

# American

## NEWS & VIEWS

*A Daily Newsletter from Public Affairs, American Embassy*

---

---

**February 1, 2010**

---

---

<b>President Obama Bolsters Climate Commitments in State of the Union .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Vice President Biden on Obama’s Nuclear Vision.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Secretary Clinton Signals Unwavering U.S. Commitment to European Security .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>U.S. Intensifies Efforts to Prevent Human Trafficking in Haiti .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>United States Condemns “Unjust” Executions of Iranian Dissenters.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>The Struggle for Internet Freedom .....</b>	<b>6</b>

## President Obama Bolsters Climate Commitments in State of the Union

By Carlyn Reichel  
Staff Writer

Washington — In his first State of the Union address to Congress on January 27, President Obama reaffirmed his commitment to American leadership on climate change, touting innovation and clean-energy initiatives as crucial elements in America's economic recovery and in spurring job creation.

New energy technologies will be essential for remaining competitive in a 21st century global economy, Obama said, and American investment in this area should be a source of national pride. "Washington has been telling us to wait for decades, even as the problems have grown worse," Obama said. "Meanwhile, China is not waiting to revamp its economy. Germany is not waiting. India is not waiting. ... They're rebuilding their infrastructure. They're making serious investments in clean energy because they want those jobs."

Obama referenced 200,000 jobs in construction and clean energy that had been preserved or created through funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, a bill passed in February 2009 to spur economic growth. He encouraged lawmakers to consider legislation that would "put more Americans to work building clean-energy facilities and give rebates to Americans who make their homes more energy-efficient," activity that the president said supports clean-energy jobs.

### CLIMATE LEGISLATION

"To create more of these clean-energy jobs," Obama said, "we need more production, more efficiency, more incentives." He called on the Senate to follow the House of Representatives and pass a comprehensive energy and climate bill "with incentives that will finally make clean energy the profitable kind of energy in America."

The House passed the American Clean Energy and Security Act in June 2009. It proposes to cut U.S. carbon dioxide emissions 17 percent from 2005 levels by 2020 and 83 percent by 2050. A similar bill has cleared the committee stage in the Senate, but has not yet been brought to the Senate floor for broader debate.

Since many lawmakers believe there are not enough Senate votes to pass the bill in its current form, Obama also signaled his openness for a bipartisan solution. He threw his support behind building new nuclear power plants and exploring new offshore drilling sites. Both options are often supported by Republicans, but are generally unpopular in the Democratic Party. Obama also

called for increased investment in advanced biofuels and clean-coal technologies.

Obama said that, regardless of one's opinion on the causes of climate change, investing in clean-energy technologies will help Americans compete in a globalized economy.

"Even if you doubt the evidence [on climate change]," he said, "providing incentives for energy efficiency and clean energy are the right thing to do for our future — because the nation that leads the clean-energy economy will be the nation that leads the global economy. And America must be that nation."

### NONCONGRESSIONAL ACTION

While Congress reviews potential legislative actions, the Obama administration has taken other important strides that do not require congressional involvement.

In December 2009, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued a finding under the Clean Air Act that greenhouse gases endanger public health and welfare. This endangerment finding authorizes the EPA to propose rules that ensure emitters use the best technology available to reduce their emissions. The EPA also is working with the U.S. Department of Transportation to enforce more stringent fuel-efficiency standards for new cars and trucks to help lower America's transportation emissions.

President Obama also signed an executive order requiring federal agencies to set reduction targets for their greenhouse gas emissions, increase their energy efficiency, and reduce their petroleum consumption.

The White House announced January 29 that the federal government will reduce its emissions 28 percent by 2020. "As the largest energy consumer in the United States, we have a responsibility to American citizens to reduce our energy use and become more efficient," President Obama said in the White House statement. "Our goal is to lower costs, reduce pollution, and shift federal energy expenses away from oil and towards local, clean energy."

On the international stage, President Obama said the United States has gone from being a "bystander to a leader in the fight against climate change." At the U.N. Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen (COP-15), the United States joined with other major economies to form a multilateral agreement to take transparent national action to curb domestic emissions and to support financing to help developing countries adapt. As part of the Copenhagen agreement, the United States announced its national emissions reduction target as 17 percent by 2020 on January 28, though the target remains contingent on

congressional legislative action.

### **Vice President Biden on Obama's Nuclear Vision**

*January 29 Wall Street Journal commentary*

The following commentary by Vice President Biden, headlined "The President's Nuclear Vision," appeared in the Wall Street Journal January 29 and is in the public domain. There are no republication restrictions.

#### **The President's Nuclear Vision**

We will spend what is necessary to maintain the safety, security and effectiveness of our weapons.

By Joe Biden

The United States faces no greater threat than the spread of nuclear weapons. That is why, last April in Prague, President Obama laid out a comprehensive agenda to reverse their spread, and to pursue the peace and security of a world without them.

He understands that this ultimate goal will not be reached quickly. But by acting on a number of fronts, we can ensure our security, strengthen the global nonproliferation regime, and keep vulnerable nuclear material out of terrorist hands.

For as long as nuclear weapons are required to defend our country and our allies, we will maintain a safe, secure and effective nuclear arsenal. The president's Prague vision is central to this administration's efforts to protect the American people — and that is why we are increasing investments in our nuclear arsenal and infrastructure in this year's budget and beyond.

Among the many challenges our administration inherited was the slow but steady decline in support for our nuclear stockpile and infrastructure, and for our highly trained nuclear work force. The stockpile, infrastructure and work force played a critical and evolving role in every stage of our nuclear experience, from the Manhattan Project to the present day. Once charged with developing ever more powerful weapons, they have had a new mission in the 18 years since we stopped conducting nuclear tests. That is to maintain the strength of the nuclear arsenal.

For almost a decade, our laboratories and facilities have been underfunded and undervalued. The consequences of this neglect — like the growing shortage of skilled nuclear scientists and engineers and the aging of critical facilities — have largely escaped public notice. Last year, the Strategic Posture Commission led by former Defense Secretaries William Perry and James Schlesinger warned that our nuclear complex requires urgent attention. We agree.

The budget we will submit to Congress on Monday both reverses this decline and enables us to implement the president's nuclear-security agenda. These goals are intertwined. The same skilled nuclear experts who maintain our arsenal play a key role in guaranteeing our country's security now and for the future. State-of-the-art facilities, and highly trained and motivated people, allow us to maintain our arsenal without testing. They will help meet the president's goal of securing vulnerable nuclear materials world-wide in the coming years, and enable us to track and thwart nuclear trafficking, verify weapons reductions, and to develop tomorrow's cutting-edge technologies for our security and prosperity.

To achieve these goals, our budget devotes \$7 billion for maintaining our nuclear-weapons stockpile and complex, and for related efforts. This commitment is \$600 million more than Congress approved last year. And over the next five years we intend to boost funding for these important activities by more than \$5 billion. Even in a time of tough budget decisions, these are investments we must make for our security. We are committed to working with Congress to ensure these budget increases are approved.

This investment is long overdue. It will strengthen our ability to recruit, train and retain the skilled people we need to maintain our nuclear capabilities. It will support the work of our nuclear labs, a national treasure that we must and will sustain. Many of our facilities date back to World War II, and, given the safety and environmental challenges they present, cannot be sustained much longer. Increased funding now will eventually enable considerable savings on both security and maintenance. It also will allow us to clean up and close down production facilities we no longer need.

Our budget request is just one of several closely related and equally important initiatives giving life to the president's Prague agenda. Others include completing the New START agreement with Russia, releasing the Nuclear Posture Review on March 1, holding the Nuclear Security Summit in April, and pursuing ratification and entry into force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

We will by these initiatives seek to strengthen an emerging bipartisan consensus on how best to secure our nation. These steps will strengthen the nonproliferation regime, which is vital to holding nations like North Korea and Iran accountable when they break the rules, and deterring others from trying to do so.

Reflecting this consensus, Sen. John McCain has joined the president in endorsing a world without nuclear weapons — a goal that was articulated by President Ronald Reagan, who in 1984 said these weapons must be "banished from the face of the Earth." This consensus was

inspired by four of our most eminent statesmen – Messrs. Henry Kissinger, William Perry, Sam Nunn and George P. Shultz.

Some critics will argue that we should not constrain our nuclear efforts in any way. Others will assert that retaining a robust deterrent is at odds with our nonproliferation agenda. These four leaders last week in these pages argued compellingly that “maintaining high confidence in our nuclear arsenal is critical as the numbers of these weapons goes down. It is also consistent with and necessary for U.S. leadership in nonproliferation, risk reduction and arms reduction goals.”

This shared commitment serves our security. No nation can secure itself by disarming unilaterally, but as long as nuclear weapons exist, all nations remain ever on the brink of destruction. As President Obama said in Prague, “We cannot succeed in this endeavor alone, but we can lead it, we can start it.”

*(Mr. Joe Biden is vice president of the United States.)*

### **Secretary Clinton Signals Unwavering U.S. Commitment to European Security**

By Merle David Kellerhals Jr.  
Staff Writer

Washington – Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton outlined a set of principles that guide U.S. foreign and security policies with Europe, and also signaled the “unwavering commitment” of the United States to European security in a speech January 29 in Paris.

Speaking at France’s École Militaire, Clinton emphasized that the Vienna-based Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and NATO, the two largest and most comprehensive security organizations in Europe, are well-suited to deal with the 21st-century security environment and should be the venues for future discussions. At the same time, she said, Russia has offered a variety of proposals about the future of European security that deserve a thoughtful response.

“European security remains an anchor of U.S. foreign and security policy,” Clinton said. “However, we believe that these common goals are best pursued in the context of existing institutions, such as the OSCE and the NATO-Russia Council, rather than by negotiating new treaties, as Russia has suggested.”

In November 2009 Russian President Dmitry Medvedev put forward new ideas on European security, arguing that organizations such as NATO and the OSCE have become outdated.

In a statement on the Russian government’s Web site, the Kremlin said the new European security treaty would be based on the principle that “no nation or international organization ... is entitled to strengthen its own security at the cost of other nations or organizations,” according to a news report by Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty.

The draft European Security Treaty calls for the U.N. Security Council to “bear primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security.” Russia is one of the council’s five veto-holding, permanent members.

In her Paris speech, Clinton rejected this notion, saying that “we strongly believe that the enlargement of NATO and the [European Union] has increased security, stability and prosperity across the continent and that this, in turn, has increased Russia’s security.”

Clinton was in Paris for consultations with French President Nicolas Sarkozy and his national security adviser, Jean-David Levitte, following two days of meetings with foreign ministers in London on Yemen and Afghanistan. While at the London talks, Clinton held private meetings with British Foreign Secretary David Miliband, French Foreign Minister Bernard Kouchner and Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, among others.

The speech before a select audience at the 250-year-old military academy in Paris was in part intended to provide Europeans with specific policies and to emphasize continued U.S. commitment to their security. Some in Europe have feared that the United States has become distracted by ongoing conflicts in the Middle East and south-central Asia.

But Clinton told the audience that the traditional definition of security as deterrence, which dominated Cold War thinking and policymaking, has become largely obsolete. While security policy still embraces arms control, territorial sovereignty, and accords against the use of force, it must now consider threats from non-state actors, terrorism, cyberattacks and natural disasters, she added.

Clinton emphasized that the United States objects “to any spheres of influence in Europe in which one country seeks to control another’s future,” adding that “NATO must and will remain open to any country that aspires to become a member and can meet the requirements of membership.” Both Georgia and Ukraine have sought NATO membership in recent years.

In the 21st-century threat environment, security cannot be taken for granted, and Euro-Atlantic nations should avoid becoming complacent, Clinton said, citing the August 2008 Russia-Georgia crisis over the breakaway provinces

of South Ossetia and Abkhazia. Russia has since recognized both provinces as newly independent states and has maintained military forces in both provinces, but the United States and European nations have rejected that claim as a violation of the sovereignty of Georgia. Clinton said the United States will not recognize the Georgian regions of South Ossetia and Abkhazia as independent states. Russian forces continue to occupy both regions despite agreeing in a ceasefire commitment to withdraw its troops to positions held before the August conflict.

Clinton said part of the U.S. security commitment to Europe is Article 5 of the North Atlantic Charter, which commits its members to the security of any NATO nation attacked by outside powers.

“An attack on one is an attack on all,” Clinton said, reiterating that the United States will maintain military forces in Europe to bolster security.

#### SECURITY PRINCIPLES

Clinton addressed six security principles that guide U.S. policies in Europe, which specify:

- The cornerstone of security in Europe is a commitment to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all states.
- The United States is committed to the collective defense of allies.
- True security requires security for individuals as well as security among states and respect for human rights, free expression and a free news media.
- There should be transparency in all relations to blunt decades of mistrust.
- Security is indivisible, which effectively means there cannot be security for some without security for all.
- People everywhere have the right to live free from the fear of nuclear destruction.

#### **U.S. Intensifies Efforts to Prevent Human Trafficking in Haiti**

*State Department joins UNICEF to protect vulnerable children*  
By Jane Morse  
Staff Writer

Washington — The State Department announced it is stepping up its efforts to prevent human trafficking — particularly of children — in post-earthquake Haiti.

The magnitude 7.0 earthquake that hit Haiti January 12 — and the strong aftershocks that followed — killed tens of thousands. Many children were separated from their families in the confusion, exposing them to a greater risk of being trafficked by the unscrupulous.

Even before the earthquake, the State Department’s Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons had been

working with Haitian authorities to control human trafficking. According to the State Department’s most recent Trafficking in Persons Report, Haiti is a source, transit and destination country for men, women and children trafficked for the purposes of forced labor and sexual exploitation. The report says several nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) working in Haiti noted that in 2008 there had been a sharp increase in the number of Haitian children trafficked for sex and labor to the Dominican Republic and the Bahamas.

Although Haitian officials recognize that human trafficking is a serious problem in their country, Haitian law does not specifically prohibit trafficking in persons, which limits the Haitian government’s ability to punish traffickers and protect victims. This is made worse by Haiti’s political instability and lack of resources, the State Department report says.

At a January 29 press briefing, Philip Crowley, assistant secretary of state for public affairs, said U.S. officials assisting in the post-earthquake relief efforts have noted a few cases involving pedophiles attempting to adopt Haitian children.

Crowley, in a statement released January 28, said that although UNICEF has taken the lead role in child protection and safety in Haiti since the earthquake, the United States is working to supplement their efforts in combating child trafficking.

Specifically, the State Department — along with UNICEF, the government of Haiti, the Red Cross and other international and nongovernmental organizations — is stepping up efforts to protect vulnerable children by:

- Registering unaccompanied and separated children and working to reunite them with their families.
- Preventing the trafficking of displaced Haitians.
- Educating Haitians about the risks of giving away children in times of crisis.
- Rebuilding the capacity of Haitian NGOs already working to protect child domestic servants, known in Haiti as *restaveks*.

There are some 90,000 to 300,000 *restaveks* in Haiti, according to the State Department’s Trafficking in Persons Report. The word *restavek* comes from the French “*reste avec*” or “one who stays with.” It is actually a social system in Haiti where poor, usually rural, families send their children to work as domestics for wealthier families. The child is to receive food, shelter and education in exchange for the labor. Many *restaveks*, however, find themselves in unpaid servitude and physically abused; many are trafficked.

This latest push to help Haiti’s most vulnerable victims,

Crowley said, "is just the first wave of coordinated efforts in the aftermath of the earthquake which builds on existing efforts and expertise on the ground. We are coordinating further action to be announced in the coming days."

### **United States Condemns "Unjust" Executions of Iranian Dissenters**

By Stephen Kaufman  
Staff Writer

Washington — The Obama administration says Iran's execution of two Iranians who were accused of being involved in protests following the country's June 12, 2009, presidential election is "unjust" and marks a "low point" in the government's crackdown against people's peaceful exercise of their rights to free speech and free assembly.

Speaking to reporters January 28, White House deputy press secretary Bill Burton said the United States "strongly condemns these unjust executions."

According to press reports, Mohammad Reza Ali Zamani and Arash Rahmanipour were executed by hanging January 28, the first reported executions of political dissidents since the post-election protests began.

"We see it as a low point in the Islamic Republic's unjust and ruthless crackdown of peaceful dissent," Burton said. "Murdering political prisoners who are exercising their universal rights will not bring the respect and legitimacy the Islamic Republic seeks. It will only serve to further isolate Iran's government in the world and from its people."

The State Department's assistant secretary for public affairs, P.J. Crowley, said January 28 that it is "unclear that these individuals had anything to do with the turmoil surrounding the elections," and described the executions as "another sign of the increasingly ruthless repression and attempts at intimidation" by the Iranian government.

Iranian authorities are sending "the wrong signals" to their people, Crowley said. "Iranian citizens have the same right that all citizens have to demonstrate peacefully, to participate in the political process."

Although the Obama administration remains willing to engage with Iran's government in hopes that the country will play a constructive role in the Middle East, it will also "continue to speak out on Iran regarding their relation with their people and what we see as serious human rights concerns and abuses."

"We want to see Iran have a different kind of relationship with its own people," Crowley said.

Speaking in London, Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton told Cable News Network January 28 that "the voices of protest, the voices of opposition, are going to continue to challenge this regime in Iran."

The Iranian leadership has apparently failed its people as well as "the very principles that they claim to govern by," Clinton said.

The resolution of Iran's political crisis remains "an internal societal matter for Iranians to decide." The outside world is not involved in the crisis, Clinton said. But the international community is actively concerned over the Iranian government's nuclear activities and is discussing potential sanctions. Iran has continued to violate its international obligations on the matter, and has not formally responded to an October 2009 offer by China, Russia, France, the United Kingdom, the United States and Germany that would allow it to enrich its uranium in another country for use in its Tehran medical research reactor.

"Absent a nuclear program, we would still be expressing our regrets and our condemnation of their behavior toward their citizens, but we would not be looking for sanctions. We are looking for sanctions because their nuclear ambitions threaten the rest of the world," Clinton said.

The United States and other countries are "beginning to share ideas" on the design and enforcement of sanctions that will be "tough and clearly aimed at the Iranian economy," she said, adding that "it is very much our agenda to move forward."

With little evidence that Iran is willing to engage over its nuclear program, the international community "does not have a choice," she said. The United States remains open to pursuing a diplomatic track, but believes it is "imperative to change the calculus" of Iran's leadership, and sanctions are "an appropriate way to proceed," Clinton said.

"The time has come for the international community to say, 'No, we cannot permit your continued pursuit of nuclear weapons. It is destabilizing, it is dangerous, and we're going to take a stand against you,'" she said.

In the meantime, the U.S. Senate passed a bill that would require unilateral U.S. sanctions against Iran because of its continued nuclear activities. The measure, approved January 28, is similar to a bill passed by the U.S. House of Representatives in December. It would restrict Iranian imports of refined petroleum products, broadly ban imports and exports between the United States and Iran with the exception of food and medicine, and require any assets in the United States from groups such as Iran's

Revolutionary Guard to be frozen.

The House and Senate must reconcile their versions in a conference committee before a final bill can be submitted to both chambers for approval.

### **The Struggle for Internet Freedom**

*United States' call for change adds to debate in Arab world, Iran*

By Jeff Baron  
Staff Writer

Washington — Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton's call for "equal access to knowledge and ideas" online increases attention to a debate already stirring the Arab world and Iran, where censorship is common but varies widely.

"The Middle East and North Africa is one of the most heavily censored regions in the world," said a 2009 report from the OpenNet Initiative.

Many governments and their citizens are embracing the use of new technology to expand their economies and to gain access to information never before available. Jordan, for instance, seeks to become a regional leader with an information technology zone in Amman and tax breaks for software companies and business development firms. King Abdullah II has gone online to post a comment on an independent blog.

But governments are also applying restrictive press laws to digital content, "which is not a very good idea" for those trying to build an Internet economy, said Robert Faris, research director for the Berkman Center for Internet and Society at Harvard University.

And Iran, the region's leader in Internet use with a reported 32 million people online, is "clearly the worst in the region" for Internet censorship, Faris said.

The tools of censorship vary along with its extent. Almost every country in the region filters for some level of content, and many do so extensively. The starting point for many governments is to block sites that many citizens legitimately find offensive, such as pornography or gambling sites. From there, censorship expands to include political issues: It is not uncommon for political opposition sites to be blocked, for example.

One problem for advocates of open expression is that once a censorship mechanism is in place, it can be used easily and quietly to broaden the reach of censorship beyond that designed to "protect" the community by software engineers who may answer to no one.

A few countries allow relatively open access to Internet

Web sites — yet many of those same governments also arrest bloggers calling for democratic reforms, what Robert Guerra, project director for Freedom House's Global Internet Freedom Initiative, called "repression after expression." An April 2009 list from the Committee to Protect Journalists identified the 10 nations most hostile to blogging; four were Arab countries.

To some extent, the online environment reflects the rules faced by newspapers and other traditional media. The International Federation of Journalists has called for an overhaul of media laws, which in many countries allow for the jailing of journalists accused of undermining the reputation of the state or leaders. "On the plus side of the Internet, there's a lot more freedom in the Arab world online than there is in the mainstream media," Faris said.

A popular Saudi blogger, Eman, said that even with censorship, the Internet is changing her society. "Internet freedom and just having it accessible is especially important in Saudi Arabia," she said in an e-mail interview. "That's because we are an extremely closed and tribal society. Add to that gender segregation, and what you get is a country where the majority of the people are closed off from each other and only socialize with same-gender, same-tribe members. So access to Internet forums, local news websites and communication across Saudi regions, Islamic sects and tribes is immensely important."

Eman said most Saudis have had limited access to the outside world, which she said Islamic fundamentalists have demonized. With greater use of the Internet — more than a quarter of Saudis are online — "average Saudis are starting to wake up and think for themselves, and this is evident everywhere," Eman said.

As for crackdowns on expression online, Eman said that varies within countries as well as across borders. In Saudi Arabia, "I believe that they are more concerned about bloggers who write in Arabic and try to influence the country internally rather than bloggers who write in English to report to the outside world," she said. "The only blogger that I know of who was jailed and harassed is Fouad al Farhan. ... Al Farhan was jailed for a couple of months but claims he was not tortured. Although this was a few years back, his blog is still blocked."

Another Saudi blogger, Ahmed, said the Internet, though censored, remains the most open form of expression in his country. "Media here is heavily censored, and they do not welcome critical voices," he said in an e-mail. "The Internet has provided a new space for people to speak out and talk freely about the issues they feel strongly about, and this is crucial for a country that is trying to reform itself."

Although the region's governments commonly defend Internet censorship as an appropriate defense of society's standards, the most severe cases focus on political expression. Guerra and Faris agreed that the most prominent example in the region is that of Iran, especially since last year's disputed presidential election. Other countries have developed extensive, multilayered filtering and censorship apparatuses, according to a 2009 Freedom House study. Governments use these to block opposition political views and discussions of human rights. Offending blogs are deleted, blogs can be blocked, and bloggers and online journalists in some countries have been arrested.

Iranians' struggle over the Internet has been particularly dramatic, as they were already expressing themselves online in large numbers, not only about politics but also poetry and everything else they care about. Millions of expatriate Iranians share information with friends and relatives back home.

After the election, mobile phones and social networks, such as Facebook, were valuable tools for Iranians who wanted to organize or join protests. The government responded by limiting the usefulness of the technology, deliberately cutting the speed of Internet connections and shutting off mobile phone systems, Guerra said. He added that the Islamic Revolutionary Guard has taken control of the country's communications systems and has become more creative and combative in interfering with citizen action.

The government reportedly has been hiring hackers and security experts to interfere with Web sites inside and outside Iran and with e-mail accounts, deleting content. It is also filtering Web sites far more extensively than before the election, blocking Facebook, Twitter and YouTube, among many others. And social networks are being infiltrated. Numerous reports from Iranians who have returned to the country say that they were required to log onto their Facebook accounts at the airport so that security agents could examine their pages.

"You could say the repression that the Iranian government carried out on the streets ... was carried over onto the Internet," Guerra said.

Iran, like China, also reportedly has used hackers and security experts to interfere with Web sites inside and outside the country. The Internet is where history is being saved, Guerra said — and governments are trying to rewrite it, as Clinton acknowledged in her speech. "As I speak to you today, government censors somewhere are working furiously to erase my words from the records of history," she said.

Activists for Internet freedom have praised the U.S.

position put forward by Clinton. Natasha Tynes, program director for Middle Eastern affairs at the International Center for Journalists, said that change ultimately must come from "local players" but that the United States should continue to encourage freedom of expression worldwide and invest in technology and training programs to make a free Internet more accessible to the world.

Guerra said diplomacy can help, along with support for technology that can help people get around the filters and the censors. He said it also is important that democracies set good examples by avoiding the temptation to impose even limited forms of censorship of the Internet. He said such action offers other governments an excuse to restrict access to information.

Faris agreed. "We need to be careful not to slip down that road, and we need to be more careful about not being too Draconian about surveillance and protecting intellectual property online," he said.

"I think ultimately the question is whether we want the government to be the arbiters of what we see on the Internet or whether we want the family to do that," he said. He added that it is a question people in each country should have the opportunity to answer for themselves.

(Preceding items distributed by the Bureau of International Information Programs, U.S. Department of State. Web site: <http://america.gov>)