

A RHETORICAL STUDY OF  
PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON:  
THE CREATION OF WHITENESS AND BLACKNESS  
IN POLITICAL COMMUNICATIONS

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of  
Southwest Texas State University  
In Partial Fulfillment of  
The Requirements

For the Degree

Masters of ARTS

By

Daniel Patrick Mahoney, B.A.

San Marcos, Texas  
May, 2001

**COPYRIGHT**

**By**

**Daniel Patrick Mahoney**

**2001**

This Thesis is Dedicated to All Those Who ask:  
What is Rhetoric?

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

I would like to first thank my family for their support throughout my life and especially in the last two years. I know that they will always be there when I need a lift in spirit and an adjustment in attitude. I would also like to thank my friends who stayed out of my way when I was in a mood and shared a booth with me in times of celebration. I would especially like to thank Dwayne Buntin, Patrick Wallace, Collin Camp, and Jennifer Tucker. I could not have made it through without you all.

I must thank the Southwest Texas State University Speech Department. I especially want to thank Dr. Ann Burnette for being my teacher and my friend over the years. I would like to thank Dr. Mary Hoffman and Mr. Wayne Kraemer for their help in completing my thesis. Finally, I would like to thank Dr. Steven Beebe for the many opportunities that he sent my way.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	PAGE
I. WHITE AMERICA, WHITE POLITICS, AND THE STRUGGLE OF BLACK CULTURE...	1
II. THE CONTINUATION OF THEORY IN RHETORICAL STYLE AND CULTURE...	13
III. THE ANALYSIS. PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON ADDRESSES AMERICA...	27
Clinton and Blackness	
Clinton and Whiteness	
Clinton and the Millions of Colors	
IV. WHAT HAS BEEN FOUND AND WHAT REMAINS TO BE UNCOVERED...	47
V. WORK CITED...	54
VI. APPENDIX ONE...	58
VII. APPENDIX TWO...	71
VIII. APPENDIX THREE...	77
IX. APPENDIX FOUR...	93
X. APPENDIX FIVE...	100

# **CHAPTER ONE:**

## **WHITE AMERICA, WHITE POLITICS, AND THE STUGGLE OF BLACK CULTURE**

Even before the Clinton era ended, much had been written about his eight years as the 42<sup>nd</sup> president of the United States. Now scholars across multiple fields from sociology to communication will begin to analyze and document what he has left behind and his effects on American society. Clinton's term was at once scandal-plagued and morally suspect while also being highly economically successful.

The following analysis will not dwell on the flaws of the Clinton era; that will be done enough by others. Instead this work will focus on one of the positive aspects of his eight years. Bill Clinton was and is a southern born white male whose campaign theme in 1992 was to build a bridge for Americans to cross into the 21<sup>st</sup> century. After years of segregation, hatred, and murder, Bill Clinton wanted to build a bridge that all Americans, no matter their race or class, could cross together.

The primary purpose of this analysis is to explain how he created that bridge and to further support its existence. While the racism of today is far less violent and obvious, it is still present (Hacker 1992). Theses must be written and theories must be discussed that will continue to close the gap between racial minorities and the white majority. This thesis will examine the discourse of President Clinton and how he used the constructs of

retorical whiteness and blackness as well as rhetorical occasion to gain support and respect from minorities in America. This thesis will attempt to show that a dynamic, southern, white man could be a unifying figure at the end of the tumultuous 20<sup>th</sup> century.

The significance of this thesis is important for both scholars and the general public. America is still a country fraught with racism toward minorities and mistrust toward the majority (Hacker 1992). Whiteness and blackness in communication theory are relatively new with the bulk of the research produced during the last twenty years. What has been discovered so far is that the awareness of whiteness comes and goes while blackness is continuously in society's eye. This thesis will attempt to analyze both of these constructs. Now, at the beginning of a new century, racial diversity is in the forefront of many people's minds. This is due in part to the push for multicultural understanding as well as the expansion of global trade and communication.

The current research, done by scholars such as Nakayama, Morrison, and many others, has focused on the social consequences of whiteness such as labor force shifts and pay scale differences. This thesis is one of the first pieces that deals with whiteness and blackness in a political arena. If this is the case, the significance of this thesis will be even greater. Whiteness and blackness as communication theory are important across many disciplines. Specifically, researchers in the field of rhetorical communication theory should find importance in this new area of study. Both whiteness and blackness are important communication constructs because it is through rhetorical artifacts such as speeches and sermons that they can be utilized. The ability to utilize these constructs will continue the process of understanding the world and the events occurring in it.

Whiteness and blackness as constructs, as well as styles of presentation, are defined fully in later chapters but a brief highlighting of both concepts is appropriate in this introductory section. Whiteness is defined by Nakayama and Krizek as being seen as the majority culture in America (1995). They state that whiteness is invisible to those who live as white. By this they mean that members of the white community do not realize that they often receive better treatment than those with other skin color. The opposite is true for those who live in minority cultures such as African-Americans. This community is only too aware of their skin color and the separation it has led to throughout America's history.

The following pages of this chapter will briefly outline racism in America and how that has led to the creation of these two constructs and how they can be developed as communication styles when combined with the idea of rhetorical occasion. The second function of this chapter will be to discuss the relevant research that supports this thesis. Finally, a brief discussion of the artifacts that will be analyzed will be incorporated.

Racism and the separation of races can be traced back throughout time. While racism is not confined to the United States, the scope of history for this artifact will be limited mostly to this country and only go as far back as colonial times. Racism in America has been one of the darkest shadows to be cast on an otherwise successful young nation. Many who came to the New World were seeking freedom from tyranny and hatred. Unfortunately, it would be those freedom seekers who would introduce tyranny and hatred to a world that had once quietly just existed.



In the New World, property ownership was a status symbol and mark of power. However, owning land meant that something must be done with that land in order to be successful. Individuals who could not afford land were paid to work the land. Soon however, slavery provided white landowners a free labor force (Roediger 1991). Ownership of humans, which had been frowned upon in Europe, now became a status symbol in the colonies of America (Nakayama and Martin 1999).

While the Civil War and President Lincoln ended the practice of slavery in the 1800's with the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863, racism in America continued. In the 18<sup>th</sup> century racism was given scientific support when zoologists classified humans for the first time. Based on skin color, hair texture, and cranial capacity scientists declared whites the last and most developed link in "the great chain of being" (Webster 1992). Anthropologists found evidence that nonwhite races were technologically and spiritually inferior to whites furthering the scientific proof that whites were the more evolved race (Nakayama and Martin 1999). These findings explain, although they do not justify, the European desire to further colonize and Christianize races around the globe, including America.

At the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century America was becoming a strong industrialized nation. Along with this change in lifestyle came a new surge of European and Asian immigrants. As the country began to develop into a strong industrial nation, the making of money began to cause great stress among those living in urban areas. There was also a constant fear that foreigners were going to take away jobs meant for those already Americans (Nakayama and Martin 1999). A new racism was born. This racism affected not just the freed blacks but also the new class of poor immigrants.

American presidents have adopted different strategies in responding to racial identity and racism. It is important to note that while President Clinton in the 1990's attempted to close the gap between the races in America, it was another president who created that gap. In 1912 Woodrow Wilson created a legal difference between black and white for the first time. President Wilson enacted the first executive laws that limited where "coloreds" could dine, work, and even which water fountains they could drink from (Kovel, 1984, p. 31). For the first time signs were hung that stated, "whites only restrooms" and "colored persons motel". All this was legitimized according to Wilson as an attempt at "cordial good feelings" between whites and blacks (Nakayama and Martin 1999). It would not be until the 1960's that white privilege, for example, the right to vote or even gain access to any store or restaurant, not to mention salary differences, would be seriously challenged.

Again it would be a president, along with an America with a newly emerging social conscience, who would attempt to bring an end to an extremely dark age in American domestic history. As a member of the Texas Congress, Lyndon Baines Johnson had voted against any laws that would strengthen minority voting and employment power. But Johnson had grown up poor and had taught poor Mexican students as a young man and he knew that the situation that existed in America was wrong (Kearns 1990). Johnson would find himself in the ideal position to change America in the mid 1960's even if no one would agree that the terms of how he got there were ideal.

Before his death President John Kennedy, with the help Johnson and many civil rights leaders across the country, created the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It was more of a symbolic act than anything because it had been severely watered down in order to gain

passage. But it created an opening for Johnson to push through a stronger bill the next year. The passing of the Civil Rights Act of 1965 was the beginning of the end of restrictions on black Americans. The bill itself dealt with employment and voting rights but the tide toward equality was finally starting to pick up steam in America.

Race relations disappeared from America's agenda during the 1980's with President Reagan at the reins of America. During this decade the white male again took center stage without being labeled the privileged class. Many observers trumpeted this time in American history as the "me" decade. Individuals spurred on by a strong economy and a renewed sense of pride in America began investing, spending, and competing for money like never before. But as the white male drank beer and smoked cigars, the black male and even the white female silently shrank in economic worth. The racial gap was an economic gap as well (Hacker 1992). In 1992, with the simple motto: "It's the economy stupid", President William Jefferson Clinton burst onto the scene.

President Clinton was a governor from a small state with no national experience and a spotty ethical past. For some in America that was enough to elect him president. For many around the country Bill Clinton the man was someone they could relate to. He was not a white male born of privilege who had never felt the struggles of real life; he was a common man who had grown up and aspired to be president.

As historians look back over the Clinton years, many will undoubtedly say it was his commonness that discredited the office of the presidency. Many will say that a common man like Bill Clinton is too flawed to hold that much power. But it was the same common man who created an environment where whiteness could again be discussed. He made a real attempt to bridge the gap that was created by the "great men" who had come

before him. Social constructs and strategies can be found throughout his speeches and his actions. They are the reasons that Bill Clinton should be remembered not as a common man, but as a unifier and builder of a greater nation.

Rhetorical whiteness is often defined not by what it is, but rather what it is not. Whiteness as social theory has really only started to become mainstream since the late 1980's. The literature of many disciplines, including sociology, political science, anthropology, and communication, will be used to lay the foundation for the thesis. These relevant articles have added to the understanding of race in America as well as the importance of bringing whiteness into the discussion of race.

Many scholars have attempted to make whiteness a topic which can be talked about without offending or setting off tempers no matter the person's race. This must be done in order for it to be operationalized in the discussion of race. One of those scholars is John Hartigan, who in 1997 defined whiteness as a neutral social arrangement that (to whites at least) has no racial basis (1997). Hartigan states that it is whiteness that is at the core of racism. He believes whiteness is a dominating, unifying strategy that continues to impede minority-Americans' ideals and goals (Hartigan 1997). This article also identifies whiteness as neutral words and actions meant to motivate the core members of the white majority.

Much of political campaign rhetoric uses this strategy. Research by Denton and Woodward has found that most political communication is specifically created for particular situations (1998). This will be discussed in more detail later in this chapter. Intentionally bland language is used in order not to highlight white culture and privilege. In fact, much of political the discourse developed by white candidates usually involves

sweepingly broad content. This is to strengthen white culture while not enraging minority leaders (Hartigan 1997). This broad use of whiteness in politics will be important in the analysis of President Clinton in later chapters. The next article of significance to this thesis helps separate who specifically is helped by whiteness and who is left out of the concept of whiteness.

The term “whiteness” immediately creates human categories. Obviously, those individuals who have skin pigment other than white fall outside of white privilege. However, there are large segments of the white population that also do not fit into the social identity and economic system of being white. According to 1990 U. S. census numbers there are 22.3 million poor white individuals who live below the national poverty line who do not benefit from their skin color (Gibson 1996).

These millions of whites are not considered white, nor are they given minority status. This group of whites are uniquely identified socially, politically, and economically as minorities. The majority white population has intentionally turned a blind eye toward these fellow whites because they show the weaknesses of the dominant majority’s racial identity (Gibson 1996). However, poor whites cling to the idea that their skin color entitles them to certain privileges. This is not the case. Those who truly are members of the white majority do not identify with their poor, white brethren.

Racial identity is created by social discourses about shared experiences. Poor whites do not share the experiences of the majority of whites in power; hence they fall outside the borders of “whiteness”. Gibson’s article has significance to this thesis in that the main actor is a president whose roots are from a poor, disadvantaged community. As

this thesis moves along it will be important to realize that whiteness and non-whiteness is not just a black and white issue.

One of the key pieces to creating this thesis is a book written by Farrell in 1993 that defines rhetorical culture and explains the importance of the rhetorical occasion. Rhetorical culture is an institutional formation in which motives of competing parties are intelligible, audiences available, expressions reciprocal, norms translatable, and silences noticeable (Farrell 1993). This definition is important because the constructs of both whiteness and blackness can only be identified if viewed from this definition's perspective.

Farrell's key argument is that place or setting dictates the norms important for specific rhetorical occasions. Norms are invoked, implied, abused, or set aside by the sermonic character of rhetorical practice. They articulate principles and procedures that define and continue traditions. And finally norms of place develop culture and the creation of rhetorical culture (Farrell 1993). This idea is important because President Clinton had to be aware of the differing norms of his two audiences.

The key article that outlines whiteness for this thesis comes from Nakayama and Krizek. Their 1995 article outlined the principles of whiteness and how it can often be used to identify a persuasive rhetorical strategy that is often overlooked. Because this piece will be one of the key sources for this thesis it is important to discuss its relevance during this early section.

These authors outline six strategies of discourse for the use of whiteness. First, "white" is a status symbol and a majority position in America. Second, if white is the status quo, then everything else is less than white. The third strategy of whiteness is that

white is the natural order and highest evolution of man. Fourth is that whiteness confuses nationality. This is true especially when dealing with Americans. The fifth strategy that Nakayama and Krizek outline is that whites often deny their ethnicity which highlights minority groups that do accept their ethnicity. Finally, whites often will simply claim their ethnicity is simply European. Chapter two will be dedicated to outlining whiteness in a more detailed fashion.

While “whiteness” has been outlined rhetorically by Nakayama and Krizek, blackness has yet to be well defined rhetorically. Many scholars of black history have developed models and created templates of what blackness seems to be, but no rhetorical scholar has surfaced at the time of this thesis. Several books and articles will be used to find an appropriate construct to view blackness and President Clinton’s use of it during his tenure.

The Boundaries of Blackness discusses the status of black leaders in the 1990’s and the handling of the AIDS virus. This book is important because it deals with black politics and black issues. The conclusions reached by the author found that often blacks found themselves to be invisible to the white majority and helplessly frustrated working in a political system that believed them to be inferior (Cohen 1999).

This sense of inferiority was also mentioned in Two Nations, a book devoted to the racial inequality in America in the 1990’s (1992). The authors describe how equality has still not been reached and how racism is still prevalent in every section of the country. This book by Andrew Hacker and a similar book by Charles Henry written in 1990, create a picture of life within the black community and culture.

Five artifacts will be analyzed in this thesis. Two will show the construct of whiteness while a second pair will highlight blackness. The final artifact will present Clinton in a situation where he is addressing both audiences and attempting to please both. These pieces have been selected over the course of President Clinton's eight years in office. The five artifacts will show that Clinton used these constructs as styles of rhetorical presentation for audiences that would find them appropriate. A balance was attempted in the situation for each style; for instance, a speech given before a large mostly black audience in a formal setting would mean a similar speech with a white audience and formal setting was also included.

The first artifact of blackness was Clinton's last address before the NAACP in the spring of 2000 in Baltimore. This was as close to an all black audience as the president would address and the speech came during a time when he was attempting to raise funds for Vice President Gore's presidential run. This was a campaign address and the strategies used should have effectively reached a majority white audience. The balance to this address is a speech given in San Francisco before an AFL-CIO meeting in 2000 that was attended mostly by blue collar, white laborers.

The second black artifact used in this thesis was also analyzed by John Murphy in 1995. Bill Clinton was a guest of The Church of God in Christ, a Baptist church assembly in Memphis where he spoke to a primarily black audience about family, love and economic strides in that particular community. The whiteness speech that will balance this address before the Baptist assembly was also set in a formal occasion dealing with similar topics but before a more mixed audience. The second address selected to represent white discourse is an address that Clinton gave before the United States Naval



Academy's graduating class of 1998. This audience is an audience of non-descript racial makeup. This speech addresses an audience that only sees the color of the American flag and white again becomes invisible and natural. The changes between the presentations of these two artifacts is a telling example of audience expectation and style.

The final artifact of interest to this thesis is Clinton's response to the Million Man March held in Washington D. C. in 1995. This speech served to address both white and black audiences. The President's strategy was to prepare a response that catered to both audiences. This single address will show how the constructs of whiteness and blackness can be successful when given together in one speech.

Chapter Two will outline the construct of whiteness as originally described by Nakayama and Krizek and discuss the traits that make up the construct of blackness. Several important scholars will be used in the creation of an observable blackness. These constructs will then be turned into rhetorical style of presentation that can be identified as in addresses of whiteness and blackness. Chapter Three will then analyze the five addresses by President Clinton. The final chapter of this thesis will summarize the finding in this work and highlight areas of study still to be researched.

## **CHAPTER TWO:**

### **THE CONTINUATION OF THEORY**

### **RHETORICAL STYLE AND CULTURE**

Up to this point, whiteness and blackness have been discussed as constructs. A construct is a set of ideas, beliefs, and behaviors that creates an observable identity (Dow 1995). For research to continue in this area they must also be defined as rhetorical styles. This chapter will argue that these two constructs are also styles of rhetorical presentation. The overall purpose of this thesis is to analyze how President Clinton used these styles in the artifacts mentioned in Chapter One. A speaker such as Clinton can enact these styles as he or she deems appropriate depending on the situation in which they find themselves. During his presidency Bill Clinton often found himself in situations that required rhetorical sensitivity and good stylistic choices.

Bitzer argued that all rhetoric is situational and all rhetorical situations have an exigence that brings them about (1968). Often an exigence is an imperfection marked by urgency or simply something that is other than it should be which can be modified by rhetoric. An exigence is an external, historically verifiable event. The purpose of rhetoric is to affect the audience by influencing their thoughts and actions and thereby

empowering the audience to address the problem and eliminate the imperfection. This idea is at the base of all political rhetoric.

According to Denton and Woodward, political rhetoric is especially grounded in situation. Political rhetoric has a short-term orientation (Denton and Woodward 1998). This means that messages are planned and delivered to specific audiences in selected contexts. Again, this is important in the construction of white and black style. Political messages are also audience-centered which means the message is directed at the audience in hopes of agreement and a desired action (Denton and Woodward 1998). No politically motivated individual however, has the power to fix all the social ills facing the nation.

The exact situational exigence for Bill Clinton varied from speech to speech. Time will be taken to briefly explain each at the appropriate time. However, Clinton used two different styles of presentation to gain the support and trust of his audiences. Further adding to the importance of situation is the understanding that a modern rhetorical situation when critiqued often pits two cultures that are radically different against one another (Farrell 1993). For example, in the case of whiteness versus blackness, two groups of people have very different ideas about identity, cohesion and future social development. Each culture often sees itself as evolving separately from the other while trying to co-exist together (Farrell 1993). For this project five pieces were selected in which Bill Clinton attempted to affect the thoughts and actions of two different audiences and cultures.

While this analysis will not argue that blackness and whiteness are genres of rhetoric, parts of genre criticism, specifically style, are important to this project. Genre scholars assert that within a genre the history of each situation will lead the rhetor to

present artifacts that are similar in several ways (Campbell and Jamieson 1995). The three important reappearing parts of a genre are situation, substance, and stylistic characteristics. Over time, some historical events will recur giving rise to rhetoric, such as speeches, books, and articles that will be similarly appropriate. These combined artifacts of rhetoric may lead to the creation of a genre. Black states that there are only a limited number of situations that are rhetorical (1965). Black's research bolsters Bitzer's argument about rhetoric being situational. For instance, while a winter snowstorm is a situation that occurs, it has no exigence that can be solved by a rhetorical artifact. If enough similar rhetoric is detected surrounding an appropriate rhetorical situation it is possible that a genre has been created (Campbell and Jamieson 1995).

As stated before, situations do recur; however, they will not be exactly the same. The rhetor may be different and the audience will undoubtedly be composed of different individuals but the situation will be similar in definition. People or audiences have a "stock knowledge" from which they draw from either by education or personal experience (Miller 1984). Through the audience the core of a situation can recur. People will view situations and the rhetoric that is created for a situation as either appropriate or inappropriate. When a similar situation occurs, those people will have an idea of what rhetoric will be acceptable. An example of this would be an inaugural address. After a presidential election has occurred Americans have come to expect a ceremonial address that shows the peaceful transition of power from the outgoing president to the newly elected one.

Substance similarities are possible because they occur within the symbols that people use (Miller 1984). Burke states that humans are symbol-using animals and that

their reality is created through commonly shared symbols (1969). It is through concepts, images, and ideas that humans identify the substance of an act and its ability to reappear in other times and places. For example, speeches such as eulogies will have a somber tone. The substance of the address will be one of mourning and remembrance. Even the dress of the speaker can create recognizable symbols.

Style similarities are what this thesis will attempt to focus on. It is important to view style as who is speaking, how they employ their own personality traits to the address, and their language usage. It is also important to identify if that style is appropriate for the situation (Nakayama and Krizek 2000). Historically the rhetorical style of whites has been taken as the norm and caused minority speakers to either adapt their style or know that they will receive criticism for speaking out. While whiteness as a style is perceived as universal, blackness has labored in smaller arenas such as churches and minority gatherings (Crenshaw 1997).

For this thesis, style will also be content specific. The style of whiteness is one that lacks a cultural unity. In fact, research has shown that many whites are barely aware of their own cultural background (Nakayama and Krizek 1999). When addresses are steeped in whiteness common identifying labels are absent and pride for shared European history is overlooked. What is highlighted in white style is the pride of the individual and the achievements of the American Dream (Stage 1999).

White style is also presented in a much more formal tone. Speakers are often coached into a plain style, void of emotional outbursts and unnecessary volume. An example of this difference comes out of the 2000 Presidential Election. Al Gore, the Democratic candidate for president, was criticized by many whites and minorities when

he attempted to include emotion and excitement into his addresses by raising his volume and gesturing wildly (Leo 2000). This example may be evidence that speakers who have primarily used white style may not be able to switch at their leisure.

Blackness as a style, like feminine style, offers an alternative way to present a message. In feminine rhetoric, the sphere of the woman and the shared experiences of women create a strong common bond between speaker and audience member (Dow and Tonn 1993). This was seen to be true especially during both the struggle to gain the right to vote and in the fight to end slavery (Campbell 1989). In black style, cultural history and shared experiences are also important. The black life experience is one that no white could ever hope to understand. But the realities of being poor and disempowered can cross cultures. This disempowerment is a battle that women rhetors and minority cultures continue to fight in today's world (Dow 1995).

Black style, unlike whiteness, can cross over culture because of this disempowerment. Individuals can understand and relate to disempowerment if not in skin color, but by economic status or gender disadvantages. Silence and discrimination in the past has lead to the evangelical black leaders of today. Black style embraces emotion and will actively ask those listening to speak up and rise up. That is how Bill Clinton could be successful using blackness. His history of growing up disadvantaged and succeeding combined with his grasp of important black issues made him a black leader in America.

Nakayama, Krizek, and others have identified strategies for highlighting whiteness in communication artifacts. For these scholars, strategy is best defined as a way of identifying whiteness that is presented but not necessarily deliberate. Much of the research done on blackness also focuses on highlighting occurrences of black style that

may not be planned. While this analysis will outline the strategies of these researchers, this thesis' ultimate goal is to show that President Clinton used whiteness and blackness as tools of persuasion because he understood that his audiences expected a certain style of presentation. Depending on the situation he found himself in, he chose to employ either a white style of speaking or a black style. The following pages will outline these two styles.

Through their research, Nakayama and Krizek attempted to open up the rhetoric of whiteness to critique. Whiteness had been invisible to most critics and even listeners until their 1995 article and subsequent book in 1999. Nakayama and Krizek identified six strategies that are apparent in white discourse and can be used to make whiteness visible. The first of these is that of whiteness as the majority and demands the higher stature (Nakayama and Krizek 1999). In the United States the white culture dominates everything from the writers of history books to the lead actors on many television shows (Hacker 1992). Statistically, whites hold the majority in population, wealth, and social control (Stage 1999). Possibly because of this dominance, whites are often extremely nervous about losing any measure of that control. This nervousness is what leads to the creation of negative stereotypes and oppression of minorities by the majority. White style continues white dominance.

These negative stereotypes or definitions are the second strategy of whiteness. White is invisible as the majority culture; thus, whites are “not colored people” (Martin, Krizek, Nakayama, and Bradford 1999). Whites are white by default. The negative definition, or being by being the opposite of something else, comes into play when people define themselves as white and pure. Blacks or other minorities are seen as dirty or contaminated by colored blood. As was mentioned in the opening chapter, during the

time of slavery blacks were thought of as less than human and to have black blood or dark skin was shameful. By defining whiteness as the reverse of something negative, whiteness becomes more dominant and more oppressive. Even popular culture has grasped the concept of white as pure, from the early cowboy movies where the hero wore white to the costumes worn by church officials (Hacker 1992).

A third strategy is based on the presumption that the scientific definition for what is “natural” is that which is white. This scientific definition makes whiteness invisible and takes it out of the world of culture by skin color (Crenshaw 1997). History books and scientific journals throughout time never bothered to mention if a leader or scientist was white skinned. It has long been an unstated assumption that those individuals were white (Roediger 1996; Crenshaw 1997). It has always just been assumed that minorities have a lesser sense of reason, objectivity, and even passion (Shome 1999). This strategy defends scholars who believe race is socially and historically constructed (Roediger 1996). This idea is also brought to light by the fact that when important non-white individuals are mentioned their culture is highlighted. This will be discussed more in the blackness section.

The fourth strategy of whiteness outlined by Nakayama and Krizek is the confusion of whiteness and nationality. Nationality is a status that is placed on individuals who reside in the boundaries of a country regardless of their color (Nakayama and Krizek 1999). This is an important point because while the United States is far from just being white, when many people in this country and around the world think of Americans they picture a white person. “Whiteness” means “of American descent.” At this time it is important to make mention the white American pictured is also quite often a



male (Martin, Krizek, Nakayama, and Bradford 1999). This picture, which often is purposely created, continues to promulgate the assumption that the white male is the center of power and that all other racial and gender groups have a marginal role in the running of America.

A fifth strategy of whiteness is the argument that whites often refuse to label themselves. The assumption is that labels are ethnically and racially defined (Nakayama and Krizek 1999). White is not an ethnicity so it is often left out as a label. Ethnicity often communicates culture and heritage among a group of individuals. Studies have shown that of all groups, whites are most often quoted as not wanting to be labeled. Again it is seen that whiteness is invisible and now is also unlabeled. Like the strategy of nationality, this strategy also has a significant gender bias. The majority of respondents that wished to not be labeled were white men (Martin, Krizek, Nakayama, and Bradford 1999).

The final strategy for highlighting whiteness discussed by Nakayama and Krizek deals with those whites who do relate their whiteness to a European ancestry. These whites identify with a country that they may have no connection to other than a heritage that has been passed down to them. This historical foundation for whiteness is also known as symbolic ethnicity (Nakayama and Krizek 1999). Studies of symbolic ethnicity show that whites often select the ethnicity that they choose to disclose to others (Nakayama and Krizek 1999). This selection of an ethnicity serves the purpose of giving whites a culture to fill a need for a shared past and a present community when necessary.

This strategy is used by whites who need to create a sense of togetherness, often when times are tough on an economic level (Roediger 1996). Gibson furthers this idea in

her research by showing how poor whites are often not included as “white” by the white majority. Even so, these whites still have a sense that their European heritage makes them higher in status than minorities in the same economic category (Gibson 1996). This notion can be traced back to the early colonial times and the slave trade. The poor white worker was still free in America.

From these six strategies scholars have come to understand that whiteness is both silent and invisible. As these strategies highlight, whiteness does not need to be justified or defended. Whiteness is the norm (Crenshaw 1996). Many scholars, including Nakayama and Krizek, are forcing whiteness to have a voice and a face. Whiteness as a construct is not unethical, it is simply not fully understood yet.

Nakayama and Krizek used the term strategy to represent ways of identifying traits of whiteness in communication events. Their research states that whiteness is not something that is done purposefully, but is enacted without reflection or deliberation. For this analysis, the argument will be made that President Clinton did purposefully choose his rhetoric to suit his audiences. The following paragraphs will discuss how whiteness can be used as a rhetorical tool for persuasion. For this section strategy will be used in the traditional sense of the word: strategy as a plan to achieve a goal, in this case the arguments in a persuasive artifact.

As the research that has been outlined states, white is still seen as the dominant culture in the United States. Because of this, those in the white culture desire a strong hold on social control. Speakers who wish to tap into this desire may simply argue overtly or covertly for the continuation of the current social order. This strategy of persuasion can often be found overtly in white supremacy rhetoric. While this analysis

does not condone this type of rhetoric, it is important to understand the undercurrent of fear some whites have of losing social status (Hacker 1992). Another part of this strategy is to argue Nakayama's second principle of whiteness, that of white existing by default. Again this is rhetoric that argues whiteness can be identified as the opposite of something else, in this case blackness.

In these cases, the obvious statement of whiteness is not necessary. Speakers will assume the audience is white and shares the same ideals and experiences that they do. This explains how up until recently many school textbooks taught only white history and many white speakers often assumed that everyone would understand their past experiences.

These experiences can also blur the line between whiteness as a culture and whiteness as the experience of being American. Addresses that are aimed toward traditionally white audiences are often dedicated to patriotism, the American dream, and economic prosperity (Gibson 1996). In the discussion of blackness it will become clear that the American dream and economic prosperity are important but defined in radically different ways. The mention of economic similarities between speaker and audience is a very powerful tool of identification for whiteness. It is in these areas where whiteness as a culture again becomes invisible to those to whom it would apply.

Bill Clinton chose to embrace his whiteness when he believed it was necessary to present himself that way. But Clinton was also able to perform another style that won him huge popularity and support. For those in America who would not identify with whiteness, Clinton took it upon himself to adopt the style of blackness. As is the case

with whiteness, there are social, anthropological, and economic spheres that make up blackness. For this project, the boundaries of blackness will be defined in opposition to the communication strategies outlined by Nakayama and Krizek. This is an appropriate contrast because it will use the same principles that define whiteness and will also help limit the scope of this analysis. When important traits of black style are relevant to this analysis but deviate from whiteness principles, they will be added to help complete the construct. The black church is the first important principle that helps define blackness.

America is a country that was founded on religious freedom from the very beginning. As the country grew and as the slave trade brought more Africans, whites attempted to Christianize blacks (Sanger 1995). Africans had their own religions but they soon found that by adopting traits of the white church into their own faith they could gain them more credibility as humans (Lincoln 1999). Today the church does not play as central a role as it did then, but for the black community the church still provides an important function. The black church today gives its devotees a safe gathering place, a sense of belonging, and often answers to the question of “why does the world treat me this way?” (Lincoln 1999). Many black worshipers see life as something that must be survived day to day (Henry 1990).

It is often church teachings and training that becomes the springboard for black leadership. But the church is also where important issues are implanted in the community’s mind and where the in-group/out-group feeling is reinforced (Cohen 1999). As the first strategy of whiteness was majority status, the first strategy of blackness is marginalization. By being an out-group since the day they arrived in America, blacks have learned how to make a disadvantage into a proud identity. Because a minority

platform would not currently succeed intact in a white dominated, political setting, black leaders have changed their strategy, rallying their communities around one issue at a time. By drawing the community (male and female, no matter the age), around one issue, black leaders have been able to slowly gain acceptance into the majority on certain issues (Henry 1990). It is usually the church that initially backs these issues and frames them as issues of the “black community” (Cohen 1999).

Along with the content church leaders provide, emotive preaching is another aspect of the black church that must be considered as part of black style. Black leaders such as Martin Luther King Jr., Jesse Jackson, and Al Sharpton have roots in the black church and are known for their evangelical preaching style. Their addresses to even the commonest of audiences are still laced with emotional language and biblical references. The argument that is grounded in faith can often defeat an argument based on strict logic. Leaders of the black church have known this for centuries as they battled against slavery and oppression. Often abolitionist leaders attempted to create the most logical and scientific argument for equality so as to seem knowledgeable and human (Campbell, 1989). However, using the Bible was often the only defense blacks had against hostility and for arguments of equality (Reid, 1995). This was plainly seen during the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960’s and the work of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. His emotional and spiritual addresses contain some of the most powerful arguments as well as motivational works to come out of that time period. It is clear that the church has always played an important role in the lives of black Americans.

Unlike whites who rarely attempt to tie their communities together based on ethnicity, blackness depends on it. A second strategy of blackness can be seen when

black leaders create the idea that blacks have a linked fate that arises out of a shared history and common experience. This racial group identity has helped mobilize blacks at key times in the last hundred years. An example of this linked fate can be found in the artifacts that emerged from the Civil Rights movement of the 1960s as well as the fight against AIDS in the 1980s (Cohen 1999; Lucaites and Condit 1990). For blacks, the process of the group excelling and making positive in-roads in society is seen as an acceptable evaluation of the individual's success.

The third strategy is how blacks define themselves. While whiteness is defined as being other than black, blackness as a style must embrace not being white. Blacks are well aware that it was whites who for decades designated how they would be represented. Black Americans have fought for several label changes from "colored" to "Negro", to "black", until the current and still not fully accurate, "African-American". This changing of labels is seen by some researchers as a statement that blackness is ever changing and evolving (Hacker 1992). There are two reasons why African-American will most likely not be the last term to represent blacks. First, not all blacks are of African descent. Second, many blacks feel that whites equate Africa with a primitive, backward continent that is far inferior to America and Europe (Hacker 1992). As long as an image of inferiority still exists, the reality of equality will not. Blacks are just people with darker skin who still are not given the opportunities that whites are allowed (Hacker 1992). At one time in America's history blacks were treated like animals because it was believed that their mental capacity was limited. The black community understands this history and attempts to shape labels that continue to separate themselves from those images.

Whiteness research has shown that whiteness is still seen as the norm and that references are still being made that highlight skin color as a mark of ability such as “he is a black doctor” or “she is a great black author”. Whiteness is still invisible and blackness is still seen as inferior. Blacks see themselves as being limited by their environment and the options that have been handed to them by the white majority (Rigsby 1993). Of all the strategies of blackness it may have been the shared environment and limited options that allowed the black community to embrace Bill Clinton in 1992.

Blackness is still evolving in America today as a growing number of business and political leaders overcome the hardships of those who came before them. The strategies that have been defined here are drawn from scholars who all wish to see progress continue. The constructs of whiteness and blackness are both important for communication scholars. As the world becomes smaller and communication with others becomes more important, cultural differences will take center stage. If two bodies of people who have shared the same country for several hundred years cannot communicate what hope does that give the shrinking planet?

For eight years during the 1990s one man was able to communicate across cultural lines. He was rhetorically sensitive and accommodated his audiences with the style believed they would find most appropriate. Bill Clinton did not please everyone, but he did try to create a common bridge through identification and common ground. The analysis to follow will take the strategies outlined in this chapter and apply them to several artifacts that were important to a wide number of Americans.

## **CHAPTER THREE:**

### **THE ANALYSIS**

#### **PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON**

#### **ADDRESSES AMERICA**

The previous chapters of this thesis have established the importance of scholarly work being done on the rhetorical constructs of whiteness and blackness. The chapters have outlined two rhetorical styles that represent race. Throughout his term in the White House, President Clinton had numerous occasions to use these two styles to successfully move between his culture of whiteness and that of a minority culture, blackness. This chapter will show this ability as enacted in five of his addresses set from 1993 to the year 2000. This thesis will show that the president used these styles as tools of persuasion due to the fact that his audiences were expecting a certain type of presentation.

This chapter will be broken into three sections of analysis. The first section will concentrate on the two artifacts of blackness. During this section each artifact's contextual scene will be outlined. This will be followed by a joint analysis using the style of blackness outlined in chapter two. The second section will deal with the whiteness discourses in the same way. The occasion that had brought each address about will be outlined, followed by the analysis done with whiteness. Finally, President



Clinton's address following the Million Man March will be analyzed. This piece will demonstrate the occurrence of both styles within one address.

It is also important at this time to mention the research of Farrell that was discussed in Chapter One. His ideas of rhetorical culture and situation will be significant in the following pages. Farrell argues that the setting of an address, including the audience make-up, will dictate the norms that are appropriate in individual situations (1993). This is a key point to remember as the content each of the addresses in this thesis analyzed. Whiteness and blackness can only be identified if addresses are viewed from the perspective that situation, community norms, and presentation style are important factors in persuading differing audiences.

### **Clinton and Blackness**

Bill Clinton understood that he was addressing black audiences and that black style would be appropriate and expected. He used evangelical, emotive language, similar to that which black church leaders use to move their audiences. He addressed topics that were relevant to his audience and continually tried to identify himself as a member of their community. The first discourse in the style of blackness to be analyzed occurred on November 13, 1993 in Memphis, Tennessee. President Clinton had been in office for close to a year and by most accounts had had a positive first hundred days. He had been successful at passing the North American Free Trade Agreement as well as his bill calling for stricter gun laws (Murphy 1997). He had fallen short in other areas, such as health care, but his overall approval rating was quite high. His purpose on the thirteenth was to continue to seek support for his upcoming areas of interest, crime and welfare. These were issues that had a great effect on black communities (Henry, 1990, p. 56).

The setting for this address was the Mason Temple Church of God in Christ before an audience that was almost completely African-American. The black church, which plays such a large role in the lives of blacks, was put at center stage for this address. Not only were the regular church attendees and regular church leaders present, but prominent black leaders were also in attendance. In this address President Clinton meant to reach out to the black community in a way that would make him seem a part of their lives. It was Clinton's desire to speak in the voice of the great black leader Martin Luther King Jr., thus creating an image of himself as a great black leader (Murphy 1997).

In contrast to the first address, which was given early in the president's term, the second address being analyzed occurred in the year 2000 while he was helping the presidential campaign of Vice President Al Gore. On July 13, in Baltimore, Maryland, Clinton addressed the National Convention of the NAACP for the last time as President of the United States. The approval rating of the president was still high for the job he was doing, but his term as executive officer had been marred with scandal since the 1993 Memphis address.

One of the most damaging events of Clinton's presidency was his impeachment by Congress. In 1996 a rumor began that President Clinton had had a sexual relationship with Monica Lewinsky, a young White House intern. This thesis chooses not to belabor the scandal; however, it was this affair that put President Clinton on trial for perjury and obstruction of justice. The affair and the subsequent trials led to the decline in the president's personal life poll numbers. Before the scandal the president had a personal approval rating of 79%. Shortly after the impeachment that number was at 66% (CNN, 1997). One segment of America that still strongly supported the president was the black

community (White, 1998). The 2000 address was meant to reaffirm that support and shift it to Al Gore (Leo, 2000). It was the president's hope that he could turn this particular community on to a second southern born, white man who would support their causes.

The 1993 and 2000 addresses both clearly show the president's ability to enact the style of blackness. The first trait in black style is the use of religious symbolism as a way to build connection between audience and speaker. Both of the selected addresses represent this idea; the first address was set in a church, while the second address is loaded with religious connotations. The opening lines of both the 1993 and 2000 address begin with language that speaks of faith, inspiration and spirit, "a happy heart doeth good like medicine, but a broken spirit dryeth the bone" (13 November 1993: 2, 13 July 2000: 11). Those in the audience had come together to bond with others who had shared their experiences and sought answers to the same questions. The Church of Christ was a meeting place for a group of citizens that depended on each other for support and encouragement on a daily basis. The NAACP is an institution that was specifically designed to take on the same role but to have a political voice and power that a single black church might not be able to create.

It is from both of these stages, the local church and the national organization, that black communities confirm important issues and come together to voice their concerns to a dismissive majority. Blackness is still an out-group in today's society. These two settings are the perfect arena for speaking on marginalized topics, forcing them to become mainstream. As stated in Chapter Two, marginalized issues can often be brought into the mainstream when a unified body of people stand firmly enough for it. Even a minority culture, when given a loud enough voice, especially one like the black

community, can often make their issues heard. Bill Clinton realized this truth and understood the importance of his appearance and discussion of these topics. Black leaders bring topics to their supporters and those supporters carry those topics home with them. That is exactly what Clinton hoped to achieve in 1993 and 2000.

In 1993 the main issues for black America was the poor economy and crime (Murphy 1997). While the economy and crime are not necessarily marginal issues in society, America's response to these issues as they pertain to black Americans does create a sense of detachment from mainstream interests. Whites often do not see crime and welfare as issues that concern them. President Clinton made the economy his first concern when running for office in 1992. Now a year later he was returning to a group of strong supporters from that election to say that they were now in better shape. It was their commitment to him, their leader, that had made them better off, "I have worked hard to keep faith with our common efforts: to restore the economy to reward work and family and community and try to move us forward in to the 21<sup>st</sup> century" (13 November 1993: 6). "We have made a good beginning...people in this room have refinanced their homes. And in the last 10 months this economy has produced more jobs than in the previous four years" (13 November 1993: 8). These statements helped to create a bond between Clinton the newly elected leader and a minority audience seeking validation and a caring voice. The economy was still an important issue in 2000 even though Bill Clinton was no longer the focus of discussion. Because this address was a campaign address, Clinton stressed that the only way to continue the progress in the economy was by electing Gore, "On economic policy the Vice President and most people on our side of the political aisle, believe that we ought to keep the prosperity going" (13 July 2000: 31).

The address before the NAACP was a campaign speech meant to impress upon the audience that Al Gore would be the only candidate interested in the black community's stake in America, "The American Dream is real to more Americans than it was seven and a half years ago: with 22 million new jobs; the lowest unemployment and welfare rolls in 30 years; the longest economic expansion in history" (13 July 2000: 15). During the campaign it was often noted that Al Gore was unable to create the same bond with the minority population. Bill Clinton was speaking before an audience of black community leaders in the hopes that they would believe that this long time friend would provide them with a candidate equal to himself in attention and affection.

A second important issue to the black community highlighted by black leaders and embraced by President Clinton was crime. In 1993 guns were the leading cause of death for African-American men (NCSB, 2001). This statistic alone would get the attention of any member of the black community. John Murphy analyzed Clinton's use of inventing authority by assuming the voice of Martin Luther King Jr.; this is an extremely important point to this thesis as well. In 1993 before a crowded church, President Clinton created a monologue of what he thought the great civil rights leader would say about crime in the black community if he were still alive. The reader of this address will see that Clinton's decision to conjoin with King was extremely powerful.

You did a good job, he would say, elevating people of color into the ranks of the United States Armed Forces or the very top of our Government. He would say you did a good job creating a black middle class...you did a good job in opening opportunity. But he would say, I did not live and die to see the American family destroyed. I did not live and die to see 13 year old boys get automatic weapons and gun down 9 year olds just for the kick of it. My fellow Americans, he would say, I fought to stop white people from being so filled with hate that they would wreak violence on black people. I did not fight for the right of black people to murder other black people with reckless abandon. (13 November 1993: 21)

These powerful words that King never spoke came from a white, southern born president who knew he could never be King, but knew assuming his name and style of speech would have a profound effect on his black audience. Clinton followed up this assumed voice with the story which appeared on the front page of the Washington Post about an 11 year old girl who planned her own funeral: “These are the hymns I want sung. This is the dress I want to wear I know I’m not going to live very long” (13 November 1993: 25). Those in the audience could easily identify with the tragedy of a little girl who had already given up in a crime-filled society. Crime and death addressed in a formal church setting made the topics real. The President’s purpose was to empower each person to return to their communities with a desire to prevent them.

Crime discussed in the context of a religious setting is apparent seven years later in Clinton’s address to the NAACP as well. In his address before this powerful crowd of black leaders, Clinton referred back to 1993 stating that, “the rate of serious crime committed by young people had dropped by more than half since 1993, to the lowest level recorded” (13 July 2000: 20). In his 2000 address he linked his statements about the turn-around in crime and the economy by quoting the Bible, specifically Ecclesiastes 11:25, “In the day of prosperity there is forgetfulness of affliction” (25). He used a biblical reference to ask that the audience enjoy the good things that they have in life and to thank God for them and to “use this moment of prosperity to build the future of our dream for all God’s children” (13 July 2000: 25).

The black church is often the cornerstone of the black community. President Clinton had the understanding and the sensibilities to use that pulpit to create a bond and a bridge of support. From the 1993 address where he took on the voice of a slain hero of

the black community to the religious references and issue-centered speech he gave in 2000, Bill Clinton knew he had to become a church leader to be a black leader.

The second trait of blackness that is obvious in both addresses is that of a shared or linked fate. Linked fate means that the actions of members in the community affect the whole community. This is an important idea to a community that has often only had themselves to look to for support. While the church is important to the community in binding them together and rallying followers around issues, the same citizens know that they have struggled as a people to gain the lives they now have. While the idea of a linked fate can originate in the church, it goes beyond the simple idea of an issue that a group has in common. The linked fate is the understanding that there is a shared history involving hardship, sacrifice, and often death. Important milestones have been reached only because a society has worked as one and in order to continue to excel, the link between individuals must remain strong. Past examples of this idea include the Civil Rights Movement. This was a time when blacks were lynched for no reason, jobs and money were scarce, and every day was a new challenge. But the African-American community survived and broke new ground in America. Bill Clinton acknowledged linked fates in both of his addresses and attempts to link his fate with theirs.

In 1992 Bill Clinton ran a campaign reaching out to the middle class and the poor. His history of growing up in Hope, Arkansas, was well documented for the purpose of creating the image that he too had struggled. He acknowledged that during the campaign many did not think he could win because of his background. In the audience in 1993 was Bishop Brooks, one black leader who said that Bill Clinton would win and that his congregation would support him, "I thank him, and I thank your faith, and I thank your

works, for without you I would not be here today” (13 November 1993: 2). As the president discussed the struggles and accomplishments of the past year he stated several times that “we have so much more to do” (13 November 1993: 13).

Clinton’s greatest attempt to use the trait of linked fate came again from his assumption of Martin Luther King Jr.’s voice. Not only did Clinton assume the voice of the great leader but he also took on the evangelical speaking tone of King. Martin Luther King Jr. during the Civil Right Movement was one of the greatest motivators to urge blacks to work together to achieve a better future. Clinton did the same thing in the 1993 address by actually using a phrase from King, “I can see the promised land, but I’m not going to be able to get there with you, but we will get there” (13 November 1993: 20). Clinton attempted to say that even if the things that they all collectively struggle for do not come in his lifetime, they will come because they, the black community, including now himself, struggled together. He believed that future economic gains, increased salaries, and less crime would all come out of the struggles of a confident and resilient people.

This sense of linked fate also reappears in the NAACP address in 2000. This time however he used the idea of linked fate to explain a desire to solve the Middle East peace talks “I know that in our quest for a full, fair and final peace—Dr. King reminded us in more than the absence of war, but the presence of justice” (13 July 2000: 9). Again Clinton invoked the name of Martin Luther King, Jr. by stating that peace among people means more than that absence of war. Clinton recounted the history of Bloody Sunday, the march in Selma when America was not at peace with itself. Having again used King to join himself to his audience, Clinton reminded them that without them the country



would not have achieved the peace that it had, “I...take the spirit of the NAACP back to Camp David. I thank you for your support for all that we have done to turn America around and bring America closer together” (13 July 2000: 12). Through the use of stories of struggles overcome, Clinton was able to link himself to his audiences in much the same way that King and other great black leaders have throughout time.

The third strategy of blackness is how one identifies oneself. Blacks must embrace their color because, unfortunately even today, skin color is a divider. Terms for blacks have changed over the years, but no unanimous term has been found and America still needs a term (Hacker 1992). In this thesis black and African-American are the terms that are used. Bill Clinton used the term African-American in his addresses. This is important to note because in the white addresses later white or European-Americans were not used.

One of the first points that President Clinton made in 1993 was that thirteen percent of his staff and five of his Cabinet members are African-American. He was specifically highlighting these numbers. His cabinet was the most diverse in history and this audience understood the significance of this. Still in 1993, it had to be mentioned that blacks (African-Americans) were a part of government (13 November 1993: 7). The beginning of Clinton’s 2000 address highlighted the achievements of several noteworthy individuals who are black such as Venus Williams, the second black woman to win the Wimbledon tennis tournament (13 July 2000: 5).

Both addresses highlighted the progress that African-Americans had made in the past decades and in the years that Clinton was in office. It is in the area of the economy that Clinton highlighted the progress of blacks the most. In 2000, black “homeownership

is at an all-time high” and “our top tax cut priorities are for working families with low incomes and lots of kids” (13 July 2000: 37).

What is most important about labeling is that there is a label at all. During the late 1950's and 1960's the label representing black was Negro. This term, however, was replaced with black and later African-American became the term that most appropriately represented this segment of America. Clinton used the term African-American, but as often as he could he simply used “we” to discuss issues, struggles, and progress: “We are more nearly one America”, “We have more opportunity than we did...” (13 July 2000: 15), and “Scripture says, you are the salt of the Earth and the light of the world, if your light shines before men they will give glory to the Father in heaven. That is what we must do” (13 November 1993: 36). That Clinton had to identify Williams as a black athlete or would discuss a book written by Julius Wilson, an African-American sociologist, meant that there is still inequality in America. White is still seen as the natural, the right way to be. There will be a day when the only “we” will be a united “we”.

The style of blackness incorporates traits from the black church, such as the use of scripture and evangelical language. Church leaders, who are often also the civic leaders, identify and push important issues that will bind communities together. Blackness depends on an understanding of a linked fate with the individuals in their care and a shared past that can be appreciated. Bill Clinton understood all these things and the importance of labels when addressing black audiences. He incorporated his life story and his struggles into his speeches. He often referred to his childhood in Hope, Arkansas, a small community where money was often scarce. He also called attention to the fact that many thought he would never succeed in politics, “most people thought I wouldn't

survive. Bishop Brooks said...I would be elected. I thank him, and I thank your faith” (13 November 1993: 2). President Clinton used the voice of the greatest hero of civil rights to bond with people who might otherwise see him as an imposter in their ranks. Bill Clinton used the style of blackness to increase his ethos and possibly become the first black president of the United States (Newsweek 2001).

### **Clinton and Whiteness**

Nakayama and Krizek’s research outlined whiteness as a construct or as a way of understanding the actions of white individuals (Nakayama and Krizek 1999). For this thesis however, whiteness is being discussed as a rhetorical tool or style that can be adapted for an audience that is mostly European and white skinned. Bill Clinton is such a speaker and has the additional labels of being a southern born white male. President Clinton incorporated into his speeches many of the characteristics of whiteness outlined by Nakayama and Krizek when addressing white audiences. The traits of whiteness Clinton used were the lack of labels; his audience as white America; non-emotive language; and whiteness as invisible to those who are white.

The first address in this thesis representing whiteness was President Clinton’s speech to an AFL-CIO Union Convention in San Francisco in 1993. Like the address in Memphis earlier that year, Clinton had high approval ratings and had watched as several of his major plans successfully passed through Congress. One example of this was NAFTA, a free trade agreement that the Unions were against. The president was in part giving this address to calm the union leaders and reassure them that the agreement would not hurt their business. The audience for this address was happy to have a Democrat as president, but was concerned that he would give too much trade power to Mexico. This

audience was homogeneous in ideas and background. This homogeneity, along with the convention setting make it a good comparison to the NAACP speech that was outlined in the section on blackness. The whiteness style was very appropriate for this Union convention setting.

The second address illustrating whiteness was given in Annapolis, Maryland, at the United State Naval Academy. This address was given in 1998 at the May graduation ceremony. While this address is not set in a church, like the Memphis address, it is given in a structured and celebratory situation that will highlight the differences between whiteness and blackness. The audience for this address, while mostly white, quite possibly had a good deal of minorities in the class. However, in the case of military service units, the image created for the public is one that has no race (Army 2001). This audience, while possible diverse in ethnicity, was being presented as a white, American audience.

Whiteness has been defined as invisible by several researchers. Invisibility means that while black is labeled to stand out, white just is. It does not have to be stated or defined, it is just understood that a person is white unless otherwise stated. Having said this the following analysis will be a description of that invisibility and ways President Clinton kept it that way. Clinton was depending on the pride of the American worker and their strong work ethic to make Americans the only audience for this speech.

President Clinton stated that unions are a democratic achievement and that union members should feel a great sense of pride that the American economy and production had remained high while world events had caused others to struggle, "The labor movement, historically, has always been on the cutting edge of change and the drive to

empower workers and give them more dignity” (4 October 1993: 14). One example of Clinton’s remarks was the decline of communism in Europe and the cultural revolutions taking place in other countries around the world, “We now know that every wealthy country in the world is having trouble creating jobs,” and “we are going to recreate opportunity for all Americans who are willing to do what it takes” (4 October 1993: 9). While the unions themselves did little to help in these events, union members can look upon these achievements as American success. They can see themselves as successful products of democracy and patriotism.

The third and fifth traits of whiteness outlined by Nakayama and Krizek will be joined together in the next section. The third trait is that white is scientifically natural while the fifth trait is the refusal to be labeled. First, writers of history texts and journals rarely highlight a leader’s skin color if it is white. In the section on blackness Clinton highlighted Venus Williams and several ministers who were successful African-Americans. In the Annapolis address no such highlighting is done: “Let me also join in...congratulating you Superintendent. Admiral Larson has performed remarkable service as an aviator, submarine commander, and twice at the helm of the Academy” (22 May 1998: 5).

The same trait can be seen in the union address: “We have nominated a Chair of the National Labor Relations board in Bill Gould” and “We have a Secretary of Labor in Bob Reich” (4 October 1993: 23). While there is no way to be sure without asking the gentlemen highlighted in these two addresses it could be assumed that Larson, Gould, and Reich would be uncomfortable if President Clinton were to introduce them or discuss their accomplishments and include the fact that each man was white. In these situations,

with audiences that are homogeneous and primarily white, no mention of race is necessary or appropriate.

In both of these addresses the familiar “we” was present. Clinton stated that he “believed that we needed a new sense of community” (4 October 1993: 22), also, “We have got over 2800 proposals in this country for technology” (4 October 1993: 39). In these examples and Clinton’s other uses of the term “we” never was he trying to bond with an audience that could see him as an ethnic outsider.

The fourth characteristic of whiteness is that whiteness is often confused with nationality. It is in this trait that Clinton is dependent on his audience to identify more with the nationality than with their skin color. In the union speech in 1993, Clinton continually spoke of American prosperity and world standing. He pointed out that, “for most of the 20<sup>th</sup> century the union movement in America has represented the effort to make sure that people who worked hard and played by the rules were treated fairly” (4 October 1993: 2). He also noted that unions “promote democracy abroad, to guarantee the right of people freely to join their own unions” (6). Again this statement ignored the reality that unions throughout time have been traditionally white organizations and minorities are often still not found in upper-level leadership positions. Clinton also mentioned that industry, headed by unions, in America helped create the lowest unemployment numbers in years (4 October 1993: 17). These numbers, unlike the numbers Clinton used in the blackness addresses, do not break down to say who specifically is benefiting from America’s prosperity.

As for the Navy address, the idea of nationality is one that is firmly implanted in Clinton’s audience. When banners and flags are waved in anger, denouncing the United

States across the planet, it is almost always a dirty, white, American who is depicted. The soldiers before Clinton at Annapolis had just graduated into the most powerful navy in the world but also the most hated: “I want to ask you to think about the challenges we face as a nation in the century that is just upon us” (22 May 1998: 8). America’s armed forces must efface their race and embrace their country as a red, white, and blue force, not a white and black one. Clinton’s remarks underscored that reality: “If our children are grow up safe...” (22 May 1998: 16) and “We will undertake a concerted effort to prevent the spread of weapons...” (22 May 1998: 24). Again, there is no cultural distinction made in these quotes. The general “we” as Americans is used to bond the audience together. Even though the members of the audience may have been a mix of races and genders, Clinton was correct to use the style of whiteness. In a setting that desired to keep differences to a minimum whiteness was the appropriate style.

Nakayama and Krizek developed a construct that helps researchers define whiteness. Their six strategies made outlining whiteness in this thesis easier. Some of their strategies did not apply to the artifact analyzed here, which is acceptable for this project. Whiteness is an elusive style because so much of it depends on its inherent invisibility. The second trait is that of negative stereotyping. That particular trait was not observed in the chosen texts. The sixth and final trait, that of whiteness as European was not observed until the Million Man March address which is next to be analyzed.

### **Clinton and the Millions of Colors**

The final address analyzed for this thesis was an address that had strong elements of both black and white style. On October 16, 1995, President Clinton spoke from Austin, Texas, in response to the Million Man March. This march was a show of strength and

solidarity for black men. It was a march in Washington D.C. that asked its members to join together to show they were not drug addicts, women abusers, and lazy welfare receivers. This march was supposed to show the world that the black stereotype was incorrect (Bierbaur 1995). The march itself did in fact show those things; however, it was the sponsor of the march who caused controversy. The Reverend Louis Farrakhan, the leader of the Nation of Islam, was often labeled as an outspoken racist and anti-Semitic. While Clinton had to address the nation on this day of celebration, he had to address both the supportive black audience and the cautious white audience. President Clinton also had to be careful not to credit Farrakhan for his part in the peaceful event (Bierbauer 1995).

The address that Clinton presented following the Million Man March was emotional and evangelical as is the tradition of the black church and its followers: “Let us pray that all who march and all who speak will stand for atonement, for reconciliation” (16 October 1995: 10). Clinton again invoked the name of Martin Luther King in his 1995 address by stating: “he spoke for the dignity of man and the destiny of democracy” (16 October 1995: 6). He was attempting to once again join the black community by speaking in the tradition of the black church. This was a setting and tone many in the audience, but especially those who had addressed the crowd, are quite familiar with.

Bill Clinton also used the idea of linked fate in his 1995 address. His address in Austin acknowledged the large number of Hispanic Americans in the audience and highlighted that they too, have been the victims of injustice. America is still divided in many ways, but America has a shared fate: “Some (divisions) are rooted in the awful history and stubborn persistence of racism. Some are rooted in the fact that we still haven’t learned to talk frankly, to listen carefully, and work together across racial lines”



(16 October 1995: 7), and “Today we face a choice. One way leads to further separation and bitterness and more lost futures. The other way, the path of courage and wisdom, leads to unity” (16 October 1995: 11). He tried to show that no matter their skin color, America’s citizens have a linked fate and a vested interest in equality and “opportunity for all Americans” (16 October 1995: 13).

While President Clinton was consciously aware that his immediate audience and his mediated audience were quite mixed and expected a style that would show support for their cause, he was also aware of a concerned majority that needed reassurance that this march would not cause violence and disruption throughout the nation. Clinton’s white audience needed to know that radical changes were not forthcoming.

In the first few paragraphs of the 1995 address, Clinton acknowledged the country’s European roots and quoted the famous British leader, Winston Churchill, who said, “I have great confidence in the judgment and the common sense of the American people and their leaders” (5). Clinton thus acknowledged a white past and highlighted the confidence others had in white America during another disruptive time in its history. Only once did he draw a line with words between white and black America. This occurred early in the address, and from then on, whiteness again became understood and only African-American is highlighted, “white and black Americans often see the same world in drastically different ways, ways that go beyond and beneath the Simpson trial” (16 October 1995: 5). Another example for the address would follow shortly, “The rift we see before us that is tearing at the heart of America exists in spite of the remarkable progress black Americans have made in the last generation” (16 October 1995: 6). Also

Clinton used the neutral “we” throughout the address. In this case the “we” represents America not a divided audience of many races but one nation seeking to find unity:

In the past, when we’ve had the courage to face the truth about our failure to live up to our own best ideals, we’ve grown stronger, moved forward, and restored proud American optimism (16 October 1995: 12).

President Clinton used the styles of whiteness and blackness effectively in these five addresses. In the artifacts of blackness, the voice of the church and the issues of the black community are key to Clinton’s use of black style. The use of King by Clinton both formal settings allowed his audiences to hear his identification with them, even if his appearance would suggest otherwise. His identifying of important blacks also strengthens his ties to this community.

Clinton used many of Nakayama and Krizek’s constructs effectively during the Annapolis and San Francisco addresses. He did not use the comparison of white as good versus black as evil. These speeches do not call for this comparison and this trait in the world of politics and public office would not normally support its use. Clinton was about to address his audience as one body of Americans. He did not attempt to separate individual ethnicities in these addresses because it would be inappropriate and awkward before a homogeneous crowd.

Finally, President Clinton combined these two styles well when addressing the national audience taking part in and watching the Million Man March in Washington D.C. He was able to use emotional language and rational arguments to quell any unrest by either whites or black. He drew on the black church and addresses America with the universal “we”. His use of these two styles is

important because it shows that they can be combined, but also that there is a possible gray style that should be analyzed in the future. For this thesis however, Bill Clinton was able to use two styles of presentation to reach two audiences of opposites.

**CHAPTER FOUR:**

**WHAT HAS BEEN FOUND**

**AND**

**WHAT REMAINS TO BE UNCOVERED**

The idea for this thesis was generated by the 1995 Nakayama and Krizek article on the social construction of whiteness and its usefulness in understanding “white” as a culture. From that article came the obvious notion that whites and African-Americans in America are still at odds. This thesis had two purposes, the first of which was to explain how Bill Clinton was able to create a bridge to white and black audiences. This goal was achieved by analyzing his speeches using observable rhetorical cultural styles. The second goal of this thesis was to create a document that would further support that bridge. Whiteness and blackness were the rhetorical styles that Clinton used depending on the situation and audience he was addressing. As Farrell concluded these styles were appropriate due to the situational content for each political address (1993).

From Nakayama and Krizek’s five strategies of social whiteness a white style of public address was formed. Five of the six characteristics of whiteness were identified in Clinton’s rhetoric, (1) white as invisible; (2) white as the opposite of something negative;

(3) white as natural or normal; (4) the absence of cultural labeling; and (5) white as American culture (Nakayama and Krizek 1995). These five characteristics are easily observable in both the union address in 1993 and the Annapolis address in 1998.

Analysis of the two whiteness speeches clearly showed the existence of a white social setting and Clinton's acceptance and continuance of that setting. In these addresses whiteness is never called to the attention of the audience. There is never a need for individuals to be labeled as white and all members in both audiences are solidly supporters of American ideals. It is likely that at no point during the two addresses using white style did anyone believe it necessary for Clinton to separate his audience by applying cultural labels to them. Both addresses were presented by Clinton in non-emotive tones that transferred his message to the audience well. For the white audience the bland language is the appropriate presentation tone. However, this would not be true during the black style speeches.

The constructs of black style used in this thesis were created from research done by black authors like Lincoln, Morrison, Cohen, and Hacker. These researchers were all attempting to further awareness of issues and values of the black community in the 1990's. These authors all found common themes that lead to an observable black style. The first and most important theme identified was that blackness is far from invisible. Every day blacks are labeled, from black athletes to black leaders. Because of this truth, the black community has had to accept that they are still different from the mainstream American.

Emotive, evangelical presentations are effective at capturing feelings and motivating the actions of African-Americans. Black communities have specific issues

that they need addressed by their leaders and those leaders are often from a church background. The black church had been a mainstay of the black community from the early days in American history (Sanger 1995). Not only was it important for black leaders to associate with a church, they had to be well versed in the Bible. Using emotive language and biblical references made speeches into sermons and enhanced credibility. While President Clinton was not a church leader, he was able to utilize the Bible and an emotive speaking style to gain credibility in the black community.

Research also found that during times of economic distress and social hardship it was almost always the church that kept the community together and uplifted. Because of this many of the black leaders in American history were pastors and preachers (Callaway-Thomas and Smith 1981). This is one reason why President Clinton embraced the tone and spirit of Martin Luther King Jr. Clinton was well aware of who blacks revered. Few leaders since had commanded the respect of the slain civil rights leader. By identifying with Dr. King in both his 1993 and 2000 addresses, Clinton identified with his audience.

Issues such as poverty and violence concerned black communities on a day-to-day basis. Any leader who hoped to be successful with blacks knew to address these topics. Bill Clinton grew up in a time of great civil unrest and observed the hardships of the African-American. He understood the issues of poverty and disadvantage and was credible to speak to others about these topics. Bill Clinton knew that to reach his black supporters he must take on their issues and speak their language.

The final address analyzed for this thesis incorporated characteristics of both styles. Clinton's address following the "Million Man March" in 1995 attempted to reach out to his black supporters by backing the march. This speech talked about the issues that

concerned the black audience and divided them from the white populace (Bierbauer 1995). Clinton used emotive language at times to stress the importance of peaceful demonstrations for equality and unity. He also warned blacks of the danger of following a path that would further divide the country.

This address had a second audience that was not present at the march. White America watched the march and the speeches that came out of the event on their televisions. This was an event that clearly labeled blacks and brought whiteness into view. A march on the capital city of America by a minority culture continued the impression white really was American culture. White culture in America excluded the black community.

This address was the first time that Nakayama's sixth characteristic of whiteness was used. Bill Clinton, possibly in an attempt to relax white anxieties, mentioned the history of whites in America. He stated that at one time in America even European whites did not have the rights and privileges they believed were rightfully theirs. This characteristic of whiteness was not used in the addresses to whites because the distinction of white as European and having a historical culture was not necessary. It became necessary when the white population saw another culture massing in Washington D. C. White and black style are two very different yet combinable new strategies of rhetoric. As Farrell had discovered, the situation will call forth the correct style. It is up to the speaker to realize this and to do what is called for.

White and black styles are both effective ways to address culturally different audiences. Unfortunately, in America, in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, these audiences and the need to address them uniquely still exists. White and black leaders alike can use these differing

styles effectively. There is no reason that an African-American leader could not address white audiences and be effective using white style. In this vein of thought, other American leaders' rhetoric should be analyzed to see if there was an attempt to reach out to varied audiences. In the address only President Clinton as observed, combined with the ideas and voice of Martin Luther King Jr. There have been other leaders in America who have fought for cultural harmony and support. The question could be asked: is it the style of message or the messenger himself or herself, such as Al Gore, that was ineffective? Also, leaders such as Reverend Jackson have always been popular and effective using the black style. Would a leader who has only used this alternative style be believable if he chose to use white style in certain settings? Must the two styles be used throughout a career in order for a rhetor to use both successfully?

As America continues to expand in population and as the world becomes more connected, these two styles will become increasingly important for communication and commerce. According to the 2000 census, America in 2001 is 48% white and 52% minority culture of some type (Census 2000). If this is an accurate representation of America, then cultural presentation style will be important to more than just politicians.

This work used a single political leader, President Clinton, to analyze political discourse. Politics and culture are areas of study that still need to be addressed by scholars in the coming years. As more minorities enter the field of politics and begin to take their rightful place in the seats of government it will be important to understand how they get their message across and motivate their support. The use of political speeches is also only one way in which to analyze messages. Political advertisements, press



conferences, and even local town hall meetings are all areas where style plays a part in the creation of a cultural message.

Limitations to the thesis have become apparent. First, the use of whiteness and blackness as ways of rhetorically analyzing artifacts is still in its infancy. While this area of communication is extremely important, like whiteness itself, the study of cultured communication can also be invisible. More theses and scholarly works addressing whiteness and blackness must be done to continue to bind America together.

Cultural definition may be yet another limitation of this thesis. While Nakayama and Krizek had outlined a six-point strategy for analyzing whiteness, blackness has yet to find itself displayed similarly. For this thesis a combination of black and white scholars were studied and their findings combined to form blackness. The argument could, and probably should, be made that important concepts that pertain to black culture were missing. This leaves area for more study. Research must continue in the field of cultural communication. In the area of politics, whiteness and blackness will be an important strategy of persuasion and identity.

The bridge that crosses the cultural divide has not been completed. Thirty-seven years after President Johnson signed his name to the Civil Rights act of 1964, America is still divided. Legally whites and blacks are no longer separated, but socially this country is still struggling to come together. In 1992 a young, educated, southern male took the mantle of power in America and attempted to speak the language of America's citizenry like no president before him. Bill Clinton reached out to both whites and blacks in their own voice to gain their acceptance.

There will be many positive and negative things written about President Clinton for decades to come. His time in office brought about many events to be studied and critiqued. He brought youth to the office as he was one of the youngest American presidents. He presided over America during one of its most economically successful periods. He also brought scandal and raised questions about private life for a public official with the Monica Lewinsky affair. Throughout his eight years as president, Bill Clinton retained a high level of support from the American people. One of the possible reasons for this was his ability to adapt his message to his audiences. While he was unsuccessful in his attempt to bring America together as one, he was able to use both white and black styles as rhetorical tools to keep himself successful. President Clinton legacy may be marred with scandal and sadness over his personal conduct, but in one area Clinton did leave lasting positive footprints. His bridge to the 21<sup>st</sup> century has one more supporting block.

## WORKS CITED

- Bierbauer, Charles. "Million Man messenger, not message, causing division."  
[www.cnn.com/US/9510/megamarch/10-15/index.html](http://www.cnn.com/US/9510/megamarch/10-15/index.html) October 15, 1995.
- Bitzer, Lloyd F. "The Rhetorical Situation." Readings in Rhetorical Criticism, ed. Carl R. Burgchardt, Pennsylvania: Strata Publishing, 1995.
- Black, Edwin. "Excerpts from *Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method*." Readings in Rhetorical Criticism. Ed. Carl R. Burgchardt. Pennsylvania: Strata; 1995.
- Burke, Kenneth. A Rhetoric of Motives. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.
- Calloway-Thomas, Carolyn, and Raymond Smith. "Images of Leadership: Black and White." The Southern Communication Journal 46 (1981): 263-277.
- Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs. Man Cannot Speak For Her: A Critical Study of Early Feminist Rhetoric. New York: Praeger, 1989.
- Cohen, Cathy. The Boundaries of Blackness. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1999.
- Crenshaw, Carrie. "Resisting Whiteness' Rhetorical Silence." The Western Journal of Communication, 61 (Summer 1997): 253-278.
- Denton, Robert E., and Gary C. Woodward. Political Communication in America. Connecticut: Praeger, 1998.
- Dow, Bonnie J., and Mari Boor Tonn. "'Feminine Style' and Political Judgment in the Rhetoric of Ann Richards." Quarterly Journal of Speech, 79 (1993): 286-302.
- Dow, Bonnie J. "Feminism, Differences, and Rhetorical Studies." Communication Studies, 46, (Spring 1995): 107-117.

- Farrell, Thomas. Norms of Rhetorical Culture. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.
- Gibson, Jane W. "The Social Construction of Whiteness in Shellcracker Haven, Florida." Human Organization 55, (1996): 379-389.
- Hacker, Andrew. Two Nations: Black and White, Separate Hostile, Unequal. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1992.
- Hartigan, John. "Establishing the Fact of Whiteness." American Anthropologist, 99 (September 1997): 495-505.
- Henry, Charles. Culture and African-American Politics. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990.
- Kerns-Goodwin, Doris. Lyndon Johnson and the American Dream. California: St. Martin's Press, 1990.
- Leeman, Richard. "Spatial Metaphors in African-American Discourse." The Southern Communication Journal 60 (1995): 165-180.
- Leo, John. "The New Al Gore." USNews and World Report. (January 1999): p. 33.
- Leo, John. "The Next Best Thing?" USNews and World Report. (July 2000): p. 32.
- Lincoln, C. Eric. Race, Religion, and the Continuing American Dilemma. New York: Hill and Wang, 1999.
- Logue, Cal, and Thurmon Garner. "Shift in Rhetorical Status of Blacks after Freedom." The Southern Communication Journal 54 (1988): 1-39.
- Lucaites, John L., Celeste Michelle Condit. "Reconstructing Equality: Culturetypal and Counter-Cultural Rhetorics in the Martyred Black Vision." Communication Monographs, 57, (March 1990): 5-19.

- Martin, Judith, Robert Krizek, Thomas Nakayama, and Lisa Bradford. "What Do White People Want to be Called." Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity. Ed. Thomas Nakayama and Judith Martin. California: Sage, 1999. 27-50.
- Murphy, John M. "Inventing Authority: Bill Clinton, Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Orchestration of Rhetorical Tradition." The Quarterly Journal of Speech. 83 (1997): 71-89.
- Nakayama, Thomas, and Judith Martin. Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity. California: Sage, 2000.
- Nakayama, Thomas, and Judith Martin. "Whiteness as Strategic Rhetoric." Ed. Thomas Nakayama and Judith Martin. Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity. California: Sage, 1999. 87-106.
- "Remarks by President William Clinton in San Francisco, California." Public Papers of the President. v 1, October 4, 1993: 1667-1676.
- "Remarks by President William Clinton in Memphis, Tennessee." Public Papers of the President. v 2, November 13, 1993: 1981-1986.
- "Remarks by President William Clinton in Austin, Texas." Public Papers of the President. v 2, October 16, 1995: 1600-1606.
- "Remarks by President William Clinton in Annapolis, Maryland." Public Papers of the President. v 1, May 22, 1998: 825-829.
- "Remarks by President William Clinton in Baltimore, Maryland." Public Papers of the President. [www.pub.whitehouse.gov](http://www.pub.whitehouse.gov) July 13, 2000.
- Rigsby, Enrique. "African-American Rhetoric and The 'Profession'." Western Journal of Communication 57 (1993): 191-199.

- Reid, Ronald F. *American Rhetorical Discourse*. Prospect Heights: Waveland, 1995.
- Sanger, Kerran. "Slave Resistance and Rhetorical Self-Definition: Spirituals as a Strategy." *Western Journal of Communication* 59 (1995): 177-192.
- Shome, Raka. "Whiteness and the Politics of Location." Ed. Thomas Nakayama and Judith Martin. *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity*. California: Sage, 1999. 107-128.
- Stage, Christina W. "We Celebrate 100 Years: An "Indigenous" Analysis of the Metaphors That Shape the Cultural Identity of Small Town, U.S.A." Ed. Thomas Nakayama and Judith Martin. *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity*. California: Sage, 1999. 69-86.
- Roegider, David. *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class*. London: Verso, 1991
- Ware, B. L., and Wil Linkugel. "The Rhetorical Persona: Marcus Garvey as Black Moses." *Communication Monographs* 49 (1982): 50-63.
- White, Jack. "Dividing Line: 'Leave Him Alone'". *Time*, (October 5 1998): p 52.
- [www.Census.com](http://www.Census.com) 2001.
- [www.CNN.com/clinton/impeachment/chronology](http://www.CNN.com/clinton/impeachment/chronology) 1997.
- [www.NCSB.com](http://www.NCSB.com) National Crime Statistics Bureau 2001.
- [www.Army.mil](http://www.Army.mil) United States Army 2001.

## APPENDIX ONE

Office of the Press Secretary

July 13, 2000

Remarks by the President to 91st National Convention of the NAACP

Baltimore Convention Center

Baltimore, Maryland

As released by the White House, Office of the Press Secretary, July 13, 2000

THE PRESIDENT: Well, let me say it's good to see you. Thank you for making me feel so welcome. Thank you, Julian; thank you, Kweisi. Thank you, Myrlie Evers Williams. Ben Hooks, Elaine Jones, the whole board. Thank you, Wendell Anthony, for letting me come to Detroit to the biggest dinner in the history of the world. (Applause.)

I know I had dinner with Wendell in Detroit with over 10,000 people, because he told me so, but I couldn't even see the people at the other head table, it was so big. (Laughter.)

Thank you, Mayor O'Malley, for welcoming us to Baltimore and for being such a great leader (Applause.) Thank you, Representative Elijah Cummings, for representing Baltimore so well. (Applause.) And thank you, Mayor John Street, for representing Philadelphia so well and making it true to the founders' dreams. (Applause.)

I have, I know, oh, a dozen or more members of the White House staff here, but I would like to mention a few: Thurgood Marshall, Jr., whose father was a native of Baltimore -- (applause) --my chief speechwriter, Terry Edmonds, a Baltimore native. (Applause.) I thank Mark Lindsey; Mary Beth Cahill; Ben Johnson, who runs our One America office; my political director, Minyon Moore; Janis Kearney; Broderick Johnson, a Baltimore native; Orson Porter; and we have at least another half a dozen folks who are here because they wanted to be here with you today. (Applause.)

This has been a remarkable week for African Americans. Venus Williams became the first African American woman since Althea Gibson to win the Wimbledon. (Applause.) Perhaps even more remarkable for those who know the mysteries of the church, Baltimore's own Dr. Vashti McKenzie became the first woman bishop in the history of the A.M.E. Church. (Applause.)

And you have had an amazing conference. I'm really glad Governor Bush came. (Laughter.) I am. But I thought the other fellow gave a better speech. (Applause.) And I

liked especially the speech that that Senate candidate from New York gave. I caught that one on Tuesday.

(Applause).

I want to tell you, I'm very proud, as we look back on the last seven and a half years of all the work that my wife has done -- not just for those, but for 30 years for children, for families, for education, for health care. But as First Lady, she has done so much to increase adoption and improve foster care, to increase the access to children to health care and to early education. (Applause.) And one thing that ought to be of particular importance to the African American community -- for the celebration of the millennium, she started -- she had this theme, we were going to honor the past and imagine the future. And part of honoring the past was setting aside millennial treasures, a lot of which are important landmarks of the civil rights movement -- Abraham Lincoln's summer home at the Old Soldiers' Home; Harriet Tubman's cottage up in New York; a lot of other places.

And the head of the National Historic Preservation Trust came up to me the other day when we were protecting Mr. Lincoln's home, and he said, Mr. President, I want you to know that your wife came up with this idea of the millennial treasures. It has now raised \$100 million in public/private money. It's the biggest historic preservation movement in the history of the United States of America. So I'm very proud of her for that. (Applause.)

Now, as all of you know, I came here from Camp David this morning, where we are meeting with the Israelis and the Palestinians in an effort to resolve the profound differences that have kept the people of the Middle East apart for a very long time. I know that in our quest for a full, fair and final peace -- which Dr. King reminded us is more than the absence of war, but the presence of justice and brotherhood and genuine reconciliation -- I know we will have your prayers and your best wishes. (Applause.)

But I had to come to Baltimore today, because you embody the spirit of freedom and reconciliation we're trying to capture there, that we need so badly in our talks; a spirit that is woven into the fabric of American life because of the contributions of African Americans from W.E.B. DuBois, to Rosa to Thurgood to Martin to Daisy Bates, Coretta, Medgar, Malcolm, to Jesse and John Lewis and Julian and Kweisi. (Applause.)

One of the greatest days of my presidency was last march, on the 35th anniversary of Bloody Sunday, when I was honored to walk with many people in this room across the Pettus Bridge in Selma. I said then something I'd like to repeat today -- that as a son of the South, the brave souls who marched across that bridge 35 years ago set me free, too. (Applause.) It is important to know that every movement for human rights in this country is about even more than gaining equal opportunity and equal rights and decent justice for the oppressed. It is also about forgiveness and healing; about letting go and moving on; about giving our children a better tomorrow.

So I wanted to be here especially during these peace talks to draw strength from you and take the spirit of the NAACP back to Camp David. (Applause.) I wanted to come here



one last time to say thank you -- a simple, but deep thank you for your support, your prayers, your friendship over all these years, for all that we have done to turn America around and bring America closer together.

Eight years ago this week -- I can't believe it -- eight years ago this week, at your National Conference in Nashville, I was the governor of Arkansas, the apparent nominee of the Democratic Party. And I brought my choice for Vice President, Senator Al Gore, to the NAACP Convention. (Applause.) Rather, I accepted Ben Hooks' mandatory invitation to appear.

(Laughter.)

And I pledged then -- and I want to quote it exactly, I don't want to miss a word -- I pledged you, "an administration that looks like America; one that knows the promise and the pain of this country; one that will rebuild, reunite and renew the American spirit." I think together we have honored that pledge. (Applause.) Thank you.

The American Dream is real to more Americans than it was seven and a half years ago. And we are more nearly one America than we were seven and a half years ago: with 22 million new jobs; the lowest unemployment and welfare rolls in 30 years; the lowest crime rates in 25 years; the lowest child poverty in 20 years; the lowest minority unemployment rates ever recorded; the lowest female unemployment rates in 40 years; the highest home ownership in history; the longest economic expansion in history. We have more opportunity than we did seven and a half years ago. (Applause.)

And, perhaps equally important, our social fabric is on the mend. The Family and Medical Leave law, the first bill I signed, vetoed in the previous administration, has allowed over 20 million Americans to take a little time off when a baby was born or a parent was sick, without losing their jobs, and it's been good for the economy, not bad for the economy. (Applause.)

For the first time ever, 90 percent of our children are immunized against serious childhood diseases. Our food is safer, our air is cleaner, our water is purer. More land has been protected for all time to come for Americans to enjoy; 150,000 young Americans have served in communities in every state in this country in AmeriCorps. The high school graduation rate of African Americans is virtually equal with that of the white majority, for the first time in the history of the United States of America. (Applause.) And all over the country I have seen schools that once were failing, turning around.

In Harlem, I was in a school the other day where, two years ago, 80 percent of the children were reading and doing mathematics below grade level; two years later, 74 percent of the children reading and doing mathematics at or above grade level -- in just two years. This is happening all over America. (Applause.)

Today, we're releasing an annual report on the status of our children. According to the study, the teen birth rate for 15 to 17-year-olds has dropped to the lowest level ever

recorded. The birth rate for African American adolescents has dropped by nearly one-third since 1991. (Applause.)

The report also found that child poverty continues its decline. And the rate of serious violent crime committed by young people has dropped by more than half since 1993, to the lowest level recorded since statistics has been kept on this subject. This is very good news. (Applause.) And I hope you will trumpet it, not because we're as safe as we need to be, but we need to destroy stereotypes so we can start making real progress on the issues still remaining.

Now -- so that's my report. Thank you for giving me a chance to serve. That's my report. Now, here's my question: What do you intend to do with all this? You know, I'm going to treasure this award for the rest of my life. But what really matters is what all of us do tomorrow with what our yesterdays have piled up. (Applause.) So before you leave here, when you go home and people say, what did you do in Baltimore, if you don't answer any other thing, you ought to be able to say, well, I figured out what I was going to do with all the prosperity and progress my country has made in the last eight years.

That is the issue. And I guess I can say this now because my hair is a lot grayer and I've got a few more wrinkles than I had eight years ago. But one thing I know -- how a nation deals with its prosperity is just as stern a test of its judgment, its vision and its values as how a nation deals with adversity. After all, when you elected me eight years ago -- and the other side kind of referred to me as a governor of a small southern state, and I was so naive I thought it was a compliment -- (laughter.) You know what -- I still do. (Applause.) But when you elected me, it didn't require rocket science to know that if we had quadrupled the debt in 12 years, and all the social indicators were going in the wrong direction, and the country was coming apart at the seams, and unemployment was going up and crime was going up, and opportunity for our children was going down, we had to change.

I mean, this was not -- I don't want to deprive myself of any credit, but it wasn't rocket science. We had to do something. So you said, well, I'll take a chance on that fellow. Now, every person in this room -- we've got a lot of young people here and I'm grateful for that and I'm grateful for the role that you've done to bring all the young people back into the NAACP. (Applause.) But listen, everybody over 30 in this room -- listen to me -- if you're over 30, you can remember at least one time in your life when you have made a mistake, not because times were so bad, but because times were good -- so good you thought there was no penalty to the failure to concentrate. Am I right about that? (Laughter.)

Listen to this. In the Scripture, Ecclesiastes 11:25 says, "In the day of prosperity there is forgetfulness of affliction." Everybody over 30 has had that kind of forgetfulness at one time or another. Am I right about that? (Applause.) So here is my point to you. You look at these kids before you leave here; we cannot do that now. I have done everything I knew to do to turn this country around, to move this country forward, to lift people up, to lift people together. (Applause.) But, man, the best stuff is still out there. And the big

challenges are still on the horizon. And we will never forgive ourselves if we don't say we are going to use this moment of prosperity to build the future of our dreams for all God's children. That's what this is for.

(Applause.)

That's what this millennial election is all about. I want to commend the NAACP for your campaign to register new voters. I want to join you in mourning the passing of the chairman of your voter empowerment campaign, Earl Shihope (phonetic). But you need to finish his job. (Applause.) And then, you have to get people to actually go to the polls, to choose, and choose wisely.

We must make it clear again that every election is a choice. This is a big election. There are big differences, honest differences, between the parties, the candidates for president, the candidates for the Senate and the House of Representatives -- big and honest differences.

I'm determined to make as much bipartisan progress with the Congress as I can in the last six months. I think we'll get a lot done, but no matter how much we do, there will still be a lot that remains on America's future agenda. And there will be differences. And the thing I like about this election is, if we've got the right attitude about it, it can be an old-fashioned election, the kind the civics books say you ought to have, where we don't have people swinging mud at each other and repeating what we've seen in too many elections in the past where people basically say, you ought to vote for me, not because I'm so great, because my opponent is just one step above a car thief. (Laughter.) I mean, how many elections have you seen run like that?

Well, we don't have to do that. We can assume everybody is honorable and good, got their merit badges in the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts. But they're different; there's a choice to be made and there are consequences.

So when you leave you say, what I learned was we've got to use this year to decide what to do with this moment of prosperity; it may never come around again in our lifetime. I want to build a future of my dreams for my children; this is a big election, that's the main arena right now and there are big differences.

Now, let me just mention a few of them. On economic policy, the Vice President and most people on our side of the political aisle, we believe that we ought to keep the prosperity going and do our dead-level best to extend it to people and to places that have been left behind so far. (Applause.) But we think to keep the prosperity going, the right thing to do is to take the taxes you pay for Medicare and take them off the books, like we do with Social Security; keep paying the debt down; use the interest savings to put into Medicare and Social Security to lengthen our life so us baby boomers don't bankrupt the rest of you when we retire; invest in education and science and technology, the health care and the environment; and then have a tax cut we can afford that helps families with the basic things they're dealing with, and still leaves us the money to meet our responsibilities around the world -- to help fight AIDS in Africa and Asia, to help relieve

the debt of the poorest countries of the world, to help promote freedom and stand against ethnic cleansing -- (applause) -- fight against terrorism -- that allows us to do these basic things and still get this country out of debt over the next 12 years.

Why? Because that will keep interest rates lower. And if interest rates stay a percent lower over the next 10 years than they otherwise would be, that saves families -- listen to this -- African American homeownership at an all-time high -- that will save families \$250 billion in home mortgage rates in a decade. (Applause.)

Now, they say something different, and it's easier for me to give you their pitch and it sounds better the first time you hear it. They say, we have a projected surplus of \$1.9 trillion, and it's your money, so we're going to give more than half of it back to you in a tax cut. And then we're going to spend the rest of it to partially privatize Social Security. And when we take money out of the Social Security trust fund, we'll put money in it from this surplus. And by the time you do that, they've spent the whole projected surplus, and then some.

Now, here's the problem with that. If I ask you -- I want to ask all of you right now -- you just think about this real quiet, now; you don't have to say anything out loud, but everybody think about this -- what is your projected income over the next 10 years? Now, think. How much money do you think you're going to make over the next 10 years? How confident are you that you're right about your projected income? (Laughter.) Now, get it on up there to where you're about 80 percent confident. Now, if I sat here at a desk with a pen and a notary public and I said, I want every one of you to come up here right now and sign a contract that commits you to spend every penny of your projected income, would you do it? Well, if you would, you should support them. If not, you should support us and keep this economy going. (Applause.) That's what this is about.

Then there are the issues of economic justice. How can we assure a fair share? We believe that we should strengthen efforts to require equal pay for equal work for women, and they don't agree with us. (Applause.) We think we should raise the minimum wage \$1 over two years, because we think the people that serve our food at restaurants and help us do things, we think they ought to be able to raise their kids, too, and send their kids to college and make a decent living. And they're not. (Applause.)

Our top tax cut priorities are for working families with low incomes and a lot of kids; for increasing child care assistance; for a long-term care tax credit, when you've got an elderly or disabled loved one; for retirement savings; and to allow you to deduct college tuition for up to \$10,000 a year. That's our top -- (applause.) And we can do all that and still pay the country out of debt over the next 12 years, and have money to invest. Their top tax cut priority rolling through Congress like a hot knife through butter is a complete repeal of the estate tax, which costs \$100 billion over 10 years, and half of the benefits -- half the benefits go to one-tenth of 1 percent of the population. There's a difference here.

In education, we know that every child can learn. I just told you about the school I visited in Harlem. I was in rural Western Kentucky the other day in this little old school

that, four year ago, 12 percent of the kids -- over half the kids on school lunches -- four years ago, 12 percent of the kids could read at or above grade level; today, 57 percent. Five percent of the kids could do math at or above grade level; today, 70 percent. Zero percent of the kids could do science at or above grade level; today, 63 percent -- in four years. It's amazing, it's happening everywhere.

(Applause.)

Now, intelligence is equally distributed. It's opportunity that's not equally distributed. (Applause.) So our education policy is to invest more and demand more -- higher standards, greater accountability, but empower people to develop the capacities of all of our children. And it's working. But we have a very definite set of ideas about that, based on what we have seen and what educators have told us.

We want to modernize or build 6,000 schools and repair another 25,000 over the next five years. (Applause.) And the other side doesn't agree with us; they think that's wrong. We want to keep our commitment to hire 100,000 teachers for smaller classes in the early grades, because we know that's important to long-time learning capacity. (Applause.) And the other side doesn't agree with us; they don't think we should require that somehow of the states.

We want universal access to pre-school, summer school, after-school for all kids who need it. You can't say end social promotion and then blame the kids for the failure system; you have to have a system that says, okay, no social promotion, but here is how the children are going to meet the standards and go on and learn and do what they're supposed to do. (Applause.)

So there are differences here -- in the economy, in economic justice, in education, and there are differences in health care. And the Vice President talked a lot about this yesterday, so I won't beat it to death. But this is very important. We believe that because we have the money to do it, we should have a true Medicare prescription drug benefit that's available and affordable to all seniors and disabled people who need it. We think we should do this. (Applause.)

They say it might be too costly. I'll give you their honest -- and I think they really believe this. (Laughter.) No, I do, I think they really do believe this. They say it could cost more money than we think it would, and so we ought to have this more limited, private benefit, funded through insurance companies.

The problem is -- let me just this -- the problem is I fought with the health insurance companies quite a bit -- you may have noticed that -- but I've got to give it to them, they've been real upfront about this. The health insurance companies have said, no, this won't work. We cannot offer these poor people an insurance policy to buy drugs that they can afford to buy that will be worth having. The insurance companies have been really honest about it. And you know what? Nevada adopted a plan just like the Republican plan, and you know how many insurance companies have offered coverage under it? Zero, not one.

So we've got this interesting debate going on now in Washington. We said we're for Medicare prescription drug coverage, and they say, so are we. So the "so are we" is designed -- I learned from reading the newspaper that they hired a political consultant to tell them what language to use so you would think they were for something they were not. (Laughter.)

And I'd rather them say, look, we're not for this, because we think it will cost too much money. But if they took that position, then they would have to explain how come they want to spend \$100 billion on repealing the estate tax and give 50 percent of it to the top one-tenth of 1 percent of the population, and not spend money on drugs for our seniors. There are choices to be made here. (Applause.)

We don't have to be hateful -- they really believe this, they don't think it's a good idea. But instead of trying to convince us that they are really for our plan, they should fess up that they're not and explain why they're against it. And then you decide whether we are right or they are.

And the same thing on the patients' bill of rights. The patients' bill of rights we're for covers all Americans and all health care plans, and gives you a right to see a specialist, a right not to be bumped from your doctor if you change employment and you're in the middle of having a baby or a chemotherapy treatment or any other kind of treatment. It gives you a right to go to the nearest emergency room if you get hit, God forbid, when you walk out of the Convention Center here today. And if you get hurt, and you're wrongly treated, it gives you the right to sue. Their plan doesn't cover 100 million people and it doesn't give you a right to sue.

Now, we say we're for the patients' bill of rights. They say -- what they should say is, we don't agree with this, we think it will cost too much. But that's not what they say. What they say -- they try to figure out how to convince you they're for what we're for. So they say, we're for a patients' bill of rights -- if you ever hear that, if you hear "a" instead of "the," big alarm bells ought to go off in your head. (Applause.) You ought to say, ding-dong, hello, what is going on here?

But this is a huge deal. You heard the Vice President talking about this yesterday. I was down the other day in Missouri with the governor, and we were with an emergency room nurse, a male, who was 6'1", weighed 230, looked like he could bench-press me on a cold day. (Laughter.) And this big old husky guy spends his life trying to save people's lives. And he almost couldn't get through his talk, talking about somebody who died because they couldn't take him to the nearest emergency room. This happens every single day.

We're one vote away from passing it. I want to compliment the Republicans in the House who voted for the patients' bill of rights, and the four in the Senate who did. We are one vote away. I'm telling you, there are big issues here. This affects 100 million of your fellow citizens.

We're for expanding the Children's Health Insurance Program that Hillary did so much to create. We think the parents of the kids ought to be able to buy in, too. We think people who are over 55 and not old enough to be on Medicare, but lost their insurance at work, ought to be able to buy into the Medicare program, and we should give them a little help if they need it.

(Applause.)

And we want to do more to close the gaps and do something about the fact that people of color suffer far higher rates of heart disease, cancer, AIDS and diabetes. (Applause.) Let me just give you one example. Diabetes is 70 percent higher among African Americans than white Americans. Hispanics are twice as likely to suffer from it.

Type 1 diabetes, commonly known as juvenile diabetes, affects a million Americans alone -- half of them children. But research has taken us to the threshold of a potential new breakthrough. Recently, researchers successfully transplanted insulin-producing cells into seven individuals with juvenile diabetes, and apparently, every single one of them was cured. (Applause.)

Now, if we can repeat these preliminary findings, it could put a cure for juvenile diabetes within our reach, a true miracle -- for anyone who has ever had this in your family, you know this. But we have to do more to get there. That's why, today, I want to tell you a couple of things we're doing.

First of all, the National Institutes of Health is investing in 10 research centers immediately to try to replicate the results of the first study so we can prove it wasn't an accident. This is part of a larger partnership between the NIH and the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation -- we have some of their leaders here with us today -- with a commitment of over \$300 million over five years for research and the prevention of diabetes. (Applause.)

Now, I've been pretty tough on my friends on the Republican side today, so I want to say something nice about them. This is one we all agree on -- that there is no partisan position on whether we would like to see our children lifted from the burden and the fear and the terrors and the agony that can come with juvenile diabetes. But we actually have some research here that may allow us to close one of the big racial gaps and help disparities in our country. And I just want you to know we're going to do everything we can about it, and I hope we'll have some of your prayers and your support. It's worth some of your money to spend on that. (Applause.)

The last thing I want to talk about in terms of your decision this year is civil rights and equal justice. I don't have to come here and say nobody should be denied a job, a home, access to school or a loan because of their race or any other condition; that no one should have to fear being a target of violence because of the way they worship God or their sexual orientation. And I don't have to come here for you to know that those indignities are still all too real to too many Americans. I have proposed the largest investment in civil rights enforcement ever, so that the EEOC, the Departments of

Health and Human Services, Agriculture and others can enforce our civil rights law. (Applause.)

And we're fighting for passage of a strong hate crimes bill. (Applause.) And I am so grateful that our unanimous caucus was joined the other day by enough Republicans who are willing to break from the leadership to pass the hate crimes bill in the Senate. I am grateful for that, and I hope that we can pass it in the House. (Applause.)

But the hate crimes legislation, if it does not become law, should be an issue in this election. The employment non-discrimination legislation, if it doesn't become law, should be an issue in this election. This is not negative politics, we should talk about what side we're on and why, and let people decide. It's important.

You look all around the world at all these places that are bedeviled by the hatreds of the groups of people within their countries for one another -- from Kosovo to Northern Ireland to the Middle East to the tribal wars in Africa to the Balkans. I mean, look at what the world has been dealing with just for the last few years. We have to keep hammering away at this. It's not over.

And you look at all the hate crimes that have occurred in America in the last few years, in spite of all of our improving attitudes and greater contact across racial and religious lines. We've still got problems here. This deals with the biggest problems of the human heart. We've got to keep at it, and we ought to debate our different approaches to it in an open way. We may never have this chance again, where we are secure and confident and we know we can go forward if we make the right decisions.

One other thing I want to say about this. One of the most important responsibilities of the next president is appointing judges. (Applause.) And one of the most important duties of a senator is deciding whether to confirm the people the President appoints. (Applause.) Now, I believe the next president will be called upon to appoint in the next four years between two and four Supreme Court judges; more than a score -- much more -- Court of Appeals judges; and perhaps over 100 federal district court judges.

The record here is instructive. The quality of justice suffers when highly-qualified women and minority candidates, fully vetted, fully supported by the American Bar Association, are denied the opportunity to serve for partisan political reasons. (Applause.)

Now, just last year, the Republican majority in the Senate, on a party line vote, defeated my nominee for the federal court in Missouri, Ronnie White, the first African American State Supreme Court judge in the history of the state of Missouri, plainly well-qualified, defeated on a party-line, political vote in an attempt to give the incumbent senator a death penalty issue against the incumbent governor in the race for the U.S. Senate in Missouri. Never mind that -- throw this guy's career away, act like he's not qualified,



distort his position on the death penalty, ignore what it will make the African American community in Missouri feel like. It was awful.

As we speak, today there are four African American appellate court nominees poised to make history if the Senate would just stop standing in their way: Judge James Wynn, Roger Gregory, Kathleen McCree Lewis, Judge Johnnie Rawlinson. (Applause.) That's just the ones I've got up there now. But let me -- to put that in perspective, in the 12 years that they served, the two previous Presidents appointed just three African Americans to the circuit courts of our country -- in 12 years.

Of course, we all want justice to be blind, but we also know that when we have diversity in our courts, as in all aspects of society, it sharpens our vision and makes us a stronger nation.

(Applause.)

I have nominated two highly-qualified candidates for the 4th Circuit -- that includes where we are now, the state of Maryland. The 4th Circuit has the largest African American population of any of our circuits and, remarkably, there has never been an African American jurist on the 4th Circuit. We've got a chance to right that wrong.

Two weeks ago I nominated Roger Gregory, of Virginia. (Applause.) He is a Richmond lawyer of immense talent and experience. Almost a year ago I nominated Judge Wynn for a North Carolina seat on the circuit -- (applause) -- and he's not the first African American from North Carolina I nominated. Now, Senator Helms won't let these people get confirmed. He says we don't need any more judges on the 4th Circuit.

Maybe that's what he thinks. But I think it's interesting that for over seven years now, he has stopped my attempts to integrate the 4th Circuit Court of Appeals, and the Republican majority has made no move to change the tide that turned the policies. This is outrageous -- the circuit court with the highest percentage of African Americans in the country, not one single judge on the Court of Appeals. (Applause.)

Now, a lot of women don't do much better. We have excellent nominees -- Elena Kagan; Helene White; Bonnie Campbell, former Attorney General of Iowa, up there -- no movement.

Another travesty of justice is taking place in Texas, and I want to talk about this. I nominated a man named Enrique Moreno to the 5th Circuit Court of Appeals. He grew up in El Paso and graduated from Harvard Law School. The state judges in Texas said he was one of the three best trial lawyers out there in far West Texas. The ABA, the American Bar Association, unanimously gave him its top rating. But the two Republican senators from Texas, they say he's not qualified. And the leader of the Republican Party in Texas -- who I think talked here a couple days ago -- (laughter) -- stone cold silence. Nobody says, give this guy a hearing.

Why don't they want to give these people a hearing and vote? Because they don't want him on the court, but they don't want you to know they don't want him on the court. (Applause.)

The face of injustice is not compassion; it is indifference, or worse. For the integrity of our courts and the strength of our Constitution, I ask the Republicans to give these people a vote. Vote them down if you don't want them on; go out and tell people. At least they voted Judge White down -- they're having a hard time explaining it in Missouri, but at least they did it.

This is not right, folks. You know, the judges I've appointed, yes, they're the most diverse judges in history. But they also have the highest ratings from the ABA in 40 years. (Applause.) And no one says that they're ideological extremists. Therefore, I conclude that the people that don't want them on the court want people who are ideological purists.

But you've got to have -- a judge needs somebody that's felt the fabric of ordinary life, that's got a good mind for stuff initiative books and a lot of common sense -- (applause) - - that can understand what happens to people; that can be fair to everybody that comes before him. I'd be ashamed if one of my judges discriminated against someone before them because they were members of the other political party, or a different religion or had strong views. I would be outraged. I just want people who will be just and fair. (Applause.) But I don't want people denied their chance to serve because of their race or their politics. It's not right. Now, you need to think about that, because it's an important part of the next four years.

I just want to make one last point in closing. You all heard the Vice President's speech. I thought it was brilliant and impassioned and I can't make a better case. (Applause.) But I want you to remember four things about him. I don't want you to forget this, the President told me four things about Al Gore. Number one, he is by far the most influential and active Vice President in this history of the country. (Applause.)

We've had a lot of vice presidents, a lot of vice presidents made great presidents -- Thomas Jefferson, Teddy Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Lyndon Johnson. But we've never had a vice president that did so much good as vice president as Al Gore -- never, not ever in the history of the country. (Applause.)

Second, for the reasons I said earlier, when none of you wanted to contract away your projected income for the next 10 years, he is the most likely, by far, to keep our prosperity going and to spread it to people left behind. (Applause.)

Thirdly, you can see from his leadership with the empowerment zones, to connect all of our schools to the Internet, to his work with the science and technology issues and the environment issue, this is a guy who understands the future. And the future is coming on us in a hurry. (Applause.)

I'm glad we've decoded the human genome, but I don't want anybody denied a job or health insurance because of their genetic map. (Applause.) I love the Internet and I think the Internet can move more people out of poverty more quickly than ever before. But I don't want anybody to be able to get your financial or health care record just because they're on somebody's computer somewhere unless you're okay.

You need someone in the White House who understands the future. So he's the most qualified person we've ever had because he's the best Vice President. He'll keep the prosperity going. He understands the future. And the fourth and most important thing for your point of view is, he really does want to take us all along for the ride -- and I want a president that wants to take us all along for the ride. (Applause.)

Thank you. Let me just say this one last thing. After January, I won't be President, but I'll still -- wait a minute -- (laughter) -- hey, everything comes to an end. (Laughter.) But I have loved every day of it. It has been an honor to fight, an honor to work. And for the rest of the time the good Lord gives me on this Earth, I'll be with you. I'll work with you. (Applause.)

But you just remember this. The arena that counts today on the question of what we're going to do with our prosperity is what we do today to elect tomorrow's leaders. You've got to lead the country in this. You've got to make sure we choose, and choose wisely. Believe me, in spite of all that's happened, the best is still out there. Go get it. I love you. Godspeed. Thank you. (Applause.)  
Return to Speeches and Remarks

## APPENDIX TWO

[Public Papers of the Presidents]

[William J. Clinton -- 1993]

[Volume 2]

[From the U.S. Government Printing Office via GPO Access]

[DOCID:pap\_text-392]

[Page 1981-1986]

Remarks to the Convocation of the Church of God in Christ in Memphis  
November 13, 1993

Thank you. Please sit down. Bishop Ford, Mrs. Mason, Bishop Owens, and Bishop Anderson; my bishops, Bishop Walker and Bishop Lindsey. Now, if you haven't had Bishop Lindsey's barbecue, you haven't had barbecue. And if you haven't heard Bishop Walker attack one of my opponents, you have never heard a political speech. [Laughter]

I am glad to be here. You have touched my heart. You've brought tears to my eyes and joy to my spirit. Last year I was with you over at the convention center. Two years ago your bishops came to Arkansas, and we laid a plaque at the point in Little Rock, Arkansas, at 8th and Gaines, where Bishop Mason received the inspiration for the name of this great church. Bishop Brooks said from his pulpit that I would be elected President when most people thought I wouldn't survive. I thank him, and I thank your faith, and I thank your works, for without you I would not be here today as your President.

Many have spoken eloquently and well, and many have been introduced. I want to thank my good friend Governor McWherter and my friend Mayor Herenton for being with me today; my friend Congressman Harold Ford, we are glad to be in his congressional district. I would like to, if I might, introduce just three other people who are Members of the Congress. They have come here with me, and without them it's hard for me to do much for you. The President proposes and the Congress disposes. Sometimes they dispose of what I propose, but I'm happy to say that according to a recent report in Washington, notwithstanding what you may have heard, this Congress has given me a higher percentage of my proposals than any first-year President since President Eisenhower. And I thank them for that. Let me introduce my good friend, a visitor to Tennessee, Congressman Bill Jefferson from New Orleans, Louisiana-- please stand up; and an early supporter of my campaign, Congressman Bob Clement from Ten-

[[Page 1982]]

nessee, known to many of you; and a young man who's going to be coming back to the people of Tennessee and asking them to give him a promotion next year, Congressman Jim Cooper from Tennessee, and a good friend. Please welcome him.

You know, in the last 10 months, I've been called a lot of things, but nobody's called me a bishop yet. [Laughter] When I was about 9 years old, my beloved and now departed grandmother, who was a very wise woman, looked at me and she said, "You know, I believe you could be a preacher if you were just a little better boy." [Laughter]

Proverbs says, "A happy heart doeth good like medicine, but a broken spirit dryeth the bone." This is a happy place, and I'm happy to be here. I thank you for your spirit.

By the grace of God and your help, last year I was elected President of this great country. I never dreamed that I would ever have a chance to come to this hallowed place where Martin Luther King gave his last sermon. I ask you to think today about the purpose for which I ran and the purpose for which so many of you worked to put me in this great office. I have worked hard to keep faith with our common efforts: to restore the economy, to reverse the politics of helping only those at the top of our totem pole and not the hard-working middle class or the poor; to bring our people together across racial and regional and political lines, to make a strength out of our diversity instead of letting it tear us apart; to reward work and family and community and try to move us forward into the 21st century. I have tried to keep faith.

Thirteen percent of all my Presidential appointments are African-Americans, and there are five African-Americans in the Cabinet of the United States, 2½ times as many as have ever served in the history of this great land. I have sought to advance the right to vote with the motor voter bill, supported so strongly by all the churches in our country. And next week it will be my great honor to sign the restoration of religious freedoms act, a bill supported widely by people across all religions and political philosophies to put back the real meaning of the Constitution, to give you and every other American the freedom to do what is most important in your life, to worship God as your spirit leads you.

I say to you, my fellow Americans, we have made a good beginning. Inflation is down. Interest rates are down. The deficit is down. Investment is up. Millions of Americans, including, I bet, some people in this room, have refinanced their homes or their business loans just in the last year. And in the last 10 months, this economy has produced more jobs in the private sector than in the previous 4 years.

We have passed a law called the family leave law, which says you can't be fired if you take a little time off when a baby is born or a parent is sick. We know that most Americans have to work, but you ought

not to have to give up being a good parent just to take a job. If you can't succeed as a worker and a parent, this country can't make it.

We have radically reformed the college loan program, as I promised, to lower the cost of college loans and broaden the availability of it and make the repayment terms easier. And we have passed the national service law that will give in 3 years, 3 years from now, 100,000 young Americans the chance to serve their communities at home, to repair the frayed bonds of community, to build up the needs of people at the grassroots, and at the same time, earn some money to pay for a college education. It is a wonderful idea.

On April 15th when people pay their taxes, somewhere between 15 million and 18 million working families on modest incomes, families with children and incomes of under \$23,000, will get a tax cut, not a tax increase, in the most important effort to ensure that we reward work and family in the last 20 years. Fifty million American parents and their children will be advantaged by putting the Tax Code back on the side of working American parents for a change.

Under the leadership of the First Lady, we have produced a comprehensive plan to guarantee health care security to all Americans. How can we expect the American people to work and to live with all the changes in a global economy, where the average 18-year-old will change work seven times in a lifetime, unless we can simply say we have joined the ranks of all the other advanced countries in the world; you can have decent health care that's always there, that can never be taken away? It is time we did that, long past time. I ask you to help us achieve that.

But we have so much more to do. You and I know that most people are still working harder

[[Page 1983]]

for the same or lower wages, that many people are afraid that their job will go away. We have to provide the education and training our people need, not just for our children but for our adults, too. If we cannot close this country up to the forces of change sweeping throughout the world, we have to at least guarantee people the security of being employable. They have to be able to get a new job if they're going to have to get a new job. We don't do that today, and we must, and we intend to proceed until that is done.

We have a guarantee that there will be some investment in those areas of our country, in the inner cities and in the destitute rural areas in the Mississippi Delta, of my home State and this State and Louisiana and Mississippi and other places like it throughout America. It's all very well to train people, but if they don't have a job, they can be trained for nothing. We must get investment into those places where the people are dying for work.

And finally, let me say, we must find people who will buy what we

have to produce. We are the most productive people on Earth. That makes us proud. But what that means is that every year one person can produce more in the same amount of time. Now, if fewer and fewer people can produce more and more things, and yet you want to create more jobs and raise people's incomes, you have to have more customers for what it is you're making. And that is why I have worked so hard to sell more American products around the world; why I have asked that we be able to sell billions of dollars of computers we used not to sell to foreign countries and foreign interests, to put our people to work; why next week I am going all the way to Washington State to meet with the President of China and the Prime Minister of Japan and the heads of 13 other Asian countries, the fastest growing part of the world, to say, ``We want to be your partners. We will buy your goods, but we want you to buy ours, too, if you please." That is why.

That is why I have worked so hard for this North American trade agreement that Congressman Ford endorsed today and Congressman Jefferson endorsed and Congressman Cooper and Congressman Clement, because we know that Americans can compete and win only if people will buy what it is we have to sell. There are 90 million people in Mexico. Seventy cents of every dollar they spend on foreign goods, they spend on American goods.

People worry fairly about people shutting down plants in America and going not just to Mexico but to any place where the labor is cheap. It has happened. What I want to say to you, my fellow Americans, is nothing in this agreement makes that more likely. That has happened already. It may happen again. What we need to do is keep the jobs here by finding customers there. That's what this agreement does. It gives us a chance to create opportunity for people. I have friends in this audience, people who are ministers from my State, fathers and sons, people--I've looked out all over this vast crowd and I see people I've known for years. They know I spent my whole life working to create jobs. I would never knowingly do anything that would take a job away from the American people. This agreement will make more jobs. Now, we can also leave it if it doesn't work in 6 months. But if we don't take it, we'll lose it forever. We need to take it, because we have to do better.

But I guess what I really want to say to you today, my fellow Americans, is that we can do all of this and still fail unless we meet the great crisis of the spirit that is gripping America today.

When I leave you, Congressman Ford and I are going to a Baptist church near here to a town meeting he's having on health care and violence. I tell you, unless we do something about crime and violence and drugs that is ravaging the community, we will not be able to repair this country.

If Martin Luther King, who said, ``Like Moses, I am on the mountaintop, and I can see the promised land, but I'm not going to be able to get there with you, but we will get there"--if he were to reappear by my side today and give us a report card on the last 25

years, what would he say? You did a good job, he would say, voting and electing people who formerly were not electable because of the color of their skin. You have more political power, and that is good. You did a good job, he would say, letting people who have the ability to do so live wherever they want to live, go wherever they want to go in this great country. You did a good job, he would say, elevating people of color into the ranks of the United States Armed Forces to the very top or into the very top of our Government. You did a very good job, he would say. He would say, you did a good job creating a black middle class of people who

[[Page 1984]]

really are doing well, and the middle class is growing more among African-Americans than among non-African-Americans. You did a good job; you did a good job in opening opportunity.

But he would say, I did not live and die to see the American family destroyed. I did not live and die to see 13-year-old boys get automatic weapons and gun down 9-year-olds just for the kick of it. I did not live and die to see young people destroy their own lives with drugs and then build fortunes destroying the lives of others. That is not what I came here to do. I fought for freedom, he would say, but not for the freedom of people to kill each other with reckless abandon, not for the freedom of children to have children and the fathers of the children walk away from them and abandon them as if they don't amount to anything. I fought for people to have the right to work but not to have whole communities and people abandoned. This is not what I lived and died for.

My fellow Americans, he would say, I fought to stop white people from being so filled with hate that they would wreak violence on black people. I did not fight for the right of black people to murder other black people with reckless abandon.

The other day the Mayor of Baltimore, a dear friend of mine, told me a story of visiting the family of a young man who had been killed--18 years old--on Halloween. He always went out with little bitty kids so they could trick-or-treat safely. And across the street from where they were walking on Halloween, a 14-year-old boy gave a 13-year-old boy a gun and dared him to shoot the 18-year-old boy, and he shot him dead. And the Mayor had to visit the family.

In Washington, DC, where I live, your Nation's Capital, the symbol of freedom throughout the world, look how that freedom is being exercised. The other night a man came along the street and grabbed a 1-year-old child and put the child in his car. The child may have been the child of the man. And two people were after him, and they chased him in the car, and they just kept shooting with reckless abandon, knowing that baby was in the car. And they shot the man dead, and a bullet went through his body into the baby's body, and blew the little bootie off



the child's foot.

The other day on the front page of our paper, the Nation's Capital, are we talking about world peace or world conflict? No, big article on the front page of the Washington Post about an 11-year-old child planning her funeral: "These are the hymns I want sung. This is the dress I want to wear. I know I'm not going to live very long." That is not the freedom, the freedom to die before you're a teenager is not what Martin Luther King lived and died for.

More than 37,000 people die from gunshot wounds in this country every year. Gunfire is the leading cause of death in young men. And now that we've all gotten so cool that everybody can get a semiautomatic weapon, a person shot now is 3 times more likely to die than 15 years ago, because they're likely to have three bullets in them. A hundred and sixty thousand children stay home from school every day because they are scared they will be hurt in their schools.

The other day I was in California at a town meeting, and a handsome young man stood up and said, "Mr. President, my brother and I, we don't belong to gangs. We don't have guns. We don't do drugs. We want to go to school. We want to be professionals. We want to work hard. We want to do well. We want to have families. And we changed our school because the school we were in was so dangerous. So when we stowed up to the new school to register, my brother and I were standing in line and somebody ran into the school and started shooting a gun. My brother was shot down standing right in front of me at the safer school." The freedom to do that kind of thing is not what Martin Luther King lived and died for, not what people gathered in this hallowed church for the night before he was assassinated in April of 1968. If you had told anybody who was here in that church on that night that we would abuse our freedom in that way, they would have found it hard to believe. And I tell you, it is our

## APPENDIX THREE

[Public Papers of the Presidents]

[William J. Clinton -- 1993]

[Volume 2]

[From the U.S. Government Printing Office via GPO Access]

[DOCID:pap\_text-197]

[Page 1667-1676]

Remarks to the AFL-CIO Convention in San Francisco, California  
October 4, 1993

Thank you very much. President Kirkland, distinguished platform guests, and to the men and women of the American labor movement, let me tell you first I am glad to be here. I feel like I'm home, and I hope you feel like you have a home in Washington.

For most of the 20th century the union movement in America has represented the effort to make sure that people who worked hard and played by the rules were treated fairly, had a chance to become middle class citizens, raise middle class kids, and give their children a chance to have a better life than they did. You have worked for that. You have done that.

For too long, in the face of deep and profound problems engulfing all the world's advanced nations, you have been subjected to a political climate in which you were asked to bear the blame for forces you did not create, many times when you were trying to make the situation better. I became President in part because I wanted a new partnership for the labor movement in America.

Before I get into the remarks that I came here to make about all of our challenges at home and the economic challenges facing us, I have to make a few remarks this morning about developments in the world in the last 48 hours.

The labor movement has been active, particularly in the last few years with the end of the cold war, in the effort to promote democracy abroad, to guarantee the right of people freely to join their own unions, and to work for freedom within their own countries. In that context most of you, I know, have strongly supported

[[Page 1668]]

and looked with great favor on the movement toward democracy in Russia.

The United States continues to stand firm in its support of President Yeltsin because he is Russia's democratically elected leader. We very much regret the loss of life in Moscow, but it is clear that the opposition forces started the conflict and that President Yeltsin had no other alternative than to try to restore order. It appears as of this moment that that has been done. I have as of this moment absolutely no reason to doubt the personal commitment that Boris Yeltsin made to let the Russian people decide their own future, to secure a new Constitution with democratic values and democratic processes, to have a new legislative branch elected with democratic elections, and to subject himself, yet again, to a democratic vote of the people. That is all that we can ask.

I think also, most of you know that in a military action yesterday, the United States sustained the loss of some young American soldiers in Somalia. I deeply regret the loss of their lives. They are working to ensure that anarchy and starvation do not return to a nation in which over 300,000 people have lost their lives, many of them children, before the United States led the U.N. mission there, starting late last year. I want to offer my profound condolences to the families of the United States Army personnel who died there. They were acting in the best spirit of America.

As you know, the United States has long had plans to withdraw from Somalia and leave it to others in the United Nations to pursue the common objectives. I urged the United Nations and the Secretary-General in my speech at the United Nations a few days ago to start a political process so that the country could be turned back over to Somalis who would not permit the kind of horrible bloodshed and devastation to reoccur. And I hope and pray that that will happen. In the meanwhile, you may be sure that we will do whatever is necessary to protect our own forces in Somalia and to complete our mission there.

From the struggle against communism in Eastern Europe to the struggle against apartheid in South Africa, the union movement in America has always answered the challenges of our time. It must be a source of great pride to you to see these elections unfold, to see the remarkable movement toward a genuine multiracial society within a democratic framework in South Africa. It must, likewise, be a source of continuing frustration to you to see that even as the ideas and the values that you have espoused now for decades are being embraced around the world, here in our country and in virtually every other wealthy country in the world, middle class workers are under assault from global economic forces that seem beyond the reach of virtually any government policy.

We now know that every wealthy country in the world is having trouble creating jobs. We now know that in the last several years, inequality of income got worse in every major country. We know that we had more growing inequality in America than anyplace else because we

actually embraced it. I mean, the whole idea of trickle-down economics was to cut taxes on the wealthiest Americans, raise taxes on the middle class, let the deficit balloon, and hope that the investment from the wealthy would somehow expand opportunity to everybody else.

We know that didn't work, and it made the situation worse. It left us with a \$4 trillion debt. It left us with a deficit of over \$300 billion a year. It left us with a legacy of weakened opportunities for workers in the workplace, too little investment, a paralyzed budget, and no strategy to compete and win in the global economy, and more inequality in America than any of the other wealthy countries. But we also know that the same problems we have are now being found in Germany, in Japan, in all of Europe, in the other advanced nations.

So we have to face the honest fact that we are facing unprecedented challenges in our own midst to the very way of life that the labor movement has fought so hard to guarantee for others around the world for decades. And therefore, it is important that we think through these issues, that we take positions on them, that we agree and that we disagree in the spirit of honest searching for what the real nature of this world is we're living in and where we are going.

The most important thing to me today is that you know that this administration shares your values and your hopes and your dreams and the interest of your children, and that together--[applause]--and that I believe together we can work our way through this very difficult and challenging time, recognizing that no one fully understands the dimensions of the age in which we live and exactly how we are going to recreate opportunity for all Americans who are willing to do what it takes to be worthy

[[Page 1669]]

of it.

The labor movement, historically, has always been on the cutting edge of change and the drive to empower workers and give them more dignity on the job and in their lives. Almost a half a century ago, at the end of World War II, labor helped to change America and the world. At home and abroad, labor helped to create a generation of prosperity and to create the broad middle class that we all cherish so much today.

Now we have to do it again. We're at a time of change that I am convinced is as dramatic as the dawning of the Industrial Age. We can no longer tell our sons and daughters--we know this now--that they will enter a job at the age of 18 or 21, enjoy secure paychecks and health benefits and retirement benefits for the rest of their working lives and retire from the same job with the same company at the age of 65 or 62.

Our changing economy tells us now that the average 18-year-old will change work seven times in a lifetime even if they stay with the same company and certainly if they change; that when people lose their jobs

now, they really aren't on unemployment, they're looking for reemployment; that most unemployment today is not like it used to be: When people got unemployed for decades, it was because there was a temporary downturn in the economy, and when the economy turned up again, most people who were unemployed were hired back by their old employer. Today, most people who are unemployed eventually get hired back usually by a different employer for a different job and unless we are very good at what we do for them, often at lower wages and less benefits. So it is clear that what we need is not an unemployment system but a reemployment system in recognition of the way the world works today.

We know, too, that most American working people are working harder than they ever have in their lives; that the average work week is longer today than it was 20 years ago; that real hourly wages adjusted for inflation peaked in 1973, and so most people are working harder for the same or lower real wages than they were making 20 years ago.

We know that in the eighties there was a dramatic restructuring of manufacturing; that being followed in the nineties with a dramatic restructuring of the service industries. We know that for the last 12 years, in every single year, the Fortune 500 companies lowered employment in the United States in six figures, and that in the years where we have gained jobs, they've come primarily from starting new businesses and from companies with between, say, 500 and 1,000 workers expanding, as the whole nature of this economy changes.

We know that the cost of health care has increased so much that millions of American workers who kept their jobs never got a pay raise because all the increased money went to pay more for the same health care. We know that some of our most powerful industrial engines, especially in industries like autos and steel have shown breathtaking increases in productivity with deep changes in the work force supported by the labor movement, and still are having trouble competing in the world, in part, because their health costs may be as much as a dime on the dollar more than all of their competitors.

We know, as I said at the beginning, that all the wealthy countries in the world are now having trouble creating jobs. If you look at France, for example, in the late 1980's, they actually had an economy that grew more rapidly than Germany's, and yet their unemployment rate never went below 9.5 percent.

So what are we to do? It seems to me that we clearly have to make some changes in the way we look at the world and the way we approach the world. And in order to make those changes, we have to ask ourselves, what do we have to do to make the American people secure enough to make the changes? One of the things that has really bothered me in the late, latter stages of this era that we're moving out of is that so few people have been so little concerned about rampant insecurity among ordinary American middle class citizens. It is impossible for people in their personal lives to make necessary changes if they are wildly insecure.

You think about that in your own life. You think about a personal challenge you faced, a challenge your family has faced. The same thing is true in the workplace. The same thing is true of a community. The same thing is true of a team. The same thing is true of our country. We have to struggle to redefine a new balance between security and change in this country because if we're not secure, we won't change, and if we don't change, we'll get more insecure, because the circumstances of the world will continue to grind us down.

[[Page 1670]]

And that's what makes this such a difficult time, because we have to rethink so many things at once. I ran for President because I was tired of 20 years of declining living standards, of 12 years of trickle-down economics and antiworker policies, and rhetoric that blamed people who are working harder for the problems that others did not respond to, and because I believe that we needed a new partnership in America, a new sense of community, not just business and labor and government but also people without regard to their color or their region or anything else. I thought we didn't have anybody to waste, and it looks to me like we were wasting a lot of people and that we needed to put together. I thought the country was going in the wrong direction, and we should turn it around. But I was then and am now under no illusions that we could do it overnight or that I could do it, unless we did it together.

The beginning of the security necessary to change, I think, is in having a Government that is plainly on the side of working Americans. I believe that any of your leaders who work with this administration will tell you that we are replacing a Government that for years worked labor over, with a Government that works with labor. We have a Secretary of Labor in Bob Reich who understands that, at a time when money and management can travel across the globe in a microsecond, our prosperity depends more than anything else on the skills and the strengths of our working people. No one can take that away from us. And our people are still our most important asset, even more than they were 20 years ago.

We have nominated a Chair of the National Labor Relations Board in Bill Gould, and a new member, Peggy Browning, who believe in collective bargaining. We have a Director of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration in Joseph Dear who comes from the labor movement and believes that workers should be protected in the workplace. We have two people in executive positions in the Labor Department in Joyce Miller and Jack Otero who were on your executive council. We have two people in the SEIU in executive positions in Karen Nussbaum and Jerry Polas who are leading us to make progress.

This administration rescinded President Reagan's order banning all reemployment of PATCO workers forever. And we rescinded President Bush's orders with regard to Government-funded contracting and one-sided

information given to workers in the workplace. And this week I will sign the Hatch Act Reform Act to give Government employees political rights they have been denied for too long.

One week ago yesterday, on a Sunday morning, I came in from my early morning run, and I turned to my right as I walked into the White House, and I saw a family standing there, a father, a mother, and three daughters, one of whom was in a wheelchair. And the person who was with them who worked for me said, "Mr. President, this little girl has got terminal cancer, and she was asked by the Make-A-Wish Foundation what she wanted to do, and she said she wanted to come to the White House and visit you. So we're giving her a special tour."

So I went over, and I shook hands with them and apologized for my condition and told them I'd get cleaned up and come back and we'd take a picture. And a few minutes later I showed up looking more like my job, and I visited with this wonderful child, desperately ill, for a while. And then I talked to her sisters, and then I talked to her mother, and I talked to her father. And as I turned around to go off, the father grabbed me by the arm and he said, he said, "Let me tell you something. If you ever get to wondering whether it makes a difference who's the President," he said, "look at my child. She's probably not going to make it, and the weeks I've spent with her have been the most precious time of my life. And if you hadn't been elected, we wouldn't have had a family and medical leave law that made it possible for me to be with my child in this time."

Now, I believe, in short, that it ought to be possible to be a good parent and a good worker. I believe that it ought to be possible for people to make their own judgments about whether they want to be organized at work or not and how they're going to--[inaudible]. And I believe if we're really going to preserve the American workplace as a model of global productivity, we have to let people who know how to do their jobs better than other people do have more empowerment to do those jobs and to make those changes in the workplace.

That's why, as we work on the Vice President's reinventing Government initiative, we've worked so closely with Federal employees and their unions. When the Vice President spoke with business leaders and workers who had changed their companies, they all said the same

[[Page 1671]]

thing: You've got to have the workers; you have to let them do it, tell you how to do it, tell you how to make the companies more productive.

Now, that's why yesterday I signed an Executive order--on Friday--creating a National Partnership Council. For the next several months the leaders of Federal employee unions, including John Sturdivant, the president of the American Federation of Government Employees, who is here today, will work with the leaders of our administration to make our

Government more effective, cost less, and more importantly, to make the jobs of the rank and file Federal employees more interesting, more stimulating, more customer-oriented, by doing things that they have been telling us they should be able to do but that the system has not permitted them to do in the past. I applaud John and the other people in the unions representing Federal employees for what they have done. This is an unprecedented partnership that I think will benefit every American.

We want to make worker empowerment and labor-management cooperation a way of life in this country, from the factory floor to the board room. We've created a commission on the future of labor and management relations, with leaders from labor, business, and the academy, chaired by former Labor Secretary John Dunlap. And I've asked Secretary Reich to create a commission to study and improve relationships in government workplaces at every level, at the State and county and local level, as well as at the Federal level.

I believe this is something that a person like Bob Reich is uniquely situated to do. And it's the kind of thing that we ought to be promoting because we have to use this opportunity we have to try to take what has worked for workers and their businesses and spread it around the country.

For the last 12 years we've had a lot of finger-pointing and blame-placing, and we've got these stirring examples of success that we could be trying to replicate. That's what we ought to be doing, taking what works. And it always is a workplace in which workers have more say. And we're going to do what we can to get that done.

Now, on the security issue, let me just mention some other things. In addition to the family leave act, the budget bill which passed by such a landslide in the Congress contained what may well be the most important piece of economic reform for working people in 20 years, by expanding the earned-income tax credit so that you can say to people, if you work 40 hours a week and you have children in your home, you will not be poor. We are bringing new hope and new dignity into the lives of 15 million working families that make \$27,000 a year or less. They'll no longer be taxed into poverty. There won't be a Government program to try to lift them out of poverty. Their own efforts will lift them out of poverty because the tax system will be changed to reward them. And there will never again be an incentive for people to be on welfare instead of work because the tax system will say, if you're willing to go to work and work 40 hours a week, no matter how tough it is, we will lift you out of poverty. That is the kind of pro-work, pro-family policy this country ought to have.

Something else that was in that bill that most Americans don't even know about yet that will benefit many, many of you in this room and the people you represent is a dramatic reform of the student loan system that will eliminate waste, lower the interest rates on student loans,



make the repayment terms easier so that young people can repay their loans no matter how much they borrow as a percentage of their income, limited so they can repay it. Even though we'll have tougher repayment terms, they'll be able to do it. We'll collect the money, but people will be able to borrow money and pay it back at lower interest rates, at better repayment terms. And therefore, no one will ever be denied access to a college education because of the cost.

When you put that with our Goals 2000 program, the education reform program for the public schools, and the work that the Education Secretary Dick Riley is doing with Secretary Reich to redo the worker training programs in the country, you have a commitment to raise standards in education and open opportunities to our young people.

We need higher standards in our public schools. Al Shanker has long been a voice for that. He now has allies in the NEA and other places in the country who are saying, "Let's have national standards and evaluate what our kids are learning and how our schools are doing."

I believe we need to give our young people more choices within the public school system, and I have advocated letting States try a lot

[[Page 1672]]

of things within districts. Let kids choose which schools they attend. Let school districts decide how they want to set up and organize schools. I think that a lot of changes need to be made in a lot of school districts. But let me say that we don't want to throw out the baby with the bath water. There are also a lot of school districts that are doing a great job under difficult circumstances. There are a lot of schools within school districts that are performing well under difficult circumstances.

And if we've learned anything, we've learned that the best way to increase the quality of education is to find better principals, get better leaders among the teachers, let them have more say over how school is run, and evaluate them based on their results rather than telling them how to do every last jot and tittle of their job every day.

We have learned these things--and if I might, since we're in California, say a special word--therefore, I believe that having worked for 12 years for higher standards, more choices and greater changes in public education, I'm in a little bit of a position to say that if I were a citizen of the State of California, I would not vote for Proposition 174, the private voucher initiative.

Now, and let me tell you why. Let me tell you why. First of all, keep in mind a lot of the schools out here are doing a good job. I can say this, you know, I never was part of the California education system. I have studied this system out here for more than a decade. They have undertaken a lot of very impressive reforms and many of their schools are doing a good job. I was interviewed last night by two people from a

newspaper in Sacramento, and one of them just volunteered that he had two children in the public schools there, and they were getting a terrific education.

This bill would start by taking \$1.3 billion right off the top to send a check to people who already have their kids in private schools, and who didn't need any Government money to do it, and taking it right off the top away from a school system that doesn't have enough money to educate the kids it's got in it in the first place.

Second thing it would do is to impose no real standards on the quality of the programs which could be funded: who could set up a school; what standards they'd have to meet; what tests the kids would have to pass. Just take your voucher, and who cares whether a private school is a legitimate school or not. That is a significant issue. And all you have to do is to work in this field for a few years to understand that that is a significant issue.

Wouldn't it be ironic that at the very moment we're finally trying to find a way to measure the performance and raise the standards of the public schools, we turn around and start sending tax money to private schools that didn't have to meet any standards at all. When we're trying to get one part of our business, we're going to make the other part worse.

And finally, let me just say, I have always supported the notion that American schools ought to have competition and the fact that we have a vibrant tradition of pluralistic education and private schools and religious private schools was a good thing, not a bad thing for America. But all the years when I grew up, and all the times I saw that, and for a couple years of my life when I was a little boy, when I went to a Catholic school, when my folks moved from one place to another, and we lived way out in the country and didn't know much about the schools in the new area where we were, no one ever thought that the church would want any money from the taxpayers to run their schools. In fact, they said just the opposite, "We don't want to be involved in that." That's what the First Amendment is all about.

So I think we have to really think through--I have spent 12 years before I became President overwhelmingly obsessed with reform of the public school system, wanting more choices in the system, wanting more accountability, wanting more flexibility about how schools were organized and established and operated. But I can tell you that this is not the way to get it done, and the people will regret this if they pass it. I hope the people of California don't do that.

Now, you can educate people all you want--and I wanted to say a little more about that. The Labor Secretary and I are working on trying to take all these 150 different Government training programs and give local communities and States the power to consolidate them, working with you, and just fund the things that work on a State-by-State basis, and to set up a system of lifetime education and training.

I don't know how many of you saw the television program I did last night in California, but one man, looked to be in his early fifties, saying, ``We need a training program that gives

[[Page 1673]]

my company some incentives to retrain me, not just people who are 25, but people who are 55." And we are trying to do that. We're trying to set up a lifetime education and training program that starts when young people are in high school, so if they want to work and learn in high school they can work and learn in high school, so that we can have the kind of school-to-work transition that many of our competitors have for all those kids that won't go to college and won't get 4-year educations. We've got to do that.

But if you do all that, you still have to have someplace for people to work. We can educate and train people all we want, but we have to be able to create more jobs. How are we going to do that at a time when the Government is not directly funding the defense jobs that have kept America's job base up for so long?

Well, the first thing we've got to do is make up our mind we're going to be serious about defense conversion. Last year when I was a candidate for President--[applause]--last year when I was a candidate for President, I went all over the country--and I wasn't in the Congress and didn't have a vote--pleading with the Congress to pass the defense conversion bill. They did it, and the previous administration absolutely refused to spend \$500 million to help convert from a defense to a high-tech domestic economy. So we have released the money. And we're going to try to get up to \$20 billion spent on defense conversion and reinvestment in the jobs of tomorrow over the next 5 years. It is very important.

We have got over 2,800 proposals in this country for technology-reinvestment initiatives, to match with what will soon be about a billion dollars in Government money that can create hundreds of thousands of jobs in America. People are brimming with ideas out there to create new jobs.

I was at McClellan Air Force Base yesterday, and the airbase is working with people in the local community and the local universities and with the Federal defense labs. They have made new electric cars. They have made new manufacturing component parts to try to come up with economical ways to do it and allow those parts to be made in America. And they are targeting things that are now made overseas and imported here. That's the sort of thing that we can use our high-tech defense base to do, and we should be doing it. It's going to make for more jobs for America.

They have developed a prototype car that gets 80 miles per gallon at 55 miles per hour on the highway, goes to 60 miles per hour in 12

seconds, has a maximum speed of 100 miles an hour. That's not bad. If we can just figure out how people can afford it, we can put people to work making them. But it's a good beginning.

We announced last week that ground-breaking project with the UAW and Ford, Chrysler, and General Motors are working with the defense labs and all the Government labs on a project to triple the average mileage of American autos within the next 10 years. If they do that, that will create untold numbers of new jobs here, and we'll be selling cars to people overseas who want that instead of the reverse.

And by the way, I want to compliment the UAW. You know, this year we have regained a lot of our market share in America. People are buying more American cars in America, and we should compliment them for it.

So we have to find ways to create these new jobs. Now, I want to talk a little about health care, but before I do, I want to mention something we disagree on in the context of the trade issue. And listen to this. Since 1986, a significant portion of America's net new jobs have come from trade growth. That's something we can all find from the figures. In California, where we now are, a lot of that has come from Asia, which is the fastest growing part of the world. Asia's growing faster than any other part of the world; Latin America the second fastest growing part of the world. Everybody knows that is true.

Now, that's why, when I went to Tokyo and met with the leaders of the G-7, the seven big industrial countries, we made an agreement that we should dramatically reduce tariffs on manufactured products around the world in ways that all analysts agree would generate a lot of new manufacturing jobs here in America. There was virtually no dispute about that, because we were largely in competition with other countries that were paying the same or higher wages with the same or better benefits, with high-tech and other manufacturing products that we wanted to sell everywhere. And we're working like crazy to get that done between now and the end of the year.

What is the difference between that and the trade agreement with Mexico? And let's talk about that just a minute, because it's very important, not so you'll agree with me but so you

[[Page 1674]]

will know what I want you to know, which is that I would never knowingly do anything to cost an American a job. That's not the business I'm in.

I was a Governor during the last 12 years, when the maquiladora system was in place. What did it do? It created a border zone on the other side of the border in Mexico in which people were free to set up plants, operate them by the standards that were enforced there--or not enforced, as the case may be--on labor and environmental issues, and then send their products back into this country, produced at much lower labor costs with no tariffs. That was the system set up to try to foster

growth there.

But in the 1980's, because of all the economic problems we had, and because of the climate that was promoted in this country that the most important thing you could do was slash your labor costs and who cared about your working people anyway, you had the movement of hundreds of plants down there. And you didn't like it worth a flip. And you were right to be upset about what happened.

Now, I was a Governor of a State that lost plants to Mexico. And my State was so small that when people lost their jobs I was likely to know who they were. This was a big deal to me. I'm also proud of the fact we got one of them to come back before I left office. I'm proud of that, too. But I understand this.

Now, that is the system we have. You also saw this system, ironically, accelerating illegal immigration. Why? For the same reason that a lot of the Chinese boat people were coming over here after they moved to the coastal towns in China, got a job where they made a little more money than they did before, but didn't much like their life, but they got enough money to try to come here. That's what was happening along the maquiladora area. A lot of people would come up there, work for a while, then come on up here.

So I understand what the American working people don't like about the present system. The real issue: Will the trade agreement make it worse or better? You think it will make it worse. I think it will make it better. And I'll tell you, I think you're entitled to know why I think that. Because there is no question that, no matter what you think about the adequacy of the side agreements, they will raise the cost of labor and environmental investments above the point where they are now. There is no question that the agreement lowers domestic content requirements in Mexico, so that we'll go from selling say 1,000 to 50,000 or 60,000 American cars down there next year. There's no question that their tariffs are 2 1/2 times higher than ours. And there's no question that we have a trade surplus there, as compared with a \$49 billion trade deficit with Japan, an \$18 billion trade deficit with China, a \$9 billion trade deficit with Taiwan.

We've got a trade problem, all right. It is that the Asian economies are not as open to us as we are to them. That's our huge trade problem. And we're going to have to do better there, because that's where a lot of the money is. So my reasoning is that if their tariffs are higher than ours and their costs go up faster than they're otherwise going to go up, and they're already buying \$350-a-person worth of American goods, second only to Canada--replaced Japan as the number two purchaser of manufacturing products this year--and we got a \$5.8 billion trade surplus, it will get better, not worse.

Is it a perfect agreement? No. But I don't want to make the perfect the enemy of the better. I think it is better than the present.

There are two other points I want to make. If the deal is not made

with the United States, and instead it's made with Germany or Japan, we could lose access to an 80-million person market and cost ourselves more jobs. And if the deal is made, it could lead to further similar agreements with the emerging market economies of Latin America. And no one believes that anybody's going to invest in Argentina, for example, to export back to the American market. So all barrier dropping the further you get away from here because of transportation costs will lead to more jobs in America through greater trade.

So that's why I think it makes it better, not worse. You're entitled to know that. I don't ask you to agree, but I ask you to make the same arguments inside your own mind, because I would never knowingly do anything to cost America jobs. I'm trying to create jobs in this country.

Now, I'll tell you what I really think. What I really believe is that this is become the symbol of the legitimate grievances of the American working people about the way they've been worked over the last 12 years. That's what I think. And I think those grievances are legitimate. And I think that people are so insecure

[[Page 1675]]

in their jobs, they're so uncertain that the people they work for really care about them, they're so uncertain about what their kids are looking at in the future, that people are reluctant to take any risks for change.

And so let me close with what I started with. I have got to lay a foundation of personal security for the working people of this country and their families in order to succeed as your President, and you have to help me do it. We have got to reform the job training system of this country, to make it a reemployment system, not an unemployment system, and to give it to kids starting when they're in high school.

We have got to have an investment strategy that will create jobs here. And that's why we removed all those export controls that were cold war relics on computers and supercomputers and telecommunications equipment, opening just this month \$37 billion worth of American products to exports. That is important.

That's why I want to pass a crime bill to put 50,000 more police officers on the street, pass the Brady bill and take those automatic weapons out of the hands of the teenagers that are vandalizing and brutalizing our children in this country. And, my fellow Americans, that is why we have got to pass a comprehensive health care bill to provide security to all Americans. And we've got to do it now.

How many Americans do you know who lost their health insurance because they lost their jobs? Who never got a pay increase because of the rising cost of their health care? Who can never change jobs because they have a sick child? Millions of them. How many companies are

represented in this room who could be selling more everywhere across the board, more abroad and more at home, if their health care costs were no greater than their competitors around the world?

Let's face it folks, we're spending over 14 percent of our income on health care. Canada's at 10. Germany and Japan are under nine. The Germans went up toward 9 percent of their income on health care, they had a national outbreak of hysteria about how they were losing control of their health care system. And yet they all cover everybody and no one loses their health insurance. And when I say we can do that and we can do it without a broad-based tax increase, people look at me like I have slipped a gear. [Laughter]

But I have spent over 3 years studying this system. And the First Lady and her task force have mobilized thousands of experts in the most intense effort to examine social reform in my lifetime. And they have recommended that we adopt a system which, first of all, builds on the system that you enjoy: an employer-based system where the employer contributes and, in some cases, the employee does and some not; a system that is focused on keeping what is good about American health care--doctors, and nurses, and medical research and technology--and fixing what is wrong--not covering everybody, kicking them off after they have a serious illness, not letting people move their jobs, having some people in such tiny groups of insurance that 40 percent of their premium goes to profit and administrative costs, and spending a dime on the dollar, a dime on every dollar in a \$90 billion system goes to paperwork that wouldn't go in any other system in the world--\$90 billion a year on that alone. Never mind the fraud and the abuse, and the incentives in this system to churn it, to perform unnecessary procedures just because the more you do the more you earn.

We can do better than that. So I want to just say, this system will be a good one. Everybody will get a health care security card like this. I feel like that guy in the ad; I'm supposed to say, "Don't leave home without it," when I pull it out. [Laughter] But I want everybody to have a health care security card like this. Just like a Social Security card. And I want people to have their health care access whether they're working or unemployed, whether they work for a little business or a big one.

Under the system we have proposed, if you've got a better deal now, you can keep it. If your employer pays 100 percent of benefits now, you can keep it. And we don't propose to tax any benefits that are above the minimum package. We told those who wanted that to give us 10 years before we put that provision in because within 10 years we'll have the minimum benefit package we start with, plus full dental benefits and full mental-health benefits and full preventive-care benefits, so it will be as good or better than any package now offered by any employer in America. Then, if somebody wants to buy something over and above that, we can talk about it. But we are not going to take anything away

from you, you have.

What we are going to do is two things for you if you have a good policy. We're going to

[[Page 1676]]

make it easier for your employer to keep these benefits you have now by slowing the rate of health care cost inflation, not by cutting health care spending, by slowing the rate of inflation in health care cost, and by removing the enormous burden of retiree benefits from our most productive companies. That will stabilize the health care benefits of working people and good plans.

The other thing we're going to do for you is to limit what can be taken away from you which is worth something. So by saying that for people who don't have any insurance now, their employer will pay 80 percent and the employees will pay 20, we are saying that no matter what happens to you, there's a limit to what can be taken away from you. So it will be easy for you to keep, easier for your employer to keep what you've got, and for you, and there will be a limit to what can be taken away.

Is it fair to ask all those employers and employees who don't have any coverage now to contribute something? You bet it is. Why? Because your premium's higher than it otherwise would be because you're paying for them now.

Can we do that without bankrupting small business? Of course, we can. We have a plan that gives a significant discount to smaller new businesses, and to smaller established businesses with lower wage employees that are operating on narrow margins.

How are we going to pay for this? Two-thirds of it will be paid for by employers and employees contributing into the system that they get a free ride in now. One-sixth of it will be paid for with a cigarette tax and with a fee on very large companies who opt out of the system so they can pay for the cost of insuring the poor and the discounts to small business, and most important, for the health education and research that makes us all richer because we are going to pay for that and for expanded public health clinics. And one-sixth of it will come from slowing the rate of growth. When you hear people say, ``Oh, Clinton wants to cut Medicare and Medicaid, let me tell you something folks, we're cutting defense. We've held all domestic investment that's discretionary flat, which means if I want to spend more money on job training, on defense conversion, or on Head Start, I have to go cut something else dollar for dollar for the next 5 years. That's what we've done. We've cut defense as much as we possibly can right at the edge, held everything else flat.

You know what Medicare and Medicaid are doing? They're going up at 3 times the rate of inflation. What have I proposed to do? Let them go up



at twice the rate of inflation. They say in Washington I can't do it. I don't talk to a single doctor who understands what we're going to do who doesn't think we can achieve those savings without hurting the quality of health care. If we can't get down to twice the rate of inflation from 3 times the rate of inflation, there's something wrong somewhere.

Now, that's how we propose to finance this. And I am pleading with you to help me pass this bill. No matter how good your health care plan is now, don't you believe for a minute you could never lose it, or at least get locked into your present job. And I am pleading with you to do it so that we can give to the rest of America, as well as to you and your families, the kind of personal security we have got to have to face the bewildering array of challenges that are out there before us.

You know as well as I do that we are hurtling toward the 21st century into a world that none of us can fully perceive. But we have to imagine what we want it to be like. We want it to be a world in which the old rules that you grew up believing in apply in a new and more exciting age, in which, if you don't have job security, you at least have employment security; in which the Government puts the people first, and in which people have security in their homes, on their streets, in their education benefits, in their health care benefits so that they are capable of seizing these changes and making life richer and more different and more exciting than it has ever been.

That is the great challenge before us. And if we don't adopt the health care reform, we won't get there. If we do, it will open the way to the most incredible unleashing of American energy that we have seen in more than a generation. Together we can do it, and I need your help.

Thank you very much, and God bless you.

Note: The President spoke at 11:30 a.m. in the Grand Ballroom of the San Francisco Hilton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Albert Shanker, president, American Federation of Teachers. The Executive order of October 1 on labor-management partnerships is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

## APPENDIX FOUR

[Public Papers of the Presidents]  
 [William J. Clinton -- 1998]  
 [Volume 1]  
 [From the U.S. Government Printing Office via GPO Access]  
 [DOCID:pap\_txt-506]

[Page 825-829]

Commencement Address at the United States Naval Academy in Annapolis,  
 Maryland  
 May 22, 1998

Thank you. Thank you very much. Secretary Dalton,<Dalton, John H.<ls-thn-eq> thank you for your generous introduction and your dedicated service. Admiral Larson,<Larson, Charles<ls-thn-eq> thank you. Admiral Johnson,<Johnson, Jay L.<ls-thn-eq> General Krulak,<Krulak, Charles C.<ls-thn-eq> Admiral Ryan,<Ryan, John R.<ls-thn-eq> Board of Visitors Chair Byron;<Byron, Beverly<ls-thn-eq> to the faculty and staff of the Academy: distinguished guests; to proud parents and family members, and especially to the brigade of midshipmen: I am honored to be here today. And pursuant to longstanding tradition, I bring with me a small gift. I hereby free all midshipmen who are on restriction for minor conduct offenses. [Applause] There was so much enthusiasm, I wonder if you heard the word ``minor" offenses. [Laughter]

You know, the President has the signal honor of addressing all of our service academies serially, one after the other in appropriate order. This is the second time I have had the great honor of being here at the Naval Academy. But I began to worry about my sense of timing. I mean, what can you say to graduating midshipmen in a year when the most famous ship on Earth is again the Titanic? [Laughter] But then I learned this is a totally, almost blindly confident bunch. After all, over in King Hall you eat cannonballs. [Laughter] Now, for those of you who don't know what they are, they're not the ones Francis Scott Key saw flying over Fort McHenry; they're just huge apple dumplings. Nonetheless, they require a lot of confidence. [Laughter]

I will try to be relatively brief today. I was given only one instruction: I should not take as long as your class took to scale Herndon Monument. Now, at 4 hours and 5 minutes, the slowest time in recorded history. I have a lot of leeway. [Laughter]

But you have more than made up for it. You have done great things, succeeding in a rigorous academic environment, trained to be superb officers. You have done extraordinary volunteer work, for which I am personally very grateful. In basketball, you made it to the NCAA's for

the second time in a row. You defeated Army in football last year. In fact, you were 26 and 6 against teams from Army this year. And while I must remain neutral in these things--[laughter]--I salute your accomplishments. [Laughter]

Let me also join the remarks that Secretary Dalton made in congratulating your Superintendent.<Larson, Charles<ls-thn-eq> Admiral Larson has performed remarkable service as an aviator, submarine commander, Commander in Chief in the Pacific, twice at the helm of the Academy. I got to know him well when he was our Commander in Chief in the Pacific. I came to appreciate more than I otherwise ever could have his unique blend of intelligence and insight and character and passionate devotion to duty.

In view of the incident on the Indian subcontinent in the last few days, I think it's important for the historical record to note that the first senior official of the United States who told me that there was a serious potential problem there and we had better get ready for it was Admiral Chuck Larson,<Larson, Charles<ls-thn-eq> several years ago.

When I asked him<Larson, Charles<ls-thn-eq> to return to the Academy, I thought it was almost too much, and then I realized it might have been too little, for he loves this Academy so much this is hardly tough duty. He met all its challenges. He taught you

[[Page 826]]

midshipmen to strive for excellence without arrogance, to maintain the highest ethical standards. Admiral, on behalf of the American people, I thank you for your service here, your 40 years in the Navy, your devotion to the United States. We are all very grateful to you.

I also have every confidence that Admiral Ryan<Ryan, John R.<ls-thn-eq> is a worthy successor, and I wish him well.

As I speak to you and other graduates this spring, I want to ask you to think about the challenges we face as a nation in the century that is just upon us and how our mission must be to adapt to the changes of changing times while holding fast to our enduring ideals. In the coming weeks, I will talk about how the information revolution can widen the circle of opportunity or deepen inequality, about how immigration and our Nation's growing diversity can strengthen and unite America or weaken and divide it.

But nothing I will have the chance to talk about this spring is more important than the mission I charge you with today, the timeless mission of our men and women in uniform: protecting our Nation and upholding our values in the face of the changing threats that are as new as the new century.

Members of the Class of 1998, you leave the Yard at the dawn of a new millennium, in a time of great hope. Around the world, people are embracing peace, freedom, free markets. More and more nations are

committed to educating all their children and stopping the destruction of our environment. The information revolution is sparking economic growth and spreading the ideas of freedom around the world. Technology is moving so fast today that the top-of-the-line, high-speed computers you received as plebes today are virtually museum pieces. [Laughter]

In this world, our country is blessed with peace, prosperity, declining social ills. But today's possibilities are not tomorrow's guarantees.

Just last week, India conducted a series of nuclear explosive tests, reminding us that technology is not always a force for good. India's action threatens the stability of Asia and challenges the firm international consensus to stop all nuclear testing. So again I ask **India to halt its nuclear weapons program and join the 149 other nations** that have already signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. And I ask Pakistan to exercise restraint, to avoid a perilous nuclear arms race.

This specter of a dangerous rivalry in South Asia is but one of the many signs that we must remain strong and vigilant against the kinds of threats we have seen already throughout the 20th century, regional aggression and competition, bloody civil wars, efforts to overthrow democracies.

But also, our security is challenged increasingly by nontraditional threats, from adversaries both old and new, not only hostile regimes but also terrorists and international criminals, who cannot defeat us in traditional theaters of battle but search instead for new ways to attack, by exploiting new technologies and the world's increasing openness.

As we approach the 21st century, our foes have extended the fields of battle, from physical space to cyberspace; from the world's vast bodies of water to the complex workings of our own human bodies. Rather than invading our beaches or launching bombers, these adversaries may attempt cyberattacks against our critical military systems and our economic base. Or they may deploy compact and relatively cheap weapons of mass destruction, not just nuclear but also chemical or biological, to use disease as a weapon of war. Sometimes the terrorists and criminals act alone. But increasingly, they are interconnected and sometimes supported by hostile countries.

If our children are to grow up safe and free, we must approach these new 21st century threats with the same rigor and determination we applied to the toughest security challenges of this century. We are taking strong steps against these threats today. We've improved antiterrorism cooperation with other countries; tightened security for our troops, our diplomats, our air travelers; strengthened sanctions on nations that support terrorists; given our law enforcement agencies new tools. We broke up terrorist rings before they could attack New York's Holland Tunnel, the United Nations, and our airlines. We have captured and brought to justice many of the offenders.

But we must do more. Last week, I announced America's first comprehensive strategy to control international crime and bring criminals, terrorists, and money launderers to justice. Today I come before you to announce three new initiatives: the first broadly directed at combating terrorism; the other two addressing two

[[Page 827]]

potential threats from terrorists and hostile nations, attacks on our computer networks and other critical systems upon which our society depends and attacks using biological weapons. On all of these efforts, we will need the help of the Navy and the Marines. Your service will be critical in combating these new challenges.

To make these three initiatives work, we must have the concerted efforts of a whole range of Federal agencies, from the Armed Forces to law enforcement to intelligence to public health. I am appointing a National Coordinator for Security, Infrastructure Protection, and Counterterrorism, to bring the full force of all our resources to bear swiftly and effectively.

First, we will use our new integrated approach to intensify the fight against all forms of terrorism: to capture terrorists, no matter where they hide; to work with other nations to eliminate terrorist sanctuaries overseas; to respond rapidly and effectively to protect Americans from terrorism at home and abroad.

Second, we will launch a comprehensive plan to detect, deter, and defend against attacks on our critical infrastructures, our power systems, water supplies, police, fire, and medical services, air traffic control, financial services, telephone systems, and computer networks.

Just 15 years ago, these infrastructures--some within government, some in the private sector--were separate and distinct. Now, they are linked together over vast computer-electronic networks, greatly increasing our productivity but also making us much more vulnerable to disruption. Three days ago, we saw the enormous impact of a single failed electronic link when a satellite malfunction disabled pagers, ATM's, credit card systems, and TV and radio networks all around the world. Beyond such accidents, intentional attacks against our critical systems already are underway. Hackers break into government and business computers. They can raid banks, run up credit card charges, extort money by threats to unleash computer viruses.

If we fail to take strong action, then terrorists, criminals, and hostile regimes could invade and paralyze these vital systems, disrupting commerce, threatening health, weakening our capacity to function in a crisis. In response to these concerns, I established a commission chaired by retired General Tom Marsh, <Marsh, Robert (Tom)> to assess the vulnerability of our critical infrastructures. They returned with a pointed conclusion: Our

vulnerability, particularly to cyberattacks, is real and growing. And they made important recommendations, that we will now implement, to put us ahead of the danger curve.

We have the best trained, best equipped, best prepared Armed Forces in history. But as ever, we must be ready to fight the next war, not the last one. And our military, as strong as it is, cannot meet these challenges alone. Because so many key components of our society are operated by the private sector, we must create a genuine public-private partnership to protect America in the 21st century. Together, we can find and reduce the vulnerabilities to attack in all critical sectors, develop warning systems including a national center to alert us to attacks, increase our cooperation with friendly nations, and create the means to minimize damage and rapidly recover in the event attacks occur. We can and we must make these critical systems more secure, so that we can be more secure.

Third, we will undertake a concerted effort to prevent the spread and use of biological weapons and to protect our people in the event these terrible weapons are ever unleashed by a rogue state, a terrorist group, or an international criminal organization. Conventional military force will continue to be crucial to curbing weapons of mass destruction. In the confrontation against Iraq, deployment of our Navy and Marine forces has played a key role in helping to convince Saddam Hussein to accept United Nations inspections of his weapons facilities.

But we must pursue the fight against biological weapons on many fronts. We must strengthen the international Biological Weapons Convention with a strong system of inspections to detect and prevent cheating. This is a major priority. It was part of my State of the Union Address earlier this year, and we are working with other nations and our industries to make it happen.

Because our troops serve on the front line of freedom, we must take special care to protect them. So we have been working on vaccinating them against biological threats, and now we will inoculate all our Armed Forces, active duty and reserves, against deadly anthrax bacteria.

Finally, we must do more to protect our civilian population from biological weapons. The Defense Department has been teaching State and local officials to respond if the weapons are brandished or used. Today it is announcing plans to train National Guard and reserve elements in every region to address this challenge. But

[[Page 828]]

again, we must do more to protect our people. We must be able to recognize a biological attack quickly in order to stop its spread.

We will work to upgrade our public health systems for detection and warning, to aid our preparedness against terrorism, and to help us cope

with infectious diseases that arise in nature. We will train and equip local authorities throughout the Nation to deal with an emergency involving weapons of mass destruction, creating stockpiles of medicines and vaccines to protect our civilian population against the kind of biological agents our adversaries are most likely to obtain or develop. And we will pursue research and development to create the next generation of vaccines, medicines, and diagnostic tools. The human genome project will be very, very important in this regard. And again, it will aid us also in fighting infectious diseases.

We must not cede the cutting edge of biotechnology to those who would do us harm. Working with the Congress, America must maintain its leadership in research and development. It is critical to our national security.

In our efforts to battle terrorism and cyberattacks and biological weapons, all of us must be extremely aggressive. But we must also be careful to uphold privacy rights and other constitutional protections. We do not ever undermine freedom in the name of freedom.

To the men and women of this Class of 1998, over 4 years you have become part of an institution, the Navy, that has repeatedly risen to the challenges of battle and of changing technology. In the Spanish-American War, 100 years ago, our Navy won the key confrontations at Manila Bay and off Cuba. In the years between the World Wars, the Navy made tremendous innovations with respect to aircraft carriers and amphibious operations. In the decisive battle in the Pacific in World War II at Midway, our communications experts and code breakers obtained and Admiral Nimitz seized on crucial information about the enemy fleet that secured victory against overwhelming odds.

In the cold war, nuclear propulsion revolutionized our carrier and submarine operations. And today, our Navy and Marine Corps are fundamental to our strategy of global engagement, aiding our friends and warning foes that they cannot undermine our efforts to build a just, peaceful, free future.

President Theodore Roosevelt put it succinctly a long time ago. "A good Navy," he said, "is the surest guaranty of peace." We will have that good Navy, because of you, your readiness, strength, your knowledge of science and technology, your ability to promptly find and use essential information, and above all, your strength of spirit and your core values, honor, courage, and commitment. I ask you to remember, though, that with these new challenges especially, we must all, as Americans, be united in purpose and spirit.

Our defense has always drawn on the best of our entire Nation. The Armed Forces have defended our freedom, and in turn, freedom has allowed our people to thrive. Our security innovations have often been sparked and supported over and over by the brilliance and drive of people in non-military sectors, our businesses and universities, our scientists and technologists. Now, more than ever, we need the broad support and

participation of our citizens as your partners in meeting the security challenges of the 21st century.

Members of the Class of 1998, you are just moments away from becoming ensigns and second lieutenants, and I have not taken as much time as you did to climb the Monument. [Laughter] I thank you for giving me a few moments of your attention to talk to you and our Nation about the work you will be doing for them for the rest of your careers. You will be our guardians and champions of freedom.

Let me say just one thing in closing on a more personal note. We must protect our people from danger and keep America safe and free. But I hope you will never lose sight of why we are doing it. We are doing it so that all of your country men and women can live meaningful lives, according to their own rights. So work hard, but don't forget to pursue also what fulfills you as people, the beauty of the natural world, literature, the arts, sports, volunteer service. Most of all, don't forget to take time for your personal lives, to show your love to your friends and, most of all, to your families, the parents and grandparents who made the sacrifices to get you here, in the future, your wives, your husbands, and your children.

In a free society, the purpose of public service, in or out of uniform, is to provide all citizens with the freedom and opportunity to live their own dreams. So when you return from an exhausting deployment or just a terrible day, never forget to cherish your loved ones, and always be grateful that you have been given

[[Page 829]]

the opportunity to serve, to protect for yourselves and for your loved ones and for your fellow Americans the precious things that make life worth living and freedom worth defending.

I know your families are very proud of you today. Now go, and make America proud.

Good luck, and God bless you.

Note: The President spoke at 10:22 a.m. in the Navy/Marine Corps Memorial Stadium. In his remarks, he referred to Adm. Charles Larson, USN, Superintendent, U.S. Naval Academy; Adm. Jay L. Johnson, USN, Chief of Naval Operations; Gen. Charles C. Krulak, USMC, Commandant of the Marine Corps; Vice Adm. John R. Ryan, USN, incoming Superintendent, U.S. Naval Academy; Beverly Byron, Chair, U.S. Naval Academy Board of Visitors; Gen Robert T. (Tom) Marsh, USAF, Chairman, President's Commission on Critical Infrastructure Protection; and President Saddam Hussein of Iraq.



## Appendix Five

[Public Papers of the Presidents]  
[William J. Clinton -- 1995]  
[Volume 2]  
[From the U.S. Government Printing Office via GPO Access]  
[DOCID:pap\_text-268]

[Page 1600-1606]

Remarks at the University of Texas at Austin  
October 16, 1995

Thank you. You know, when I was a boy growing up in Arkansas, I thought it highly--[applause]--I thought it highly unlikely that I would ever become President of the United States. Perhaps the only thing even more unlikely was that I should ever have the opportunity to be cheered at the University of Texas. I must say I am very grateful for both of them. [Laughter]

President Berdahl, Chancellor Cunningham, Dean Olson; to the Texas Longhorn Band, thank you for playing ``Hail to the Chief." You were magnificent. To my longtime friend of nearly 25 years now, Bernard Rapoport, thank you for your statement and your inspiration and your life of generous giving to this great university and so many other good causes. All the distinguished guests in the audience--I hesitate to start, but I thank my friend and your fellow Texan, Henry Cisneros, for coming down here with me and for his magnificent work as Secretary of HUD. I thank your Congressman, Lloyd Doggett, and his wife, Libby, for flying down with me. And I'm glad to see my dear friend Congressman Jake Pickle here; I miss you. Your attorney general, Dan Morales; the land commissioner, Garry Mauro, I thank all of them for being here. Thank you, Luci Johnson, for being here, and please give my regards to your wonderful mother. I have not seen her here--there she is. And I have to recognize and thank your former Congresswoman and now distinguished professor, Barbara Jordan, for the magnificent job you did on the immigration issue. Thank you so much. [Applause] Thank you. Thank you.

My wife told me about coming here so much, I wanted to come and see for myself. I also know, as all of you do, that there is no such thing as saying no to Liz Carpenter. [Laughter] I drug it out as long as I could just to hear a few more jokes. [Laughter]

My fellow Americans, I want to begin by telling you that I am hopeful about America. When I looked at Nikole Bell up here introducing me and I shook hands with these other young students--I looked into their eyes; I saw the AmeriCorps button on that gentleman's shirt--I was reminded--as I talk about this thorny subject of race today--I was

reminded of what Winston Churchill said about the United States when President Roosevelt was trying to pass the Lend-Lease Act so that we could help Britain in their war against Nazi Germany before we, ourselves, were involved. And for a good while the issue was hanging fire, and it was unclear whether the Congress would permit us to help Britain, who at that time was the only bulwark

[[Page 1601]]

against tyranny in Europe. And Winston Churchill said, "I have great confidence in the judgment and the common sense of the American people and their leaders. They invariably do the right thing after they have examined every other alternative." [Laughter] So I say to you, let me begin by saying that I can see in the eyes of these students and in the spirit of this moment, we will do the right thing.

In recent weeks, every one of us has been made aware of a simple truth: White Americans and black Americans often see the same world in drastically different ways, ways that go beyond and beneath the Simpson trial and its aftermath, which brought these perceptions so starkly into the open.

The rift we see before us that is tearing at the heart of America exists in spite of the remarkable progress black Americans have made in the last generation, since Martin Luther King swept America up in his dream and President Johnson spoke so powerfully for the dignity of man and the destiny of democracy in demanding that Congress guarantee full voting rights to blacks. The rift between blacks and whites exists still in a very special way in America, in spite of the fact that we have become much more racially and ethnically diverse and that Hispanic-Americans, themselves no strangers to discrimination, are now almost 10 percent of our national population.

The reasons for this divide are many. Some are rooted in the awful history and stubborn persistence of racism. Some are rooted in the different ways we experience the threats of modern life to personal security, family values, and strong communities. Some are rooted in the fact that we still haven't learned to talk frankly, to listen carefully, and to work together across racial lines.

Almost 30 years ago, Dr. Martin Luther King took his last march with sanitation workers in Memphis. They marched for dignity, equality, and economic justice. Many carried placards that read simply, "I am a man." The throngs of men marching in Washington today, almost all of them, are doing so for the same stated reason. But there is a profound difference between this march today and those of 30 years ago. Thirty years ago, the marchers were demanding the dignity and opportunity they were due because in the face of terrible discrimination, they had worked hard, raised their children, paid their taxes, obeyed the laws, and fought our wars.

Well, today's march is also about pride and dignity and respect. But after a generation of deepening social problems that disproportionately impact black Americans, it is also about black men taking renewed responsibility for themselves, their families, and their communities. It's about saying no to crime and drugs and violence. It's about standing up for atonement and reconciliation. It's about insisting that others do the same and offering to help them. It's about the frank admission that unless black men shoulder their load, no one else can help them or their brothers, their sisters, and their children escape the hard, bleak lives that too many of them still face.

Of course, some of those in the march do have a history that is far from its message of atonement and reconciliation. One million men are right to be standing up for personal responsibility. But one million men do not make right one man's message of malice and division. No good house was ever built on a bad foundation. Nothing good ever came of hate. So let us pray today that all who march and all who speak will stand for atonement, for reconciliation, for responsibility. Let us pray that those who have spoken for hatred and division in the past will turn away from that past and give voice to the true message of those ordinary Americans who march. If that happens, the men and the women who are there with them will be marching into better lives for themselves and their families. And they could be marching into a better future for America.

Today we face a choice. One way leads to further separation and bitterness and more lost futures. The other way, the path of courage and wisdom, leads to unity, to reconciliation, to a rich opportunity for all Americans to make the most of the lives God gave them. This moment in which the racial divide is so clearly out in the open need not be a setback for us. It presents us with a great opportunity, and we dare not let it pass us by.

In the past, when we've had the courage to face the truth about our failure to live up to our own best ideals, we've grown stronger, moved forward, and restored proud American optimism. At such turning points, America moved to preserve the Union and abolish slavery, to embrace women's suffrage, to guarantee basic legal rights to America without regard to race, under the leadership of President Johnson. At each of these moments, we looked in the

[[Page 1602]]

national mirror and were brave enough to say, this is not who we are; we're better than that.

Abraham Lincoln reminded us that a house divided against itself cannot stand. When divisions have threatened to bring our house down, somehow we have always moved together to shore it up. My fellow Americans, our house is the greatest democracy in all human history. And

with all its racial and ethnic diversity, it has beaten the odds of human history. But we know that divisions remain, and we still have work to do.

The two worlds we see now each contain both truth and distortion. Both black and white Americans must face this, for honesty is the only gateway to the many acts of reconciliation that will unite our worlds at last into one America.

White America must understand and acknowledge the roots of black pain. It began with unequal treatment, first in law and later in fact. African-Americans indeed have lived too long with a justice system that in too many cases has been and continues to be less than just. The record of abuses extends from lynchings and trumped up charges to false arrests and police brutality. The tragedies of Emmett Till and Rodney King are bloody markers on the very same road. Still today, too many of our police officers play by the rules of the bad old days. It is beyond wrong when law-abiding black parents have to tell their law-abiding children to fear the police whose salaries are paid by their own taxes.

And blacks are right to think something is terribly wrong when African-American men are many times more likely to be victims of homicide than any other group in this country, when there are more African-American men in our corrections system than in our colleges, when almost one in three African-American men in their twenties are either in jail, on parole, or otherwise under the supervision of the criminal justice system, nearly one in three. And that is a disproportionate percentage in comparison to the percentage of blacks who use drugs in our society. Now, I would like every white person here and in America to take a moment to think how he or she would feel if one in three white men were in similar circumstances.

And there is still unacceptable economic disparity between blacks and whites. It is so fashionable to talk today about African-Americans as if they have been some sort of protected class. Many whites think blacks are getting more than their fair share in terms of jobs and promotions. That is not true. That is not true.

The truth is that African-Americans still make on average about 60 percent of what white people do, that more than half of African-American children live in poverty. And at the very time our young Americans need access to college more than ever before, black college enrollment is dropping in America.

On the other hand, blacks must understand and acknowledge the roots of white fear in America. There is a legitimate fear of the violence that is too prevalent in our urban areas. And often, by experience or at least what people see on the news at night, violence for those white people too often has a black face.

It isn't racist for a parent to pull his or her child close when walking through a high-crime neighborhood or to wish to stay away from neighborhoods where innocent children can be shot in school or standing

at bus stops by thugs driving by with assault weapons or toting handguns like Old West desperadoes. It isn't racist for parents to recoil in disgust when they read about a national survey of gang members saying that two-thirds of them feel justified in shooting someone simply for showing them disrespect. It isn't racist for whites to say they don't understand why people put up with gangs on the corner or in the projects or with drugs being sold in the schools or in the open. It's not racist for whites to assert that the culture of welfare dependency, out-of-wedlock pregnancy, and absent fatherhood cannot be broken by social programs unless there is first more personal responsibility.

The great potential for this march today, beyond the black community, is that whites will come to see a larger truth: that blacks share their fears and embrace their convictions, openly assert that without changes in the black community and within individuals, real change for our society will not come.

This march could remind white people that most black people share their old-fashioned American values, for most black Americans still do work hard, care for their families, pay their taxes, and obey the law, often under circumstances which are far more difficult than those their white counterparts face. Imagine how you would feel if you were a young parent in your twenties with a young child living in a housing project, working somewhere for \$5

[[Page 1603]]

an hour with no health insurance, passing every day people on the street selling drugs, making 100 times what you make. Those people are the real heroes of America today, and we should recognize that.

And white people too often forget that they are not immune to the problems black Americans face, crime, drugs, domestic abuse, and teen pregnancy. They are too prevalent among whites as well, and some of those problems are growing faster in our white population than in our minority population.

So we all have a stake in solving these common problems together. It is therefore wrong for white Americans to do what they have done too often, simply to move further away from the problems and support policies that will only make them worse.

Finally, both sides seem to fear deep down inside that they'll never quite be able to see each other as more than enemy faces, all of whom carry at least a sliver of bigotry in their hearts. Differences of opinion rooted in different experiences are healthy, indeed essential, for democracies. But differences so great and so rooted in race threaten to divide the house Mr. Lincoln gave his life to save. As Dr. King said, "We must learn to live together as brothers, or we will perish as fools."

Recognizing one another's real grievances is only the first step. We

must all take responsibility for ourselves, our conduct, and our attitudes. America, we must clean our house of racism.

To our white citizens, I say, I know most of you every day do your very best by your own lights to live a life free of discrimination. Nevertheless, too many destructive ideas are gaining currency in our midst. The taped voice of one policeman should fill you with outrage. And so I say, we must clean the house of white America of racism. Americans who are in the white majority should be proud to stand up and be heard denouncing the sort of racist rhetoric we heard on that tape, so loudly and clearly denouncing it that our black fellow citizens can hear us. White racism may be black people's burden, but it's white people's problem. We must clean our house.

To our black citizens, I honor the presence of hundreds of thousands of men in Washington today committed to atonement and to personal responsibility and the commitment of millions of other men and women who are African-Americans to this cause. I call upon you to build on this effort, to share equally in the promise of America. But to do that, your house, too, must be cleaned of racism. There are too many today, white and black, on the left and the right, on the street corners and the radio waves, who seek to sow division for their own purposes. To them I say, no more. We must be one.

Long before we were so diverse, our Nation's motto was E Pluribus Unum, out of many, we are one. We must be one, as neighbors, as fellow citizens, not separate camps but family, white, black, Latino, all of us, no matter how different, who share basic American values and are willing to live by them.

When a child is gunned down on a street in the Bronx, no matter what our race, he is our American child. When a woman dies from a beating, no matter what our race or hers, she is our American sister. And every time drugs course through the vein of another child, it clouds the future of all our American children. Whether we like it or not, we are one nation, one family, indivisible. And for us, divorce or separation are not options.

Here in 1995, on the edge of the 21st century, we dare not tolerate the existence of two Americas. Under my watch, I will do everything I can to see that as soon as possible there is only one, one America under the rule of law, one social contract committed not to winner-take-all but to giving all Americans a chance to win together, one America.

Well, how do we get there? First, today I ask every Governor, every mayor, every business leader, every church leader, every civic leader, every union steward, every student leader, most important, every citizen, in every workplace and learning place and meeting place all across America to take personal responsibility for reaching out to people of different races, for taking time to sit down and talk through this issue, to have the courage to speak honestly and frankly, and then to have the discipline to listen quietly with an open mind and an open

heart, as others do the same.

This may seem like a simple request, but for tens of millions of Americans, this has never been a reality. They have never spoken, and they have never listened, not really, not really. I am convinced, based on a rich lifetime of friendships and common endeavors with people of different races, that the American people will find out they have a lot more in common than they think they do.

[[Page 1604]]

The second thing we have to do is to defend and enhance real opportunity. I'm not talking about opportunity for black Americans or opportunity for white Americans; I'm talking about opportunity for all Americans. Sooner or later, all our speaking, all our listening, all our caring has to lead to constructive action together for our words and our intentions to have meaning. We can do this first by truly rewarding work and family in Government policies, in employment policies, in community practices.

We also have to realize that there are some areas of our country, whether in urban areas or poor rural areas like south Texas or eastern Arkansas, where these problems are going to be more prevalent just because there is no opportunity. There is only so much temptation some people can stand when they turn up against a brick wall day after day after day. And if we can spread the benefits of education and free enterprise to those who have been denied them too long and who are isolated in enclaves in this country, then we have a moral obligation to do it. It will be good for our country.

Third and perhaps most important of all, we have to give every child in this country, and every adult who still needs it, the opportunity to get a good education. President Johnson understood that, and now that I am privileged to have this job and to look back across the whole sweep of American history, I can appreciate how truly historic his commitment to the simple idea that every child in this country ought to have an opportunity to get a good, safe, decent, fulfilling education was. It was revolutionary then, and it is revolutionary today.

Today that matters more than ever. I'm trying to do my part. I am fighting hard against efforts to roll back family security, aid to distressed communities, and support for education. I want it to be easier for poor children to get off to a good start in school, not harder. I want it to be easier for everybody to go to college and stay there, not harder. I want to mend affirmative action, but I do not think America is at a place today where we can end it. The evidence of the last several weeks shows that.

But let us remember, the people marching in Washington today are right about one fundamental thing: At its base, this issue of race is not about government or political leaders, it is about what is in the

heart and minds and life of the American people. There will be no progress in the absence of real responsibility on the part of all Americans. Nowhere is that responsibility more important than in our efforts to promote public safety and preserve the rule of law.

Law and order is the first responsibility of government. Our citizens must respect the law and those who enforce it. Police have a life-and-death responsibility never, never to abuse the power granted them by the people. We know, by the way, what works in fighting crime also happens to improve relationships between the races. What works in fighting crime is community policing. We have seen it working all across America. The crime rate is down, the murder rate is down where people relate to each other across the lines of police and community in an open, honest, respectful, supportive way. We can lower crime and raise the state of race relations in America if we will remember this simple truth.

But if this is going to work, police departments have to be fair and engaged with, not estranged from, their communities. I am committed to making this kind of community policing a reality all across our country. But you must be committed to making it a reality in your communities. We have to root out the remnants of racism in our police departments. We've got to get it out of our entire criminal justice system. But just as the police have a sacred duty to protect the community fairly, all of our citizens have a sacred responsibility to respect the police, to teach our young people to respect them, and then to support them and work with them so that they can succeed in making us safer.

Let's not forget, most police officers of whatever race are honest people who love the law and put their lives on the lines so that the citizens they're protecting can lead decent, secure lives and so that their children can grow up to do the same.

Finally, I want to say, on the day of this march, a moment about a crucial area of responsibility, the responsibility of fatherhood. The single biggest social problem in our society may be the growing absence of fathers from their children's homes, because it contributes to so many other social problems. One child in four grows up in a fatherless home. Without a father to help guide, without a father to care, without a father to teach boys to be men and to teach girls to expect respect from men, it's harder.

[[Page 1605]]

There are a lot of mothers out there doing a magnificent job alone, a magnificent job alone, but it is harder. It is harder. This, of course, is not a black problem or a Latino problem or a white problem, it is an American problem. But it aggravates the conditions of the racial divide.

I know from my own life it is harder, because my own father died before I was born, and my stepfather's battle with alcohol kept him from



being the father he might have been. But for all fathers, parenting is not easy, and every parent makes mistakes. I know that, too, from my own experience. The point is that we need people to be there for their children day after day. Building a family is the hardest job a man can do, but it's also the most important.

For those who are neglecting their children, I say it is not too late; your children still need you. To those who only send money in the form of child support, I say keep sending the checks; your kids count on them, and we'll catch you and enforce the law if you stop. But the message of this march today--one message is that your money is no replacement for your guiding, your caring, your loving the children you brought into this world.

We can only build strong families when men and women respect each other, when they have partnerships, when men are as involved in the homeplace as women have become involved in the workplace. It means, among other things, that we must keep working until we end domestic violence against women and children. I hope those men in Washington today pledge among other things to never, never raise their hand in violence against a woman.

So today, my fellow Americans, I honor the black men marching in Washington to demonstrate their commitment to themselves, their families, and their communities. I honor the millions of men and women in America, the vast majority of every color, who without fanfare or recognition do what it takes to be good fathers and good mothers, good workers and good citizens. They all deserve the thanks of America.

But when we leave here today, what are you going to do? What are you going to do? Let all of us who want to stand up against racism do our part to roll back the divide. Begin by seeking out people in the workplace, the classroom, the community, the neighborhood across town, the places of worship to actually sit down and have those honest conversations I talked about, conversations where we speak openly and listen and understand how others view this world of ours.

Make no mistake about it, we can bridge this great divide. This is, after all, a very great country. And we have become great by what we have overcome. We have the world's strongest economy, and it's on the move. But we've really lasted because we have understood that our success could never be measured solely by the size of our gross national product.

I believe the march in Washington today spawned such an outpouring because it is a reflection of something deeper and stronger that is running throughout our American community. I believe that in millions and millions of different ways, our entire country is reasserting our commitment to the bedrock values that made our country great and that make life worth living.

The great divides of the past called for and were addressed by legal and legislative changes. They were addressed by leaders like Lyndon

Johnson, who passed the Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act. And to be sure, this great divide requires a public response by democratically elected leaders. But today, we are really dealing, and we know it, with problems that grow in large measure out of the way all of us look at the world with our minds and the way we feel about the world with our hearts.

And therefore, while leaders and legislation may be important, this is work that has to be done by every single one of you. And this is the ultimate test of our democracy, for today the house divided exists largely in the minds and hearts of the American people. And it must be united there, in the minds and hearts of our people.

Yes, there are some who would poison our progress by selling short the great character of our people and our enormous capacity to change and grow. But they will not win the day; we will win the day. With your help, with your help, that day will come a lot sooner. I will do my part, but you, my fellow citizens, must do yours.

Thank you, and God bless you.

Note: The President spoke at 9:34 a.m. at the Frank Erwin Center, as part of the Liz Sutherland Carpenter Distinguished Lectureship in the Humanities and Sciences. In his remarks, he referred to Robert Berdahl, president, William

[[Page 1606]]

Cunningham, chancellor, Sheldon Ekland-Olson, dean, college of liberal arts, Bernard Rapoport, chairman, board of regents, and Nikole Bell, student, University of Texas at Austin. A portion of these remarks could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.