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The first national conference sponsored by the Richard W. Riley Institute of Government, Politics and Public Leadership, held March 20-21, could hardly have attracted a more auspicious keynote speaker. Former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright was the star attraction of the two-day program on “National Security in a New Age.” Albright’s opening-night speech, which played to a packed house in McAlister Auditorium, was followed the next evening by a panel discussion featuring Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist Jim Hoagland, Georgetown University professor G. John Ikenberry, former U.S. Ambassador Phil Lader and Los Angeles Times correspondent Robin Wright.

Albright, who served in the Clinton Cabinet with Richard Riley, is the first woman to be Secretary of State and the highest-ranking woman in the history of the U.S. government. Before being named to the post in 1995, she was the U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations and a member of the President’s Cabinet and National Security Council. Founder of The Albright Group, LLC, a global strategy firm, she is the first Michael and Virginia Mortara Endowed Professor in the Practice of Diplomacy at the Georgetown School of Foreign Service and the first Distinguished Scholar of the William Davidson Institute at the University of Michigan Business School. She also chairs The National Democratic Institute for International Affairs.

The panel discussion March 21 featured experts on the national and international issues and concerns facing the United States today. Hoagland is associate editor and chief foreign correspondent for The Washington Post. He has received two Pulitzers, one in 1970 for international reporting and the other in 1991 for commentary on the events leading up to the Gulf War and the political turmoil within the Soviet Union.

Ikenberry is the Peter F. Krogh Professor of Geopolitics and Global Justice at Georgetown, where he teaches in both the School of Foreign Service and the Government Department. He is the author of After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint and the Rebuilding of Order After Major Wars and Reasons of State: Oil Politics and the Capacities of American Government.

Lader, who moderated the discussion, was U.S. Ambassador to the United Kingdom during the Clinton administration. He also served as administrator of the U.S. Small Business Administration and was White House Deputy Chief of Staff under Clinton. A former president of Winthrop University, he is founder of Renaissance Weekends, the family retreats for innovative leaders in diverse fields. He lives in Charleston, S.C., is a partner in the law firm of Nelson, Mullins, Riley & Scarborough, and serves as chair of WPP Group, a worldwide advertising and communications firm.

Wright, chief diplomatic correspondent for The Los Angeles Times, has reported from more than 130 countries on six continents for CBS News, The Sunday Times of London, The Washington Post and The Christian Science Monitor. She received a National Magazine Award for her reportage from Iran in The New Yorker and an Overseas Press Club Award for her coverage of African wars. In 2001, she received the Weintal Prize for “the most distinguished diplomatic reporting.”

The Riley Institute is named for the 1954 Furman graduate who, in the words of The Greenville News, “personifies statesmanship and served his state well as governor and his country well as Secretary of Education.” Riley was on hand to introduce each evening’s program.

On the following pages are the text of Secretary Albright’s speech, highlights from the question-and-answer session that followed, and a summary of the panel discussion.
THE TOOLS OF Diplomacy

By Madeleine Albright

It is such an honor to participate in this conference and to be associated with the Richard W. Riley Institute of Government, Politics and Public Leadership. It has a very bright future and I know it is a great asset for Furman, for South Carolina and for the country.

One purpose of the institute is to encourage public discussion of issues that affect our security, prosperity and freedom. And today, no issue affects us more than the war on terror.

When I joined the State Department, I said that I had all my partisan instincts surgically removed. I have to admit that a few months after I left office, I could feel those instincts starting to grow back. On September 12, I returned to the surgeon.

Because Americans must be united. We were attacked as one country on that wretched morning half a year ago. And as one country, we must respond.

The terrorists' goal is to make America retreat from the world, abandon our allies, forget our commitments and cease to lead. But the terrorists are learning that the nation whose patriots proclaimed, "Give Me Liberty or Give Me Death," and whose soldiers plunged into Hell on Omaha Beach, will not be intimidated.

And a people whose firefighters and police faced death to save others will never be shut down.

The Bush administration deserves our support, and that of law-abiding people everywhere, in opposing al-Qaeda and other groups that willfully murder innocent people in pursuit of political goals. It deserves our support in defeating the Taliban, who ran a sort of bed and breakfast for terrorists and brutally repressed their own people.

And it deserves credit for acknowledging that we are only at the beginning of what will be a long and perhaps permanent struggle against the forces of destruction. In the months ahead, we must employ every means available, every tool of politics and policy, to rally the world and defeat the devil's marriage between technology and terror.

The front line remains in Afghanistan, where fighting continues and the interim government is beset by a sea of troubles. Cabinet ministers are fighting, warlords are clashing, the Taliban is regrouping, Osama bin Laden is still missing, and the international peacekeeping force is woefully inadequate.

This creates a fundamental diplomatic challenge. We must persuade Afghanistan's neighbors — including Iran — to cooperate in holding the country together instead of squabbling and ripping the country apart.

We must persuade the international community to support an interim security force that is big enough and well-equipped enough to make the warlords go out and get real jobs.

We must insist that, when the future of Afghanistan is debated, Afghan women should not just be clearing the dishes off the table. They must be at the table, with a substantive role in making the decisions that will shape their lives and affect the security of us all in years to come. This may be the only way to get those with power in Afghanistan to focus on education, jobs and health, instead of power, guns and drugs.

Finally, we must work with the interim government to create national institutions that are strong enough and effective enough to make Afghanistan a permanent terrorist-free zone.

In other words, we have to stay and finish the job.

Secretary of State Powell has made it clear he supports this, but others ridicule the task by calling it nation-building. They say that American troops have more important things to do, and that helping Afghans build a secure future is something our allies should take care of for us.

Having won a few battles, these voices seem to suggest that winning the peace is the international equivalent of women's work — which is, I would reply, precisely why it is so important.

We cannot convince the world that Afghanistan matters if we treat Afghanistan as a short-term crisis and not a long-term commitment. In all we do, in and outside Afghanistan, we must stay focused, and keep the world's focus, on responding to the most dangerous threats.

Right now, the most dangerous threat remains the terrorists that have targeted America. In confronting them, we must...
back diplomacy with force, and force with diplomacy. We must do the hard work required to ensure that our alliances in Europe and Asia are united in policy and purpose. That’s what it means to use diplomatic tools.

We must strive with friends and scholars on every continent to isolate and defeat the apostles of hate. This means reforming education in places such as Pakistan and Saudi Arabia so that children are no longer brainwashed into becoming suicide bombers, and terrorists are denied the ideological swamplands in which they breed.

We must also be vigilant at home. Like most Americans, I was startled to learn recently that the Immigration and Naturalization Service had issued student visas to two of the pilots who murdered Americans on September 11. It is hard to believe that this kind of miscommunication could occur in the United States in the 21st century.

There is a lesson in this that we must heed. Information, properly used, can protect and empower us. Information that does not get to the right place at the right time can kill us.

When I was at the State Department, we worked hard to promote the sharing of information between other governments and our own, and within the various branches of the U.S. government.

This is actually a lot harder than you might think. Agencies protect their own turf. And foreign countries have their own interests to protect.

But after September 11, there can be no higher priority than ensuring that we obtain as much information as we can through every means we can devise, and that all the relevant data we have are centrally processed to apprehend terrorists and prevent terrorist attacks.

The question of information is important in another sense, because the battle against terror is, at bottom, a struggle of ideas, a conflict we cannot win simply by smashing caves and splitting rocks.

President Bush has pledged that we must pay “whatever it costs to defend our country.” In this year’s budget, he has proposed a dramatic increase in military spending. He has also recently shifted course and expressed support for more assistance to less developed nations.

I agree that we must move ahead on all fronts. Adversaries will be less likely to threaten us if they know we are prepared to respond effectively and with undaunted courage. And our enemies will find less sympathy abroad if America is known for its commitment to improving education and fighting poverty and disease.

Today, we rank dead last among industrialized countries in the percentage of our wealth that we devote to helping poor nations succeed and grow. In these perilous times, we cannot afford to allow the wrong perceptions to take hold. We have to do a better job of telling our story.

And we have the best possible story to tell.

During World War II and the Cold War, great American presidents, with bipartisan support from Congress, outlined bold initiatives to complement our security goals. We must be bold in developing and financing a new generation of initiatives that will help deliver on the promise of democracy and win the battle of ideas.

After the events of the past six months, we should all understand the danger of defining our interests too narrowly. Notwithstanding the current bestseller, we don’t live in the world of John Adams and Thomas Jefferson anymore. The two oceans neither protect us nor confine us.

America in the 21st century has an interest in all of Europe — and in Asia, Latin America and Africa.

And today, I am convinced our people will support a foreign policy that is clearer than clear, not only about what we are against, but also about what we are for. We are for working with others to build a freer, more humane and more broadly prosperous world, in which terrorists will cease to attract followers and there will be no havens for hate.

When I was a child, Nazi troops marched into my hometown of Prague. My family fled to London when that city was being bombed nearly every night. After the war, we returned home to a country that was soon to be taken over by Communists.

I learned early in life that there is great evil in this world. But I also learned early about a country across the sea where freedom was cherished and freedom’s allies were helped and defended.

At the age of 11, I sailed like millions before me past the Statue of Liberty into New York Harbor, with no other desire in my heart than to grow up to be an American.

Since then, more than half a century has passed. But over the years, I have never forgotten the fundamental lesson taught to me by my parents. And that is to honor and value freedom, and never to take for granted the blessings that come with living in the United States.

In that time, I have seen this message reinforced not only in the lives of immigrants and refugees, but also those of millions abroad who have been liberated by American soldiers, uplifted by American assistance and inspired by American ideals.

On September 11, our nation was dealt a terrible blow. We will never forget those who were lost. We are still unsettled and on edge.

But we draw strength from the knowledge of what terror can and cannot do. Terror can turn life to death, and laughter to tears, and shared hopes to sorrowful memories. It can crash a plane and bring down towers that scraped the sky. But it cannot alter the essential goodness of the American people, diminish our loyalty to one another, or shake our respect for the importance and dignity of every individual.

There is evil in this world and we have no choice but to acknowledge that. But we can choose never to lose sight of the good.

We face the possibility of further attacks. But if we are united, there is no chance we will ever give in, give up or back down.

The American journey is an upward journey. Together, our nation defeated Hitler, outlasted Stalin and helped make the democratic tide a rising tide on every continent.

Today we look forward, not with trepidation but with determination, to see that our adversaries fail in their purpose of destruction — and that we prevail in our purpose of building a freer, more just and peaceful future for us and for all people.
After her talk, Madeleine Albright took questions from Furman students. Among her comments:

**In response to a query about whether the United States has lost support among its European allies by focusing on terrorism beyond Afghanistan (for example, in Iraq):**

"I meet regularly with former colleagues and former ministers as they come through Washington, and they are concerned. They do not share the same views about some of the problems that Saddam Hussein has posed. Vice President Cheney had a very difficult trip [to the Middle East] and was not able to get the support of the Arab countries around Iraq, which is very necessary if we are going to carry out any campaign against Saddam.

"While I actually do believe that Saddam Hussein is a serious problem and needs to be dealt with, I think it is essential at this point to keep our eye on the ball and to do the job in Afghanistan. While I do think that Iraq is evil, I do not think that the framing of the issue as the Axis of Evil has been particularly helpful.

"Iran is a neighbor of Afghanistan and is important to us in dealing with Afghanistan. Besides, it's not totally monolithic. There are different trends within Iran and by putting it in this Axis of Evil I think it complicates the problem. The Clinton administration always thought North Korea was dangerous, which is why we had a policy review to deal with North Korea. Former Defense Secretary Perry offered a fork in the road — they could either have confrontation with us or go down a road to where they would negotiate to get rid of their missile technology. And I went there and had fairly decent talks, and I think we were moving toward a verifiable agreement. But that has all now been jettisoned by this Axis of Evil."

**In regard to balancing tactical and strategic approaches in the Middle East:**

"Our administration spent more time working for peace in the Middle East than any other single issue. I made it a huge point to try to get to know the Palestinian delegation very closely and also to understand the legitimate needs of the Palestinian people.

"I think the saddest part for all of us in the administration is that we were not able to bring peace at Camp David [in the summer of 2000]. I also think that it is absolutely essential in a long-term view to understand that there is no way to achieve peace in the Middle East unless the United States is involved in it.

"This administration stayed out of it too long. I'm very glad [special envoy Anthony] Zinni and Vice President Cheney were forced into seeing the connection between what is going on and the anger of the Arab countries and their disappointment that the Palestinian issue has not been considered in a consistent way. The tragedies going on there are an abomination to everybody."

**To a question about the role of foreign aid in nation-building and winning the peace:**

"I wish I could banish the words foreign aid. Because 'foreign' and 'aid' is like trying to sell some terrible disease. Everybody thinks that the money is completely misused and that there's endless corruption.

"We should call it national security assistance. Whenever you say national security it kind of raises the level of interest.

"The shocking part is that basically out of every federal dollar, only one penny is spent in national security assistance. The new Bush proposals, which do not come into effect until 2004, might actually make it a penny and a quarter. It obviously depends on the size of the federal budget as we get to 2004.

"This kind of assistance provides educational possibilities and helps in terms of building small businesses and providing infrastructure. At the same time it helps psychologically by indicating to the people of a country that we are interested in their social and economic lives, in their intrinsic value. That then changes the view they might have about the United States.

"I have been involved in a survey where at the end of the year people around the world would be asked what they thought about the U.S. The results were that they do like American culture and American technology. What they don't like is that we don't share our culture with them, that we're selfish, and that the gap between the rich and the poor is growing."

**In regard to how to raise Americans' understanding of the importance of foreign policy beyond terrorism:**

"How do we all learn our news? I find it shocking that news programs are being taken off and substituted for late-night humor. News about foreign countries is not entertainment. It is serious; it affects people's lives. You can't expect people to understand what's going on if they don't see it.

"What I found at the UN was that CNN is the 16th member of the Security Council. When CNN put something on the news, people were aware of it and suddenly had to do something about it. But the war in Sudan was never on the news. There was fighting in various parts of the world that never made it.

"Our media have a responsibility to have longer news programs. I got pretty good at sound bites, but they don't get you anywhere and don't really allow you to explain things. Whenever you get a chance to be on television and get out three sentences before you're interrupted, it's a big deal.

"In addition, we must make sure that our immigration policies stay supple and open. This is a country of immigrants, and students at universities will be poorer if we decide we will not have foreign students coming in. We have to be careful about what we're doing with immigration laws and tightening immigration systems.

"I don't think anyone should be on a student visa who isn't a student, but we should allow foreign students in. If not, American students will be the poorer for it. We must understand that the U.S. can only be secure in a world where we understand the problems in other countries."
Experts in international affairs hold forth on the obstacles and opportunities facing the United States — and the world.

By Jim Stewart

America's role in the international order. The Axis of Evil. The mounting tensions in the Middle East.

The topics covered the world for an all-star panel consisting of journalists Jim Hoagland and Robin Wright and Georgetown University professor John Ikenberry. And they proved that they were up to the task of following former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, the headline opening act of the Richard W. Riley Institute's two-day conference on "National Security in a New Age."

The March 21 program in McAllister Auditorium engaged the audience as effectively as did Albright's lecture the night before. Deftly guided through a range of issues by moderator Phil Lader, the former United States ambassador to the United Kingdom, the three experts offered a forthright and provocative analysis of international affairs.

A number of themes emerged during the evening:

■ The United States must play a role in brokering a ceasefire in the Middle East. Without an American presence in Middle East negotiations, the United States cannot expect support from the Muslim world should it decide to pursue military action against Iraq.

■ President Bush's Axis of Evil comments could have both positive and negative consequences.

■ Even after the events of September 11, the world may not be in as bad a shape as people might think.

Ikenberry, author of two books on international relations, voiced this last view early in the program, pointing out that dire post-September 11 predictions of violence, social decay and backlash against American power have not happened. As he said, "The world hasn't fallen apart."

Instead, there is still a base of order in the world, and the United States has rallied support for its efforts to confront the first "ism" that isn't attached directly to another great power (as opposed to Nazism or Communism, for example). "Most major countries are united with us in this cause," he said.

Furthermore, Ikenberry suggested that the world order established since World War II has led to more physical security and prosperity for more people than at any other time in history — something, he said, we do not always appreciate. This new, transformed international order, he argued, is relatively stable and somewhat institutionalized, and it features elements of interdependence, integration and collective decision-making. "It provides a foundation upon which to construct foreign policy," he said.

But how do we continue to build a cooperative foreign policy when, as Wright said, the United States is not so good at seeing the bigger picture? She asserted that America tends to act forcefully "when it comes to committing money and troops and dealing with such issues as al-Qaida, the Taliban and Saddam Hussein." Where the U.S. falters, she said, is in dealing with the larger questions of "how to make the peace, how to build coalitions and how to transform societies."

This seems especially true in the Middle East, where the Bush administration initially appeared to respond slowly to the crisis. Hoagland, however, pointed out that the Middle East is such a quagmire that it is difficult to develop a viable plan that includes an "American presence."

"That's such a vague term," he said. "What does it mean? A military presence? A diplomatic one?"

Hoagland, a Washington Post columnist and two-time Pulitzer Prize recipient, went on to say that, in his opinion, significant movement toward sincere negotiations in the Middle East would not occur until the Arabs and Israelis search for new leadership and Sharon and Arafat are gone. "They are part of the problem," he said.

Wright, an award-winning Los Angeles Times correspondent, contrasted the approaches of the Bush and Clinton administrations to the Middle East. She described Clinton and his first Secretary of State, Warren Christopher, as almost too deeply engaged, to the point that American clout was actually diminished because the administration would respond too expectantly to every overture. Once Albright became Secretary of State, Wright said, the United States was not so available.

Bush, on the other hand, was more distant initially, and made a mistake in suggesting that there should be "no linkage" between settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict and possible U.S. military action against Iraq. Wright, who has written books on militant Islam and on the Khomeini era in Iran, said that Muslims, and most of the world, "see a direct linkage, and Muslims would not support U.S. action against Iraq unless the U.S. had done something to ease the Arab-Israeli situation."

All seemed to agree that American involvement was essential to establishing a framework for peace in the region. As Ikenberry noted, "It's a trouble spot where a solution would unleash opportunities to focus our energies elsewhere. Using the full might of the U.S. to find a settlement would go much further toward creating security in the U.S. than the focus on Iraq."

The panel split on the impact of Bush's Axis of Evil speech, in which he put Iraq, Iran and North Korea on notice because of their development of weapons of mass destruction — and the potential for those weapons to fall into the hands of terrorists.

Wright said that Bush's use of the Axis of Evil phrase raised concerns among a
number of countries who feared that the president’s comments would be counterproductive. She pointed particularly to Iran, where many took part in candlelight vigils after September 11 and expressed their sympathies to the victims. Since the Bush comments, she said, the mood in Iran “has shifted dramatically. It's a different environment now. Iranians are worried about the U.S., where they were previously interested in reconciling.”

Ikenberry, who throughout the evening emphasized how America’s status as the world’s superpower afforded it an opportunity to build coalitions and “make power less provocative,” was also concerned that the Axis of Evil concept would alienate different groups: “This kind of rhetoric sets us back.”

Hoagland, however, found the president’s comments less disconcerting. For one thing, he said, the speech helped Bush “settle the debate within his own administration that Saddam Hussein would be removed from power on this watch. That view is now accepted within the administration, and planning along those lines is proceeding. He also laid down very clear warnings not only to Iraq, Iran and North Korea, but to any other state, not to provide terrorists with support or harbor, and certainly not with weapons of mass destruction.”

After the panelists sorted through other subjects — nuclear deterrence, the Japanese economy, the legacy of Clinton’s foreign policy — moderator Lader asked each of them what advice they would offer the Bush administration.

Ikenberry said that the president should be aware of long-term structural shifts in the world economy. “Eighty-five percent of the world’s wealth is concentrated in the democratic industrial world,” which, he said, creates a dangerous level of international economic inequality. “The rich countries are getting older and their populations are shrinking, while the poor countries are getting bigger and younger. There’s something deeply destabilizing about this, and it will be interesting to see how these inequalities are manifested.”

Wright agreed that the economic divide could fuel extremism. She encouraged the administration to focus on “winning the peace,” and particularly on “the aftermath of where we venture militarily, which will be our legacy of involvement in these regions.” She urged the government to develop policies designed to help rebuild and transform societies — physically, socially and economically. In doing so, she said, we will “do much to insure our own peace down the road.”

The last word was left to Hoagland, whose suggestions included:

- Develop an energy policy to dramatically reduce reliance on Persian Gulf oil;
- Develop an alliance with India to counterbalance China;
- Reconcile with Iran, which could lead to a solution for Iraq;
- And, echoing Albright’s remarks from the previous evening, make education and educational diplomacy part of American foreign policy, “and name Dick Riley to head that initiative so those of us in Washington will have the pleasure of having him back in D.C.”

Hoagland’s final comment brought down the house while bringing the evening — and the conference — to a most appropriate conclusion.