

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: salkire@worldbank.org (salkire@worldbank.org [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:26-SEP-2000 11:55:35.00

SUBJECT: Various Prague Articles

TO: FRIDAY%WORLDBANK@worldbank.org (FRIDAY%WORLDBANK@worldbank.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

Frank W. Fountain (CN=Frank W. Fountain/OU=PFIAB/O=EOP [PFIAB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Below please find some various treatments of the Prague meetings and protests in the Times and Economists

As for websites, the main one for Prague is: <http://www.inpeg.org/> (the local version <http://inpeg.ecn.cz/>)

Others: <http://www.destroyimf.org/>
<http://www.50years.org/>
<http://www.brettonwoodsproject.org/>

September 26, 2000

NEWS ANALYSIS

By JOSEPH KAHN

PRAGUE, Sept. 25 Deepa Narayan, a Indian woman with a steely gaze who spends much of her time in the poorest villages on earth, speaks of power, voice and equality as the keys to ending poverty. Keeping men from beating women does far more to raise living standards than any dam project ever did, she argues.

She would make a fine spokeswoman for protesters who plan to blockade World Bank and International Monetary Fund officials in their hotels here on Tuesday, when they hope to send a message that global lending agencies hurt the poor.

But Ms. Narayan, 48, works for the World Bank, and seems to like it there. And therein lies one of messages emerging from the meetings here: the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund are successfully repelling the attacks.

Like those who disrupted the World Trade Organization's meeting in Seattle last year and the bank and the fund's meeting in Washington last spring, the protesters here view the World Bank and the monetary fund as retrograde institutions that carry water for multinational corporations. But increasingly the protesters are aiming at moving targets. The bank and the fund are, by the standards of huge bureaucracies, changing quickly, largely because of outside pressure.

In fact, Ms. Narayan just completed a two-year, two-volume survey of 20,000 people who live on less than \$1 a day. She and others at the bank say the study is one of several revolutionizing who gets the bank's \$30 billion in loans each year.

"I think some of the protests have been helpful in bringing about changes," Ms. Narayan said on the sidelines of the bank's annual meetings here today. "But they are also worrying. You can destroy overnight what has taken so long to build."

Ms. Narayan's study, called "Voices of the Poor," is one example of how James D. Wolfensohn, an American who is the World Bank's president, has tried to reinvent poverty programs. But equally telling is how he and Horst Kohler, the German who is managing director of the I.M.F., have cast themselves as allies of governments and charity groups in poor countries, sometimes taking stands against the rich nations that provide most of their financing.

The Prague meetings may be remembered among globalization experts as the time when the two institutions, so much under attack, managed to gain some footing. Their tormentors on the streets, always at a disadvantage because of their small budgets and mixed messages, seem to be taking the blows.

"Wolfensohn and Kohler have become extremely important allies for us," said Trevor A. Manuel, South Africa's finance minister and the chairman of the Prague meetings. "Our real problem is the U.S., Britain and France. The protesters seem not to understand these things."

He was referring to the reluctance of lawmakers in the rich nations, especially in the United States Congress, to provide more money to the bank and the fund that could be used to relieve the old debts of developing countries.

Mr. Manuel also criticized the reluctance of industrial countries to share power at the two lending agencies. Mr. Wolfensohn and Mr. Kohler have quietly pushed ministers of wealthy nations, especially Europeans, to give up some voting power.

Many critics are actually spending more time inside the Congress Center in Prague than on the streets this year. Mr. Kohler and Mr. Wolfensohn gave entry passes to some 300 charity and watchdog groups so that they could attend the annual meetings, and the outreach seems to be working. Many protesters now call the two lending agencies potential friends or, at worst, ciphers.

"They are civil servants," Ann Pettifor, organizer of the Jubilee 2000 coalition of debt-relief groups, said of Mr. Wolfensohn and Mr. Kohler. "We know who the bad guys are. It's the G-7," referring to the Group of 7, the organization of seven leading economic powers.

To some outside protesters, a mix of anarchists, Marxists, student activists and environmentalists, hers is a distinction without a difference. But their lack of discrimination is a handicap.

Their main protest event is scheduled for Tuesday, when the bank and the fund hold their formal meeting ceremonies. The Group of 7 ministers, including Treasury Secretary Lawrence H. Summers, attended sessions on Saturday at the German Embassy here unhindered. Some ministers have already left.

The bank and the fund, along with the World Trade Organization, make appealing protest targets as symbols of globalization. Their leaders are hand-picked, not elected, and they have historically been secretive. They make tens of billions of dollars of loans each year.

But they are accountable to nations who are members, rich ones most of all, but also poor ones. And, like any bureaucracy, they are scrambling to survive in a new era, making themselves imperfect proxies for multinational corporations or other presumed forces of evil.

Take Mr. Kohler, the new managing director at the fund. He took over the reins of the Washington-based monetary fund at perhaps the low point of its reputation last spring, when it was under attack for mismanaging bailouts in Asia and Russia in recent years.

He quickly departed on what he called a listening tour of 16 developing countries and when he returned he began talking about changes in how the fund makes loans. He says he will streamline the much criticized conditions it attaches to its money.

For instance, when the fund provided \$40 billion in emergency financing to Jakarta during the Asian crisis, it attached a list of more than 100 conditions. It required, for example, that the government disband its clove monopoly and eliminate price subsidies on basic foodstuffs, seen as ways of using the lending as leverage toward a free market.

Mr. Kohler said the conditions went too far, alienating Indonesians. "I will not have another Indonesia," he said.

He also agreed to eliminate a requirement the fund had imposed on Mozambique. There, fund officials had told the government to eliminate import tariffs on sugar, which the government had imposed to help the troubled industry. Mr. Kohler now says he will no longer force developing nations to adopt trade liberalization that rich countries like the United States or those in Europe have not yet undertaken.

At the World Bank, Mr. Wolfensohn routinely points out that almost half the world's population lives on less than \$2 a day. He readily admits that many of the bank's traditional clients have not done much to improve the lives of the poor.

Although Mr. Wolfensohn is a former investment banker, he is proving hard to outflank on the left. He gave Ms. Narayan's team of economists latitude to write what the bank calls its World Development Report, a flagship document that after much internal debate threw stones at the orthodox temple of development economics by challenging the notion that all loans should aim to stimulate growth. Freeing trade, privatizing government companies and limiting government spending were once seen as main ingredients.

The latest report does not attack those ideas. Instead it focuses on "empowering" poor people, addressing dysfunctional family structures, and cutting government middlemen out of aid distribution. It reads like something written by people Mr. Wolfensohn himself once described as the "Berkeley Mafia."

Bank officials promise that their loan portfolio will look radically different in five years, reflecting the report's new priorities. But it already looks quite different than it did when Mr. Wolfensohn took power five years ago when the bank spent one in five of its aid dollars on electrical infrastructure projects. Today that ratio is 1 in 50.

This year the bank is spending hundreds of millions of dollars to fight AIDS and malaria. It has begun a \$500 million pilot program in Indonesia examining how to channel aid directly to villages where poor people live, rather than entrusting authorities to do that for them.

All this talk raises pressure on the bank and the fund to make far more progress in fighting poverty in the next decade than they did during the last, when living conditions for the poor in Africa, the former Soviet Union and much of Latin American actually deteriorated.

But now, at least, the protesters have worthy challengers in the battle for public opinion.

The New York Times on the Web
<http://www.nytimes.com>

Copyright 2000 The New York Times Company

----- Forwarded by Sabina Alkire/Person/World Bank on
09/26/2000 11:35 AM -----

Cecile Fruman
09/26/2000 09:07 AM
Extn: 80166 EAPVP

To: Sabina Alkire, Robert Goodland
cc:

Subject: Economist on anti-globalization

In case you and others in the group have not seen these articles...
----- Forwarded by Cecile Fruman/Person/World Bank on
09/26/2000 09:06 AM -----

Peter L. Stephens
09/25/2000 07:18 AM
Phone: (65) 324-4612 EXTRO

To: Eaprmt, Eapexall
cc:

Subject: Economist on anti-globalization

The following from this week's Economist. Well worth reading.

N30, A16, S11, S26. If you are part of the anti-capitalist resistance, these terms will need no explaining. Each denotes a day of protest against "corporate-led globalisation". First came the World Trade Organisation's ill-fated ministerial meeting in Seattle in November 1999; then the spring meetings of the World Bank and the IMF in April this year; next, the World Economic Forum's gathering in Melbourne on September 11th; and, coming to Prague next week, the main annual meetings of the Bank and the Fund. Each term also connects you to a website where the plans for the demos, and other useful information for would-be protesters, are posted.

The approach is the same every time. A variety of ill-defined and sometimes spontaneous "radical" groups?environmentalists, feminists, anarchists, neo-communists, and assorted non-aligned malcontents, to name only some?join to march on the streets. A "convergence centre" is proposed, usually a disused warehouse. (As The Economist went to press, the Prague venue had not been announced.) This is where protesters are housed and fed (vegan food preferred); and where they receive medical and legal advice, plus training in "non-violent" civil protest.

The lack of hierarchy is ostentatious. The protesters have no leaders. They join small "affinity groups". Despite this, the events are well organised. Possible activities include colourful puppets, street theatre, catchy slogans and lots of noise, and for some (to quote the S26 site) "pickets, occupations of offices, blockades and shutdowns, appropriating and disposing of luxury consumer goods, sabotaging, wrecking or interfering with capitalist infrastructure, [and] appropriating capitalist wealth and returning it to the working people". The immediate aim is to shut down, or at least badly disrupt, the meetings of the global elite. Afterwards, the movement evaporates into cyberspace.

Seattle saw both the birth and, to date, the high point of this new mode of activism. There had been isolated days of anti-corporate protest before, notably in Britain, but the disruption of the WTO gathering, amid street scenes reminiscent of the 1960s, confirmed Seattle's standing as the birthplace of the "backlash against globalisation".
Onward and eastward

If the protest websites and the elite's contingency planners can be believed, Prague may not be far behind. Organised almost exclusively by European activists?the Ruckus Society and other veterans of America's protests do not plan to attend?demos there could prove more disruptive and more violent than anything so far. There will be around 18,000 delegates, financiers and assorted hangers-on; the Czech interior ministry is expecting some 20,000-25,000 protesters (other estimates say 5,000-10,000). Many would-be protesters have already been denied entry at the border. Even so, this could be the biggest invasion of foreigners since the Russian army arrived in 1968. All these elitists and anti-elitists will be crammed together into Prague's warren of narrow winding streets?a tricky situation for the authorities.

The Czech police have been co-operating with the FBI and the British police.

Not noted for restraint, they are inexperienced at dealing peacefully with large-scale protest. Some errant officers have reportedly sent death threats

to protest organisers. Meanwhile, some of the organising websites sound an ominous note. One of them, www.destroyIMF.org, promises a "mass working-class protest", dismissing Seattle as a "passive ideological showpiece". Neo-Nazi skinheads may turn up as well, to fight on one side or the other.

As a result the town is preparing for siege. Schools and theatres have been told to close. Officials have advised those without business in Prague, as well as the old and those with small children, to leave. Hospital beds have been set aside. One bank has asked its top people to declare their blood group. Other bigwigs have been advised to leave their spouses at home (usually the annual meetings are an occasion for heavy-duty socialising). Many bankers have just decided to give this year's gathering a miss. Even if all this preparation and anxiety turn out to be overdone, this is far from business as usual?so, whatever happens, the protesters have won a kind of victory. Protest groups are already planning next year's events. These include action in April against the Summit of the Americas gathering in Quebec; a global May Day rally (codeword, M12K01); and, yet again, protests at the next IMF/World Bank annual meetings, this time in Washington in September 2001.

What, if anything, does all this signify? Is it, as some claim, the start of a global citizen-activist movement? (If you took that view, you might see Europe's current fuel-tax "revolt" as part of the trend, despite its anti-green, middle-class character.) Or is it, in the words of Naomi Klein, an anti-corporate sympathiser and author of a recent book deploring the power of corporate brands, merely "a movement of meeting-stalkers, following the trade bureaucrats as if they were the Grateful Dead"?

The protesters are certainly not part of an intellectually coherent movement. They represent a diverse set of groups, often with very differing agendas, and sometimes with mutually contradictory ones. Almost all they have in common is a loathing of the established economic order, and of the institutions?the IMF, the World Bank and the WTO?which they regard as either running it or serving it. The League for a Revolutionary CommunistInternational sums 19-page manifesto demanding an end to debt, poverty and capitalist exploitation; for good measure, it also wants to liberate advances in genetics and pharmaceuticals from the tyranny of patent rights and to "eliminate the meaningless and harmful marketing of useless products". Blinkered, as yet

Many of the protesters know little about the organisations they are attacking?but not all of them, by any means, are in it merely to vent incoherent rage or have a fun day out. The more thoughtful among them recognise that street protests are only a convenient tactic in a larger war, and that if their movement is to grow it will need a vision?positive proposals, that is, as well as a list of things it hates. So far, this vision is lacking, though a few ambitious types are working on it.

The International Forum on Globalisation, based in San Francisco, has been

preparing a document that it hopes will win the support of a wide range of activist groups. According to John Cavanagh, head of the Institute for Policy Studies, a radical think-tank based in Washington, DC, this manifesto would outline a new "global democracy" based on human rights and ecological sustainability. It would also define new rules for globalisation. (For instance, certain goods and services, such as bulk water and living things, should not be subject to patents and trade rules.) And it would demand new bodies. The Fund, the Bank and the WTO should be shrunk or shut down. The UN?which is deemed more accountable and democratic?should be souped up. Whether any agenda, even one so general, could be adopted by such a rag-bag of protesters is unclear. An effort by Vaclav Havel earlier this year to broker a meeting between the protesters and the boss of the World Bank foundered because the activists could not agree on whether such negotiations were a good idea: in fact, they had no way of actually making any decision. Who should represent a disparate collection of websites, all of which take pride in their lack of leaders? (Mr Havel has since managed to set up a forum on September 23rd that will be attended by Bank and Fund officials and by assorted opponents of globalisation.)

Nonetheless, it would be a big mistake to dismiss this global militant tendency as nothing more than a public nuisance, with little potential to change things. It already has changed things?and not just the cocktail schedule for the upcoming meetings. Protests organised through the Internet succeeded in scuttling the OECD's planned Multilateral Agreement on Investment in 1998; then came the greater victory in Seattle, where the hoped-for launch of global trade talks was aborted. It is still unclear when, or whether, that round will start.

Also, many of the groups have already swayed the decisions of firms and official institutions. Global Exchange, for instance, is an outfit of 40 people based in San Francisco, and an avid believer in street protest. It reckons it bullied Starbucks into promising to sell "fair trade" coffee beans in its caf,s, starting next month. ("Fair trade" coffee is supposedly bought at a price that offers peasant producers a "living wage", rather than at the "exploitative" price paid for commercial coffee.) Starbucks says it had been thinking about doing this anyway.

Similarly, "anti-sweatshop" campaigns, mostly in America and mostly student-led, have had effects well beyond the university campus. A coalition of non-governmental organisations (NGOs), student groups and UNITE, the textile workers' union, for instance, recently sued clothing importers, including Calvin Klein and Gap, over working conditions in the American commonwealth of Saipan in the Pacific. Faced with litigation and extended public campaigns against their brands, 17 companies settled (others, including Gap, are still fighting the case). The deal includes promises to improve working conditions. The factories will be monitored by yet another group, Verit,, based in Massachusetts, and part of a growing industry of organisations dedicated to inspecting labour conditions in third-world factories.

Activist groups have been just as successful in causing big international agencies to bend. A World Bank project in China, which involved moving poor ethnic Chinese into lands that were traditionally Tibetan, was abandoned after a political furore led by a relatively small group of influential pro-Tibetan activists. Similarly, the Bank had a tough fight to fund an oil

pipeline through Cameroon because of activists' efforts.
Technology of complaint

The Internet has proved a crucial tool in organising these groups for protest; it has also directly furnished the protesters, once organised, with a potent weapon. E-mail makes it much easier not only to gather activists and disseminate information, but also to bombard a target with protests from around the world. As Debra Spar of the Harvard Business School points out, the activists have globalised faster than the firms they target. Global Exchange's online anti-Gap campus-organising kit has pro forma letters to send to the company, anti-Gap flyers and suggested slogans and chants. All are easily downloaded. It is hardly surprising that firms are often wrong-footed.

The activists have also raised the profile of "backlash" issues—notably, labour and environmental conditions in trade, and debt relief for the poorest countries. This has dramatically increased the influence of mainstream NGOs, such as the World Wide Fund for Nature and Oxfam. Such groups have traditionally had some say (albeit less than they would have wished) in policymaking. Assaulted by unruly protesters, firms and governments are suddenly eager to do business with the respectable face of dissent.

In the Bretton Woods institutions, in particular, the shift is striking. Public protest has accelerated change on several fronts, notably debt relief. The rallies, human chains and petitions for debt cancellation organised by the Jubilee 2000 campaign applied enormous political pressure for debt write-downs. As a result, groups such as Oxfam were all but co-opted into designing the debt-relief strategies. Next week is likely to see more measures announced to speed up the process, so that governments can say they will keep the promise they made in 1999 that at least 20 poor countries will see their debt burdens lifted this year.

The IMF, long regarded as impermeable to outsiders, now runs seminars to teach NGOs the nuts and bolts of country-programme design, so that they can better monitor what the Fund is doing and (presumably) understand the rationale for the Fund's loan conditions. Horst Kähler, the IMF's new boss, has been courting NGOs. Jim Wolfensohn, the Bank's boss, has long fawned in their direction, but in the Bank too the pace of bowing down has been stepped up.

In Prague this year a programme of meetings has been designed for non-government, non-corporate groups. At last count well over 300 had signed up. This raises the interesting possibility that radical groups will try to prevent slightly less radical groups from attending their meetings. Mark Malloch Brown, the administrator of the United Nations Development Programme, has gone further. He has a board of NGOs (including some fairly radical ones) to advise him, and he explicitly wants to position UNDP as an honest broker, arbitrating the interests of firms, government and civil society in individual developing countries. Presuming too much?

The increasing clout of NGOs, respectable and not so respectable, raises an important question: who elected Oxfam, or, for that matter, the League for a Revolutionary Communist International? Bodies such as these are, to varying

degrees, extorting admissions of fault from law-abiding companies and changes in policy from democratically elected governments. They may claim to be acting in the interests of the people?but then so do the objects of their criticism, governments and the despised international institutions. In the West, governments and their agencies are, in the end, accountable to voters. Who holds the activists accountable?

Some politicians are beginning to press this point. The Foreign Policy Centre, a think-tank sponsored by the British government, recently proposed a code of conduct for NGOs that would include certification by a regulator. For now, though, governments and international institutions would rather bend at least part of the way to the NGOs' demands than question their credentials.

There could be no objection, of course, to the influence of NGOs and protesters if they were merely stating their case. Many protesters are out to do more than that?up to and including "sabotaging, wrecking or interfering with capitalist infrastructure". When they get their way, that looks like a defeat for democracy rather than a victory. Then again, even this might be all right if the concessions won by protesters genuinely advanced the cause of the world's poor, whose interests most protesters claim to defend. This too is very much in doubt.

Forcing higher labour standards on factories in Saipan, for instance, may simply cause the "sweatshops" to move on, leaving the workers without jobs. Poor countries cannot afford rich-country standards of labour regulation; people in poor countries will bear the cost of denying this fact. Similarly, the furore over Tibet simply led China to withdraw its loan request. The Chinese decided to fund the project themselves, presumably with less regard for the environment and human rights. Even debt relief is capable of doing more harm than good?as when it channels new capital to countries whose economic policies are in disarray.

A more complicated issue is the World Bank's thinking on poverty and development. Recently, the organisation has undergone a pronounced shift, clearly visible in its latest World Development Report, the Bank's flagship publication. Poverty is now described as a "multidimensional" problem that includes powerlessness, voicelessness, vulnerability and fear?as well as mere lack of food, shelter and other economic necessities. Combating poverty therefore requires not only economic growth, it is argued, but also "security" and "empowerment".

Empowering poor people, says the Bank, means strengthening their ability to shape decisions that affect their lives?by removing discrimination, promoting equity (for instance, between the sexes) and ensuring that government institutions are more open, accountable and oriented towards the poor. The Bank reckons it should no longer impose reform strategies on its clients. They should be designed mainly by poor countries themselves on the basis of a national dialogue with various civil groups.

In part this "fuller" account of development reflects a shift in thinking that was under way before the backlash began. Some economists were already becoming more sympathetic to the view, almost universal before the 1980s, that growth by itself is not enough to reduce third-world poverty; and a consensus (broader than the one on growth and poverty) was already forming

around the idea that the Bank's traditional lending conditions are not the best way to promote economic reform. But the NGO critics, scores of whom were invited to discuss the new report while it was in preparation, gave these intellectual tendencies a mighty push.

Again, whether the developing countries will benefit is very much in doubt. Empowerment, supposing the idea is taken seriously, may distract governments

and the Bank alike from the simpler pro-growth tasks that they already appear to find impossibly difficult. And it seems odd for the Bank to demand

that third-world governments, often these days democratically elected, should design their reforms alongside civil groups that are unelected, unaccountable and very often unrepresentative.

But these are not points to worry the protesters as long as they enjoy the sympathy of many people in the West, as they appear to. Many of the issues they raise reflect popular concern about the hard edges of globalisation?fears, genuine if muddled, about leaving the poor behind, harming the environment, caring about profits more than people, unleashing dubious genetically modified foods, and the rest. The radicals on the streets are voicing an organised and extremist expression of these widely shared anxieties. Along with mainstream NGOs, the protesters are prevailing over firms, international institutions and governments partly because, for now, they do reflect that broader mood. If their continuing success stimulates rather than satisfies their appetite for power, global economic integration may be at greater risk than many suppose.

Subject: Leader from the Economist

Why globalization is important for the poor...

THE anti-capitalist protesters who wrecked the Seattle trade talks last year, and who hope to make a great nuisance of themselves in Prague next week when the city hosts this year's annual meeting of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, are wrong about most things. However, they are right on two matters, and the importance of these points would be difficult to exaggerate. The protesters are right that the most pressing moral, political and economic issue of our time is third-world poverty. And they are right that the tide of "globalisation", powerful as the engines driving it may be, can be turned back. The fact that both these things are true is what makes the protesters?and, crucially, the strand of popular opinion that sympathises with them?so terribly dangerous.

International economic integration is not an ineluctable process, as many of

its most enthusiastic advocates appear to believe. It is only one, the best,

of many possible futures for the world economy; others may be chosen, and are even coming to seem more likely. Governments, and through them their electorates, will have a far bigger say in deciding this future than most people appear to think. The protesters are right that governments and companies?if only they can be moved by force of argument, or just by force?have it within their power to slow and even reverse the economic trends of the past 20 years.

Now this would not be, as the protesters and their tacit supporters must reckon, a victory for the poor or for the human spirit. It would be just

the
opposite: an unparalleled catastrophe for the planet's most desperate
people, and something that could be achieved, by the way, only by trampling
down individual liberty on a daunting scale. Yet none of this means it
could
never happen. The danger that it will come to pass deserves to be taken
much
more seriously than it has been so far.
Pandering as they go

The mighty forces driving globalisation are surely, you might think,
impervious to the petty aggravation of street protesters wearing silly
costumes. Certainly, one would have hoped so, but it is proving otherwise.
Street protests did in fact succeed in shutting down the Seattle trade
talks last year. More generally, governments and their international
agencies?which means the IMF and the World Bank, among others?are these
days
mindful that public opinion is anything but squarely behind them. They are
not merely listening to the activists but increasingly are pandering to
them, adjusting both their policies and the way these policies are
presented
to the public at large (see article). Companies too are bending to the
pressure, modest as it might seem, and are conceding to the
anti-capitalists
not just specific changes in corporate policy but also large parts of the
dissenters' specious argument.

These outbreaks of anti-capitalist sentiment are meeting next to no
intellectual resistance from official quarters. Governments are apologising
for globalisation and promising to civilise it. Instead, if they had any
regard for the plight of the poor, they would be accelerating it,
celebrating it, exulting in it?and if all that were too much for the public
they would at least be trying to explain it.

Lately, technology has been the main driver of globalisation. The advances
achieved in computing and telecommunications in the West offer enormous,
indeed unprecedented, scope for raising living standards in the third world
(see our survey). New technologies promise not just big improvements in
local efficiency, but also the further and potentially bigger gains that
flow from an infinitely denser network of connections, electronic and
otherwise, with the developed world.

The "gains" just referred to are not, or not only, the profits of western
and third-world corporations but productive employment and higher incomes
for the world's poor. That is what growth-through-integration has meant for
all the developing countries that have achieved it so far. In terms of
relieving want, "globalisation" is the difference between South Korea and
North Korea, between Malaysia and Myanmar, even (switching timespan)
between
Europe and Africa. It is in fact the difference between North and South.
Globalisation is a moral issue, all right.

If technological progress were the only driver of global integration, the
anti-capitalist threat would be less worrying. Technological progress, and
(it should follow) increasing global integration, are in some ways natural
and self-fuelling processes, depending chiefly on human ingenuity and
ambition: it would be hard (though, as history shows, not impossible) to
call a halt to innovation. But it is easier to block the effects of
technological progress on economic integration, because integration also
requires economic freedom.

The state of the developing countries is itself proof of this. The world is still very far from being a single economy. Even the rich industrialised economies, taken as a group, by no means function as an integrated whole. And this is chiefly because governments have arranged things that way. Economic opportunities in the third world would be far greater, and poverty therefore vastly reduced, right now except for barriers to trade?that is, restrictions on economic freedom?erected by rich- and poor-country governments alike. Again, the protesters are absolutely right: governments are not powerless. Raising new barriers is as easy as lowering existing ones. Trade ministers threaten to do so on an almost daily basis.

The likelihood of further restrictions has increased markedly of late. Rich-country governments have all but decided that rules ostensibly to protect labour and the environment will be added to the international trading regime. If this comes about, it will be over the objections of developing-country governments?because most such governments have come round to the idea that trade (read globalisation) is good. Europe and the United States are saying, in effect, that now that the poor countries have decided they would like to reduce poverty as quickly as possible, they can't be allowed to, because this will inconvenience the West.

If that reason were true, it would be a crime to act on it. But it isn't true, or even all that plausible. Rich-country governments know very well that the supposed "adjustment problems" of expanded trade are greatly exaggerated: how convincing is it to blame accelerating globalisation for the migration of jobs from North to South, when America has an unemployment rate of less than 4% and real wages are growing right across the spectrum? Yet even under these wonderful circumstances, politicians in Europe and America (leftists, conservatives, Democrats and Republicans alike) are wringing their hands about the perils of globalisation, abdicating their duty to explain the facts to voters, and equipping the anti-capitalists with weapons to use in the next fight.

It would be naive to think that governments could let integration proceed mainly under its own steam, trusting to technological progress and economic freedom, desirable as that would be. Politics could never be like that. But is defending globalisation boldly on its merits as a truly moral cause?against a mere rabble of exuberant irrationalists on the streets, and in the face of a mild public scepticism that is open to persuasion?entirely out of the question? If it is, as it seems to be, that is dismal news for the world's poor.

Poverty Group (PRMPO), MC4-749, World Bank, 1818 H St NW, Washington DC
20433
(202) 473-2684 (tel), (202) 522-3283 (fax), salkire@worldbank.org

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Lisa J. Macecevic (CN=Lisa J. Macecevic/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 4-OCT-2000 14:23:11.00

SUBJECT: House remarks on HR238 (passed yesterday)

TO: Steven M. Mertens (CN=Steven M. Mertens/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christine J. Lindsey (CN=Christine J. Lindsey/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Debra J. Bond (CN=Debra J. Bond/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark D. Magana (CN=Mark D. Magana/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Wendy L. Patten (CN=Wendy L. Patten/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joel K. Wiginton (CN=Joel K. Wiginton/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Irene Bueno (CN=Irene Bueno/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ruth M. Samardick (CN=Ruth M. Samardick/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Richard E. Green (CN=Richard E. Green/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD
HOUSE
PAGE H8694
Oct. 3, 2000

AMENDING IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT WITH REGARD TO
BRINGING IN AND HARBORING CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 238) to amend section 274 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to impose mandatory minimum sentences, and increase certain sentences, for bringing in and harboring certain aliens, and to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide enhanced penalties for persons committing such offenses while armed, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 238

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. INCREASED PERSONNEL FOR INVESTIGATING AND
COMBATING ALIEN SMUGGLING.

The Attorney General in each of the fiscal years 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005 shall increase the number of positions for full-time, active duty investigators or other enforcement personnel within the <Immigration> and Naturalization Service who are assigned to combating alien smuggling by not less than 50 positions above the number of such positions for which funds were allotted for the preceding fiscal year.

SEC. 2. INCREASING CRIMINAL SENTENCES AND FINES FOR ALIEN
SMUGGLING.

(a) IN GENERAL.-Subject to subsection (b), pursuant to its authority under section 994(p) of title 28, United States Code, the United States Sentencing Commission shall promulgate sentencing guidelines or amend existing sentencing guidelines for smuggling, transporting, harboring, or inducing aliens under sections 274(a)(1)(A) of the <Immigration> and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324(a)(1)(A)) so as to-

(1) double the minimum term of imprisonment under that section for offenses involving the smuggling, transporting, harboring, or inducing of-

(A) 1 to 5 aliens from 10 months to 20 months;

(B) 6 to 24 aliens from 18 months to 36 months;

(C) 25 to 100 aliens from 27 months to 54 months; and

(D) 101 aliens or more from 37 months to 74 months;

(2) increase the minimum level of fines for each of the offenses described in subparagraphs (A) through (D) of paragraph (1) to the greater of the current minimum level or twice the amount the defendant received or expected to receive as compensation for the illegal activity; and

(3) increase by at least 2 offense levels above the applicable enhancement in effect on the date of enactment of this Act the sentencing enhancements

for intentionally or
recklessly creating a substantial risk of serious bodily injury
or causing bodily injury,
serious injury, permanent or life threatening injury, or death.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.-Subsection (a) shall not apply to an offense
that-

(1) was committed other than for profit; or

(2) involved the smuggling, transporting, or harboring only
of the defendant's
spouse or child (or both the defendant's spouse and child).

SEC. 3. ELIMINATION OF PENALTY ON PERSONS RENDERING EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.-Section 274(a)(1) of the <Immigration> and
Nationality Act (8
U.S.C. 1324(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(C) In no case may any penalty for a violation of subparagraph
(A) be imposed on
any person based on actions taken by the person to render emergency
assistance to
an alien found physically present in the United States in life
threatening
circumstances."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.-The amendment made by subsection (a) shall
take effect 90
days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply to
offenses
committed after the termination of such 90-day period.

SEC. 4. AMENDMENTS TO SENTENCING GUIDELINES REGARDING THE EFFECT OF PROSECUTORIAL POLICIES.

In the exercise of its authority under section 994 of title 28,
United States Code, the
United States Sentencing Commission shall amend the Federal
sentencing guidelines
to include the following:

"§5H1.14. Plea bargaining and other prosecutorial policies.

"Plea bargaining and other prosecutorial policies, and
differences in those policies
among different districts, are not a ground for imposing a sentence
outside the
applicable guidelines range."

SEC. 5. ENHANCED PENALTIES FOR PERSONS COMMITTING OFFENSES WHILE ARMED.

(a) IN GENERAL.-Section 924(c)(1) of title 18, United States

Code, is amended-

(1) in subparagraph (A)-

(A) by inserting after "device)" the following: "or any violation of section 274(a)(1)(A) of the <Immigration> and Nationality Act"; and

(B) by striking "or drug trafficking crime-" and inserting ", drug trafficking crime, or violation of section 274(a)(1)(A) of the <Immigration> and Nationality Act-"; and

(2) in subparagraph (D)(ii), by striking "or drug trafficking crime" and inserting ", drug trafficking crime, or violation of section 274(a)(1)(A) of the <Immigration> and Nationality Act".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.-The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply to offenses committed after the termination of such 90-day period.

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.-In addition to funds otherwise available for such purpose, there are authorized to be appropriated to the <Immigration> and Naturalization Service of the Department of <Justice> such sums as may be necessary to carry out section 1 and to cover the operating expenses of the Service and the Department in conducting undercover investigations of alien smuggling activities and in prosecuting violations of section 274(a)(1)(A) of the <Immigration> and Nationality Act (relating to alien smuggling), resulting from the increase in personnel under section 1.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.-Amounts appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) are authorized to remain available until expended.

SEC. 7. ALIEN SMUGGLING DEFINED.

In sections 1 and 6, the term "alien smuggling" means any act prohibited by paragraph (1) or (2) of section 274(a) of the <Immigration> and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324(a)).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROGAN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr.

CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. Rogan).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 238, as amended.

[Page H8695]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer legislation that will curb the inhuman trafficking in human lives known as alien smuggling. In areas like my home State of California, the impact of alien smuggling is felt at all levels. With the passage of this bill we can take a major step toward eliminating this despicable trade.

The problem of alien smuggling is widespread. From each of our southern border States to the northern border States and along the ports of the East and West Coast, aliens are traded like commodities often with deadly consequences. Stories of aliens packed like produce into shipping containers and moving vans abound, as do reports of corpses found throughout the desert as aliens are abandoned by their smugglers.

What was once a trickle of aliens transported by smugglers has today grown into an international trade ring, comparable in size and scope to the drug trade, generating vast revenue and crowning new kings of crime. Making the trade more deadly is the toll in human lives. Media reports describe in gruesome detail how aliens paid the large sums to be transported across our southern border, only to be abandoned in the desert, where many are robbed, raped, and sometimes murdered.

Sadly, current law permits minimal penalties for convicted smugglers. To criminals who generate millions of dollars in revenue each year from this trade, a small fine is the equivalent of paying for a parking ticket. This is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 238, will strengthen the punishment for

smugglers convicted in our courts. As amended, it will double the minimum sentence recommended by the sentencing commission for alien smuggling crimes and increase sentences for those who cause serious bodily injury or threaten a life. Specifically, the Alien Smuggler Enforcement Act, as amended, puts in place five key changes to current law.

First, the bill will add an additional 50 officers per year for 5 years to enforce our antismuggling laws.

Second, the legislation will double criminal sentences for alien smugglers through direction to the Federal sentencing commission. An increase in sentences will act as an additional deterrent. It also will guarantee that those who traffic in human lives are severely punished for this unjust crime.

Third, the bill will increase fines for those convicted of smuggling aliens to twice the amount the smuggler received for the original crime. The current minimum fine of \$3,000 is deceptively small, considering the frequency of the crime and the amount of money generated in smuggling fees.

Fourth, the legislation will authorize additional funds to expand undercover investigation and enforcement programs through the <Immigration> and Naturalization Service.

Finally, H.R. 238 will add alien smuggling to the list of Federal crimes that receive an increased sentence if a firearm is involved, putting this crime on par with drug smuggling and other violent crimes. Our bill would add 5 additional years to a sentence and will keep smugglers off the streets.

Mr. Speaker, the focus of this legislation is professional alien smugglers and those who knowingly aid and abet professional alien smuggling for commercial or financial gain. The legislation is not designed against the unwitting employers of illegal aliens.

Mr. Speaker, our country is strengthened by the diversity of its people; our heritage of <immigration> is what makes us whole. However, alien smuggling chips away at both the rule of law and at human dignity. We owe it to the families of the countless victims of smugglers to enact serious penalties for this serious offense. We also owe it to the legal residents of this country to enforce strict laws against illegal <immigration>.

We can meet both needs by passing this bill.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Jim Willen, our very distinguished attorney on the House Committee on the <Judiciary> for his work on this.

And I also especially want to thank Grayson Wolfe, an attorney on my staff, who has done just a yeoman's job in working on this bill over the many months that it has been proceeding.

I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the ranking member of the committee, and the minority members of the committee for their valuable input which has helped to shape this bill. I thank my colleagues for their consideration on this.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a mandatory minimum sentences bill for bringing in and harboring certain aliens, and the bill to me does not pass muster because experience and numerous studies have shown that mandatory minimum sentences which are spread throughout our Federal statutes or blindly increasing sentences, as the managers amendment does, creates an unfairness and requires judicial and correctional expenditures that are disproportionate to any deterrent or rehabilitative effect that they might have.

Studies have also highlighted the very high costs of the unnecessary incarceration resulting from mandatory minimums and increased sentences. In fact, scientific study has found that no empirical evidence linking increased sentences to reductions in crime. No empirical evidence linking increased sentences to reductions in crime have been found by scientific studies. Instead, we know that they distort the sentencing process, discriminate against minorities in their application and waste money.

A Rand commission study has concluded that mandatory minimum sentences were less effective than either discretionary sentencing or drug treatment in reducing drug-related crime and far more costly than either.

Mr. Speaker, and for the twelfth time, the Judicial Conference of the United States has once again reiterated its opposition to mandatory minimum sentencing. Many conservatives have joined us in recognizing the policy problems caused by mandatory minimums and increased sentences. Thus, for example, after realizing the damage and ineffectiveness of mandatory minimums at reducing crime, Democrats and Republicans, in a

bipartisan effort repealed Federal mandatory minimum sentencing in 1970.

Similarly, Chief <Justice> Rehnquist, who is not known to be lenient on criminals, has observed that mandatory minimums are frequently the result of floor amendments to demonstrate emphatically that legislators want to get tough on crime. Just as frequently, they do not involve any careful consideration of the effect that they might have on sentencing guidelines as a whole.

Proliferation of harsh sentencing policies has inhibited the ability of the courts to sentence offenders in a way that permits a more problem-solving approach to crime.

By limiting consideration of factors contributing to crime or to a range of responses, as the measure H.R. 238 does, such sentencing policies fail to provide justice for either victims or offenders. In light of these concerns, a less Draconian approach than H.R. 238 would be to enact a legislative directive to the United States Sentencing Commission to revise their existing sentencing guidelines to increase sentences for alien smuggling offenses. This would at least permit more informed consideration of aggravating and mitigating circumstances.

[] 1800

Whatever the political benefits of increased sentences, they simply do not do what they purport to do. They do not deter criminal behavior by guaranteeing that a particular penalty will be imposed for a particular crime.

Instead, they impose unfair and harsh results and unnecessarily increase the prison costs to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. Lofgren).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding time to me.

[Page H8696]

Mr. Speaker, I support the bill before us. While I certainly respect our ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), and the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Crime, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), I do not always share their viewpoint on mandatory

minimums, but I do respect their thinking.

I do believe that even if one concurs in their overall approach on the issue of mandatory minimums, this is an exception to that general rule.

Smuggling of aliens is a very serious and I would add very dangerous thing to do. It is something that criminals are making vast fortunes doing, and we know that the body count in the desert between the United States and Mexico is rising as the coyotes are taking more money but also abandoning people in the desert.

A fine for a coyote is just part of the cost of doing business. It is like a license. I think the only way to add to the cost of doing business in a way that will be meaningful to people who would abuse helpless people in this way is to have an actual strong sentence that puts that abusive person out of business and behind bars for a deterrent period of time.

I would also like to note that the gentleman from California (Mr. ROGAN) in committee did agree to several amendments that make this bill targeted towards what it is aimed at. For example, family members were excluded from the bill. Good samaritans who might become involved in saving people who were abandoned were excluded.

Finally, we excluded people who were not involved in anything such as this, for example, people in the sanctuary movement who were not profiting or in the business of being a coyote, because the idea is to make a real constraint on those who are smuggling in aliens and who are endangering so many men, women, and even small children as they do it.

So I respect very much my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, and his comments, but I do think this bill is worth voting for. I enthusiastically support it and plan to vote for it.

I thank the gentleman for his great courtesy in recognizing me.

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, I want to thank my friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from California, for her statement, and also for her valuable input, both in committee and as this bill has been progressing, as we have amended it.

Once again, I want to publicly thank her for her support of the measure.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to our good friend, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON).

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 238, sponsored by my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from California.

The Alien Smuggling Prevention and Enforcement Act addresses the serious and growing problem of professional smugglers who violate our Nation's borders carrying not illegal drugs or bootleg alcohol, but human cargo. These alien smugglers are active throughout our country, not just in the border States, but in my home State of Utah and many others.

We have tightened our Nation's borders in recent years, making it more difficult for people to enter the United States illegally. The demand for entry, however, has not decreased because of tighter border controls, but the desperation of those seeking to get in has increased. Worldwide, people yearning to be free are willing to pay a tremendous price to gain entry to this great country by whatever means necessary.

The situation has produced a new, contemptible breed of predatory smuggler who specializes in taking advantage of people in exchange for the promise to get to America. Those people who put their hopes for new life in America into the hands of an alien smuggler often find their fondest dreams have turned to their worst nightmare.

Inhumane conditions are the norm as aliens find themselves packed into cargo containers for days or weeks, abandoned in the desert without basic supplies, or dumped in the sea miles from shore. Some media reports have produced a portrait of conditions which sometimes rival those imposed by slave traders during the "middle passage" two centuries ago.

For this misery, aliens pay smugglers exorbitant fees, whether they are successful or not. Some of those who are successful in entering America must pay off their admission through years of indentured servitude in sweatshops, or are forced to live lives of crimes or prostitution.

Many find themselves robbed, raped, brutalized, or even murdered by the smugglers to whom they have entrusted their lives without ever reaching our shores. This legislation today is not aimed at the poor, tired huddled masses of aliens seeking freedom, but at those who take advantage of those same aliens by preying upon their misery. The bill increases enforcement efforts against alien smugglers, and increases penalties for those who are caught.

Today's vote can help bring some truly despicable criminals to justice. I thank my friend, again, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROGAN), for taking the lead on yet another important issue and working hard to move it to completion. He is truly a tremendous asset to this body.

I urge my colleagues to support this fine effort to address a serious problem and vote for this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Scott), a member of the Committee on the <Judiciary>.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize the seriousness of this offense, but I must oppose the bill because Congress should not be dictating and mandating sentences to the Sentencing Commission.

As we know, the Sentencing Commission was established to determine the appropriate sentencing guidelines based on the severity of the offense and after giving consideration to all other relevant factors, including the proportionality of the sentence to other offenses.

The review needs to be thorough and thoughtful. But this review, however, has not been thorough and thoughtful, because without the Sentencing Commission, crimes are considered out of context, and as a result, we have sentencing disparities.

For example, this bill provides for a sentence of 1« to 3 years for getting caught smuggling 24 aliens, while Congress has required a 5-year mandatory minimum sentence for possession of a weekend's worth of crack cocaine.

It seems to me that an enterprise involved in smuggling 24 aliens is far more serious than an offense of smoking crack at home, but we would be

better served with the Sentencing Commission considering all of those offenses in context and avoid such disparities.

The bill before us takes that responsibility from the Sentencing Commission and simply mandates that the sentences be doubled, a process which was neither thoughtful nor thorough. If Congress must dictate to the Sentencing Commission, we must at least assess the full effect of the sentencing changes Congress has already directed the Sentencing Commission to implement.

In the 1996 Illegal <Immigration> Reform and <Immigration Responsibility Act, Congress required the United States Sentencing Commission to substantially increase the sentences for alien smuggling. The revised sentencing guidelines have resulted in a 300 percent increase in the median sentence for immigrant smuggling from 1997 to 1998.

Without taking the time to evaluate the impact of such an increase in sentencing for immigrant smuggling, Congress cannot know whether doubling the sentence is appropriate.

In addition to doubling the base offense level for alien smuggling, the bill includes mandatory minimums if the defendant used a firearm. Unfortunately, here we are again with Congress's favorite solution to crime: the mandatory minimum sentence. This is despite the fact that research has shown that mandatory minimum sentences are both ineffective and unduly harsh.

A 1997 study by the Rand Corporation on drug sentencing found that in all cases, conventional enforcement is more cost-effective than mandatory minimums, and treatment is more than twice as cost-effective as mandatory minimums.

[Page H8697]

Furthermore, in March of this year in a letter to the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE), the Judicial Conference of the United States set forth the problems with mandatory minimums as follows:

"The reason for our opposition is manifest: Mandatory minimums severely distort and damage the Federal sentencing system. . . . Far from fostering certainty in punishment, mandatory minimums result in unwarranted sentencing disparity. Mandatories also treat dissimilar offenders in a similar manner, offenders who can be quite different with respect to the seriousness

of their conduct or their danger to society. Mandatories require the sentencing court to impose the same sentence on offenders when sound policy and common sense call for reasonable differences in punishment."

Based on these facts, it is clear that we should not be expanding mandatory minimums. The better approach would be directing the Sentencing Commission to review and to rationally consider increasing the offense level for alien smuggling to reflect the seriousness of the offense.

To this end, I offered an amendment to H.R. 238 which would have referred the issue to the Sentencing Commission for further consideration in light of the seriousness of the offense. Unfortunately, the amendment was not adopted. As a result, we are here today preventing the Sentencing Commission from doing its job.

I therefore must oppose this legislation, because we are dictating new sentences out of context of other crimes 6 weeks before an election.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 238.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROGAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 238, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read:

"A bill to improve the prevention and punishment of criminal smuggling, transporting, and harboring of aliens, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Paula R. Lynch (CN=Paula R. Lynch/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:11-OCT-2000 14:50:43.00

SUBJECT: NYTimes.com Article: Immigrants in the Middle in Union Push at Bakery

TO: arbogastjr@ms.state.gov (arbogastjr@ms.state.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: brownne2@state.gov (brownne2@state.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: camponovcn@ms.state.gov (camponovcn@ms.state.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Debra A. Carr (CN=Debra A. Carr/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sharon B. Kotok (CN=Sharon B. Kotok/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Adrian E. Miller (CN=Adrian E. Miller/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: obrieny@state.gov (obrieny@state.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth J. O'Connell (CN=Elizabeth J. O'Connell/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Wendy L. Patten (CN=Wendy L. Patten/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: wagenseilsa@state.gov (wagenseilsa@state.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: zweibenb@state.gov (zweibenb@state.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mbpica@hotmail.com (mbpica@hotmail.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: surenaam@ms.state.gov (surenaam@ms.state.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paula R. Lynch (CN=Paula R. Lynch/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer H. Smith (CN=Jennifer H. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: a.jury@state.gov (a.jury@state.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "(RIA) Pascua, Gerard R" <g.pascua@state.gov> ("(RIA) Pascua, Gerard R" <g.pasc
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: perlowh@state.gov (perlowh@state.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Katie Hong (CN=Katie Hong/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Not sure what it is about the fact that the workers are immigrants that differentiates this from any other labor organization dispute, but never mind...prl

----- Forwarded by Paula R. Lynch/WHO/EOP on 10/11/2000 02:49 PM -----

Paula_R._Lynch@who.eop.gov
10/11/2000 02:32:15 PM

Please respond to Paula_R._Lynch@who.eop.gov
Record Type: Record

To: Paula R. Lynch/WHO/EOP

cc:

Subject: NYTimes.com Article: Immigrants in the Middle in Union Push at Bakery

This article from NYTimes.com
has been sent to you by Paula_R._Lynch@who.eop.gov.

Paula_R._Lynch@who.eop.gov

/----- advertisement -----\

Olympic Greats Photo Screensaver

Download Olympic Greats Photo Screensaver

from NYTimes.com, featuring the unforgettable

Times's photos of past Olympic games. Enjoy these

images every day on your computer, absolutely FREE.

<http://www.nytimes.com/partners/screensaver/index.html?eta3>

\-----/

Immigrants in the Middle in Union Push at Bakery
<http://www.nytimes.com/2000/10/09/nyregion/09BAKE.html>

October 9, 2000

By STEVEN GREENHOUSE

PORT CHESTER, N.Y., Oct. 8 The fortresslike bakery was founded nine decades ago by an immigrant from Italy who sold bread from a bake shop in a barn. The founder, John Joseph Cassone, prospered by offering baked goods to fellow immigrants in a town that then, as now, had an earthier, more working-class feel than the rest of Westchester County.

Over the years, the J. J. Cassone Bakery has grown into a modern giant with 250 employees, several 100-foot-long ovens and an elaborate system of conveyors, mixing machines and steam-filled vats. Its 100-yard-long, red-brick walls dominate a neighborhood where two families often squeeze into a single home and immigrants from Latin America have supplanted those from Italy.

Now, this sizable industrial enterprise finds itself in an unusually fierce labor battle between management and union. In the sprawling, sweaty room at the heart of the bakery, some workers complain about scorching temperatures, on-the-job injuries and compulsory 72-hour weeks. Some workers almost all the workers are immigrants, many of them illegal say co-workers sometimes faint from heat and exhaustion.

"I came to the United States because it was the country of my dreams, but at this point it's turned into a nightmare," said Roberto Lostaunau, a 39-year-old from Peru who is a leader in an effort to unionize the bakery's workers. "This is a nightmarish company."

His view is not shared by all. For some workers at the bakery, like Antonio Torres, an immigrant from El Salvador who works from 4:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. placing bread and bagels into the ovens, the long hours provide the paycheck he needs to support his family.

"When you work a lot of hours, you make a lot of money," Mr. Torres said.

The labor battle at Cassone (pronounced kuh-SOHN) has become a national cause for the union movement, and underscores labor's stepped-up efforts to organize more immigrants, including illegal ones. But the Cassone battle pits immigrant against immigrant, with some looking to the union as the savior for their problems in the workplace, while others see it as an unwelcome intruder.

Seemingly out of place in genteel Westchester, the dispute is exceptional for its bitterness. So far, it has involved firings, litigation, unionization votes and divisions among immigrants who come from the same countries, but who have very different sensibilities and desires. The battle reflects the labor movement's hopes and problems in dealing with a fast-changing labor force in which legal and illegal immigrants account for an ever-larger share of the working population.

Convinced that immigrants are ripe for labor's message, union officials have devoted extensive manpower to try to organize the bakery's workers, who they say are horribly exploited. But to labor's surprise and chagrin, many of the immigrant workers praise Cassone's 72-hour weeks and even its modest wages, viewing them as the key to achieving their American dream of buying a house and a family car.

Several immigrant workers said management used an especially worrisome tactic to keep the union out. They said supervisors threatened to call in the Immigration and Naturalization Service to clean out the place if the workers voted to unionize something management has denied. In recent years, unions have had a hard time unionizing workplaces with many illegal immigrants because these workers are often fearful of deportation and reprisals by management.

In some ways, the labor war in working-class Port Chester grows out of tensions roiling just beneath the surface of Westchester's affluence. As in other wealthy suburbs, the county's economy is increasingly relying on immigrant laborers. But for these workers, it is often a daunting challenge to make ends meet in a county where housing, and so much else, is so expensive.

At the heart of the unionization drive is the alluring pitch that a union contract could provide such large pay increases that the bakery's employees would need to work just 40 hours a week, not 72, to support their families and begin their climb to the middle class.

But several workers at Cassone said the union has misunderstood the immigrants' desires and work ethic. Indeed, the main reason that several workers gave for voting against unionization was the fear that a contract would limit them to 40 hours a week. Mr. Torres said that thanks to the 72-hour weeks, he has been able to buy a house, support his wife and three children and take a two-week family vacation to Disney World.

"If you work just 40 hours a week, there's no way you can afford a vacation like that," said Mr. Torres, who has worked at the bakery for 11 years. "Do you think you can work 40 hours a week and still buy a house?"

For most of the bakery's workers, pay runs from \$6.50 to \$11 an hour, which translates to about \$13,500 to \$23,000 a year, based on a 40-hour workweek. But for a 72-hour week, with time-and-a-half pay for overtime, those hourly earnings add up to \$29,000 to \$49,000 a year.

Officials from the Bakery and Confectionary Workers Union, the labor group that is trying to organize Cassone, say that if management paid the \$11 to \$15 an hour that some unionized bakeries offer, the employees would not need to work 72-hour weeks.

Mr. Lostaunau, the union supporter, has a far grimmer view of the bakery and its long hours than Mr. Torres does. Mr. Lostaunau, who spent 20 years working for a Peruvian oil company before moving to New York, complained about earning \$7.10 an hour, about the exhausting hours, and about the withering heat from working alongside an oven. He also complained of injuring his left shoulder

when he slipped on a floor slick from water and flour.

He tensed up, his expression turning angry, as he described an episode several months ago in which he was not scheduled to take a break for five hours. After four hours of loading loaves into the oven, he recalled, he left his work station to use the bathroom, not being able to wait any longer. Mr. Lostaunau, who was working the 3 a.m.-to-3 p.m. shift, said his boss told him he was being fired for leaving his oven without permission, even though he said he had found a co-worker to substitute for him.

"My boss was yelling and screaming and cursing at me, and he told me, 'You're fired,' " Mr. Lostaunau said, noting that his boss, after cooling down, reduced the punishment to a three-day suspension.

Marc L. Silverman, the bakery's lawyer, denied that Mr. Lostaunau had been punished for merely going to the bathroom. He said Mr. Lostaunau had been punished for taking 15 minutes to go, and for not having someone substitute for him.

J. J. Cassone's managers said that the bakery was a contented place and that the union had manipulated immigrant workers into maligning their employer.

"If they're trying to make us out to be the bakery equivalent of a sweatshop and a labor law violator, they're dead wrong," Mr. Silverman said. "Many of our employees are happy. They can work substantial hours and can make \$35,000 and up a year in what is basically a minimum-wage industry."

Mr. Silverman said the workers did not want a union. He pointed to last December's election, in which 118 workers voted against joining the union and 37 voted in favor of joining.

Union officials said the election had been poisoned by what they insisted was illegal behavior by management. They said management had fired four of the most outspoken union supporters to chop the head off the organizing drive and to scare other workers. They said management threatened to close the bakery if the workers backed a union.

Federal law prohibits companies from firing workers or retaliating in any other way for supporting a union.

Several workers said management's most effective weapon was its threat to have illegal immigrant workers deported if they voted to unionize.

"They would tell us they're going to fire us if the union wins," said a pencil-thin illegal immigrant from Guatemala, who would give only his first name, Antonio. "They'd say they're going to get rid of all the undocumented people. That made a lot of people very afraid."

The union has pointed to such threats in urging the National Labor Relations Board to overturn December's election. Yet some workers back management's version of events.

"Nobody talked about getting rid of the undocumented workers,"

said Gustavo Cardenas, 37, an immigrant from Mexico who works in shipping and receiving. "That's a lie."

Jose Mario Castro, a 33-year-old from El Salvador, said he concluded that a union was needed soon after he began working at Cassone seven years ago. Most weeks, he put in 67 hours a week cleaning the machinery, often working months at a time without a day off.

"For five and a half years, I worked seven days a week," Mr. Castro said. "I had no days off. We need a union because of the very low wages and for better treatment. Nobody can complain by themselves."

Mr. Castro said management fired him in April after he arrived at work a half-hour late. Workers are rarely punished for minor lateness, he said, asserting that he was dismissed because he had campaigned for the union.

Mr. Silverman said all the fired workers were dismissed for legitimate reasons, like lateness.

Many workers say no union is needed because the bakery provides pensions, sick days and four-week vacations to longtime workers.

"This is the best job around," said Mr. Cardenas, the shipping worker. "The union can't give me anything that I can't get from the company."

The New York Times on the Web
<http://www.nytimes.com>

/-----\

Visit NYTimes.com for complete access to the most authoritative news coverage on the Web, updated throughout the day.

Become a member today! It's free!

<http://www.nytimes.com?eta>

\-----/

HOW TO ADVERTISE

For information on advertising in e-mail newsletters or other creative advertising opportunities with The New York Times on the Web, please contact Alyson Racer at alyson@nytimes.com or visit our online media kit at <http://www.nytimes.com/adinfo>

For general information about NYTimes.com, write to help@nytimes.com.

Copyright 2000 The New York Times Company

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Scensny, Leonard F" <ScensnyLF@state.gov> ("Scensny, Leonard F" <ScensnyL

CREATION DATE/TIME:18-OCT-2000 09:04:33.00

SUBJECT: SA News Wednesday, October 18

TO: "Alter, Bernard" <AlterBJ@state.gov> ("Alter, Bernard" <AlterBJ@state.gov> [UN
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Anderson, Grant" <GAnderson@usaid.gov> ("Anderson, Grant" <GAnderson@usaid.gov
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Bennett, John" <BennettJE@State.gov> ("Bennett, John" <BennettJE@State.gov> [
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Blake, Stephen" <BlakeSJ3@state.gov> ("Blake, Stephen" <BlakeSJ3@state.gov> [
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Boggs, Robert" <BoggsRK2@state.gov> ("Boggs, Robert" <BoggsRK2@state.gov> [UN
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Donald A. Camp (CN=Donald A. Camp/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Chakravarthy, Anu" <ChakravarthyA@state.gov> ("Chakravarthy, Anu" <Chakravarth
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Cutler, Thomas (DOE)" <thomas.cutler@hq.doe.gov> ("Cutler, Thomas (DOE)" <thom
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Davis, Charles" <DavisCZ@state.gov> ("Davis, Charles" <DavisCZ@state.gov> [UN
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Dinger, Larry" <DingerLM@state.gov> ("Dinger, Larry" <DingerLM@state.gov> [UN
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Domowitz, Susan" <SDomowit@exchange.usia.gov> ("Domowitz, Susan" <SDomowit@exc
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Donahue, David" <DonahueDT@state.gov> ("Donahue, David" <DonahueDT@state.gov>
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Duguid, Gordon" <DuguidG@state.gov> ("Duguid, Gordon" <DuguidG@state.gov> [UN
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Dyson, John" <DysonJA@state.gov> ("Dyson, John" <DysonJA@state.gov> [UNKNOWN
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Fakan, Stephen" <FakanSG@state.gov> ("Fakan, Stephen" <FakanSG@state.gov> [UN
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Fessenden, Pamela" <PamelaF2@dosnet.usaid.gov> ("Fessenden, Pamela" <PamelaF2@
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Hamilton, Patrick (DOE)" <patrick.hamilton@hq.doe.gov> ("Hamilton, Patrick (DO
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Hanson, Margaret (DOC-Delhi)" <margaret.hanson-muse@mail.doc.gov> ("Hanson, Ma

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Harding, Richard (DOC)" <richard_harding@ita.doc.gov> ("Harding, Richard (DOC)"
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Hawkins, Jeffrey" <HawkinsJJ2@state.gov> ("Hawkins, Jeffrey" <HawkinsJJ2@state.gov>
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Irwin, Lee" <IrwinLJ@state.gov> ("Irwin, Lee" <IrwinLJ@state.gov> [UNKNOWN]
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Jhirad, David (DOE)" <david.jhirad@hq.doe.gov> ("Jhirad, David (DOE)" <david.jhirad@hq.doe.gov>
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Katz, David" <KatzDJ@state.gov> ("Katz, David" <KatzDJ@state.gov> [UNKNOWN]
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Kim, Carol (DOC-Delhi)" <carol.kim@mail.doc.gov> ("Kim, Carol (DOC-Delhi)" <carol.kim@mail.doc.gov>
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Kincannon, John" <KincannonJS@state.gov> ("Kincannon, John" <KincannonJS@state.gov>
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Kuhn, Louis" <LKuhn@usaid.gov> ("Kuhn, Louis" <LKuhn@usaid.gov> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "McCullough, Dundas" <McCulloughDC@state.gov> ("McCullough, Dundas" <McCulloughDC@state.gov>
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Millard, Elisabeth" <MillardE@state.gov> ("Millard, Elisabeth" <MillardE@state.gov>
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Moser, Rex" <rmoser@pd.state.gov> ("Moser, Rex" <rmoser@pd.state.gov> [UNKNOWN]
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Neuling, Bruce" <NeulingBX@state.gov> ("Neuling, Bruce" <NeulingBX@state.gov>
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Noziglia, David" <DNozigli@pd.state.gov> ("Noziglia, David" <DNozigli@pd.state.gov>
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Paine, George (DOC)" <george_paine@ita.doc.gov> ("Paine, George (DOC)" <george_paine@ita.doc.gov>
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Pasi, Geeta" <PasiGX@state.gov> ("Pasi, Geeta" <PasiGX@state.gov> [UNKNOWN]
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Rich, Chris" <richcelt@aol.com> ("Rich, Chris" <richcelt@aol.com> [UNKNOWN]
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Seligsohn, Deborah" <SeligsohnD@state.gov> ("Seligsohn, Deborah" <SeligsohnD@state.gov>
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Sharpe, Patricia" <SharpePX@state.gov> ("Sharpe, Patricia" <SharpePX@state.gov>
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Sison, Michele" <SisonMJ@state.gov> ("Sison, Michele" <SisonMJ@state.gov> [UNKNOWN]
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Thiede, Paula" <ThiedePS@state.gov> ("Thiede, Paula" <ThiedePS@state.gov> [UNKNOWN]
READ:UNKNOWN

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Trunzo, Judith" <JTRUNZO@pd.state.gov> ("Trunzo, Judith" <JTRUNZO@pd.state.gov
 READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Zaffarano, Joan" <jzaffara@pd.state.gov> ("Zaffarano, Joan" <jzaffara@pd.state
 READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Wednesday, October 18

Guidance requested to update Sheikh Hasina visit

Contents:

Events: Sheikh Hasina schedule for today

Bangladesh: PM's Agenda in DC; Embassy's taste in music

Afghanistan: Bin Laden warns against attack; op-ed prescription for ending fighting

Sri Lanka: Delay in naming cabinet; talks with EU

Kashmir: latest fighting

Pakistan: Another cabinet minister resigns

India: RSS on Christians

Congress: Acceptance of debt relief; legislation on trafficking in women and children

BANGLADESH/HASINA VISIT

-- The following is the schedule of Prime Minister and Minister of Defense Sheikh Hasina of the People's Republic of Bangladesh on her four-day visit

to Washington, D.C. Third of four days.

Schedule

11:15 a.m. (TENTATIVE): Meets with U.S. Trade Representative Charlene Barshefsky. Blair House.

12:30 p.m.: Attends lunch hosted by U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Meets with Roger Beach, chairman and chief executive officer of Unocol Corp., an independent oil exploration and production company. U.S. Chamber of Commerce, 1615 H St. NW.

+3 p.m.: Holds news conference. National Press Club, 14th and F streets NW, Murrow room.

Contact: 202-647-0668

Washington Times

Date: 10/18/2000

Embassy Row

News and dispatches from the diplomatic corridor.

Author: James Morrison

Bangladeshi agenda

Bangladeshi Prime Minister Sheik Hasina Wazed arrived in

Washington

this week after warning that the political opposition in her country will

use any means it can to unseat her government.

"The BNP [Bangladesh National Party] does not believe in independence and democracy. It is bluffing people in the name of so-called politics of agitation," she told an audience Sunday in London, where she stopped en route to the United States.

The BNP has refused to recognize her 1996 election and frequently organizes protests that shut down businesses and traffic in the capital, Dhaka.

Sheik Hasina, who is running for a second term, told Bangladeshi expatriates that her Awami League party has fulfilled its campaign promises to improve the economy and the country's image abroad.

"What we feel is that power is not for enjoying but for working for the cause of the people," she said, according to an account yesterday in the Bangladeshi press.

Sheik Hasina, who is due to meet President Clinton today, said one of her primary goals on her Washington visit is to continue promoting U.S. investment in Bangladesh. American corporations have invested \$800 million since her election, a staggering increase from the \$20 million under the old government.

In an interview with the British Broadcasting Corp. (BBC) on Monday, she also said she will advocate the elimination of tariffs and quotas on exports to the United States.

Sheik Hasina also said she will again ask the United States to deport three men who were convicted in Bangladesh for the 1976 murder of her father, Sheik Mujibur Rahman, the founder of the country. The United States has no extradition treaty with Bangladesh.

"Despite the absence of an extradition treaty, the criminals could be deported," she told the BBC. "This kind of [treaty] is not necessarily required for deportation."

"A criminal is a criminal. A terrorist is a terrorist," she added. "They have committed state terrorism, and they are very much a threat to the law and order situation of a country where they stay."

Sheik Hasina also said she will resist any pressure from the United States that Bangladesh permit the export of natural gas.

"Our position on the issue is that we can consider exporting or selling surplus gas after meeting the requirement of our people and keeping a gas reserve of 50 years for our next generation," she said.

Sheik Hasina's visit follows Mr. Clinton's trip to Bangladesh in March. He is the first U.S. president to visit the country.

Bangladesh on hold

There's no Tennessee waltz at the Bangladeshi Embassy, but there

is
a little bit of Texas.

A caller put on hold is treated to a rendition of "The Yellow Rose of Texas," sort of the unofficial state song, and "Home on the Range," sort of the unofficial cowboy song. Texas Gov. George W. Bush would be pleased.

Certainly the embassy is not taking the side of the Republican presidential nominee over Vice President Al Gore of Tennessee.

Then again, it could be "subliminable."

Associated Press

Date: 10/17/2000

Bin Laden warns against U.S. attack on Afghanistan

Author: Kathy Gannon

ISLAMABAD, Pakistan (AP) _ Suspected terrorist Osama bin Laden on Tuesday warned the United States not to attack his home in Afghanistan, where fears have grown of a retaliatory strike to the Yemen ship bombing that killed 17 Americans.

In a statement published in Pakistan's largest circulation Urdu-language newspaper, The Jang, meaning War, bin Laden said an attack would not kill him and vowed to continue his battle against the ``enemies of Islam'' _ an apparent reference to the United States, Israel and the Saudi royal family. He made no direct reference to the Yemen attack.

The suicide bombing last week damaged a U.S. Navy vessel off the coast of Yemen. No credible claims for the attack on the USS Cole have emerged. But immediate suspicion fell on bin Laden and his organization, al Qaida, which the United States accuses of organizing a worldwide terrorist network. Since the attack, officials in Afghanistan and newspapers in neighboring Pakistan have repeatedly warned of a possible U.S. retaliatory strike against Afghanistan.

Although there are no apparent signs Washington is planning a strike, Afghans remember August 1998, when the United States fired dozens of Tomahawk cruise missiles on eastern Afghanistan in an attempt to kill bin Laden.

That assault was in retaliation for the bombings of two U.S. Embassies in East Africa that killed 224 people. Washington blamed bin Laden for the attacks and a U.S. court has since indicted him.

Bin Laden has been living in Afghanistan since 1996, when he fled Sudan.

The

Taliban militia have refused to hand him over and on Monday denied he was responsible for the Yemen attack.

Bin Laden's statement _ his first since December 1998 when the Taliban supposedly shut down his communications _ was apparently issued from Kandahar

in southern Afghanistan, the headquarters of the country's ruling militia.

``The dream to kill me will never be completed,'' bin Laden was quoted as saying.

``I am not afraid of the American threats against me,'' he said. ``As long as I am alive there will be no rest for the enemies of Islam. I will continue my mission against them.''

The Taliban seemed concerned about a possible U.S. strike.

``After 20 years of war we want only to have an Islamic system for our people. We should not be the target of the United States,'' Taliban spokesman Qadratullah Jamal told The Associated Press on Monday. ``They should not have attacked us before and they should not attack us now.

``There is no reason for the United States to hurt the innocent people of Afghanistan,'' Jamal said in the capital, Kabul.

International Herald Tribune

Date: 10/18/2000

Menace in Afghanistan

Author: Amin Saikal, International Herald Tribune

CANBERRA - Fighting between the ruling Islamic Taleban militia and its Muslim opponents, combined with the worst drought in 50 years, has had a devastating impact on the Afghan population. The UN secretary-general, Kofi Annan, has warned that instability could spread from Afghanistan to the whole of Central Asia.

The opposition says the Taleban is a Pakistani-run force including thousands of Pakistani regulars and volunteers as well as Chechen and Arab mercenaries.

Islamabad admits that it supports the Taleban, which captured Kabul in 1996, but denies direct involvement. But the Afghan opposition has repeatedly displayed captured Pakistani soldiers and officers. UN special envoys for Afghanistan have pointed a finger at Pakistan as the main force behind the Taleban.

Afghan opposition claims of foreign involvement may be exaggerated to win sympathy from the West and Russia, but it is clear that the Taleban is not purely homegrown. Its fighters have received training and aid from Pakistan's military intelligence service. Most are ethnic Pashtuns.

Pakistan wants to ensure that Afghanistan is under effective Pakistani control in case of war with India, to settle a long-standing border dispute with Afghanistan, to create a friendly backyard where it can train Kashmiri militants, and to secure leverage to gain wider regional influence.

This focus on Islamic radicalism in Afghanistan also serves to divert the energy of Pakistan's own Islamic militants away from opposition activities at home.

The United Nations, the United States, Russia and others have condemned the Taleban for harsh and repressive rule. But limited economic sanctions have not moderated its behavior or persuaded it to stop offering safe haven to international terrorists.

The UN Security Council should impose a fuel embargo on the Taleban to cripple its military operations. The Security Council should warn Pakistan that it will be hit by similar sanctions if it fails to enforce the embargo.

The United States, Russia and moderate Arab countries should aid the Afghan opposition. This would put real pressure on the Taleban and Pakistan to seek a negotiated settlement.

The writer, professor of Central Asian studies at the Australian National University, contributed this comment to the International Herald Tribune.

Reuters

Date: 10/17/2000

Sri Lanka president delays naming cabinet

COLOMBO, Oct 17 (Reuters) - Sri Lanka's president has delayed naming a new cabinet as she negotiates with smaller parties demanding a greater role in her tenuous coalition.

``The cabinet will be sworn-in on Saturday the 21st,'' A.H.M. Fowzie, the outgoing transport minister, told Reuters by telephone on Tuesday. The swearing-in ceremony had originally been expected to take place on Wednesday, when the new parliament will meet for the first time to choose a speaker and other officials.

Neither President Chandrika Kumaratunga's People's Alliance nor the main opposition United National Party won a working majority in last

week's election which was marred by violence and ballot tampering. Kumaratunga cobbled together a coalition to give the People's Alliance a slim majority, but Fowzie said the coalition partners were still negotiating over cabinet portfolios.

``The small parties are making big demands,'' he said in an apparent reference to the Eelam People's Democratic Party (EPDP) -- a former Tamil rebel group -- and the largely Muslim National Unity Alliance (NUA). The EPDP has five seats and NUA 10, including six on the PA ticket, making them indispensable to Kumaratunga, whose party has only 107 of parliament's 225 members.

Fowzie said the coalition partners were also haggling over who would get the post of junior defence minister, a key position in the war-torn country.

``There is some trouble over the defence ministry,'' Fowzie added. Speculation has been mounting over whether junior defence minister Anuruddha

Ratwatte would keep his job after he was publicly accused by his own party of vote rigging in the central district of Kandy, which suffered the worst violence on election day.

Ratwatte has denied the charges made by People's Alliance general secretary D.M. Jayaratne and NUA leader Rauf Hakeem.

Kumaratunga, who is expected to retain the senior defence portfolio, has vowed to crush the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) who are fighting for a separate state for minority Tamils in the country's north and east. She has promised to pass a new constitution giving more power to the regions, including one controlled by Tamils, to give them an alternative to the rebels.

More than 61,000 people have died in the war since 1983.

Reuters

Date: 10/18/2000

Sri Lanka to push for trade agreement with EU

COLOMBO, Oct 18 (Reuters) - Sri Lanka is looking to forge a preferential trade agreement with the European Union, the island's largest source of investment, a government official said on Wednesday.

``The government will try to forge a preferential trade agreement with EU...it will take meaningful steps in this direction,'' former industrial development minister, Ronnie de Mel, said at the inauguration of the European Trade Fair 2000.

The fair brought together exhibitors from the EU, local companies in joint venture with European firms and some companies from Pakistan and Bangladesh.

Kim Howells, Britain's consumer affairs minister, said the time was ripe for ``the EU and Sri Lanka to consolidate their links.''

'EU companies are interested in looking beyond the frontiers of Europe,' Howells said.

Some 45 percent of total foreign investment in Sri Lanka comes from the EU.

EU and Sri Lankan firms have joint ventures in a range of areas including garments, textiles, printing, steel products and jewellery.

The ruling People's Alliance, in power since 1994, cobbled together a slim majority after last week's parliamentary polls. New cabinet portfolios are due to be announced on Saturday.

Reuters

Date: 10/17/2000

Twelve killed in clashes in Indian Kashmir

SRINAGAR, India, Oct 17 (Reuters) - Twelve people, including eight separatist guerrillas, have been killed in clashes in the troubled Indian state of Jammu and Kashmir, police said on Tuesday.

Police shot dead a division commander of the Hizbul Mujahideen militant group on Tuesday in a shootout in Baramulla district, 54 km (33 miles) north of Srinagar, the state's summer capital, police said.

In another incident in the same district on Tuesday, Indian security forces shot dead two separatist militants, police said.

Two Indian Border Security Force men and two militants were killed in a gunbattle in Baramulla district on Monday evening, police said.

Five people, including three separatist militants, and an Indian soldier were killed in other clashes in the Himalayan state late on Monday and on Tuesday, police said.

Officials say separatist violence has increased in the restive Himalayan state this year, particularly after the Hizbul Mujahideen ended a brief ceasefire in August.

India, which controls 45 percent of Kashmir region, accuses Pakistan of arming and training Kashmiri separatists, a charge Islamabad denies.

Pakistan rules over a third of Kashmir and China the rest.

Nearly a dozen militant groups are fighting New Delhi's rule in Jammu and Kashmir, India's only Muslim-majority state where police and hospitals say more than 30,000 people have been killed in nearly 11 years of separatist violence.

Reuters

Date: 10/17/2000

Second Pakistan minister resigns in four days

ISLAMABAD, Oct 17 (Reuters) - Pakistani Agriculture Minister

Shafqat

Jamote resigned on Tuesday, the second cabinet member to leave the government in four days.

A government statement issued late on Tuesday said Jamote had tendered his r

The statement, quoted by the official APP news agency, gave no reason for the resignation, which followed the departure of Information and Media Development Minister Javed Jabbar on Saturday.

The second resignation came only hours after military ruler

General

Pervez Musharraf dismissed chances of a major reshuffle in his cabinet, which he said was doing well. But he made it clear he would not compel any cabinet member who wanted to quit to stay on.

'There is no reason for a major change in the cabinet,' APP

quoted him as telling reporters in Islamabad.

He said his cabinet was performing well and added: ``I am happy there are so many talented people in it and working with honesty, dedication, patriotic spirit and zeal.''

Asked about speculation in newspapers about the possibility of more resignations, he said: ``Whosoever tenders (his) resignation, it is accepted... there is no doubt on this count.

``Nobody is indispensable. Whosoever wants to quit, he leaves.selection is on merit and continuation (in office) is on performance.''

The two ministers have not given their reasons for leaving Musharraf's one-year-old government.

Newspaper reports have cited the ministers' perceived differences with senior officials close to Musharraf or the general's dissatisfaction with their performances as the main grounds for their resignations.

Musharraf, who seized power in a bloodless army coup on October 12, 1999 that toppled prime minister Nawaz Sharif, had brought in non-political former bureaucrats or technocrats as his ministers.

Article #122

Washington Times

Date: 10/18/2000

Hindu party seeks to ban foreign churches in India

Author: Azizur Rahman The Washington Times

AGRA, India - The head of a Hindu nationalist party that embraces the prime minister among its members is calling for the banning of foreign churches and the creation of a national Christian church such as exists in China.

At a huge rally this week in Agra, the city where the Taj Majal is located, RSS leader Kuppahalli Sitharamaiya Sudarshan appealed to patriotic Indian Christians to "free themselves from the stranglehold of foreign countries by setting up Indian nationalistic churches."

India should follow the example of China by establishing a national church and ban foreign churches, continued Mr. Sudarshan, head of the Rastriya Swayamsevak Sangh, or National Volunteer Organization.

The 75-year-old party, with 4.5 million active members in India and more than 100 affiliate bodies, is an important part of the ruling Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) coalition of Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee.

Mr. Vajpayee, while distancing himself from the group's most extreme positions, remains a member of the party, as does the internal affairs minister, Lal Krishen Advani.

More than 75,000 Hindu volunteers turned out in Agra in khaki shorts and white shirts for the three-day weekend rally, the largest in the history of the RSS.

"Foreign churches and their missionaries have wreaked havoc with India's unity and integrity -they have a conspiracy to destabilize the whole

nation," said Mr. Sudarshan.

Elaborating a day later in New Delhi, Mr. Sudarshan charged that the United States denied the use of Indian military bases during the Cold War and used the church to gain access to strategically important northeast India, where most of India's Christians are concentrated.

The region has seen a wave of violence against Christians, who comprise less than 2.5 percent of India's population. A few days ago four churches were destroyed by fire in eastern Bihar state.

Mr. Sudarshan, warning in New Delhi that the West could use the church to guide Christians into political action, argued that an "indigenized" Indian church was essential for India's national security.

"You have the blood of Lord Rama and Lord Krishna in your veins," he told Muslims and Christians, urging them to join the country's cultural "mainstream" by accepting their Hindu ancestry.

Christian leaders reacted angrily to the outburst, denouncing Mr. Sudarshan's remarks as "patently absurd" and "totally unreasonable."

The establishment of a national church would "be a violation of [India's] constitution and destroy the concepts of secular India," said the Rev. Dominic Emanuel, a spokesman of the Catholic Bishops Conference of India.

"The Indian church is 1,948 years old - obviously we are Indian," said Father Emanuel. "Each one of the 145 Catholic dioceses in India is under an Indian bishop. Our worship is all in Indian languages and we abide by Indian hours of worship."

Archbishop Oswald Gracias, secretary-general of the bishops' conference, said in a statement that Mr. Sudarshan "has challenged not only constitutional guarantees of freedom of faith, but sought to interfere directly in the internal structures of several religions including Christianity."

Despite their anger, few Christian leaders believe that Mr. Vajpayee will do anything to muzzle the RSS and other pro-Hindu groups, which form an important part of his political base.

"The church holds that the government is not directly involved in the violence against Christians in India, but the BJP is a Hindu nationalist party - so how much help can we really ask from them?" asked Amrose Pinto, a Christian priest and the director of the Social Science Institute in New Delhi.

The U.S.-based organization Human Rights Watch has accused the government of failing to prevent violence against Christians and of exploiting sectarian tensions for political ends. It has claimed in the past that attacks against Christians have increased significantly since the BJP came to power in 1998.

The Indian parliament has recorded more than 100 cases of anti-Christian violence including the killing of priests, the raping of

nuns, and the destruction of churches, schools and cemeteries

U.S. Ambassador Richard Celeste was assured during a recent meeting with the president of the BJP that the party and the government were committed to ensuring religious freedom for Christians.

"But the truth of the matter is that Christians here in India feel more unsafe every day," Father Emanuel said. "While I may just feel psychologically unsafe, my brothers in the remote villages fear for their lives."

* Janaki Kremmer contributed to this report in New Delhi.

New York Times

Date: 10/18/2000

Congressional Leadership Agrees to Debt Relief for Poor Nations

Author: Joseph Kahn

WASHINGTON, Oct. 17 - Congressional leaders said today that they planned to grant President Clinton all the money he had sought to forgive debts of the world's poorest nations this year, a victory for a coalition of rock stars, religious figures and charity groups that have made debt forgiveness a moral touchstone for wealthy nations.

The agreement to allot \$435 million for the United States share of a global debt relief initiative this year, though still subject to final approval in both the House and the Senate, is a sign that street protests and parish activism about the problems of globalization have had an impact on Congress, which has been chary about foreign aid for the last decade.

Among the diverse political, cultural and religious leaders to throw their weight behind debt relief recently are Pope John Paul II;

Pat Robertson, the Republican televangelist; Bono, singer of the Irish pop group U2, and George W. Bush. Their support tipped the balance in the Republican-led Congress, which had not previously offered much support for calls by developing countries for debt relief.

"The debt relief issue is now a speeding train," Representative Sonny Callahan, an Alabama Republican who is the ranking member on the House committee that controls the foreign aid budget, said in an interview.

"We've got the pope and every missionary in the world involved in this thing, and they persuaded just about everyone here that this is the noble thing to do."

If, as is now expected, the money is included in final appropriations bills working their way through Congress, the United States would be spared the embarrassment of being the only major industrial nation unwilling to pay its share of a \$90 billion global debt relief plan.

The international movement to reduce the debt burden of 41 poor nations in Africa and Latin America began in Europe several years ago, and European parliaments have made funds available to forgive debts much more readily than Congress.

Leaders of developing nations have been pressing for donor nations to forgive past debts, arguing that many of the debts were incurred by earlier - and often corrupt - governments that misused aid.

Congressional support for the measure is a victory for the Clinton administration, which has been working to reassure lawmakers that the money made available to poor nations by relieving some debt payment obligations would be used for humanitarian purposes only. President Clinton committed the United States to participate in debt relief at a meeting of world leaders in the summer of 1999, and he has been working to generate bipartisan political support for the measure.

Late last month, Mr. Clinton invited Congressional leaders to the White House to discuss debt relief with Mr. Robertson, the conservative Christian preacher who has run for president as a Republican, and Bono, who wore a black leather jacket and one earring to the session. A group of multinational businesses, including Merck, Motorola, Caterpillar and Goldman Sachs, also joined the debt relief push earlier this month.

"It's not often we have a chance to do something that economists tell us is a financial imperative and religious leaders say is a moral imperative," Mr. Clinton said after that meeting.

Several groups have expressed caution about the debt relief plan. Senator Phil Gramm, a Texas Republican, has said that the money should not be granted until international financial institutions like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund overhaul the way they do business and improve their effectiveness. Some of the debt relief money would replenish the coffers of the financial institutions, the primary lender to the poorest nations.

Clinton administration officials say they have won support for a variety of changes at the I.M.F. and the World Bank.

Other lawmakers said they worried that the plan was ill-conceived because it would bail out bankers rather than generating new cash to help poor people. A United Nations report on debt relief also faulted the plan for it said was an unrealistic view of how it could help poor nations develop faster, predicting that the program would end up relieving only a small portion of the outstanding debt and force poor nations to rely on fresh loans.

Republicans came under pressure this month from Mr. Bush, who championed debt relief during his second debate with Vice President Al Gore. Asked by the moderator, Jim Lehrer, if America's strong economy brought an obligation to the rest of the world, Mr. Bush said it did.

"I think we ought to be forgiving third world debt under certain conditions," Mr. Bush said, going beyond the position many of his party's stalwarts in Congress had advocated. "I think it would make sense for us to use our wealth in that way."

Vice President Gore has been a strong supporter of the administration's debt-relief plan.

Anti-globalization protesters who took to the streets in Seattle late last year, and in Washington and Prague earlier this year, have made

debt forgiveness a priority at both the World Bank and the I.M.F.

A Congressional staff member involved with the debt relief issue said religious groups had mobilized letter-writing campaigns that targeted Representative Richard K. Arney of Texas, the majority leader, and Tom DeLay of Texas, the majority whip. The House leaders sent word "to just get this done," the staff member said.

The debt relief effort still faces one significant obstacle. Congress has the power to deny an I.M.F. request to reallocate some of its gold reserves to support the monetary fund's own commitment to debt relief, an accounting change that the fund says would free \$570 million to relieve poor nations' debt. The accounting provision does not require any more money from the United States.

Mr. Gramm, who heads the Senate Banking Committee, which has oversight over the issue, has so far declined to support the accounting change. He presented the Treasury Department with a lengthy list of changes he wants completed at the financial institutions, which he has said tend to support corrupt dictatorships and waste billions in taxpayer money on ill-conceived rescue efforts for failed economies.

Lawmakers familiar with the negotiations in Congress said they believe that Mr. Gramm has softened his demands in recent days, recognizing that debt relief had become a priority for Republicans as well as Democrats.

A spokeswoman for Mr. Gramm said the senator is still pursuing his plans for changes at the financial institutions but that the list of his demands is "evolving."

Christian Science Monitor

Date: 10/18/2000

Congress takes aim at modern-day slavery

Traffickers in human cargo for sex trade or sweatshops will face tougher penalties.

Author: Gail Russell Chaddock, Staff Writer Of The Christian

Science
Monitor

WASHINGTON - Bipartisan coalitions have not been a feature of the fiercely partisan 106th Congress. But lawmakers on both sides of the aisle came together last week with nearly unanimous votes to curb the global scourge of trafficking in persons.

From Burmese girls lured to brothels in Thailand, Ukrainians to Bosnia, or Nepalese to India - recent estimates range from hundreds of thousands to millions of people forced into prostitution and sweatshops worldwide. That includes as many as 50,000 people, mainly women and children, trafficked into the United States each year.

"This is the most significant human rights legislation this Congress," says Sen. Sam Brownback (R) of Kansas, a sponsor. "We're the first nation in the world to go after sex trafficking aggressively and openly, both domestically and internationally."

Until now, law enforcement efforts in the US and abroad have largely punished the victims of trafficking, who are targeted as illegal aliens or prostitutes. Those who go to the police for help are often deported without

further assistance, while traffickers escape or face only minor charges.

The new law gives the president and US law enforcement tools to go after traffickers and governments that allow them to operate with impunity.

These include:

- * Tough penalties for traffickers, including life imprisonment for sex-trafficking in children.

- * Visas for trafficking victims who cooperate with law enforcement, capped at 5,000 a year.

- * Assistance for victims, regardless of their immigration status. * Da
abroad.

- * A requirement to withhold some forms of US foreign assistance from countries that do not make significant efforts to address the problem.

For activists, who waited outside the Senate chambers during the historic vote, the 95-to-0 tally signifies how far public thought has come toward respecting the rights of women and children.

"Violence against women is not personal. It's not about culture or ethnicity. It's a violation of basic human rights, and it should be protected both nationally and internationally," says Eleanor Smeal, president of the Feminist Majority Foundation, an advocacy group based in Arlington, Va.

But lawmakers who sponsored this legislation say the unanimous vote belies how difficult it was to move these issues forward.

"It took hundreds of hours of negotiation to get us here," said Sen.

Paul Wellstone (D) of Minnesota, who began working on international trafficking three years ago, at the urging of his wife.

The trafficking bill was bundled with four others, including a ban on the sale of alcohol over the Internet, compensation for victims of international terrorism, "Aimee's Law" (which imposes sanctions on states that grant early release to sexual predators who subsequently repeat the crime), and the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.

House sponsors had to guide the bill in and out of four committees. Some committee members balked at elements such as the new visa, which could increase the level of US immigration. Others worried that mandatory US sanctions on governments that turn a blind eye to trafficking within their borders could undermine other foreign-policy goals. (The final version limited sanctions to "nonhumanitarian" and "nontrade" US assistance, and the president will be able to waive the requirement for national-security reasons.)

"We wrote [this bill] to give the president maximum flexibility. He now has many arrows in his quiver," says Rep. Christopher Smith (R) of New Jersey, a lead sponsor.

The House passed the measure 371-to-1, and the president is expected to sign it soon.

The problem of trafficking and forced labor has surged in recent years, along with growth in the global economy. And experts say that it

will

take a concerted effort from the Western world to roll it back.

"For all the lip service and good intentions, it is clear that most Western governments are more concerned about the pirating of computer software or the importing of counterfeit designer watches than about the modern slave trade," says Kevin Bales, author of "Disposable People: New Slavery in the Global Economy."

Sponsors say US resolve on this issue could change that pattern. "Overall, globalization is a good thing. It leads to greater understanding," says Senator Brownback. "But with everything, there are dark aspects. Trafficking is one of the darkest, and we're beginning to deal with it."

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Wendy L. Patten (CN=Wendy L. Patten/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])

CREATION DATE/TIME:27-OCT-2000 15:39:53.00

SUBJECT: Re: revised VAWA radio draft

TO: Paul D. Glastris (CN=Paul D. Glastris/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

thanks Paul

Paul D. Glastris
10/27/2000 03:35:59 PM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: revised VAWA radio draft

Revised draft 10/27/00 3:30 pm
Paul Glastris
PRESIDENT WILLIAM J. CLINTON
RADIO ADDRESS ON SIGNING
VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING AND VIOLENCE PROTECTION ACT OF 2000
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON, DC
October 27, 2000

Good morning. Here in Washington, after months of partisan delay by the congressional majority, Congress has still not completed its work on the budget, even though the budget year ended a month ago. And yet when Congress has acted in a spirit of bipartisanship, we have made profound progress. Today, I want to talk to you about the most significant step we've ever taken to secure the health and safety of women, at home and around the world. It's a new law I will be signing called the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act.

In America today, domestic violence is the number one health risk for women between the ages of 15 and 44. Close to a third of all women murdered in this country were killed by their husbands, former husbands, or boyfriends. Every 12 seconds, another woman is beaten. That's nearly 900,000 victims each year. And statistics tell us that in half the families where a spouse is beaten, the children are beaten too.

Domestic violence is a criminal activity. It devastates its victims, and it affects us all. It increases health costs (keeps people from showing up to work (and prevents them from performing at their best. It destroys families, relationships, and lives. It tears at the fabric of who we are as people.

That's why, as part of our 1994 Crime Bill, Al Gore and I fought hard to pass the landmark Violence Against Women Act--the foundation of the bill I

will be signing. That law imposed tough new penalties for actions of violence against women. It helped train police, prosecutors, and judges, to better understand domestic violence, recognize its symptoms when they see it, and take steps to prevent it. It gave grants to shelters that are havens for victims of domestic violence. It set up a 24-hour, seven-day-a-week, toll-free national hotline -- to help women get emergency assistance and counseling, find a shelter, and report abuse to the authorities.

Most of all, the Violence Against Women Act worked. The hotline has been a tremendous help. More than half-a-million victims have found assistance by calling it. Police officers who once shied away from so-called "family squabbles" are now getting involved, and saving lives. Best of all, violence against women by an intimate partner has fallen 21 percent in the last seven years.

The bill I am signing will keep that progress going by keeping the Violence Against Women Act the law of the land. It provides new resources for Native American communities, restores protections for battered immigrant women, and for the first time extends the law to cover women abused by their boyfriends.

This new law contains another provision, one that will strengthen our fight against insidious global practice of trafficking in human beings. Every year, one million or more women, children, and men are forced or tricked into lives of utter misery -- into prostitution, sweatshop work, domestic or farm labor, or debt bondage. This is slavery, plain and simple. And it is not just something that happens far from our shores. In fact, each year as many as 50,000 people are brought to the U.S. for this cruel purpose. We must do our part to stop those responsible for this crime and to help their victims. And the bill I am signing will help do that.

It establishes the first federal law that specifically targets this problem. It sets out harsh penalties for those who trade in human beings. It requires convicted traffickers to forfeit their assets and make restitution to those they have exploited. It gives victims better access to services like shelters, counseling, and medical care. It enables victims to stay in the United States so they can receive those services and help law enforcement agencies prosecute traffickers. It increases our assistance to other countries to help them detect and punish this pernicious practice. And it provides for sanctions for any countries that refuse to take steps to end it. I worked hard for these provisions. They build on what we have been doing at home and abroad to address this problem.

There's no great secret to getting things done. When we put progress over partisanship, we get results. Now that we've shown we can work together by passing this landmark legislation to fight violence against women and the trade in human beings, it's time for Congress to set partisanship aside and complete a budget. A budget that cuts taxes fairly, and treats immigrants fairly. That invests in school construction and health care and raises the minimum wage. A budget that reflects the values of the American people, and secures a better future for our great nation.

Thanks for listening.

Message Sent

To:

Joshua S. Gottheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
James R. Kvaal/OPD/EOP@EOP
Elliot J. Diringer/WHO/EOP@EOP
aedmonds1@home.com @ inet
Terry Edmonds/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey A. Shesol/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michele Ballantyne/WHO/EOP@EOP
Fern Mechlowitz/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rachael F. Goldfarb/WHO/EOP@EOP
John Podesta/WHO/EOP@EOP
Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP@EOP
Carolyn T. Wu/WHO/EOP@EOP
Irene Bueno/WHO/EOP@EOP
Maria Echaveste/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rochelle G. Thompson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Christine M. Glunz/WHO/EOP@EOP
Linda Ricci/OMB/EOP@EOP
Patrick M. Dorton/OPD/EOP@EOP
Jason Furman/OPD/EOP@EOP
Loretta M. Ucelli/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa G. Green/OPD/EOP@EOP
Joseph N. Crisci/OPD/EOP@EOP
Jenni R. Engebretsen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Bruce N. Reed/OPD/EOP@EOP
Cathy R. Mays/OPD/EOP@EOP
Thomas L. Freedman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Emil J. Barth/WHO/EOP@EOP
Christopher C. Jennings/OPD/EOP@EOP
Jennifer E. McGee/OPD/EOP@EOP
Karin Kullman/OPD/EOP@EOP
Steve Ricchetti/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer L. Dewitt/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mara A. Silver/WHO/EOP@EOP
Richard L. Siewert/WHO/EOP@EOP
Devorah R. Adler/OPD/EOP@EOP
Stephanie A. Cutter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Christopher M. Wanken/OPD/EOP@EOP
Cheri L. Stockham/WHO/EOP@EOP
Drew T. Gardiner/WHO/EOP@EOP
Valerie J. Owens/WHO/EOP@EOP
Barbara Chow/OMB/EOP@EOP
shesol@aol.com @ inet
gottheim@aol.com @ inet
Joel Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Tomasz P. Malinowski/NSC/EOP@EOP
Wendy L. Patten/NSC/EOP@EOP
Mary L. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Natalie S. Wozniak (CN=Natalie S. Wozniak/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])

CREATION DATE/TIME:27-OCT-2000 19:39:01.00

SUBJECT: 2000-10/28 EMBARGOED RADIO ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

TO: philipcrowley@home.com (philipcrowley@home.com [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Natalie S. Wozniak/NSC/EOP on
10/27/2000 07:57 PM -----

Margaret M. Suntum
10/27/2000 07:25:52 PM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: 2000-10/28 EMBARGOED RADIO ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

Embargoed

For Release
Until 10:06 A.M. EDT
Saturday, October 28, 2000

RADIO ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT
TO THE NATION
ON SIGNING VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING AND
VIOLENCE PROTECTION ACT OF 2000

THE PRESIDENT: Good morning. Here in Washington, after months of partisan delay by the congressional majority, Congress still hasn't completed its work on the budget -- even though the budget year ended a month ago.

Yet, when Congress has acted in a spirit of bipartisanship, we've made remarkable progress. Today, I want to talk to you about the most significant step we've ever taken to secure the health and safety of women at home and around the world. It's a new law I'm signing called the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act.

In America today, domestic violence is the number one health risk

for women between the ages of 15 and 44. Close to a third of all women murdered in this country were killed by their husbands, former husbands or boyfriends. Every 12 seconds, another woman is beaten. That's nearly 900,000 victims every year.

And statistics tell us that in half the families where a spouse is beaten, the children are beaten too. Domestic violence is a criminal activity. It devastates its victims and affects us all. It increases health costs, keeps people from showing up to work, prevents them from performing at their best. It destroys families, relationships and lives, and it tears at the fabric of who we are as a people.

That's why, as part of our 1994 Crime Bill, Al Gore and I fought hard to pass the landmark Violence Against Women Act -- the foundation of the bill I will be signing. That law imposed tough new penalties for actions of violence against women. It helped to train police, prosecutors and judges to better understand domestic violence, to recognize its symptoms when they see them, and to take steps to prevent them.

It gave grants to shelters that are havens for victims of domestic violence, and it set up a 24-hour, seven-day-a-week toll-free national hotline to help women get the emergency assistance and counseling they need, to find a shelter, and to report abuse to the authorities.

Most of all, the Violence Against Women Act worked. The hotline has been a tremendous help. More than half a million victims have found assistance by calling it. Police officers who once shied away from so-called "family squabbles" are now getting involved in saving lives. Best of all, violence against women by an intimate partner has fallen 21 percent since 1993.

The bill I'm signing will keep that progress going by keeping the Violence Against Women Act the law of the land. It provides new resources for Native American communities, restores protections for battered immigrant women, and for the first time extends a law to cover women abused by their boyfriends.

The new law contains another provision, too; one that will strengthen our fight against the insidious global practice of trafficking in human beings. Every year, a million or more women, children and men are forced or tricked into lives of utter misery -- into prostitution, sweatshop work, domestic or farm labor or debt bondage. This is slavery, plain and simple. And it's not just something that happens far from our shores.

In fact, each year, as many as 50,000 people are brought to the United States for this cruel purpose. We must do our part to stop those responsible for these crimes and to help their victims. The bill I'm signing will help to do that.

It establishes the first federal law that specifically targets this problem, setting out harsh penalties for those who trade in human beings, requiring convicted traffickers to forfeit their assets and make restitution to those they have exploited. The law gives victims better access to services like shelters, counseling and medical care. It enables victims to stay in the United States so they can receive those services, and helps law enforcement agencies to prosecute the traffickers. It increases our assistance to other countries as well to help them detect and punish this pernicious practice, and it provides for sanctions for any countries that refuse to take steps to end trafficking in women and

children. I've worked hard for these provisions. They build on what we've been doing at home and abroad to address the problem.

We see in the success of this landmark legislation once again that there is no real secret to getting things done in Washington. When we put progress over partisanship, we get results. When we work together, we get results.

Now, we've shown once again we can work together by passing this landmark legislation to fight violence against women. Let's follow the rule and finish all the work the American people expect of us. It's time for Congress to set partisanship aside on the last two unfinished bills, and complete a budget with smaller class sizes, modern classrooms, family tax cuts and a higher minimum wage -- one that honors our values and secures a better future for our children and our great nation.

Thanks for listening.

END

Message Sent

To:

Constance M. Colabatistto/OA/EOP@EOP
Carolyn T. Wu/WHO/EOP@EOP
William Hadley/OA/EOP@EOP
William C. Haymes/OA/EOP@EOP
Debra R. Reid/OA/EOP@EOP
Deborah Akel/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeannetta P. Allen/OA/EOP@EOP
Ralph Alswang/WHO/EOP@EOP
Karen L. Barbuschak/OA/EOP@EOP
Brian A. Barreto/WHO/EOP@EOP
Antony J. Blinken/NSC/EOP@EOP
Patrick E. Briggs/WHO/EOP@EOP
Karen C. Burchard/WHO/EOP@EOP
Barbara D. Woolley/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mary E. Cahill/WHO/EOP@EOP
George G. Caudill/WHO/EOP@EOP
Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP@EOP
Delia A. Cohen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Justin L. Coleman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Carolyn T. Wu/WHO/EOP@EOP
Elliot J. Diringer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Patrick M. Dorton/OPD/EOP@EOP
Dawn M. Chirwa/WHO/EOP@EOP
Debra D. Bird/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anne M. Edwards/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sharon Farmer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Alberto O. Feraren/OA/EOP@EOP
Jennifer Ferguson/OMB/EOP@EOP
Martha Foley/WHO/EOP@EOP
Paul D. Glastris/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dario J. Gomez/WHO/EOP@EOP
Joshua S. Gottheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
William Hadley/OA/EOP@EOP
Michael A. Hammer/NSC/EOP@EOP
William C. Haymes/OA/EOP@EOP
Marty J. Hoffmann/WHO/EOP@EOP

Maureen A. Hudson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Wayne C. Johnson/OA/EOP@EOP
David E. Kalbaugh/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mark A. Kitchens/WHO/EOP@EOP
Kris M Balderston/WHO/EOP@EOP
Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP@EOP
Laura D. Schwartz/WHO/EOP@EOP
Laura S. Marcus/WHO/EOP@EOP
Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa M. Murray/WHO/EOP@EOP
Minyon Moore/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steven J. Naplan/NSC/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey H. Oakman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sean P. O'Shea/WHO/EOP@EOP
Denver R. Peacock/WHO/EOP@EOP
Linda Ricci/OMB/EOP@EOP
Robin M. Roland/WHO/EOP@EOP
Peter Rundlet/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robert B. Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP
G. Timothy Saunders/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Brooks E. Scoville/WHO/EOP@EOP
Christopher K. Scully/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey A. Shesol/WHO/EOP@EOP
Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OPD/EOP@EOP
Richard L. Siewert/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer H. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dana C. Strand/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael J. Sullivan/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sarah E. Gegenheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Margaret M. Suntum/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sylvia M. Mathews/OMB/EOP@EOP
Serena C. Torrey/WHO/EOP@EOP
Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP@EOP
June G. Turner/WHO/EOP@EOP
Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP@EOP
Loretta M. Ucelli/WHO/EOP@EOP
Victoria L. Valentine/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robert S. Weiner/ONDCP/EOP@EOP
Lowell A. Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP
Debra S. Wood/WHO/EOP@EOP
cestefani@protranslating.com
mmcarrasco@aol.com
mruano@protranslating.com
sdiaz@protranslating.com
backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu
wh-outbox-distr@pub.pub.whitehouse.gov
Anne W. Bovaird/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lynn G. Cutler/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lana Dickey/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rachel E. Forde/WHO/EOP@EOP
Fern Mechlowitz/WHO/EOP@EOP
Wendy E. Gray/NSC/EOP@EOP
George E. Lewis/OA/EOP@EOP
Joel Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP
John H. Corcoran III/WHO/EOP@EOP
KTORPEY@AOL.COM
Sally Katzen/OMB/EOP@EOP
Michael K. Gehrke/WHO/EOP@EOP
MichaelT@ag.state.ar.us

Michele Ballantyne/WHO/EOP@EOP
Ellen E. Olcott/WHO/EOP@EOP
TDIXON@smtpgate.mac.whca.mil
Renee Sagiv/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steven J. Naplan/NSC/EOP@EOP
Natalie S. Wozniak/NSC/EOP@EOP
carolmast@aol.com
dmilbank@tnr.com
john_see@ed.gov
klasky_helaine@ustr.gov
pcaplan@fbr.com
Lisa Ferdinando/WHO/EOP@EOP
Matthew T. Schneider/WHO/EOP@EOP
Maria L. Haley/WHO/EOP@EOP
Aaron DeCamp/WHO/EOP@EOP
Emily Karcher/WHO/EOP@EOP
John A. Wertman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Christine L. Anderson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Joshua J. Ackil/WHO/EOP@EOP
Eileen P. McCaughey/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jenni R. Engebretsen/WHO/EOP@EOP
skgmd@umich.edu
Manuel Munoz-Carrasc@912022448493@fax
Prof Translation@913053718366@Fax
Silvia Diaz@913053718366@fax
John Zollinger - AFP@912024140635@fax
usia01@access.digex.com
62955104@eln.attmail.com
newsdesk@usnewswire.com
Pub_Arch@EOP
Releases@pub.pub.whitehouse.gov
Releases@www3.whitehouse.gov
Alexander N. Gertsen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Daniel L. Cruise/NSC/EOP@EOP
Craig A. Minassian/WHO/EOP@EOP
Cheri L. Stockham/WHO/EOP@EOP
Kristen A. Triggs/OMB/EOP@EOP
Jennifer K. Harelik/OA/EOP@EOP
Miranda B. Carland/WHO/EOP@EOP