

President William Jefferson Clinton
Remarks as Delivered
University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, April 3, 2003
(This same speech was delivered at Carver Hawkeye Arena, Iowa City, February 26, 2003
<http://www.clintonpresidentialcenter.com/>

....

I know that the conflict in Iraq is foremost in the news and I think in the minds and hearts of a lot of people I met already. One lady said her daughter was in Kuwait, having been called up from the reserves to active duty. So let me just say that tonight there'll be ample time to debate how we got there and what we should do when it's over, but as someone who has had the responsibility of ordering young men and women in uniform into combat (in Bosnia, Kosovo, the Middle East, Haiti, East Timor and Africa), I think we ought to want those young people, their commanders, and President Bush to know that we're pulling for them and praying for them. We hope that it will be over as soon as possible. We hope it will lead to the disarmament of Iraq, the beginning of the new future for the Middle East, including peace between the Israelis and the Palestinians, and that this will occur with as little loss of life on both sides as possible.

Tonight, what I would like to try to do is to put all the big events that are churning in the present, Iraq, North Korea, the current economic troubles of America, into the larger context of the 21st century world. To try to explain as fairly as I can while admitting by own biases, what the choices before you are, about how to make the most of the world in which you will live most of your lives. The university is a good place to do that, especially this great university. Here ideas matter and open, honest discussion is encouraged and not attacked. It is seen as essential to patriotism and the survival of our great democracy.

And let me say, when I finish tonight, or this afternoon. I've been working on my book and I get my days and nights mixed up sometimes. I will determine in my own mind the success of the talk I give not based on whether you agree with me when I'm done, but whether after it's over, you have more discussions about the ideas and the arguments that I will try to raise today.

If you ask most people to describe the world in which we live, they would say, "This is the age of globalization." I prefer the term "interdependence," because for most people, globalization has an almost exclusively economic context. But interdependence means something more. It means whether by trade or travel, by immigration or information technology, by shared cultural experiences or shared scientific endeavor or shared vulnerability to terrorism, we simply cannot escape each other. Like it or not, our fates are bound up with one another. Presumably the students here understand that, which is why you raised \$1 million for community and volunteer projects last year and gave 195,000 hours to community service. 4,200 students in Florida have served in the AmeriCorps program that was started when I was President. People don't do that unless they understand that somehow their fate is bound up with their neighbors, no matter how different their neighbors might look or seem at first blush.

Interdependence means we cannot escape each other, for good or ill. Trade and travel, immigration and information technology have brought enormous benefits to places like the University of Florida, where the knowledge economy has caused Gainesville to thrive and given thousands and thousands of young people in each successive year the opportunity to know people. Look around this room. This student body looks a lot different than it would have 30 years ago, with different races, different religions, different languages, different countries with different first languages. The interdependent world has been a great blessing.

But on September the 11th, 2001, the al-Qaeda terrorists used the forces of interdependence. They used open borders, easy travel, easy access to information and technology to kill 3,100 people from 70 countries, including over 200 other Muslims in New York and Washington and Pennsylvania. So the main message that I want to advance today is that you can't be satisfied with interdependence. You will do just fine. In the world we have, you're doing fine. You're here at the University of Florida. You'll have an interesting life. But if the world stays in its present state of interdependence, equilibrium cannot be maintained. Your life will be, at the very best, more confined and insecure than it would otherwise have been. The trouble it takes to get on an airplane now as compared before September the 11th is just the beginning of that. And at the

very worst, if we stay in the present condition of interdependence, your life will be miserable and more exposed to deadly forces.

My daughter's just a little older than a lot of you and I stay in touch with a lot of her friends, and a lot of them work in New York. They ask me amazing questions for young people that age. "Should I keep working here or should I go someplace else to work? I'm not really scared but I want to live long enough to have children." People really worry. This is the consequence of a world that is interdependent but not yet an integrated community. And I would argue to you that the central challenge of your generation, the challenge that will dominate the next few decades of this new millennium is to move this world of ours from interdependence to an integrated community with shared benefits, shared values and shared responsibilities.

What I'd like to do is to talk about how we should do that and what the honest differences are today in America about the best approach. If we were here in a seminar and I could call you back next week and the week after that, and the week after that, I would give you a reading assignment, to examine how we might achieve global cooperation. I would ask you to start with three books. The first book, which I think most closely mirrors the view of the dominant foreign policy forces in the Bush administration, is a remarkable little book you can read in an hour and a half by the distinguished Journalist, Robert Kaplan, who once wrote about Bosnia that had a big impact on me. The book is called *Warrior Politics*. Kaplan's basic argument is that people never cooperate until they're forced to. We'd rather do anything then get along with people who are different from us. And until somebody beats us upside the head, we don't do it. So for example, he supported my use of American armed forces in Bosnia and Kosovo. He just thinks I should have done it sooner and done more of it. And he was doubtless (although this book came out before the Iraq conflict) supportive of that, because he thinks America is not an imperialist power. We have the only significant military capacity in the world and we should just do this. That's what he thinks we should do, because we'll never cooperate in this world unless people are forced to.

A milder view is contained in a book called *NONZERO*, by Robert Wright. Some of you may have read his book *The Moral Animal* in your classes. Essentially Wright argues that people may not like cooperating, but the more interdependent they are, the more they realize they have no choice and so they cooperate. They just always do.

And since the first people came out of caves and clans and came into contact with different people, they figured out that if they didn't cooperate, they'd destroy each other, so they just kept on widening the circles of cooperation all the way down to the 20th Century (the creation of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and things like that).

And then there's a middle view articulated by an English writer named Matt Ridley, who wrote a book called *The Origins of Virtue*. Virtue is defined in this book as social cooperation. He says that people never want to cooperate initially and they go right up to the edge of destruction and then they cooperate, when they realize that if they don't, they're going to destroy themselves. And so far, humanity has always (in the nick of time) backed away from destruction in favor of cooperation.

In the 20th century, millions of people were killed in World War I; millions of people were killed in World War II; millions of people were killed in the totalitarian purges. We had the atomic bomb drop. But after World War II, we had the U.N. We had the Marshall Plan to rebuild Europe. We had the plan to rebuild Japan and we haven't had World War III. We won the Cold War and we survive. So Ridley says we're not quite as good as Mr. Wright thinks we are in *NONZERO*, but we're not quite as bullheaded as Mr. Kaplan thinks we are in his book, *Warrior Politics*.

Now that whole view has a lot to do with how you view what we're doing in Iraq, whether I did the right thing in Bosnia and Kosovo, what kind of country you think we ought to have here at home. How much should we bend over backwards to get along with people who are different than we are? But I will say again, the great challenge of your lifetime will be to figure out how to take this interdependent world and move it to an integrated community.

I think we should do five things. First, we have to have a security strategy, because you can't have a world with shared benefits, shared responsibilities and shared values if people don't share your values, won't assume any responsibilities and reject the benefits of the system that most people believe in. The security strategy cannot make you 100% safe, anymore than there's any city in America where there's never been a crime. So the focus should be on keeping the big, bad things from happening. We thought a lot about that in the years that I served and I think they think a lot about that now. You don't want September the 11th. Hopefully, you don't want Timothy McVeigh in Oklahoma City. You want to keep big, bad things from happening.

In order to do that, it seems to me, we have to do three things. First, there has to be a coordinated effort to fight terror and terrorist networks and therefore, I strongly support the fact that we still have forces in Afghanistan and intend to stay until Mr. bin Laden and his deputy, Dr. al-Zawahri (who's the head of the Egyptian unit that killed Anwar Sadat in 1991) are captured or killed. I don't think there is any alternative. If the President said tomorrow, "I want to double or triple or quadruple the forces we have in Afghanistan and along the Pakistani border," I would strongly support that because it's not just a law enforcement issue. We took down 20 al-Qaeda cells when I was President, but they kept on coming. They kept on coming and they will keep on coming. They've taken down a lot of al-Qaeda cells since September the 11th. The CIA was instrumental in destroying the people who blew up the U.S.S. Cole (very near the end of my term) in Yemen, but we have to keep doing that and there has to be a continued effort against other major terrorist networks.

The second thing we have to do is to try to deprive the terrorists of the ability to have what the military people call "forced multipliers." That's what happened on September the 11th. You get a big jet airplane full of jet fuel that's supposed to fly all the way to California. It's a big force multiplier. Therefore, there must be a concerted effort to restrict the production, the distribution and the use of chemical and biological weapons and nuclear material. If you have enough fissile material about the size of a little cookie like this, you could put it into a bomb like Timothy McVeigh had in Oklahoma City. And you could take out half of Gainesville, just with that. So this business of trying to identify all the sources of chemical and biological weapons and nuclear materials and then confining them or destroying them is very important.

When I was President, we spent a lot of your tax money on something called the Nunn-Lugar Program, which got all the nuclear weapons in the former Soviet Union out of the other states and back into Russia. We then destroyed the missiles, destroyed the weapons, neutralized as much of the nuclear material as possible and did more to protect the rest. There were some years when Russia was in devastating economic circumstances, when your tax dollars paid for the salaries of 20,000 of the 40,000 Russian nuclear and chemical and biological scientists and technicians. And it was a good expenditure of your money, because they were doing good things instead of going to work for rogue nations or terrorist groups, and they had a right to feed their families too.

I think we should do more of this. Last year, there was an effort in Congress that unfortunately failed to dramatically increase Nunn-Lugar funding and emphasize biological and chemical materials more and offer these services to India and Pakistan and other countries that we know are the repositories of chemical, biological and nuclear weapons.

The third thing we have to do is to really work seriously on homeland defense. It's kind of become a catchall now, but the truth is we need adequate police and fire forces and other first responders. We need to know what happens if there's a chemical or biological attack. You could drastically minimize the loss of life. Those things are frightening but the truth is they're scarier in theory than they are often are in fact, because it's easy to talk about and harder to do. The anthrax scare in America, which unfortunately killed five people, actually involved enough anthrax that, in theory, could have killed 100,000 people. But knowing how to handle it and how to respond is important.

And the fourth thing we have to do is something that the administration has worked on that I support and that is trying to help our allies do more to fight terror on their own. In my last year, I worked with the Republican Speaker of the House, Dennis Hastert, to pass something called "Plan Colombia," which

provided a billion dollars to Colombia and its nearest allies and neighbors to try to fight the narco-traffickers and the terrorists that were helping them.

Colombia is the oldest democracy in Latin America. I wear this bracelet on my arm, and I have since June, because it was given to me by native Indians there, who live in an area dominated by the narco-traffickers and the terrorists. 35% of their land is now in the control of those people. Can you imagine your reaction if even one American State lost control of 35% of its territory to terrorists and drug runners? So we have a big stake in that.

The Bush administration has done a lot to try to help the Philippines combat terror there. We should do that. The more other countries have the capacity to deal with it, the less Americans in uniform will be called upon to deal with it later. So we need a security strategy against terror, against weapons of mass destruction, for stronger homeland defense and to help other people defend themselves. But I would argue to you that a security strategy will never be enough to build an integrated global community for a simple reason. There's no way in the world we'll ever be able to kill, jail or occupy every actual or potential adversary. And if you were in an interdependent environment and you can't kill, jail, or occupy all your enemies, sooner or later, you've got to make a deal and bring them into it.

Look at the Middle East. It's a classic example. For seven years of my presidency, we were making progress toward peace in the Middle East. Why? Because both sides said, "We're going to share the future. We'll have shared responsibilities for security. We'll have shared benefits. We'll work together economically and the Palestinians will have a homeland and we'll have shared values. We'll respect each other's religious traditions." Then when they stopped, two years later, we had 1,800 dead Palestinians and 600 dead Israelis, but they were no less interdependent then they were when they were working together, not a whip. So they are the classic example of an interdependent environment where neither side can kill, jail or occupy successfully all of its adversaries. That applies to the world.

So we have to make a world with more partners and fewer enemies, fewer terrorists. We know how to do it and it doesn't cost much money. Let me just say the world I grew up in that saw the growth of the great American middle class, and gave us the economic and social strength as well as the military power to win the Cold War. It also removed the specter of nuclear war and total annihilation from your generation was made possible. Because at the end of World War II, Harry Truman and George Marshall and Douglas MacArthur (who had fought in World War I and World War II), said, "Why don't we take a little bit of our money to build a world with more friends and fewer enemies?" That's what the Marshall Plan did and it included our enemies (Germany and Japan). That's what our efforts in Japan did, to make it a great democracy, and we have to do that.

Most Americans think we give 10-15% of the Federal budget in foreign aid. We give less than 1%. Of the 22 richest countries in the world, we're the cheapest. We give the smallest percentage of our aid, of our income in foreign aid. I had to fight every year I was in to keep the budget that we had. But let me just give you some examples with what we can do with aid, trade, investment, and debt relief to build a world with more friends and fewer enemies.

In 2000, we had an overwhelming bipartisan Congress supporting two things. First was global debt relief for the poorest countries if they would put their money into economic development, healthcare or education and if they would observe human rights and democratic norms. Uganda doubled the size of primary school enrollment. Honduras went from 6 to 9 years of mandatory schooling in a year. And those people aren't mad at you. They don't want to come up here and put off a bomb, because we tried to help them have a better future.

We passed a bill with overwhelming bipartisan support to open American markets, to products from Africa and our neighbors in the Caribbean. I was in Ghana a few months ago with the great Peruvian economist Hernando DeSoto to try to help them jumpstart their economic program. And I was walking to the airplane and this woman runs out on the tarmac saying, "President Clinton, don't go. Don't go" and she's waving something. So she comes up to me and she said, "I'm one of 400 women that works in a shirt factory in downtown Accra. We all have jobs because of your Africa Trade Bill, so here's your shirt." I thought,

"What the heck. I'm not President anymore. I'll take the shirt. I could do it." But let me tell you. I put that shirt in a place in my house where I have to look at it every single day. Why? Because that woman is not mad at you. She knows you're richer than she is, but she thinks you want her kids to have a better future. She doesn't want her children to grow up and fight in African tribal wars. She wants them to go to school and have jobs and it hardly costs you anything to do that. It doesn't cost you anything to do that.

I'll give you another example. The Secretary General of the U.N. has asked for \$10 billion a year in a Global Fund to fight AIDS, TB, Malaria and infections related to diarrhea. They kill: 1 in 4 people every year die from AIDS, TB, Malaria and infections related to diarrhea. 10 million children die from preventable childhood diseases.

Along toward the end of my term, we set up this Global Fund for AIDS and then Kofi Annan asked for that. Should we fund our part of that? All I can tell you is that Botswana, the richest country in Sub-Saharan Africa, now has 30% of its people who are HIV positive. There are 25 million AIDS cases in South Africa, the most important democracy in Africa, the beacon of hope for people who believe that a biracial future is possible for Africa. Of course we ought to.

President Bush said that he wants to go from spending \$1 billion to \$3 billion a year in AIDS over the next 5 years, and that's a good thing. And my only difference is (and I'll come back to this later), I think we ought to put most of it in that fund and not give it out ourselves so it doesn't look like we're trying to buy friends. But I think he should get credit for saying we ought to spend \$3 billion a year there. That's a good thing to do.

Now, here's what I want to tell you. We could double our foreign assistance to build a world with more friends and fewer enemies. We could double it for one-sixth of the increase in defense and domestic defense spending last year. We could double it from one-sixth of the increase. So should we do it? I think we should and I think it would pay us back many times over.

Now, the third thing that we ought to do, in my opinion, is to strengthen the institutions of international cooperation. When I was President, we created the Free Trade Area of the Americas, a program through the Summit of the Americas. We started the Asian Pacific Leaders Meeting. We had the World Trade Organization. We brought China in. We expanded NATO and made a special deal with Russia. And I signed the International Criminal Court, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, the Kyoto Accord on Climate Change, and was working with the Russians to amend the ADM Treaty, but not scrap it, because I think we need more cooperation. Why? Because we can't kill, jail or occupy all our adversaries so we have to find a way to share the future with them and we've got to share the responsibilities and the benefits. And if you join these organizations, if you're American, you can still win most of the time but not all the time.

Now the people in the current administration who got out of a lot of these things are absolutely right when they say they can make decisions we don't agree with. Once in a while, the World Trade Organization handed down a decision that I thought was absolutely nuts, and I ate it and followed it, because I thought we were better off in it than out of it. Look, if you never joined anything unless you got your way 100% of the time, there would be no marriages in America. Nobody would ever get married. Nobody would ever join a football team or a basketball team. Nobody would ever enter into a business partnership. You couldn't run a university. Faculty meetings would turn into blood-fests. Nothing would ever happen if you only were part of the deal that you got your way all the time. We should agree that we should only join those things where we think we're better off than not. But if you believe that we have to move to an integrated global community, then any time some group is working on something that has a worthy end in a cooperative way and you have minimized the bad things that can happen to you, then I think we ought to be in.

The fourth thing I think we have to do is to keep making America better at home. I think that one of the things that it's easy for us to forget about when we have such overwhelming power (economic power, political power, military power) is that in the whole history of this country, we've probably won more friends through the power of our example than from our military, economic or political power. I think it's important to remember that.

When I was in office, I went to 72 countries. I'd go to little countries and find people with a dog-eared copy of the Constitution of the United States, or the Declaration of Independence, or some speech Abraham Lincoln or Franklin Roosevelt or President Kennedy had given, something that had inspired them, that had made them believe. It didn't have anything?? Often it was a place where we had not done anything for them. We hadn't given them any money, but they believed in the ideals and the promise of America and they had kin folks in our country making a living or going to school, sending their money back home to help the families that were behind. And therefore I think that is a great mistake to say that we should put domestic debates about whether we should have tax cuts or investments in education, whether we should weaken or strengthen our environmental laws. With all these domestic issues, I think it's a terrible mistake for us to put them on hold. That's giving the people who are our enemies a victory because it's the power of our example to constantly improve and constantly do better and to keep getting better. That is the source of America's great moral strength in the world and it will be so in the future.

Now, the final point I want to make is that, if you believe that we need a security strategy, a strategy for more friends and fewer enemies, a strategy for greater cooperation and a strategy to keep America getting better at home as we grow more diverse, we have to develop the mind and heart necessary to build this kind of world and that may be the hardest thing of all.

What do I mean by that? Well, think about your own life. We all define ourselves by categories, which not only say what we are, but they say what we're not. "I'm a man, not a woman." "I'm a Baptist, not a Jew." "I'm black, not white." "I'm a conservative, not a liberal." Right? It's all not?ing. Whatever you are, there's something you're not, and that's necessary. All these little boxes of reality in which we put ourselves are necessary so that we have identity and self worth. But throughout history, one of mankind's biggest problems has been that we often find it impossible to think well of ourselves unless we have somebody else to look down on.

Now, you can all clap, but let me say this. There's not a living soul over this room, who's over 12 years old, who hasn't at least in one time in your life committed the following offense. You have said to yourself, "Well, I may not be perfect, but thank God, I'm not him, or her." Isn't that right? "I'm sort of down on myself today, but thank God, I never did that!" This is a deep-seeded psychological problem, because we all need self-definition. We need some way of knowing that we are important. And a part of going to the university and growing up and learning to appreciate and respect people who are different from us is learning to find the value of our life, not so much in what is different about us, but is in the common humanity that we share in this fleeting existence on the globe.

And so you can have shared benefits and shared responsibilities, but you've got to have shared values, simple ones. Everybody counts. Everybody deserves a chance. We all have a responsible role to play. We all do better when we work together. Our differences make life a whole lot more interesting, but our common humanity matters more. Now that is easy to say but hard to do. And we all know how people have been persecuted by those who are different from them.

When I was your age, in my last year in college, Robert Kennedy was murdered by a person who thought he symbolized too much American support for Israel. And then Martin Luther King was murdered by a man who thought he was too much in favor of blacks in a way that hurt whites. And my friend, Nelson Mandela, spent 27 years in prison because the apartheid regime thought their life wouldn't matter anymore unless they could keep their heels on the black people's necks in South Africa. So we're familiar with that. But very often, we are harder on our own kind when they reach out to others.

The greatest man who lived in my lifetime, who was killed when I was a young child, was Ghandi. Ghandi was not killed by a Muslim. Ghandi was killed by a Hindu because Ghandi wanted India for the Hindus, the Muslims, the Janes, the Sikhs, the Christians, the Jews, the Buddhists, everybody. So the young man that killed Ghandi thought he was a bad Hindu and a bad Indian because he didn't want it just for their crowd.

Anwar Sadat was killed in the Middle East, not by an Israeli Commando, but by an angry Egyptian, because they thought he was a bad Muslim and a bad Egyptian because he wanted a secular government in

Egypt and peace with Israel. And on maybe the lowest day of my presidency, the Prime Minister of Israel, Yitzhak Rabin (whom I loved as much as any other man I have ever loved in my life) was murdered not by a PLO terrorist, not by someone from the Palestinian Islamic Jihad or Hamas, but by a young Israeli Jew who thought Rabin (who had given his whole life to military service for Israel) was a bad Israeli and a bad Jew because he figured out he had to share the future, including the West Bank, and give the Palestinian kids a homeland and a chance at a decent education and integrity in order for Israel to ever be secure and at peace in the end. And he killed him because he reached out across the divide.

So that's the last thing I want to say to you. The Bush administration is essentially closer to the Kaplan view. They believe they should maximize power at home and abroad and force the changes they want and that multilateralism and cooperation are often a fool's errand. We've got the power. We've got the juice. We should do the job.

I am more in the other camp. I'm more where, at least where Mr. Ridley is. I don't think we ought to ever give up the right to unilaterally use our military when we need to do it, but I think we ought to bend over backwards to build a world in which we are sharing responsibilities, sharing benefits and sharing our path to the future.

Now, to be fair, the differences are obvious. I wouldn't have pulled out of Kyoto or the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty or those other things, but there's also a lot of overlap. I think that we have to get the chemical and biological weapons out of Iraq and any other place we can control or get rid of them. Because I don't want you exposed to them and I don't want anybody else exposed to them. I think we have to have a strong and a modernized military.

I think that we're doing the right thing in Columbia, as I said. There's overlap and differences. So I don't want to get into the weeds here today so much as I want you to think about this. It's your life. You've got a lot more years ahead of you than I do. You know, if a car hit me walking out of here tonight, I'd still be one of the luckiest people that ever walked across the face of the earth and I know it. So what I don't want to see is any people who are younger than me die before they have to, any people have their lives wrecked that don't have to be wrecked. I don't want to see the promise of America, that gave me the life of my dreams, taken away from you and your generation.

And I may not be right about a lot of things, but I think that this big picture issue is right. I believe that we have to be moving to an integrated global community and I want America to be the world's leading force for peace and freedom and security and prosperity, but I think to do it, we have to have security plus. Plus building a world with more friends and fewer enemies, plus building a world with more cooperation, plus building a world where America continues to be an example, and plus being a leading light of understanding that this is ultimately a problem of the heart. And we have to keep expanding the world's "them" into "us" so that some day, there won't be any "them," there will only be "us." Thank you.