burden on our friends that we would not tolerate if it were placed on us.

We have critical business to conduct in these organizations: keeping the heat on Saddam Hussein; denying weapons of mass destruction to rogue states; preserving peace in the Balkans; punishing the perpetrators of genocide; and safeguarding the rights and safety of Americans who travel or do business overseas. If we fail to pay, we will lose influence over policy, lose leverage over reform, and run the risk of losing our vote in the General Assembly and other bodies.

Last year, thanks to leaders especially in the Senate, we came close to approving a bill that would have moved us in the right direction. Failure to enact it has cost us. Inaction this year would be unacceptable. The best America is a leader, not a debtor. We have an obligation that we must meet, to abide by rules we helped write, as members of organizations we helped build, in pursuit of goals such as law, peace and prosperity that Americans deeply support.

Weapons of Mass Destruction.

We must work to ensure that this century is the last to see a nuclear arms race. I have underscored to Russia the importance of Duma approval of START II, after which President Yeltsin and I will immediately begin to negotiate deeper reductions in a START III agreement. In this next phase, we will be working for the first time to eliminate warheads, not just the missiles and bombers that carry them. And we will be pursuing transparency measures that should allow us to make headway on the “loose nukes” problem that is such a serious cause for concern.

Last September, I submitted for Senate approval the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, outlawing all nuclear explosions. We have stopped nuclear explosive testing; it is in our interest to enforce the same restraint throughout the world. The CTBT will help to prevent a new arms race, and erect another strong barrier against the spread of
nuclear weapons. I ask the Senate's early approval of this treaty sought by American presidents since Dwight Eisenhower.

Meanwhile, the danger of use of weapons of mass destruction by terrorists or others has increased. Last year, thanks to your bipartisan support, the United States joined the Chemical Weapons Convention as an original party. This year, we must intensify our efforts to make the Biological Weapons Convention a truly effective tool against those who would use dread diseases as instruments of war.

China.

While we will continue to pursue our concerns about human rights practices in China, and about the growing imbalance in our trade, the overall trend in our relationship is positive. During the summit last October, President Jiang Zemin and I agreed to work together more closely to control the spread of weapons of mass destruction and to fight drug trafficking, terrorism and international crime. I will look to Congress this year to encourage further progress by supporting the U.S.-China agreement on peaceful nuclear cooperation and maintaining normal trade relations.

Russia.

I will be seeking your help as we enter a new and critical phase in our relationship with democratic Russia, as we encourage that great nation's modern aspirations, while counseling it to reject outdated fears.

This year, we seek progress in Russia's integration into a democratic Europe, in further reducing the risks and size of our nuclear arsenals, in halting proliferation, and consolidating the rule of law.

Central Asia-Caucasus.

We will have an opportunity this year—which we should seize—to help consolidate security and stability in the vast region of Asia from Turkey to China and from Siberia to the Himalayas. By taking an active leadership role, we can help nations to resolve long-festering conflicts and to harness their vast energy and mineral resources as the engine of regional cooperation and economic growth.

Drugs.

To safeguard the health of our children and reduce the threat of violence in our streets, I will propose at the Summit of the Americas in April, a new hemispheric alliance against those who
produce, transport, sell, or profit from trafficking in illegal drugs.

**Global Climate Change.**

In Kyoto, last month, more than 160 nations agreed to limit emissions of greenhouse gases that are responsible for global climate change. This was a vital and necessary first step. In the months ahead, we will seek to broaden that agreement to include the developing world, whose share of responsibility for greenhouse gas emissions is on the rise and whose participation in the agreement is essential. As a generation, we have few obligations more sacred than to bequeath to our children a healthy planet. So let us vow tonight that before the new century begins, we will have in place an agreement on climate change that is truly global, truly fair and truly effective.
November 21, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: SIDNEY BLUMENTHAL

SUBJECT: Notes on National Interest

In your interview with Michael Oreskes of the Times this evening your responses to his questions were conceptually well formulated, even as you discussed the detail. You talked about the unique security challenges of the 21st century, transnational threats and economic containment in maintaining the coalition. You also spoke of the misinterpretation of a Times analysis of the fast track defeat. The new situation, as you pointed out, demands new ways of thinking. However, such ideas, especially now, should be framed within a more settled foreign policy framework, elements of which, as it happens, the Administration has already defined.

In the immediate wake of the Iraq stand-off, the rightward leaning pundits and foreign policy experts clustered within the Washington-based think tanks and institutes are forming a critical line on the Administration's success. It is that the Administration suffered a failure of nerve to carry through on removing Saddam and, consequently, created an opening for the Russians, allowing them to seize diplomatic room that they had not been permitted during the Gulf War. Perverse as these arguments may be, grandiose goals that were never intended in our policy to justify their chest-thumping postures, they are starting to filter through the op-ed pages and television.

The moment presents the apparent intersection of disparate events: a qualified Iraq success; a potentially undermining right-leaning critique if not met; the APEC conference; and the beginning of the launch of a new domestic agenda. Yet this confluence represents an opportunity to link foreign policy to the national interest, the national interest to economic security, and foreign to domestic policy.

In brief: The security challenges of the 21st century are unique. For more than 50 years, in the Cold War, the US guarded against dangers from weapons of mass destruction. Now, this threat has taken a new form—chemical and biological weapons, as possessed by Saddam, for example. The threat is an unconventional military threat. It also poses an economic threat, not only to the
region, but to the West. Our national interest demanded, in this crisis, a military and diplomatic response; and we understood that by projecting force we were protecting economic security. In the latest Iraq crisis, moreover, the US approach demonstrated our position as the indispensable nation. Only the US could have acted as we did. By acting as the indispensable nation in the crisis, we made it possible for other nations to play useful roles in achieving the tentative resolution. Our force opened the window of diplomacy. If we had not acted as the indispensable nation, the others would not have been provided with the room to operate toward these ends. Our means and ends, therefore, were measured; our military stance leveraged our diplomacy.

Iraq and APEC are new arenas in which our national interest is related. The shifts in the Asian economic markets have made it clear that our national interest is dependent on maintaining economic security. But rather than speaking here about abstract and abstruse concepts of global integration, emphasizing the national interest conveys a hardheaded, pragmatic attitude that tends to neutralize the right, at the same time that equating the national interest with economic security appeals to broad public opinion. In this way, foreign policy can seem to flow logically into the new domestic agenda. We must stabilize markets and open markets precisely in order to gain economic security. If we do not, our national interest will be adversely affected. Threats to national security no longer come from a great power. They come from the new threats of weapons of mass destruction in the hands of rogue tyrants like Saddam and from economic upheavals elsewhere. They are likely to come from countries who may prevent us from exporting our goods, block our resources and thwart the expansion of our growth. We can’t mortgage our future on narrow parochialism because the threats elsewhere can destabilize our national interest. The national interest also requires that we act in concert with others. If we act unilaterally, we will bear alone all the risks. We will needlessly expose, rather than strengthen and protect, our national interest. Here, the relevant issues are UN debts and IMF funding. (National interest and economic security can be conflated sometimes so that they are almost interchangeable phrases.) Maintaining our economic security in the world, then, can be grasped as necessarily connected to a program for economic security at home.

So long as you hold on to the string of the national interest, referring to it as the basis of our foreign policy, you can tie the whole logic together: indispensable nation; economic security; the seamless web of foreign and domestic policies.
From: Hofmann, Karl W.
Sent: Friday, January 23, 1998 1:36 PM
To: @PLANNING - Strat Plan & Comm; @NSA - Natl Security Advisor; @KERRICK INTERAM - Inter-American; @GLOBAL - Global Affairs; @DEMOCRACY - Dem/Human Affairs
Cc: SOU: Southwest Border mention [UNCLASSIFIED]

Diana: This is FYI for Jim.
Tony: Attached is our counter-proposal to the latest ONDCP draft language for the State of the Union re the Southwest border. (I'm faxing you separately the ONDCP language.) We believe McCaffrey's SW Border Initiative remains too ill-defined and controversial within the Administration for mention in the SOU, but, if there must be mention, the attached is what we would favor.

I'm also faxing the ONDCP language and our response to DPC's Elena Kagan, for her info.

Fred Rosa, Scott Busby: FYI.

ONDCP language.doc
In 1997 alone, over 250 million people, 75 million cars and 3.5 million trucks and railcars entered the United States from Mexico legally. This stream of commerce, people and culture represents tremendous economic growth and opportunity for each of our two great nations. But over half the cocaine and marijuana entering the United States overland also crosses this border. Just as we are successfully reducing the demand for drugs at home, we must further stem the flow by land and by sea. Since taking office, my Administration has doubled the size of the Border Patrol, significantly increased commercial inspections, and increased federal counter-drug spending in this region by almost $600 million. This year we will add another 1,000 new Border Patrol and Customs Service agents. We will also continue to develop and deploy the sophisticated new technologies that will speed the movement of legitimate cargo and documented visitors, even as they counter the threat of illegal drugs. Our borders will remain the world's most open to commerce, culture and knowledge, but our technology and vigilance will close the gate on drugs. We can prevail in this struggle.
<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. email</td>
<td>Robert Bell to Steven Andreasen and Anthony Blinken re: State of Union Foreign Policy Section (1 page)</td>
<td>01/26/1998</td>
<td>P1/b(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COLLECTION:**
- Clinton Presidential Records
- National Security Council
- Anthony Blinken (Speechwriting)
  OA/Box Number: 3389

**FOLDER TITLE:**
State of the Union '98 Inserts

**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(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]