

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. schedule	re: Schedule for Hillary Rodham Clinton [partial] (2 pages)	03/11/1997	b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Speechwriting
Lissa Muscatine
OA/Box Number: 12092

FOLDER TITLE:

HRC - International Women's Day 3/12/97

2017-1164-S

rc2657

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

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

DRAFT 3/11/97
8:00 pm

FIRST LADY HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
REMARKS FOR A CELEBRATION OF INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY
THE STATE DEPARTMENT
WASHINGTON, D.C.
MARCH 12, 1997

Acknowledgments: TK

Today, we celebrate International Women's Day in the heart of the State Department. And we have much to celebrate -- starting with a Secretary of State, who broke a barrier by virtue of her own gender, but who, more importantly, is committed to defending the rights not just of Americans but of citizens around the world regardless of gender.

I thank her for her leadership, her courage, and most of all, her friendship.

I come here this morning to advance a simple idea: The seamless inclusion of girls and women in American foreign policy. Despite the work they do, the families they raise, the communities they hold together, too many of the world's women -- particularly in developing nations -- live on the outskirts of opportunity and equality.

Why should this be a concern of ours here in the United States? Because if half of the citizens on this earth are undervalued, underpaid, undereducated, under-represented, fed less, fed worse, not heard -- we cannot sustain the democratic values and way of life we have come to cherish.

If, as a nation, we care about opening foreign markets for American goods and services...if we care about making our country secure in the face of new threats...if we care about widening the circle of peace and prosperity . . . then we must do nothing less than address the conditions and circumstances of the world's women.

You in this room know better than anyone else that our world is in a time of great transformation, heralding ever more democracy, leading to ever more peace. But the great promise of this time is not without its challenges.

Global competition, the Information Revolution, and the rapid pace of change create new pressures on all of society, from governments on down to families. And these pressures pose unavoidable questions for all of us as we approach the 21st century: Questions about how to balance individual and community rights and responsibilities; about how parents will raise children in the face of the influences of the mass media and consumer culture; about personal identity and work in an age of globalization and high technology; about the roles of women in

society; about how people will preserve their ethnic pride and value their national citizenship; about how nations will protect their sovereignty while cooperating regionally and globally with others.

Thinking about these challenges, and how a free nation like ours will respond to them, we may need to be reminded that democracy is not just about our legally protected rights, elections or even free market economies. It's about the internalization of democratic values in people's hearts and minds. It's about how, in the absence of either hot or cold wars, democracy is rooted in people's everyday lives.

Given these changes, we can no longer gauge our interests around the world solely through power blocs and vast arsenals. Across the globe, as here at home, the end of the Cold War has freed us to focus on issues that edge right up to our frontdoors. How do we educate our children? How do we ensure that our families have proper health care? How do we see to it that our children -- boys and girls -- have the opportunity to live up to their God-given promise? These are not, of course, "women's issues." But no one is better able to point us toward answers than women, who by necessity have become the world's experts on the hazards and vicissitudes of life.

I have seen for myself on continent after continent the solutions women are forging: New mothers in Jojakarta, Indonesia, who gather every week to learn about family planning and better nutrition for their children. Doctors and nurses in Belarus and Ukraine, who are caring for the children of Chernobyl. Women from Santiago to San Diego who are working on issues as diverse as education, crime, and the environment.

These issues are central to our global democratic interests, for what distinguishes democracy is fair and genuine participation in every aspect of life. It should be too obvious to point out -- but, too often, it isn't -- that giving women a stronger voice and full say over their futures is intimately related to the health of democracies because women are the majority in most countries and the world over.

America's credo should ring clearly: A democracy without the full participation of women is a contradiction in terms. As such, it is doomed to fail.

Clearly, whether we succeed in strengthening democratic values around the world is of special consequence to women who -- in our country and others -- are still striving to attain and define their rightful place in government, the economy and civil society and claim their share of personal, political, economic and civic power.

Raising the status of women -- and investing in their potential -- means ensuring that women and girls around the world have access to the tools of opportunity: education, health care, credit and jobs, legal protections and the right to participate fully in the political life of their countries. And that is why the United States must continue its bipartisan tradition of supporting

initatives that move our world closer to these goals.

Today, more than 600 million women worldwide are denied the opportunity of an education. Women make up two-thirds of those who can neither read nor write.

Yet the single most important investment any developing nation can make is in the education of girls and women. We are discovering in country after country that the benefits of educating women go far beyond the schoolroom -- to stronger families, better health, nutrition, wages, and level of political participation.

I saw this firsthand in the state of Kerala in India. Kerala has the highest literacy and life expectancy rates in India. It has the lowest infant mortality rate. Why? Because there is a tradition of investing in health care for **both** boys and girls.

In Sri Lanka, where women have had the right to vote for most of this century, they are well-educated, receive the best health care in the region, and have lower maternal mortality rates than women in many wealthier nations.

I have seen how similar social investments -- many supported by the United States -- can make a difference in countries as diverse as Brazil, the Philippines, Nepal, and Pakistan. Perhaps the most extraordinary was Bangladesh. There, a government program helps very poor families to send their children -- including their daughters -- to school, in return for food. The government actually deposits a small sum in a family's bank account, so long as the girls stay in school.

Women will not flourish -- and neither will democracy -- if they continue to be undervalued in and outside the home. Women constitute 70% of the world's poor. And as the income gap continues to widen in country after country -- and we see a proliferation of jobs that require greater skill and education -- women are in danger of falling farther and farther behind.

Women must be assured the opportunity to earn a decent income and become economically self-sufficient. This means investing in the great untapped reservoir of human potential that women represent.

A bank run by the Self-Employed Women's Association in Ahmedabad, India was founded by a disciple of Gandhi named Ela Bhatt. The bank has one room. The teller's counter is an old kitchen table. Bank clerks record all the transactions by hand, on yellow sheets of paper bound in volumes that look like worn-out phone books. But women walk 12 to 15 miles from remote villages to take out their small loans -- some as small as \$1 -- to invest in dairy cows, or plows, or goods they sell at market. The bank has 60,000 members -- all women, many of whom are among the poorest, least educated, most ostracized in India. Women run the bank, make the deposits, borrow the money. Today, the bank has assets of more than \$3 million. Its loan repayment rate is nearly 100% -- the envy of most commercial banks. It is but one example of the grassroots enterprises targeted at women that are reshaping local and regional landscapes around

the world.

I said that women's ingenuity yields solutions, and nowhere is this clearer than in how the lessons of microcredit learned in South Asia can bring equally impressive results halfway across the globe. Mi Casa, in a busy city in America's Rocky Mountains, is one of a growing number of microenterprise projects in the United States. Mi Casa provides women in Denver -- many of them Hispanic Americans who have been on public assistance -- career counseling, vocational training, and technical assistance to start their own businesses. These women are talented, eager, and hard-working. But there is no way they can qualify for credit through traditional commercial institutions. Microcredit gives them the opportunity to lift themselves and their families to a higher economic station in life. Even an advanced economy such as ours, this simple system of providing credit for the poor has enormous implications as we try to narrow the income gap, enlarge the middle class, and move people from welfare to work.

Investing in women also means investing in their health -- and in turn, in the health of their families. I am especially proud that the United States has provided assistance through the U.S. Agency for International Development to assure that women, children and families have access to a full spectrum of low-cost, high-yield health care services -- from safe birthing kits for expectant mothers, to basic immunizations for infants, to oral rehydration therapy to treat children suffering from diarrhea.

Let me say a special word about family planning and its importance in this larger effort. Family planning is fundamental to letting women take responsibility for themselves and their children. Right now, though, roughly 100 million women cannot get or are not using family planning services because they are poor, uneducated, or do not have access to care. Some 20 million women will seek unsafe abortions. Of these women, some will become disabled for life. The rate of unsafe abortions is a tragedy; but even more of a disgrace is the high rate of abortions worldwide [*is this language okay?*]. This high abortion rate does not represent women's equality. It represents a failure on all of our parts to help women prevent unwanted pregnancies in the first place. No woman wants to go through an abortion if she can possibly avoid it.

If we really care about reducing abortion and fostering strong families, we must not back away from our commitment to family planning efforts overseas.

And if we really care about making women equal partners in societies the world over, we must do everything in our power to fight violence against women -- whether it is a hidden crime of domestic abuse or a blatant tactic of war.

No single social investment is a panacea for women or for developing countries. Nor should every just cause in the world be America's to embrace. But I do believe that as long as discrimination and inequities persist, a stable, prosperous and peaceful world will be far from a reality.

Before I close, I want to say a word about my forthcoming trip to Africa.

Just as women worldwide have demonstrated that their solutions can make a difference for us all, so the African continent, too often overlooked, yields its own examples of hope. Contemporary history is a story that citizens and countries are writing, and around the globe, there is a new narrative of peace. Every region is contributing its own chapter. And Africa has a remarkable story to tell.

Africa is moving toward democracy. In the last 6 years, the number of democracies on that continent has jumped from 5 to 25.

Africa is growing economically, moving from suffocating state-controlled economies to open markets that can give full life and scope to human endeavor. Last year, 30 countries recorded positive economic growth.

Africa is beginning to forge a new relationship with the United States -- one based not on aid, but on shared ideals, mutual responsibilities, and partnerships designed to resolve conflicts and to meet common challenges.

To be sure, many of the African democracies are new and fragile. Hope remains tenuous. Too much of the continent continues to be riven by disease, malnutrition, poverty, injustice, corruption, perilous conflicts -- and their terrible aftermath: refugee crises that trap women and children, especially, in lives that go from bad to worse.

And yet. And yet in spite of these challenges, for the first time in a long time we can say that for Africa, there are now grounds for more hope than despair. With the support of the United States, we can solidify that hope.

I will visit Senegal, South Africa, Zimbabwe, Tanzania, Uganda, and Eritrea -- and I am pleased that so many of their Excellencies are here with us today. I hope to witness firsthand, and to highlight, each country's efforts to build a strong democracy and a civil society; I will focus particularly on grassroots initiatives and on efforts that affect women and children.

I hope this trip will give the American people a renewed sense of the importance of our commitment to Africa. I hope it will lay out exactly why we must do our utmost to support democracy and social investment in Africa and to strengthen Africa's place in the community of nations. And I hope it will show that American engagement must be measured not just in aid dollars but in the democratic values we reinforce, in the human rights we defend, and in the conflicts we help resolve.

There are issues of national security at stake. Instability in Africa, whether it is rooted in war, in terrorism, in organized crime, in disease, in environmental degradation, in poverty, touches us, too.

There are economic issues at stake. Right now the United States holds only 7% of the African market of 600 million people. By forging stronger economic ties with Africa, we will do much to secure the prosperity of our own people, as well.

And there are moral issues: We must include Africa in American foreign policy because Africa is a neighbor on this one shared Earth. This new era proves daily that for us all to be successful, we must acknowledge that we are all dependent and interdependent. We do not have a person, a country, a region, much less a continent to waste.

Thank you.

###

3/12/97
9:00 am

FIRST LADY HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
REMARKS FOR A CELEBRATION OF INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY
THE STATE DEPARTMENT
WASHINGTON, D.C.
MARCH 12, 1997

Acknowledgments: TK

Today, we celebrate International Women's Day in the heart of the State Department. And we have much to celebrate -- starting with a Secretary of State, who broke a barrier by virtue of her own gender, but who, more importantly, is committed to defending the rights not just of Americans but of citizens around the world regardless of gender.

I thank her for her leadership, her courage, and most of all, her friendship. And I am delighted that she has agreed to serve as the new chair for the President's Interagency Council on Women.

we all know that this is
~~That council, of course, is but one of the~~ countless responsibilities facing our new Secretary of State -- and ^{all his} ~~you~~. Our foreign policy does not lack for challenges. We must continue to reduce weapons of mass destruction; to realize the century's long dream of a wholly united, democratic, and peaceful Europe; to capture new opportunities in Asia; to seize opportunities for peace in the Middle East and other strategic areas of the world; to work with our partners in Latin America, Africa, and elsewhere to build an inclusive and expanding global economy; to safeguard our people from the new threats of terrorism, extremism, international crime, drugs, and environmental degradation.

While all 6. Note require your attention + time back, But 6 days I want to talk about just one. I have one here for you.
~~And we must do something else -- which is what I would like to talk with you about today. We must advance a simple idea:~~ The seamless inclusion of girls and women in American foreign policy. Despite the work they do, the families they raise, the communities they hold together, too many of the world's women -- particularly in developing nations -- live on the outskirts of opportunity and equality.

But let me be clear: This issue is not consigned to the developing world. We still have plenty of work to do in America and in the advanced economies of the world to ensure that women have a full stake in democracy. Our goal in every country should be to see to it that all citizens -- regardless of race, or gender, or ethnicity -- have a full place at the table.

If you'll forgive me one personal story. I was in Arkansas yesterday. I visited people who had been hit by a terrible tornado. Even before disaster took everything they had, these people were already ^{been} working overtime to build good lives, to reach their aspirations. The full benefits of

society were still a long way away.

Later, I spoke at an event to help single parents go to college. I heard stories from 5 women who had been convinced by their families and their communities that getting more education wouldn't really help much. Fortunately, there was an outside organization to convince them otherwise. These women all returned to school and today they are citizens in the fullest sense.

Here as
The point I want to make is that: Wherever disparities of wealth exist -- in our country and around the world -- people ~~are~~^{ne} by the side of the road, unable to benefit from the full benefits of society. What we are trying to do is to promote democracy and civil society in every society so that every citizen can live up to his God-given potential.
-- men, women, + child --

democracy.
So why should women in developing countries and around the world be a concern of ours here in the United States? Because if half of the citizens on this earth are undervalued, underpaid, undereducated, under-represented, fed less, fed worse, not heard -- we cannot sustain the democratic values and way of life we have come to cherish.

If, as a nation, we care about opening foreign markets for American goods and services...if we care about making our country secure in the face of new threats...if we care about widening the circle of peace and prosperity . . . then we must do nothing less than address the conditions and circumstances of the world's women.

You in this room know better than anyone else that our world is in a time of great transformation, heralding ever more democracy, leading to ever more peace. But the great promise of this time is not without its challenges.

Global competition, the Information Revolution, and the rapid pace of change create new pressures on all of society, from governments on down to families. And these pressures pose unavoidable questions for all of us as we approach the 21st century: Questions about how to balance individual and community rights and responsibilities; about how parents will raise children in the face of the influences of the mass media and consumer culture; about personal identity and work in an age of globalization and high technology; about the roles of women in society; about how people will preserve their ethnic pride and value their national citizenship; about how nations will protect their sovereignty while cooperating regionally and globally with others.

Thinking about these challenges, and how a free nation like ours will respond to them, we may need to be reminded that democracy is not just about our legally protected rights, elections or even free market economies. It's about the internalization of democratic values in people's hearts and minds. It's about how, in the absence of either hot or cold wars, democracy is rooted in people's everyday lives.

Given these changes, we can no longer gauge our interests around the world solely through power blocs and vast arsenals. Across the globe, as here at home, the end of the Cold War has freed us to focus on issues that edge right up to our frontdoors. How do we educate our children? How do we ensure that our families have proper health care? How do we see to it that our children -- boys and girls -- have the opportunity to live up to their God-given promise? These are not, of course, "women's issues." But no one is better able to point us toward answers than women, who by necessity have become the world's experts on the hazards and vicissitudes of life.

I have seen for myself on continent after continent the solutions women are forging: New mothers in Jojakarta, Indonesia, who gather every week to learn about family planning and better nutrition for their children. Doctors and nurses in Belarus and Ukraine, who are caring for the children of Chernobyl. Women from Santiago to San Diego who are working on issues as diverse as education, crime, and the environment.

These issues are central to our global democratic interests, for what distinguishes democracy is fair and genuine participation in every aspect of life. It should be too obvious to point out -- but, too often, it isn't -- that giving women a stronger voice and full say over their futures is intimately related to the health of democracies because women are the majority in most countries and the world over.

America's credo should ring clearly: A democracy without the full participation of women is a contradiction in terms. As such, it is doomed to fail.

Clearly, whether we succeed in strengthening democratic values around the world is of special consequence to women who -- in our country and others -- are still striving to attain and define their rightful place in government, the economy and civil society and claim their share of personal, political, economic and civic power.

Raising the status of women -- and investing in their potential -- means ensuring that women and girls around the world have access to the tools of opportunity: education, health care, credit and jobs, legal protections and the right to participate fully in the political life of their countries. And that is why the United States must continue its bipartisan tradition of supporting initiatives that move our world closer to these goals.

Today, more than 600 million women worldwide are denied the opportunity of an education. Women make up two-thirds of those who can neither read nor write.

Yet the single most important investment any developing nation can make is in the education of girls and women. We are discovering in country after country that the benefits of educating women go far beyond the schoolroom -- to stronger families, better health, nutrition, wages, and level of political participation.

DRAFT 3/11/97
11:30 pm

nuclear
policy -
rise to

A lot of other issues at stake in
policy - many other things could be
discussed with relation to nation
globalization of economy, rise of terrorism,
But as much as all these other issues are
one among

**FIRST LADY HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
REMARKS FOR A CELEBRATION OF INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY
THE STATE DEPARTMENT
WASHINGTON, D.C.
MARCH 12, 1997**

[Acknowledgments]

Today, we celebrate International Women's Day in the heart of the State Department. And we have much to celebrate -- starting with a Secretary of State, who broke a barrier by virtue of her own gender, but who, more importantly, is committed to defending the rights not just of Americans but of citizens around the world regardless of gender.

[More on Albright]

I thank her for her leadership, her courage, and most of all, her friendship.

I come here this morning to advance a simple idea: The seamless inclusion of girls and women in American foreign policy. Despite the work they do, the families they raise, the communities they hold together, too many of the world's women -- particularly in developing nations -- live on the outskirts of opportunity and equality.

Why should this be a concern of ours here in the United States? Because if half of the citizens on this earth are undervalued, underpaid, undereducated, under-represented, fed less, fed worse, not heard -- we cannot sustain the democratic values and way of life we have come to cherish.

If, as a nation, we care about opening foreign markets for American goods and services...if we care about making our country secure in the face of new threats...if we care about widening the circle of peace and prosperity... then we must do nothing less than address the conditions and circumstances of the world's women.

You in this room know better than anyone else that our world is in a time of great transformation, heralding ever more democracy, leading to ever more peace. But the great promise of this time is not without its challenges.

Global competition, the Information Revolution, and the rapid pace of change create new

Not just an issue in relation to developing countries
Even advanced economies need to be vigilant - no matter
That women have a stake - all citizens - no matter gender or race

have a stake with perpetuation of democracy. women
forgive me for my personal - last night - visited

people who already were —
the majority of S

spoke at an event to read

Heard testimony at L

5 women who had been

convinced w/ our families

& communities

Now citizens in fullest sense

Anywhere where there are

vast disparities of wealth

&

you have people left out

of full

what we are trying to do is

to promote democracy & civil

success —

pressures on all of society, from governments on down to families. And these pressures pose unavoidable questions for all of us as we approach the 21st century: Questions about how to balance individual and community rights and responsibilities; about how parents will raise children in the face of the influences of the mass media and consumer culture; about personal identity and work in an age of globalization and high technology; about the roles of women in society; about how people will preserve their ethnic pride and value their national citizenship; about how nations will protect their sovereignty while cooperating regionally and globally with others.

Thinking about these challenges, and how a free nation like ours will respond to them, we may need to be reminded that democracy is not just about our legally protected rights, elections or even free market economies. It's about the internalization of democratic values in people's hearts and minds. It's about how, in the absence of either hot or cold wars, democracy is rooted in people's everyday lives.

Given these changes, we can no longer gauge our interests around the world solely through power blocs and vast arsenals. Across the globe, as here at home, the end of the Cold War has freed us to focus on issues that edge right up to our frontdoors. How do we educate our children? How do we ensure that our families have proper health care? How do we see to it that our children -- boys and girls -- have the opportunity to live up to their God-given promise? These are not, of course, "women's issues." But no one is better able to point us toward answers than women, who by necessity have become the world's experts on the hazards and vicissitudes of life.

I have seen for myself on continent after continent the solutions women are forging: New mothers in Jojakarta, Indonesia, who gather every week to learn about family planning and better nutrition for their children. Doctors and nurses in Belarus and Ukraine, who are caring for the children of Chernobyl. Women from Santiago to San Diego who are working on issues as diverse as education, crime, and the environment.

These issues are central to our global democratic interests, for what distinguishes democracy is fair and genuine participation in every aspect of life. It should be too obvious to point out -- but, too often, it isn't -- that giving women a stronger voice and full say over their futures is intimately related to the health of democracies because women are the majority in most countries and the world over.

America's credo should ring clearly: A democracy without the full participation of women is a contradiction in terms. As such, it is doomed to fail.

Clearly, whether we succeed in strengthening democratic values around the world is of special consequence to women who -- in our country and others -- are still striving to attain and define their rightful place in government, the economy and civil society and claim their share of personal, political, economic and civic power.

Raising the status of women -- and investing in their potential -- means ensuring that

women and girls around the world have access to the tools of opportunity: education, health care, credit and jobs, legal protections and the right to participate fully in the political life of their countries. And that is why the United States must continue its bipartisan tradition of supporting initiatives that move our world closer to these goals.

Today, more than 600 million women worldwide are denied the opportunity of an education. Women make up two-thirds of those who can neither read nor write.

Yet the single most important investment any developing nation can make is in the education of girls and women. We are discovering in country after country that the benefits of educating women go far beyond the schoolroom -- to stronger families, better health, nutrition, wages, and level of political participation.

Take the state of Kerala in India. Kerala has the highest literacy and life expectancy rates in India. It has the lowest infant mortality rate. Why? Because there is a tradition of investing in health care for **both** boys and girls.

In Sri Lanka, where women have had the right to vote for most of this century, they are well-educated, receive the best health care in the region, and have lower maternal mortality rates than women in many wealthier nations.

I have seen how similar social investments -- many supported by the United States -- can make a difference in countries as diverse as Brazil, the Philippines, Nepal, and Pakistan. Perhaps the most extraordinary was Bangladesh. When I was there, the government supported a that was helping very poor families send their children -- including their daughters -- to school, in return for food. The government actually deposited a small sum in a family's bank account, so long as the girls stayed in school.

Women will not flourish -- and neither will democracy -- if they continue to be undervalued in and outside the home. Women constitute 70% of the world's poor. And as the income gap continues to widen in country after country -- and we see a proliferation of jobs that require greater skill and education -- women are in danger of falling farther and farther behind.

Women must be assured the opportunity to earn a decent income and become economically self-sufficient. This means investing in the great untapped reservoir of human potential that women represent.

A bank run by the Self-Employed Women's Association in Ahmedabad, India was founded by a disciple of Gandhi named Ela Bhatt. The bank has one room. The teller's counter is an old kitchen table. Bank clerks record all the transactions by hand, on yellow sheets of paper bound in volumes that look like worn-out phone books. But women walk 12 to 15 miles from remote villages to take out their small loans -- some as small as \$1 -- to invest in dairy cows, or plows, or goods they sell at market. The bank has 60,000 members -- all women, many of whom

are among the poorest, least educated, most ostracized in India. Women run the bank, make the deposits, borrow the money. Today, the bank has assets of more than \$3 million. Its loan repayment rate is nearly 100% -- the envy of most commercial banks. It is but one example of the grassroots enterprises targeted at women that are reshaping local and regional landscapes around the world.

Let me say a special word about family planning and its importance in this larger effort. Family planning is fundamental to letting women take responsibility for themselves and their children. Right now, though, roughly 100 million women cannot get or are not using family planning services because they are poor, uneducated, or do not have access to care. Some 20 million women will seek unsafe abortions. Of these women, some will become disabled for life. The rate of unsafe abortions is a tragedy; but even more of a disgrace is the high rate of abortions worldwide [*is this language okay?*]. ~~This high abortion rate does not represent women's~~ *step* ~~equality. It represents a failure on all of our parts to help women prevent unwanted pregnancies in the first place. No woman wants to go through an abortion if she can possibly avoid it.~~

If we really care about reducing abortion and fostering strong families, we must not back away from our commitment to family planning efforts overseas.

And if we really care about making women equal partners in societies the world over, we must do everything in our power to fight violence against women -- whether it is a hidden crime of domestic abuse or a blatant tactic of war.

No single social investment is a panacea for women or for developing countries. Nor should every just cause in the world be America's to embrace. But I do believe that as long as discrimination and inequities persist, a stable, prosperous and peaceful world will be far from a reality.

Taken together, our investments in social development are vital to strengthening free market interests, spreading our democratic ideals, and enhancing our security.

Over time, we have learned that our ideals and interests cannot be divorced from the political, economic and social cross-currents swirling around us. And I hope we have also learned that engagement represents opportunities at home as well as obligations abroad.

Let me give you one modest example: The use of oral rehydration therapy, supported by USAID to save lives in developing countries, is now being used in some of our own cities as a simple, low-cost health care strategy. *imaging / door-to-door*

Less than one percent of our budget. Countless lives improved — abroad and right here at home.

Before I close, I want to say a word about my forthcoming trip to Africa.

A lot of direct aid we & our
partners have provided has helped create
democracies
for
Africa.

Just as women worldwide have demonstrated that their solutions can make a difference for us all, so the African continent, too often overlooked, yields its own examples of hope. Contemporary history is a story that citizens and countries are writing, and around the globe, there is a new narrative of peace. Every region is contributing its own chapter. And Africa has a remarkable story to tell.

Africa is moving toward democracy. In the last 6 years, the number of democracies on that continent has jumped from 5 to 23.

Africa is growing economically, moving from suffocating state-controlled economies to open markets that can give full life and scope to human endeavor. Last year, 30 countries recorded positive economic growth.

Africa is beginning to forge a new relationship with the United States -- one based not on aid, but on shared ideals, mutual responsibilities, integration into the world economy, and partnerships designed to resolve conflicts and to meet common challenges.

To be sure, many of the African democracies are new and fragile. Hope remains tenuous. Too much of the continent continues to be riven by disease, malnutrition, poverty, injustice, corruption, perilous conflicts -- and their terrible aftermath: refugee crises that trap women and children, especially, in lives that go from bad to worse.

And yet. And yet in spite of these challenges, for the first time in a long time we can say that for Africa, there are now grounds for more hope than despair. With the support of the United States, we can solidify that hope.

I will visit Senegal, South Africa, Zimbabwe, Tanzania, Uganda, and Eritrea -- and I am pleased that so many of their Excellencies are here with us today. I hope to witness firsthand, and to highlight, each country's efforts to build democracy and a strong civil society; I will focus particularly on grassroots initiatives and on efforts that affect women and children.

I hope this trip will give the American people a renewed sense of the importance of our commitment to Africa. I hope it will lay out exactly why we must do our utmost to support democracy and social investment in Africa and to strengthen Africa's place in the community of nations. And I hope it will show that American engagement must be measured not just in aid dollars but in the democratic values we reinforce, in the human rights we defend, and in the conflicts we help resolve.

There are issues of national security at stake. Instability in Africa, whether it is rooted in war, in terrorism, in organized crime, in disease, in environmental degradation, in poverty, touches us, too.

Now even. because —
But our reasons for engagement with Africa are built on a positive foundation. Africa is on

finally

the move, with a new generation of leaders, the fresh air of political reform, and thriving multi-ethnic societies that can teach the world about the benefits of diversity.

There are economic benefits to our engagement. Right now the United States holds only 7% of the African market of 600 million people. Yet already 100,000 American jobs are directly related to trade with Africa. By forging stronger economic ties with Africa, we will do much to secure the prosperity of our own people, as well.

And there are moral issues. We must include Africa in American foreign policy because Africa is a neighbor on this one shared Earth. This new era proves daily that for us all to be successful, we must acknowledge that we are all dependent and interdependent. ~~We do not have a person, a country, a region, much less a continent to waste.~~

Thank you.

###

End w/ a quote from an
African leader -

Mamphela Ramphele -

- Grace Michel -

Gaithe

I wish it's app on Int'l

Women's Day to
a heady day.

TO: HRC
FROM: Lissa 
RE: State Dept. Speech
DATE: March 11

I've incorporated the changes that Melanne relayed. You may still want more detail about Lessons Without Borders. I've also asked David to expand the opening about Sec. Albright, given that she will go on at some length about you.

DRAFT 3/11/97

8:00 pm

FIRST LADY HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
REMARKS FOR A CELEBRATION OF INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY
THE STATE DEPARTMENT
WASHINGTON, D.C.
MARCH 12, 1997

Acknowledgments: TK

Today, we celebrate International Women's Day in the heart of the State Department. And we have much to celebrate -- starting with a Secretary of State, who broke a barrier by virtue of her own gender, but who, more importantly, is committed to defending the rights not just of Americans but of citizens around the world regardless of gender.

I thank her for her leadership, her courage, and most of all, her friendship.

I come here this morning to advance a simple idea: The seamless inclusion of girls and women in American foreign policy. Despite the work they do, the families they raise, the communities they hold together, too many of the world's women -- particularly in developing nations -- live on the outskirts of opportunity and equality.

Why should this be a concern of ours here in the United States? Because if half of the citizens on this earth are undervalued, underpaid, undereducated, under-represented, fed less, fed worse, not heard -- we cannot sustain the democratic values and way of life we have come to cherish.

If, as a nation, we care about opening foreign markets for American goods and services...if we care about making our country secure in the face of new threats...if we care about widening the circle of peace and prosperity . . . then we must do nothing less than address the conditions and circumstances of the world's women.

You in this room know better than anyone else that our world is in a time of great transformation, heralding ever more democracy, leading to ever more peace. But the great promise of this time is not without its challenges.

Global competition, the Information Revolution, and the rapid pace of change create new pressures on all of society, from governments on down to families. And these pressures pose unavoidable questions for all of us as we approach the 21st century: Questions about how to balance individual and community rights and responsibilities; about how parents will raise children in the face of the influences of the mass media and consumer culture; about personal identity and work in an age of globalization and high technology; about the roles of women in

society; about how people will preserve their ethnic pride and value their national citizenship; about how nations will protect their sovereignty while cooperating regionally and globally with others.

Thinking about these challenges, and how a free nation like ours will respond to them, we may need to be reminded that democracy is not just about our legally protected rights, elections or even free market economies. It's about the internalization of democratic values in people's hearts and minds. It's about how, in the absence of either hot or cold wars, democracy is rooted in people's everyday lives.

Given these changes, we can no longer gauge our interests around the world solely through power blocs and vast arsenals. Across the globe, as here at home, the end of the Cold War has freed us to focus on issues that edge right up to our frontdoors. How do we educate our children? How do we ensure that our families have proper health care? How do we see to it that our children -- boys and girls -- have the opportunity to live up to their God-given promise? These are not, of course, "women's issues." But no one is better able to point us toward answers than women, who by necessity have become the world's experts on the hazards and vicissitudes of life.

I have seen for myself on continent after continent the solutions women are forging: New mothers in Jojakarta, Indonesia, who gather every week to learn about family planning and better nutrition for their children. Doctors and nurses in Belarus and Ukraine, who are caring for the children of Chernobyl. Women from Santiago to San Diego who are working on issues as diverse as education, crime, and the environment.

These issues are central to our global democratic interests, for what distinguishes democracy is fair and genuine participation in every aspect of life. It should be too obvious to point out -- but, too often, it isn't -- that giving women a stronger voice and full say over their futures is intimately related to the health of democracies because women are the majority in most countries and the world over.

America's credo should ring clearly: A democracy without the full participation of women is a contradiction in terms. As such, it is doomed to fail.

Clearly, whether we succeed in strengthening democratic values around the world is of special consequence to women who -- in our country and others -- are still striving to attain and define their rightful place in government, the economy and civil society and claim their share of personal, political, economic and civic power.

Raising the status of women -- and investing in their potential -- means ensuring that women and girls around the world have access to the tools of opportunity: education, health care, credit and jobs, legal protections and the right to participate fully in the political life of their countries. And that is why the United States must continue its bipartisan tradition of supporting

the world.

I said that women's ingenuity yields solutions, and nowhere is this clearer than in how the lessons of microcredit learned in South Asia can bring equally impressive results halfway across the globe. Mi Casa, in a busy city in America's Rocky Mountains, is one of a growing number of microenterprise projects in the United States. Mi Casa provides women in Denver -- many of them Hispanic Americans who have been on public assistance -- career counseling, vocational training, and technical assistance to start their own businesses. These women are talented, eager, and hard-working. But there is no way they can qualify for credit through traditional commercial institutions. Microcredit gives them the opportunity to lift themselves and their families to a higher economic station in life. Even an advanced economy such as ours, this simple system of providing credit for the poor has enormous implications as we try to narrow the income gap, enlarge the middle class, and move people from welfare to work.

Investing in women also means investing in their health -- and in turn, in the health of their families. I am especially proud that the United States has provided assistance through the U.S. Agency for International Development to assure that women, children and families have access to a full spectrum of low-cost, high-yield health care services -- from safe birthing kits for expectant mothers, to basic immunizations for infants, to oral rehydration therapy to treat children suffering from diarrhea.

Let me say a special word about family planning and its importance in this larger effort. Family planning is fundamental to letting women take responsibility for themselves and their children. Right now, though, roughly 100 million women cannot get or are not using family planning services because they are poor, uneducated, or do not have access to care. Some 20 million women will seek unsafe abortions. Of these women, some will become disabled for life. The rate of unsafe abortions is a tragedy; but even more of a disgrace is the high rate of abortions worldwide [*is this language okay?*]. This high abortion rate does not represent women's equality. It represents a failure on all of our parts to help women prevent unwanted pregnancies in the first place. No woman wants to go through an abortion if she can possibly avoid it.

If we really care about reducing abortion and fostering strong families, we must not back away from our commitment to family planning efforts overseas.

And if we really care about making women equal partners in societies the world over, we must do everything in our power to fight violence against women -- whether it is a hidden crime of domestic abuse or a blatant tactic of war.

No single social investment is a panacea for women or for developing countries. Nor should every just cause in the world be America's to embrace. But I do believe that as long as discrimination and inequities persist, a stable, prosperous and peaceful world will be far from a reality.

> defense / endorsement 6 ..

initatives that move our world closer to these goals.

Today, more than 600 million women worldwide are denied the opportunity of an education. Women make up two-thirds of those who can neither read nor write.

Yet the single most important investment any developing nation can make is in the education of girls and women. We are discovering in country after country that the benefits of educating women go far beyond the schoolroom -- to stronger families, better health, nutrition, wages, and level of political participation.

9 I saw this firsthand in the state of Kerala in India. Kerala has the highest literacy and life expectancy rates in India. It has the lowest infant mortality rate. Why? Because there is a tradition of investing in health care for **both** boys and girls.

In Sri Lanka, where women have had the right to vote for most of this century, they are well-educated, receive the best health care in the region, and have lower maternal mortality rates than women in many wealthier nations.

I have seen how similar social investments -- many supported by the United States -- can make a difference in countries as diverse as Brazil, the Philippines, Nepal, and Pakistan. Perhaps the most extraordinary was Bangladesh. There, a government program helps very poor families to send their children -- including their daughters -- to school, in return for food. The government actually deposits a small sum in a family's bank account, so long as the girls stay in school.

Women will not flourish -- and neither will democracy -- if they continue to be undervalued in and outside the home. Women constitute 70% of the world's poor. And as the income gap continues to widen in country after country -- and we see a proliferation of jobs that require greater skill and education -- women are in danger of falling farther and farther behind.

Women must be assured the opportunity to earn a decent income and become economically self-sufficient. This means investing in the great untapped reservoir of human potential that women represent.

A bank run by the Self-Employed Women's Association in Ahmedabad, India was founded by a disciple of Gandhi named Ela Bhatt. The bank has one room. The teller's counter is an old kitchen table. Bank clerks record all the transactions by hand, on yellow sheets of paper bound in volumes that look like worn-out phone books. But women walk 12 to 15 miles from remote villages to take out their small loans -- some as small as \$1 -- to invest in dairy cows, or plows, or goods they sell at market. The bank has 60,000 members -- all women, many of whom are among the poorest, least educated, most ostracized in India. Women run the bank, make the deposits, borrow the money. Today, the bank has assets of more than \$3 million. Its loan repayment rate is nearly 100% -- the envy of most commercial banks. It is but one example of the grassroots enterprises targeted at women that are reshaping local and regional landscapes around

Before I close, I want to say a word about my forthcoming trip to Africa.

Just as women worldwide have demonstrated that their solutions can make a difference for us all, so the African continent, too often overlooked, yields its own examples of hope. Contemporary history is a story that citizens and countries are writing, and around the globe, there is a new narrative of peace. Every region is contributing its own chapter. And Africa has a remarkable story to tell.

Africa is moving toward democracy. In the last 6 years, the number of democracies on that continent has jumped from 5 to ~~25~~ 23.

Africa is growing economically, moving from suffocating state-controlled economies to open markets that can give full life and scope to human endeavor. Last year, 30 countries recorded positive economic growth.

Africa is beginning to forge a new relationship with the United States -- one based not on aid, but on shared ideals, mutual responsibilities, and partnerships designed to resolve conflicts and to meet common challenges.

To be sure, many of the African democracies are new and fragile. Hope remains tenuous. Too much of the continent continues to be riven by disease, malnutrition, poverty, injustice, corruption, perilous conflicts -- and their terrible aftermath: refugee crises that trap women and children, especially, in lives that go from bad to worse.

And yet. And yet in spite of these challenges, for the first time in a long time we can say that for Africa, there are now grounds for more hope than despair. With the support of the United States, we can solidify that hope.

I will visit Senegal, South Africa, Zimbabwe, Tanzania, Uganda, and Eritrea -- and I am pleased that so many of ~~their~~ Excellencies are here with us today. I hope to witness firsthand, and to highlight, each country's efforts to build a strong democracy and a civil society; I will focus particularly on grassroots initiatives and on efforts that affect women and children.

I hope this trip will give the American people a renewed sense of the importance of our commitment to Africa. I hope it will lay out exactly why we must do our utmost to support democracy and social investment in Africa and to strengthen Africa's place in the community of nations. And I hope it will show that American engagement must be measured not just in aid dollars but in the democratic values we reinforce, in the human rights we defend, and in the conflicts we help resolve.

There are issues of national security at stake. Instability in Africa, whether it is rooted in war, in terrorism, in organized crime, in disease, in environmental degradation, in poverty, touches us, too.

yet already look job in U.S. and directly related to rate Africa 301656
3905

There are economic issues at stake. Right now the United States holds only 7% of the African market of 600 million people. By forging stronger economic ties with Africa, we will do much to secure the prosperity of our own people, as well.

And there are moral issues: We must include Africa in American foreign policy because Africa is a neighbor on this one shared Earth. This new era proves daily that for us all to be successful, we must acknowledge that we are all dependent and interdependent. We do not have a person, a country, a region, much less a continent to waste.

Thank you.

###



British Embassy
Washington

F A X C O V E R S H E E T

3100 Massachusetts Ave. N.W.
Washington D.C. 20008-3600

Telephone: (202) 588 6533
Facsimile: (202) 588 7859

TO:

- Mr Michael Beschloss (Fax No: 965 0919)**
- Mr Neil Carothers (Fax No: 965 7028)**
- Mr Jonathan Davidson (Fax No: 429 1766)**
- Mr E J Dionne Jr (Fax No: 334 5269)**
- Mr Thomas Hughes (Fax No: 862 2610)**
- Mr David Law (Fax No: 296 1529)**
- Mr Roberts Owen (Fax No: 778 5254)**
- Mr Patrick Brogan (Fax No: 223 1764)**
- Mr Gregory Craig (Fax No: 434 5760)**
- Ms Lucie Morton Garrett (Fax No: 540-347 2601)**
- The Rev Geoffrey Hoare (Fax No: 703-548 7534)**
- Mr George Keys (Fax No: 328 6153)**
- Ms Alison (Lissa) Muscatine (Fax No: 456 5709)**
- Mr Frank Sieverts (Fax No: 293 9431)**
- Ms Carolyn Williams (Fax No: 434 5029)**
- Mr Gordon Page Williams (Fax No: 301-925 7680)**
- Dr Walter Roberts (Fax No: 363 2294)**
- * Ms Sarah Papineau Marshall)**
- * Mrs Christine Sarbanes) by post**
- * Mr Burke Wilkinson)**
- * Mr Edwin Yoder)**

FROM: Margaret Byrd
Office of Peter Westmacott (Secretary)
Oxford & Cambridge Committee

DATE: 29 JANUARY 1997

MESSAGE: Minutes of Oxford & Cambridge Meeting held on
Tuesday 28 January 1997.

MEETING OF THE OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE COMMITTEE, TUESDAY
28 JANUARY 1997, AT THE MARVIN CENTER, GEORGE WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY

1. The Oxford and Cambridge Committee met over lunch on Tuesday 28 January at the Marvin Center, George Washington University. The following were present:

Mr Neil Carothers
Mr Thomas Hughes
Mr David Law
Mr Patrick Brogan
The Rev Geoffrey Hoare
Mr George Keys
Mr Frank Sieverts (Chairman)
Ms Carolyn Williams
Mr Gordon Page Williams
Dr Walter Roberts
Mr Edwin Yoder
Mr Peter Westmacott (Hon. Secretary)

Justice David Souter

2. The Chairman said he had tried to dissuade David Souter from resigning from the Committee (see minutes of the 7 November meeting), on the grounds that the Justice's attendance record did not place him under any moral or other obligation to go. Several members (no names, no packdrill) attended Committee lunches less frequently than he did. But the Chairman's efforts had failed, leaving him with no choice but to seek, with regret and warmest thanks for his contributions over the years, the acquiescence of the Committee in David's resignation. Reluctantly, the Committee granted it.

1997 Dinner

/ 3. The Chairman explained that Bob Owens had written (copy attached) explaining that, for Bosnian reasons, he could not agree to be the 1997 Dinner Toastmaster - even on a provisional basis. The Committee agreed that a new candidate would have to be found; but noted, with satisfaction, that Mr Owens' letter was proof that one person, at least, had read the minutes of the previous meeting.

4. The Chairman reiterated that 1997 was the year to try and get President Clinton to attend the Dinner. George Stephanopoulos, having left the White House, was no longer in a position to help. The Chairman had therefore written to Sylvia Mathews, in her new capacity as Deputy Chief of Staff. Other members of the Committee agreed to liaise with appropriately placed contacts/friends to try and obtain the President's consent.

5. The Committee felt that, while it was unlikely that there would be an early decision from the President, it would help if the flyers for this year's dinner could say that the Committee

hoped he would attend. At the very least, we wanted permission to say that he had been invited. Frank Sieverts would pursue with Sylvia Mathews.

6. The Committee agreed that Wednesday April 30 was the preferred date for the dinner, but George Keys would look at the availability of suitable venues on 7 and 8 May as well. Invitations had to be out by the middle of March. The front runner was the National Press Club, but George reported that the Willard Hotel were keen to host the dinner this year. They claimed to be able to accommodate over 400, but capacity would shrink if the President came. George Keys would continue to pursue the options.

7. The Committee agreed that Sir John Kerr should be asked to speak at this year's dinner. If the President came, the Ambassador would introduce him. If not, the Committee might ask Sir John to take on the principal speaking role. The Committee also agreed to renew its 1996 invitation to Tina Brown, editor of The New Yorker, who had indicated last year that she would like to be asked again. Peter Westmacott would pursue both candidates.

8. In discussion of other possible speakers, Gordon Williams said he had received discouraging noises from the Office of the Vice Chancellor of Cambridge University, Alec Broers. Patrick Brogan reminded the Committee that Noel Annan, former Provost of Kings College Cambridge and Master of Trinity, was still an excellent speaker. The Committee agreed to extend invitations (non-speaking, at this stage) to Emma Thompson and John Cleese. It was also agreed that, if President Clinton attended the dinner, Strobe Talbott might be offered a speaking/warm-up role.

Next Meeting

9. Carolyn Williams reported that Williams and Gosselin would

**SCHEDULE FOR HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 1997
FINAL**

LEAD ADVANCE, **EDWARD PREWITT**
LITTLE ROCK, AR **EXCELSIOR HOTEL**
501-375-5000 RM# 1827
501-375-4721 FAX
800-SKY-GRAM PIN 207-4590

PRESS LEAD **GEORGE SHELTON** RM# 1820

PRESS 2 **CHRIS BROWN** RM# 729

SITE **MOLLY BUFORD** RM# 729

SITE **NATALIE HARTMAN** RM# 1916

SITE **STEVEN LAMB** RM# 1820

SCHEDULER **HOLLY NICHOLS**
202-456-7561 OFFICE
703-931-2483 HOME
WHCA PAGER 4096

PREV RON The White House

6:45 am **DEPART** South Portico
EN ROUTE Andrews Air Force Base
[drive time: 25 minutes]

7:20 am **ARRIVE** Andrews Air Force

7:30 am **WHEELS UP** Washington, D.C.

FLIGHT TIME: 2 HOURS AND 30 MINUTES [-1]

9:00 am **WHEELS DOWN** Little Rock, AR
FBO: Central Flying Service
Hold: n/a
Phone: 501-375-3245
Fax: 501-375-7274/x282
OPEN PRESS/CLOSED PUBLIC

SCHEDULE FOR HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 1997
PAGE 2

Greeters:

- Gov. Mike Huckabee
- Buddy Young
- Attorney General Winston Bryant
- Secretary of State Sharon Priest
- Auditor Gus Wingfield, Auditor
- Alice Wingfield, spouse
- Speaker of the House Bobby Hogue
- Land Commissioner Charlie Daniels
- Mayor Jim Dailey, Mayor of Little Rock
- Mayor Mitch McDonald, Mayor of Benton
- Saline County Judge Terry Parsons
- State Senator Doyle Webb
- State Rep. Shane Broadway
- State Rep. Wanda Northcutt
- State Rep. Myra Jones [T]
- State Rep. Charlotte Schexnayder [T]
- State Rep. Erma Hunter Brown [T]

9:15 am **DEPART** Adams Field
 EN ROUTE Saline County, Benton, AR
 [drive time: 30 minutes]

9:45 am **ARRIVE** Bennett Trailer Park

9:50 am - **TOUR** Bennett Trailer Park
10:10 am **VIA** Mini Van
 OPEN PRESS

FORMAT:

-- HRC to drive through "U" shape trailer
 park.

-- HRC to get out and talk to families.

PARTICIPANTS: Approx. 6 people to attend.

10:15 am **DEPART** Bennett Trailer Park
 EN ROUTE Recovery Unit
 Crestwood Plaza Shopping Center
 14106 Chicot Road, Ste. 2
 Phone: 501-888-3846
 [drive time: 10 minutes]

10:25 am **ARRIVE** Recovery Unit

SCHEDULE FOR HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 1997
PAGE 3

Greeters:

- Josie States, FEMA
- Becky Edwards, AR Office of Emergency Services

10:30 am -
11:10 am

DROP-BY RECOVERY UNIT

Recovery Unit
Hold: n/a
Phone: n/a
Fax: n/a
POOL PRESS

FORMAT:

- HRC is escorted by Josie States and Buddy Young to informally greet victims and observe recovery efforts.
- HRC proceeds to SBA table and greets victims seeking SBA assistance.
- Missy Kincaid, SBA, intros newly selected SBA loan recipients to HRC.
- HRC announces to 3 business owners/individuals TBA that they will receive SBA money tomorrow (3/12).
[POOL PRESS]
- HRC departs.

PARTICIPANTS: Approx. 50 victims and workers to attend.

11:15 am

DEPART Saline County, Benton, AR
EN ROUTE Excelsior Hotel, Little Rock, AR
[drive time: 30 minutes]

11:45 am

ARRIVE Excelsior Hotel

NOTE: There will be approx. 50 people in courtyard to welcome HRC to Little Rock. HRC will have option to wave or work ropeline.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. schedule	re: Schedule for Hillary Rodham Clinton [partial] (2 pages)	03/11/1997	b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Speechwriting
Lissa Muscatine
OA/Box Number: 12092

FOLDER TITLE:

HRC - International Women's Day 3/12/97

2017-1164-S
rc2657

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

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

SCHEDULE FOR HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 1997
PAGE 4

Greeters in hotel lobby:

- Linus Raines, General Manager
- Dennis Earles, Residential Manager
- Mike McGinnity, Director of Sales and Marketing

11:50 am - **DOWN TIME** (b)(6) [001]
12:30 pm Presidential Suite
Staff Hold: Presidential Suite
Phone: 501-375-5000/x1915
Fax: 501-375-7320 (Contact: Angela Burtan)
CLOSED PRESS

12:30 pm **PROCEED TO CLINTON BALLROOM, 2ND LEVEL**

Greeters at Clinton Ballroom:

- Gene Campbell, Dean, College of Education, UALR
- State representative, Robert McGinnis
- Janita Hoskyn, Marketing Director, Reading Recovery/Early Literacy, UALR

12:35 pm - **"EARLY LITERACY FOR ALL CHILDREN: MEETING THE**
1:15 pm **CHALLENGE" LUNCHEON**
Clinton Ballroom
Hold: n/a
Phone: n/a
Fax: n/a
OPEN PRESS

FORMAT:

- Gene Campbell, Dean, College of Education, UALR announces HRC to stage, accompanied by Robert McGinnis and Janita Hoskyn.
- HRC enters stage right and proceeds to head table.
NOTE: HRC is seated next to Sybel Hampton, President, Winthrop Rockefeller Foundation.
- Gene Campbell welcomes and intros Dr. Linda Dorn.
- Dr. Linda Dorn remarks and intros video.

SCHEDULE FOR HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 1997
PAGE 5

- Video, "Reading Recovery: A Promise Fulfilled" is played (10 minutes).
- Robert McGinnis, State Representative makes remarks and intros HRC.
- HRC delivers remarks from podium.
- HRC exits stage right and departs.

PARTICIPANTS: Approx. 450 people to attend.

Contact: Janita Hoskyn/501-569-3113

1:20 pm

PROCEED TO SUITE

1:25 pm -

PRIVATE MEETING
Presidential Suite
CLOSED PRESS

1:55 pm

PARTICIPANTS:

(b)(6)

2:00 pm -

DOWN TIME
Presidential Suite
CLOSED PRESS

2:55 pm

3:00 pm

DEPART Excelsior Hotel
EN ROUTE Children's Hospital,
800 Marshall
[drive time: 15 minutes]

3:15 pm

ARRIVE Children's Hospital

NOTE: There will be approx. 50 students from the William Jefferson Clinton Elementary Magnet School to greet HRC.

Greeters:

- Dr. Jon Bates, CEO, Children's Hospital
- Dr. Betty Lowe, Medical Director
- Dr. Bonnie Taylor, Assistant Medical Director
- Blanch Moore, Dir. Govt. Relations
- Bob Schultz, Chairman of the Board

**SCHEDULE FOR HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 1997
PAGE 6**

NOTE: There will be approx. 12 children gathered in the lobby.

Greeter on 3rd Floor:

-Melissa Sanders, Head Nurse, Neo-Natal Unit

3:20 pm -

TOUR NEO-NATAL UNIT

3:40 pm

3rd Floor

Hold: Multipurpose Room #5

Phone: 501-320-7079

Fax: n/a

POOL PRESS

NOTE: HRC to put smock on at this time.

FORMAT:

-- HRC, escorted by Melissa Sanders and Dr. Bonnie Taylor to walk through the new Neo-Natal Unit.

-- HRC departs.

3:45 pm -

**REMARKS TO HOSPITAL ADMINISTRATORS, PATIENTS
AND FAMILIES**

4:05 pm

Eye Clinic Reception Area, 1st Floor

Hold: Eye Clinic Staff Lounge

Phone: 501-320-4441

Fax: 501-320-1285 (Contact: Barbara Vaught)

OPEN PRESS

FORMAT:

-- HRC and Dr. Jon Bates proceed to podium on stage.

-- Dr. Bates welcomes and intros HRC.

-- HRC delivers brief remarks from podium.

-- HRC exits stage left and works ropeline from left to right

-- HRC departs.

PARTICIPANTS: Approx. 75 people to attend.

SCHEDULE FOR HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 1997
PAGE 7

4:10 pm

DEPART Children's Hospital
EN ROUTE Fleming Residence
5405 Sherwood
[drive time: 15 minutes]

4:25 pm -

5:10 pm

MEET AND GREET W/ FRIENDS
Susan and Vic Fleming Residence
Staff Hold: Den, lower level
Phone: 501-661-1758
Fax: n/a
CLOSED PRESS

FORMAT: Informal mix and mingle.

PARTICIPANTS: Approx. 10-15 people to attend.

5:15 pm

DEPART Fleming Residence
EN ROUTE Excelsior Hotel
[drive time: 15 minutes]

5:30 pm

ARRIVE Excelsior Hotel

5:35 pm -

6:30 pm

DOWN TIME/DINNER
Presidential Suite
Staff Hold: Presidential Suite
Phone: 501-375-5000/x1915
Fax: 501-375-7320 (Contact: Angela Burtan)
CLOSED PRESS

6:35 pm -

7:15 pm

ARKANSAS SINGLE PARENT SCHOLARSHIP FUND
RECEPTION
River Ballroom
Hold: River Room
Phone: n/a
Fax: n/a
CLOSED PRESS/WH PHOTO

FORMAT:

-- HRC to do a photo receiving line from left to right.

NOTE: Rose Adams, President, Single Scholarship Fund, intros guests to HRC.

Before 8:30 depart
375-
7320

**SCHEDULE FOR HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 1997
PAGE 8**

PARTICIPANTS: Approx. 70 people to attend.

Contact: Ralph Nesson/501-927-1402

7:20 pm -
8:45 pm

SINGLE PARENT SCHOLARSHIP FUND DINNER

Clinton Ballroom

Hold: River Room

Phone: n/a

Fax: n/a

OPEN PRESS

FORMAT:

- Anne Jansen, Little Rock TV News Anchor welcomes and intros HRC and Rose Adams onto stage.
- HRC proceeds to seat on stage at head table.
NOTE: HRC is seated next to Diane Blair and podium.
- Rev. Fred Lee offers invocation.
- Dinner is served.
- Yvonne King, former scholarship recipient performs a song.
- Diane Blair acknowledges donors Helen Walton and Bernice Jones.
- Rose Adams intros 5 former and scholarship recipients.
- Testimonial by Sara Clay.
- Testimonial by Kay Jester.
- Testimonial by Stephanie Pollard.
- Testimonial by Brindon Dixon.
- Testimonial by Yvonne King.
- Diane Blair intros HRC.

SCHEDULE FOR HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 1997
PAGE 9

-- HRC delivers remarks from podium.

-- HRC exits stage right and departs.

PARTICIPANTS: Approx. 250 people to attend.

8:45 pm **DEPART** Excelsior Hotel
 EN ROUTE Adams Field Airport
 [drive time: 15 minutes]

9:00 pm **ARRIVE** Adams Field Airport
 FBO: Central Flying Service
 Phone: 501-375-3245
 Fax: 501-375-7274/x282
 CLOSED PRESS/CLOSED PUBLIC

9:10 pm **WHEELS UP** Little Rock, AR

FLIGHT TIME: 1 HOUR 55 MINUTES [+1]
--

12:05 am **WHEELS DOWN** Andrews Air Force Base

12:15 pm **DEPART** Andrews Air Force Base
 EN ROUTE The White House
 [drive time: 25 minutes]

12:35 pm **ARRIVE** South Portico

RON The White House

WEATHER FORECAST FOR WASHINGTON, D.C.:

-Partly cloudy and breezy becoming mostly cloudy. Wind southwest to north at 12 to 20 knots. Low 40. High 61.

WEATHER FORECAST FOR LITTLE ROCK, AR:

-Mostly sunny with a high of 72 and low of 44.

**FAX****(202) 647-7191****FAX (202) 647-0753**

DATE:

3/11/97

TO:

LISSA MUSCATINE

FROM:

BILL WOODWARD

456-5709

ATTACHED: DRAFT ALBRIGHT REMARKS

Please let me know if this is OK.

Especially the "conversation" crack
on page 9.

THANKS.

DRAFT 3/11/97

**FIRST LADY HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
REMARKS ON INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY
THE STATE DEPARTMENT
WASHINGTON, D.C.
MARCH 12, 1997**

Today, we celebrate International Women's Day in the heart of the State Department. And there is much to celebrate -- starting with a Secretary of State who replaced the most raveled sec of state in history and apparently determined to set a new record....overtake him in the first year; has been called a lot of names since her selection by the pres. Been called a wonk, a inscrutable, sharp-tongued lioness.....she's gone around the country with message that for policy not only relevant to americans but, in her words to high school audiences, is "totally awesome."

broke a barrier by virtue of her **own** gender, but who, more importantly, is committed to defending the interests of our nation its citizens **regardless** of gender. That is an historic turning point. The great women visionaries of democracy of the past fought for their entire lives with little reason to believe that such a day as this would actually arrive. I imagine them now looking down upon us -- and smiling.

These women knew that the solutions to problems are often found in parts of the picture that are traditionally left out. [problems with people too often left out. Women in every country too often are overlooked --*for the work they do, for the leadership they provide, for the examples they set.* And those of us who have had the priv of traveling here and abroad know that women are central to every family and community. **WOMEN PLAY CENTRAL ROLE. AND** although historians and economists and many in positions of power are reluctant to admit it, women are women need to be **THEY NEED TO BE PART OF THE LARGER EQUATION OF FOREIGN POLICY IF WE CARE ABOUT DEMOCRACY.** at home and at work, in the work they do, in the leadership they provideAs a gender, women are too often overlooked. Yet the specific work of women holds new solutions to problems facing us all. It is for this reason that I am here to talk about the solutions to be found in a newly urgent goal of American foreign policy: The seamless inclusion of girls and women in global outlook and actions.

You in this room know better than anyone else that our world is in a time of great transformation, heralding ever more democracy, leading to ever more peace. Around the world, just as here at home, the end of the Cold War has freed us to focus on those issues that edge right up to our frontdoors.

THERE ARE PRESSURES IN THIS TIME OF CHANGE. SUSTAIN VALUES AT THIS TIME OF TRANS. WOMEN FIND RIGHTFUL PLACES. ARE WE GOING TO

Europe. In it she describes flying into Sydney and seeing -- from above -- the beauty of the harbor, the golden beaches and the "grey-green city" lying at the edge of a continent.

At that moment she finally understands Australia's unique orientation in the world. The country, she writes, looks "across the vast expanse of the Pacific, not to Europe, but to Japan and Continental Asia."

Having read that passage, and now being here for a few days before I travel to the Philippines and Thailand -- the Near North, not the Far East -- I feel better oriented in our world too.

Despite the thousands of miles of ocean that separate your country and mine, we are bound together in friendship and partnership based on common experiences.

We are united, not least, by our commitment to democracy and the values that democracy seeks to uphold. As proponents of freedom, we rejoice in recent developments around the globe: There is no Iron Curtain any more. In country after country, dictatorships have crumbled and democracy has come alive. The threat of nuclear war no longer hovers over us. As my husband said yesterday in Parliament, opportunities for peace and prosperity are greater than ever before. And the prospect of a new and even more dynamic century beckons us. ←

Yet at the same time, many people in our countries and around the world feel the strains caused by global competition and the rapid pace of change. The superficial cultural homogenization of the world means that people from Boston to Brisbane [Briz-bin], Paris to Perth, and Moscow to Melbourne wear the same jeans, eat the same fast food, and listen to the same music. But these surface similarities do not override a longing for identity and meaning in their lives. Despite improving material conditions in advanced economies, families seem under stress. The gap between rich and poor grows wider. Even in the United States and Australia, the social safety net -- health care, education, pensions, good wages and good jobs -- is in danger of fraying for those less able to navigate this new world.

These pressures pose unavoidable questions for all of us as we approach the 21st century: Questions about how to balance individual and community rights and responsibilities; about how parents will raise children in the face of the influences of the mass media and consumer culture; about personal identity and work in an age of globalization, information overload and high technology; about the roles of women in society; about how people will preserve their ethnic pride and value their national citizenship; about how nations will protect their sovereignty

11/22/90 10:00 AM OF 2 0001 0013 SECRET AUSTRALIA 0004

while cooperating regionally and globally with others.

Thinking about these challenges, and how free nations like ours will respond to them, we may need to be reminded that democracy is not just about our legally protected rights, elections or even free market economies. It's about the internalization of democratic values in people's hearts, minds and everyday lives. It's about how, in the absence of either hot or cold wars, democracy is rooted in the experiences of our young people. It's about developing among democratic nations what I call "an alliance of values" that withstands tyranny and terrorism. Such an alliance is based on the shared values of freedom, opportunity, responsibility, community and respect for human rights.

Building and sustaining democracy has always required a balance of power that allows those values to flourish: A balance of public political power, private economic power and the power of civil society, the formal and informal networks that bring people together to make decisions for themselves and for the common good.

Democratic values are at risk when that balance shifts to the extremes: When government becomes too cumbersome or too intrusive or too restrictive. When the marketplace, which by definition knows the price of everything but the value of nothing, lures citizens into becoming merely consumers who care about satisfying their personal wants. When civil society, which consists of local organizations, philanthropies, volunteer associations, neighborhood groups and individual families, is weakened by larger political and economic forces.

Every generation faces the task of achieving the proper balance of power so that democratic values can survive and thrive.

Whether we succeed at this task is particularly important for women, whose voices are still too often silenced in too many parts of the world. It is equally important for women in countries such as ours who still are striving to attain and define their rightful place in government, the economy and civil society and claim their share of personal, political, economic, and civic power.

During the United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing, I said that women's rights ~~are~~ human rights -- and human rights are women's rights. One would think that at the end of this century that should be an unremarkable statement. I have been overwhelmed by the response that speech received. And also bewildered that the proposition should be open to question.

A few months ago I appeared on a radio program for the Voice of America. I fielded questions from all over the world. Many callers referred to my Beijing speech. And one male caller asked what my statement about women's rights really meant. I told him to imagine the rights men had and wanted and to apply them to women: the right to be valued as a member of a family, to be protected from violence and exploitation, to be assured equal access to the tools of opportunity -- health care, education, legal rights, political participation, economic empowerment -- that equip an individual with the capacity to make responsible decisions for one's life. Where women are given human rights they help create conditions in which they, their families and communities flourish.

Yet we know that even in advanced democracies such as ours, where these conditions are present for the vast majority of women, women's roles and rights are still being debated. They are being debated among women as well as between men and women, with implications for whether our democracies will meet the challenges of the future.

A few weeks ago we had an election in the United States. Many critical issues were raised during the campaign. But for the first time a new set of concerns took on political importance -- concerns about enhancing the quality of our lives, about raising children, about meeting the demands of work and family.

Why were these issues suddenly at the heart of American politics? Because they are about real issues on people's minds -- kitchen table issues -- and about how public and private power should be balanced to address them.

Will a new mother and her infant be allowed to stay in the hospital as long as a doctor deems it necessary -- or will private business considerations determine when they are ready to be sent home?

Will parents be allowed to take time off from work to care for a sick child or loved one -- or will they be forced to choose between meeting their responsibilities to their jobs and meeting their responsibilities to their families?

The Family and Medical Leave law, which was the first piece of legislation my husband signed as President in 1993, took on greater political significance because my husband's opponent and leaders of the other party in Congress disagreed about the law and the need to expand it. Family leave became a leading issue during the campaign, along with maternity stays for new mothers and how to protect health care coverage for older and poorer Americans, the majority of whom are women.

Even the book I wrote, It Takes a Village, became an issue in the campaign after it was attacked as an endorsement of government taking a dominant role in the raising of children. Anyone who reads the book knows that was not its theme. Rather, I argued that, although families bear the primary responsibility for child-rearing, each individual and institution in society has a responsibility toward children too. The village of which I wrote is not a geographic location but a community of shared values and relationships.

People all over America started coming up to me at my campaign appearances on behalf of my husband wearing buttons that said, "It does take a village" or "I am a villager" or "Welcome to our village." They recognized that building a sense of community based on mutual responsibility not only helps all of us to work for our own ends -- but also to help each other succeed. From what I know of your country, that is an unassailable tenet of your social contract even though you may disagree over the specifics.

Many observers in America, however, were perplexed that these issues were so important to voters this year. Accustomed to discussions of defense, diplomacy, economics and trade, some commentators never really caught on that so-called "women's issues" mattered because -- at root -- they were about the way that men and women live together and in society.

Such issues instead were often dismissed as marginal to the larger challenges our nation is facing or derided as "the feminization of politics."

What an unfortunate term. After all, don't fathers worry about how long their wives and babies can stay in the hospital when they need care? Don't men want to be able to take time off when a family member is gravely ill? Don't sons want to ensure that their elderly parents have health care coverage in the later stages of life?

Instead of the "feminization of politics," I prefer to think of this phenomenon as the "humanization of politics" in America. What we saw being played out in the political arena was how in a democracy people's personal concerns can become political if they use their voices -- and their votes -- to define them.

That represents a maturing of politics. The gender gap we heard so much about was simply a measure of how women, who are experts on the hazards and vicissitudes of life, voted their self-interest and their values. In so doing they delivered a clear message that the issues they care about deserve to be on the front burner of national politics.

11/22/80 THE NEW YORK TIMES 1980 0001 0013 STREET AUSTRALIA 00007

I have come up with my own term for this phenomenon. Like some of you, I studied political science in college. I've followed politics closely in my years as a citizen activist and political spouse. And I have come to a fairly good understanding of the historic concept of *realpolitik* among and between nations.

What women are saying today -- loudly and clearly -- is that national politics is not just about *realpolitik*. It's also about *real life politik*.

I realize that there will be women who disagree with me and with each other about specific issues and where the balance of power between and among institutions and individuals should rest. In my country, some women believe the President and Congress over-extended government's power in legislating family leave and the length of maternity hospital stays. In contrast, other women think government needs more power to control economic forces that can disrupt the lives of families and communities.

And some women are just plain squeamish when the subject of power arises. It is something, they believe, that should be discussed quietly behind the scenes and exercised -- if at all -- by women only within the scope of their personal lives.

Regardless of where we stand on any particular issue or on the larger question of balancing the powers in our lives, we must acknowledge that much is at stake for women collectively in this debate. Not just in the United States but here and around the world.

Will democracies on every continent come to understand that issues affecting women are not soft or marginal, but are central to the progress and prosperity of every nation?

Will public and private institutions help empower women with the tools they need to expand their choices and take responsibility for their lives? And by that I mean: Will education be affordable and accessible to all women so that they can acquire the skills and knowledge they need to help themselves and contribute to society? Will businesses initiate policies that make work more family-friendly, like child care, flexible hours, or parental leave? Will employers value women by paying them equal pay for equal work?

Will law enforcement and justice systems act more efficiently to protect women from violations of their legal rights, particularly from violence in their own homes?

Will financial institutions provide credit for women -- especially poor women who, with access to small loans, can lift themselves and their families out of poverty?

Will individual women be respected for the choices they make about family, work and personal growth -- and will they be able to make those choices free of the burden of other people's and society's expectations? Will we stop pigeon-holing women and invoking stereotypes that limit their potential? Will we admit that there is no formula for being a successful or fulfilled woman in today's society? That one can choose full-time motherhood and homemaking. Or be committed to work outside the home without marriage or children. Or, like most of us today, balance work and family responsibilities. And that each of our choices is supported and respected.

Yesterday at the Australian War Memorial in Canberra my husband and I visited the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. One of the honor guards was a woman. I was heartened that she had the freedom to choose military service as a way to fulfill her aspirations. This was the right choice for her. It would not necessarily be the right choice for me, or for many of you. But we should all be able to celebrate the diversity of experiences that women are choosing for themselves today.

And finally, will we acknowledge, once and for all, that issues of concern to women do not just affect women but affect men too?

These are the questions we are struggling to answer. They are about the balance of power and about the balance we seek in our lives and in the larger community we share.

I welcome the debate. It is a great debate. It is a contentious debate. It is a necessary debate for any democracy on the eve of a new century.

And I am optimistic that woman will help shape the answers we seek. I'm optimistic because I have met women throughout the world who have seized this moment to make their voices heard on behalf of themselves and democracy's values. I have met women in Northern Ireland -- Catholics and Protestants -- who are working together to address the root causes of sectarian violence. I have met women in South Africa -- blacks and whites -- who helped lead the struggle to end apartheid. I have met women in Bosnia -- Croats, Serbs and Muslims -- who are transcending long-standing ethnic hatreds to keep the peace in that war-torn land. I have met women in Russia, Poland, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania, Slovakia, the Baltic region and in Mongolia who are leading the effort to build democratic governments, free market economies and civil society from the ruins of dictatorship. I have met women in South America who are joining forces to improve literacy and health care for women and children throughout the continent. I have met women in South and East Asia who are working to provide economic opportunity for the poorest of the

poor through small loans and credit.

I have met women in my own country who have come together to make their streets safer, their schools stronger, and the environment cleaner. And just in the few days I have been here, I have met women who are enriching this nation through their contributions to politics, law, science, education, the arts and journalism.

Some of the women I have met are famous. But many are not. They are not high-level diplomats or professional negotiators. They have not been elected to office. They aren't wealthy or connected in the right social circles.

They simply took it upon themselves to get organized and make their voices heard. They had faith in their own capacity to affect change. And they weren't going to wait around for someone else to do it for them.

So I am hopeful. Because every country and every time has its Caroline Chisholm, Edith Cowan, and Mother Mary McKillop -- women who, well known or not, understand that we must find common ground. And that on that common ground we will build a society that is in balance, where our democratic values are alive and where individuals can seek fulfillment and live up to their own God-given potentials.

Mary Woolstonecraft once said: "I do not wish women to have power over men, but over themselves."

That is what we are all striving for. This is what will ensure progress for women and their families, safeguard democracy, and make the world a better place for our children and ourselves.

Thank you very much.

###

● Alison Muscatine

03/11/97 11:38:15 AM

Record Type: Record

To: David Shipley/WHO/EOP

cc:

Subject: speech draft

i think there is some great stuff in the draft and that it's going in the right direction. my only worry is that the central theme is a bit diluted and hard to get a handle on. here are some things that could be added or amplified:

1) the connection between how investing in women (and how the "tools of opportunity") are critical to global political, economic, and social progress needs to be stated more clearly and more emphatically. (the idea that "women's issues aren't soft of marginal, they are central to the future of democracy and open markets"). although she has said it many times, i'm sure she thinks it's worth repeating. it's her most direct way of countering the "foreign policy as social work" criticism.

hrc also likes to make the point that given changes wrought by the Information Age-- changes in social relationships; the opportunities and costs brought by new technology; an explosion of materialism etc. -- there are new pressures on everyone in society, from families to governments. The implications are especially great for women, who are the primary caretakers for most families and who do much of the world's hard work. if we care about democracy, free markets, and global peace and stability in this era of such momentous change, we have to think seriously about whether we are investing in the vast reservoir of untapped human potential that women represent and whether we are doing enough to help women survive and thrive in this new age.

2) one other favorite idea that might work well in this speech is that every sector of society needs to examine its attitudes and actions toward women....governments need to create conditions that allow women to fulfill their individual potential as workers and citizens. businesses need to resist pressure to operate solely on the basis of profits and consider the social costs of doing business (e.g. there are benefits to family-friendly policies, etc). A strong NGO community must exist to help build and strengthen civil society and pressure governments to address the problems of women and families. Families must value girls as much as boys, and not view them just as commodities. And women themselves must take responsibility for their own lives and futures and work together to achieve their goals.

3). I think she would be remiss not to mention the Beijing conference and the galvanizing effect it had on women, NGOs and most important -- governments -- around the world. she can also talk about how, around the world, she has met women (many of whom are not famous) who are leading the movement for change: women in Bosnia, Ireland, S. Africa, and in neighborhoods throughout the U.S. etc (see end of Australia speech for the key paragraph).

4) for the segue into africa, i liked your original idea about drawing a parallel between our attitudes about women and about africa: both have too often been viewed as marginal; neither should be viewed that way. just as many of our interests -- building democracy, helping sustain open markets and trade, protecting human rights, ensuring that everyone enjoys legal protections and the right to participate fully in their societies -- require us to invest in women, so do they require our

engagement in africa.

let's talk more.

2ND STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1996 Inter Press Service
Inter Press Service

December 26, 1996, Thursday

LENGTH: 799 words

HEADLINE: POPULATION: VOTE ON FAMILY PLANNING AID AWAITS NEW CONGRESS

DATELINE: WASHINGTON, Dec. 26

BODY:

When the new Congress convenes for 1997, one of its first major policy acts will be a vote on the future of the U.S. family planning assistance program overseas, traditionally the world's largest.

The incoming Congress will have to decide whether to release 1997 funds to the U.S. international family planning program in March, or to delay their disbursement for 90 days, as desired by a majority in the Republican-controlled House of Representatives.

Following tough negotiations on the 1997 foreign aid bill, Republican lawmakers agreed in September to drop a controversial provision that would have sharply cut aid to agencies which encourage abortion. Instead, they moved to tighten controls on the disbursement of funds.

As it now stands, Congress has approved some \$ 385 million for population programs for fiscal 1997, which began Oct. 1. But the money may not be spent before July 1, 1997, nine months into the fiscal year. Under the 1997 foreign aid bill, the total funding can be disbursed at the rate of only eight percent per month.

Congress could decide to bring forward the release date by three months if President Bill Clinton formally determines by early February that the three-month delay until July 1 would result in a substantial rise in the number of unwanted pregnancies in the recipient countries.

Clinton is expected to report just that. It will then be up to the Congress to decide whether to begin releasing the funds beginning March 1.

Population activists say the delayed disbursement of funds will severely restrict population programs in developing countries, and they are looking to the new Congress to at least make the money available in March.

"But it's impossible to predict what will happen in February in terms of the vote," says Sally Ethelston of the Washington-based non-governmental organization, Population Action International (PAI). "It depends on whether people act on the merits of the issues or come (at it) from an ideological perspective."

For some -- mainly Republican -- members of Congress, the family planning debate is about abortions. They want to re-impose a policy under former presidents Ronald Reagan and George Bush which barred U.S. funding from groups that either performed or promoted abortions.

Inter Press Service, December 26, 1996

* In 1985, the Reagan administration and Congress cut off assistance to the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) after anti-abortion groups accused the agency of helping China implement a population control program that included compulsory abortion and sterilization.

"On merit, one would have to conclude that a hold on funds does have a negative impact on programs," says Ethelston. "If people understand this and vote purely on family planning assistance, it is not a problem."

The Republican-controlled Congress began imposing restrictions on disbursement under the fiscal 1996 foreign aid bill. It also required that population aid be delayed for nine months and then be disbursed at the monthly rate of 6.7 percent. That arrangement caused the bulk of the money to be carried over into the 1997 fiscal year, effectively reducing the flow of population assistance to recipient countries by about half of its previous level.

"It's a very unusual situation," says Werner Fornos, president of the Washington-based Population Institute. He says the actions of the Congress come as population programs show some success. "Fertility rates have dropped and (population) growth rates have gone down," he said. "It's no time to pull back on the success formula."

Describing the actions of the lawmakers as "mean-spirited," Fornos and other population activists say U.S. funding cuts for voluntary family planning programs could have serious repercussions for the health of women and children around the world and could result in higher growth rates of the past.

Population Action International notes that tens of millions of couples use family planning services as a direct result of U.S. assistance. And even though the average number of children has dropped in some recipient countries, "the reality still remains that one-quarter to one-half of women in developing countries report that their last birth was either unwanted or mistimed," the agency says in a new study.

That study, "Why Population Matters," says that while the world population is now growing at about 1.5 percent annually, the numbers of women in developing countries in their child-bearing years (aged 15-49) is increasing by about 2.3 percent, or some 24 million each year.

Population Action makes the argument that spending on voluntary family planning programs will therefore have to increase at a similar rate, just to serve the women who already use contraceptives.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: December 27, 1996

36TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1997 Information Access Company,
a Thomson Corporation Company
IAC (SM) Newsletter Database (TM)
Penny Hill Press
Congressional Research Report

March 1, 1997

LENGTH: 186 words

HEADLINE: POPULATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS: IMPENDING CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

BODY:

By Kerry Dumbaugh, Foreign Affairs and National Defense Division. January 27, 1997. 6 pages. Congressional debate over U.S. population assistance policy was quite contentious in the 104th Congress. House and Senate differences over abortion restrictions and United Nations population programs were such that the 104th Congress was not able to agree to a final, long-term resolution on U.S. international family planning assistance. Instead, House, Senate, and White House negotiators eventually reached a settlement, included in the FY1997 Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations measure, that represented more of a temporary solution to the family planning issue and that required Congress to revisit early in 1997 the single issue of when FY1997 funds could be disbursed. Order No. 97-147 F.

Same-day shipment of the above-described Congressional Research Report costs \$ 47 (nonsubscriber rate) from Penny Hill Press, 6440 Wiscasset Road, Bethesda, MD 20816; phone 301-229-8229; fax 301-229- 6988; e-mail "pennyhill@clark.net".

COPYRIGHT 1997 Penny Hill Press

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

IAC-ACC-NO: 03543202 ND

LOAD-DATE: February 26, 1997

2ND STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1997 The Washington Post
The Washington Post

March 01, 1997, Saturday, Final Edition

SECTION: A SECTION; Pg. A18

LENGTH: 416 words

HEADLINE: WHAT ON EARTH? A WEEKLY LOOK AT TRENDS, PEOPLE AND EVENTS AROUND THE WORLD

BODY:

IN THE FAMILY WAY

The U.S. Senate voted this week to release \$ 385 million in already budgeted family planning funds that had been frozen over an abortion policy dispute. Here is a look at some of the effects family planning has in developing countries.

Surveys show that most women in developing countries want to delay or avoid having another child, yet for millions, contraceptive services are still difficult to obtain, unaffordable or of poor quality.

International donors contributed \$ 1.2 billion toward family planning assistance in 1994.

The United States for years has been the largest contributor to family planning programs in poor countries, having allocated \$ 548 million in 1995, \$ 356 in 1996 and \$ 385 for this year.

Proportion of married Proportion of

women age 15 to 49 married women

using family planning who would like

to space or limit births but do not have access to family planning

Haiti 18% 48%

Kenya 33% 36%

Pakistan 12% 32%

Senegal 7% 28%

Mali 7% 26%

Nigeria 6% 21%

Bangladesh 45% 19%

Egypt 48% 16%

The Washington Post, March 01, 1997

Morocco 50% 16%

Turkey 63% 12%

Indonesia 55% 11%

Colombia 72% 8%

Spacing births can lower infant mortality

Deaths per 1,000 Deaths when

infants under age births are

1 when births are spaced at

spaced less than two least two

years apart years apart

Brazil* 138 72

Pakistan 135 57

Nigeria 134 70

Egypt 128 46

Indonesia 118 55

Turkey 113 45

Senegal 112 60

Morocco 110 47

Kenya 81 51

Colombia 44 28

* Northeast Brazil only.

SOURCES: Population Reference Bureau, Macro International, Population Action International, Alan Guttmacher Institute

GRAPHIC: Illustration, dita smith and tobey

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 01, 1997

Copyright 1997 Gannett Company, Inc.
USA TODAY

January 9, 1997, Thursday, FINAL EDITION

SECTION: NEWS; Pg. 10A

LENGTH: 1068 words

HEADLINE: Hugs, kisses set hearing's tone Protest doesn't spoil lovefest for Albright

BYLINE: Lee Michael Katz

BODY:

Madeleine Albright's confirmation hearing for Secretary of State was in danger of turning mushy Wednesday before protesters gave her the chance to display her celebrated rhetorical cool under fire.

Outgoing Secretary Warren Christopher and a bipartisan cast of senators vied for the most flowery tribute to the first woman

These are not communications from the United States that represent any commitment or obligation on the ...

... funds some of our assistance efforts as well, is being squeezed.

I'll repeat something that Sandy Berger said over the weekend -- that Madeleine Albright is very sharp and crisp when she makes the point that about 1 percent of the federal budget will account for what is arguably about 50 ...

NOTES:

???? - Indicates Speaker Unknown

- Could not make out what was being said.

off mike - Indicates Could not make out what was being said.

concluded a consular convention, worked to promote American whale-oil and tobacco exports to France, and reported on the mob violence that preceded the French Revolution. The principal difference, however, is that Jefferson did it with a staff of one.

Today, America's Paris embassy has a staff of 800, part of a sprawling bureaucracy that employs 23,000 people worldwide in 249 embassies and consulates. Luxurious by Jefferson's standards, perhaps--but in her recent Senate confirmation hearings, President Clinton's feisty nominee for secretary of state, Madeleine Albright, added her voice to a swelling bipartisan chorus lamenting the austerity that has been imposed on the State Department and warning that America cannot conduct first-rate diplomacy "on the cheap."

In traditional foreign-policy circles, what has happened to the State Department's budget since the 1980s is seen as a disaster for U.S. diplomacy. American foreign-affairs spending has fallen by about 50 percent in real terms, 36 installations have been closed, and 2,000 people have been let go. Noting that only about 1 percent of the federal budget goes toward foreign affairs, Albright said, "That 1 percent may well determine 50 percent of the history that is written about our era." Seized by this logic, the White House is now planning to press for a \$ 1 billion increase in the foreign-affairs budget for next year, bringing it to \$ 19.3 billion.

Russian President Boris Yeltsin waved off an interpreter during Kremlin talks, saying "she doesn't need translation" of his comments.

Albright finds comparisons uncomfortable but style differences with her predecessor Warren Christopher are profound.

Energetic and personable at 59, she is the most articulate U.S. foreign policy spokesman. Her perfectly pitched soundbites are practiced, however, not left to chance.

More than 40 news organisations competed for 12 seats on her airplane on the Europe-Asia trip that ends next Tuesday.

Often, only a handful of reporters would travel with Christopher. A cautious man, he struck many as a lawyer's lawyer who was a wooden public speaker, awkward with reporters and widely viewed as a weak secretary of state.

The blunt-spoken Albright has been dubbed "Iron Lady" by Russian Foreign Minister Yevgeny Primakov.

In Rome, she took a walking tour and was swamped with people wanting to say hello. In his tenure, Christopher could go places at home and not be

De Charette, who clashed openly with Christopher, called her "a very great lady from a very great country."

Speaking French did not hurt her. Nor did speaking Russian in Moscow, where an interpreter was told to dispense with translating Yeltsin's remarks a half-hour into their meeting because Albright understood the language well enough.

Foreign Minister Primakov, still not happy with NATO's planned expansion, was a picture of grace. He called Albright "not just an iron lady, but also a very constructive lady."

GRAPHIC: The Associated Press looking: U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright looks over the North Korean side during her visit to guard post Oullette at the border village of Panmunjom, north of Seoul, Saturday.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: February 25, 1997

"They believe it has to be submitted," she said Friday. "We do not."

Last Tuesday in Brussels, she unveiled a proposal for a joint NATO-Russian brigade in a package of conciliatory gestures to Moscow to make NATO expansion go down easier.

Asked for details, Albright readily admitted it's an idea that has not been developed. Most diplomats would not admit to proffering such an incomplete proposal.

On the other hand, in Paris, trying to smooth over the differences with the prickly French that bedeviled her predecessor Warren Christopher, she openly invited President Jacques Chirac to "put his shoulder to the wheel" and complement American peacemaking efforts between Israel and the Arabs.

American officials said privately she wasn't really inviting France to share in the unique role the United States plays as the sole mediator trusted by the two sides.

But the French liked her complimentary ways. Chirac kissed her on both cheeks. French Foreign Minister Herve de Charette outdid his boss and kissed the American secretary of state five times.

old days when she beamed before the party nominees.

"Gerry's fascinating to watch," said Representative Barbara B. Kennelly, the Connecticut Democrat, who is an old friend. "She's adjusted to the show, doesn't worry about it." The pugnacious format is "perfect" for her because she has enormous self-confidence, said Ms. Kennelly, who senses that her friend is ready to capitalize on a new kind of opportunity. "I am 60 years old myself, watching Madeline Albright, Geraldine, Kay Graham, others around that age, and it seems to be the time of the older woman," said Ms. Kennelly, who treasures having nominated her friend at the convention for the Vice Presidential slot.

A conversation with Ms. Ferraro as she studies the night's prep work for "Crossfire" is an instant measure of her lingering appetite for politics. "I really don't know yet if I want to run again," she began in the requisite demurral before noting that she is pondering either a gubernatorial or Senate run. In her letter to potential supporters, she asked them not to commit to another candidate until she decides early next year. Her decision, she said in a particularly revealing passage, was either to close her public service career once and for all or to tell her supporters, "I love you and I need you to help me send Al D'Amato back to Island Park."

FAMILY PLANNING

For-53/Against-46

The Senate approved the early release of \$ 385 million for international family planning programs. This sent the measure (HJ Res 36) to conference with the House, which also voted to begin releasing the specialized foreign aid this month rather than in July. Although U.S. law prevents the money from being used for abortions, opponents wanted the legislation to contain stricter antiabortion language. A yes vote supported early release of international family planning funds.

..... YES ... NO ... NV

MARYLAND

Mikulski (D) X

Sarbanes (D) X

VIRGINIA

Robb (D) X

Warner (R) X

SOCIAL SECURITY

For-55/Against-44

The Senate tabled (killed) a bid to remove Social Security from a proposed balanced budget constitutional amendment (SJ Res 1). The measure killed by this vote sought to put the Social Security trust funds "off budget" and thus insulated from balanced budget calculations. The trust fund surpluses are part of the federal budget. Critics say this disguises the actual size of annual deficits. The surpluses exist not as cash reserves but as "IOUs" from the Treasury to the trust funds. At issue on this vote was whether the constitutional amendment imperils or protects Social Security. A yes vote was to keep Social Security in the unified federal budget under terms of a balanced budget constitutional amendment.

..... YES ... NO ... NV

- o Thank you Mrs. Clinton and Secretary Albright
- o In closing our program, we invite all of you to join us for coffee in the Delegates Lounge and Diplomatic reception area with cookies provided by the Girl Scouts who are celebrating their 85th anniversary .
- o You will also have a chance to view a film by Laura Liswood, who is here in our audience and who is a strong advocate for women's leadership. Laura's film, World Women Leaders, is a great inspiration and gets rave reviews.
- o Thank you again for joining us at the State Department and for your support for the work we all care so much about.

WANGARI [WAHN-GAREE] MAATHAI [MA-THIGH]

SPOKE AT U.N. CONF ON AFRICA IN 1995. LEADER OF PRO-ENVIRONMENTAL AND WOMEN'S "GREENBELT MOVEMENT" IN KENYA. CHAMPION OF RURAL WOMEN

"

THE TRUTH IS THAT AFRICANS, LIKE ALL OTHER HUMAN BEINGS WANT JUSTICE, EQUITY, ~~IT'S~~ RESPONSIBILITY, AND ACCOUNTABILITY. THEY WANT RESPECT AND HUMAN DIGNITY. THEY WANT A DECENT LIFE AND AN OPPORTUNITY TO FEED, CLOTHE AND SHELTER THEIR FAMILIES. THEY ARE NOT SEEKING TO MARGINALIZE EACH OTHER."

Kerala - never been there

Bayladesi - food -
don't know that much about food

Micro credit - too much -

[bottom 6] get a 'd of his case

End 6 p. 4 -

more explicit point -

foreign
not just good for interests but good
for us

USAID lessons w/o borders -

translate

last this - set up for Africa -

take arguments from Col. U. article

why in our interests -
more positive

