



SENATOR GEORGE MITCHELL

ROSCOE LECTURE – 24<sup>TH</sup> APRIL 2008

“THE CHALLENGES FACING WESTERN DEMOCRACIES IN THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY”

Lord Lieutenant, my Lord Mayor, Lord Alton, Colin Parry, Gemma, Lee, distinguished guests and friends. Thank you for your warm reception. It's an honour for me to serve as the chairman of DLA Piper and to be here to deliver the Roscoe Foundation Lecture at Liverpool John Moores University. This is a distinguished institution of higher learning in a famous and historic city. I've had the pleasure of visiting Liverpool in the past and like all recent visitors I have been deeply impressed by the resurgence of this great city. The signs of renewal are all around us. It was in England where the industrial revolution began. It transformed the world. Now we are going through another revolution, this time of technology, information and communication and the world is changing again. And, once again, England and Liverpool can show the way, not least because of your spirit and your remarkable ingenuity. I hope to return often to observe and to share in your progress and success.

I confess that when I received the invitation to deliver this lecture I hesitated. First, it's humbling, intimidating even, to be asked to address an audience of people in a country other than my own, almost all of whom I don't know, about a subject on which I have no special knowledge. But as I reflected on it I thought about my first day in the United States Senate. As you heard in the introduction I entered the Senate in an unusual manner. Most senators of course are elected; I was appointed, one of Maine's two senators appointed to become Secretary of State of the United States and under our law, the governors of the States are empowered to appoint someone to complete the term. I was serving as a Federal Judge in my home state of Maine.

When the announcement was made, there was a great deal of speculation and media interest. A lot of names were mentioned, mine was not among them. The Governor announced that on the following Monday noon he would hold a press conference at the capital in our state to announce his choice, and so on that Sunday evening I went to bed like almost everyone else in Maine

# foundation for citizenship



wondering who the Governor was going to appoint. About eleven o'clock that night the telephone rang. I picked it up and it was the Governor calling. He said "I'd like you to come down to the state capital at noon tomorrow so I can announce that I'm going to appoint you to the Senate". I said "well gee Governor, this is a complete surprise. It's a big decision. I'd like some time to consult with my family and to think about it." He said "I'll give you one hour." When I protested that the time was insufficient, he said "look in an hour it'll be midnight and if you say no I only have twelve hours until noon tomorrow to come up with someone else so you'd better call me back in an hour." I agreed.

I hung up and I immediately called my three older brothers. I grew up in a very small town in the largely rural state of Maine, and I had three older brothers who were very famous athletes so they were very prominent, not just in our community but throughout our state, even my native New England and when I was growing up I was not as good an athlete as my brothers. In fact I was not as good as anybody else's brother, and I began very early in life to be known in our small town as Johnny Mitchell's kid brother, the one who isn't any good. As you might expect I developed both a massive inferiority complex and a very competitive attitude toward my brothers. So I confess that when I called them that evening I arranged immediately a conference call by phone, there was a note of triumphalism in my voice, as I informed them that the Governor wanted to appoint me to the United States Senate, what did they think? I immediately get a very negative response. My brother Johnny put it directly as he always does when he said "look everyone knows you're a born loser." He said "you couldn't possibly get elected to a full term. No-one can understand how you'd even get to be a Federal Judge so you'd better stay where you are." In our country of course Federal Judges are appointed for life whilst Senators must regularly stand for election. My other brothers replied in the same way, less delicate language and I get very agitated, I hung up the phone. I called the Governor immediately. I said "Governor, I don't need an hour, I have already received all the reassurance I need to take this position."

So I drove to the state capital the next day, the Governor made the announcement and I flew immediately to Washington. I went into the Senate where I was sworn in and then I was taken to what was now my office, to meet what was now my staff and a young man there was in charge. He had a long card with a list of things and he read off all these things for me to do. It

# foundation for citizenship



was kind of a shock because I'd been a Judge before and I was used to telling others what to do but I got over it and at the end he said "now we have a very interesting invitation for you to give a speech tonight." I said "really what is it?" He said "there are three thousand certified public accountants meeting in a convention here in Washington and they have called and asked if you would come down this evening and deliver the key note address" and I said "gosh that's amazing," I said "I can't understand how it was they would hold this position, this important opportunity open for me when just twenty four hours ago I myself didn't even know I was going to be here." "Oh" he said "it's nothing like that." He said "they've had four last minute cancellations." He said "you're the only member of the Senate they could think of who might not have anything to do tonight." I said "well what do they want me to talk about?" He said "the tax code." I said "well wait a minute. You want me to talk about the tax code to an audience of three thousand people, each of whom knows much more about the subject than I do?" And he looked at me with disdain and said to me with sarcasm he said "Senator with that attitude you'll never get anywhere in politics." He said "you are now a United States Senator and you will regularly be called upon to address in public subjects about which you know nothing," he said, "so you'd better get used to it starting right now." So I went down to tell the accountants about the tax code and here I am to talk with you at the Roscoe Foundation Lecture.

In my remarks tonight I'll describe and comment on the challenges facing western democracies in the early decades of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. As an American who has spent much time in the United Kingdom I'll concentrate on our two countries. We are linked in many ways; by history, by language, by culture, by alliance and by democracy. The word is a combination of two Greek words – 'demos' 'the people' 'crace' 'the rule or the reign of'. Democracy means literally 'the rule of the people'. Nowhere has that ideal been more fully realised than in our societies. Our institutions are imperfect as are all human efforts. Yet they function effectively in the most important task of all – placing and keeping sovereignty in the people. It's been a pleasure for me personally to spend so much time in the United Kingdom in recent years. I've come to know and to admire your great country. While ancient Greece was the birthplace of democracy, surely the United Kingdom is the home of its modern version. The parliament building at Westminster is one of the most visible symbols in the world of self governance by a free and vibrant people. Of course Americans haven't always used such flattering words to describe their mother country.

# foundation for citizenship



Two hundred and twenty one years ago, forty five of them gathered in Philadelphia in a constitutional convention. Their objective was independence and self governance and they achieved both. But they used the English language to make their case and they accepted for their society British law, customs and principles. Although our earlier relations were difficult it soon became a staunch friendship that has flourished to the benefit of the people of both countries, indeed to the benefit of many others around the world.

One such benefit began late in 1942 when a small group of American officials came to London to meet with their British counterparts. Although the end of the Second World War was still a few years and many millions of deaths away, they began planning for the immense task of reconstruction that would be necessary when the fighting ended. They concentrated at first on the need for an international trading regime that they hoped would prevent the protectionist response to the economic downturns of the 1920s and 30s which they uniformly believed had been a major contributing factor to the Second World War.

Gradually the two governments expanded the scope of their discussions and other nations took part in a widening effort to secure peace and to promote stability and prosperity. With the United States and the United Kingdom leading the way, new international institutions and alliances were established. The United Nations was created, NATO was organised, Germany and Japan were rebuilt and became democratic and resurgent. On the continent the European Union was founded. All this and more helped what started as the North Atlantic Alliance to become one of the most successful economic, political and military collaborations in all of history. But that alliance is now under great stress, just as we face new threats in the potential convergence of several dangerous trends.

The first and most dangerous is the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The US led the world into the nuclear age and has led the effort to contain these fearsome weapons with some success. As a result there are many countries in the world with the capacity to develop nuclear weapons which have refrained from doing so. But the number of countries with such weapons has now reached nine, and Iran is trying hard to make it ten. As a result the entire nuclear non-proliferation regime is at risk and that poses an enormous danger to every person on Earth.



A second trend is the increase in the number of terrorist groups and their de-centralisation.

Intelligence agencies in our countries and those of other allies, and many experts in the field, tell us that there are now many more such groups and they are less likely to be centrally controlled, making detection, infiltration and prevention much more difficult than it was just a decade ago.

A third trend is the increasing competition for energy security among the developed and the developing nations. Driven by growth in China and India, in 2006 oil consumption in Asia exceeded that in North America for the first time in history, and the trend will continue and the gap will widen. With rising demand in the two most populist countries and with political instability in many of the important producing areas, high oil prices and intense competition for stable and secure sources of supply are likely to continue.

A fourth trend of concern is climate change. Although there are some doubters still around, the weight of scientific evidence is that the Earth is warming and that man-made emissions are the principle cause. The consequences of our failure to act could be disastrous for future generations, indeed by accounts of some scientists, even for our own.

We don't lack knowledge. What is lacking, particularly in the United States, is the political will needed to do what we know must be done. Crises occur regularly throughout history. Often they seem distant, and impersonal, almost irrelevant to us as individuals. That's the way many now see the crisis of climate change. But the reality is that each of us can make a difference. Modest changes in personal behaviour – how we travel, what we eat, where we live. These can have large effects if enough people join in. Indeed, while action by governments is obviously necessary, by itself that will never be enough. Personal attitudes and individual actions will have to change as well. There is of course no single act, no one policy which will enable us to reverse these trends, but some needs are clear. First and most important, you can't solve a problem of any kind until you understand what it is. So we must be realistic about the threats we face. They are real, they are dangerous and we must treat them as such. But they also are very different from the threats we faced in the 20<sup>th</sup> century and we must recognise and act on those differences. It's unlikely that we will, in the near future, face a major conflict involving nation

# foundation for citizenship



states of the types that dominated and devastated Europe in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. More likely will be a continuing series of actions by non-government organisations committed to the use of terror, many of them covertly supported and supplied by governments. So, one need is for a much more effective counter-terror programme.

If we've learnt anything in the past few years it is that military force by itself is plainly insufficient, because counter-terrorism is not a conventional war. The effort must include effective and cooperative police work, diplomacy, economic and financial interdiction and much more that is not primarily military in nature. It is constantly referred to as the 'war on terror'. But terror is a tactic, not an enemy, and there are many differences among those who use such tactics. Some have specific political objectives, some do not. Some are coherent political groups, with whom dialogue is possible, some are not. But it is inaccurate, unhelpful and ultimately self-deluding to simply lump them all together. As a high priority, the network of alliances among free nations that developed over the past half century under the leadership of the United States and the United Kingdom must be renewed and reinvigorated.

That leads me to a final dangerous trend which is difficult for me to discuss, but it must be, because it is the rising tide of hostility to the United States throughout the world. Today American power is ascendant in the world, yet Americans are not celebrating, nor is anyone else. To the contrary, poll after poll reports widespread and rising hostility to the United States. Our power is the greatest it's ever been, but our standing in the world is the lowest it's ever been. There's not much doubt about this result although there's much debate about the causes. There are many reasons, among them the reality that every dominant power in history has aroused antagonism simply by virtue of its dominance. And of course, some of the policies of the current administration have exacerbated that antagonism, most notably in Iraq. But whatever the cause, it is imperative that we respond and change the situation, because this negative attitude severely impairs our ability to create effective coalitions to deal with the many problems we face.

We are now seeing that effect in Iraq, in our dealings with Iran, in the efforts to deal with the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and elsewhere. So I believe it critical that we rebuild our historic relationships and regain our moral stature in the world. In the past several years I have met with

# foundation for citizenship



leaders from most of the countries in Europe, from Ireland to Russia, from Scandinavia to the Mediterranean. I asked each of them this question – now that the Soviet Union no longer exists, and Russia has withdrawn its military forces back to its national territory, do you believe the United States should withdraw all of its military forces back to its territory? Without exception, every European leader answered with an emphatic ‘no’. So ask yourself, ‘why do some countries want US military forces on their soil’ and ‘how can that be reconciled with the widespread hostility to the United States’ to which I earlier referred? Obviously part of the answer lies in power itself, most people want to be on the side of the strong. But for too many people, in and out of our country, American power and principles appear to be diverging.

Power increasingly is perceived as the primary or even to some the exclusive basis of American influence in the world. But I believe that it’s not, nor has it never been. I believe that ideals always have been the primary basis of American influence in the world. Those ideals which can be traced directly back to British history are not easily summarised, but surely they include the sovereignty of the people, the primacy of individual liberty, the rule of law, applied equally to all citizens, and opportunity for every member of society. It is in fact one of the great strengths of our democracies that we have power to protect us and principles to guide us, so when our power is deployed it must be in a manner consistent with our ideals.

There is one other point that is to me so important that I must mention it here. I recall clearly my first day in Northern Ireland many years ago. I saw for the first time the huge wall which physically separates the communities in Belfast. Thirty feet high, topped in places with barbed wire, it is an ugly reminder of the intensity and the duration of the conflict. Ironically it’s called the peace line. On that first morning I met with Nationalists on their side of the wall, in the afternoon with Unionists on their side. Their messages had not been coordinated but to my surprise they were much the same. In Belfast, they told me, there was a high correlation between unemployment and violence. They said that where men and women had no opportunity, no hope, they were more likely to take the path of violence. They told me that despair is the fuel for instability and conflict, that hope is essential for peace and stability.

# foundation for citizenship



Men and women everywhere need income to support their families and they need the satisfaction of doing something worthwhile and meaningful in, and with, their lives. The conflict in Northern Ireland obviously has not been exclusively or even primarily economic. It involves religion, national identity, territorial disputes and many, many other factors. But if there is to be durable peace and stability, there, in the Middle East, in the Balkans, in Africa or anywhere else, people need hope. There can be no hope without opportunity and that requires economic growth and job creation. Economic growth cannot be just a product of democracy, it is essential for the success of democracy because to a man without a job, to a woman who can't feed or care for her children, to a young adult lacking education and skill, unable to compete in this age of technology, debates about democracy seem irrelevant. They worry about coping, getting by, day to day. Democracy means the rule of the people. It also must mean opportunity for all of the people. The 21<sup>st</sup> century can be, like so many in the past, a time of endless war, of famine, of oppression, of injustice, but it also can be a time when the dominant powers use their strength carefully and commit their people, their power and their prestige to a great and noble vision – a world largely at peace with freedom, education, opportunity and prosperity, extending to more and more people throughout the world. That's our challenge; we must make it our destiny. Thank you very much for having me this evening.

*Lord David Alton responds:*

*Well I think the warmth of your response doesn't need any explanation, I think clearly the audience enjoyed very much what you had to say. Because of the time constraints it's often we take questions from the floor, but we did ask in advance this evening, because we know you're on a very tight schedule, if people would submit questions to us, and they have done, and you've kindly agreed to take some of them. The first question is from Tim Clement-Evans, who is a local businessman who says: 'in view of the continued, and according to the British Home Secretary, escalating terror threats to the western economy, a point you touched on, is our repressive approach to that threat the correct one? Should we not examine, and perhaps address the reasons why the number of young Muslims posing these threats is increasing?'*

# foundation for citizenship



In a word, yes. But I don't believe that the two approaches, what I would call protection and dialogue are mutually exclusive, in fact, it is probably fair to argue that either one without the other, is unlikely to succeed. But we certainly do need a much better and deeper understanding to encourage the kind of exchanges that reduce the likelihood of stereotyping and fear of those who are different, to what I think is essential to avoid further acts of terror or further conflict. There is nothing new in any society about stigmatising opponents. I was a very young boy during the Second World War but I can remember clearly the portrayals of Germans and Japanese. A few years later upon graduation from college, I was still a very young man, I went for the first time outside of the country and I was sent to Germany as a US military intelligence officer, and I confess my surprise to find that Germans really weren't very much different from the people that I had grown up with and known all of my life. It is a common event in human history and we must do all we can to overcome stereotyping but I think we also have to take necessary steps to ensure the protection of all of our citizens to the degree that's possible and consistent with our values and principles.

*Thank you very much for that, and I suppose in a way this next question logically follows, because of course, both British and American service men and women are involved in conflict in Iraq and in Afghanistan and I think it's fair to say that whilst conflict is underway it's very difficult to create cohesion and peace, those two things are almost mutually exclusive and this question, which comes from a former Lord Mayor of the city, Councillor Frank Doran, who has done two tours of duty with the Territorial Army in Iraq, asks 'in what substantial ways would United States and British engagement change depending on which of the current three Senators in contention for the US Presidency were to win, and what hope is there of a long-term settlement in the Middle East?'*

First let me say that I have said repeatedly, publicly, and repeat here, that whatever happens in Iraq, and we hope very much that the situation improves, there is not likely to be a stability in the region until the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is resolved. That's the central issue of concern in the region, indeed to people not just in the Middle East, but in many parts of the world. So while we would hope for a successful outcome in Iraq, one of the unfortunate consequences of the effort here has been a, in effect, a taking the eye off the more important conflict and not taking

# foundation for citizenship



aggressive action to deal with that, and my hope is that whoever is elected President will undertake a new and determined initiative to deal with the Israeli-Palestinian conflict because that is the central issue of concern so that I think will hopefully be one of the changes in policy – a change in focus in the region on what needs to be done.

With respect to Iraq itself, there is of course, a very sharp and well-publicised difference between the candidates on the subject. Senator McCain, with whom I served for more than a dozen years in the Senate, know very well, has made clear that while he disagrees with some of the tactical decisions made in the conduct of the conflict, is generally supportive of the decision to invade and is likely to continue to support continued action until the desired level of stability and self-governance in Iraq is achieved, whereas both Senator Obama and Senator Clinton have made clear their intention to move as swiftly as possible under the circumstances to bring the conflict to an end, and to withdraw US forces on the ground, that the continued presence of American forces merely increases the incentive for the Iraqi leadership to delay making the very difficult decisions they must make to achieve national unity and stability there. That will be not the exclusive, perhaps not even the dominant factor in the election, but it surely will be an important factor in the decision to be made in November.

*Thank you. The American elections are something which inevitably a number of questions came in about; this particular one has a special local significance for you. It comes from Simon Hill, the History department of Liverpool John Moores University. He has two questions, the second one is rather further afield, but obviously he wants some inside information in the first. He says 'with the November elections coming up and with John McCain as the GOP nominee, what are the chances that he will pick up the second main congressional district?', and the other question is, 'what is the likelihood of the United States coming to a permanent arrangement with North Korea regarding nuclear weapons?'*

With respect to the first one, there's very little likelihood that the Republicans will regain the seat in the second congressional district of Maine. That will be not news nor I think of any interest to most of the people in the audience. It's a largely rural district which for many many years was a Republican seat but in the past ten years or so Democratic candidates have won it and the

# foundation for citizenship



incumbent congressman Mike Michaud is very well established and is almost certain to win an overwhelming victory in November. With respect to, what was the second part of it?

*The second question was really about North Korea.*

Oh yes, North Korea. It's a very difficult situation and once again we lost a considerable amount of time over the past few years. President Clinton negotiated an agreement with the North Koreans that was not fully implemented, and the Bush administration took an early stance of not talking to the North Koreans, or indeed to others with whom we disagree.

That proved to be not productive; indeed it was counter-productive because in the five or six years that that policy was in place, North Korea increased its nuclear arsenal significantly and increased its potential for further expanding it. The Bush administration then reversed its policy and did engage in negotiations with the North Koreans through a very skilful American diplomat in the system Secretary of State named Christopher Hill and an agreement was reached. The problem with the agreement is the same problem that exists with respect to President Clinton's agreement, is that the North Koreans have repeatedly not lived up to their agreements and have not fully implemented what they agreed to do. They contend that the Bush administration didn't live up to the original provisions that President Clinton had nominated, but there's no doubt there's a risk in pursuing and reaching agreements with erratic and unpredictable regimes, such as exist in North Korea. But it is certainly the least bad of all of the bad alternatives that exist, and so I commend President Bush for reversing the prior policy to pursuing the agreement I think we must now continue to pursue it even as we understand that the possibility, perhaps even the likelihood of less than full compliance by the North Koreans is a reality against which we must guard.

*Thank you again for that. There were two questions which come from people who are students at King George V College in Southport, so they are at school there. The first is Daniel Mercer and he takes us back to Northern Ireland. He says 'as a result of external influences on the resolution of problems of Northern Ireland, isn't it the case that this in itself can compromise the actions of internal democracy and national self-determination?'*



Yes, is it true it can, and of course history is filled with circumstances in which external forces limited or prevented the self-governance and democracy among many societies. Not to be offensive, but you go back and read the history of the British Empire and it's pretty clear that occurred in a lot of places. Interestingly and ironically I just finished on the plane on the way over Sunday a book by an English author describing the circumstances under which India and Pakistan achieved their independence from Britain in the late 1940s and of course I have been to China and Hong Kong a lot and I was there both before and after the relinquishment came and you hear quite different versions about democracy and non-democracy, so it's a fact of life, it's occurred repeatedly throughout history.

At the same time one must fairly and in a balanced way conclude that there are some occasions, and there are certainly circumstances which can be conceived, where external participation can be helpful. Of course I have to say that because I was external to Northern Ireland and I'd like to think that the manner in which we participated was helpful. Now, we didn't drop a single bomb, we didn't fire a single bullet, we didn't tell anybody in Northern Ireland what to do. In fact on the very first day of the negotiations I was clear and explicit to the delegates of the peace talks when I said that I do not come with an American plan, there is no Clinton plan, there is no Mitchell plan, any agreement will be yours, every word in the agreement will be spoken or written by you and two years later when I drafted the agreement I made a point to see that every single word in it had in fact been spoken or written by someone from Northern Ireland.

So I think there are circumstances when external assistance can be useful, and there are many occasions when it is proven to be otherwise. As in most things in life, it's rather easy to state general principles. It's much more difficult to apply them to individual circumstances and I think the wisest and most proven course of action is neither to commend without reservation external intervention, nor to denounce without reservation external intervention, rather than to make a case by case judgement on the individual merits of each case.

*If we're to look at these things on a case by case basis, what would be the application of that principle then in the Middle East at the moment, or for instance in Darfur where 300,000 have*

# foundation for citizenship



*died, or the Congo where 3,000,000 have died, is there a role for external mediation in those situations?*

I think there is. I believe that an important moment in history has gone largely unremarked when the Helsinki Accords were signed in the 1970s, which for the first time created a clear legal basis for intervention across borders based upon actions by a government within its own sovereign territory. You recall that during the Second World War one of the arguments against intervention was this is an internal problem. It of course in retrospect shocks everyone's conscience to think that others, including the United States, did not intervene, in light of the knowledge that existed of the terrible events that were occurring within Nazi Germany. For a long time the Soviet Union and China resisted any suggestion of intervention because they saw it as a western imperialist mechanism to intrude in their affairs. But they finally did agree and it did establish an important legal principle, and I believe it now applies in the case of Sudan.

One of my concerns and criticisms of our societies and others is that we have allowed the government of Sudan to pursue policies which have resulted in death and mayhem and destruction to very large numbers of people on the grounds that we don't want to interfere, intervene in another country's problems. It's difficult to do because you always lay yourself open to the same charge and there's a real danger of so-called 'mission creep' and expanding the mission. I think there should have been much more direct and vigorous action by our and other democracies through the United Nations in Darfur than there has been. I think it is shocking what we have allowed to develop just as we allowed it to develop in Rwanda and it's not surprising that many in Africa and many of African origin who live outside Africa including the United States take the position that if there were oil that we had access to there we'd have been in there a long time ago.

Now with respect to the Middle East, I think it is a reality that there can't be a resolution without direct and active American leadership. In large part because of the recent history of the region the United States is the only country that has both the capacity to create a context in which meaningful discussion can occur and more importantly guarantee implementation of an agreement. Americans are very proud of the fact that we, our President Jimmy Carter helped

# foundation for citizenship



brokered the peace agreement between Israel and Egypt at Camp David in 1979 but the blunt truth of the matter is that the glue that holds that agreement together is that the United States agreed to pay Egypt two billion dollars a year and Israel three billion dollars a year as long as they kept the peace, that is to create an economic incentive to maintain peace. That's five billion dollars a year, it's nearly thirty years so now it's nearly 150 billion dollars that's been paid by American taxpayers and it's still going on, and probably will go on, certainly surviving me and maybe everybody else in the room, and the same thing is going to happen with respect to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the economic and military domination comes at a very heavy price as the British found out in the early part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and ultimately had to withdraw, because, one of the principle reasons for British withdrawal from all across the Middle East, India, Pakistan, everywhere else was the economic burden that it imposed, the intolerable economic burden that it imposed on the people of this country, and we in the United States are in a position where we can meet that burden but I think we have to do it with great care and sensitivity, both to the concerns of the people involved and to try to create a peace which is durable and sustainable on its own merits.

It's always troubled me that in effect what we're saying is we're going to pay you not to fight among yourselves but that was the reality, that's what we did and hopefully that peace will become durable over time. I think what we need to do with respect to the Israel-Palestinian conflict and others, is what I said in my comments. You need to emphasise, of necessity, political and security matters, but you are building a house of sand if you don't include as a high priority economics, that if you don't include provisions that will enable people to get work, to do something meaningful to become participating members of society. Where you have despair and lack of opportunity, you have the fuel for instability, no matter the circumstance, no matter the country, no matter the error. And what I hope is, and my emphasis in the Middle East has been, that there has to be great attention paid.

You don't just get, give people the right to have an election, I think you've got democracy or success. People need work, they need income, they need opportunity, they need a chance to go as high and as far as their talent will take them, and most importantly, universally, regardless of background, race, continent, people want the chance to get their children off to a good start in

dream 

plan 

achieve 

# foundation for citizenship



life. What every one of you wants for your children is the same thing that Palestinians, and Israelis, and people in Africa, and people in Asia, and South America want for their children. If you think of it in those terms, then you know what it is necessary to make peace. Think of it in your terms, look at your children, and ask yourself, should not children in other societies have the same opportunity that I want for my children?