

BACK IN SEPTEMBER OF 1989, I GAVE A SPEECH IN WHICH I DISCUSSED THE UNIQUE AND DIFFICULT CHALLENGES THE UNITED STATES WAS INEVITABLY GOING TO FACE IN FOREIGN POLICY AS WE MOVED FROM A BIPOLAR TO A MULTIPOLAR WORLD. MY GOOD FRIEND PETER TARNOFF WAS QUICK TO TAKE ME TO TASK IN THE NEW YORK TIMES FOR HAVING DEMONSTRATED NOSTALGIA FOR THE COLD WAR. I DISPUTED THAT CHARACTERIZATION AT THE TIME, BUT TODAY, PETER, I HAVE A CONFESSION TO MAKE: I AM NOW TRULY NOSTALGIC FOR THE COLD WAR -- AND I SUSPECT YOU MAY SOON EMBRACE THIS FEELING YOURSELF.

THE FACT IS THAT I HAD NO WAY OF FORESEEING THEN JUST HOW TUMULTUOUS THE NEW ERA WAS GOING TO BE. BUT TODAY, IT IS ABUNDANTLY CLEAR THAT WE ARE IN THE MIDDLE OF A GLOBAL REVOLUTION, A PERIOD OF CHANGE AND INSTABILITY EQUALLED IN MODERN TIMES ONLY BY THE AFTERMATH OF THE FRENCH AND RUSSIAN REVOLUTIONS. THE STATUS QVO EVERYWHERE IS UNDER SIEGE. FOR ONE THING, THE END OF THE COLD WAR'S RIGID DIVISION OF THE WORLD INTO TWO SUPERPOWER-LED BLOCS HAS RESULTED IN A MORE WIDE OPEN INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM, WITH SADDAM HUSSEIN'S INVASION OF

- 2 -

KUWAIT BEING BUT THE MOST EGREGIOUS EXAMPLE OF THE MUCH GREATER POTENTIAL FOR GLOBAL ANARCHY WHICH NOW EXISTS.

AND FOR ANOTHER, THE POST-WORLD WAR II AND POST-COLONIAL STATE SYSTEM ITSELF IS BREAKING DOWN AS MANY NATIONS ARE INCREASINGLY UNABLE TO PERFORM BASIC GOVERNMENTAL FUNCTIONS, TO CONTROL THEIR INTERNAL AFFAIRS, OR TO RESIST PARTICULARIST AND SEPARATIST TENDENCIES WITHIN THEIR BORDERS. HERE, SOMALIA AND YUGOSLAVIA ARE THE MOST EGREGIOUS -- BUT BY NO MEANS THE ONLY EXAMPLES OF THIS TENDENCY TOWARDS FRAGMENTATION.

THESE CHANGES, TOGETHER WITH THE FULFILLMENT OF AMERICA'S COLD WAR MISSION, NOW CONFRONT THE UNITED STATES WITH THE EXISTENTIAL NEED TO REDEFINE ITS PLACE AND PURPOSE IN THE WORLD. SOME VIEW THE RECENT GLOBAL ASCENDANCE OF DEMOCRACY AS THE DEFINING FEATURE OF THIS NEW ERA, AND ARGUE THAT THE END OF THE COLD WAR HAS MADE IT BOTH SAFE AND NECESSARY FOR THE UNITED STATES TO PURSUE A WILSONIAN FOREIGN POLICY ON BEHALF OF THE DEMOCRATIC CAUSE. OTHERS SEE A WORLD FULL OF UNIQUE DANGER AND DISORDER, AND ARGUE THAT A UNITED STATES NO LONGER ABLE TO DOMINATE POLITICALLY AND ECONOMICALLY AS BEFORE MUST CONTINUE TO PURSUE NATIONAL SECURITY AND INTERNATIONAL STABILITY AS ITS HIGHEST FOREIGN POLICY OBJECTIVES.

- 3 -

I AM NOT GOING TO SETTLE THE DEBATE BETWEEN THE PARTISANS OF IDEALISM AND REALPOLITIK HERE TONIGHT, BUT WHAT I WOULD LIKE TO DO IS TO EXAMINE HOW THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION HAS HANDLED SOME OF THE CHALLENGES IT HAS FACED OVER THE PAST FOUR YEARS. I DO THIS NOT ONLY TO DEMONSTRATE -- TO MY SATISFACTION IF NOT TO YOURS -- WHERE WE SUCCEEDED IN LAYING A FOUNDATION FOR U.S. FOREIGN POLICY IN THE POST-COLD WAR ERA, BUT ALSO SO THAT I CAN DESCRIBE WHAT I BELIEVE TO BE SOME OF THE LESSONS THAT SHOULD BE DRAWN FROM OUR EXPERIENCE.

MANY HAVE ARGUED THAT WE DID NOT SUCCEED IN LAYING ANY NEW FOUNDATION AT ALL -- THAT OUR FOREIGN POLICY HAS BEEN ESSENTIALLY REACTIVE, UNDULY WEDDED TO THE STATUS QUO, AND LACKING IN STRATEGIC RATIONALE OR DEMOCRATIC VISION. I DO NOT, AS YOU WOULD EXPECT, AGREE. I BELIEVE THIS ADMINISTRATION HAS SUCCESSFULLY CONFRONTED THREE UNIQUE CHALLENGES:

- TO END THE COLD WAR PEACEFULLY;
- TO DEAL WITH THE INSTABILITIES GENERATED BY THE COLD WAR'S DEMISE; AND
- TO BEGIN THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW ARCHITECTURE FOR THE NEW WORLD ORDER.

- 4 -

WE MAY BE FAULTED, PERHAPS, WITH HAVING CHOSEN TO ARTICULATE OUR VISION MORE IN DEEDS THAN IN WORDS. BUT I SINCERELY BELIEVE THAT THE RECORD OF WHAT WE HAVE DONE, AND HOW WE HAVE DONE IT, IS ONE THAT OUR SUCCESSORS CAN USEFULLY BUILD UPON AS THEY, TOO, CONFRONT A WORLD WHICH WILL CONTINUE TO BE UNSTABLE AND UNPREDICTABLE FOR A GOOD MANY YEARS TO COME.

LET ME TURN NOW TO THAT RECORD — THE RECORD OF HOW WE MET THE THREE CHALLENGES NOTED ABOVE.

THE FIRST CHALLENGE: ENDING THE COLD WAR

TODAY WE TAKE FOR GRANTED SOMETHING WHICH EXPERTS AND HISTORIANS WOULD HAVE FOUND INCREDIBLE TO IMAGINE ONLY A DECADE AGO: NAMELY THAT THE DISENGAGEMENT OF THE SOVIET UNION FROM EASTERN EUROPE AND THE DISSOLUTION OF THE USSR ITSELF COULD BE ACHIEVED SO QUICKLY, SO THOROUGHLY, AND ABOVE ALL, SO PEACEFULLY. HISTORY HOLDS FEW, IF ANY, EXAMPLES OF AN EMPIRE COLLAPSING WITHOUT AN ANGRY SPASM OF VIOLENCE; AND NO ONE EXPECTED THE COMMUNIST PARTY TO RELINQUISH ITS MONOPOLY OF POWER AT HOME AND IMPERIAL DOMINATION ABROAD WITHOUT A FIGHT. IT WAS ENTIRELY CONCEIVABLE THAT THE SOVIET UNION'S DEMISE WOULD BE ACCOMPANIED BY CIVIL STRIFE, WAR IN EUROPE, AND PERHAPS EVEN THE RISK OF A GLOBAL NUCLEAR EXCHANGE,

- 5 -

THAT IT WAS NOT, I THINK, IS DUE IN PART TO GEORGE BUSH'S SKILLFUL, THOUGH SOMETIMES MISUNDERSTOOD, DIPLOMACY. EVEN TODAY, HIS CRITICS ARGUE THAT THE PRESIDENT WAS CONSTANTLY BEHIND THE CURVE IN HIS DEALINGS WITH THE FORMER SOVIET UNION -- LATE AND LUKEWARM IN HIS EMBRACE OF GORBACHEV; LATE AND LOW-KEY IN HIS REACTION TO THE COLLAPSE OF SOVIET CONTROL IN EASTERN EUROPE; AND LATE TO DISENGAGE FROM GORBACHEV AND TO EMBRACE THE CAUSE OF DEMOCRATIC REFORM IN RUSSIA AND INDEPENDENCE IN THE REPUBLICS. AT EACH POINT, THE PRESIDENT WAS TAXED FOR UNDUE ATTACHMENT TO THE STATUS QUO AND INSUFFICIENT DEVOTION TO AMERICAN IDEALS.

BUT WHAT WAS THE PRESIDENT TRYING TO ACHIEVE? HIS EARLY APPROACH WAS TO CHALLENGE MR. GORBACHEV TO INFORM SOVIET NEW THINKING WITH A PRACTICAL CONTENT ON MATTERS RANGING FROM REGIONAL DISPUTES TO ARMS CONTROL. THEN AS REVOLUTION BEGAN TO ENGULF EASTERN EUROPE, HE WORKED QUIETLY TO PERSUADE GORBACHEV AND HIS GENERALS THAT THE WEST WOULD NOT SEEK TO EXPLOIT THEIR TROUBLES, AND THAT THE SOVIET UNION COULD ENJOY A NEW KIND OF SECURITY IN A DEMOCRATIC EUROPE IF PEACEFUL NORMS WERE ACCEPTED. AND LATER HE URGED CAUTION AND NEGOTIATION UPON BOTH THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT AND THE INDEPENDENCE MOVEMENTS, EARNING CRITICISM AT HOME BUT THEREBY DENYING THE SOVIET RIGHT WING ANY PRETEXT TO COOPT GORBACHEV IN THEIR EFFORTS TO DESTROY THE PROCESS OF REFORM.

- 6 -

SUCCESSFUL DIPLOMACY IS A MATTER OF TIMING AS WELL AS SUBSTANCE. IN THE END, HISTORY WILL JUDGE GEORGE BUSH BY THE RESULTS OF HIS EFFORTS -- BY HIS MASTERY OF TIMING AND SUBSTANCE -- PARTICULARLY AGAINST THE MANY ALTERNATIVE SCENARIOS THAT MIGHT HAVE COME TO PASS. HISTORY WILL NOTE THAT ON HIS WATCH OCCURRED THE PEACEFUL DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION IN EASTERN EUROPE; THE REUNIFICATION OF GERMANY AND THE INCLUSION OF A UNITED GERMANY IN NATO; THE END TO REGIONAL CONFLICTS, INCLUDING, MOST IMPORTANTLY, IN CENTRAL AMERICA; THE HALTING, AND LATER REVERSAL, OF THE NUCLEAR ARMS RACE; AND FINALLY THE PEACEFUL COLLAPSE OF A REGIME WHICH COMMANDED BOTH THE MOST FORMIDABLE TOTALITARIAN APPARATUS IN HISTORY, AND THE FATE OF THE WORLD AT ITS NUCLEAR FINGERTIPS. THIS IS A LEGACY WHICH BY ITSELF WOULD QUALIFY PRESIDENT BUSH AS ONE OF OUR NATION'S GREAT DIPLOMATISTS.

THE SECOND CHALLENGE: A FRAGMENTING WORLD

BUT HISTORY ALSO CALLED UPON THIS PRESIDENT TO CONFRONT THE MULTIFACETED CHALLENGES OF A DISINTEGRATING WORLD ORDER, FIRST IN THE PERSIAN GULF, AND LATER IN AFRICA AND THE BALKANS.

AGAIN, ACCORDING TO SOME, THIS HAS BEEN A CHALLENGE LARGELY UNMET. INDEED, IT IS SAID IN SOME QUARTERS THAT THE ADMINISTRATION BEARS SOME RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE INVASION OF

- 7 -

KUWAIT BY HAVING "CODDLED" THE IRAQI DICTATOR, AND FOR THE TRAGIC CIVIL WAR IN THE FORMER YUGOSLAVIA BY HAVING FAILED TO SUPPORT THE VARIOUS REPUBLICS IN THEIR BID FOR INDEPENDENCE. AS IN THE CASE OF OUR APPROACH TO GORBACHEV, HOWEVER, I BELIEVE THE PRESIDENT'S DIPLOMACY HAS BEEN MISUNDERSTOOD, AND IN SOME CASES DELIBERATELY DISTORTED.

FOR EXAMPLE, OUR EFFORTS TO INFLUENCE SADDAM HUSSEIN BY DIPLOMATIC MEANS WERE DEMONSTRABLY UNSUCCESSFUL, BUT THOSE EFFORTS, I BELIEVE, WERE THE NECESSARY PREDICATE TO OUR ULTIMATE SUCCESS. THE FACT IS THAT THERE WAS SIMPLY NO CONSENSUS FOR MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC SANCTIONS AGAINST IRAQ PRIOR TO THE AUGUST 2 INVASION, NOR WAS THERE A CONSENSUS TO COUNTER IRAQ MILITARILY. IT WAS SADDAM HUSSEIN HIMSELF WHO CREATED SUCH A CONSENSUS BY INVADING KUWAIT. UNTIL THAT MOMENT, OUR ARAB FRIENDS CONSIDERED DETERRENT ACTION BOTH UNWARRANTED AND PROVOCATIVE, AND WOULD HAVE RALLIED TO SADDAM HAD WE SOUGHT TO ISOLATE OR PUNISH HIM. THUS IT WAS THANKS TO THE VERY DIPLOMACY FOR WHICH THE PRESIDENT IS NOW CRITICIZED, AND WHICH WAS THE SOURCE OF HIS CREDIBILITY IN THE ARAB WORLD, THAT WE WERE ABLE TO ENLIST THE SUPPORT WITHOUT WHICH WE COULD NOT HAVE LIBERATED KUWAIT.

I ALSO BELIEVE IT IS IMPORTANT TO CORRECT THE IMPRESSION THAT WE COULD HAVE DETERRED SADDAM HUSSEIN FROM INVADING KUWAIT

- 8 -

JUST PRIOR TO AUGUST 2. THE PROBLEM WAS THAT SADDAM BELIEVED THAT WE HAD YET TO LIBERATE OURSELVES FROM THE SHAME AND THE SHADOW OF VIETNAM. HE MADE THIS VERY CLEAR TO OUR AMBASSADOR, TELLING HER HE DID NOT THINK WE HAD THE GUTS TO FACE HIM ON THE FIELD OF BATTLE. WHAT WAS SHE SUPPOSED TO TELL HIM? -- THAT WE WOULD SEND HALF A MILLION TROOPS HALFWAY AROUND THE GLOBE, AND THAT THE CONGRESS, BY THE SLIMMEST OF MARGINS, WOULD IN THE END APPROVE THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN TO SEND THOSE TROOPS INTO BATTLE?

I AM NOT TRYING TO SCORE CHEAP POINTS HERE, BUT INSTEAD TO MAKE AN IMPORTANT MATTER CLEAR. WE CERTAINLY MADE MISTAKES, AND FAILED -- ALONG WITH EVERYONE ELSE -- TO ANTICIPATE THE IRAQI INVASION. BUT WHAT WE DID NOT KNOW, AND WHAT IT TOOK SADDAM HUSSEIN TO DEMONSTRATE, WAS THAT THE PASSING OF THE COLD WAR HAD CHANGED THE INTERNATIONAL RULES OF THE GAME, AND THAT REGIONAL POWERS COULD NOW CONTEMPLATE AGGRESSION ON THE ASSUMPTION THAT THE SUPERPOWERS COULD NO LONGER CIRCUMSCRIBE THEIR FREEDOM OF MANEUVER. AND WHAT SADDAM HUSSEIN DID NOT KNOW, AND WHAT IT TOOK GEORGE BUSH TO DEMONSTRATE, WAS THAT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE, IF NOT THE ENTIRE POLITICAL CLASS, WERE NO LONGER IN THE THRALLOF OF THE VIETNAM SYNDROME.

ULTIMATELY, IT WAS THE PRESIDENT'S DUAL ACHIEVEMENT TO PREVENT SADDAM FROM ESTABLISHING THE LAW OF THE JUNGLE AS THE NORM FOR INTERNATIONAL BEHAVIOR IN THE POST-COLD WAR ERA, AND

- 9 -

TO ESTABLISH A MODEL FOR COLLECTIVE RESPONSES TO INTERNATIONAL ACTS OF AGGRESSION. IN SO DOING, HE DEMONSTRATED HOW ABSOLUTELY CRITICAL AMERICAN DIPLOMACY AND AMERICAN WILLINGNESS TO USE FORCE ARE TO THE PROSPECTS FOR STABILITY IN THE OTHERWISE CHAOTIC AFTERMATH OF THE COLD WAR.

THE PRESIDENT HAS ALSO BEEN FAULTED FOR HIS DECISION TO END THE FIGHTING WHEN HE DID. BUT GEORGE BUSH UNDERSTOOD ANOTHER REALITY OF THE POST-COLD WAR ERA -- NAMELY THAT, HAVING PERSONALLY AND NECESSARILY ASSEMBLED AN INTERNATIONAL COALITION OF FORCES, HE HAD AN OBLIGATION TO CONSIDER THE VIEWS OF OUR CONTRIBUTING ALLIES, AND ABOVE ALL AN OBLIGATION TO REMAIN WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE UNITED NATIONS RESOLUTIONS. FURTHERMORE AND PERHAPS MOST IMPORTANT OF ALL -- HE UNDERSTOOD THAT, HAVING GIVEN PRECISE DEFINITION TO THE PURPOSE OF OUR MISSION, HE HAD AN OBLIGATION -- TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE AND TO THE FUTURE -- TO WITHDRAW U.S. FORCES ONCE THE MISSION WAS COMPLETED.

A SECOND MANIFESTATION OF THE GLOBAL DISORDER INHERENT TODAY IS THE ERUPTION INTO CONFLICT OF ANCIENT TRIBAL, ETHNIC AND RELIGIOUS RIVALRIES. WE SEE THIS MOST OBVIOUSLY IN THE FORMER YUGOSLAVIA. BUT WE NEED TO UNDERSTAND THAT YUGOSLAVIA IS BUT THE MOST OBVIOUS MANIFESTATION OF WHAT IS GOING ON TODAY IN MANY PLACES, AND WHAT WILL LIKELY CHARACTERIZE THE INTERNATIONAL LANDSCAPE FOR PERHAPS DECADES TO COME.

- 10 -

FOR MANY, YUGOSLAVIA IS ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY BEHIND THE CURVE AND OUT OF TOUCH WITH AMERICAN IDEALS. I PERSONALLY DO NOT BELIEVE THAT VIOLENCE COULD HAVE BEEN AVOIDED UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES. BUT I DO REMAIN CONVINCED THAT THE REPUBLICS' UNILATERAL AND UNCOORDINATED DECLARATIONS OF INDEPENDENCE, WHICH WE UNSUCCESSFULLY OPPOSED, LED INEXORABLY TO CIVIL WAR. THEN, AS NOW, THE ONLY ALTERNATIVE TO PERPETUAL BLOODSHED WAS FOR THE PARTIES TO NEGOTIATE THEIR SEPARATION FROM EACH OTHER, AND MEANWHILE TO GUARANTEE RESPECT FOR PLURALISM AND THE RIGHTS OF MINORITIES WITHIN THEIR BORDERS. AND THE ONLY RESPONSIBLE POLICY FOR THE UNITED STATES WAS THE ONE WE FOLLOWED — NAMELY TO DISCOURAGE UNILATERAL ACTS INTENDED TO AVOID SUCH NEGOTIATIONS AND SUCH GUARANTEES. AS THE PRESIDENT RIGHTLY SAID IN HIS MALIGNED AND MISUNDERSTOOD SPEECH IN KIEV, IT WAS OUR POLICY NOT TO SUPPORT "THOSE WHO PROMOTE A SUICIDAL NATIONALISM BASED UPON ETHNIC HATRED."

OF COURSE, ALL OF THIS BEGS THE QUESTION OF WHAT WE SHOULD DO WHEN THE IRRATIONAL FORCES OF HISTORY AND HATRED PREVAIL OVER OUR APPEALS TO REASON. AS THEY ARE DOING TODAY IN YUGOSLAVIA, IN SOME PARTS OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION, SOMALIA, AND ELSEWHERE.

THERE ARE NO SIMPLE ANSWERS. AS THE PRESIDENT STATED THIS WEEK AT WEST POINT, THERE WILL BE TIMES WHEN OUR VITAL

- 11 -

INTERESTS ARE AT STAKE AND WE MUST INTERVENE -- AS WE DID IN THE GULF, THERE WILL BE TIMES WHEN A HUMAN TRAGEDY COMPELS US TO INTERVENE, PROVIDING WE CAN JUSTIFY THE COST TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE -- AS WE HAVE IN SOMALIA AND ON BEHALF OF THE KURDS OF NORTHERN IRAQ. AND THERE WILL BE TIMES WHEN NEITHER THE FORCE OF AMERICAN IDEAS NOR THE FORCE OF AMERICAN ARMS CAN MAKE A DIFFERENCE TO PEOPLES WHO ARE TRULY UNWILLING TO COEXIST PEACEFULLY WITH EACH OTHER.

THE THIRD CHALLENGE: BUILDING A NEW WORLD ORDER

PERHAPS THE MOST FUNDAMENTAL CRITICISM OF THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION'S FOREIGN POLICY IS THAT IT WAS TOO REACTIVE TO CHANGING EVENTS, WITH LITTLE ATTENTION TO THE LONGER-TERM REQUIREMENTS OF THE NEW ERA. HOWEVER, I BELIEVE THAT WE CAN IN FACT TAKE CREDIT FOR HAVING BEGUN WHAT WILL BE -- AND SHOULD BE -- THE LONG WORK OF CONSTRUCTING AN INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK NECESSARY TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEW WORLD ORDER. OUR SUCCESSORS WILL HAVE TO BUILD IN PLACES WE OVERLOOKED OR NEGLECTED. BUT I BELIEVE THEY WILL FIND A SOLID FOUNDATION IN MANY IMPORTANT AREAS.

AMONG THOSE AREAS OF INSTITUTIONAL CREATIVITY, I WOULD IDENTIFY THE FOLLOWING:

- 12 -

(1) EUROPE, WHERE WE HAVE SOUGHT TO EXTEND THE COMMUNITY OF DEMOCRACIES BY HELPING TRANSFORM THE FORMER COMMUNIST NATIONS INTO SECURE AND STABLE FREE MARKET SOCIETIES. HERE, WE HAVE CREATED TWO INNOVATIVE INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURES -- THE G-24 PROCESS BY WHICH WE HAVE COORDINATED ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE TO CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE, AND THE NORTH ATLANTIC COOPERATION COUNCIL, THROUGH WHICH WE HAVE AIMED TO ENHANCE, OVER TIME, THE POLITICAL AND SECURITY RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BOTH HALVES OF EUROPE. I WOULD URGE THE NEW ADMINISTRATION TO BUILD UPON THIS STILL EMBRYONIC STRUCTURE.

(2) NORTH AMERICA, WHERE WE HAVE SOUGHT TO CONSOLIDATE OUR NATION'S CONTINENTAL BASE THROUGH THE CREATION OF A SINGLE MARKET LINKING THE UNITED STATES, MEXICO AND CANADA -- THE NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT. OUR SUCCESS IN THIS ENDEAVOR WILL PAY DIVIDENDS IN POLITICAL AND SECURITY TERMS AS WELL AS BENEFIT THE ECONOMIES OF ALL THREE NATIONS.

(3) LATIN AMERICA, WHERE THIS ADMINISTRATION LEAVES OUR OVERALL HEMISPHERIC TIES IN PERHAPS THE BEST SHAPE OF ANYTIME IN THIS CENTURY. PRESIDENT BUSH'S LANDMARK ENTERPRISE FOR THE AMERICAS INITIATIVE HAS BEEN GREETED THROUGHOUT THE HEMISPHERE AS A HISTORIC TURNING POINT AND AN OPPORTUNITY TO CONSOLIDATE DEMOCRACY AND THE FREE MARKET SYSTEM THROUGHOUT NORTH AND SOUTH AMERICA.

- 13 -

(4) ASIA, WHERE WE HELPED TO CREATE APEC TO ENHANCE OUR ENGAGEMENT OF THE MOST DYNAMIC ECONOMIC REGION OF THE WORLD, AND WHERE WE HAVE BEGUN TO DEVELOP A GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP WITH JAPAN.

(5) THE MIDDLE EAST, WHERE WE BUILT UPON OUR GULF WAR COALITION VICTORY TO LAUNCH THE FIRST DIRECT NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN ISRAEL AND HER ARAB NEIGHBORS.

(6) AND FINALLY, ACROSS THE BROAD SPECTRUM OF TRANSNATIONAL ISSUES, WHERE WE HAVE TRIED TO ADVANCE A POST-COLD WAR AGENDA OF GLOBAL FREE TRADE THROUGH THE GATT NEGOTIATIONS, AND THROUGH NEGOTIATIONS TO CONTROL THE PROLIFERATION OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION.

THE BUSH LEGACY

I KNOW I AM BY NO MEANS A NEUTRAL OBSERVER, BUT I BELIEVE THE RECORD I HAVE JUST DESCRIBED IS ONE OF SUBSTANTIAL ACCOMPLISHMENT IN THE FACE OF GREAT DANGERS AND CHALLENGES. I ALSO BELIEVE THAT THE BUSH FOREIGN POLICY WAS GREATER THAN THE SUM OF ITS PARTS; AND THAT, INDEED, THERE WAS A STRATEGY BEHIND THE PRESIDENT'S CONDUCT OF FOREIGN POLICY WHICH WE NEED TO UNDERSTAND BECAUSE IT IS SO UNIQUELY SUITED TO THE VASTLY CHANGED INTERNATIONAL SITUATION WE NOW CONFRONT. I WOULD SUMMARIZE THIS LEGACY AS FOLLOWS:

- 14 -

FIRST, THE BUSH FOREIGN POLICY WAS CHARACTERIZED BY PRAGMATISM AND FLEXIBILITY. I THINK IN THIS RESPECT WE MUST PLEAD GUILTY TO THE CHARGE THAT OUR APPROACH WAS OFTEN AD HOC. A CERTAIN DEGREE OF "AD HOCERY" IS A VIRTUE, NOT A VICE, WHEN YOU ARE DEALING WITH A WORLD IN CRISIS AND IN CHAOS, ONE IN WHICH IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO BE CERTAIN OF ANYTHING SIX MONTHS AHEAD. THE FACT OF THE MATTER IS THAT, FOR A LONG TIME TO COME, WE WILL BE IN A POST-REVOLUTIONARY TRANSITIONAL PERIOD WHICH WILL REQUIRE OF US AN ABILITY TO REACT QUICKLY TO EVENTS. IN THESE CIRCUMSTANCES, GOOD INSTINCTS ARE AS INVALUABLE AS A GOOD PLAN.

SECOND, THE PRESIDENT HAS BEEN DEEPLY COMMITTED TO THE PRINCIPLE AND THE PRACTICE OF DIPLOMACY. HE, MORE THAN HIS CRITICS, HAS UNDERSTOOD THAT THE END OF THE COLD WAR HAS MEANT THE UNITED STATES CAN NO LONGER DOMINATE EITHER ADVERSARIES OR ALLIES AS WE DID IN A BIPOLAR FRAMEWORK. IF WE WANT TO GET OUR WAY — AND TO GET OTHERS TO SHARE OUR BURDEN, AS THE AMERICAN PEOPLE SURELY DESIRE — WE WILL INCREASINGLY HAVE TO TAKE THE VIEWS AND INTERESTS OF OTHERS INTO ACCOUNT. AND WE WILL SOMETIMES HAVE TO BUILD AD HOC ALLIANCES OF LIKE-MINDED NATIONS AS EACH NEW, AND OFTEN UNIQUE, CIRCUMSTANCE MAY DEMAND. IN OTHER WORDS, WE WILL HAVE TO PRACTICE THE ART OF COMPROMISE, AND THUS OF DIPLOMACY.

- 15 -

THIS IS AN ART WHICH DOES NOT NECESSARILY COME EASILY TO US. OUR NATIONAL VIRTUE IS THAT WE ARE COMFORTABLE ONLY WITH A FOREIGN POLICY ROOTED IN THE VALUES OF OUR POLITICAL TRADITION; OUR NATIONAL VICE IS A TENDENCY TOWARDS MORALISM IN FOREIGN POLICY, AND A KIND OF MORAL HUBRIS WHICH VIEWS THE ACTIONS OF OTHERS ONLY THROUGH THE PRISM OF OUR OWN STANDARDS OF CONDUCT. PRESIDENT BUSH RESISTED THIS LATTER TENDENCY THROUGHOUT HIS PRESIDENCY, OFTEN AT GREAT POLITICAL COST. BUT BECAUSE OF HIS COMMITMENT TO WORKING WITH, AND MAINTAINING LEVERAGE OVER, GOVERNMENTS WHOM HIS CRITICS DEEMED WORTHY OF PUNISHMENT AND ISOLATION -- I AM THINKING PRINCIPALLY OF THE PEOPLES REPUBLIC OF CHINA, BUT THERE WERE OTHER EXAMPLES -- HE WAS ABLE CONSISTENTLY TO FORGE INTERNATIONAL COALITIONS UNDER UN AUSPICES TO ADDRESS CRITICAL CHALLENGES TO WORLD PEACE AND STABILITY, INCLUDING THE SUCCESSFUL PROSECUTION OF THE WAR AGAINST SADDAM HUSSEIN.

THIRD, THE ADMINISTRATION'S FOREIGN POLICY WAS MARKED BY A COMMITMENT TO HARNESSING UNITED STATES POWER -- BOTH DIPLOMATIC AND MILITARY -- TO REALIZE THE PRESIDENT'S LONG-TERM VISION OF A NEW WORLD ORDER. THE RECORD OF THE PAST FOUR YEARS DEMONSTRATES THAT THE NEW WORLD ORDER IS SOMETHING WE ARE NOT EVEN CLOSE TO ACHIEVING -- NOT WITH THE FORCES OF FRAGMENTATION CURRENTLY ON THE LOOSE. BUT THE EXTENT TO WHICH WE HAVE BEEN ABLE TO KEEP THOSE FORCES AT BAY HAS BEEN LARGELY A RESULT OF

- 16 -

AMERICAN WILLINGNESS TO ACT, TO FORGE AD HOC COALITIONS, AND TO BEGIN TO BUILD THE INSTITUTIONS OF A BETTER AND SAFER WORLD.

LOOKING AHEAD

I WILL CONCLUDE, FOR WHAT IT IS WORTH, WITH A FEW PERSONAL OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE ROAD AHEAD AND WHAT I THINK OUGHT TO BE OUR PRIORITIES AND OBJECTIVES.

I CONSIDER OUR PRINCIPAL FOREIGN POLICY CHALLENGE TO BE THE MAINTENANCE AND STRENGTHENING OF THE CORE OF DEMOCRACIES WHICH WON THE COLD WAR. AS I INDICATED IN MY 1989 SPEECH AT GEORGETOWN, IT IS GOING TO BE HARDER TO KEEP THIS CORE TOGETHER WHEN THE INHERENT CENTRIFUGAL FORCES OF MULTIPOLARITY WILL CONSPIRE TO DRIVE US APART. IF, HOWEVER, WE WANT TO AVOID A RETURN TO THE DANGEROUS BALANCE OF POWER POLITICS WHICH CHARACTERIZED THE WORLD PRIOR TO THE COLD WAR, WE WILL HAVE TO STRENGTHEN THE ECONOMIC, POLITICAL AND MILITARY TIES WHICH LINK THE WESTERN DEMOCRACIES, AS WELL AS THE MULTILATERAL INSTITUTIONS WE HAVE ESTABLISHED OVER THE PAST HALF CENTURY. IF WE DO NOT SUCCEED IN STRENGTHENING THOSE COLLECTIVE LINKS AND INSTITUTIONS, WE WILL NEVER BE ABLE TO CONFRONT THE INSTABILITIES NOW ARISING BEYOND THE WESTERN FOLD.

- 17 -

IN THIS REGARD, THERE ARE SEVERAL INCOMPLETE TASKS WE LEAVE TO THE NEXT ADMINISTRATION -- TO BUILD MORE COMPREHENSIVE AND DURABLE POLITICAL TIES WITH JAPAN; TO ENSURE THAT THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY DOES NOT BUILD UNITY AT THE EXPENSE OF RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES; AND TO PRESERVE THE OPEN WORLD TRADING SYSTEM THROUGH SUCCESSFUL CONCLUSION OF THE GATT NEGOTIATIONS AND EARLY RATIFICATION OF THE NORTH AMERICA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT.

THE SECOND CHALLENGE WE FACE IS TO EXTEND THE CORE OF DEMOCRACIES TO INCLUDE THE FORMER COMMUNIST WORLD, AS WELL AS OTHER NATIONS WHICH HAVE EMBRACED OUR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC VALUES. HERE, THERE IS AN ABSOLUTE CONVERGENCE BETWEEN OUR INTERESTS AND OUR IDEALS. OUR SECURITY IS ESPECIALLY LINKED TO THE FATE OF REFORM ACROSS THE EURASIAN LANDMASS, WHICH IS THE MOST HEAVILY ARMED REGION OF THE WORLD, AND THE SOURCE OF GLOBAL CONFLICT TWICE IN THIS CENTURY. IT IS THUS HEARTENING THAT THE INCOMING PRESIDENT HAS IDENTIFIED SUPPORT FOR DEMOCRACY IN RUSSIA AND THROUGHOUT CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE AS ONE OF HIS HIGHEST PRIORITIES.

FINALLY, WE MUST DEAL WITH THE MANIFOLD ILLS AFFLICTING WHAT WAS KNOWN AS THE THIRD WORLD -- THE PROBLEMS OF POVERTY, DEBT, UNDERDEVELOPMENT, AND OVERPOPULATION -- WHICH THREATEN TO BRING GLOBAL CHAOS IN THEIR WAKE, AND THUS THREATEN OUR OWN

- 18 -

SECURITY AND PROSPERITY. AMONG THE TASKS FACING THE NEXT ADMINISTRATION WILL BE THE DEVELOPMENT OF BOTH GLOBAL NONPROLIFERATION REGIMES AND ENHANCED UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING AND PEACEMAKING CAPABILITIES.

I BEGAN THESE REMARKS BY REFERRING TO THE DEBATE UNDERWAY IN THIS COUNTRY OVER THE PURPOSE OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY. IT SEEMS TO ME THAT WE HAVE ARRIVED AT AN IMPORTANT TURNING POINT IN OUR HISTORY. WE HAVE NEVER HAD A NORMAL ATTITUDE TOWARDS FOREIGN POLICY, AT LEAST IN THE SENSE UNDERSTOOD IN OTHER COUNTRIES. FOR MOST OF OUR NATIONAL EXISTENCE, WE TURNED OUR BACKS ON THE WORLD BEYOND OUR SHORES. AND THEN WHEN WE BECAME A GLOBAL POWER, WE JOINED THE WORLD IN THE NAME OF A MISSION WHICH WE HAVE NOW SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLETED. THUS WE FIND OURSELVES TODAY CONFRONTING AN INCREASINGLY UNCERTAIN INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENT, INCREASINGLY AWARE THAT OUR ROLE AND PURPOSE MUST CHANGE TO MEET THAT NEW ENVIRONMENT, BUT UNCLEAR AS TO WHAT THOSE CHANGES OUGHT TO BE.

WHAT WE MAY NOT SUFFICIENTLY REALIZE, HOWEVER, IS THAT THIS UNCERTAINTY IS BOTH NORMAL AND HEALTHY. WE ARE -- AND WILL BE FOR SOME TIME TO COME -- IN THE PROCESS OF DISCOVERING OUR PURPOSE AS WE GO ABOUT THE EVERYDAY BUSINESS OF FOREIGN POLICY. IT GOES WITHOUT SAYING THAT WE BRING OUR IDEALS TO THE TABLE, AND THAT OUR THINKING IS INFUSED WITH A DESIRE TO SEE

- 19 -

THOSE IDEALS ADVANCED. BUT A GROWING AWARENESS OF OUR LIMITED RESOURCES AND POWER IS FORCING US TO DECIDE WHAT IS IMPORTANT TO US IN FOREIGN POLICY, AND THUS TO DEVELOP A SENSE OF HIERARCHY AMONG A MULTITUDE OF INTERESTS AND PRIORITIES.

ALL THIS IS VERY MUCH TO THE GOOD. I SEE MUCH EVIDENCE THAT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE HAVE ACCEPTED THE LESSONS OF THE 20TH CENTURY, AND UNDERSTAND THAT OUR PERIOD OF VIRTUAL SUPREMACY IS OVER, AND THAT OUR FATE IS NOW AND FOREVER LINKED TO WHAT HAPPENS BEYOND OUR BORDERS. WHAT REMAINS TO BE SEEN IS NOT SO MUCH WHETHER WE HAVE WHAT IT TAKES TO CONTINUE TO SHOULDER THE BURDENS OF GLOBAL LEADERSHIP WHICH ARE NECESSARILY OURS. RATHER, THE QUESTION IS WHETHER WE WILL IN THE COMING DECADE DEAL WITH THE NEW CHALLENGES OF THE POST-COLD WAR ERA WITH THE WISDOM AND STRENGTH OF CHARACTER THAT, ON THE WHOLE, MARKED OUR INTERNATIONAL PASSAGE OVER THE COURSE OF THE PAST HALF CENTURY. I, FOR ONE, AM PROUD OF THE PART GEORGE BUSH PLAYED IN CHARTING A NEW COURSE FOR AMERICA. AND I AM PROUD TO HAVE BEEN A PART OF THAT ADVENTURE.