

11/24/97

Phil. ltr says POTUS ^{Suggested} ~~suggested~~
writer send in proposal.

1. send to POTUS? M

2. send to Don [✓] Kind for
reply? (yes)
S

Cron



—



ami

AMERICAN MALLS INTERNATIONAL

2620 P STREET, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20007

(202) 338-5200

FAX (202) 338-6014

*cc: Miller
2. through
JFF sec*

January 20, 1997

President William J. Clinton
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC

97 JAN 24 PM 5:50

Dear Mr. President:

You suggested at last month's Holiday Dinner that I send you this proposal for **Celebration 2000 - A Bridge To The Future**. This global millennium celebration on January 1, 2000, has been conceived as a forum where the presence and commitment of the world's leaders can be focused to rally around your vision of a new era in global communications and commerce.

I believe that an international event of this magnitude, building upon expectations of this significant date, would make manifest your Administration's world leadership in bringing the planet closer together through world telecommunications and commerce. Economic cooperation is the best foundation for world peace.

I would be pleased to assist whomever in your Administration is responsible for furthering this concept.

Sincerely,

Herbert S. Miller

P.S. After we met, I ran into Bob Burkett who felt that Michael Ovitz would love to sink his teeth into Celebration 2000.

Celebration 2000 - A Bridge To The Future

On January 1, 2000, in cities around the world, celebrations are planned to welcome in the new year, new century, and new millennium. From small to grandiose, these preparations reflect the western world's fascination with the coming era, and its hopes for a peaceful and prosperous future. Despite their good intentions, however, these celebrations lack a single unifying element: the presence and commitment of the world's leaders to begin a new era in global communications and commerce. We propose that on January 1, 2000, a series of events coordinated with these significant national and international celebrations will occur, to demonstrate a new international vision by the world's leaders for the new millennium: **Celebration 2000 - A Bridge To The Future.**

Beginning from Japan, world leaders would travel in relay fashion with the sun during the 48 hours that constitute January 1, 2000. They would travel via supersonic transport to major cities in China, Europe, Africa, South America, and North America. In each location, a significant national event symbolic of international cooperation and trade will be visited and celebrated to welcome in a new millennium of global connectedness.

At each site, the host nation would propose a celebration meaningful to its own vision of trade and cooperation. These events would be linked by advanced telecommunication facilities, bridging the distances between nations with instantaneous participatory voice and vision transmitted via broadcast, cable, and Internet text, audio, and video.

As an example, **Celebration 2000's** east coast U.S.A. component could include the celebration of the decade of The New District Of Columbia. The Nation's Capital is poised to step onto the world stage as a pivotal location for international commerce and communication. The Washington Center Alliance is actively planning to integrate downtown planning elements such as the new World Convention and Telecommunications Center which is scheduled to open on January 1, 2000.

Each of the selected events would be attended by several world leaders, who would move on to the next event via supersonic transport, where they would be greeted and joined by other world leaders who would then take over the ceremonial duties and travel to the next destination. These legs could occur simultaneously or otherwise as necessary to maintain the timing of the events. In this way, the spirit of cooperation would fly around the world with the sun: a powerful and compelling gesture of unity drawing the attention of the whole world to those projects and policies representing the new millennium, setting the agenda for the next generation.

COPY



AMERICAN MALLS INTERNATIONAL

2620 P STREET, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20007

(202) 338-5200 FAX (202) 338-6014

ami

January 20, 1997

President William J. Clinton
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC

Dear Mr. President:

You suggested at last month's Holiday Dinner that I send you this proposal for **Celebration 2000 - A Bridge To The Future**. This global millennium celebration on January 1, 2000, has been conceived as a forum where the presence and commitment of the world's leaders can be focused to rally around your vision of a new era in global communications and commerce.

I believe that an international event of this magnitude, building upon expectations of this significant date, would make manifest your Administration's world leadership in bringing the planet closer together through world telecommunications and commerce. Economic cooperation is the best foundation for world peace.

I would be pleased to assist whomever in your Administration is responsible for furthering this concept.

Sincerely,

Herbert S. Miller

P.S. After we met, I ran into Bob Burkett who felt that Michael Ovitz would love to sink his teeth into Celebration 2000.

Celebration 2000 - A Bridge To The Future

On January 1, 2000, in cities around the world, celebrations are planned to welcome in the new year, new century, and new millennium. From small to grandiose, these preparations reflect the western world's fascination with the coming era, and its hopes for a peaceful and prosperous future. Despite their good intentions, however, these celebrations lack a single unifying element: the presence and commitment of the world's leaders to begin a new era in global communications and commerce. We propose that on January 1, 2000, a series of events coordinated with these significant national and international celebrations will occur, to demonstrate a new international vision by the world's leaders for the new millennium: **Celebration 2000 - A Bridge To The Future.**

Beginning from Japan, world leaders would travel in relay fashion with the sun during the 48 hours that constitute January 1, 2000. They would travel via supersonic transport to major cities in China, Europe, Africa, South America, and North America. In each location, a significant national event symbolic of international cooperation and trade will be visited and celebrated to welcome in a new millennium of global connectedness.

At each site, the host nation would propose a celebration meaningful to its own vision of trade and cooperation. These events would be linked by advanced telecommunication facilities, bridging the distances between nations with instantaneous participatory voice and vision transmitted via broadcast, cable, and Internet text, audio, and video.

As an example, **Celebration 2000's** east coast U.S.A. component could include the celebration of the decade of The New District Of Columbia. The Nation's Capital is poised to step onto the world stage as a pivotal location for international commerce and communication. The Washington Center Alliance is actively planning to integrate downtown planning elements such as the new World Convention and Telecommunications Center which is scheduled to open on January 1, 2000.

Each of the selected events would be attended by several world leaders, who would move on to the next event via supersonic transport, where they would be greeted and joined by other world leaders who would then take over the ceremonial duties and travel to the next destination. These legs could occur simultaneously or otherwise as necessary to maintain the timing of the events. In this way, the spirit of cooperation would fly around the world with the sun: a powerful and compelling gesture of unity drawing the attention of the whole world to those projects and policies representing the new millennium, setting the agenda for the next generation.



Stanley K. Sheinbaum

FAX TRANSMITTAL

DATE: 11 January

TO:

Nancy Hennrich

FIRM:

FROM:

Stanley

'97 JAN 24 PM 2:16

COMMENTS:

For The President.

Thank you!

To Samy Berger / NS C

Eyn

BK

OF PAGES (including cover sheet)

7

DESTINATION FAX #

If you experience any problems with this transmittal
please call us at 310-472-9541

Fax: # 310-476-9853

e-mail: SKS345@aol.com

345 North Rockingham Avenue Los Angeles California 90049-2635 Telephone (310) 476-9853



Stanley K. Sheinbaum

MEMO TO: President Bill Clinton
SUBJECT: *Honest Brokering Between Palestinians and Israelis*
DATE: 11 January, 1997

Of all things I am enclosing part of a section from Turmoil and Triumph, the recent book by George Shultz—of all people. In the chapter on the Middle East he has a section on "A Lesson From My Days With Nixon"—again, of all people. Shultz, then Secretary of Labor, is describing to Shamir how, in the battle over integration in the South, Nixon talked much of and indeed followed the principle that the intermediary between such hostile antagonists as blacks and whites had to be crystal clear and impartial. Shultz, then, of course, analogizes that scene to the equally hostile antagonists, the Israelis and the Palestinians. Once the intermediary—the same US government—shows sign of a tilt or a bias toward one side or another the dynamic becomes impaired.

You must consider that the starting points are not on level ground. Both the economic and military strength of the Israelis are far superior to that of the Palestinians. Worse—and this may be even far more critical—is that there is a natural tendency in the West to be biased against the Arabs of Islam. So starting from that weak subjective position if the Palestinians conclude the mediator to be biased—whether validly based or not—a major impediment is created for that mediator to overcome. No one else can do it. And overcome it he must, certainly not add to it.

I know from personal contact that Arafat and running through most of their hierarchy, the Palestinians have as a result become much more difficult to work with. There is always the fear because of their perceived bias that the US mediator is trying to put something over on them.

Different rhetoric is used. In last week's *Los Angeles Times*, Hanan Ashrawi talks about the US mediator micro-managing, by actually proposing terms. When Arafat is quoted as saying there is a bias in the American mediation team Nicholas Burns says that was "extraordinarily unwise" to say, a judgmental comment from a non-policy person. But for the Palestinians even that is one more manifestation of the tilt against them.

Another confusing factor is the gray area of compromise. Any mediator would always be chomping at the bit to recommend a compromise that could get past a particular impasse. On a minor item that is acceptable. However, as in the present case of the Israelis wanting to put off the date of deployment well beyond what Oslo II called for—Oslo being most critical to the Palestinians' long-run hopes for peace and statehood—the Palestinians

e-mail: SKS345@aol.com

345 North Rockingham Avenue Los Angeles California 90049-2635 Telephone (310) 472-0541 FAX (310) 476-0822

President Bill Clinton
11 January, 1997
Page 2

don't see any compromise offered by the mediator in that context as a run-of-the-mill matter. It is critical to them.

I have gotten a bit wordy in all this but I am trying to emphasize the need for being squeaky clean in the eyes of each of the antagonists. If the American team does not succeed at this then the peace process will clearly come to naught. It may at times seem by us as hand holding assuagement—especially if the Palestinians' perception is ill-based. Ill-based or not, it is a reality which we must deal with—that is, if you want to reach a solution.

In the final analysis, it is my judgment in the face of that possibility that it is you who has to make it clear to your team that the US has to be the *honest broker*. Put differently, it is you and only you—and I fully recognize the presumptuousness of such a comment—who has to determine whether the peace process is in your own Presidential interest as well as that of the nation.

PS There is an interesting irony in the Shultz/Nixon passage that I alluded to, and in which Shultz emphasizes the need for complete impartiality on the part of the American mediator. I learned a decade ago from an impeccable source that when Shultz took over State after two years of nothingness from his predecessor, Alexander Haig, he was lectured at his first cabinet meeting by Mrs. Reagan that he, Shultz, had to understand that the Reagan administration was a pro-Israel administration. I guessed accurately it turned out that the reason for her tilt was a very close friendship here in LA with Mrs. Armand Deutsch and Mrs. Alfred Bloomingdale, both strong zealots about Israel. George loyally adhered to the *diktak* of that particular first lady until his last year at State when he did attempt to do something about the Middle East—unsuccessfully. His credibility on the Palestinian side was shot by then, and they would not even meet with him. Nevertheless, I consider his emphasis on the principle of the *honest broker* to be critical—despite his own deviation.

PPS The foregoing is background for my hoped-for telephone conversation with you.

JAN 11 '97 16:30 FR SK SHEINBAUM

310 476 9853 TO CLINTON PRES

P.04/08



George P. Shultz

*TURMOIL
AND TRIUMPH*

My Years as Secretary of State

A ROBERT STEWART BOOK

Charles Scribner's Sons
New York

Maxwell Macmillan Canada
Toronto

Maxwell Macmillan International
New York Oxford Singapore Sydney

text over for the president. At 4:30, I asked Jim Baker to come to my office so I could show Arafat's statement to him as well. "Arafat's statement meets our conditions," I told him.

"It's just great to have this done. Congratulations," Jim Baker responded.

At 5:14, Colin Powell called back: the president agreed and authorized me to make a public statement that the PLO had met our conditions for a dialogue. At 6:30 that evening, I went down to the pressroom and announced: "The Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) today issued a statement in which it accepted U.N. Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, recognized Israel's right to exist in peace and security, and renounced terrorism. As a result, the United States is prepared for a substantive dialogue with PLO representatives."

I wanted to control this dialogue carefully, so I designated Robert Pelletreau, our ambassador to Tunisia and a top-notch professional, as the only authorized channel. I stated flatly, "The United States does not recognize the declaration of an independent Palestinian state." And, I emphasized, "The United States' commitment to the security of Israel remains unflinching."

In a reference to the Arab "three noes" of 1967 (no recognition, no negotiation, no peace with Israel), Bill Safire on December 15, 1988, in the *New York Times*, called this the "three yesses": yes to Israel, yes to forswearing terrorism, yes to 242. Safire amplified perceptively:

In the end, our unrelenting pressure paid off. "We totally and absolutely renounce all forms of terrorism," read Yasir Arafat, "including individual, group and state terrorism. . . . we want peace." . . . For weeks the P.L.O. leader has been trying to entice the departing Reagan Administration into talks with half-concessions and phony "yesses."

Secretary of State George Shultz was not having any of that. Others, from Margaret Thatcher to a group of dovish Jewish citizens of the U.S., read the murky Arafat tea leaves and saw what they wanted to see, but the Reagan Administration, to its credit and credibility, demanded straight answers.

I think the key in forcing the P.L.O. leader to act was the denial of his visa to the U.S. That was an action that brought almost universal denunciation upon Secretary Shultz's head, but one that carried more weight than any form of cajoling or persuasion.

I had stood firm, and the denial of a visa to Arafat had been tough evidence that I would continue to do so. The waters had swirled, roared, and tumbled around me. When they receded, the PLO had made a new decision, while the United States had held fast to a constant position.

Reactions varied widely, mostly following preconceived hopes. Some people were excited by the prospect that the PLO, long thought indispensable

to progress in the peace process, would now be involved. Others were furious that an odious organization and its chieftain had been legitimized. The Israelis launched into their familiar tactic, when something went against their perceived interests, of "damage magnification," blowing out of all proportion the negative side of this development and ignoring the positive possibilities. Some Arabs were ecstatic. Others responded warily, with the familiar tendency to view any development with a conspiratorial bent. Our ambassador to Tunis reported that "Arab diplomats fear the U.S. dialogue with the PLO is motivated by an American desire to take pressure off Israel"—to defuse the intifada and thereby get Israel out of that jam. More generally, though, the reaction to the PLO decision was rather like the way the stock market anticipates news: when the news actually breaks, the market doesn't react; it has already absorbed the idea.

I was skeptical of the PLO's ability to maintain a consistent and constructive position, but I was glad that a self-imposed prohibition to American diplomacy was now a matter of history. I was also glad to have forced some important words out of Arafat's mouth. Words are important. Once issued, they can never be taken back.

Representation:

A Lesson from My Days with Nixon

I had no high expectations for the PLO before or after they met our conditions. Their capacity for change and accommodation was, by their past performance, a question mark at best. Nevertheless, in my discussions with the Israelis, I repeatedly emphasized the importance of having as opposite numbers in negotiations Palestinians who were not involved in terrorism but who were legitimate, who truly represented their constituencies. At some point, sooner or later, Israel would have to face up to that truth. Over an informal and private dinner at his official residence, I discussed my views with Prime Minister Shamir on April 15, 1988. "You need strong representation on the other side of any bargaining table," I said. To deliver on any deal, the deal makers must have the full confidence of their constituencies. To underscore my point, I told Shaniir a long story about my involvement in the desegregation of the schools in the American South, an account meant to dramatize for him the importance of credible and legitimate representation if the outcome of a negotiation is to get support. He listened patiently as I recounted my own personal story from a page of U.S. history.

As late as 1970, I told him, the schools in seven of our Southern states were still segregated by law. The *Brown v. Topeka Board of Education* decision by the Supreme Court in 1954 had declared such segregation unconstitutional. Time passed. Tension mounted. The whole subject was

intensely controversial, with great arguments over the problems of busing in areas where the schools were segregated.

In March 1970, President Nixon had declared the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision to be "right in both constitutional and human terms" and expressed his intention to enforce the law. He decided to form a cabinet committee to work on this process in a direct, managerial way. Vice President Spiro Agnew was made chairman, and I was the vice chairman. Our problem was how to manage the transition to desegregated schools in the seven affected states: Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina.

Agnew wanted no part of this problem and basically declined to participate in the committee's deliberations. So I wound up as de facto chairman. I had strong help from Presidential Counselor Pat Moynihan, Special Counsel Len Garment, and Ed Morgan, a savvy former advance man for the president. I first formed biracial committees in each of the seven states. We determined, with the president's agreement, that politics should have nothing to do with the selection of the people for these committees. We wanted people in equal numbers of black and white who were truly representative of their constituencies. And so, with great care, we picked strong, respected leaders from each of these states.

This was a key point. I told Shamir, "We didn't pick people who agreed with us or with each other. We picked people who were respected by those they would represent."

The first group invited to Washington came from Mississippi in the late spring of 1970. I took them into the Roosevelt Room of the White House, right opposite the president's Oval Office, and started in. The discussion was civil, but the deep divisions were evident. The blacks argued that desegregation of the schools would be good for education and that it was absolutely essential. The whites were resistant. Both sides were tough but truly representative. I let them argue and get it out of their systems. There came a point in the meeting, after about two hours—and this happened with regularity as groups from the other states came in—when I felt that it was time to shift gears. By prearrangement, I had John Mitchell standing by. He was known throughout the South as the tough guy, and on the whole was regarded by the whites as "their man." I asked Mitchell, as attorney general, what he planned to do insofar as the schools were concerned. "I am attorney general, and I will enforce the law," he growled in his gruff, pipe-smoking way. He offered no value judgments and did not take part in the debate about whether this was good, bad, or indifferent. "I will enforce the law." Then he left. No nonsense. Both the blacks and the whites were impressed.

This message from the attorney general, I explained to Shamir, allowed me to move our discussion forward from "whether" to "how," to mana-

gerial and administrative topics. The fact was, desegregation was going to happen. The only question for these outstanding community leaders was, *how would it work?* Would there be violence? How would the educational system in their community be affected? What would be the effect on their local economies? They had a great stake in seeing that this effort was managed in a reasonable way, whether they liked it or not, I told them.

The same was true on the West Bank and Gaza, I told Shamir. "The status quo is not stable. Change will come. The questions are, how and to what."

When lunchtime arrived, back then in the spring of 1970, I took the whole group over to the diplomatic reception rooms in the State Department, where we were surrounded by the artifacts of colonial America. I pointed out the desk designed by Jefferson on which he wrote portions of the Declaration of Independence: "dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." I sat with the two strong men I wanted to cochair the Mississippi advisory committee.⁴ I argued that if they would accept, the committee would immediately have great credibility with whites and blacks; their acceptance would thereby enhance the ability of the committee to attain its goal: a desegregated school system with the least possible disruption and the greatest chance to enhance the quality of education for their children.

I saw that I was making headway, so I left them alone for a bit, much to the consternation of an observer from the Justice Department. "I learned long ago that when parties get that close to agreement, it is best to let them complete their agreement by themselves," I told the perplexed observer. "That way, the agreement belongs to them—it's theirs—and they will try hard to make it work." As lunch ended, these two tough, respected leaders shook hands on their own deal. We were in business in what many regarded as the most problematic state.

Gradually, after we returned to the White House, the whole group came around, and individuals started to make suggestions about how to handle this or that potential problem. A small kitty out of HEW flexible funds had been set aside, so I was able to say to the committee members that if they judged that funds were needed for minor expenditures, I could provide them on a fast-track basis. That seemed to help.

When I felt the time was right, again by prearrangement, I let President Nixon know that we were ready for him. We then walked across the hall and into the Oval Office, where he met each of them and sat them down. President Nixon spoke to them with a great sense of conviction and with considerable emotion. Looking around the room, he said, in essence,

4. Warren Hood, the president of the Mississippi Manufacturers' Association, and Dr. Gilbert Mason, president of the Biloxi chapter of the NAACP.

"Here we are in the Oval Office of the White House. Think of the decisions that have been made here and that have affected the health and the security of our country. But remember, too, that we live in a great democracy where authority and responsibility are shared. Just as decisions are made here in this office, decisions are made throughout the states and communities of our country. You are leaders in those communities, and this is a time when we all have to step up to our responsibilities. I will make my decisions, and I count on you to make yours. We must make this work."

By the time he got through and people were ready to leave, they were charged up to get their backs into making the school openings and subsequent operations of the schools go forward as smoothly and constructively as possible.

The group went home to Mississippi, and they were able to provide real leadership. They were strong people, and they were accepted as legitimate and valid representatives within their communities of the true feelings that people had. We went through the same process with representatives of five other states before the school year was to start. The last state to go was Louisiana. I suggested to the president that we hold this meeting in New Orleans. We would go to the South, where the action would take place. I would do my part in the morning. He could fly down from Washington and do his part with the Louisianans at the end of the morning meeting. Then, in the afternoon, we would invite the cochairmen from each of the seven states to join the president and me for an overall discussion of the school openings.

I remembered well a meeting in the Oval Office to discuss this possible set of events, I recounted to Shamir. Vice President Agnew strongly warned the president not to go. He said, there you will be in that room, Mr. President, half the people there will be black, half will be white. The schools will be opening, beginning the following week. There will be blood running throughout the streets of the South, and if you go, this will be blood on your hands. This is not your issue. This is the issue of the liberals who have pushed for desegregation. Let them have it. Stay away.

President Nixon looked at me, the nonpolitician in the crowd. I thought he had already decided to go and didn't need arguments from me. But I told him what I thought: "Well, Mr. President, I can't predict what will happen. The vice president may very well be right about violence in the streets, but this is your country. You are the president of all the people, and it seems to me that we have seen some very reasonable and strong people come up here. You've met with them and have had a big impact on them. We should do everything we can to see that the schools open and operate peacefully and well."

The president decided to go ahead with our plan. Down we all went to New Orleans, except for Vice President Agnew, who stayed home.

I left the night before the president and started in the morning with the biracial Louisiana group. The going was tough, much more so than with any other state. As I struggled, I thought, maybe my problem was the closeness of the school opening, maybe the more restricted amount of time, maybe we just missed the ambience of the White House. President Nixon was due to arrive about noon to put on his final touch. As noon arrived, I had not achieved the degree of agreement that I usually had by the time the president met with the group. We took a recess. I went out to meet with the president. "Mr. President," I told him, "I'm sorry to tell you that I haven't got this group to the point you usually find when you meet with them. They're still arguing. I'm afraid this time you're going to have to do the job yourself."

Nixon came in. He listened. He talked. He raised the sights of everyone. He stepped up to the problem, did a wonderful job, and brought them all on board.

That afternoon we had our meeting with the cochairmen from the seven states. The meeting was highly publicized throughout the South. President Nixon talked eloquently about the importance of what was going to happen and the stake that everyone had in seeing it go smoothly. There were strong pledges of cooperation from whites and blacks alike. A sense of determination in a joint, compelling enterprise filled the room.

Riding home on *Air Force One*, we gathered around to discuss the day's activities—Pat Moynihan, Len Garment, Bryce Harlow, the president, and I. We felt very good about the day's activities. Bryce Harlow, who was from Oklahoma and the only real Southerner in the crowd, said that he thought things would go pretty well in the South. But, he said, wait until this process of desegregation comes to the North. The lawyers from Boston have been coming South preaching all these years. But wait until they have to face desegregation in their own communities.

The president said, "How do you figure that, Bryce?"

He said, "Well, Mr. President, people in the South have been living with the Negro for all these years, side by side. In the South, we love the Negro as a human being, but we hate the Negro as a race. In the North, it's just the opposite. There is no experience of living together as human beings, so Northerners love the Negro as a race, but they hate the Negro as an individual. Therefore, and since this all comes down in the end to individual human relationships, it will go better in the South than in the North."

As the schools opened, we worried about how this would be covered on television. Len Garment went around to the leading networks and told them that they should report the facts as they were. He said to them, "Suppose a hundred schools open, and there is violence at one of them. What is the story? I think the story is that the schools opened 99 percent

peacefully." The schools opened, and all went well. The openings were peaceful, much to the amazement of almost everyone. The leaders in their communities had done a fine job. They stood up to their responsibilities.

After having told this long, involved story, I looked at Shamir. "There are two big lessons in this story as I see it," I told him. "The first is that if you are to give legitimacy to an effort, involve people who truly represent their own constituencies, not people who think the way you do and are easy for you to talk to. The other big lesson has to do with the human relationships involved. Jews and Palestinians have been living side by side throughout the region for centuries. I have traveled around in the Middle East a fair amount, and I have heard many expressions of admiration, respect, and affection for human beings across ethnic lines. Just as in our South, there are personal relationships of long standing. Although deep and abiding hatreds exist—and the intifada and Israel's harsh reaction are intensifying those hatreds—there is also personal rapport and respect to be nurtured.

I hoped also that Shamir would gain inspiration from the example of President Nixon, who had courageously stepped up to this historic and difficult problem and had given the leadership needed at a critical moment. "The moment must come," I said, "when strong Arabs and Israelis step up to their possibilities as well as their problems, when 'whether' turns to 'how,' and when the job of creating better and more stable conditions of life begins."

That was my exit from the peace process: I left with ideas on the table that I hoped could be taken up anew by new players. I remembered my first visit to Jerusalem in 1969 and the words of Mayor Teddy Kollek, "Jerusalem is like a beautiful mosaic. The colors don't run into each other, but if you put them together in the right way, they can make a beautiful picture." I also remembered Shamir's statement to me that "somehow we will find a way to live together peacefully."

Somehow, but how?

Tough decisions on all sides were needed, made with a foresight that eluded the Middle Eastern scene. Otherwise, the drift would continue toward spiraling violence and positions that become more and more irreconcilable. The United States had, and has, a unique ability to bring together all the parties and to help them overcome hatreds and forge solutions to their deep-seated problems. But those who reside in the Middle East, and those who lead them or aspire to, must in the end bear the burden of responsibility for conditions where they live.

CHAPTER 48

The Struggle to Oust Noriega

On Saturday, May 21, 1988, at 10:35 A.M., all the key people in the national security agencies of the executive branch gathered in the White House.¹ The subject: how to get military dictator General Manuel Antonio Noriega out of Panama and whether, in negotiating with him, we were wise to use the possibility of quashing an indictment—which had been brought against him in February on drug charges—as a lever to get him out of power and out of Panama. President Reagan had decided almost two weeks earlier in a meeting with Attorney General Ed Meese to do so.

On May 10, in a meeting in the Oval Office attended by Vice President Bush, the details of a potential deal with Noriega had been spelled out. I could see then that the vice president was uneasy. He wanted the dropping of the indictment to be described as "in the nature of a plea bargain" and counseled that we must orchestrate Latin support for the deal and be sure that House Speaker Jim Wright was on board. Mike Kozak, a lawyer in State's Latin America bureau who had played a role in achieving the Panama Canal Treaty in the 1970s, was our negotiator. Toward the end of the meeting, I said, "So we can take this as a decision for Kozak to go ahead?" All agreed: President Reagan, Vice President Bush, everybody.

But here we were, eleven days later, with the deal almost in hand, arguing the fundamentals all over again. Nothing ever gets settled in this town, I thought once again. At one point the president turned to me, "George, you and I seem to be pretty lonely here." Vice President Bush, Treasury Secretary Jim Baker, Chief of Staff Howard Baker, and his deputy, Ken

1. In addition to President Ronald Reagan, Vice President George Bush, and myself, also present were Secretary of the Treasury Jim Baker, Attorney General Ed Meese, Secretary of Defense Frank Carlucci, Chief of Staff Howard Baker, NSC adviser Colin Powell, CIA director William Webster, Deputy Chief of Staff Ken Duberstein, deputy to the NSC adviser John Negroponte, Under Secretary Mike Armacost, Assistant Secretary Elliott Abrams, and Mike Kozak.

21 Jan 97

Dear Mr. Stein,

Could I receive official passes
for my family to visit the White
House.

Your assistance to my reply
would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely

Philip Lyman
859 Park Circle
Harrisonburg, Va. 22801

1.24/97

TOOP

Do you know this gentleman?

MD

OR

Send to Doriskind?

yes

S



RE: PRESIDENT HAS BEEN

1/24/97

**National Winning Entry
For the PBS Democracy Project's Presidential Inaugural
Speech Contest**

**Written by Alexandra Leichtman
High School Senior
Washburn Rural High School
Topeka, Kansas**

**For information about the contest, please contact Kevin Dando, PBS Manager of
Education Communications, (703) 739-5073**

*Should do a min
letter to our young lady*

JIM DORSKIND:

Please coordinate
the reply

Today we are faced with the greatest threats to liberty in the American experience. I do not speak of communism, nuclear arms, poverty or drugs, but of apathy and intolerance, ^{these} lasting enemies to our society. It is thus our mission as a people, as a nation and as a global community to dedicate ourselves wholeheartedly to the eradication of these evils and to the creation of a more perfect world.

We have emerged from the dark night of the Cold War when the priority of nations was the assembly of ever larger machines of destruction. However, the globe we have inherited is still far from peaceful. Though gone are the days when two monoliths faced off and the world drew a line between East and West, in their place have come the days when the world must maintain an everlasting vigil against the insidious threat of oppression and prejudice everywhere. The United States and the Soviet Union have their missiles trained on each other no longer, but we must never forget that wherever there is hatred and misunderstanding, there is also menace to peace worldwide. We have created an environment where all nations are linked with the common ability to annihilate. However, the science that has allowed us this awesome and frightening power has also given us the ability to communicate on a global scale. No longer can oppressive governments hold their people in the bondage of ignorance and isolation, for the same technology that has given us smart bombs has given us the Internet and a future in which we can truly be one civilization united in liberty and working for the good of all peoples.

Furthermore, we cannot assume that in America, the oceans divorce us from enmity and antagonism, or that malice is reserved for Northern Ireland or Jerusalem or the Kashmir. More than ever our world is interconnected and we cannot afford to turn a blind eye to hatred and

violence, nor are we allowed the luxury of isolation as those very evils plague our nation as well.

For too long Americans have been blissfully ignorant of the subtle terrorism in their own society.

Racism and ethnicism did not end in the 1960's. Today we watch as our urban youth wage war against each other in the streets and wonder where it all went wrong. We blame drugs and genetics and indolence, never realizing that we have yet to overcome the inertia created by hundreds of years of inequity and prejudice, that the energy of a solitary generation is not enough to change the world forever. Lulled by our achievements and daunted by the task of transforming not laws but attitudes, too often we have given up the fight at the very moment when we, as a free and equal society, should have banded together in a single force against the animosity and savagery we find so foreign. But the very diversity that complicates our society also equips us to aid in the resolution of conflicts worldwide. We are in a unique position of understanding and should lead by example and honor the differences among us.

My fellow Americans, though we are still faced with enormous challenges, we have been blessed with the freest society of the modern world. Yet, the danger of success is that it makes us complacent and often ignorant of injustice. We must not rest on our laurels assuming our culture to be static and flawless. Thomas Jefferson and Patrick Henry gave us a first taste of liberty, but the fight did not end with their struggles. We owe our current freedoms to Susan B. Anthony, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., and others who worked to eliminate^e bias and discrimination. Let us continue in their spirit of inclusion and tolerance and honor their memory by carefully guarding the freedoms they fought so hard to establish. Above all, we must respect everyone's right to the freedom we hold so dear. Though we may believe that how others use their freedom is un-American, we must protect their liberty as we do our own. However, let not our liberty cleave us

JAN 02 '97 02:17PM PBS/K-12 LEARNING SVCS P.3
into embattled factions, but let liberty unite us into one community of free thinking and tolerant peoples. This is the united front our country must present to the world and to the future.

Let us all bear in mind that the United States is a nation conceived in and characterized by equality. Our power did not and does not stem from economy or weaponry or diplomacy, but from the equality of opportunity that has drawn immigrants to our shores for a dozen generations. However, today it is hard to uphold a position of world leadership when we have children who go to bed hungry, elderly who freeze in their homes, and adults who cannot read. The programs of the Great Society have not succeeded in eliminating poverty and illiteracy, but neither have they failed us entirely. We must not abandon hope of creating a better nation. We must reform and refine those programs that protect the most vulnerable of our society, for the poorest citizen is no less American than the richest entrepreneur. How we are seen as a world leader is often defined by how we treat the weakest among us and we should work to show the world that we are not only powerful, but compassionate and humane as well.

To those who would forge ahead, I would add a caution. Remember that lasting change is gradual. Remember that unlike policies and institutions and governments, minds cannot be changed by legislation. Remember that meaningful progress begins with the heart and mind that is within. And remember not to give up hope. I cannot and will not promise that this administration will see the end of terrorism, racism, poverty and inequality. I can only say that our commitment to our country and to our world is to move forward regardless of how slowly the first steps must be taken.

Some say that we have inherited a world of despair and nihilism. I say we have before us a world of promise and potential. For though we may be of different cultures, religions and languages, our humanity and compassion are the same. The next four years will usher out the old

JAN 02 '97 02:18PM PBS/K-12 LEARNING SVCS

millennium and welcome the new and I challenge you as I challenge myself to begin the 21st

Century ever wary of the specters that haunt our civilization and ever confident that in the 21st

Century justice, freedom and prosperity will reign both at home and abroad. Never forget that your government, your country, your world is a living being ready to be shaped by your patience, tolerance and determination. Think of the problems before you not as obstacles, but as mountains to be climbed and challenges to be mastered. You are given a voice and a vote and these tools are more powerful than the most deadly of nuclear weapons. To let them remain unused is the greatest affront to freedom, democracy and progress. The time has come for us to join hands and seek a more perfect world.



Ms. Kelly Green
Presidential Inaugural Committee
Washington, D.C.

Ms. Green:

This is the background biographical information Alexandra Leichtman, the national winner of the PBS Democracy Project's Presidential Inaugural Speech Contest, has sent us.

Alexandra is a senior at Washburn Rural High School in Topeka, Kansas.

Future Educational Plans

I am in the process of considering colleges and vice versa. I plan to study History and International Relations as well as French and Psychology.

Community Activity

I am a member of EarthBound, my school's environmental club, and I served as vice-president my sophomore year and president my junior year. One of our main achievements was to establish a school recycling program. I have also served on various local political campaigns doing such glamorous work as stuffing envelopes and making signs.

Scholarships and Awards

I am a National Merit Semi-Finalist. I am also a member of National Honor Society. And I am a member of the state champion Knowledge Master Open Team.

Voting

I was not eligible to vote this election.

Hobbies

I am a member of my school's varsity girl's soccer team and a co-captain of my club soccer team. I also am employed at the Olive Garden as a hostess and a cashier. I am a Kansas Jayhawks Basketball fan.

Family

My parents are both employed as child psychologists at the Menninger Clinic. My mother is a first-generation immigrant from the Philippines. My brother is a student at the College of the University of Chicago majoring in Biology.

Please call me at (703) 739-5073 if you need any additional information. Thank you.

Kevin Dando
Manager of Education Communications

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN

1-24-97

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

January 21, 1997

97 JAN 21 4:55

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: DONALD A. BAER *DB*

SUBJECT: JONATHAN ALTER EDUCATION ARTICLE

I wanted you to see this as soon as possible before your Wednesday education event in Chicago. This is the best single statement I have read of both: 1) why education should be the defining issue for your Presidency, and 2) how you can and must achieve great goals on education mobilizing all sectors of the country.

Jonathan and I have discussed this issue and approach numerous times. I recommend the core of these thoughts should be in your Chicago speech (with higher standards as the focus) and, more important, should be the heart of your State of the Union.

Clinton believes history will judge him by how well he scores on education. A primer on what's coming in the second term. BY JONATHAN ALTER

Bill's Final Exam

HISTORY HAS AN IRONIC sense of humor. It turns out that President Clinton's fondest hope for the millennium is to fulfill one of George Bush's casual promises from back in 1988. Campaigning against Michael Dukakis, Bush pledged to be "the Education President." He wasn't. Nor was Clinton in his first term. But now, barring an unexpected crisis, Clinton will bet his legacy on educating the American work force for the future.

Of course, this must be accomplished in what the Washington wonks are calling "the context of a balanced budget." And what exactly does that mean? The rap on Clinton is that by becoming essentially a

moderate Republican on fiscal issues, he'll be remembered mostly as a president who played a good game of defense against extremist ideas, with some nice on-court cheerleading to make everyone feel better. There was even a mantra for it in the campaign: "balancing the budget while protecting our values," the values being "M2, E2" (code for Medicare, Medicaid, education and the environment).

This defensive maneuver worked brilliantly last year, but it hampers Clinton as he begins his second term. Commitment to a balanced budget means little money for the big, bold initiatives that could catapult him to greatness—or at least greatness in the eyes of the liberals who write most American history. At the same time, by promising so feverishly to protect the elderly, the president will have a hard time making the long-term cuts in entitlement programs necessary to make balancing the budget anything more than a temporary achievement.

Clinton's new Medicare proposal, for instance, amounts to little more than an accounting gimmick that buys him nothing in the long run. Unless he pulls a Nixon-to-China on entitlement reform, he will win few points for fiscal responsibility. The epitaph HE CUT THE DEFICIT IN THE MIDDLE OF HIS TENURE, ONLY TO HAVE IT BALLOON LATER will not be carved on a monument any time soon.

This is what the British call a sticky wicket, and it has yielded a domestic agenda widely derided as too modest, even for a centrist. The usual Washington wise guys anticipate a kind of energetic do-nothingism from Clinton. His short-term goals are viewed as either futile, like campaign-finance reform and trying to roll back the food-stamp and welfare cuts for legal immigrants, or as cakewalks, like uncontroversial regional trade pacts and more money for community policing.

But don't write off Clinton's priorities as puny without a close look at education, a



ILLUSTRATION BY JOHN KASCHT

major concern of his since his earliest days in politics. The president's best hope for leaving a lasting imprint is that seemingly prosaic ideas like tax credits for college and national student-performance standards just might transform the country the way the GI Bill did in the 1950s. In 1996 the president began envisioning a nation where the first two years of college are as common as high school. Eventually, Clinton may be able to invoke "education" the way earlier presidents invoked "national defense"—as Mom-and-apple-pie crust for expensive goodies that would never be swallowed otherwise.

And that's not just political packaging. In today's knowledge economy, the idea of education is broadening beyond the classroom to welfare (job training) and health care (educating people to shift to preventive, less costly medicine). Clinton won election and re-election partly by convincing voters that education was their ticket to survival in the confusing future, and that he would help them write it. That is actually a mammoth promise.

But the odds are against him, and not just because he could be capsize by scandal or recession or a balky Republican Congress. Though the new line-item veto will help (recalcitrant Republicans will face a choice between losing their pet projects and siding with the president), the two domestic issues most likely to affect Clinton's historical reputation—education and welfare—are now largely state and local duties.

Which means the president will have to fashion a whole new way of governing, in which Washington doesn't run many programs or pass many laws but instead coordinates and leverages broader social change. Evoking Theodore Roosevelt, Clinton calls this the bully-pulpit approach. But given the reduced moral authority of the presidency and the increased complexity of public life, the pulpit's sound system is not strong enough. Exhorting Americans or highlighting successes is important but insufficient.

To move farther, Clinton needs what his communications director, Donald Baer, calls a domestic "Marshal Plan"—that's "marshal" with one "l." The original Marshall Plan, announced in 1947 by Secretary of State George Marshall, was a huge investment in postwar Europe. No one is expecting that now domestically. Instead, this organizational effort, whatever it is called, would move beyond eloquent words toward concrete-action plans for marshaling existing resources of govern-

ment, the private sector and nonprofits.

Despite endless conferences and a lot of talk about rebuilding "civil society," this is not fully happening yet. "Replication" of successful programs is all too rare. For instance, Oregon has an innovative health-care plan that has cut the rate of uninsured Oregonians to 11 percent—much lower than the national average. But the plan has not been emulated. Government engages in "a systemic suppression of good ideas," says Harvard professor Alan Altschuler, who is trying to address the replication problem by helping judge the Ford Foundation's Innovations in American Government awards.

Even if Clinton does educate and marshal, he will still swim upstream in the old-fashioned, everyday world of Washington policymaking. Here's some of the rest of this year's agenda.

The Plan From Hope: The president's "Hope Scholarships" are named not after his hometown but after a similar program

The Little Engine That Could: Clinton keeps the children's book of that title in the Oval Office, and it will take a similar Herculean effort to get enough reading tutors into the schools. America's Reading Corps is lightly funded—only \$200 million over five years to train 30,000 reading specialists, who in turn are supposed to train a million volunteers. The aim is to make sure every child reads by third grade, a noble goal that, if achieved, would yield huge personal and economic benefits for the country. But until Clinton and Congress add another zero to the funding, it's little more than a charade.

KiddleCare: One of Clinton's biggest campaign promises was to provide health coverage for the 10 million children who are uninsured. But when states and private employers now generously insuring some lower-middle-class families figure out that Washington will do it, they'll dump those kids into the federal pool, sending costs into the stratosphere. No one has figured out how to solve that one yet.

Help Wanted: For welfare reform to work, it must become an education program. Former recipients must learn how to hold down jobs. The president's favorite idea, based on a Kansas City plan, is to allow states to transfer a welfare recipient's check to an employer as a wage supplement. The government picks up at least half of the new worker's salary, plus benefits, and the employer picks up the other portion, often minuscule. By the time benefits expire, the company should have a fully trained employee.

In theory, anyway. Incentives to hire welfare recipients haven't worked in the past. Clinton may be forced to revisit the old idea of low-wage public-sector jobs, though he would have to persuade labor to drop its hidebound opposition. The president is seriously interested in making welfare reform a reality, but not yet seriously enough committed to what's necessary to accomplish it.

Having been burned so badly on health-care reform in 1993-94, Clinton has become a quintessential consensus politician, determined to move slowly with confidence-building measures that restore faith in government before trying big fixes. The confusion comes from interpreting this as a retreat from the lofty goals of the Inaugural Address. Under fire, the president is still trying to advance. But he must move from merely exhorting his troops to marshaling them for conquest.

With PAT WINGERT, RICH THOMAS and KAREN BRESLAU in Washington and bureau reports

The Beltway wise guys are expecting an energetic do-nothing-ism from Clinton. But don't write him off yet: his education ideas could still transform the country the way the GI Bill did.

in Georgia. They would provide a \$1,500 tax credit (direct money) and a \$10,000 tax deduction for college costs. The plan, which is aimed at middle-class families more than poor ones, would make the first year of college essentially free. Students earning at least a B average would be eligible for a second year of the credit. This is a big-budget item—\$42 billion over six years—and it could generate both grade inflation and tuition inflation. But it's the biggest plank on Clinton's bridge.

Bricks and Mortar: Computers in the schools? Try classrooms that don't leak. A new report says that more than a third of American children attend schools that need to be rebuilt or undergo major repairs. The backlog now totals a staggering \$112 billion. Clinton is proposing \$5 billion over five years, with a bonding formula to leverage an additional \$20 billion locally. It's a start—and a way to get federal money into the schools without threatening local control over curriculum.

DATE: 1/29

TO:  Bob Nash

FROM: Staff Secretary

Do you want him to
go to the President? Let me
know. Thanks

Phil Caplan



97 JAN 24 PM4:49

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
THE SECRETARY

January 23, 1997

The President
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

I am writing to recommend William Clyburn, Jr., for your consideration for appointment to the Surface Transportation Board.

Mr. Clyburn is experienced in the issues this Board handles. He served as Staff Counsel of the Senate Surface Transportation Subcommittee of the Commerce Committee when the Democrats were in the majority in the Senate, and he now handles transportation and education issues for Senator Robb as his Commerce Counsel and Legislative Assistant. Mr. Clyburn has an engineering degree from Georgia Tech and is an attorney, having graduated from the University of South Carolina School of Law.

I have worked extensively with Mr. Clyburn's family during my time in public service in South Carolina. I appointed Mr. Clyburn's father, Bill, to the South Carolina Workers' Compensation Commission. Both Bill and his wife Beverly have been public school teachers; Bill was a teacher, coach, and principal, and Beverly is a guidance counselor. Bill now is a member of the South Carolina House of Representatives. William's cousin, Jim Clyburn, served as director of the South Carolina Human Affairs Commission before, during, and after my time as Governor. Jim was a leader in improving race relations in the State, and now serves as South Carolina's first African-American member of Congress since Reconstruction. The Clyburn family remain close friends of mine.

William Clyburn has the qualifications to be a valuable member of the Surface Transportation Board. He also has the qualities to be an excellent public official.

Yours sincerely,


Richard W. Riley

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20500

DATE: 1-24-97

TO: Jack (Queen)

FROM: Staff Secretary

This is a very good
plan. My understanding
from Cheryl is that we can
do this kind of thing, since
the book is pretty about the
Administration. I'd recommend
that we do OK? Ted
cc: Cheryl Mills

HARVARD UNIVERSITY
CENTER FOR SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

*John F. Kennedy School of Government
79 John F. Kennedy Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
Fax (617) 495-8903*

Mr. Jack Quinn
White House Counsellor
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington DC 20500

January 21, 1997.

Dear Mr. Quinn,

Dr. Abdullah Toukan, Science Advisor to King Hussein of Jordan, and I -- an Israeli, currently at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government -- have cooperated in writing a short book: Bridging the Gap: A New Security Architecture for the Middle East. The book focuses on ways of enhancing and stabilizing Arab-Israeli peace -- a task in which the United States under the guidance of President Clinton has invested considerable time and energy. Many of the issues discussed in the book have been the focus of the Middle East multilateral Arms Control and Regional Security (ACRS) talks, co-sponsored by the United States and Russia. This is the first time that an Arab official and an Israeli scholar have cooperated in charting a common vision for regional security in the Middle East. The book, written under the auspices of the Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict, is due to be published by Rowman, Littlefield by the end of March. Given the unique nature of this book, we are hopeful that it would attract much attention.

In designing a front cover for the book, we would like to make use of a photograph that captures the regional -- or multilateral -- character of the Middle East peace process as well as the central role that President Clinton has played in this process over the past four years. We therefore seek your permission to use for this purpose a White House photograph that shows President Clinton, King Hussein, Prime Minister Rabin, President Mubarak and Chairman Arafat in one of the recent White House ceremonies.

We would be very grateful if you could grant us such permission at your earliest convenience.

With many thanks and very best wishes,

Shai Feldman

Shai Feldman
Senior Research Associate

RECEIVED AS SEEN
1-24-97

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

January 23, 1997

97 JAN 23 PM 7:32

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM : MIKE McCURRY *MMC*
SUBJECT : SUPER BOWL PHONE CALL

It is my recommendation that you do not call the Super Bowl Champions on Sunday night due to the usual post-game chaos in the locker room. Instead, I feel you should call the coach privately Monday morning and extend to him and the team your congratulations and an invitation to the White House.

OK (There are several reasons for this.)

1-24-97

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

97 JAN 23 PM 1:04

January 23, 1997

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT

FROM: STEPHANIE STREETT & ANNE HAWLEY AH

SUBJECT: SCHEDULING DECISION

CC: JOHN PODESTA

ACCEPT:

Date of Event:

Description of Event:

1/24/97

Meeting With Ambassador Pamela Harriman

1/24/97

Meeting With Ambassador Clay Constantinou

1/24/97 - 2/5/97

Meeting With Doug Coe and Tony Hall to Discuss the National Prayer Breakfast

1/28/97

Meeting to Discuss the Next Steps of the Middle East Peace Process

2/7/97

Meeting With Russian Prime Minister Chernomyrdin and the Vice President

2/11/97

White House Screening and Reception For the New Ken Burns Movie, "Thomas Jefferson"

2/21/97

White House Event For the Chicago Bulls

copies to
Streett
Hawley
Chon

PENDING:

Date of Event:

Description of Event:

1/24/97

Option

OPTION: Departure Party in Honor of Tony Lake, Blair House

2/1/97 - 2/28/97

Meeting With Representative Charlie Rangel

OK

Representative Rangel would like to discuss the role that the Ways & Means Committee will play in crafting Medicare protections, tax revisions, international trade and welfare to work legislation.

2/1/97 - 2/28/97

OK

Meeting With the Black Leadership Forum (BLF)

This meeting would provide you an opportunity to meet with the leaders of some of the most influential African American national organizations and maintain their continued support.

2/3/97

OK

OPTION: Drop by First Lady's Tea in Honor of Sheikh Hasina, Prime Minister of Bangladesh

2/11/97

*Let me see
Sullivan*

Mardi Gras Dinner Hosted by Leo O'Donovan at Georgetown University

2/28/97

*you can
go by Molly*

— Dinner Party Hosted by Molly Raiser

You will probably be in New York City for Chelsea's birthday weekend.

Feb. tbd

yes

Meeting With the Bipartisan Leadership to Discuss Foreign Policy

Feb. tbd

Pro

White House Event With Mrs. Clinton to Launch the Ad Council's PSA on Children's Programs

REGRET:

Date of Event:

Description of Event:

1/20/97 - 2/15/97

Press Conference to Announce Memorandum of Understanding Between Ford, Chrysler, GM and the Small Business Administration.

*also need to meet
up with group including
Cranfield CTR member
then need to meet by
GOP CTR chair - PK*

Super Bowl

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN
1-24-97
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

*with Brunker
to Super Bowl watch*

Be

Copies sent to

Brophy
Scheduling
Chron

IF PRESIDENT HAS SEEN

1-24-97

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

Sen. Darche, Kerry

want to come see me

on 98 State Meet

~~Passport~~

BC

copies sent to:

Scheduling

Brophy

chron

Rather
using a pin on the title
for

Lobbyists' Gifts to Politicians Reap Benefits, Study Shows

By LESLIE WAYNE

WASHINGTON, Jan. 22 — It may be a political truism here that money buys influence and votes on Capitol Hill. But a research group sought to prove the point today in a study of votes and campaign contributions in the last Congress. In analyzing 14 heavily lobbied issues, the group found that corporations that poured money into Congress typically got the votes they wanted.

"It might be an obvious fact that there's a connection between money and votes," said Nancy Watzman, a project director at the Center for Responsive Politics, the nonprofit research group that issued the study. "But until we began to analyze votes, we began to see how this relationship works out. This money is going for very practical business reasons, not because of lofty grand ideals. You need money to play and be heard."

For instance, the sugar industry poured money into the campaigns of 61 senators and 217 House members who voted to maintain a sugar-price subsidy that consumer groups say adds an extra 50 cents to a five-pound bag of sugar.

The study found that the 61 senators who voted with the industry received an average of \$13,473 in sugar industry political action committee donations from 1991 to 1996, while the 35 senators who voted against the industry received an average of \$1,461.

And, the study found that the 217 House members who voted with the sugar industry from 1991 to 1996 received an average contribu-

**Campaign contributions
prove a matter of business,
not lofty ideals.**

tion of \$5,994; the 208 who voted against the industry got an average of \$853 in contributions over the same period.

"The sugar lobby proved invincible, surviving numerous attempts to eliminate the Federal subsidy program," the report said. "Sugar clout was also strong enough to defeat proposals to charge the industry to clean up the Everglades."

The same held true for a group as diverse as peanut growers, Glaxo Wellcome pharmaceuticals, the Northrop Grumman Corporation and other military contractors, oil and gas companies, cattlemen, miners, doctors, the timber industry, the tobacco industry and assault weapons manufacturers.

The timber industry was able to persuade the 104th Congress to allow logging of dead and dying trees on public lands through the year, over the objections of environmental groups, and succeeded in getting several measures passed that made it more difficult for environmental groups to attack the industry.

The 54 Senators who supported the timber industry received an average of \$19,503 in contributions; the 42 who opposed them received

an average of \$2,675 from timber companies. In the House, the 211 members who supported the industry on a major vote received average contributions of \$2,415; the 209 members who voted against got an average of \$542.

The military industry also wrote big checks to members of Congress. For instance, the 213 members of Congress who voted to spend an additional \$493 million on Northrop Grumman's B-2 stealth bombers received an average of \$2,100 from the contractor; the 210 who voted against, got an average of \$100 each.

"What we are saying is that people should look at these numbers," Ms. Watzman said.

Glaxo Wellcome, a British pharmaceutical company, fought off efforts in the 104th Congress to close a loophole that allowed the company to sell its Zantac anti-ulcer medication in the United States for an additional 19 months before any competitor could make a generic version.

Glaxo gave the 53 Senators who voted with it an average of \$5,470 in contributions; those 45 voting against it received \$1,447.

By contrast, Ciba-Geigy, a United States pharmaceutical company that had been seeking to offer a generic version of Zantac, spent far less and lost. Moreover Ciba-Geigy spent more money on Congressmen who voted against it than on those who supported it: It gave \$902 to the 53 Senators who voted against Ciba-Geigy and in favor of Glaxo; it gave an average of \$578 to the 45 Senators who voted in Ciba-Geigy's favor.

The New York Times

THURSDAY, JANUARY 23, 1997

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN

LB-HC-1

U.S. Is Selling Missiles It Once Banned

By RAYMOND BONNER

BANGKOK, Thailand, Jan. 22 — Just a few years after they ended their nuclear arms race, the United States and Russia are locked in a fierce competition for arms sales to Southeast Asia, with both countries offering potential purchasers some of the world's most sophisticated missiles as incentives.

From Thailand to Malaysia, countries shopping for advanced fighter aircraft are demanding — and receiving — the chance to buy deadly accurate, air-to-air missiles that allow a jet pilot to shoot down an enemy plane he can not even see — indeed, one that might be as far as 30 miles away.

When Thailand first asked for the missiles, known as Amraams — an acronym for their formal name of advanced medium range air-to-air missile — Clinton Administration officials rejected the request. The officials feared that the sale could cause regional instability and trigger an arms race.

Bangkok immediately said that if the United States blocked the sale of the missiles, it would not buy American-made F-18 jets, a pending deal worth nearly \$600 million. The Thais made it clear they were considering

the Russian MIG-29, which can carry a similar missile.

Washington eventually capitulated, even though American and Thai officials say Bangkok did not really want to buy a plane from Russia.

The Amraam's journey from a weapon that Washington zealously protected to one that is now available to a range of countries illustrates what happens once arms restrictions are relaxed even a little, American officials and arms control advocates said in interviews.

"Once we've said 'yes' to one, it is hard to say 'no' to the next," said an official in Washington.

American officials said this week that the decision to provide the missile to the Thai Air Force opens the door for other countries in the Association of South East Asian nations to make similar requests, although each would still face a case-by-case review.

The sale of Amraams to Thailand is also a telling illustration of the workings of the global arms bazaar. These days, American officials say, it is business, not ideology, that is driving sales.

During the Cold War, the Pentagon advocated restrictive policies on arms sales, particularly of sophisticated weapons that might fall into enemy hands. Now, the military services push the arms trade as a way of helping defense contractors suffering from cutbacks.

The aim, American officials said, is to drum up sufficient business to keep the defense manufacturers profitable and ready to serve the American military.

The Amraam was one of the most effective weapons for the American-led alliance that routed Iraq in the Persian Gulf war.

Navy admirals, whose pilots fly the F-18, were among the earliest advocates of clinching the sale to the Thai Air Force by including Amraams in the deal.

Just a few years ago, the United States would permit the sale of Amraams only to NATO allies.

Then, in 1995, the United Arab Emirates went shopping for 80 combat jets, a deal worth between \$6 billion and \$8 billion, which the oil-rich country could afford, though there were questions about whether it had enough qualified pilots.

The Emirates demanded various types of sophisticated gear for their planes, and at the top of the list was the Amraam, American officials said.

After an intense debate, and over opposition from the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Clinton Administration agreed. With that, Lockheed's F-16 has now emerged as the likely winner of the contract, edging out the French Mirage.

After the sale to the United Arab Emirates, Thailand demanded the same missiles. "We caved to them as well," said a State Department official in Washington. "It shows how the threshold gets passed."

Now, Saudi Arabia and Egypt, which have been turned down in the past on requests for Amraams, are expected to come knocking again. And this time it will be hard to say no, American officials said this week.

Because of Amraam's "extremely good" potential to hit aircraft out of visual range, any air force that has it enjoys a clear advantage over the enemy, according to Jane's Defense Weekly, a publication that assesses military weapons systems.

In seeking to buy Amraams, the Thais are not preparing for an imminent war, Western military analysts said. Rather, they are modernizing their air force in line with Bangkok's status as a growing economic and political power.

"Even in the absence of a specific threat, the Thais are correct in their strategic thinking," a senior Western military officer said about Bangkok's purchase of Amraams.

The F-18, the French-built Mirage and Russia's MIG-29 all would have fulfilled Thailand's needs, he and other military analysts said.

The MIG-29 is an extremely good combat plane, and is less expensive than either the French or American jets. But its "Achilles heel," as one Western military officer put, is that maintenance and service are not at the same level. And many countries, including Thailand, are still reluctant to buy from Russia.

The Malaysians bought MIG's three years ago, in large part because the Russians agreed to offset part of the price with the purchase of Malaysian palm oil.

Similarly, in Thailand, McDonnell Douglas, manufacturer of the F-18, agreed to buy some Thai products — from rubber to frozen chickens — in order to sweeten the deal.

"It was a high stakes game," said a senior Western military official in the region. "Had we called their bluff, it's anyone's guess what might have happened."

With so much money at stake, Washington was not willing to take the risk. A senior American diplomat added, "We couldn't tolerate a treaty ally buying a Russian jet."

The Thais won't get the missile technology right away, not until someone else in the neighborhood gets comparable technology. But that is a question of when, not if, American officials said. Malaysia already has MIG-29's, and it has promises from Russia for eventual sale of the sophisticated missiles.

The New York Times

THURSDAY, JANUARY 23, 1997

Sawyer

Article - Amraam to Thai

Be

The Washington Post

THURSDAY, JANUARY 23, 1997

FINAL

GOP Queries White House On Tuition Tax Break Plan

By Clay Chandler
Washington Post Staff Writer

Days after President Clinton's inaugural appeal for bipartisanship, congressional Republicans have questioned the package of tax breaks for students that is high on Clinton's agenda for his second term.

In a letter sent yesterday to Treasury Secretary Robert E. Rubin, House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Bill Archer (R-Tex.) expressed support for using the tax code to make post-secondary education more affordable. But he asked whether the specific provisions urged by Clinton would:

- Entice colleges to push tuition costs higher.
- Grant new power to the Internal Revenue Service by requiring it to monitor student report cards.
- Pressure teachers to go easy in grading students.
- Prove difficult to administer because school years are unlikely to correspond with the tax year.

"The principle of using the tax code to help provide for affordable educational opportunities represents common ground," Archer wrote, "but I await your reply in order to evaluate the merits of this particular tax proposal." Archer's committee has jurisdiction over all tax measures.

Republicans last year scrambled to keep Clinton from claiming the cost-of-education issue for himself. In the final days of the last Congress, GOP legislators allocated more money even than Clinton had requested for education programs.

But they stopped short of endorsing the specifics of Clinton's education program, which calls for nearly \$40 billion in tuition tax breaks over the next five years to expand educational opportunities for students after high school.

Clinton will outline his education proposals in greater detail Feb. 6 when he submits his fiscal 1998 budget to Congress. He is expected to stick with the measures he advocated in last year's budget and during the campaign.

Under that plan, freshmen and sophomores could choose between a \$1,500 refundable tax credit and a federal income tax deduction of as much as \$10,000 a year. Students would be required to earn at least a B average to be eligible for the credit in their second year—the final year that the tax credit could be used. For the tax deduction, there would be no minimum grade requirement and no limit

on the number of years that it could be used. To qualify for either break, taxpayers would have to earn below \$100,000 for joint filers and below \$70,000 for single filers.

The Republican game plan, many analysts contend, is to feign opposition to Clinton's plans, then offer to accept them in exchange for concessions on a cherished Republican objective: the reduction of tax rates on capital gains.

"The thing Clinton wants most is his tuition tax cuts, and the thing Republicans want most is a capital gains tax cut," reasons John F. Jennings, director of the Center on National Education Policy. "It looks to me like we're headed for a deal where both sides get what they're after."

At the same time, fiscal analysts as well as education policy experts say there is good reason for skepticism about Clinton's education programs. Many echo Archer's concerns that the Clinton plan could trigger tuition inflation and make it hard for teachers to grade objectively. But they also raise an objection Archer didn't cite: Tax breaks are a clumsy tool for reducing the financial obstacles to college study and will mostly end up as a "windfall" gain for families who could afford to send their kids to college anyway.

"I see this as a grossly unfair tilting of federal resources away from students who have the greatest need in favor of higher-income families," said Lawrence E. Gladieux, executive director for policy analysis in the Washington office of the College Board.

Deputy Treasury Secretary Lawrence H. Summers argued that the Clinton proposals were modeled on a successful program adopted in Georgia where there has been no evidence of significant tuition or grade inflation. "This is the best way we could think of to ensure that Americans' opportunities for higher education are not limited by their capacity to pay for it," Summers said.

Earlier this week, Senate Republicans also endorsed the idea of using the tax code to provide relief to students and their families. Among other proposals, Senate Republicans urged restoring the interest deduction for student loans, new tax breaks for savings accounts designated for education and new tax breaks for students taking advantage of state-sponsored prepaid college tuition plans.

*Guinea/Bleed
we need a sincere
response to these
questions & we need
you to respond
PR*

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN

1-24-97

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

97 JAN 23 PM 5:27

January 23, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

From: Ann Lewis
Ann Walker

Subject: Tribute to President Reagan

The Ronald Reagan Presidential Foundation has requested a short essay to be used in the new book, *The Shining City*. A section of the book will contain personal tributes to President Reagan from world leaders and policy makers. They have asked you to submit a short essay (less than a page).

According to Eric Felton (staffer for Reagan), *The Shining City* will include some of Ronald Reagan's most memorable reflections on America, his love for its people, and his views on the world and those people who have helped to shape it. The purpose of the book is to honor him and his life by re-living some of his greatest speeches and famous quotes. The hope is to "inspire in others to the same traits that make President Reagan great."

See changes
+ send

President William J. Clinton
Prepared Text
Tribute to Ronald Reagan
January 23, 1997

It was shortly after I took office that I sat down with President Reagan. We talked for a long time, about many things that were important to us--families, our nation's future and the world. ~~I have been how much I have enjoyed working with him. I have been~~ ^{over generous, especially on the welfare reform that he pushed} ~~boundless optimism about~~ ^{our own}

I came away that day with a deeper appreciation of Ronald Reagan's ~~unfaltering and~~ ^{bottomless hope for} our people, beyond any issues or daily debates. As President, Ronald Reagan assured the American people that nothing is impossible, and he wanted our nation to always "reach for the stars." He wanted the best for America.

President Reagan combined hope, humor, ~~and~~ ^{and} a deep love of this land and its people. ~~This optimism was born of humble beginnings, so his sense of hope was richer, with so much more to dream about and to make real. When Ronald Reagan looked at the horizon, he never saw limits.~~ ^{and a dedication to the}

On leaving the Presidency, he spoke of looking out the windows of the White House, down the hall and up the stairs from the Oval Office, from the Family Quarters on the top floor. I often look out from those same windows, over the memorials to Washington, Jefferson and Lincoln, past the Potomac River and beyond the nation's capital. You can see a broad sweep of Americans, from families who have traveled to see the monuments, to those on their way to work. These windows are perfect for considering America's past and the people who built it, for thinking about the workers and their families who are trying to make their way in the present, and for imagining America's future. ~~As Ronald Reagan reminds us, the future is without limits.~~

Today, as yesterday, no amount of adversity will diminish Ronald Reagan's dream for our nation. We all wish him the best, because he has the same wish for all Americans. That generous sense of hope and optimism is his continuing gift to America.