

## **A New World Order, 1989-2001**

### **Articles of Impeachment Against William Jefferson Clinton (1999)**

*One of the most important guarantees of freedom and liberty in the United States is the constitutional division of powers in the federal government. It prevents any one branch from undermining the democratic order. The drafters of the Constitution also made it very difficult even for two branches of the federal government to gain control over the third.*

*Since the Constitution was ratified, each branch of government has been involved in a three-way struggle to gain power at the expense of the others. In *Marbury v. Madison*, the Supreme Court established the principle of judicial review. Beginning in the Progressive age, possibly even since the Civil War, the balance of power between Congress and the president shifted in favor of the president. This process reached its high point in the postwar era in what, during the Nixon administration, was termed the imperial presidency. Since the 1970s, Congress has struggled to regain some of the power and prestige it seemed to have lost.*

*The impeachment of President Clinton, the second impeachment of a president, demonstrated once again the way in which the constitutional order preserves itself. Although there were no victors in this instance, the impeachment served to remind the members of Congress, the Supreme Court justices, and the officers of the executive branch that they are equals whom the Constitution requires to cooperate or at least compromise with one another.*

---

At 10:05 a.m., the managers on the part of the House of Representatives of the impeachment of William Jefferson Clinton appeared below the bar of the Senate, and the Sergeant at Arms, James W. Ziglar, announced their presence, as follows:

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I announce the presence of the managers on the part of the House of Representatives to conduct the proceedings on behalf of the House concerning the impeachment of William Jefferson Clinton, President of the United States.

The President pro tempore: The managers on the part of the House will be received and escorted to the well of the Senate.

The managers were thereupon escorted by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, James W. Ziglar, to the well of the Senate.

The President pro tempore: The Sergeant at Arms will make the proclamation.

The Sergeant at Arms, James W. Ziglar, made the proclamation, as follows:

Hear ye! Hear ye! Hear ye! All persons are commanded to keep silent, on pain of imprisonment, while the House of Representatives is exhibiting to the Senate of the United States articles of impeachment against William Jefferson Clinton, President of the United States.

The President pro tempore: The managers on the part of the House will proceed.

Mr. Manager Hyde: Mr. President, the managers on the part of the House of Representatives are here present and ready to present the articles of impeachment which have been preferred by the House of Representatives against William Jefferson Clinton, President of the United States.

The House adopted the following resolution, which with the permission of the Senate I will read.

House Resolution 10

*Resolved*, That in continuance of the authority conferred in House Resolution 614 of the One Hundred Fifth Congress adopted by the House of Representatives and delivered to the Senate on December 19, 1998, Mr. Hyde of Illinois, Mr. Sensenbrenner of Wisconsin, Mr. McCollum of Florida, Mr. Gekas of Pennsylvania, Mr. Canady of Florida, Mr. Buyer of

Indiana, Mr. Bryant of Tennessee, Mr. Chabot of Ohio, Mr. Barr of Georgia, Mr. Hutchinson of Arkansas, Mr. Cannon of Utah, Mr. Rogan of California, and Mr. Graham of South Carolina are appointed managers to conduct the impeachment trial against William Jefferson Clinton, President of the United States, that a message be sent to the Senate to inform the Senate of these appointments, and that the managers so appointed may, in connection with the preparation and the conduct of the trial, exhibit the articles of impeachment to the Senate and take all other actions necessary, which may include the following:

(1) Employing legal, clerical, and other necessary assistants and incurring such other expenses as may be necessary, to be paid from amounts available to the Committee on the Judiciary under applicable expense resolutions or from the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives.

(2) Sending for persons and papers, and filing with the Secretary of the Senate, on the part of the House of Representatives, any pleadings, in conjunction with or subsequent to, the exhibition of the articles of impeachment that the managers consider necessary.

With the permission of the Senate, I will now read the articles of impeachment, House Resolution 611.

#### House Resolution 611

*Resolved*, That William Jefferson Clinton, President of the United States, is impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors, and that the following articles of impeachment be exhibited to the United States Senate:

Articles of impeachment exhibited by the House of Representatives of the United States of America in the name of itself and of the people of the United States of America, against William Jefferson Clinton, President of the United States of America, in maintenance and support of its impeachment against him for high crimes and misdemeanors.

#### Article I

In his conduct while President of the United States, William Jefferson Clinton, in violation of his constitutional oath faithfully to execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, has willfully corrupted and manipulated the judicial process of the United States for his personal gain and exoneration, impeding the administration of justice, in that:

On August 17, 1998, William Jefferson Clinton swore to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth before a Federal grand jury of the United States. Contrary to that oath, William Jefferson Clinton willfully provided perjurious, false and misleading testimony to the grand jury concerning one or more of the following: (1) the nature and details of his relationship with a subordinate Government employee; (2) prior perjurious, false and misleading testimony he gave in a Federal civil rights action brought against him; (3) prior false and misleading statements he allowed his attorney to make to a Federal judge in that civil rights action; and (4) his corrupt efforts to influence the testimony of witnesses and to impede the discovery of evidence in that civil rights action.

In doing this, William Jefferson Clinton has undermined the integrity of his office, has brought disrepute on the Presidency, has betrayed his trust as President, and has acted in a manner subversive of the rule of law and justice, to the manifest injury of the people of the United States.

Wherefore, William Jefferson Clinton, by such conduct, warrants impeachment and trial, and removal from office and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States.

#### Article II

In his conduct while President of the United States, William Jefferson Clinton, in violation of his constitutional oath faithfully to execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, has prevented, obstructed, and impeded the administration of justice, and has to that end engaged personally, and through his subordinates and agents, in a course of conduct or scheme designed to delay, impede, cover up, and conceal the existence of evidence and testimony related to a Federal civil rights action brought against him in a duly instituted judicial proceeding.

The means used to implement this course of conduct or scheme included one or more of the following acts:

(1) On or about December 17, 1997, William Jefferson Clinton corruptly encouraged a witness in a Federal civil rights action brought against him to execute a sworn affidavit in that proceeding that he knew to be perjurious, false and misleading.

(2) On or about December 17, 1997, William Jefferson Clinton corruptly encouraged a witness in a Federal civil rights action brought against him to give perjurious, false and misleading testimony if and when called to testify personally in that proceeding.

(3) On or about December 28, 1997, William Jefferson Clinton corruptly engaged in, encouraged, or supported a scheme to conceal evidence that had been subpoenaed in a Federal civil rights action brought against him.

(4) Beginning on or about December 7, 1997, and continuing through and including January 14, 1998, William Jefferson Clinton intensified and succeeded in an effort to secure job assistance to a witness in a Federal civil rights action brought against him in order to corruptly prevent the truthful testimony of that witness in that proceeding at a time when the truthful testimony of that witness would have been harmful to him.

(5) On January 17, 1998, at his deposition in a Federal civil rights action brought against him, William Jefferson Clinton corruptly allowed his attorney to make false and misleading statements to a Federal judge characterizing an affidavit, in order to prevent questioning deemed relevant by the judge. Such false and misleading statements were subsequently acknowledged by his attorney in a communication to that judge.

(6) On or about January 18 and January 20-21, 1998, William Jefferson Clinton related a false and misleading account of events relevant to a Federal civil rights action brought against him to a potential witness in that proceeding, in order to corruptly influence the testimony of that witness.

(7) On or about January 21, 23, and 26, 1998, William Jefferson Clinton made false and misleading statements to potential witnesses in a Federal grand jury proceeding in order to corruptly influence the testimony of those witnesses. The false and misleading statements made by William Jefferson Clinton were repeated by the witnesses to the grand jury, causing the grand jury to receive false and misleading information.

In all of this, William Jefferson Clinton has undermined the integrity of his office, has brought disrepute on the Presidency, has betrayed his trust as President, and has acted in a manner subversive of the rule of law and justice, to the manifest injury of the people of the United States.

Wherefore, William Jefferson Clinton, by such conduct, warrants impeachment and trial, and removal from office and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States.

Passed the House of Representatives December 19, 1998. Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives.  
Attest: Robin H. Carle, Clerk.

Mr. President, that completes the exhibition of the articles of impeachment against William Jefferson Clinton, President of the United States. The managers request that the Senate take order for the trial. The managers now request leave to withdraw.

The President pro tempore. Thank you, Mr. Manager Hyde. The Senate will notify the House of Representatives when it is ready to proceed.

Mr. Lott addressed the Chair.

The President pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT-AGREEMENT

Mr. Lott. Mr. President, I modify my previous request and ask unanimous consent that the Presiding Officer be authorized to appoint a committee of six Senators, three upon the recommendation of the majority leader and three upon the recommendation of the Democratic leader, to escort the Chief Justice into the Senate Chamber.

The President pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. Lott. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 12:45 today. Before the Chair rules on this request, I say as a reminder to all Senators that at 1 p.m. today, following a live quorum, the Chief Justice and all Senators will be sworn in. I thank all Senators.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 10:16 a.m., recessed; whereupon, at 12:49 p.m., the Senate reassembled when called to order by the President pro tempore.

## **Bill Clinton, "A Time of Healing" Prayer Service (1995)**

*After the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah federal building, it was decided to raze the building and to landscape that area into a memorial park. Although the park was completed only recently, President Clinton came to Oklahoma City less than a week after the bombing to lead the nation in a prayer service to commemorate the 169 people who were killed.*

---

The President:

Thank you very much. Governor Keating and Mrs. Keating, Reverend Graham, to the families of those who have been lost and wounded, to the people of Oklahoma City, who have endured so much, and the people of this wonderful state, to all of you who are here as our fellow Americans.

I am honored to be here today to represent the American people.

But I have to tell you that Hillary and I also come as parents, as husband and wife, as people who were your neighbors for some of the best years of our lives.

Today our nation joins with you in grief. We mourn with you. We share your hope against hope that some may still survive. We thank all those who have worked so heroically to save lives and to solve this crime — those here in Oklahoma and those who are all across this great land, and many who left their own lives to come here to work hand in hand with you.

We pledge to do all we can to help you heal the injured, to rebuild this city, and to bring to justice those who did this evil.

This terrible sin took the lives of our American family, innocent children in that building, only because their parents were trying to be good parents as well as good workers; citizens in the building going about their daily business; and many there who served the rest of us — who worked to help the elderly and the disabled, who worked to support our farmers and our veterans, who worked to enforce our laws and to protect us. Let us say clearly, they served us well, and we are grateful.

But for so many of you they were also neighbors and friends. You saw them at church or the PTA meetings, at the civic clubs, at the ball park. You know them in ways that all the rest of America could not.

And to all the members of the families here present who have suffered loss, though we share your grief, your pain is unimaginable, and we know that. We cannot undo it. That is God's work.

Our words seem small beside the loss you have endured. But I found a few I wanted to share today. I've received a lot of letters in these last terrible days. One stood out because it came from a young widow and a mother of three whose own husband was murdered with over 200 other Americans when Pan Am 103 was shot down. Here is what that woman said I should say to you today:

"The anger you feel is valid, but you must not allow yourselves to be consumed by it. The hurt you feel must not be allowed to turn into hate, but instead into the search for justice. The loss you feel must not paralyze your own lives. Instead, you must try to pay tribute to your loved ones by continuing to do all the things they left undone, thus ensuring they did not die in vain."

Wise words from one who also knows.

You have lost too much, but you have not lost everything. And you have certainly not lost America, for we will stand with you for as many tomorrows as it takes.

If ever we needed evidence of that, I could only recall the words of Governor and Mrs. Keating. If anybody thinks that Americans are mostly mean and selfish, they ought to come to Oklahoma. If anybody thinks Americans have lost the capacity for love and caring and courage, they ought to come to Oklahoma.

To all my fellow Americans beyond this hall, I say, one thing we owe those who have sacrificed is the duty to purge ourselves of the dark forces which gave rise to this evil. They are forces that threaten our common peace, our freedom, our way of life.

Let us teach our children that the God of comfort is also the God of righteousness. Those who trouble their own house will inherit the wind. Justice will prevail.

Let us let our own children know that we will stand against the forces of fear. When there is talk of hatred, let us stand up and talk against it. When there is talk of violence, let us stand up and talk against it. In the face of death, let us honor life. As St. Paul admonished us, let us not be overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good.

Yesterday Hillary and I had the privilege of speaking with some children of other federal employees —children like those who were lost here. And one little girl said something we will never forget. She said, we should all plant a tree in memory of the children. So this morning before we got on the plane to come here, at the White House, we planted a tree in honor of the children of Oklahoma.

It was a dogwood with its wonderful spring flower and its deep, enduring roots. It embodies the lesson of the Psalms — that the life of a good person is like a tree whose leaf does not wither.

My fellow Americans, a tree takes a long time to grow, and wounds take a long time to heal. But we must begin. Those who are lost now belong to God. Some day we will be with them. But until that happens, their legacy must be our lives.

Thank you all, and God bless you.

## **George H.W. Bush, Gulf War Address (1990)**

*On September 11, 1990, President George Herbert Walker Bush addressed a joint session of Congress and outlined his administration's stance on Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. The Persian Gulf War, also known as Operation Desert Storm, would not begin until January 1991, and it was over by late February. The war brought Bush a surge of popular support at home, although economic and other domestic issues prevented him from being reelected in 1992. With the resumption of hostilities against Iraq in March 2003, during the presidency of George H.W. Bush's son, George W. Bush, world attention continues to focus on Iraq.*

---

We gather tonight, witness to events in the Persian Gulf as significant as they are tragic. In the early morning hours of August 2d, following negotiations and promises by Iraq's dictator Saddam Hussein not to use force, a powerful Iraqi army invaded its trusting and much weaker neighbor, Kuwait. Within 3 days, 120,000 Iraqi troops with 850 tanks had poured into Kuwait and moved south to threaten Saudi Arabia. It was then that I decided to act to check that aggression.

At this moment, our brave servicemen and women stand watch in that distant desert and on distant seas, side by side with the forces of more than 20 other nations. They are some of the finest men and women of the United States of America. And they're doing one terrific job. . . .

A soldier, Private First Class Wade Merritt of Knoxville, Tennessee, now stationed in Saudi Arabia, wrote his parents of his worries, his love of family, and his hope for peace. But Wade also wrote, "I am proud of my country and its firm stance against inhumane aggression. I am proud of my army and its men. I am proud to serve my country." Well, let me just say, Wade, America is proud of you and is grateful to every soldier, sailor, marine, and airman serving the

cause of peace in the Persian Gulf. I also want to thank the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Powell; the Chiefs here tonight; our commander in the Persian Gulf, General Schwartzkopf; and the men and women of the Department of Defense. What a magnificent job you all are doing. And thank you very, very much from a grateful people. I wish I could say that their work is done. But we all know it's not.

So, if there ever was a time to put country before self and patriotism before party, the time is now. . . . So, tonight I want to talk to you about what's at stake—what we must do together to defend civilized values around the world and maintain our economic strength at home.

Our objectives in the Persian Gulf are clear, our goals defined and familiar: Iraq must withdraw from Kuwait completely, immediately, and without condition. Kuwait's legitimate government must be restored. The security and stability of the Persian Gulf must be assured. And American citizens abroad must be protected. These goals are not ours alone. They've been endorsed by the United Nations Security Council five times in as many weeks. Most countries share our concern for principle. And many have a stake in the stability of the Persian Gulf. This is not, as Saddam Hussein would have it, the United States against Iraq. It is Iraq against the world.

As you know, I've just returned from a very productive meeting with Soviet President Gorbachev. And I am pleased that we are working together to build a new relationship. In Helsinki, our joint statement affirmed to the world our shared resolve to counter Iraq's threat to peace. Let me quote: "We are united in the belief that Iraq's aggression must not be tolerated. No peaceful international order is possible if larger states can devour their smaller neighbors." Clearly, no longer can a dictator count on East-West confrontation to stymie concerted United Nations action against aggression. A new partnership of nations has begun.

We stand today at a unique and extraordinary moment. The crisis in the Persian Gulf, as grave as it is, also offers a rare opportunity to move toward an historic period of cooperation. Out of these troubled times, our fifth objective—a new world order—can emerge: a new era—freer from the threat of terror, stronger in the pursuit of justice, and more secure in the quest for peace. An era in which the nations of the world, East and West, North and South, can prosper and live in harmony. A hundred generations have searched for this elusive path to peace, while a thousand wars raged across the span of human endeavor. Today that new world is struggling to be born, a world quite different from the one we've known. A world where the rule of law supplants the rule of the jungle. A world in which nations recognize the shared responsibility for freedom and justice. A world where the strong respect the rights of the weak. This is the vision that I shared with President Gorbachev in Helsinki. He and other leaders from Europe, the Gulf, and around the world understand that how we manage this crisis today could shape the future for generations to come.

The test we face is great, and so are the stakes. This is the first assault on the new world that we seek, the first test of our mettle. Had we not responded to this first provocation with clarity of purpose, if we do not continue to demonstrate our determination, it would be a signal to actual and potential despots around the world. America and the world must defend common vital interests—and we will. America and the world must support the rule of law—and we will. America and the world must stand up to aggression—and we will. And one thing more: In the pursuit of these goals America will not be intimidated.

Vital issues of principle are at stake. Saddam Hussein is literally trying to wipe a country off the face of the Earth. We do not exaggerate. Nor do we exaggerate when we say Saddam Hussein will fail. Vital economic interests are at risk as well. Iraq itself controls some 10 percent of the world's proven oil reserves. Iraq plus Kuwait controls twice that. An Iraq permitted to swallow Kuwait would have the economic and military power, as well as the arrogance, to intimidate and coerce its neighbors—neighbors who control the lion's share of the world's remaining oil reserves. We cannot permit a resource so vital to be dominated by one so ruthless. And we won't.

Recent events have surely proven that there is no substitute for American leadership. In the face of tyranny, let no one doubt American credibility and reliability. Let no one doubt our staying power. We will stand by our friends. One way or another, the leader of Iraq must learn this fundamental truth. From the outset, acting hand in hand with others, we've sought to fashion the broadest possible international response to Iraq's aggression. The level of world cooperation and condemnation of Iraq is unprecedented. Armed forces from countries spanning four continents are there at the request of King Fahd of Saudi Arabia to deter and, if need be, to defend against attack. Moslems and non-Moslems, Arabs and non-Arabs, soldiers from many nations stand shoulder to shoulder, resolute against Saddam Hussein's ambitions.

We can now point to five United Nations Security Council resolutions that condemn Iraq's aggression. They call for Iraq's immediate and unconditional withdrawal, the restoration of Kuwait's legitimate government, and categorically reject Iraq's cynical and self-serving attempt to annex Kuwait. Finally, the United Nations has demanded the release of all foreign nationals held hostage against their will and in contravention of international law. It is a mockery of human decency to call these people "guests." They are hostages, and the whole world knows it. . . .

We're now in sight of a United Nations that performs as envisioned by its founders. We owe much to the outstanding leadership of Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar. The United Nations is backing up its words with action. The Security Council has imposed mandatory economic sanctions on Iraq, designed to force Iraq to relinquish the spoils of its illegal conquest. The Security Council has also taken the decisive step of authorizing the use of all means necessary to ensure compliance with these sanctions. Together with our friends and allies, ships of the United States Navy are today patrolling Mideast waters. They've already intercepted more than 700 ships to enforce the sanctions. Three regional leaders I spoke with just yesterday told me that these sanctions are working. Iraq is feeling the heat. We continue to hope that Iraq's leaders will recalculate just what their aggression has cost them. They are cut off from world trade, unable to sell their oil. And only a tiny fraction of goods gets through.

The communiqué with President Gorbachev made mention of what happens when the embargo is so effective that children of Iraq literally need milk or the sick truly need medicine. Then, under strict international supervision that guarantees the proper destination, then food will be permitted.

At home, the material cost of our leadership can be steep. That's why Secretary of State Baker and Treasury Secretary Brady have met with many world leaders to underscore that the burden of this collective effort must be shared. We are prepared to do our share and more to help carry that load; we insist that others do their share as well.

The response of most of our friends and allies has been good. To help defray costs, the leaders of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and the UAE—the United Arab Emirates—have pledged to provide our deployed troops with all the food and fuel they need. Generous assistance will also be provided to stalwart front-line nations, such as Turkey and Egypt. . . .

There's an energy-related cost to be borne as well. Oil-producing nations are already replacing lost Iraqi and Kuwaiti output. More than half of what was lost has been made up. And we're getting superb cooperation. If producers, including the United States, continue steps to expand oil and gas production, we can stabilize prices and guarantee against hardship. Additionally, we and several of our allies always have the option to extract oil from our strategic petroleum reserves if conditions warrant. As I've pointed out before, conservation efforts are essential to keep our energy needs as low as possible. And we must then take advantage of our energy sources across the board: coal, natural gas, hydro, and nuclear. Our failure to do these things has made us more dependent on foreign oil than ever before. Finally, let no one even contemplate profiteering from this crisis. We will not have it.

I cannot predict just how long it will take to convince Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait. Sanctions will take time to have their full intended effect. We will continue to review all options with our allies, but let it be clear: we will not let this aggression stand.

Our interest, our involvement in the Gulf is not transitory. It predated Saddam Hussein's aggression and will survive it. Long after all our troops come home—and we all hope it's soon, very soon—there will be a lasting role for the United States in assisting the nations of the Persian Gulf. Our role then: to deter future aggression. Our role is to help our friends in their own self-defense. And something else: to curb the proliferation of chemical, biological, ballistic missile and, above all, nuclear technologies.

Let me also make clear that the United States has no quarrel with the Iraqi people. Our quarrel is with Iraq's dictator and with his aggression. Iraq will not be permitted to annex Kuwait. That's not a threat, that's not a boast, that's just the way it's going to be.

Our ability to function effectively as a great power abroad depends on how we conduct ourselves at home. Our economy, our Armed Forces, our energy dependence, and our cohesion all determine whether we can help our friends and stand up to our foes. For America to lead, America must remain strong and vital. Our world leadership and domestic strength are mutual and reinforcing; a woven piece, strongly bound as Old Glory. To revitalize our leadership, our leadership capacity, we must address our budget deficit—not after election day, or next year, but now.

Higher oil prices slow our growth, and higher defense costs would only make our fiscal deficit problem worse. That deficit was already greater than it should have been—a projected \$232 billion for the coming year. It must—it will—be reduced.

To my friends in Congress, together we must act this very month—before the next fiscal year begins on October 1st—to get America's economic house in order. The Gulf situation helps us realize we are more economically vulnerable than we ever should be. Americans must never again enter any crisis, economic or military, with an excessive dependence on foreign oil and an excessive burden of Federal debt. . . .

. . . Congress should, this month, enact a prudent multiyear defense program, one that reflects not only the improvement in East-West relations but our broader responsibilities to deal with the continuing risks of outlaw action

and regional conflict. Even with our obligations in the Gulf, a sound defense budget can have some reduction in real terms; and we're prepared to accept that. But to go beyond such levels, where cutting defense would threaten our vital margin of safety, is something I will never accept. The world is still dangerous. And surely, that is now clear. Stability's not secure. American interests are far reaching. Interdependence has increased. The consequences of regional instability can be global. This is no time to risk America's capacity to protect her vital interests. . . .

. . . Congress should, this month, enact a 5-year program to reduce the projected debt and deficits by \$500 billion—that's by half a trillion dollars. And if, with the Congress, we can develop a satisfactory program by the end of the month, we can avoid the ax of sequester-deep across-the-board cuts that would threaten our military capacity and risk substantial domestic disruption. I want to be able to tell the American people that we have truly solved the deficit problem. And for me to do that, a budget agreement must meet these tests: It must include the measures I've recommended to increase economic growth and reduce dependence on foreign oil. It must be fair. All should contribute, but the burden should not be excessive for any one group of programs or people. It must address the growth of government's hidden liabilities. It must reform the budget process and, further, it must be real. . . .

Once again, Americans have stepped forward to share a tearful goodbye with their families before leaving for a strange and distant shore. At this very moment, they serve together with Arabs, Europeans, Asians, and Africans in defense of principle and the dream of a new world order. That's why they sweat and toil in the sand and the heat and the sun. If they can come together under such adversity, if old adversaries like the Soviet Union and the United States can work in common cause, then surely we who are so fortunate to be in this great Chamber—Democrats, Republicans, liberals, conservatives—can come together to fulfill our responsibilities here. . . .

## **Hillary Clinton, Speech on Health Care (2007)**

---

*With an aging "baby boomer" population, health care is an issue on the minds of many voters in this first decade of the 21st century. During the first presidential administration of her husband, Hillary Clinton chaired the 1993 Task Force on National Health Care Reform and produced a comprehensive plan for universal health care covering all Americans. President Bill Clinton introduced that plan before a joint session of Congress on September 22, 1993 and the First Lady went before Congress for days of intensive testimony. The bill went down to ignoble defeat and conservatives mounted a rebellion that handed them control of both houses of Congress in 1994 on the campaign mantra that the Clinton's were big spending liberals. No solution to health care issues was ever adopted. It is not surprising that candidate Hillary Clinton is back in the 2008 campaign with the health care issue again.*

---

Well, thank you very, very, much. I am delighted to be back at GW and I want to thank President Trachtenberg for his kind introduction, but he and his wife Francine have been leading advocates on behalf of higher education and so many other issues for as long as I've known them, and that goes back many years. And as Joel said, we shared the experience of our children in high school, and that was indeed an experience we both survived, so we're grateful to tell the tale. I want to thank Dr. Williams, and, of course, Dr. Becker. I want also to recognize Russ Ramsey, the chair of the board, Dr. Scott, Dean of the Medical School and the CEO of GW Medical Faculty Associates, Stephen Badger. It is an honor to be back at GW in order to talk about one of the most important issues facing the health care community, and of course, our country. As I travel around America, I have talked with people from all walks of life about the challenges that our country is facing: from ending the war in Iraq to ending our dependence on foreign oil — from improving our education system to reducing our deficit. And no matter where I go or with whom I talk — whether it's small business owners or CEOs, doctors or nurses or patients — I hear growing concern about the crisis in our health care system: exploding costs, declining coverage and shortcoming in care and prevention. Now, I've tangled with this issue before — and I've got the scars to show for it. But I learned some valuable lessons from that experience. One is that we can't achieve reform without the participation and commitment of health care providers, employers, employees and other citizens who pay for, depend upon, and actually deliver health care services. I think we finally have a recognition that everyone sees there is an economic imperative to rein in costs. There is a moral imperative to extend coverage to all Americans. And, there is a practical necessity to promote wellness and prevent illness wherever possible. I plan to put those lessons to work to ensure every single American has



quality, affordable health coverage.

There are three parts to my approach. First, lowering costs for everyone. Second, improving quality for everyone. Third, insuring everyone.

Today, I will focus on the challenge of lowering costs.

Health care costs are spiraling out of control. Premiums have almost doubled since 2000 — increasing four times faster than average wages.

Every day, parents choose between paying the premium for themselves or their children. Small businesses wonder how they will stay afloat when their health care costs eat up their profits year after year. CEOs of major American companies worry about how they will succeed in the global economy when they're competing with foreign companies that spend significantly less on health care.

We spend 16 percent of our gross domestic product - \$2 trillion — on health care. And by 2016, health costs are scheduled to exceed \$4 trillion, or almost 20% of GDP. That means that within less than 10 years, 20 cents out of every dollar produced in America will be spent on healthcare. No other country spends more than 12%, a difference of more than \$500 billion. All other wealthy countries spend even less. We spend \$5,711 per patient. The next highest spending country, Switzerland, spends \$3,847 on patients. Yet, they cover every single one of their citizens and have an average life expectancy that is three years longer than ours.

Now, how have our costs spiraled out of control like this? Well, about 30% of the rise in health care spending is linked to the doubling of obesity among adults over the past 20 years. In other words, if our obesity levels had remained at 1990 levels, we would be spending 10% less on health care today — a savings of \$220 billion. About two-thirds of the rise in health care spending is associated with a rise in the prevalence of treatable disease - like diabetes, asthma and heart disease. 75% of all health care spending — roughly \$1.5 trillion — is associated with the 4 to 5 percent of patients who have multiple chronic illnesses and require ongoing medical management over a period of years, or even decades. And 10-12% of the total health care budget is spent on end of life care. Our administrative costs are by far the highest in the world. Today more than one in four health care dollars goes to administration. 64% of private insurance plans' administrative costs are dedicated to underwriting health risks, sales, and marketing. Every man, woman and child in America spends \$412 on health care administration, nearly six times as much as other countries. According to a recent report by McKinsey, the United States spends \$98 billion more than other countries on excessive administrative costs that have nothing to do with delivering good health care. Too much of the money we spend is wasted on care that doesn't improve health. A study in Santa Barbara, California found that one out of every five lab tests and X-rays were conducted solely because previous test results were unavailable. A recent study reported in the Atlantic Monthly found that for two-thirds of the patients who received a \$15,000 surgery to prevent strokes, there was no compelling evidence that the surgery actually worked. At the same time, in situations where the benefits of intervention are clear, many patients still don't receive the care they need. A recent study in The New England Journal of Medicine found that, overall, Americans get needed care only 55 percent of the time.

If we spend so much, why does the World Health Organization rank the United States 31st in life expectancy and 40th in child mortality — worse than Cuba and Croatia?

Our health care system is plagued with under-use, overuse and misuse. It is, simply put, broken. As President, I will make it my mission to fix it, starting by helping the 250 million people with public or private insurance who face skyrocketing costs, inadequate care, and bureaucratic obstacles to coverage.

Today, I'm announcing a seven point plan to lower health care costs for all American and again to make our healthcare system, without doubt from any corner, the best in the world. Building a national consensus around

these cost savings is the first crucial step to cover all Americans with quality, affordable healthcare.

First, we're going to focus on prevention — on wellness, not just sickness. Under my reforms, all Americans will have access to comprehensive preventive care, which will save money in the long run. Today, we pay doctors and hospitals to treat diseases and injuries, but not to help prevent them from occurring in the first place. Only 38 percent of adults receive recommended colorectal screening, and roughly 20 percent of children do not receive recommended immunizations. In fact, our country spends only an estimated 1 to 3 percent of national health expenditures on preventive health care services and health promotion per year. That is about the same percentage we spent in the 1920s. For example we have many more adults and young people being diagnosed with type 2 diabetes. While, the costs of caring for them are increasing exponentially, many insurance companies won't pay for someone who's pre-diabetic or who's been diagnosed with diabetes to go to a nutritionist to learn how to eat properly, to get preventive medicine or to go to a podiatrist to have their feet checked. But the companies will pay if you have to have your foot amputated. The insurance companies will actually tell you they don't want to pay for preventive health care because the patient might change insurance companies, and the original company won't get the benefits of the money they invested. But if a patient's doctor tells them that a foot needs to be amputated, well the company is kind of stuck with that. Talk about a system that is upside down and backwards.

We clearly need a new approach. We know we can save money if we give insurance companies incentives to cover preventive care and wellness services — and my plan will do exactly that. Keeping people healthy today will not only keep our costs down in the future, but improve quality of life as well. We know that preventive care works. I could cite thousands of examples, but just consider the following: The incidence of diabetes was 58 percent lower among adults with elevated blood sugar where enrolled in a lifestyle intervention program than the control group that was only given drugs. Among those aged 60 and older the reduction was 71 percent. And some of the research that was done leading to these outcomes was right here at GW.

Or look at what the private sector has tried to do. Safeway has made a conscious decision to focus on prevention. It pays 100% of all appropriate preventive care services, and it offers a 24-hour hotline staffed by registered nurses, and provides services to help people manage chronic conditions and incentives designed to promote healthier lifestyles.

Again, the results speak for themselves. While average costs went up 7.7% across the country, Safeway its health care costs will be flat. And they aren't the exception: Motorola's wellness initiative showed savings of almost \$4 per every dollar invested.

Under my plan, all insurers who are already participating in a federal health program like Medicare or Medicaid or the federal employee's health benefit plan will have to cover prevention as a condition of doing business with the Federal government. Insurers would encourage both individuals and providers to use prevention services by paying for benefits like cancer screenings and immunizations.

My plan also pools and coordinates federal spending on prevention to help redeploy high-priority preventive services. Working in collaboration with the private sector, this initiative would pay for preventive care initiatives in schools, workplaces, supermarkets, churches, communities. It would fund and train new health prevention outreach workers, who understood the language, understood the culture of various constituencies around our country. Now, we still have so many people, and I'm sure you see it in the hospital, who come in unable to speak English, often times bringing a child to interpret. And we're just not doing a good enough job in getting information broadly available to people who need it.

Now, of course, you can have the best insurance plan in the world, but if you don't take the medicine your doctor prescribes, or follow lifestyle advice your doctor recommends, you aren't going to improve your health. If we're going to reduce costs through prevention, all of us all must take responsibility for taking better care of

ourselves and I will have more to say about that later. The second way to bring costs under control is to bring our health care system's record keeping into the 21st century, finally leaving behind paper records and outdated, obsolete, 20th century information technology. Right now, if you're rushed to a hospital with a medical emergency, they may not be able to access your medical history or to find out what medications you're taking, what surgeries you've had — or even what your blood type is. Electronic medical records would change that.

This is also important in the event of catastrophes. After Katrina, medical records were under water, never to be recovered. A lot of people who were taking prescription drugs who fled their homes or were rescued didn't even know the names of the drugs they were taking. Only, those who had been buying drugs from drug stores that had electronic medical records could immediately access to find out what the drug was and what the prescription should be. Modernizing our system will improve quality of care and reduce costs. Today, processing paper claims costs an average of \$1.60 to \$2.20 per claim. It costs 85 cents for an electronic claim. A RAND study found that, as a nation, we could save more than \$77 billion annually through the widespread use of electronic medical records, and these savings could double with the addition of prevention and chronic disease management. If the use of information technology impacts our health care system as much as it has impacted other sectors of the economy, like for example, the wholesale and retail industry, we could see savings as high as \$346 billion annually or over 15% of health care spending. There is no reason why people's health files — their test results, lab records, X-rays — can't be stored securely and confidentially on a computer file accessible from a doctor's office or hospital. In fact, if all hospitals used a computerized physician order entry system, an estimated 200,000 fewer adverse drug events would occur, saving roughly \$1 billion per year. We can also use information technology to disseminate research. A government study recently showed it takes 17 years from the time of a new medical discovery to the time clinicians actually incorporate that discovery into their practice at the bedside. Why not 17 seconds, the moment we know the discovery improves care?

The Veterans medical system provides a perfect example of a fully automated health information system that supports the needs of patients, clinicians, and administrators. Its computerized patient record system (CPRS), contains every detail of a patient's health record, including laboratory test results, medical images, bar code medication administration, progress notes, and appointments, all accessible from anywhere within the VA system.

The VA started modernizing its programs in 1993, using health IT as well as other care management techniques. And it delivers some of the best quality health care in the United States with amazing efficiency. Between 1999 and 2003, the number of patients enrolled in the VA system increased by 70 percent, yet funding (not adjusted for inflation) increased by only 41 percent. So the VA has not only become one of the health care industry's best quality performers, it has done so while spending less and less on each patient. Health care spending per capita averages, as I said, over \$6,300 in the U.S.; at the VA, however, the per-patient cost is \$5,000, and 20% lower than the national average, even though the average age of a VA patient is 60.

Last year I was at the hospital here at GW announcing legislation that has since passed the Senate that promotes the use of information technology so we can end the paper chase, limit medical errors and reduce the number of malpractice suits. It would allow us to use IT to develop a nationwide, interoperable system, to streamline our healthcare costs, and, I believe, reduce errors as well. Now, I'm proud of my legislation, we didn't get it passed in the House last year, we're going to try again this year. But if we don't get it passed, I will have it as one of my highest priorities as President. I'm going to build on that legislation by requiring health providers that participate in federal programs, which is nearly all of them, to adopt private, secure, and interoperable technology. And to help hospitals and doctors modernize their systems and promote the widespread adoption of health IT, I would invest \$3 billion a year in grants to help ramp up the system. No more yellowing paper records — no more trying to decipher messy handwriting.

Third, we're finally going to coordinate and streamline the care our chronically ill patients receive. Americans with chronic disease such as heart disease and diabetes account for an astonishing percentage. When I first saw

this, I couldn't believe it—that it was 75 percent of our national health care expenditures. And improving the quality of their care will help limit costs, and improve health.

To that end, I propose establishing medical "homes" similar to those operating right now in Oregon. Dr. David Dorra, a primary care physician, spoke at the Senate Aging Committee, on which I serve, two weeks ago about the success of these medical homes. He told the story of a patient, Ms. Viera, a 75 year-old woman in Oregon who suffered from five chronic illnesses, including diabetes, high blood pressure, and mild congestive heart failure. She also had difficulties remembering what bills to pay and what pills to take.

Now, in most clinics across this country, Ms. Viera would receive care from qualified, capable doctors and nurses. But her care would likely not be coordinated — her providers wouldn't be talking to each other, making sure that the treatments they were prescribing were working together. This ends up raising costs and increasing the chances that she will suffer complications or end up back in the hospital. Anyone who has ever tried to coordinate their own care, or the care of a loved one, knows that this is all too common situation. Fortunately, her care was addressed comprehensively through Care Management Plus in Oregon, an IT system with trained care managers in primary care clinics to treat older adults with complicated conditions. She's in good hands. Her care managers and her primary care physician addressed her symptoms early, preventing problems rather than treating them after they occurred. And she is helped to navigate the system. Under this program, seniors with complex diabetes have had a 20 percent reduction in mortality, a 24 percent reduction in expensive hospitalization, and up to 42 percent improvement in control of their disease.

Every patient should have access to a system with outcomes like that. That's why my proposal would require that Americans with costly, hard to manage illnesses have access to state-of-the-art chronic care coordination models under federally-funded plans, like Medicare and the Federal Employees Health Benefits (FEHBP) plan. This proposal would permit multi-specialty clinics (GW, Mayo Clinic, Johns Hopkins, Partners Healthcare), provider-sponsored organizations and private plans to bid on and provide services such as care coordination amongst and between providers, drug management, diet and exercise control and the promotion of individual patient responsibility.

We know that this coordinated care model would result in significant cost savings. A recent RAND study concluded that chronic disease management, preceded by prevention and backed by information technology, could save \$147 billion annually. Another study found this model could reduce the cost of diabetes care alone by 3 percent, saving us \$4 billion dollars.

Fourth, my plan will offer will offer individuals and small businesses market access to larger insurance pools that will lower costs and end insurance company discrimination against people with pre-existing conditions. As part of a plan for universal coverage, which I will discuss in detail in the coming months, we would create large insurance pools that lower administrative costs for small businesses and individuals by spreading the risk. In a system of universal coverage insurance companies cannot as easily shift costs through cherry picking and other means.

In fact, according to a recent McKinsey report, insurance companies in America spend tens of billions a year figuring out how not to cover people — doing complicated calculations to figure out how to cherry pick the healthiest persons, and leave everyone else out in the cold. That is how they profit: by avoiding insuring patients who will be "expensive" — and then trying to avoid paying up once the insured patient actually needs treatment.

I see this all the time. My office spends countless hours arguing with insurance companies to get my constituents the health care they have paid for. For example, a father called me from northern New York — his son had a rare illness. Now he and his son were well insured. He'd worked for many years for the same employer who provided a good policy. But when his son needed a special operation — that could only be

performed at one place in the country — the insurance company said, sorry, that's out of network, we're not going to send you to have that done.

So my office intervened. And in the end they got permission for the operation. But I don't think people should have to go to their United States Senator to get their insurance company to give them what they've paid for.

As President, I will end the practice of insurance company cherry-picking once and for all by allowing anyone who wants to join a plan to do so and prohibiting insurance companies from carving out benefits or charging higher rates to people with health problems. I also will call for rating reforms to ensure that older and other vulnerable populations are not discriminated against. The whole point of insurance, lest we forget, is to spread risk across a group of enrollees. It's one of the reasons that the administrative costs of Medicare are so much lower; because they are actually insuring everyone. Everyone is in the pool, and we have to figure out how to better control the costs within Medicare but they start with an advantage because they have such a considerably lower administrative cost. Finally, insurers would be required to prove they were spending much less on marketing and schemes to avoid providing insurance to high-risk Americans, and more on direct care-giving. Now most businesses and some states have become tough purchasers of health insurance, insisting on fair marketing and cracking down on high overhead. We should follow their lead. One of the things I've advocated now for 14 years is a common vocabulary and a common form that every insurance company must use. This sounds like a pretty common-sense idea—so you can actually compare and contrast what you're paying for—but when I proposed in back in '93 and '94 it was, shall we say, vigorously objected to. Because we need more transparency and we need that common vocabulary in order to get costs down, and that's opposite of what the insurers want to happen. By insuring all Americans through accountable public and private plans, we can get rid of administrative costs that do nothing but add to insurance companies' bottom line. In such a reformed system, risk would be widely spread and we could reduce administrative costs by as much as \$20 to 30 billion a year. Fifth, I will work to improve the quality of care which will also help us drive down costs. I'll start by establishing an independent public-private Best Practices Institute. This Institute would be a partnership among the public and the private sector, to finance comparative effectiveness research, so that doctors, nurses and other health professionals — as well as consumers and businesses — would know what drugs, devices, surgeries and treatments work best. This would reduce the use of inefficient and ineffective treatments, and I believe that it would have tremendous benefits because we could get evidence-based medicine into the bloodstream of the country much more effectively. I spearheaded a similar proposal to authorize the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality to start doing research on comparative effectiveness at the Department of Health and Human Services. Eight reports have been released and dozens more are underway.

One of the things they're finding is a lot of these so-called "blockbuster drugs" are no more effective, and sometimes less effective, in treating conditions than old standbys that have been around for a long time, and don't have all the advertising of, you know, people running through fields of wildflowers that convince patients that they need the new drug, as opposed to the one that has worked well. Too often, doctors and patients don't know which medical interventions are most effective — and which have little benefit. A recent study by Dartmouth researchers shows that close to one third of the \$2 trillion we spend goes to care that is duplicative and fails to improve patient health — in fact, the researchers posited that it may even make health worse. More care is not necessarily better care, and inefficient care may do more harm than good.

My plan will provide incentives to encourage doctors to keep up with the research and prescribe the most effective treatments. The University of Michigan and Pitney Bowes are doing just that — linking out of pocket drug costs to clinical benefit for patients. The more effective the medication, the less that patient has to pay for the drug. As of 2005, Pitney Bowes had saved more than \$3.5 million dollars using this method.

Another innovative idea is the Geisinger Health System's suggestion of a medical warranty: it charges a flat fee for surgery that includes 90 days of follow-up treatment. Currently, there is little incentive to seek out the most effective treatments, because if a treatment regimen or surgery doesn't work, the patient simply returns for more

costly treatments. The warranty is an incentive to do it right the first time, because there is no extra billing if more care is needed. Geisinger doctors have identified 40 essential steps to bypass surgery, and they've established procedures to ensure they're always followed.

The Best Practices Institute will empower with information and evidence those who have to make the decisions. It will not only be beneficial with respect to pharmaceuticals but also medical devices and even practice protocols and I think that it will give a lot of doctor's ammunition against insurance companies, drug companies and even sometimes patients about what works better than other options. The Oregon drug effectiveness review founded by Governor John Kitzhaber in 1999, is a collaborative partnership between states and non-profits that conducts reviews of widely used drugs to promote the most effective ones. North Carolina has used such reviews to educate providers, saving the state an estimated \$80 million in 2003 alone. Now I can't extrapolate how much we would save as a nation, but I believe it would obviously be in the billions.

Sixth, if we want to get health care costs under control, we need to get prescription drug costs under control. We know that Americans pay the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs that we have already in most instances funded the research on funded the clinical trials on, done the FDA evaluation of, then we put it into the market place and we end up still paying the highest prices. Studies have shown that brand drug prices are 35 to 55 percent higher in the U.S., and top-selling medications a full 2.3 times more expensive compared to other industrialized countries. Over the past decade, prescription drugs accounted for 15 percent of the total increase in health spending, even though they account for only about 10 percent of what other countries spend.

Let's start getting drug costs under control by allowing Medicare to negotiate for lower drug prices and to lower those costs for everyone. We also have to crack down on the overpayments in Medicare to private plans. These Private plan payment rates are around 12 percent higher than Medicare traditionally pays to treat the same beneficiaries. Reducing these overpayments could save Medicare \$10 to \$20 billion dollars a year. Seniors don't want to lose the benefits they have under these plans, but under my reforms they would not. We should also allow the importation of drugs from certain countries to lower costs and let's remove barriers to generic competition. While 53 percent of all prescriptions are generic medicines, they account for only 12 percent of total pharmaceutical costs. A one percent increase in the use of generics could yield \$4 billion dollars in government savings.

We need to break the monopoly that biotech pharmaceutical companies have over their products, which can cost us so much money. Most Americans have no idea that right now, under current law and FDA practice, generic biopharmaceuticals are precluded from going to the market. And businesses and consumers are paying for that. You know the cost differential between generic and non-generic drugs is astounding: in 2003, the average cost for a one-day supply of non-generic drugs was \$45.00, but only \$1.66 for generic drugs.

There is bipartisan support for providing the long overdue authority for the FDA to approve generic products that are the biologics. Already, an unprecedented coalition of patients' groups, labor, business, pharmacists, governors and a number of forward looking biotech companies have united to support legislation that I introduced with Senator Charles Schumer and Congressman Henry Waxman. Providing such competition is projected to save \$5 to \$7 billion dollars a year in savings to businesses and consumers.

The final point that I would make today about lowering costs is to reduce costs through medical malpractice reform. While some have overstated the role that malpractice insurance plays in the health care crisis, I think we can all agree that we need reform that works for doctors and patients alike.

I have offered one solution that has been used successfully at the University of Michigan Hospital system. It's called the National Medical Error Disclosure and Compensation (MEDiC) Act as I have borrowed it from the University of Michigan to put it into law. It's a novel approach to improving patient safety and the quality of health care while protecting patients' rights, reducing medical errors and lowering malpractice costs. This Act

would encourage physicians, hospitals and health systems to provide liability protections for physicians who disclose medical errors to patients and offer to enter into negotiations for fair compensation. At the University of Michigan, these policies have already resulted in greater patient trust and satisfaction, more patients being compensated for injuries, fewer malpractice suits, significantly reduced administrative costs and between one and three million dollars in litigation cost savings.

The rise in malpractice rates has spurred states like Texas and Nevada to allow doctors to create their own risk retention companies as an alternative to traditional liability insurance. Because a large percentage of actual malpractice is committed by a very small percentage of doctors who won't be included in insurance groups that other doctors control, thereby lowering malpractice rates for all.

Now as I have made clear in these seven points, we know that if we continue on our present path, health care costs in the U.S. will double within a decade, we know that we will spend increasing amounts and we aren't sure, and I think it is fair to say we know, that we won't improve quality and outcome.

Now how will this actually work? Well it has to be implemented over time according again to Rand who has been studying healthcare costs intensely now for several years. We could save \$147 billion dollars from the information technology changes I have recommended, \$20 to \$30 billion dollars in administrative savings every year, \$25 billion in savings from overpayments for pharmaceuticals and health plans, and there are billions more in countless other inefficiencies that could be rung out of our often wasteful health care system. We also will have to move toward a system where it is doctor-patient centered and consumer driven if we expect to really get the results that we need. Now there is no question that at least \$120 billion dollars in projected savings that I have included in my plan are not only reasonable, but extremely conservative.

Now I know that a lot of this is kind of overly wonky, which is why I am glad there is an audience of people here today who really understand a lot of these issues, but I imagine, you know, many people wonder what all this adds up to. Well the Business Roundtable has recently estimated that just with a system that used information technology, the typical family would save \$2,200 dollars, and I think that is a pretty impressive outcome for us doing what we need to be doing anyway. The money we save from the waste we eliminate and the way we change how we care for people should be used to help finance coverage for the 45 million Americans who have no insurance. Also, when you insure everyone, it will maximize the impact of the prevention programs I have recommended — with earlier care as opposed to emergency care — as well as cutting administrative costs.

Our present system is outdated, ineffective, and unsustainable. We know how to do this. Many of you in this audience could give me ten more suggestions that we need to do immediately. Well the key is to develop the political will to make it happen through a coalition of those who are most directly affected. The people who deliver care, our doctors, our nurses our pharmacists and others, the people who pay for care, our business and our government and the people who receive care which is all the rest of us, because I know very well that every one of these recommendations will run into considerable opposition from forces that do not want change in our system.

So I believe that equally importantly to having a plan, we have to have a political consensus and that is what I am trying to develop as I talk about healthcare and engage in a conversation with the American people because I think Americans are ready for change. They are ready for a healthcare system that produces better results at lower cost and ends the shame of us not covering 45 million plus of our fellow Americans.

I look forward to your ideas about how we can pursue these goals and I hope you will join with me in being part of this broad based, national coalition that will not only talk about and demand change, but work to make sure, starting in 2009, that our political system actually delivers the changes we all know our healthcare system desperately needs. Thank you all very much.

## ***U.S. v. Timothy James McVeigh, Sentencing (August 14, 1997)***

*On April 19, 1995, Timothy McVeigh set off a bomb in a rented truck next to Oklahoma City's federal building. This bomb would kill 169 men, women, and children. He committed this crime on the anniversary of the Waco tragedy, sharing in their belief of the evils of an evil government. Below are excerpts from his sentencing.*

---

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO  
Criminal Action No. 96-CR-68  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, vs. TIMOTHY JAMES McVEIGH, Defendant.

(Sentencing Hearing)

THE DEFENDANT: If the Court please, I wish to use the words of Justice Brandeis dissenting in *Olmstead* to speak for me. He wrote, "Our Government is the potent, the omnipresent teacher. For good or for ill, it teaches the whole people by its example."

That's all I have.

THE COURT: All right.

The rule also provides for counsel for the Government to have an opportunity to speak. Mr. Hartzler, do you have any statement to make?

MR. HARTZLER: Thank you, your Honor. We do not.

THE COURT: Then I'm prepared for the imposition of sentence. Mr. McVeigh, will you please come forward with counsel to the lectern.

Timothy James McVeigh, pursuant to the jury verdict returned on June 2, 1997, finding you guilty on all 11 counts of the indictment, the defendant is adjudged guilty of each of the following offenses: A conspiracy to use a weapon of mass destruction as charged in Count One, the use of a weapon of mass destruction as charged in Count Two, destruction by explosive as charged in Count Three, and first degree murder as charged in Counts Four through Eleven.

Pursuant to the Federal Death Penalty Act of 1994, appearing in 18 United States Code Sections 3591 to 3596 and the special findings of the jury returned on June 13, 1997, and the jury's unanimous vote recommending that the defendant shall be sentenced to death, it is the judgment of the Court that the defendant, Timothy James McVeigh, is sentenced to death on each of the 11 counts of the indictment.

Pursuant to the provisions of 18 United States Code Section 3596, it is ordered that the defendant is committed to the custody of the Attorney General of the United States until exhaustion of the procedures for appeal of the judgment of conviction and review of the sentence. When the sentence is to be implemented, the Attorney General shall release defendant to the custody of a United States marshal, who shall supervise implementation of the sentence in the manner prescribed by the law of the State of Colorado.

### **Entering a New Time, 2001-2013**

## ***Barack H. Obama, A More Perfect Union (2008)***

---

*On March 18, 2008, during the presidential campaign, Barack Obama gave the following speech to an audience at the National Constitution Center in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. In his speech, Obama responded to criticism of controversial remarks made by the Reverend Jeremiah Wright. Wright was his former pastor and active in Obama's campaign. The speech's title, from the Preamble to the United States Constitution, addressed*



"We the people, in order to form a more perfect union."

Two hundred and twenty one years ago, in a hall that still stands across the street, a group of men gathered and, with these simple words, launched America's improbable experiment in democracy. Farmers and scholars; statesmen and patriots who had traveled across an ocean to escape tyranny and persecution finally made real their declaration of independence at a Philadelphia convention that lasted through the spring of 1787.

The document they produced was eventually signed but ultimately unfinished. It was stained by this nation's original sin of slavery, a question that divided the colonies and brought the convention to a stalemate until the founders chose to allow the slave trade to continue for at least twenty more years, and to leave any final resolution to future generations.

Of course, the answer to the slavery question was already embedded within our Constitution - a Constitution that had at its very core the ideal of equal citizenship under the law; a Constitution that promised its people liberty, and justice, and a union that could be and should be perfected over time.

And yet words on a parchment would not be enough to deliver slaves from bondage, or provide men and women of every color and creed their full rights and obligations as citizens of the United States. What would be needed were Americans in successive generations who were willing to do their part - through protests and struggle, on the streets and in the courts, through a civil war and civil disobedience and always at great risk - to narrow that gap between the promise of our ideals and the reality of their time.

This was one of the tasks we set forth at the beginning of this campaign - to continue the long march of those who came before us, a march for a more just, more equal, more free, more caring and more prosperous America. I chose to run for the presidency at this moment in history because I believe deeply that we cannot solve the challenges of our time unless we solve them together - unless we perfect our union by understanding that we may have different stories, but we hold common hopes; that we may not look the same and we may not have come from the same place, but we all want to move in the same direction - towards a better future for our children and our grandchildren.

This belief comes from my unyielding faith in the decency and generosity of the American people. But it also comes from my own American story.

I am the son of a black man from Kenya and a white woman from Kansas. I was raised with the help of a white grandfather who survived a Depression to serve in Patton's Army during World War II and a white grandmother who worked on a bomber assembly line at Fort Leavenworth while he was overseas. I've gone to some of the best schools in America and lived in one of the world's poorest nations. I am married to a black American who carries within her the blood of slaves and slaveowners - an inheritance we pass on to our two precious daughters. I have brothers, sisters, nieces, nephews, uncles and cousins, of every race and every hue, scattered across three continents, and for as long as I live, I will never forget that in no other country on Earth is my story even possible.

It's a story that hasn't made me the most conventional candidate. But it is a story that has seared into my genetic makeup the idea that this nation is more than the sum of its parts - that out of many, we are truly one.

Throughout the first year of this campaign, against all predictions to the contrary, we saw how hungry the American people were for this message of unity. Despite the temptation to view my candidacy through a purely racial lens, we won commanding victories in states with some of the whitest populations in the country. In

South Carolina, where the Confederate Flag still flies, we built a powerful coalition of African Americans and white Americans.

This is not to say that race has not been an issue in the campaign. At various stages in the campaign, some commentators have deemed me either "too black" or "not black enough." We saw racial tensions bubble to the surface during the week before the South Carolina primary. The press has scoured every exit poll for the latest evidence of racial polarization, not just in terms of white and black, but black and brown as well.

And yet, it has only been in the last couple of weeks that the discussion of race in this campaign has taken a particularly divisive turn.

On one end of the spectrum, we've heard the implication that my candidacy is somehow an exercise in affirmative action; that it's based solely on the desire of wide-eyed liberals to purchase racial reconciliation on the cheap. On the other end, we've heard my former pastor, Reverend Jeremiah Wright, use incendiary language to express views that have the potential not only to widen the racial divide, but views that denigrate both the greatness and the goodness of our nation; that rightly offend white and black alike.

I have already condemned, in unequivocal terms, the statements of Reverend Wright that have caused such controversy. For some, nagging questions remain. Did I know him to be an occasionally fierce critic of American domestic and foreign policy? Of course. Did I ever hear him make remarks that could be considered controversial while I sat in church? Yes. Did I strongly disagree with many of his political views? Absolutely - just as I'm sure many of you have heard remarks from your pastors, priests, or rabbis with which you strongly disagreed.

But the remarks that have caused this recent firestorm weren't simply controversial. They weren't simply a religious leader's effort to speak out against perceived injustice. Instead, they expressed a profoundly distorted view of this country - a view that sees white racism as endemic, and that elevates what is wrong with America above all that we know is right with America; a view that sees the conflicts in the Middle East as rooted primarily in the actions of stalwart allies like Israel, instead of emanating from the perverse and hateful ideologies of radical Islam.

As such, Reverend Wright's comments were not only wrong but divisive, divisive at a time when we need unity; racially charged at a time when we need to come together to solve a set of monumental problems - two wars, a terrorist threat, a falling economy, a chronic health care crisis and potentially devastating climate change; problems that are neither black or white or Latino or Asian, but rather problems that confront us all.

Given my background, my politics, and my professed values and ideals, there will no doubt be those for whom my statements of condemnation are not enough. Why associate myself with Reverend Wright in the first place, they may ask? Why not join another church? And I confess that if all that I knew of Reverend Wright were the snippets of those sermons that have run in an endless loop on the television and You Tube, or if Trinity United Church of Christ conformed to the caricatures being peddled by some commentators, there is no doubt that I would react in much the same way

But the truth is, that isn't all that I know of the man. The man I met more than twenty years ago is a man who helped introduce me to my Christian faith, a man who spoke to me about our obligations to love one another; to care for the sick and lift up the poor. He is a man who served his country as a U.S. Marine; who has studied and lectured at some of the finest universities and seminaries in the country, and who for over thirty years led a church that serves the community by doing God's work here on Earth - by housing the homeless, ministering to the needy, providing day care services and scholarships and prison ministries, and reaching out to those suffering from HIV/AIDS.

In my first book, *Dreams From My Father*, I described the experience of my first service at Trinity:

"People began to shout, to rise from their seats and clap and cry out, a forceful wind carrying the reverend's voice up into the rafters....And in that single note - hope! - I heard something else; at the foot of that cross, inside the thousands of churches across the city, I imagined the stories of ordinary black people merging with the stories of David and Goliath, Moses and Pharaoh, the Christians in the lion's den, Ezekiel's field of dry bones. Those stories - of survival, and freedom, and hope - became our story, my story; the blood that had spilled was our blood, the tears our tears; until this black church, on this bright day, seemed once more a vessel carrying the story of a people into future generations and into a larger world. Our trials and triumphs became at once unique and universal, black and more than black; in chronicling our journey, the stories and songs gave us a means to reclaim memories that we didn't need to feel shame about...memories that all people might study and cherish - and with which we could start to rebuild."

That has been my experience at Trinity. Like other predominantly black churches across the country, Trinity embodies the black community in its entirety - the doctor and the welfare mom, the model student and the former gang-banger. Like other black churches, Trinity's services are full of raucous laughter and sometimes bawdy humor. They are full of dancing, clapping, screaming and shouting that may seem jarring to the untrained ear. The church contains in full the kindness and cruelty, the fierce intelligence and the shocking ignorance, the struggles and successes, the love and yes, the bitterness and bias that make up the black experience in America.

And this helps explain, perhaps, my relationship with Reverend Wright. As imperfect as he may be, he has been like family to me. He strengthened my faith, officiated my wedding, and baptized my children. Not once in my conversations with him have I heard him talk about any ethnic group in derogatory terms, or treat whites with whom he interacted with anything but courtesy and respect. He contains within him the contradictions - the good and the bad - of the community that he has served diligently for so many years.

I can no more disown him than I can disown the black community. I can no more disown him than I can my white grandmother - a woman who helped raise me, a woman who sacrificed again and again for me, a woman who loves me as much as she loves anything in this world, but a woman who once confessed her fear of black men who passed by her on the street, and who on more than one occasion has uttered racial or ethnic stereotypes that made me cringe.

These people are a part of me. And they are a part of America, this country that I love.

Some will see this as an attempt to justify or excuse comments that are simply inexcusable. I can assure you it is not. I suppose the politically safe thing would be to move on from this episode and just hope that it fades into the woodwork. We can dismiss Reverend Wright as a crank or a demagogue, just as some have dismissed Geraldine Ferraro, in the aftermath of her recent statements, as harboring some deep-seated racial bias.

But race is an issue that I believe this nation cannot afford to ignore right now. We would be making the same mistake that Reverend Wright made in his offending sermons about America - to simplify and stereotype and amplify the negative to the point that it distorts reality.

The fact is that the comments that have been made and the issues that have surfaced over the last few weeks reflect the complexities of race in this country that we've never really worked through - a part of our union that we have yet to perfect. And if we walk away now, if we simply retreat into our respective corners, we will never be able to come together and solve challenges like health care, or education, or the need to find good jobs for every American.

Understanding this reality requires a reminder of how we arrived at this point. As William Faulkner once wrote,

"The past isn't dead and buried. In fact, it isn't even past." We do not need to recite here the history of racial injustice in this country. But we do need to remind ourselves that so many of the disparities that exist in the African-American community today can be directly traced to inequalities passed on from an earlier generation that suffered under the brutal legacy of slavery and Jim Crow.

Segregated schools were, and are, inferior schools; we still haven't fixed them, fifty years after *Brown v. Board of Education*, and the inferior education they provided, then and now, helps explain the pervasive achievement gap between today's black and white students.

Legalized discrimination - where blacks were prevented, often through violence, from owning property, or loans were not granted to African-American business owners, or black homeowners could not access FHA mortgages, or blacks were excluded from unions, or the police force, or fire departments - meant that black families could not amass any meaningful wealth to bequeath to future generations. That history helps explain the wealth and income gap between black and white, and the concentrated pockets of poverty that persists in so many of today's urban and rural communities.

A lack of economic opportunity among black men, and the shame and frustration that came from not being able to provide for one's family, contributed to the erosion of black families - a problem that welfare policies for many years may have worsened. And the lack of basic services in so many urban black neighborhoods - parks for kids to play in, police walking the beat, regular garbage pick-up and building code enforcement - all helped create a cycle of violence, blight and neglect that continue to haunt us.

This is the reality in which Reverend Wright and other African-Americans of his generation grew up. They came of age in the late fifties and early sixties, a time when segregation was still the law of the land and opportunity was systematically constricted. What's remarkable is not how many failed in the face of discrimination, but rather how many men and women overcame the odds; how many were able to make a way out of no way for those like me who would come after them.

But for all those who scratched and clawed their way to get a piece of the American Dream, there were many who didn't make it - those who were ultimately defeated, in one way or another, by discrimination. That legacy of defeat was passed on to future generations - those young men and increasingly young women who we see standing on street corners or languishing in our prisons, without hope or prospects for the future. Even for those blacks who did make it, questions of race, and racism, continue to define their worldview in fundamental ways. For the men and women of Reverend Wright's generation, the memories of humiliation and doubt and fear have not gone away; nor has the anger and the bitterness of those years. That anger may not get expressed in public, in front of white co-workers or white friends. But it does find voice in the barbershop or around the kitchen table. At times, that anger is exploited by politicians, to gin up votes along racial lines, or to make up for a politician's own failings.

And occasionally it finds voice in the church on Sunday morning, in the pulpit and in the pews. The fact that so many people are surprised to hear that anger in some of Reverend Wright's sermons simply reminds us of the old truism that the most segregated hour in American life occurs on Sunday morning. That anger is not always productive; indeed, all too often it distracts attention from solving real problems; it keeps us from squarely facing our own complicity in our condition, and prevents the African-American community from forging the alliances it needs to bring about real change. But the anger is real; it is powerful; and to simply wish it away, to condemn it without understanding its roots, only serves to widen the chasm of misunderstanding that exists between the races.

In fact, a similar anger exists within segments of the white community. Most working- and middle-class white Americans don't feel that they have been particularly privileged by their race. Their experience is the immigrant experience - as far as they're concerned, no one's handed them anything, they've built it from scratch. They've

worked hard all their lives, many times only to see their jobs shipped overseas or their pension dumped after a lifetime of labor. They are anxious about their futures, and feel their dreams slipping away; in an era of stagnant wages and global competition, opportunity comes to be seen as a zero sum game, in which your dreams come at my expense. So when they are told to bus their children to a school across town; when they hear that an African American is getting an advantage in landing a good job or a spot in a good college because of an injustice that they themselves never committed; when they're told that their fears about crime in urban neighborhoods are somehow prejudiced, resentment builds over time.

Like the anger within the black community, these resentments aren't always expressed in polite company. But they have helped shape the political landscape for at least a generation. Anger over welfare and affirmative action helped forge the Reagan Coalition. Politicians routinely exploited fears of crime for their own electoral ends. Talk show hosts and conservative commentators built entire careers unmasking bogus claims of racism while dismissing legitimate discussions of racial injustice and inequality as mere political correctness or reverse racism.

Just as black anger often proved counterproductive, so have these white resentments distracted attention from the real culprits of the middle class squeeze - a corporate culture rife with inside dealing, questionable accounting practices, and short-term greed; a Washington dominated by lobbyists and special interests; economic policies that favor the few over the many. And yet, to wish away the resentments of white Americans, to label them as misguided or even racist, without recognizing they are grounded in legitimate concerns - this too widens the racial divide, and blocks the path to understanding.

This is where we are right now. It's a racial stalemate we've been stuck in for years. Contrary to the claims of some of my critics, black and white, I have never been so naïve as to believe that we can get beyond our racial divisions in a single election cycle, or with a single candidacy - particularly a candidacy as imperfect as my own.

But I have asserted a firm conviction - a conviction rooted in my faith in God and my faith in the American people - that working together we can move beyond some of our old racial wounds, and that in fact we have no choice if we are to continue on the path of a more perfect union.

For the African-American community, that path means embracing the burdens of our past without becoming victims of our past. It means continuing to insist on a full measure of justice in every aspect of American life. But it also means binding our particular grievances - for better health care, and better schools, and better jobs - to the larger aspirations of all Americans -- the white woman struggling to break the glass ceiling, the white man whose been laid off, the immigrant trying to feed his family. And it means taking full responsibility for own lives - by demanding more from our fathers, and spending more time with our children, and reading to them, and teaching them that while they may face challenges and discrimination in their own lives, they must never succumb to despair or cynicism; they must always believe that they can write their own destiny.

Ironically, this quintessentially American - and yes, conservative - notion of self-help found frequent expression in Reverend Wright's sermons. But what my former pastor too often failed to understand is that embarking on a program of self-help also requires a belief that society can change.

The profound mistake of Reverend Wright's sermons is not that he spoke about racism in our society. It's that he spoke as if our society was static; as if no progress has been made; as if this country - a country that has made it possible for one of his own members to run for the highest office in the land and build a coalition of white and black; Latino and Asian, rich and poor, young and old -- is still irrevocably bound to a tragic past. But what we know -- what we have seen - is that America can change. That is the true genius of this nation. What we have already achieved gives us hope - the audacity to hope - for what we can and must achieve tomorrow.

In the white community, the path to a more perfect union means acknowledging that what ails the African-American community does not just exist in the minds of black people; that the legacy of discrimination - and current incidents of discrimination, while less overt than in the past - are real and must be addressed. Not just with words, but with deeds - by investing in our schools and our communities; by enforcing our civil rights laws and ensuring fairness in our criminal justice system; by providing this generation with ladders of opportunity that were unavailable for previous generations. It requires all Americans to realize that your dreams do not have to come at the expense of my dreams; that investing in the health, welfare, and education of black and brown and white children will ultimately help all of America prosper.

In the end, then, what is called for is nothing more, and nothing less, than what all the world's great religions demand - that we do unto others as we would have them do unto us. Let us be our brother's keeper, Scripture tells us. Let us be our sister's keeper. Let us find that common stake we all have in one another, and let our politics reflect that spirit as well.

For we have a choice in this country. We can accept a politics that breeds division, and conflict, and cynicism. We can tackle race only as spectacle - as we did in the OJ trial - or in the wake of tragedy, as we did in the aftermath of Katrina - or as fodder for the nightly news. We can play Reverend Wright's sermons on every channel, every day and talk about them from now until the election, and make the only question in this campaign whether or not the American people think that I somehow believe or sympathize with his most offensive words. We can pounce on some gaffe by a Hillary supporter as evidence that she's playing the race card, or we can speculate on whether white men will all flock to John McCain in the general election regardless of his policies.

We can do that.

But if we do, I can tell you that in the next election, we'll be talking about some other distraction. And then another one. And then another one. And nothing will change.

That is one option. Or, at this moment, in this election, we can come together and say, "Not this time." This time we want to talk about the crumbling schools that are stealing the future of black children and white children and Asian children and Hispanic children and Native American children. This time we want to reject the cynicism that tells us that these kids can't learn; that those kids who don't look like us are somebody else's problem. The children of America are not those kids, they are our kids, and we will not let them fall behind in a 21st century economy. Not this time.

This time we want to talk about how the lines in the Emergency Room are filled with whites and blacks and Hispanics who do not have health care; who don't have the power on their own to overcome the special interests in Washington, but who can take them on if we do it together.

This time we want to talk about the shuttered mills that once provided a decent life for men and women of every race, and the homes for sale that once belonged to Americans from every religion, every region, every walk of life. This time we want to talk about the fact that the real problem is not that someone who doesn't look like you might take your job; it's that the corporation you work for will ship it overseas for nothing more than a profit.

This time we want to talk about the men and women of every color and creed who serve together, and fight together, and bleed together under the same proud flag. We want to talk about how to bring them home from a war that never should've been authorized and never should've been waged, and we want to talk about how we'll show our patriotism by caring for them, and their families, and giving them the benefits they have earned.

I would not be running for President if I didn't believe with all my heart that this is what the vast majority of Americans want for this country. This union may never be perfect, but generation after generation has shown

that it can always be perfected. And today, whenever I find myself feeling doubtful or cynical about this possibility, what gives me the most hope is the next generation - the young people whose attitudes and beliefs and openness to change have already made history in this election.

There is one story in particular that I'd like to leave you with today - a story I told when I had the great honor of speaking on Dr. King's birthday at his home church, Ebenezer Baptist, in Atlanta.

There is a young, twenty-three year old white woman named Ashley Baia who organized for our campaign in Florence, South Carolina. She had been working to organize a mostly African-American community since the beginning of this campaign, and one day she was at a roundtable discussion where everyone went around telling their story and why they were there.

And Ashley said that when she was nine years old, her mother got cancer. And because she had to miss days of work, she was let go and lost her health care. They had to file for bankruptcy, and that's when Ashley decided that she had to do something to help her mom.

She knew that food was one of their most expensive costs, and so Ashley convinced her mother that what she really liked and really wanted to eat more than anything else was mustard and relish sandwiches. Because that was the cheapest way to eat.

She did this for a year until her mom got better, and she told everyone at the roundtable that the reason she joined our campaign was so that she could help the millions of other children in the country who want and need to help their parents too.

Now Ashley might have made a different choice. Perhaps somebody told her along the way that the source of her mother's problems were blacks who were on welfare and too lazy to work, or Hispanics who were coming into the country illegally. But she didn't. She sought out allies in her fight against injustice.

Anyway, Ashley finishes her story and then goes around the room and asks everyone else why they're supporting the campaign. They all have different stories and reasons. Many bring up a specific issue. And finally they come to this elderly black man who's been sitting there quietly the entire time. And Ashley asks him why he's there. And he does not bring up a specific issue. He does not say health care or the economy. He does not say education or the war. He does not say that he was there because of Barack Obama. He simply says to everyone in the room, "I am here because of Ashley."

"I'm here because of Ashley." By itself, that single moment of recognition between that young white girl and that old black man is not enough. It is not enough to give health care to the sick, or jobs to the jobless, or education to our children.

But it is where we start. It is where our union grows stronger. And as so many generations have come to realize over the course of the two-hundred and twenty one years since a band of patriots signed that document in Philadelphia, that is where the perfection begins.

---

## **Dirty Politics in the 2008 Election (2007)**

---

*During the 1990s and early years of the 21st century, politics in the United States have devolved into a level of filth seen only a few times in American political history. The involvement of mass media, especially media aimed specifically to support one or the other side of the political spectrum, leads to a lack of truth and a level of misinformation that misleads the American people. In the instance given below the CNN network gleefully points out the lack of responsibility of the Fox Network, much like Pulitzer joyfully attacking the integrity of a*

*falsified Hearst news report in the 1890s at the height of "yellow journalism." The target of this attack was a report that seemed to provide evidence that Senator Barack Obama, a candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination in 2007, once fell under the influence of radical Islamic terrorists in a "madrassa" or a school for Muslim children in Indonesia. NOTE: The Washington Times and its associated magazine, Insight, are considered conservative journalistic organizations. Source: CNN Report, False Report About Obama, January 23, 2007; <http://www.cnn.com/2007/POLITICS/01/22/obama.madrassa/index.html>*

---

JAKARTA, Indonesia (CNN) — Allegations that Sen. Barack Obama was educated in a radical Muslim school known as a "madrassa" are not accurate, according to CNN reporting.

*Insight Magazine*, which is owned by the same company as *The Washington Times*, reported on its Web site last week that associates of Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton, D-New York, had unearthed information the Illinois Democrat and likely presidential candidate attended a Muslim religious school known for teaching the most fundamentalist form of Islam.

Obama lived in Indonesia as a child, from 1967 to 1971, with his mother and stepfather and has acknowledged attending a Muslim school, but an aide said it was not a madrassa. (Watch video of Obama's school)

Insight attributed the information in its article to an unnamed source, who said it was discovered by "researchers connected to Senator Clinton." A spokesman for Clinton, who is also weighing a White House bid, denied that the campaign was the source of the Obama claim.

He called the story "an obvious right-wing hit job."

*Insight* stood by its story in a response posted on its Web site Monday afternoon.

The Insight article was cited several times Friday on Fox News and was also referenced by the New York Post, The Glenn Beck program on CNN Headline News and a number of political blogs. (Watch how the Obama "gossip" spread)

But reporting by CNN in Jakarta, Indonesia and Washington, D.C., shows the allegations that Obama attended a madrassa to be false. CNN dispatched Senior International Correspondent John Vause to Jakarta to investigate.

He visited the Basuki school, which Obama attended from 1969 to 1971.

"This is a public school. We don't focus on religion," Hardi Priyono, deputy headmaster of the Basuki school, told Vause. "In our daily lives, we try to respect religion, but we don't give preferential treatment."

Vause reported he saw boys and girls dressed in neat school uniforms playing outside the school, while teachers were dressed in Western-style clothes.

"I came here to Barack Obama's elementary school in Jakarta looking for what some are calling an Islamic madrassa ... like the ones that teach hate and violence in Pakistan and Afghanistan," Vause said on the "Situation Room" Monday. "I've been to those madrassas in Pakistan this school is nothing like that."

Vause also interviewed one of Obama's Basuki classmates, Bandug Winadijanto, who claims that not a lot has changed at the school since the two men were pupils. Insight reported that Obama's political opponents believed the school promoted Wahhabism, a fundamentalist form of Islam, "and are seeking to prove it."

"It's not (an) Islamic school. It's general," Winadijanto said. "There is a lot of Christians, Buddhists, also



Confucian. ... So that's a mixed school."

The Obama aide described Fox News' broadcasting of the Insight story "appallingly irresponsible."

Fox News executive Bill Shine told CNN "Reliable Sources" anchor Howard Kurtz that some of the network's hosts were simply expressing their opinions and repeatedly cited Insight as the source of the allegations.

Obama has noted in his two books, "*Dreams From My Father*" and "*The Audacity of Hope*," that he spent two years in a Muslim school and another two years in a Catholic school while living in Indonesia from age 6 to 10.

## **President Bush Addresses the Nation on the Iraq Invasion, 2003**

*On March 20, 2003 American troops and a coalition of multinational forces invaded Iraq for the stated purpose of (1) ridding Iraq of "weapons of mass destruction," (2) ending Saddam Hussein's support of terrorism, and (3) freeing the people of Iraq. The following address was given to the people of the United States by George W. Bush as the military operations began around the globe in the Middle East. This is what President Bush had to say to the American people on that night.*

*Source:*

*<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/03/20030319-17.html>*

---

THE PRESIDENT: My fellow citizens, at this hour, American and coalition forces are in the early stages of military operations to disarm Iraq, to free its people and to defend the world from grave danger.

On my orders, coalition forces have begun striking selected targets of military importance to undermine Saddam Hussein's ability to wage war. These are opening stages of what will be a broad and concerted campaign. More than 35 countries are giving crucial support -- from the use of naval and air bases, to help with intelligence and logistics, to the deployment of combat units. Every nation in this coalition has chosen to bear the duty and share the honor of serving in our common defense.

To all the men and women of the United States Armed Forces now in the Middle East, the peace of a troubled world and the hopes of an oppressed people now depend on you. That trust is well placed.

The enemies you confront will come to know your skill and bravery. The people you liberate will witness the honorable and decent spirit of the American military. In this conflict, America faces an enemy who has no regard for conventions of war or rules of morality. Saddam Hussein has placed Iraqi troops and equipment in civilian areas, attempting to use innocent men, women and children as shields for his own military -- a final atrocity against his people.

I want Americans and all the world to know that coalition forces will make every effort to spare innocent civilians from harm. A campaign on the harsh terrain of a nation as large as California

could be longer and more difficult than some predict. And helping Iraqis achieve a united, stable and free country will require our sustained commitment.

We come to Iraq with respect for its citizens, for their great civilization and for the religious faiths they practice. We have no ambition in Iraq, except to remove a threat and restore control of that country to its own people.

I know that the families of our military are praying that all those who serve will return safely and soon. Millions of Americans are praying with you for the safety of your loved ones and for the protection of the innocent. For your sacrifice, you have the gratitude and respect of the American people. And you can know that our forces will be coming home as soon as their work is done.

Our nation enters this conflict reluctantly -- yet, our purpose is sure. The people of the United States and our friends and allies will not live at the mercy of an outlaw regime that threatens the peace with weapons of mass murder. We will meet that threat now, with our Army, Air Force, Navy, Coast Guard and Marines, so that we do not have to meet it later with armies of fire fighters and police and doctors on the streets of our cities.

Now that conflict has come, the only way to limit its duration is to apply decisive force. And I assure you, this will not be a campaign of half measures, and we will accept no outcome but victory.

My fellow citizens, the dangers to our country and the world will be overcome. We will pass through this time of peril and carry on the work of peace. We will defend our freedom. We will bring freedom to others and we will prevail.

May God bless our country and all who defend her.

---

## Document Analysis

1. President Bush was addressing more than one audience in this speech. What were the separate audiences he was addressing and what message did he bring to each group?
2. To what extent and in which instances did President Bush repeat his reasons for going to war against Iraq in this speech?
3. **George W. Bush, Address to the Nation (September 11, 2001)**

---

*On September 11, 2001 a series of coordinated terrorist attacks were launched on targets within the United States including the World Trade Center in New York City, the Pentagon in Washington DC, and an unknown target of United Airlines Flight 93 whose passengers seemed to have forced a crash of their liner at a rural location in Pennsylvania. An assumed 2,973 victims died in the attacks by 19 al Qaeda trained terrorists. Confused and erroneous reports of other attacks were aired on national television during that day. The president addressed the nation that evening, as had previous presidents during the Cuban Missile Crisis, the Pearl Harbor Attack, and other national disasters.*

*Source: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010911-16.html>*

---

## THE PRESIDENT:

Good evening. Today, our fellow citizens, our way of life, our very freedom came under attack in a series of deliberate and deadly terrorist acts. The victims were in airplanes, or in their offices; secretaries, businessmen and women, military and federal workers; moms and dads, friends and neighbors. Thousands of lives were suddenly ended by evil, despicable acts of terror.

The pictures of airplanes flying into buildings, fires burning, huge structures collapsing, have filled us with disbelief, terrible sadness, and a quiet, unyielding anger. These acts of mass murder were intended to frighten our nation into chaos and retreat. But they have failed; our country is strong.

A great people has been moved to defend a great nation. Terrorist attacks can shake the foundations of our biggest buildings, but they cannot touch the foundation of America. These acts shattered steel, but they cannot dent the steel of American resolve.

America was targeted for attack because we're the brightest beacon for freedom and opportunity in the world. And no one will keep that light from shining.

Today, our nation saw evil, the very worst of human nature. And we responded with the best of America — with the daring of our rescue workers, with the caring for strangers and neighbors who came to give blood and help in any way they could.

Immediately following the first attack, I implemented our government's emergency response plans. Our military is powerful, and it's prepared. Our emergency teams are working in New York City and Washington, D.C. to help with local rescue efforts.

Our first priority is to get help to those who have been injured, and to take every precaution to protect our citizens at home and around the world from further attacks.

The functions of our government continue without interruption. Federal agencies in Washington which had to be evacuated today are reopening for essential personnel tonight, and will be open for business tomorrow. Our financial institutions remain strong, and the American economy will be open for business, as well.

The search is underway for those who are behind these evil acts. I've directed the full resources of our intelligence and law enforcement communities to find those responsible and to bring them to justice. We will make no distinction between the terrorists who committed these acts and those who harbor them.

I appreciate so very much the members of Congress who have joined me in strongly condemning these attacks. And on behalf of the American people, I thank the many world leaders who have called to offer their condolences and assistance.

America and our friends and allies join with all those who want peace and security in the world, and we stand together to win the war against terrorism. Tonight, I ask for your prayers for all those who grieve, for the children whose worlds have been shattered, for all whose sense of safety and security has been threatened. And I pray they will be comforted by a power greater than any of us, spoken through the ages in Psalm 23: "Even though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I fear no evil, for You are with me."

This is a day when all Americans from every walk of life unite in our resolve for justice and peace. America has stood down enemies before, and we will do so this time. None of us will ever forget this day. Yet, we go

forward to defend freedom and all that is good and just in our world.

Thank you. Good night, and God bless America.

## **George W. Bush, From "National Security Strategy of the United States of America" (September 2002)**

*After the devastating terrorist attacks in September 11, 2001, a main focus of President George W. Bush was national security. Below are excerpts from a strategy devised almost a year after these attacks.*

---

### I. Overview of America's International Strategy

"Our Nation's cause has always been larger than our Nation's defense. We fight, as we always fight, for a just peace—a peace that favors liberty. We will defend the peace against the threats from terrorists and tyrants. We will preserve the peace by building good relations among the great powers. And we will extend the peace by encouraging free and open societies on every continent."

President Bush  
West Point, New York  
June 1, 2002

The United States possesses unprecedented- and unequalled-strength and influence in the world. Sustained by faith in the principles of liberty, and the value of a free society, this position comes with unparalleled responsibilities, obligations, and opportunity. The great strength of this nation must be used to promote a balance of power that favors freedom.

For most of the twentieth century, the world was divided by a great struggle over ideas: destructive totalitarian visions versus freedom and equality.

That great struggle is over. The militant visions of class, nation, and race which promised utopia and delivered misery have been defeated and discredited. America is now threatened less by conquering states than we are by failing ones. We are menaced less by fleets and armies than by catastrophic technologies in the hands of the embittered few. We must defeat these threats to our Nation, allies, and friends.

This is also a time of opportunity for America. We will work to translate this moment of influence into decades of peace, prosperity, and liberty. The U.S. national security strategy will be based on a distinctly American internationalism that reflects the union of our values and our national interests. The aim of this strategy is to help make the world not just safer but better. Our goals on the path to progress are clear: political and economic freedom, peaceful relations with other states, and respect for human dignity.

And this path is not America's alone. It is open to all. To achieve these goals, the United States will:

- champion aspirations for human dignity;
- strengthen alliances to defeat global terrorism and work to prevent attacks against us and our friends;
- work with others to defuse regional conflicts;
- prevent our enemies from threatening us, our allies, and our friends, with weapons of mass destruction;
- ignite a new era of global economic growth through free markets and free trade;
- expand the circle of development by opening societies and building the infrastructure of democracy;
- develop agendas for cooperative action with other main centers of global power; and
- transform America's national security institutions to meet the challenges and opportunities of the twenty-first century.

## **"America Enters a New Century with Terror", N.R. Kleinfield, *The New York Times*, 2001**

*The destruction of New York City's World Trade Center Towers on September 11, 2001, shocked the nation and*

*the world. That day, two hijacked airplanes purposely slammed into the two towers, a third plane struck the Pentagon, and a fourth crashed into the Pennsylvania countryside. Within hours, all commercial aviation had ground to a halt. The devastation in New York City is detailed by New York Times reporter N. R. Kleinfield in a September 12 article.*

---

SOURCE: *The New York Times*, September 12, 2001.

---

## U.S. ATTACKED; HIJACKED JETS DESTROY TWIN TOWERS AND HIT PENTAGON IN DAY OF TERROR

By N. R. KLEINFELD

It kept getting worse.

The horror arrived in episodic bursts of chilling disbelief, signified first by trembling floors, sharp eruptions, cracked windows. There was the actual unfathomable realization of a gaping, flaming hole in first one of the tall towers, and then the same thing all over again in its twin. There was the merciless sight of bodies helplessly tumbling out, some of them in flames.

Finally, the mighty towers themselves were reduced to nothing. Dense plumes of smoke raced through the downtown avenues, coursing between the buildings, shaped like tornadoes on their sides.

Every sound was cause for alarm. A plane appeared overhead. Was another one coming? No, it was a fighter jet. But was it friend or enemy? People scrambled for their lives, but they didn't know where to go. Should they go north, south, east, west? Stay outside, go indoors? People hid beneath cars and each other. Some contemplated jumping into the river.

For those trying to flee the very epicenter of the collapsing World Trade Center towers, the most horrid thought of all finally dawned on them: nowhere was safe.

For several panic-stricken hours yesterday morning, people in Lower Manhattan witnessed the inexpressible, the incomprehensible, the unthinkable. "I don't know what the gates of hell look like, but it's got to be like this," said John Maloney, a security director for an Internet firm in the trade center.

"I'm a combat veteran, Vietnam, and I never saw anything like this."

The first warnings were small ones. Blocks away, Jim Farmer, a film composer, was having breakfast at a small restaurant on West Broadway. He heard the sound of a jet. An odd sound—too loud, it seemed, to be normal. Then he noticed: "All the pigeons in the street flew up."

It was the people outside, on the sidewalk, who saw the beginning. At 8:45, David Blackford was walking toward work in a downtown building. He heard a jet engine and glanced up. "I saw this plane screaming overhead," he said. "I thought it was too low. I thought it wasn't going to clear the tower."

Within moments, his fears were confirmed. The plane slammed into the north face of 1 World Trade Center. As he watched, he said, "You could see the concussion move up the building."

"It was a large plane flying low," said Robert Pachino, another witness. "There was no engine trouble. He didn't try to maneuver. This plane was on a mission."

Dark spots fell from the sides of the buildings, and at first it wasn't clear what they were. Sarah Sampino, who worked across the street, noticed black smoke outside and went to the window. "We saw bodies flying out of the windows," she said. "It was the 85th floor. I used to work on that floor."

James Wang, 21, a photography student snapping pictures of people doing tai chi at a nearby park, looked up and saw people high in the north tower. They seemed like tiny figurines, and he didn't know if they were awaiting rescue or merely looking out. "They were standing up there," he said. "And they jumped. One woman, her dress was billowing out."

Inside the towers, people felt it without knowing what it was. At about 15 minutes to 9, Anne Prosser, 29, rode the elevator to the 90th floor of Tower 1, where her global banking office was. As the doors

opened, she heard what seemed like an explosion. She didn't know it, but the first plane had just hit several floors above her.

"I got thrown to the ground before I got to our suite," she said. "I crawled inside. Not everybody was at work." She said she tried to leave but there was so much debris in the air she couldn't breathe. Port Authority rescuers finally steered her to a stairway.

Tim Lingenfelder, 36, an office manager at a small investment banking firm, was sitting before his computer terminal on the 52nd floor of Tower 1. He had just sent an e-mail to his sister in Minnesota. Nothing special—just how was she and what he had had for breakfast.

The windows rattled. He heard a loud noise. The entire building shook. He looked up. Outside the windows, he noticed rubble falling, and he thought, "That can't be from here."

Only two others were at work, a father and son who were both bond traders. They said they had better get out. They hurried to the stairs and, along with flocks of others, began their descent.

"When I got to the 18th floor, my cell phone rang," Mr. Lingenfelder said. "It was my sister. She said a plane had hit and to get out now."

On the 32nd floor, the entourage was stuck for about 20 minutes because of smoke. Everyone ducked into offices on the floor to catch their breath. Mr. Lingenfelder peered out the window and saw a body lying on the roof of the hotel.

They returned to the stairs and made it out onto the plaza. Rubble and debris was all around. On the street there was endless paper and unmatched shoes.

John Cerqueira, 22, and Mike Ben Fanter, 36, were working on the 81st floor of 1 World Trade Center when they felt the collision. "People were freaking out," said Mr. Fanter, a sales manager. "I tried to get them in the center of the office. About 40 people. I led them to the hall down the steps."

He continued: "We stopped on the 68th floor. I could hear people screaming. There was a woman in a wheelchair. John and I carried her down from the 68th floor to the 5th floor, where we got out. We started to see people jumping from the top of the World Trade Center."

Teresa Foxx, 37, works at an investment banking firm a block from the World Trade Center, and she had dropped off her 15-month-old daughter, Trinity, at the Discovery Learning Center on the plaza level of 5 World Trade Center, the building adjacent to the two towers. While she was in her office, Ms. Foxx heard the blast and immediately knew it was a bomb. "Ever since I enrolled her in the World Trade Center, I keep thinking about the bombing that they had there," she said.

She grabbed her purse and went outside and began running toward the daycare center. Other people were speeding toward her, crying and screaming. She was crying herself. She had to get her daughter. By the time she got to the center, the children had been evacuated several blocks away. She hurried over there and found her daughter. "I just grabbed her and held her," she said. "I was still crying, the other parents were still crying, but we all got our children."

When she got home, Ms. Foxx told her husband, "Now I understand why people run into burning buildings."

Within about 15 minutes of the first crash, the second plane struck the neighboring tower.

People in the street panicked and ran. Some tripped, fell, got knocked down, were pulled up. People lost their keys, their phones, their handbags, their shoes.

Brianne Woods, a student at Pace University, was walking to class, and as she passed a Burger King not a hundred feet from the trade center she heard a blast and felt the ground shake. She ran to a bank, where people were banging on the glass, breaking it, trying to get inside. "I saw a guy bleeding from the head right by the bank," she said. "People were getting stomped on under the crowd. I saw a lady with no shoes, her feet were bleeding. I was probably in there for about 10 minutes, and I was hysterical."

Her brother worked in the World Trade Center and she didn't know if he was in there. She learned later that he had not gone to work.

She happened to have her cat, Oliver, with her, and she began wandering around, clutching her cat carrier, dazed. "I saw two people jump out," she said. "It was horrible. I felt I was in a bad nightmare."

Then a calm set in again. For blocks around, all the way up to 14th Street, the sidewalks were a mass of people, eerily quiet, for the incomprehension had struck them mute. As emergency vehicles, sirens

blaring, sped downtown, people stood and gaped at the towers with holes in them. Many people were steadily inching downtown, not imagining anything worse was to come.

Marilyn Mulcahy, 31, had a business appointment at 9 at an office on Broadway a few blocks from the World Trade Center. She got off the subway at Chambers and Church Streets. She saw what she believed were pieces of a plane engine on the sidewalk, police officers running tape around it. She saw the holes in the towers and was dumbstruck.

Reason dictated caution, to get out of the area, but she was overcome with shock. Almost unknowingly, she walked to the office where her appointment was. Everyone had left. Even so, she took the time to scribble a note that she had been there and would call later.

Back on the street, fear caught up with her. She changed out of her heels into flat shoes she had in her bag and ran uptown.

On the corner of Vesey and Church Streets, across from the Borders Books and Music store in the corner of the trade center, a small-boned woman, her hair caked with blood, was sitting on the curb, shaking uncontrollably. One eye was clouded over. A man in a business suit was lying on a stretcher, being loaded into an ambulance. Emergency workers came to comfort the woman. Five feet away, another rescue worker crouched down next to a heavysset woman who was breathing through an inhaler and hugged her.

Some Trade Center workers blessed their luck at being late for work. Kathleen Dendy, 50, had gotten her hair cut and so never got to her office at her usual 8:30. She worked on the 99th floor. Rajesh Trivedi, 40, a computer programmer, normally reported at 7, but he had to drop his son off at school and so didn't get in. He worked on the 80th floor.

A plane was heard overhead and people looked up. Another one, they thought. "No, it's a fighter," someone said. "Ours."

"Are you sure?" a woman asked.

Many people were busy on cell phones, trying to reach friends and relatives they knew in the buildings or to alert their own loved ones that they were all right. But the circuits overloaded. Fear mounted.

And then it got even worse.

Police officers warned people in the vicinity to move north, that the buildings could fall, but most people found that unthinkable. They stayed put or gravitated closer.

Abruptly, there was an ear-splitting noise. The south tower shook, seemed to list in one direction and then began to come down, imploding upon itself.

"It looked like a demolition," said Andy Pollock.

"It started exploding," said Ross Milanytch, 57, who works at nearby Chase Manhattan Bank. "It was about the 70th floor. And each second another floor exploded out for about eight floors, before the cloud obscured it all."

Seth Bower was on Broadway when the force of the collapse knocked him over onto other people.

Bodies fell on top of him—not all of them, he thought, alive.

A plume of smoke reminiscent of an atomic bomb rose upward and then descended to street level and sped uptown. People began running, chased by the smoke. The air rained white ash and plaster dust, coating people until they looked ghostlike.

Some people were screaming, and many were in shock. "Don't breathe the air," people shouted. "It could be toxic." People held their breath or covered their faces as best they could with cloths or their shirts.

Lisle Taylor, 26, a recruiter with Goldman, Sachs, had just gotten out of a nearby subway stop and saw hundreds of pieces of paper in the air. She thought it was a marketing campaign. Then she looked up and saw the tower collapsing. "A woman grabbed my hand," she said. "She was saying the Lord's Prayer." For several blocks, everything was black. People found their eyes burned. Many wondered if they were seeing the very face of death.

Michael Clinch, a security officer for an Internet company, left his office soon after the first plane struck and was standing on Broadway talking to a police officer when the first tower fell. He saw a woman running, grabbed her and pulled her under a sport utility vehicle with him. "We got under the truck and waited until it got light again," he said. "There were cars just blowing up. They were trying to get

equipment off this emergency truck and get it into a building and all these cars just blew up. One would blow up and set off the next one. It got so bad we just couldn't do anything any more and we had to get out of there."

Ten or so blocks north of the towers, the smoke had been outrun and it began to dissipate into the air. People stopped, turned and looked downtown. As the air cleared, an unthinkable site presented itself: empty space where a 110-story tower had been.

People gasped. They trembled. They sobbed.

"It can't be," an elderly woman said. "It just can't be. Where did it go? Oh, lord, where did it go?"

Many of the onlookers stayed put, frozen in horror. Slowly, the next thought crept into their consciousness: The other tower would come down too.

Several people voiced the thought: "Get out of here, the other tower's going to fall."

People started walking briskly north until the premonition became real—another horrifying eruption, as one floor after another seemed to detonate. Another giant cloud, soot, smoke streaming through the avenues. Again, people ran.

Many of them stopped at Canal Street and watched the smoke dissolve. People cried at what they saw: a crystalline sky with nothing in it.

"Oh my God," Tim Lingenfelder said, "there's nothing there."

That was when he lost it and began to cry.

People stood, numb, transfixed by what had to be a mirage. "All that were left of the buildings that you could see were the steel girders in like a triangular sail shape," said Ross Milanytch. "The dust was about an inch and a half thick on the ground."

Onlookers gathered in clumps and tried to understand. People with cars opened the doors and turned on the radios, and knots of people leaned close to hear what was happening. The news came across of of the plane at the Pentagon, the plane in Pittsburgh.

"It's like Pearl Harbor," said a middle-aged man at a small parking lot on Canal Street. "It's Pearl Harbor. It's war."

"It's sickos," someone else said. "Sickos."

"This is America," a man said. "How can it happen in America? How?"

A young man came around imploring people to report to St. Vincent's Manhattan Hospital to donate blood.

Lines five, eight deep developed at pay phones, but many of the phones didn't work. Most of the downtown businesses were closed. People borrowed cell phones, but the heavy phone traffic made communicating hard if not impossible. Countless people spent hours not knowing where a wife, a husband or a child was.

For hours, people lingered, uncertain where to go or what to do in a no longer plausible world. Some felt compelled to leave Manhattan, taking ferries to New Jersey. A man holding his weeping wife headed toward the Manhattan bridge, telling her, "Let's walk over the bridge to Brooklyn. They can't hurt us in Brooklyn."

Late in the afternoon, hundreds of rescue workers remained outside where the trade towers once loomed, watching the stubs of the buildings continue to burn into infinity. Several stories still stood, but it was hard to judge how many. Above the second story was nothing but an intense orange glow.

"It's eerie," said Monet Harris, 22, a transit worker. "You always look for those two buildings. You always know where you are when you see those two buildings. And now they're gone."

1. *What events do the witnesses of the World Trade Center catastrophe remember most vividly?*
2. *What do most survivors' actions tell about the way people react in such a crisis?*

## **Nancy Pelosi, Inaugural Address (2007)**

---

*The ascension of Nancy Pelosi to the position of Speak of the House of Representatives represented a double political change in 2007 - the positioning of a woman as the top leader of the House and a Democratic takeover*



*of both houses of Congress since the middle of the first Clinton administration. Matching this to the positioning of Hillary Clinton as a serious candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination in 2008 and the movement of Condoleezza Rice into the position of Secretary of State and it would look like the glass ceiling for women in Washington D.C. might be permanently smashed. This is what Speaker Pelosi had to say in her inaugural address to the House: Source: Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi, Inaugural Address, January 4, 2007; <http://www.house.gov/pelosi/press/releases/Jan07/FloorSpeech.html>*

---

Thank you my colleagues, thank you leader (John) Boehner (R-Ohio).

I accept this gavel in the spirit of partnership, not partisanship, and I look forward to working with you Mr. Boehner and the Republicans in the Congress on behalf of the American people.

After giving away this gavel in the last two Congress', I'm glad someone else had the honor today.

In this House, we may belong to different parties, but we serve one country. We stand united in our pride and prayers for our men and women in the armed forces. They are working together to protect America, and we, in this House, must also work together to build a future worthy of their sacrifice.

In this hour, we need and pray for the character, courage, and civility of a former member of this House — President Ford. He healed the country when it needed healing. This is another time, another war, and another trial of our American will, imagination, and spirit. Let us honor his memory, not just in eulogy, but in dialogue and trust across the aisle. Let us express our condolences and appreciation to Mrs. Ford and the entire Ford family for their decades of service to our country.

With today's convening of the 110th Congress, we begin anew. I congratulate all members of Congress on your election; I especially want to congratulate our new members of Congress. The genius of our Founders was that every two years, new members bring to this House their spirit of renewal and hope for the American people. This Congress is reinvigorated new members by your optimism, your idealism, and your commitment to our country. Let us acknowledge your families, whose support has made your leadership possible.

Each of us brings to this new Congress our shared values, our commitment to the Constitution, and our personal experience.

My path to Congress and the speakership began in Baltimore where my father was mayor. I was raised in a large family that was devoutly Catholic, deeply patriotic, very proud of our Italian American heritage, and staunchly Democratic. My parents taught us that public service was a noble calling, and that we had a responsibility to help those in need. I viewed them as working on the side of the angels and now they are with them.

I am so proud that my brother Tommy D'Alesandro, who was also a mayor of Baltimore, is here leading my D'Alesandro family today.

Forty-three years ago, Paul Pelosi and I were married. We raised our five children in San Francisco, where Paul was born and raised. I want to thank Paul and our children Nancy Corinne, Christine, Jacqueline, Paul, and Alexandra and our six magnificent grandchildren for giving me their love, support and the confidence to go from the kitchen to the Congress.

And I thank my constituents in San Francisco and to the state of California for the privilege of representing them in Congress. Saint Francis of Assisi is our city's patron saint, and his song of St. Francis is our city's anthem: 'Lord, make me a channel of thy peace; where there is darkness may we bring light, where there is

hatred, may we bring love, and where there is despair, may we bring hope.'

Hope, hope, that is what America is about and it is in that spirit that I was sent to Congress.

And today, I thank my colleagues. By electing me speaker, you have brought us closer to the ideal of equality that is America's heritage and America's hope.

This is an historic moment — and I thank the leader for acknowledging it. I thank you Leader Boehner. It is an historic moment for the Congress, and an historic moment for the women of this country. It is a moment for which we have waited over 200 years. Never losing faith, we waited through the many years of struggle to achieve our rights. But women weren't just waiting; women were working. Never losing faith, we worked to redeem the promise of America, that all men and women are created equal. For our daughters and granddaughters, today we have broken the marble ceiling. For our daughters and our granddaughters, the sky is the limit, anything is possible for them.

The election of 2006 was a call to change — not merely to change the control of Congress, but for a new direction for our country. Nowhere were the American people more clear about the need for a new direction than in the war in Iraq.

The American people rejected an open-ended obligation to a war without end. Shortly, President Bush will address the nation on the subject of Iraq. It is the responsibility of the president to articulate a new plan for Iraq that makes it clear to the Iraqis that they must defend their own streets and their own security, a plan that promotes stability in the region, and a plan that allows us to responsibly redeploy our troops.

Let us work together to be the Congress that rebuilds our military to meet the national security challenges of the 21st century.

Let us be the Congress that strongly honors our responsibility to protect the American people from terrorism.

Let us be the Congress that never forgets our commitment to our veterans and our first responders, always honoring them as the heroes that they are.

The American people also spoke clearly for a new direction here at home — they desire a new vision, a new America, built on the values that have made our country great.

Our founders envisioned a new America driven by optimism, opportunity, and strength. So confident were they in the America they were advancing, they put on the seal, the great seal of the United States, 'novus ordo seclorum' — a new order for the centuries. Centuries, they spoke of the centuries. They envisioned America as a just and good place, as a fair and efficient society, as a source of opportunity for all.

This vision has sustained us for over 200 years, and it accounts for what is best in our great nation: liberty, opportunity, and justice.

Now it is our responsibility to carry forth that vision of a new America into the 21st Century.

A new America that seizes the future and forges 21st Century solutions through discovery, creativity, and innovation, sustaining our economic leadership and ensuring our national security.

A new America with a vibrant and strengthened middle class for whom college is affordable, health care is accessible, and retirement reliable.

A new America that declares our energy independence, promotes domestic sources of renewable energy, and combats climate change.

A new America that is strong, secure, and a respected leader among the community of nations.

And the American people told us they expected us to work together for fiscal responsibility, with the highest ethical standards and with civility and bipartisanship.

After years of historic deficits, this 110th Congress will commit itself to a higher standard: pay as you go, no new deficit spending. Our new America will provide unlimited opportunity for future generations, not burden them with mountains of debt.

In order to achieve our new America for the 21st Century, we must return this House to the American people. So our first order of business is passing the toughest congressional ethics reform in history. This new Congress doesn't have two years or 200 days.

Let us join together in the first 100 hours to make this Congress the most honest and open Congress in history - 100 hours.

This openness requires respect for every voice in the Congress. As Thomas Jefferson said, 'Every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle.' My colleagues elected me to be Speaker of the House — the entire House. Respectful of the vision of our Founders, the expectations of our people, and the great challenges that we face, we have an obligation to reach beyond partisanship to work for all Americans.

Let us all stand together to move our country forward, seeking common ground for the common good.

We have made history, now let us make progress for our new America.

May God bless our work, and may God bless America.

## **When Historians ... and Economists ... Disagree**

### **Does the U.S. Economy Need More, or Less, Government Intervention?**

It is still early for historians to write about the financial crisis of 2006-2008, but economists began doing so from the beginning of the crisis. Late in 2009, two economists described the steps they thought best to avoid another crisis. For Derek Scott, even if short-term government intervention may be essential, long term economic health is assured by less government intervention or restriction. Paul Krugman, however, argues the opposite, that the government must anticipate economic turn downs and must intervene when they happen.

Derek Scott, "More Capitalism, Less Regulation," <i>Financial Times</i> , December 22, 2009	Paul Krugman, "How Did Economists Get It So Wrong?" <i>New York Times</i> , September 6, 2009.
---	--

The current crisis reflects not the failure of capitalism, but the failure of the people running capitalism to understand how it works. This is bound to affect how we get out of the mess.

In simple terms, the prevailing consensus is to view the post-2007 crisis as the result of an external shock which could not have been anticipated. The remedy is to deal with the perceived cause (bankers or regulators) embarking on large-scale fiscal and monetary stimuli until the damaged “animal spirits” of households and businesses are restored. After this, things can get back to normal and the stimuli be withdrawn.

In fact, the world’s problems did not come from an external shock but were created within the various economies ... and resulted from the failure of policymakers to understand the implications of the re-emergence of genuine capitalism, including large-scale private sector capital flows, which puts a premium on the relationship between the anticipated rates of return and the real rate of interest as the means of combining economic dynamism with overall stability...

In essence what happens is that inappropriately low rates of interest bring forward investment spending by households and business (adding to demand when it takes place) from “tomorrow” to “today” so that when “tomorrow” arrives, budget constraints reduce spending at precisely the time when “yesterday’s” investment comes on stream, adding to supply. The only way to keep things going is even lower interest rates, bringing forward even more spending, so establishing the international Ponzi game that eventually burst in 2007...

Once the bubble burst, policymakers adopted what might be termed Keynesian solutions...

Without this, any attempt to normalize interest rates risks pushing economies off the cliff again; and policymakers will either have to tolerate a protracted period of slow growth and high unemployment or run faster to stand still by bringing yet more spending forward from “tomorrow” to “today”.

All the previous periods when high levels of debt in Britain and the US have been brought under control have been associated with either increased innovation and enterprise (Britain after the Napoleonic Wars, the US after the two world wars and later after Reagan’s “supply-side” economics)

It’s hard to believe now, but not long ago economists were congratulating themselves over the success of their field... Last year, everything came apart. Few economists saw our current crisis coming, but that predictive failure was the least of the field’s problems. More important was the profession’s blindness too the very possibility of catastrophic failure in a market economy. During the golden years, financial economists came to believe that markets were inherently stable—indeed, that stocks and other assets were always priced just right. There was nothing in the prevailing models suggesting the possibility of the kind of collapse that happened last year...

The birth of economics as a discipline is usually credited to Adam Smith, who published “The Wealth of Nations” in 1776. Over the next 160 years an extensive body of economic theory was developed, whose central message was: Trust the market... This faith was, however, shattered by the Great Depression... [M]any, and eventually most, economists turned to the insights of John Maynard Keynes for both an explanation of what had happened and a solution to future depressions.

Keynes did not, despite what you may have heard, want the government to run the economy. He described his analysis in his 1936 masterwork, “The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money,” as “moderately conservative in its implications.” He wanted to fix capitalism, not replace it. But he did challenge the notion that free-market economies can function without a minder, expressing particular contempt for financial markets, which he viewed as being dominated by short-term speculation with little regard for fundamentals. And he called for active government intervention—printing more money and, if necessary, spending heavily on public works—to fight unemployment during slumps...

So here’s what I think economists have to do. First, they have to face up to the inconvenient reality that financial markets fall far short of perfection, that they are subject to extraordinary delusions and the madness of crowds. Second, they have to admit—and this will be very hard for the people who giggled and whispered over Keynes—that Keynesian economics remain the best framework we have for making sense of recessions and depressions. Third, they’ll have to do their best to incorporate the realities of finance into macroeconomics...

When it comes to the all-too-human problem of recessions and depressions, economists need to

or have been periods of technological "catch-up" (for Britain and western Continental Europe after the second world war). In both cases rates of return rose.

Today, if rates of return are to rise, it requires not necessarily capitalism "red in tooth and claw" but certainly more capitalism rather than less. The problem is that in most countries policies are moving in the opposite direction: more regulation (it's called "better" but means "more") and, from some quarters, a desire to replace Anglo-Saxon capitalism with European corporatism.

abandon the neat but wrong solution of assuming that everyone is rational and markets work perfectly. The vision that emerges as the profession rethinks its foundations may not be all that clear; it certainly won't be neat; but we can hope that it will have the virtue of being at least partly right.