



The President's Interagency Council on Women

July 29, 1999

Council Member Melanne Vermeer
Assistant to the President and Chief of
Staff to the First Lady
Office of the First Lady

Dear Melanne:

Enclosed you will find three items that
we hope will be of interest:

1. Our new Factsheet about: **Women
2000: Beijing Plus Five.**
2. The United States Response to the
United Nations Questionnaire.
3. The Council Member Phone and
Bio Information Booklet, Fall 1999.

Please let us know if you would like more
copies.

Sincerely,

Lidia Soto-Harmon
Deputy Director

America's Commitment



The United Nations Women's Conference

Women 2000 • Beijing Plus Five

The President's Interagency Council on Women
July 27, 1999

OBJECTIVE

To celebrate the fifth anniversary of the UN Fourth World Conference on Women by highlighting progress made in implementing the 1995 *Platform for Action* adopted in Beijing; and to begin the first year of the new millennium with a reaffirmation and recommitment to policies that advance the lives of women and girls.

BACKGROUND

In 1995, 189 countries signed the *Platform for Action* at the UN Fourth World Conference on Women. The platform calls for economic opportunity and security for women; for quality education and health care; for full participation of women politically and economically; for equality; and for the promotion of the human rights of women. It is one of the strongest policy statements promoting women's advancement ever made by the international community.

THE ROLE OF THE PRESIDENT'S INTERAGENCY COUNCIL ON WOMEN

President Clinton established the President's Interagency Council on Women to coordinate the implementation of the U.S. commitment to follow up on the *Platform for Action*. First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton serves as Honorary Chair of the Council, Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright serves as Chair, and Secretary of Health and Human Services Donna Shalala as Immediate Past Chair. The members of the Council are high level representatives from executive branch agencies who work within the U.S. government. The Council holds quarterly open public briefings and discussions to continue a strong partnership with non-governmental organizations.

The Council leads U.S. government preparation for U.S. participation in *Women 2000*: the Special Session of the United Nations in June 2000 which will mark 5 years since Beijing.

- The Council will publish a five-year review of U.S. government programs, policies, and initiatives that promote the advancement of women. The 2000 edition of this publication, entitled *America's Commitment*, will highlight current efforts and projected policies and programs measured against the goals of the *Platform for Action*. Copies of *America's Commitment* will be available for distribution in time for the *Women 2000* Special Session.
- The Council is also coordinating various outreach events across the United States to celebrate the progress made since the UN Fourth World Conference on Women. These regional events will be organized in partnership with non-governmental organizations, colleges and universities, and regional community organizations, and will offer opportunities to share best practices, achievements and lessons learned.

Statement of Linda Tarr-Whelan

Ambassador-Designate to the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women

Senate Committee on Foreign Relations

July 15, 1997

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to make a short statement and to respond to any questions. Please allow me to introduce my husband, Keith Tarr-Whelan, who accompanies me today. I am honored to have been selected by President Clinton and Secretary Albright to be the nominee to be Ambassador to the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women of the Economic and Social Council.

The United Nations Commission on the Status of Women has just celebrated its Fiftieth Anniversary. It continues to serve as the central international forum where governments work together to promote and protect the human rights of women and take measures to increase women's participation in political, economic, and social life.

Since 1946 the Commission on the Status of Women has been the leading United Nations body in setting international norms for women's human rights, making women full and capable citizens and increasing women's capacities, in partnership with men, to develop their countries. The Convention to End Discrimination Against Women which embodies these norms has been ratified by more than 140 nations. It has been submitted by the Administration to the Senate as its highest human rights treaty priority.

At annual meetings in New York the 45 members of the Commission on the Status of Women, which includes the United States, review the status of women around the world, share ideas with other governments on ways to improve the lives of women and their families and recommend action by the General Assembly on issues related to women. The governments are normally represented by high level officials including cabinet ministers, ambassadors and leading members of parliament. A large number of non-governmental groups attend the sessions.

2

The most recent Commission meeting in March, 1997, for example, dealt with ways to improve women's access to capital through micro-enterprise, increase the number of women candidates for public office and improve in the participation of young girls in primary education. Next year's agenda deals substantially with issues of violence against women, women in peacekeeping and women's human rights.

President Bush was the first President to request the rank of ambassador for the U.S. Representative to this Commission. The rank of ambassador enhances the ability of the United States to negotiate and advocate for women's human rights and sends a strong signal of the importance that the United States attaches to the advancement of women. As Secretary Albright said, "...as we approach the new century, we know that we cannot build the kind of future we want without the contribution of women. And we know that, around the world, women will only be able to contribute to their full potential if they have equal access, equal rights, equal protection and a fair chance at the levers of economic and political power."

However, we are still a long way from a time when women are part of every aspect and level of contemporary life. Most of the world's abject poor including refugees are women and children. Two-thirds of adults who are illiterate are women. Women's contributions are often invisible and women and girls in many countries continue to be undervalued and their human potential underdeveloped. Unfortunately, appalling abuses continue to be committed against women. And in many governments women's voices are still not heard.

The Commission has a clear mandate to play a central and catalytic role in ensuring that women and women's rights are fully integrated into the activities of the United Nations and that the positive and negative actions of member states on women's human rights are spotlighted. The United States has an important leadership role to play in partnership with other governments and non-governmental organizations.

I appreciate the confidence which President Clinton has expressed in my work on behalf of the United States in the Commission. In 1994 and 1995 I was a public member of our delegation

3

to the Commission on the Status of Women as well as to the Regional World Preparatory Conference in Vienna, Austria and the Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing, China. For the 1996 and 1997 sessions I served as the U.S. Representative to the Commission on the Status of Women and head of the U.S. Delegation.

With deep ties to the non-profit sector, I have worked to increase access for all American non-governmental organizations in the activities of the Commission and consulted widely at regional and national gatherings across the country and at United Nations meetings. The United States continues to be the only country providing daily briefings for all accredited non-governmental organizations at sessions of the Commission.

My professional career has been primarily in the area of domestic policy. Since 1986 I have been the President/CEO of the Center for Policy Alternatives located in Washington, D.C. CPA is a 21 year old nonpartisan nonprofit progressive policy center which connects innovative people and ideas across the 50 states on state economic and social policy. I have lectured, written, developed policies and served as a spokesperson in the media on women and the economy, particularly women's economic self-sufficiency, the expansion of women-owned business, health, family and work, and education. I have served in federal and state government as Deputy Assistant to President Carter in the White House Office of Women's Concerns and Administrative Director of the New York State Department of Labor. My original field was nursing and I practiced and taught nursing for a decade.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that my roots are also important to how I would carry out my duties as Ambassador to Commission on the Status of Women if confirmed. Like many other women I balance my work life with family roles as a wife, mother, proud grandmother and very engaged daughter in the care of my elderly mother-in-law. To me, equality for women lies in the recognition of women's seamless roles in the home and in civil society and the development of full partnerships between women and men in all levels of political, social and economic institutions.

Thank you for your attention. I look forward to answering your questions.

THE YEAR OF THE WOMAN, EXECUTIVE-STYLE

BY GREG RUSHFORD

Spending a year profiling 80 of the most important economic policy-makers of the Clinton administration, as I did in 1993, would give most anyone a strong dose of résumé envy. Whether one supports him or not, there is no doubt that President Bill Clinton has brought many exceptionally talented people to Washington.

Consider just two of the brightest lights, economists Lawrence Summers and Joseph Stiglitz. Summers, 39, now undersecretary of the treasury for international affairs, became in 1983 at age 28 the youngest-ever tenured professor of economics at Harvard. And Council of Economic Advisers member Stiglitz, who first became a full professor at Yale in 1970 at age 27, is, at age 50, widely considered a shoo-in for a Nobel Prize at some point in his career.

But wait a minute. Summers and Stiglitz are, well, men. U.S. presidents have brought powerful men to Washington for more than two centuries. The real story—both in quantity and quality—of President Clinton's 1993 appointments is women.

Powerful women. Smart, assertive women. Women who make decisions that affect how big sums of money are spent. Women in non-traditional roles. Clintonites.

I'm not just talking about cabinet powers like Attorney General Janet Reno or Stiglitz' boss, Council of Economic Advisers Chairwoman Laura D'Andrea Tyson. While it is, of course, significant that Clinton has named women to six of his 22 cabinet-level positions, an arguably more accurate measure of the president's real intentions is seen a couple of steps down, in his sub-Cabinet. That's where the details of governing are really shaped.

The roughly 600 sub-Cabinet officials have their hands on the levers of power; they make thousands of decisions vital to government operations, many of them virtually unreviewable. And of the 500 people who had been named to Clinton administration sub-Cabinet positions by December, about 30 percent have been women, a percentage that could well rise significantly by the time the entire sub-Cabinet is on the job. By contrast, women made up only about 20 percent of President George Bush's sub-Cabinet.

'Sea Change'

In short, Bill Clinton has given more women important Washington jobs than any president ever has. Whatever else he does in office, this will be seen as one of Clinton's major accomplishments.

"There has been a sea change," says Doral Cooper, president of C&M International, an international trade subsidiary of D.C.'s Crowell & Moring. "The numbers of women in serious policy positions will inevitably have a trickle-down effect throughout the whole government," adds Cooper, who was the top-ranking official for Asian affairs in the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative during the Reagan administration.



When Cooper talks about "trickle down," she doesn't mean Reaganomics; rather, that women, once given high-profile jobs, are likely to bring still more women into government when they do their own hiring. Hillary Rodham Clinton, for example, has hired experienced D.C. civil-rights advocate Melanne Verwee—a woman who once helped engineer the defeat of Robert Bork for the Supreme Court—as her deputy chief of staff for issues. First ladies used to have social secretaries as aides, not sophisticated political operatives like Verwee.

Moreover, as women's rights activist Marcia Greenberger of the National Women's Law Center points out, the increasing number of women in the Clinton executive branch builds on the political events of 1992, the Year of the Woman, in which the number of women in Congress nearly doubled—to 47 in the House and seven in the Senate.

"Now, when Congress and the executive branch talk, look who's sitting at the table," says Greenberger. "Women are working together in ways they have never before. And in some respects, the sum is greater than the parts."

For those of us who came of political age in the late 1950s, as did Bill Clinton, the explanation for this does not seem complicated. Clinton is the first president who grew up with the women's movement; it's a generational thing. To a de-

gree unprecedented for a U.S. chief executive, Clinton is simply not threatened by professional, independent-thinking women. After all, in Hillary Rodham Clinton, he married such a woman.

And when you talk about powerful women in the Clinton administration, you don't have to look far:

- E. Olena Berg, an assistant secretary of labor, runs the Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration, where she oversees pension plans for some 50 million working Americans that have assets of more than \$2.3 trillion—that's about 40 percent of all U.S. financial assets.

- Jamie Gorelick, the Defense Department's general counsel and a former partner in D.C.'s Miller, Cassidy, Larroca & Lewin, oversees a legal staff of some 7,400 lawyers and provides legal advice pertaining to federal acquisition regulations, which establish the rules of the game for multibillion dollar defense procurements.

- Assistant U.S. Trade Representative Charlene Barshefsky, formerly a prominent D.C. international trade partner at Steptoe & Johnson, handles negotiations with Japan.

- Carol Lee, formerly a partner at Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, plays a key role in moving billions of dollars around the world as general counsel of the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

- Another former Wilmer, Cutler part-

ner, Sally Katzen (who became her firm's first woman partner in 1975), is the administrator of the Office of Management and Budget's Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, where she touches directly the lives of real people more than almost anyone else in government. As OIRA's head, Katzen has the power to review all proposed federal regulations involving health, safety, worker rights, and consumer protections before they can be issued.

'First' Ladies

Katzen is hardly the only woman that President Clinton has brought into government who was a "first" in something. Anne Bingaman, a leading antitrust litigator and a former partner in the D.C. office of Atlanta's Powell, Goldstein, Frazer & Murphy—now assistant attorney general for antitrust in the Department of Justice—was once the first woman law professor at the University of New Mexico School of Law. Another path-breaker is Ruth Harkin, now president and chief executive officer of the Overseas Private Investment Corp. Harkin, who was most recently of counsel in the D.C. office of Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer & Feld, became one of the first females in the United States to be elected prosecutor back in 1973, when she became prosecutor in Story County, Iowa. (Bingaman and Harkin also have husbands who have done well for themselves; both are U.S. senators.)

And at the Commerce Department's National Institute of Standards and Technology, Director Arati Prabhakar—who in 1984 became the first woman to earn a Ph.D. in applied physics at the prestigious California Institute of Technology—will dole out more than \$500 million in 1994 to boost research and development in the nation's high-technology firms.

To be sure, Clinton didn't invent the idea of empowering women. Astronaut Kathryn Sullivan—who was the first American woman ever to walk in space, and who speaks five foreign languages—has replaced the accomplished scientist Sylvia Earle as chief scientist at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Sullivan would have likely been Earle's replacement even if George Bush had been re-elected president in 1992.

And over at the Internal Revenue Service, Commissioner Margaret Milner Richardson (formerly a tax partner in the D.C. office of Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan) replaces Shirley Peterson, a Bush appointee who became the first female IRS commissioner.

But let's give most of the credit where it is due. The year 1993 began with a new president who promised to bring significant change to Washington on many fronts. On this one, at least, he has kept his word.

Greg Rushford is a senior reporter at Legal Times and the author of *Appointments With Power*, which profiles sub-Cabinet business and trade policy-makers in the Clinton administration and will be published next month by Legal Times Books.



file
Women

The President's Interagency Council on Women

First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton
Honorary Chair

Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright
Chair

Secretary of Health and Human Services
Donna Shalala, Immediate Past Chair

March 26, 1999

MEMORANDUM

TO: Ambassador Wendy R. Sherman
Under Secretary Frank Loy

FROM: Theresa Loar *TL*

SUBJECT: Recent highlights

Expanding Women's Political Participation

- Thank you, Wendy, for speaking at the event we hosted with Leadership America for the women Northern Ireland Assembly members. Your participation meant a great deal to the members of the Assembly and Mary Boergers, who had organized their visit. The women Assembly members and Mary also joined us at the White House for the St. Patrick's Day celebration. We were able to arrange for Ambassador Ruth Davis to accept Leadership America's Hummingbird Award on the Secretary's behalf on Wednesday night.
- ✓ • Durriya joined the First Lady in Tunis for a conference on women's political participation. We worked closely with NEA and AmEmbassy Tunis to shape the regional component of the meeting and the substance of the First Lady's speech. We are hoping to use some of the contacts and substantive outcomes of this conference for a future *Vital Voices*-type initiative in the region.
- ✓ • The White House's St. Patrick's Day events brought many visitors from Northern Ireland and Ireland. We used this occasion to conduct follow-up with a number of our *Vital Voices* partners. In her remarks to the guests at the White House St. Patrick's Day reception, the First Lady highlighted the success of *Vital Voices* and called for continued support of the initiative. We are working with our interagency *Vital Voices* team to identify additional follow up activities to be underway during the First Lady's visit to Belfast in mid-May.

- Alethea traveled to San Francisco to lead a debriefing session with EAP and USIA for the delegation of Chinese women leaders participating in the first of the series of exchange programs announced by the First Lady last June in Beijing. The program concluded in San Francisco after three intense weeks of activities designed to further the dialogue between Chinese women and their American counterparts. From this debriefing session, we have valuable feedback that will be used to shape future programs. The President's FY2000 budget includes International Exchanges funding to continue this initiative, and we will continue to work closely with EAP and USIA to plan and implement a minimum of four more exchanges in the coming fiscal year. EAP has come around on this program after initially opposing it. They are now grateful for the funding we have identified for this project, which has tangible, positive results.
- We met with NDI to exchange ideas for projects in several countries, including Yemen, Iceland and Northern Ireland. In Yemen, our office will help shape the component on women's political participation in NDI's Emerging Democracies Forum to be held in Sanaa this June.

Violence Against Women

- I joined the Feminist Majority Foundation for a meeting with the President to discuss the plight of women and girls in Afghanistan. The President affirmed the policy of no USG recognition for the Taliban regime, and we discussed increased support for girls' education, private sector scholarships and greater protection of Afghan refugees.
- Harold Koh and I continue to work together on the formulating the Administration's strategy for the ratification of CEDAW. We joined representatives from H and the NSC to discuss a renewed approach to ratification, including strategies to gain Congressional support, coordinate with NGOs, and develop the Administration's message on the issue. We met this week with NGOs to hear about their activities around this issue. We are presently reviewing DRL's draft paper outlining the Administration's strategy on CEDAW ratification and developing next steps for the implementation of this strategy in the near future.

Trafficking in Women and Children

- I am chairing a meeting Monday morning to coordinate the Administration's response to trafficking legislation being introduced on the Hill. Senator Wellstone introduced his legislation on trafficking this week, and we expect Congressman Chris Smith to introduce his proposal shortly. We anticipate that other members of Congress will introduce trafficking legislation as well. The Council is leading the development of a substantive response to these proposals in accordance with the Council's policy framework.

- Anita chaired a working group on trafficking in women at a U.S./Finland seminar on women's issues in the Baltic region, held in Riga, Latvia. Finnish Foreign Minister Halonen opened the conference and actively engaged in this discussion that involved over 100 representatives from Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. Foreign Minister Halonen emphasized the need for the protection and reintegration of trafficking victims back into the Baltic countries. The seminar was held as part of the Northern European Initiative and focused on economic entrepreneurship and violence against women. In a press conference, Foreign Minister Halonen acknowledged that the seminar was the result of a meeting she had with Secretary Albright at the United Nations in September 1998.
- As part of a USIA sponsored international visitor project, Alethea briefed a group of narcotics and contraband control officers from around the world on trafficking in women and children. The briefing exposed the officers to the problem of trafficking, the heavy link with organized crime, and USG strategies to combat trafficking around the world. The officers expressed appreciation for the briefing, which for many was their first introduction to issue. We look forward to working with USIA to expose international visitors to USG policies and programs on issues affecting women and girls.
- Anita met with a group of women leaders from Poland and Lithuania to discuss USG efforts to combat trafficking in women and children. The women shared first hand experiences related to trafficking in their countries, and Anita presented information on OSCE efforts to combat trafficking in the region. Anita also highlighted outcomes from the conference in Riga, Latvia on women's issues in the Baltic region, outlining ways in which the U.S., Baltics and Finland can work together on the trafficking issue.

Strategic Planning/Institutional Change

- As part of our work to institutionalize our issues in foreign policy development and resource allocation, we have completed another major phase of the strategic planning process that we began with S/RPP in September. We have just submitted to S/RPP a supplement to the guidance we provided to posts on international women's issues to inform the development of FY1999-2001 Mission Performance Plans. The supplement provides mission planning teams with strategies and performance indicators to achieve objectives related to eliminating violence against women and increasing women's political and economic participation. The supplement also highlights key countries under these objectives, as identified by Department regional and functional bureaus.

Beijing Plus Five

- Lidia and I were part of the US delegation to the Beijing Plus Five Prepcom, held at the United Nations in New York. The enabling resolution for the June 5- 9 Special Session of the General Assembly to review progress made to implement the Beijing

Platform was adopted by member-states on the last day of this session. Of note, language was adopted which included not only NGOs with ECOSOC consultative status but also NGOs accredited for the Fourth World Conference on Women. The resolution also contains a reference to electronic networking that will allow the United States to explore the possibility of broadcasting the Special Session through satellite.

- I held a planning meeting this week which included members of the U.S. delegation to the Beijing Plus Five prep-com. This working group will meet regularly and keep all interested parties advised of progress. We have a separate memo on Beijing Plus Five preparations coming to both of you.

Outreach

- As the *Vital Voices* global network continues to expand, we have had numerous requests for more information about the initiative. In light of this growing demand, we have devoted significant effort to updating our *Vital Voices* website. The website highlights conference photos, follow-up activities, and video footage and is housed on USIA's server at: www.usia.gov/vitalvoices/. ✓
- Durriya helped Bob Seiple plan the second DOS roundtable with leaders from Muslim American organizations and experts on the Islamic world. The two hour discussion, chaired by Marc Grossman, centered on issues of religious freedom in Turkey, particularly as they relate to Turkish Muslim women. This is the second time that the issue of women in Islam was raised at these roundtables. Participants also expressed their desire for a citizen exchange program for Turkish women to visit the United States and interact with American women leaders.
- We have been working with the Afghan desk on a Dateline NBC story about women and girls in Afghanistan. We have provided Dateline with good background material, including remarks from the Secretary and interview contacts for NGO experts and Afghan women and men. The piece, scheduled to air on March 31st, will include clips from the First Lady's address on March 4th at the UN and the President's remarks at the Feminist Majority Foundation's event. ✓

*Beir
Woman*



1999

Women's Economic Summit of the Americas
Buenos Aires, Argentina
November 11-13, 1999

TO: FIRST LADY HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
THE WHITE HOUSE

FR: MS. IRENE NATIVIDAD *IN*
SUMMIT DIRECTOR

DT: DECEMBER 9, 1999 ATTN: MELANNE VERVEER, CHIEF OF STAFF

Dear Hillary:

I wanted to tell you that another follow-up project to the *Vital Voices in Democracy* series that you've spearheaded has just completed and was deemed a success by all. I am referring to the 1999 *Women's Economic Summit of the Americas*, which took place in Buenos Aires last Nov. 11-13th. After "Vital Voices" in Montevideo, I heard from the business and entrepreneurial women in my sessions that they wanted to link up along the lines of economic development. This plea combined with my past experience in organizing five prior Summits, in which Latin American and Caribbean women were conspicuously absent, moved me to organize the Buenos Aires conference.

Well, as difficult as it was to assemble this Women's Economic Summit, I must say that it was worth all the effort. About 400+ business, entrepreneurial and professional women participated in the Summit. USAID, USIA, SBA and the Dept. of Commerce provided support, with Commerce organizing a trade mission of American women entrepreneurs, which joined the Summit. Canada also organized its own trade mission. There was great electricity and excitement among the women, many of whom remarked on the high caliber of the speakers and the presentations. We provided a strong overlay of technology, as well as showcased women who head up world trade centers, women ministers, women heads of major enterprises and major microenterprise organizations. Amb. Ashby even led one of the sessions on E-commerce, along with a Nortel vice president. The publisher of *Latin Trade* magazine (who is a woman), a Belize microentrepreneur who now exports to the U.S. and Japan, the CEO of Cybergrrl, who designs web sites for women 18-35 years old, are some of the interesting speakers who were part of this exciting conference.

I am sending along a copy of the program and some press clips to give you a sense of what transpired, so you can see what wonderful energy and regional linkages you have wrought. More than the new strategies, ideas and contacts, the women revelled in the sense of the possible. I know you're busy with the New York Senate race, but I wanted you to see that your international work continues to flourish.

*file
women*

Remarks of J. Brian Atwood

Women's Foreign Policy Group

Washington, D.C.

September 8, 1995

I am very honored by your invitation to speak to this group. As I reviewed your membership list, I saw many friends and colleagues, and many individuals who might have been more interesting luncheon speakers than me!

That led me to ask myself a question to which I have long struggled to find a satisfactory answer. Do women bring a different perspective to foreign policy issues?

For a long time, I have resisted that proposition. I can remember arguing the point with my friend Gerry Ferraro. She feels that women bring a very different perspective to most public policy issues and she makes a persuasive case. I can remember arguing that those women who have led governments, like men, do not fit any distinct pattern -- some were very tough indeed, others less so. I also said that I didn't feel that it served the interest of professional women or women in politics to accentuate gender differences with men. Gerry, of course, agreed that no society or no profession can realize its full potential if half the population cannot fully participate. That was sufficient common ground for me.

Now, the Beijing conference is reopening these issues as it calls attention to the status of women. We are being reminded on a daily basis that women are most often the victims of social, economic and legal discrimination and of foreign policy failures. Two-thirds of the refugees from civil conflict, for example, are women and their children. Yet, only six percent of the policy level positions in governments around the world are occupied by women.

Is there a connection between these two facts? Probably. If 50 percent of the population is represented in only six percent of the policy positions, then how can our decision-making be whole; how can we fully exploit the human ingenuity that will produce the creative solutions we need?

And maybe Gerry Ferraro is right. Maybe there is a gender-related perspective that is different. Goodness knows, we need a new perspective. As we struggle to find the new George Kennon -- the person or persons who will help us define Post-Cold War foreign policy -- we cannot afford to waste anyone's good mind, anyone's special perspective.

Let me offer mine. My perspective has changed over time -- to some extent because of where I sit and because of what I have done over the past decade. Most importantly, I have come to see diplomacy as only one element of foreign policy. I have come to see that it is possible to penetrate within a foreign society far beyond the governmental level to advance interests that are common to the peoples of both sides in any bilateral relationship. I have also been directly exposed to the extraordinary costs -- in human and monetary terms -- of the international community's failures. More on that later.

The first point I would make is an obvious one: that traditional power-block diplomacy is less relevant today. Now, for those disciples of Henry Kissinger, I want to emphasize: that is not the same as saying that power is irrelevant. We are the remaining superpower because we can project military might, influence foreign markets and force the world to address its inequities -- whether the world likes it or not.

Witness Hillary Clinton in China. She was one of many who were speaking truths in Beijing. She was doing it forcefully, eloquently, and she was also the First Lady of the United States. When she speaks, people listen.

Like many things we do today, Hillary Clinton was not practicing traditional diplomacy in Beijing. She was inspiring millions of people to contemplate their position in society and to take action to improve it. She was forging a new and stronger international consensus on the status of women. She was creating new alliances, non-governmental alliances. But she was not conducting traditional diplomacy. And perhaps because of that, her effect was all the more dramatic.

Let me make a point that is less arguable today than it might have been last week: Mrs. Clinton did more for the cause of human rights in China by going to Beijing than she would have by staying home. That is also, by the way, an argument for engagement. When in doubt, engage!

Back in the 70's, what de Tocqueville saw as our uniquely pluralistic society -- a society he said was probably incapable of conducting a viable foreign policy -- produced yet another innovative approach to international relations. Some called it a new brand of interventionism. Driven by political and moral forces, our government began to express concern about individuals who were being tortured and abused in foreign prisons. Human rights became a part of global diplomatic discourse. And we not only saved human beings, we strengthened the international legal regime and indirectly spawned a new expansion of democracy. Mrs. Clinton's public diplomacy on behalf of women has raised that particular brand of interventionism to a new art.

So it is possible to introduce new initiatives, new approaches -- and to gain public support for them. Yet we seem stuck today as we contemplate our challenges and assess our needs. We are coming to understand the threats to our interests, yet we cannot generate the political support necessary to raise the resources we need. And we seem afraid to venture too far from the comfortable mind-set and institutional structures of the Cold War. Thus, we speak of preventive diplomacy while we drown in crises.

And we are paying through the nose for these crises, yet we can't find the money to pay for prevention. We spend endless hours negotiating for peace with intractable opponents, but little time negotiating the new structures to prevent conflict.

This is where perspective comes into play. We need a new one. We need to break out of our old think; we need to broaden our definition of national security. We need to be shamelessly creative.

How should we respond? Maybe we should argue it differently. Let's talk about how much it costs to not act against threats, to fail to seize opportunities, or to act too late, after the fact. Is this cheaper?

The costs of the conflict in the former Yugoslavia are staggering. From 1991 through 1995, the total USG assistance package was nearly \$1 billion. The UN sanctions are estimated to have cost the region well over \$20 billion. The human costs are unparalleled in the past 40 years in Europe.

But the costs of failure in the developing world far exceed this.

The so-called complex crisis in Mozambique ran for more than a decade and cost \$5.9 billion in relief aid. Mozambique's own economic losses were an estimated \$15 billion.

The complex crisis in Sudan has cost half a million lives. Sudan has squandered a billion dollars on arms. Relief for a quarter of a million refugees costs the industrial states hundreds of millions of dollars a year.

In Peru, the Shining Path guerrillas inflicted \$22 billion in direct damage on the economy. In Rwanda, in the past 18 months, the world community spent nearly \$2 billion to help the refugees; the tab for the U.S. over \$500,000,000. Peacekeeping costs alone in 1994 exceeded everything that the UN had spent on peacekeeping for the preceding 35 years!

And the costs don't end when the conflict ends. Long after the refugees return to their homes, there are reconstruction costs. Mogadishu, Somalia, no longer has an electrical grid; the copper wire was stripped and sold. Resettlement costs. The cost of reintegrating combatants. In El Salvador, that will exceed \$300,000,000. The cost of removing land mines, which in a place like Cambodia, for instance, may ultimately require \$7 billion.

Now tell me that we can afford -- afford, as in pay for -- to let nations fail. Tell me that doing nothing saves money. Tell me that we cannot afford a program that provides education or health care or creates housing or turns farmers into exporters, but that we can afford to lay out billions each year to accommodate the latest wave of refugees.

Although there is no question that we must allocate resources to prevention, we cannot think of the cost only in dollar terms, nor within the old Cold War budget framework. Prevention will save us money, but we must have the political will to fund it and to spend time engaging in it even when we know that conflict garners more media attention.

For two years, I have been saying that foreign assistance is a strategic response to a strategic threat, no less relevant in its time than ICBMs or bombers. The armaments of the Cold War are useless against many of the threats we face now. Though our traditional defense remains the core of our credibility and our own national security, no military can fight poverty or hunger or environmental damage on a global scale.

We are slowly coming to realize that these conditions contribute to civil strife. You will be pleased to know that the military has become the institution most sensitive to this. They know they can contain one civil conflict, maybe two, but not dozens. And they do not want to become the President's first option.

Our national security community is fast gearing up to adjust our responses to meet the new realities. For example, a recent CIA study correlates societal stability with the extent of human development, the level and relative fragility of democratic systems and a nation's openness to trade. The CIA Task Force on Failed States has identified the very problems that foreign aid addresses as key determinants of stability.

The Defense Intelligence Agency recently identified the ecological deterioration of Lake Victoria as one of the greatest underlying non-traditional causes of instability in East Africa, a region where ethnic conflict, structural food insecurity and rapid population growth have already brought widespread chaos. Thirty million people are

at risk of having their livelihoods and their well-being compromised by a fast growing water hyacinth plant inadvertently imported from Latin America. That is of concern to the Defense Intelligence Agency in 1995, because in the next few years our military forces may be called upon to deal with the consequences.

This concern has also been manifested in strong public statements supporting foreign aid from the likes of Secretary Perry and General Shalikashvili, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They recently wrote a USA Today article which concluded with the following line: "Foreign aid, like defense spending, helps preserve our national security."

It is somewhat ironic. Generals Shalikashvili and Scowcroft and Defense Secretary Perry are advocating foreign aid as an important part of our national security apparatus. The intelligence community is pointing to development as a key element of crisis prevention. Yet, Congress is slashing foreign aid while spending precious tax dollars on B-2 bombers and STARWARS -- programs the military hasn't asked for.

These intelligence community assessments and more like them reflect a growing understanding throughout our U.S. government that U.S. leadership in the development field is a crucial part of our arsenal in the post-Cold War world. We know that in 20 years, when there are two billion additional people, the challenges will be far less manageable. No one wants our military to be the first and only option in an endless stream of engagements. We need a preventive strategy that we can afford and one that works.

We also need new structures and mechanisms to carry out preventive diplomacy effectively. We need more effective early warning systems that incorporate an assessment of the pressures created by deteriorating conditions. We need to act in concert with the international community to mitigate those conditions. And we need to find ways to intervene more effectively to resolve internal disputes within sovereign borders.

There is a growing appreciation that foreign assistance that produces results, like the defense we maintained during the Cold War, is a strategic deterrent. Democracies reinforce each other; free markets reward each other. Just as crisis can feed upon crisis, so can success spur success. Progress discourages adventurism. Opportunity cuts the ground out from those extremists who would disrupt and create conflict.

I do not believe that humanity is doomed to self-destruct. While we cannot

prevent every Rwanda, we can work for a world in which people have a way to avoid hopelessness, a world where people do not see violence as their last resort.

Fortunately, despite the realities of today's Washington, we still have an opportunity to realize the peace dividend afforded us by the end of the Cold War. We have accumulated valuable experience and we have new tools for crisis prevention that did not exist even a decade ago. Today's opportunities, combined with all those flaws of pluralism that de Tocqueville saw, are the strengths with which we can face the challenges of the 21st century. We cannot afford to squander them.

So we need a new perspective. We need to accept the proposition that being tough-minded can also lead us to conclude that military weapons alone are not sufficient. We need to welcome newcomers into a debate that has been closed and stultified. After all, one of them may be the next George Kennon. Thank you.