

Remarks by Hillary Rodham Clinton at the Congress

Thank you. Thank you very much. I want to thank all of the panelists for their presentations and I want to thank all of you who are gathered here for this occasion. I was particularly interested in fitting in such a visit and learning more about the women's political network during my very short trip to Montevideo.

I was interested for several reasons.

First because what you have done starting with your Declaration on July 22, 1992, is unusual, if not unique, in politics around the world. It is rare that people, men or women, from opposing parties and different philosophies come together to seek common ground and find ways to work on behalf of common issues. I happen to think that this is not only important for women but is important for the future of politics in general. So I view this network as an example both of a very important step forward for women involved in politics, but also as a model for what both women and men in other political systems should be considering.

Secondly, I am very interested in the specific issues that you have taken on to work on behalf of this common network approach. Of course as we have heard, there are differences between people of different political experiences and points of view. But what is significant is how you've worked on behalf of women's rights, on behalf of children, on behalf of issues such as domestic violence and family policies, on behalf of

ending discrimination in the work place, and because of your presence, you have made a difference in the policy of your country and in the policies of the various parties that are represented.

Finally I believe strongly that there is a great movement that is a global movement in which women are coming to recognize our common interests. Certainly Beijing, which I agree was a seminal, historic moment, not only for women but on behalf of human rights and issues related to the opening of opportunities for all people and the alleviation of poverty, set forth a platform that we are still hoping to implement in our various countries. But if one looks at what is sweeping the world today, there is a growing awareness on the part of many people, but particularly women, of first, the importance of the political process for the realization of many of our hopes and dreams. And secondly an understanding that although we may speak different languages, hold different religious beliefs, be of different racial or religious backgrounds, we have much more in common than what divides us. If you look at what is going to be some of the great challenges of the 21st Century, it will be how do we bridge the differences that for too long have divided human kind. Certainly one of the great differences has been the inequality between men and women. And attempting to address that difference and create conditions of equality will be, I believe, essential to making the 21st century a more peaceful, prosperous and stable place.

But there are other differences as well. Racial differences, religious differences, ethnic differences, political differences where we will have to continually be seeking ways that

we can find in common to address our problems. So I view what you are doing with the network as a very important effort here in your country, but I think it is more significant than that. I think it is a real model of how we are going to have to work together in the future. All different kinds of people who will have to learn how to put aside their strongly held beliefs in order to reach compromise, in order to make it possible for more people to have the opportunities they deserve to have to make the decisions governing their own lives.

Now you know that I am here for the Vital Voices Conference and this is the third of such conferences that we have held, sponsored in part by the United States government but also by individuals and businesses and governments in other countries as well. The idea behind these Vital Voices Conferences is to literally give voice to the aspirations of women in different cultures and settings around the world. And I am very grateful that the media finds these voices worth covering and listening to. We held the first of such Vital Voices Conferences in Vienna, Austria, and it was held for women who were from Central and Eastern Europe who had been part of the former Soviet Union. Many of those women were very well educated but they had little experience with freedom, with a marketplace, with a political system that was democratically based. So much of what we focused on in Vienna was how to create conditions that would empower women to become full political participants in these new democracies in Central and Eastern Europe.

The second Vital Voices Conference was held a few weeks ago in Belfast, in Northern

Ireland. It was held to further the peace process because it was one of the very first, if not the first, opportunities for Protestant and Catholic women to meet together. They had very little contact over all the years of their troubles. They did not work together, they did not go to school together, they did not visit in each other's homes, so the conference was a setting for women who cared about their own families, about the future of their children, about increasing opportunities for women in the work place and the political system, to put aside their religious differences and learn to talk with each other in order to create a common peaceful future.

Now this third Vital Voices Conference is held to bring women who are from every part of the Americas together to talk about the progress that women have been making in our hemisphere and the problems that still exist. Montevideo was chosen deliberately as the site for this conference because of the educational level here, particularly of women, of the way that women are entering into the business and financial affairs of the country, and what an incredible example of development, despite the difficulties that still remain, that Uruguay represents in our hemisphere. What we hope to do is address those issues that you have addressed through the network. Issues of political leadership, of economic opportunity, of education, of health care, of credit, the ways that we know women are still disadvantaged and held back. Some of it is a matter of education, some of it is a matter of changing laws, some of it of enforcing laws, some of it changing attitudes. And let me end with just one example that I think is very important to mention. And that is access to credit.

Access to credit we now know is one of the surest ways to change women's lives around

the world. If women have access to credit, women are able to start their own businesses, expand businesses, take what is a particular talent they might have, such as baking or sewing or some other creative activity and turn it into a business that generates income for their families. In both the formal market and the informal market, equipping women with access to credit literally transforms lives and changes communities and, I believe, eventually countries. Now how do we get more access to credit? Well, unfortunately, many commercial banks do not see poor women as good credit risks. They are wrong about that because in every setting where women have been given credit in the poorest countries of the world, they pay their loans back at rates between 95 and 99 percent. But they take more effort to service, there is more technical assistance that must be given to them, they just don't seem as good a risk or as worth the time and effort that a company might. I have said to many of my banker friends that a lot of the investments that they have made over the last 30 years that have not turned out so well would have been better if they had invested in poor women around the world.

But we need to change attitudes and we need to provide more credit. But how do we do that? Just think about the steps required to providing more credit to women in any country, including my own, where we are trying to expand credit to poor women. First you need to change attitudes of people with money. Most people still with money are men. Most people still with money are educated, affluent men who don't think much of poor, uneducated women's chances to be economically independent.

Secondly, you have to change political attitudes. You have to have people in positions of

power at all levels of government who understand why access to credit is a critical component of advancing women's rights and opportunities.

And, finally, you have to have people who understand how to equip women to take advantage of those opportunities because there are many women who do not have enough self-confidence to be able to take advantage of opportunities if they are available.

So there are many different strategies that have to be employed at one time. But clearly you cannot advance the cause of women without active participation by women in the political process and without a critical mass of women willing to be active in their parties, run for office and accept appointed office because until that critical mass occurs, many of these attitudes will not change significantly enough to create the circumstances that will give more women the opportunities that we are seeking for them to have.

So I hope that what you are doing here will continue to influence the direction of policy. I was very impressed with what the Minister said about the National Action Plan for Equal Opportunity in the Work Place. It is that kind of effort that she has brought to bear, being the first woman in that particular cabinet position. And I think that all of these issues that were raised by all of the panelists need more attention and more effort and they do not need to be seen as women's issues. And that will be my final, final point. It is not a woman's issue to equip women to be self-sufficient and economically independent. That is an economic issue. It is not a women's issue to make sure that

domestic violence is treated as a crime. That is a legal issue. So on each issue that we can look at we need to be making the argument that there are not women's issues and then everyone else's issues. There are issues that cut across all sectors of society that impact in different ways on men and women, but it is to the benefit of society that there be transparency in the labor market, the best person should be chosen for the job, pregnant women should not be discriminated against, women with small children should not be pushed out of jobs, it is what I think of as old thinking to think of those as just women's issues. And we will be, I believe, successful in the 21st century by bringing women together in networks such as you have done here to advocate on behalf of issues that have a disproportionate impact on women, but to make clear that these are not marginal issues, these are mainstream issues, these are issues that will benefit the entire society. And then once that argument is made over and over and over again it will not seem surprising or unusual that a woman is a minister, because a woman or a man who cares about the right issues will be in the position to make a difference in moving the society forward.

So I am very grateful that you have invited me here to be part of this exciting concept that you have created with this network. And what I would really like to do is have the chance to hear more about how it works and what you are doing and what the people who are involved are hoping to accomplish so I can take that message back to my own country as well.

Thank you very much.

**Sustainable Development:
A Progress Report**

**The Honorable Timothy E. Wirth
Under Secretary for Global Affairs
United States Department of State**

**Address Before the National Press Club
July 12, 1994**

Thank you. It is a pleasure to be with you this afternoon and to be part of the 1994 National Press Club Journalism Awards.

I am particularly delighted to be here for the presentation of the Robert L. Kozik Award for Environmental Reporting. The winning entry for this award is Jane Day's story about the influences straining the San Francisco Bay, an enormously famous and extraordinarily rich national, and natural, treasure. It is, as titled, a story about a "Bay in Peril." In turn, it is story about one of the thousands of ecosystems around the world being stretched to the limits of nature; and about this historic moment in history when we have the opportunity and the responsibility to look beyond the crisis of the moment toward the underlying causes that are making the world ever more complex and redefining the priorities for long-term national security and global stability.

The Cold War, which defined long-term security for more than 40 years, is fast becoming a distant era. In its place, we face a range of unfamiliar challenges in a world itself so unfamiliar as to be nearly unrecognizable. The changes and the choices that the United States and the world community now confront are every bit as demanding as those we have known since 1945. But the nature, diversity and speed with which the new challenges emerge dictate an urgent effort to understand the long-term challenges of our foreign policy and to reassess the priorities for American leadership in meeting new tests and forging a better world.

As always, our interest is in sustained peace and prosperity. What is novel are the diffuse trends that will determine those interests in the future, when we pass on the task of governance to our children. What I would like to do today is suggest that the pursuit of sustainable development -- the lofty idea launched at the Earth Summit in Rio -- must be a pillar of renewed American foreign policy and redefined national security for the 21st century.

Sustainable development fundamentally means that the economies of the world, including our own, should attempt to meet the needs of today's generation without compromising or stealing from future generations. Understood and pursued, the idea of sustainable development can integrate and harmonize the

enormously powerful economic and environmental forces at work in today's world. It is a concept rooted in the recognition of the mutually reinforcing nature of economic and environmental progress. Ecological systems are the very foundation of modern society -- in science, in agriculture, in social and economic planning. Over the long-term, living off our ecological capital is a bankrupt economic strategy. At the same time, most peoples and nations aspire to economic growth and scientific and technological progress, which in turn are the essential building blocks of environmental protection.

Unhappily, for far too long, concern about the environment has been regarded as a peripheral, soft issue that can be treated as luxury in the context of prosperity. Far too many will nod their head, saying "Yes, I'm for the environment.....as long as it doesn't cost jobs." And it is within this terribly mistaken analysis that we encounter the fundamental intellectual challenge to sustainable development.

The biggest obstacle to the pursuit of sustainable development -- here in our country or around the world -- is the misguided belief that protecting the environment is antithetical to economic interests. The fact is that the economy is inextricably tied to the environment, and totally dependent upon it.

Five biological systems -- croplands, forests, grasslands, oceans and fresh waterways -- support the world economy. Except for fossil fuels and minerals, they supply all the raw materials for industry; and provide all our food:

Croplands supply food, feed and an endless array of raw materials for industry such as fiber and vegetable oils;

Forests are the source of fuel, lumber, paper and countless other products;

Grasslands provide meat, milk, leather and wool; and .

Oceans and freshwater produce food for individuals and resources for industry.

In short, that's about all there is. That's the bulk of the economy. That's the foundation for all economic activity and all the jobs. Stated in the jargon of the business world, the economy is a wholly owned subsidiary of the environment. All economic activity is dependent on the environment and its underlying resource base. When the environment is finally forced to file for bankruptcy under Chapter 11 because its resource base has been polluted, degraded, dissipated, irretrievably compromised, then the economy goes down to bankruptcy with it.

Is this just a theoretical concept? Of course not.

It happened in Central and Eastern Europe, whose profound environmental destruction we are only now uncovering and comprehending. It is, in fact, happening all over the world, even in many of today's headlined troublespots.

Resource scarcities are a root cause of the violent conflicts that have convulsed civil society in Rwanda, Haiti, and Chiapas. These conflicts could intensify and widen as ever-growing populations compete for an ever-dwindling supply of land, fuel, and water. Professor Tad Homer-Dixon, of the University of Toronto, warns that in coming decades, resource scarcities "will probably occur with a speed, complexity and magnitude unprecedented in history."

Current conflicts offer a grim foreshadowing of the anarchy that could engulf more and more nations if we fail to act.

o In Rwanda, the unspeakably brutal massacres of recent months have occurred against a backdrop of soaring population growth, environmental degradation, and unequal distribution of resources. Rwanda's fertility rate is among the highest in the world -- over eight children per woman. The nation's once rich agricultural land is so severely depleted and degraded that between 1980 and 1990, during a time of unprecedented population growth, food production fell by 20 percent.

o In Chiapas State, Mexico, resource conflicts underlie the insurgency to the South. Unequal distribution of land and rapid population growth has forced poor peasants -- mostly indigenous people -- to eke out a meager living by farming environmentally fragile uplands. But these lands are quickly degraded, plunging the increasing population even more deeply into poverty. A similar cycle has been observed in places as diverse as the Philippines, the Himalayas, the Sahel, Indonesia, Brazil and El Salvador.

o In Haiti, dwindling resources are even more central to the social collapse that has overtaken an island nation that was once the crown jewel of the French Empire. Almost totally deforested, its poor croplands divided into smaller and less productive parcels with each generation, these problems are compounded by a predatory government that has drained the nation's scant resources and failed to invest in its people. Looming ominously over this environmental, economic and political collapse is the fact that Haiti's population of seven million -- already unsustainable by every measure -- is expected to double in the next 18 years.

o And in China -- home to one in five of the earth's people -- severe water shortages and soil erosion threaten that nation's ability to sustain its population. Between 1957 and 1990, China lost some 35 million hectares of

cropland -- an area the size of all the farms in France, Germany, Denmark and the Netherlands combined. This depletion is prompting an exodus from the impoverished interior to the booming coastal cities, which along with the demands of rapid industrialization, will combine into an environmental wall which the Chinese economy will soon hit full speed.

And it can happen to us, where our biological systems are under varying degrees of stress. As we continue to degrade them we are consuming our capital. In the process, we erode living standards -- it is a dangerous and slippery slope:

- o the timber environment of our Pacific Northwest was ravaged, and the rivers, fisheries and cheap power complex are not far behind;

- o we from the American West should watch and listen for the alarm bells, as we draw down water on our high plains and wait, often blindly, for the inevitable economic decline in these farm communities.

- o and next door to us here, something as seemingly simple as the oyster population of the Chesapeake Bay, which used to filter the entire Bay every three days, is now so depleted that this filtration occurs only once a year, sharply lowering the health and productivity of this remarkable system of life. Can total collapse be far behind?

We are learning that environmental capital cannot be measured simply by counting trees, stocks of fish, or ears of corn. It also encompasses complex ecological systems that filter wastes, regenerate soils, and replenish fresh water supplies. Those systems, which we have belatedly begun to understand, form the very basis of life on earth. Ozone depletion, species loss, and the increasing carbon content of our atmosphere are all reflections of the fact that the planet's ecological systems are under great strain.

Our deficit spending of environmental capital has a direct, measurable impact on human security. Simply put, the life support systems of the entire globe are being compromised at a rapid rate -- illustrating our interdependence with nature and changing our relationship to the planet. Our security as Americans is inextricably linked to these trends. The security of our nation and our world hinges upon whether we can strike a sustainable, equitable balance between human numbers and the planet's capacity to support life.

Why has this new aspect of security only recently been recognized? Two trends tell the tale. First, is the exponential growth of the human population. World population has doubled since 1950, and now stands at 5.6 billion. Every

year, the world gains another 91 million inhabitants -- the equivalent of another New York City every month, another Mexico every year, another China every decade. Ninety-five percent of that growth is taking place in the impoverished countries of the developing world, which are already struggling to provide jobs and sustenance for their people.

At the same time, the industrialized world has developed the capability and consumptive capacity to utilize resources and produce wastes at a rate that is unprecedented in human history. Although we comprise only one-fifth of the world's population, the industrialized countries use two-thirds of all resources consumed and generate four-fifths of all pollutants and wastes.

So we are getting ourselves into a terrible fix -- the globe's population is growing at a rate that is matched or exceeded only by our growing capacity to consume resources and produce wastes. This is a completely unsustainable course.

It is now fair for you to ask: "Okay, you all were elected to run the show. What are you doing about it?" And the answer is "plenty."

The Clinton Administration has embraced the challenge of economics and the environment -- which is the challenge of sustainable development. We've gotten the first part right, in many ways far beyond what anyone had hoped; and this economic success story has been pretty well explained and reported. We are working hard as well on the second, environmental part of the sustainable equation, less understood, in many ways more difficult, but absolutely essential if we hope to hand on to our children and grandchildren a world that is as productive or looks anything like what was given to us.

Clearly, economics is an essential foundation for this new definition of national security and what we must do. That is why President Clinton has charted a course for economic renewable at home and partnership abroad, as he said last week, "to focus on global growth in the short run, and then to think about what the world will look like in the next century and what we must do to get there."

The G-7 Summit was completed last week, and where are we related to our developed global partners (Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Japan and Canada)? The numbers are a startling success story:

o the United States has 40 percent of the gross domestic product of the G-7 nations combined -- but in the last year we had 75 percent of the growth, almost 100 percent of the new jobs, twice the investment, twice the export rate increase, and highest rate of productivity growth;

o We have got our deficit down to being the second lowest, and next year we'll have the lowest deficit of all the G-7 countries;

o NAFTA is being implemented, the Uruguay Round has been concluded, and our trade policy has clearly embraced an open, robust global marketplace as crucial for our long-term prosperity and national security.

But the agenda of this Administration is far wider and more ambitious -- weaving our economic plans and hopes into a sustainable fabric that will be a worthy legacy for posterity. In a far-ranging foreign policy address to the United Nations General Assembly last fall, the President described how the United States is working to assure a secure future by promoting sustainable development. And as he reiterated in a speech to the National Academy of Sciences 10 days ago, at the top of this agenda is population stabilization.

Unchecked, the spiral of population growth will dim every hope for economic progress in the developing world and cast a pall over every environmental endeavor. Population (and the 1994 Cairo Conference on Population and Development) must be and is at the top of our agenda for sustainable development. American leadership has been restored in international population policy and we have helped create a plan for Cairo that will launch a consensus and comprehensive approach to addressing rapid demographic change -- making family planning and reproductive health services universally available; sharply expanding the education of girls and focussing on child survival, male responsibility, strong families and the engagement of grassroots, non-governmental organizations.

Part and parcel of our strategy is the promotion of the social, political, and economic rights of women -- extraordinarily important resources for growth and agents of change. The return on these initiatives -- in terms of stability, environmental quality and economic productivity -- will outweigh the costs for generation after generation. And in the next year, at the Cairo Conference, the Social Summit in Copenhagen, and the Women's Conference in Beijing, this will be a common theme of American foreign policy, and we believe an achievable goal early in the 21st century.

Similarly, provision of basic health services is a wise investment for the community of nations, and can be achieved at relatively little global cost. The elimination of four major, easily-preventable diseases -- measles, tetanus, whooping cough and polio; eradication of iodine and Vitamin A deficiencies and the global availability of oral rehydration therapy are all achievable early in the next century. Successfully done, these measures alone would save 3-4 million lives annually and perhaps eliminate upwards of 20 million early childhood deaths, ease immeasurable, unnecessary suffering, and make a significant contribution to lowering pressures for larger families.

Part of our global health strategy also includes a major focus on AIDS, recognizing that while cure may be decades away, we can help with aggressive prevention strategies in those parts of the world where the spread of the infection is epidemic.

Biodiversity is a third priority -- a broad umbrella for the task of preserving God's creation, the biological inheritance that comprises all living things. This vast wealth of genetic information is critical to our long term economic and environmental integrity, and we must do all that we can to preserve it. The Clinton Administration has signed the Biodiversity Treaty, which in turn was passed almost unanimously by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and should be ratified by the full Senate this summer. We can then go to the first Conference of the Parties with the momentum we need to help launch a worldwide effort to catalog, prospect in, and sustainably utilize this great and largely unknown library of information. The next century will surely be the century of biology, and we must be engaged in order to fully utilize these remarkable opportunities for new sources of food, fuel, fibre and pharmaceuticals.

Integrating environmental and economic imperatives at the national level is a fourth unmet task. Nations, including the United States can no longer assume that we bear no cost for fouling the air or depleting our resources. Instead, we need to internalize those costs and allow the genius of the marketplace to help determine the most efficient means of achieving our environmental goals. Under the leadership of Commerce Secretary Ron Brown, we are embarked on a serious and difficult undertaking to "get the prices right," to develop a so-called green accounting system that can give us proper, unsubsidized measures of what is really happening in our economy.

Fifth is the challenge of reforming our international institutions to better promote sustainable development. The World Bank, the most important public engine for development, will play a central role in fostering the transition to sustainable development. We must work harder to encourage changes in lending practices to make good on the promise of greater emphasis on smaller-scale, decentralized projects to promote alternative development, to protect the environment, to preserve the rights of local populations, and to recognize the role of crucial sub-populations -- particularly women -- in the development process.

This goal of institutional reform is part of the sixth and final challenge, which I will call the challenge of governing in the 21st century. Traditionally we have assumed that our relationships with the rest of the world were like a hub and a spoke; we are the hub in Washington, and individual spokes go out to capitals around the world -- to London, Delhi, Tokyo or Bogota. But much of this traditional way of managing our

affairs and dealing with world problems is changing, as we move up to broader, cooperative international alliances and organizations, and down to the rapidly growing network of private, non-governmental, voluntary organizations. Let me explain.

In this post-Cold War world, our problems spill messily across traditional lines -- global climate change, ozone depletion, biodiversity, refugees, narcotics -- all these issues have become concerns which challenge us all, and must be dealt with through stronger multilateral, cooperative organizations. President Clinton raised this issue with our G-7 partners last week -- isn't it time to re-examine our international institutions, to be sure they are adequate to the tasks of the 21st century? This will not be easy. Walls can be brought down in a day. Changing the consciousness of individuals and forging common cause among institutions is much, much more difficult. But we have a rich, if complicated, framework from which to build. The United Nations Development Programme, UNFPA, UNICEF, the Commission on Human Rights -- creative and capable all -- must rally behind common themes and a common sense of purpose. I believe sustainable development will be that cause for the 21st century.

These ideas are not only supported, but also being championed by the team put in place by the Administration to reinvent development priorities for the United States and the world. That is the challenge of the Global Affairs unit at the State Department and corresponding teams put in place at the NSC and the intelligence community. It is the unenviable and often thankless task that has been taken on by Brian Atwood who is trying to transform sustainable development from concept to reality -- supporting broad access by people to their country's economic, environmental and political decisionmaking. It is the work of Gus Speth at UNDP, where he is working to improve UN coordination and focus on sustainable human development, which links the abstract goals of sustainable development to people and their lives.

And the challenge of governance goes down, to the great wave of people organizing to have a say in the direction of their own lives around the world, who have been far ahead of government in recognizing the challenge of sustainable development. The phenomenal growth of non-governmental organizations around the world is one of the salient features of our time. The OECD counted over 2,500 NGOs among its 24 countries in 1990, up from 1,600 a decade before. But that is nothing compared to NGO growth in the developing world. Roger Riddell of the Overseas Development Institute suggests there may be 25,000 grassroots organizations in one Indian state, Tamil Nadu.

The heroes of the Earth Summit in Rio were not the heads of State, but the NGO's who defined and drove Agenda 21. Women's groups from around the world played a leading role in the

organization and agenda of the recent UN Human Rights Conference in Vienna; in fact, they saved the UN commitment to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. And the preparations for Cairo have not only reinforced, but surpassed these prior standards. Our challenge is to enlist and engage the sensitivity, enthusiasm and creativity that grassroots groups offer, a new and highly promising challenge for those who presume to govern.

Together, the momentum that is building in the Clinton Administration and the citizenry reflects an understanding that our nation's security depends on more than military might. It recognizes that our security is entwined with the well being of our neighbors. Political boundaries are porous; environmental devastation and disease do not stop at national borders. And the increasingly globalized economy has drawn more tightly the bonds that connect us.

In the newly configured world, national security is closely linked to human security. Human security is built on a foundation of peace and political stability, physical health, and economic well being. The primary threats to human security may not be as easy to recognize as, say, an enemy's nuclear arsenal, but they are no less deadly.

These are the threats posed by the abject poverty in which one billion of the world's people live; the hunger that stalks 800 million men, women, and children; the spread of HIV/AIDS, which will infect 30-40 million people by the year 2000; and the combination of violence, poverty and environmental degradation that have forced 20 million people from their homes.

Here in the United States and around the globe we are coming to understand the close connections between poverty, the environment, the economy and security. This historic transformation demands that we now liberate ourselves -- from outworn policies, from old assumptions, from fixed views that only yesterday seemed to be the dividing and defining lines of our politics.

Crisis prevention and the challenge of sustainable development are among the great challenges for the remainder of this and into the next Century. It is time to retool our approach to national security -- recognizing that our economic and environmental futures are one in the same. And it is these challenges which will determine the future we leave to our children and grandchildren.

And we have no choice. Let me close by asking you to imagine that a man is out on the ledge of a high building, and you have been asked to talk him back, to persuade him not to jump.

That is where we are today; the United States must take the lead in persuading the world not to gravely hurt itself. Some will minimize the threat, or say that we don't have enough knowledge to act now. Others, including many of you here, have noticed that the man on the ledge has a rope tied around his ankle. The other end is tied to us, and if he goes down, we all go down together.

Thank you.