

A New Realism for the Next Administration

An address given to the Los Angeles World Affairs Council
On June 3, 2008 by

The Honorable Bill Richardson
Governor of New Mexico

Today, two remaining primaries, South Dakota and Montana, conclude, and possibly the American primary season ends and the general election starts. So it's appropriate to talk about what I perceive to be the main challenges facing the next administration. I want to talk about the challenges but also I want to focus on recommendations on what we need to do. Politicians are very good about whining and talking about all the enormous problems we have, I'm going to offer some recommendations that may be controversial, but I think in light of international reality, we have to face them. Because as I travel around the world one of the concerns I have is that somehow America is no longer viewed as the undisputed leader. In fact, I was just in Latin America where I've been trying to work on the American hostages in Colombia and Venezuela – the FARC revolutionary group had three Americans, a French woman and over 300 Colombians in almost isolation for the last seven years. And everywhere I went the message was “You know the President of Venezuela, Hugo Chavez, has more votes than the president of the United States when it comes to a Latin American issue.” So, it's not just in the Middle East and Africa or other parts of the world where we have challenges. It's in our own back yard.

Whoever becomes the next president is going to inherit a legacy of foreign policy challenges both from state actors and non-state actors. Here are the state actors, in other words, nations, Iraq, Iran, Pakistan, North Korea, the Middle East situation with Palestine—any of these issues could be the focus of an entire presidency. At the same time, the next president is going to face unprecedented challenges from non-state actors; from movements, jihadists, environmental crisis, and energy crisis. They've replaced armies and missiles as the greatest threats, and globalization has eroded the significance of national borders. Many problems that were once national are today global, and dangers that once came only from states also come from societies not necessarily from hostile governments but hostile individuals or self-destructive trends such as the consumption of fossil fuel and our dependence on foreign oil.

I see five major trends gathering against us all us, transforming the world. And these are challenges not just to America but to the nations that are represented here today by the consulates and to many in the free world. These are all transforming us and they're evolving on a day-to-day basis. Here are the five as I see it.

First, terrorism continues to grow out of a more unstable and more violent Middle East. The invasion and collapse of Iraq has only helped fuel that growth. Not only do we have a challenge of how we extricate from Iraq but what will be the landscape after that happens.

Second, the proliferation of nuclear weapons to countries with potentially terrorist elements such as North Korea and Pakistan, has increased further the opportunities for jihadists to obtain them.

Third, the rapid rise of China and India as economic and military powers, along with a more assertive Russia; in other words, Russia is back. It kind of went under a little bit with the collapse of the Soviet Union but now you have a nation assertive militarily, energy wise, and also flexing its muscles economically. These three relationships demand our attention and strategic leadership, particularly that of China and Russia.

Fourth, globalization has also made our own economy more vulnerable—economic interdependence, financial imbalances, the fact that we have a \$9 trillion dollar debt today, a lot of it to China, Japan to commercial banks. We have this crushing debt, we have a weak dollar, job outsourcing. Many nations like India and China are graduating more engineers than America does, American education needing a dramatic push. So, economically, we're in this vulnerable position.

Fifth, there is no one nation threatening us, but there are international trends and movements transforming the world. We have urgent and worsening health, poverty and environmental problems throughout the world plus global warming, and ethnic and tribal conflicts. Why is it that in Africa today there are six wars going on and nobody seems to care or know about them? What is it about this continent that doesn't evoke the strategic response of other parts of the world? Pandemic diseases, AIDS, genital mutilation, child abuse, sexual slavery, over population, food crisis, spilling across borders and across continents and I believe that that the current food riots surround a dangerous omen of what the future may hold. And then you have new situations like what do you do with governments in Myanmar and Darfur or Sudan that refuse to respond to stop genocide, or in the case of Myanmar, they refuse basically to allow humanitarian supplies to come in to save their own people from natural disasters. These trends present us with problems that are international in their origins but also I believe must be international in their solutions. My main point is that other nations can take steps to make a difference. International institutions have to also, but only, I believe, the United States can provide the essential leadership.

I will now talk about what we are to do. I call it the "new realism" and to adapt to this new world we need a new realism in our foreign policy—an ethical, principled realism that harbors no illusions about the importance of a strong military in a dangerous world and we have to have a strong military not one that today seems to be overstretched, but also we must understand the importance of diplomacy and multilateral cooperation.

We need a new realism based on the understanding that what goes on inside other countries profoundly impacts us—but we can only influence, not control, what goes on inside other countries. A new realism for the 21st century must understand that to solve our own problems we need to work with other governments that respect and trust us.

Relaunching American leadership in the wake of this administration is going to require us to focus on the following priorities and I think this is the number one—energy. We need to find ways for the international communities to lessen its dependence on fossil fuels. This is not just America's problem but with America we need to find dramatic ways to say that we're going to cut our dependence on fossil fuel by 50 percent by the year 2020. That means vehicles that are 50 miles per gallon fuel efficiency. It means new ways that we construct our transportation systems, in light rail and open space. It's new ways to say that our electricity by the year 2020, 30 percent

should come from renewable, from solar wind. In addition to that we need to develop an ethos that somehow every American has to share in becoming more responsible with our energy uses, with our appliances, with our vehicles, the way we go back and forth to work, in our daily lives. This is something that I believe affects our national security, too, because when we're paying \$130 a barrel for oil that means a lot of that money is funneled to jihadists and to other movements in the world that want to harm us. So that is threat number one and objective number one would be a Manhattan Project that by the year 2020 lessens our dependence on fossil fuel by 50 percent.

Number two and this sounds very simple but it's a reality. We have to repair our alliances. We have to respect our allies again, and for the democratic values that unite us. The next president needs to make it clear, through words and deeds, that we value our alliances—NATO, SETO, the European community and that we're committed to strengthen them. We should always prefer multilateral efforts that unite us and share burdens, but if we choose to act alone, we should not accuse our allies of disloyalty or cowardice.

Number three and we need to remember that diplomacy and military power are complementary sources of strength. Diplomacy without power is weak, but power without diplomacy is blind. We have to commit ourselves to international law and multilateral cooperation. That includes not just joining the Kyoto protocol, but taking the lead in making it twice as strong. It also means saying to the United Nations and to the IMF and the World Bank, "You are useful institutions but for the next century for the next challenges that deal with world problems, you have to modernize yourself." The United Nations—I served there as your Ambassador for two years. It's a good institution, but besides some of the financial problems it has, it hasn't adapted to realities in this 21st century. There are five countries that today are the special powers—the powers with vetoes—France, England, China, Russia and the United States. Yet there are other power centers in the world. You don't give them a veto but what about India, Germany, what about Japan, what about countries in Latin America, Mexico or Brazil; Asia or Africa, Nigeria? Somehow the composition of this international body, which in many cases in peacekeeping, in dealing with humanitarian problems can have a more useful role. Or in the same way, with the World Bank and the IMF. Why aren't we doing more micro-lending? Build human needs instead of big projects and building big roads, money that many times is siphoned off by corruption and dictators.

Number four, we need to respect both the spirit and the letter of the Geneva Convention. America should join the International Criminal Court and support it enthusiastically, so that those who violate human rights know they will be held accountable. That means that America should return, not in a blind fashion, to say that human rights and democracy and democratic values and elections and absence of torture is important in America's dealings with other countries. As a start if I had to advise the next president I would say, "On your first day you should make a statement about American values and that means shutting down Guantanamo, that means bringing back habeas corpus, that means no eavesdropping on our own citizens, that means saying that torture is unacceptable in our foreign policies."

It's important to stay as bipartisan as possible because really we can't succeed in our national agenda unless we have bipartisanship. If you look at the great environmental movements in the past, the start of our national parks, our wilderness, protection of our forests, water, wild life, endangered species – it only happened with bipartisanship. And the same with national security. Today, this war is totally politicized. You have one side and the other side and it's almost

entirely partisan. Our foreign policy should be something that is in the national interests not in any party's interest.

Russia, China. What is it about these countries that somehow there's a weekly crisis or disagreement with them? We need to find a way to work with each other. It doesn't mean we concede what Russia and China want. But we need to establish our priorities with those countries and this is something that I believe is very important—personal contact, personal knowledge between leaders. I give credit and one of the best was George Bush I who had personal relationships. He would pick up the phone, and he knew all these world leaders and they'd exchange notes. They had a chemistry that I think is very important and lacking today, especially with Russia and China. We need to set priorities with these troublesome partners and recognize that we can only influence, not control, what they do.

Now, here's an issue that I think may cause some concern to many in this audience. We have to engage our adversaries diplomatically. Remember what Yitzhak Rabin said when he won the Nobel Prize. He said, "You don't make peace with your friends; you make peace with your enemies." This administration's refusal to engage obnoxious regimes has only encouraged and strengthened their most paranoid and hard line tendencies. It's instructive to note that Iran and North Korea responded to Washington's snubs and threats by intensifying their nuclear programs. We need to talk tough to rogue states, but do so, *we need to talk*, and it's important that we not say, "We're not going to talk to a country that disagrees with us" as this administration has done. At that rate, pretty soon we're only going to be talking to the Vatican!

Number seven we also have to focus on urgent security threats from which the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have diverted our attention, above all nuclear proliferation and nuclear terrorism. What do we mean by nuclear proliferation and nuclear terrorism? What we mean is a loose nuclear weapon, or a little sliver of enriched uranium, that may cross the border, that may go in the hands of a terrorist, that may be used on an American city, or an American facility overseas. Also arms control. The last weapons of mass destruction, the last arms control treaty was at the beginning of the Clinton administration. There have been none since. America has 5,000 nuclear weapons. I think the time has come, jointly, not just unilaterally with other nations, as President Reagan once did, to look at the possibility of severely reducing the world's nuclear arsenal. We have to do the hard diplomatic work to unite the international community, especially Russia and China, to stop the nuclear ambitions of Iran and North Korea and we provide these nations with incentives to renounce nuclear weapons. No nation has ever been forced to renounce nuclear weapons, but many have been persuaded to renounce them. The example of Libya shows that even states with terrorist pasts can come out of the cold, and I'll give credit to this administration for engaging Libya although we're not totally out of the woods. Some progress is finally being made with North Korea, and we need to stop the saber-rattling and use a similar carrot-and-stick approach with Iran, which will not be easy. Urgently, we must lead comprehensive global negotiations to lock down the entire world's bomb-grade nuclear material and to secure nuclear enrichment, worldwide.

The United States also needs comprehensive immigration reform that is realistic and human. You talk about Latin America and you don't have comprehensive immigration, and you don't deal with getting rid of the Cuban trade embargo which has gone nowhere for years; if you don't relate to democratic populous movements in countries like Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Bolivia, it's going to permit that Hugo Chavez' of the world to continue to have undue influence. And so we need comprehensive immigration reform that is both realistic and human. We need to strengthen our borders with more border patrols, smarter technology, National Guard, while punishing

employers who break the law and hire undocumented workers. But building a fence is not going to work. You build a 12 foot fence and you know what will happen next? 13-foot ladders. I can tell you as a border governor that sees this every day. Let's increase border security, no question about it, but also deal with the push-and-pull of immigration. America must also recognize that we simply can't deport 12 million people—that's one of the solutions in a bill that passed the House of Representatives three years ago. Deport 12 million people!! How are you going to do that? Who's going to do it? The L. A. Police Department? You can't do it. It's impossible.

We need a tough, fair path to legalization and I'll give credit to Senator McCain who with Senator Ted Kennedy proposed a legalization plan for the 12 million and this is going to be an issue that has to be addressed because of the huge uncertainty and division that it is causing in our country. We don't need a wall—they don't work. If your Latin American policy starts with a wall between nations it will quickly collapse into rubble. I remember when I came into the Congress in the early '80s and Ronald Reagan was president, and I have an admission to make, I kind of liked the old guy. I hardly ever voted with him, but I remember him standing right at the Berlin Wall and saying, "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down that wall," and I think that this is applicable to dealing with the immigration issue. Walls don't work. Let's enhance security at the border with people, with technology, with equipment.

At its root, illegal immigration is an economic problem, driven by a lack of decent jobs for people in their home countries, and driven by extreme poverty. So long as other economies are unable to produce good high-paying jobs, people will continue to come to the United States. We need to recognize that for years to come, the American economy is going to continue to attract Latin American workers. While our laws say they cannot come here, our economy is saying that they should. We need to be realistic. As we need to crack down on illegal immigration, we need to allow more legal immigration. We need a reasonable guest worker program and an earned path to legalization. We need to allow skilled workers that we need, especially in the computer era to come in. We need to work with the governments of Central America and Mexico to start creating more jobs at home.

I was recently with the governors of border states and the president of Mexico and immigration came up. You know, a logical question is: Do more to help your own people. Do something about poverty, find ways that maybe America and Mexico can jointly produce more jobs in central Mexico so that those aspiring for economic growth don't have to leave.

You know, the problems of the 21st century are not the problems of one nation; they're the shared problems of an interdependent global society. The challenge for America is to stop looking for points of disagreement with the world and start looking for points of agreement.

Every challenge that I've outlined is not going to be easy but it's going to require tough diplomacy, carried out by dedicated public servants. It will also require that our next president reaches out to the American public and builds consensus, not just to bully his or her position, but to explain the road forward. If America is going to engage internationally again, this leader has to have the support of its people and we have to show the seventh largest economy in the world, California, that being interdependent and being for trade and commerce and academic contacts is in the interests not just of the country but of this State, too.

Each of these problems is complex and it's going to require patience of an educated public and this is why the World Affairs Council for any policy maker it is an honor to be asked to address you. To face the challenges we have is going to require strong leadership and, most importantly



as I said, bipartisanship. I'll tell you one thing. I served in the Clinton administration when we had a Democratic House, a Democratic Senate and a Democratic president. We thought we were going to get all our programs through. It didn't happen. Two years later we lost the Congress. You need bipartisanship, you need ways that independents and Republicans and Democrats can look and say, "We're going to pursue the national interests instead of narrow partisan interests," and it's my hope that the next administration, be it Democrat or Republican—I have a preference—steps up to these challenges and changes our world.

Now, I come to the best part of my speech, the end.

Thank you.

www.lawac.org

Speeches are edited for readability and grammar, not content. The views expressed herein are not endorsed by the Council. The Los Angeles World Affairs Council is a non-profit, non-partisan organization that pays neither honoraria nor expenses to its speakers.