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Dear Howard:

Attached, our final edit of the typeset piece. We have cut the requisite 12 lines by tightening the graf on APEC on page 2 and deleting the graf on crime-drugs-nukes on page 4 (please note that a phrase was added to the last sentence of the graf above the deleted graf).

I hope this does the trick. Thanks for your patience.
Anthony Lake is President Clinton's national security adviser. This article is adapted from remarks to the Council on Foreign Relations on Sept. 12.

To many Americans, the cold war divisions have given way to a confusing tangle of problems that prevent us from setting clearly defined goals for our foreign policy. These problems include aggression by regional bullies, transnational dangers like overpopulation and refugees, a global economic and information free-for-all that produces fear and uncertainty, and terrible ethnic conflicts.

Beneath the surface, however, there is an enduring truth about this new world. The same idea attacked by Fascism and Communism remains under attack today. Now, as then, we are defending an idea that comes under many names - democracy, liberty, civility, pluralism - but has a constant face. It is the face of the tolerant society, in which leaders and governments exist not to use or abuse people but to provide them with freedom and opportunity.

We are at the start of a new stage in this old struggle. This is not a clash of civilizations. Rather, it is a contest that pits nations and individuals guided by openness, responsive government and moderation against those animated by isolation, repression and extremism. The enemies of the tolerant society are not some nameless, faceless force. They are extreme nationalists and tribalists, terrorists, organized criminals, coup plotters, rogue states and all those who would return newly free societies to the intolerant ways of the past.
For all its dangers, this new world presents immense opportunities to reshape and create international structures that are adapted to post-cold-war realities and designed to consolidate the victory of democracy and open markets.

We are not starry-eyed about the prospects for spreading democracy, but we know that to do so serves our interests. Democracies create free markets that offer economic opportunity, and they make for reliable trading partners. They tend not to abuse their citizens' rights or wage war on one another.

The Administration has made a good start at building security and economic institutions designed to create the conditions in which democracy can flourish. In Europe, we are deeply engaged in transforming NATO to fulfill President Clinton's vision of an integrated continent by establishing Combined Joint Task Forces for peacekeeping and crisis management and the Partnership for Peace to begin expanding security in Europe eastward.

The new global economy requires that we design structures that produce tangible benefits for our citizens and turn their fears into hope. That is why President Clinton went to the mat for the North American Free Trade Agreement, which has dramatically accelerated the exchange of goods and ideas between the United States, Mexico and Canada. That is why he was next at the first gathering of the Organization for Asian-Pacific Economic Cooperation leaders and helped to set a pro-trade agenda in the fast-growing Asian-Pacific economies. And that is why our successful completion of the GATT world trade talks was so important: it promises to make a real
difference in real lives by creating jobs and raising wages.

The challenges we face also demand the patient application of diplomacy and the measured exercise of power. We use diplomacy to pursue peace. But peace is not just an end in itself. It also creates conditions necessary for democratic values to thrive. Thus, when we foster peace in the Middle East, Northern Ireland and South Africa we are promoting the tolerant society as well.

Effective diplomacy depends not only on the skill of our diplomats but also on power. Nothing better demonstrates this proposition than our approach to Haiti. There we have relied on diplomacy backed by power - the threat of the use of force. The regime agreed to step down because of the credible and imminent prospect of a massive U.S.-led invasion. As a result, we are accomplishing a goal that this Administration - and its predecessor - have pursued for three years: the restoration of democratic Government. And we are doing so peacefully, with less risk to our troops - whose presence will guarantee that the Haitian military keeps its word.

The progress we have made in Bosnia came when power was tied to diplomacy. The Sarajevo ultimatum succeeded because the threat of NATO air power was judged real. The ultimatum also sparked the agreement on a federation between the Croats and Muslims. And it was the threat of further action by NATO, combined with our sanctions, that lead Serbia to close its border with the Bosnian Serbs when they rejected the recent peace plan. Now, we are firmly committed to increasing the pressure on the Bosnian
Serbs to accept the plan, partly by enforcement of the ban on heavy weapons around Sarajevo and Gorazde.

It cannot and must not be the responsibility of the international community or this nation finally to resolve all deeply rooted conflicts. But where practical, we can save lives, as in Rwanda and Somalia, and we can offer conflicting societies a breathing space in which to sort out their own affairs. Whether or not they do so must be their own responsibility.

These explosions in states are also exacerbated by transnational problems - refugees; population growth; an endangered environment; a nefarious nexus of crime, terrorism and the weapons of mass destruction - whose dimensions have been clearly exposed by the end of the cold war.

Several times in recent weeks, police seized nuclear materials smuggled through Europe. Cooperation among intelligence services helped police intercept this deadly cargo. Now we must turn our energy toward securing nuclear materials at their source, and proving our intelligence sharing with allies, and conducting joint anti-terrorist training.

We must also contend with regional rogue states like Iran, Iraq and Libya, which seek to traffic in the weapons of mass destruction, support terrorism and are dedicated to the destruction of the tolerant society.

For that reason, President Clinton will maintain and modernize the finest military in the world so that we can deter aggression – and counter it when the need arises. We also have developed a strategy of dual containment of Iraq and Iran. And we will
uphold our commitment to South Korea even as we negotiate a solution to the nuclear issue with the North. Because we must fight on so many fronts at once, we will make progress only over time, in small victories, through persistence and pragmatism. These are not evidence of indecision; they are the hallmarks of determination, of a nation engaged in the long struggle for democracy and the freedom and tolerance it brings.<ws>[OBX]

(END)
Anthony Lake is President Clinton's national security adviser. This article is adapted from remarks to the Council on Foreign Relations on Sept. 12.

To many Americans, the cold war divisions have given way to a confusing tangle of problems that prevent us from setting clearly defined goals for our foreign policy. These problems include aggression by regional bullies; transnational dangers like overpopulation and refugees, a global economic and information free-for-all that produces fear and uncertainty, and terrible ethnic conflicts.

Beneath the surface, however, there is an enduring truth about this new world. The same idea attacked by Fascism and Communism remains under attack today. Now, as then, we are defending an idea that comes under many names - democracy, liberty, civility, pluralism - but has a constant face. It is the face of the tolerant society, in which leaders and governments exist not to use or abuse people but to provide them with freedom and opportunity.

We are at the start of a new stage in this old struggle. This is not a clash of civilizations. Rather, it is a contest that pits nations and individuals guided by openness, responsive government and moderation against those animated by isolation, repression and extremism. The enemies of the tolerant society are not some nameless, faceless force. They are extreme nationalists and tribalists, terrorists, organized criminals, coup plotters, rogue states and all those who would return newly free societies to the intolerant ways of the past.
For all its dangers, this new world presents immense opportunities to reshape and create international structures that are adapted to post-cold-war realities and designed to consolidate the victory of democracy and open markets.

We are not starry-eyed about the prospects for spreading democracy, but we know that to do so serves our interests. Democracies create free markets that offer economic opportunity, and they make for reliable trading partners. They tend not to abuse their citizens' rights or wage war on one another.

The Administration has made a good start at building security and economic institutions designed to create the conditions in which democracy can flourish. In Europe, we are deeply engaged in transforming NATO to fulfill President Clinton's vision of an integrated continent by establishing Combined Joint Task Forces for peacekeeping and crisis management and the Partnership for Peace to begin expanding security in Europe eastward.

The new global economy requires that we design structures that produce tangible benefits for our citizens and turn their fears into hope. That is why President Clinton went to the mat for the North American Free Trade Agreement, which has dramatically accelerated the exchange of goods and ideas between the United States, Mexico and Canada. That is why he took the lead in setting

\[\text{he}^{\text{has taken the lead in setting}}\]
difference in real lives by creating jobs and raising wages.

The challenges we face also demand the patient application of diplomacy and the measured exercise of power. We use diplomacy to pursue peace. But peace is not just an end in itself. It also creates conditions necessary for democratic values to thrive. (Thus, when we foster peace in the Middle East, Northern Ireland and South Africa we are promoting the tolerant society as well.)

Effective diplomacy depends not only on the skill of our diplomats but also on power. Nothing better demonstrates this proposition than our approach to Haiti. There we have relied on diplomacy backed by power - the threat of the use of force. The regime agreed to step down because of the credible and imminent prospect of a massive U.S.-led invasion. As a result, we are accomplishing a goal that this Administration - and its predecessor - have pursued for three years: the restoration of democratic Government. And we are doing so peacefully, with less risk to our troops - whose presence will guarantee that the Haitian military keeps its word.

The progress we have made in Bosnia came when power was tied to diplomacy. The Sarajevo ultimatum succeeded because the threat of NATO air power was judged real. The ultimatum also sparked the agreement on a federation between the Croatians and Muslims. And it was the threat of further action by NATO, combined with our sanctions, that lead Serbia to close its border with the Bosnian Serbs when they rejected the recent peace plan. Now, we are firmly committed to increasing the pressure on the Bosnian
Serbs to accept the plan, partly by enforcement of the ban on heavy weapons around Sarajevo and Goražde.

It cannot and must not be the responsibility of the international community or this nation finally to resolve all deeply rooted conflicts. But where practical, we can save lives, as in Rwanda and Somalia, and we can offer conflicting societies a breathing space in which to sort out their own affairs. Whether or not they do so must be their own responsibility.

These explosions in states are also exacerbated by transnational problems - refugees; population growth; an endangered environment; a nefarious nexus of crime, terrorism and the weapons of mass destruction - whose dimensions have been clearly exposed by the end of the cold war.

Several times in recent weeks, police seized nuclear materials smuggled through Europe. Cooperation among intelligence services helped police intercept this deadly cargo. Now we must turn our energy toward securing nuclear materials at their source, and proving our intelligence sharing with allies, and conducting joint anti-terrorist training.

We must also contend with regional rogue states like Iran, Iraq and Libya, which seek to traffic in the weapons of mass destruction, support terrorism and are dedicated to the destruction of the tolerant society.

For that reason, President Clinton will maintain and modernize the finest military in the world so that we can deter aggression - and counter it when the need arises. We also have developed a strategy of dual containment of Iraq and Iran. And we will
uphold our commitment to South Korea even as we negotiate a solution to the nuclear issue with the North. Because we must fight on so many fronts at once, we will make progress only over time, in small victories, through persistence and pragmatism. These are not evidence of indecision: they are the hallmarks of determination, of a nation engaged in the long struggle for democracy and the freedom and tolerance it brings. <ws>[OBX]
Tara:

We need 12 lines to make this fit as two pieces, and even then Tony is the longer piece. The issue is largely mechanical.

I've suggested three points on pp. 2, 3 and 4 (they are in brackets) which seem to me to be less on the main points of the larger debate which this dialogue seeks to define. The rest is strong and clear, so I hope we don't have to lose it all at this point. It would be a shame.

Cheers, and thanks.

Mike

TO:  Tara Sonnenschein

FROM:

202-4569270

Mike Levitas

Phone 212 556-4555

Fax 212 556-4100
TO: Howard Goldberg
New York Times
FAX (212) 556-4100
DATE: 9/21/94
NO. PAGES: 4

FROM: Antony Blinken
ROOM: 164
TEL: 202/456-5689
FAX: 202/456-6485

MESSAGE:

Dear Howard:

I attach an updated version of Tony Lake’s op/ed. I have underlined additions and struck through deleted text. Both additions and deletions are marked by an "X" in the right margin.

By my computer, the piece now runs 1130 words, including the additions and deletions, the header and the credit box.

Tony will not cut further, though of course he will look at any non-substantive edits you propose. He was quite clear with me that, if the piece cannot stay as is, he would prefer that it not be published.

If you have trouble reaching me tomorrow, please feel free to page me by dialing 202/395-6661 and punching in beeper # 4234.

Thank you.
For too many Americans, the predictable divisions of the Cold War have given way to a confusing tangle of problems that prevent us from setting clearly defined goals for our foreign policy. These include "traditional" aggression by regional bullies; transnational dangers like over-population and refugees; a global economic and information free-for-all that produces fear and uncertainty; and terrible ethnic conflicts.

Beneath the surface, however, there is an enduring truth about this new world. The same idea that was under attack by fascism and then by communism remains under attack today. Now, as then, we are defending an idea that comes under many names -- democracy, liberty, civility, pluralism -- but has a constant face. It is the face of the tolerant society, in which leaders and governments exist not to use or abuse people, but to provide them with freedom and opportunity.

Far from reaching the end of history, we are at the start of a new stage in this old struggle. This is not a clash of civilizations. Rather, it is a contest that pits nations and individuals guided by openness, responsive government and moderation against those animated by isolation, repression and extremism. The enemies of the tolerant society are not some nameless, faceless force. They are extreme nationalists and tribalists, terrorists, organized criminals, coup plotters, rogue states and all those who would return newly free societies to the intolerant ways of the past.

For all its dangers, this new world presents immense opportunities -- the chance to reshape and create international structures that are adapted to post-Cold War realities, and specifically designed to consolidate the victory of democracy and open markets.

We are not starry eyed about the prospects for spreading democracy, but we know that enlarging the community of democracies serves our interests. Democracies create free markets that offer economic opportunity and they make for more reliable trading partners. They tend not to abuse their citizens' rights -- And democracies are far less likely to wage war on one another.

The Clinton Administration has made a good start at building security and economic institutions designed to create the conditions in which democracy can flourish. In Europe, for example, we are deeply engaged in transforming NATO to fulfill President Clinton's vision of an
We have taken the lead in establishing Combined Joint Task Forces for peacekeeping and crisis management, and the Partnership for Peace to begin the process of expanding security in Europe eastward.

The new global economy requires that we design structures that produce tangible benefits for our citizens and turn their fears into hope. That is why President Clinton went to the mat for NAFTA, which has dramatically accelerated the exchange of goods and ideas between the United States, Mexico and Canada. That is why he hosted the first ever gathering of the Organization for Asian-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) leaders and helped to set a pro-trade agenda within the fast growing Asian-Pacific economies. And that is why our successful completion of the GATT world trade talks was so important -- it promises to make a real difference in real lives by creating jobs and raising wages.

The challenges we face also demand the patient application of diplomacy and the measured exercise of power.

We use diplomacy to pursue peace. But peace is not just an end in itself. It also creates conditions necessary for democratic values to thrive. Thus, when we support and foster peace in the Middle East or Northern Ireland or South Africa, we are promoting the tolerant society as well.

Effective diplomacy depends not only on the skill of our diplomats, but also on power.

Nothing better demonstrates this proposition than our approach to Haiti. There, we have relied on diplomacy backed by power -- the real threat of the use of force. The Cedras regime only agreed to step down because of the credible and imminent prospect of a massive U.S.-led invasion. As a result, we are accomplishing a goal that this Administration -- and its predecessor -- have pursued for three years: the restoration of democratic government to Haiti. And we are doing so peacefully, with less risk to our troops -- whose presence will guarantee that the Haitian military keeps its word.

The progress we have made in Bosnia also came when power was tied to diplomacy. The Sarajevo ultimatum succeeded because the threat of NATO air power was judged real. The ultimatum also sparked the agreement on a federation between the Croats and Muslims. And it was the threat of further action by NATO, combined with the effect of our sanctions, that led
Serbia to close its border with the Bosnian Serbs when they rejected the recent peace plan. Now, we are firmly committed to increasing the pressure on the Bosnian Serbs to accept the plan, including through enforcement of the heavy weapons bans established around Sarajevo and Gorazde.

It cannot and must not be the responsibility of the international community or this nation finally to resolve all deeply-rooted conflicts. But where practical, we can save lives, as in Rwanda and Somalia, and we can offer conflicted societies a breathing space in which to sort out their own affairs. Whether or not they do so must, ultimately, be their own responsibility.

These explosions within states are also exacerbated by transnational problems -- refugees; population growth; an endangered environment; a nefarious nexus of crime, terrorism and weapons of mass destruction -- whose dimensions have been more clearly exposed by the end of the Cold War.

Several times in recent weeks, police seized nuclear materials smuggled through Europe. Cooperation among intelligence services helped police intercept this deadly cargo. Now we must turn our energy toward securing nuclear materials at their source, improving our intelligence sharing with allies, and conducting joint anti-terrorist training.

We must also contend with regional rogue states like Iran, Iraq and Libya who seek to traffic in the weapons of mass destruction, who support terrorism, who are dedicated to the destruction of the tolerant society. For that reason, President Clinton is determined to maintain and modernize the finest military in the world so we can deter aggression -- and counter it when the need arises. We also have developed a strategy of "dual containment" of Iraq and Iran. And we will uphold our commitment to South Korea even as we negotiate a solution to the nuclear issue with the North.

Because we must fight on so many fronts at once, we will only make progress over time, in small victories, through patience, persistence and pragmatism. These are not evidence of indecision: they are the hallmarks of determination -- of a nation engaged in the long struggle for democracy and the freedom and tolerance it brings.

* Mr. Lake is Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs. This article is adapted from remarks he delivered to the Council on Foreign Relations on September 12, 1994.
TO: Howard Goldberg - NYT op/ed  
FROM: Antony Blinken  
FAX: (212) 556-4100  
ROOM: 164  
DATE: Sept 21, 1994  
TEL: 202/456-5689  
FAX: 202/456-6485  
NO. PAGES: 4

MESSAGE:

Dear Howard:

Sorry for the delay. The attached draft does not yet have Tony Lake's final clearance, so we will probably want to do some minor tinkering. In particular, I would expect the Bosnia paragraph to suffer some revision.

Thanks for your patience. I will be dictating the copy onto your recording system.
The Purpose of American Power
By Anthony Lake*

To many Americans, the predictable divisions of the Cold War have given way to a confusing tangle of problems that prevent us from setting clearly defined goals for our foreign policy. These include "traditional" aggression by regional bullies; transnational dangers like over-population and refugees; a global economic and information free-for-all that produces fear and uncertainty; and terrible ethnic conflicts.

Beneath the surface, however, there is an enduring truth about this new world. The same idea that was under attack by fascism and then by communism remains under attack today. Now, as then, we are defending an idea that comes under many names -- democracy, liberty, civility, pluralism -- but has a constant face. It is the face of the tolerant society, in which leaders and governments exist not to use or abuse people, but to provide them with freedom and opportunity.

Far from reaching the end of history, we are at the start of a new stage in this old struggle. This is not a clash of civilizations. Rather, it is a contest that pits nations and individuals guided by openness, responsive government and moderation against those animated by isolation, repression and extremism. The enemies of the tolerant society are not some nameless, faceless force. They are extreme nationalists and tribalists, terrorists, organized criminals, coup plotters, rogue states and all those who would return newly free societies to the intolerant ways of the past.

For all its dangers, this new world presents immense opportunities -- the chance to reshape and create international structures that are adapted to post-Cold War realities, and specifically designed to consolidate the victory of democracy and open markets.

We are not starry eyed about the prospects for spreading democracy. But we know that enlarging the community of democracies serves our interests. Democracies create free markets that offer economic opportunity and they make for more reliable trading partners. They tend not to abuse their citizens' rights. And democracies are far less likely to wage war on one another.

The Clinton Administration has made a good start at building security and economic institutions designed to create the conditions in which democracy can flourish. In Europe, for example, we are deeply engaged in transforming NATO to fulfill President Clinton's vision of an
integrated continent. We have taken the lead in establishing Combined Joint Task Forces for peacekeeping and crisis management, and the Partnership for Peace to begin the process of expanding security in Europe eastward.

The new global economy requires that we design structures that produce tangible benefits for our citizens and turn their fears into hope. That is why President Clinton went to the mat for NAFTA, which has dramatically accelerated the exchange of goods and ideas between the United States, Mexico and Canada. That is why he hosted the first ever gathering of the Organization for Asian-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) leaders and helped to set a pro-trade agenda within the fast growing Asian-Pacific economies. And that is why our successful completion of the GATT world trade talks was so important -- it promises to make a real difference in real lives by creating jobs and raising wages.

The challenges we face also demand the patient application of diplomacy and the measured exercise of power.

We use diplomacy to pursue peace. But peace is not just an end in itself. It also creates conditions necessary for democratic values to thrive. Thus, when we support and foster peace in the Middle East or Northern Ireland or South Africa, we are promoting the tolerant society as well.

Effective diplomacy depends not only on the skill of our diplomats, but also on power.

Nothing better demonstrates this proposition than our approach to Haiti. There, we have relied on diplomacy backed by power -- the real threat of the use of force. The Cedras regime only agreed to step down because of the credible and imminent prospect of a massive U.S.-led invasion. As a result, we are accomplishing a goal that this Administration -- and its predecessor -- have pursued for three years: the restoration of democratic government to Haiti. And we are doing so peacefully, with less risk to our troops -- whose presence will guarantee that the Haitian military keeps its word.

The progress we have made in Bosnia came when power was tied to diplomacy. The Sarajevo ultimatum succeeded because the threat of NATO air power was judged real. The ultimatum also sparked the agreement on a federation between the Croatians and Muslims. And it
was the threat of further action by NATO, combined with the effect of our sanctions, that led Serbia to close its border with the Bosnian Serbs when they rejected the recent peace plan.

It cannot and must not be the responsibility of the international community or this nation finally to resolve all deeply-rooted conflicts. But where practical, we can save lives, as in Rwanda, and we can offer conflicted societies a breathing space in which to sort out their own affairs. Whether or not they do so must, ultimately, be their own responsibility.

These explosions within states are also exacerbated by transnational problems -- refugees; population growth; an endangered environment; a nefarious nexus of crime, terrorism and weapons of mass destruction -- whose dimensions have been more clearly exposed by the end of the Cold War.

Several times in recent weeks, police seized nuclear materials smuggled through Europe. Cooperation among intelligence services helped police intercept this deadly cargo. Now we must turn our energy toward securing nuclear materials at their source, improving our intelligence sharing with allies, and conducting joint anti-terrorist training.

We must also contend with regional rogue states like Iran, Iraq and Libya who seek to traffic in the weapons of mass destruction, who support terrorism, who are dedicated to the destruction of the tolerant society. For that reason, President Clinton is determined to maintain and modernize the finest military in the world so we can deter aggression -- and counter it when the need arises. We also have developed a strategy of "dual containment" of Iraq and Iran. And we will maintain our commitment to South Korea even as we negotiate a solution to the nuclear issue with the North.

Because we must fight on so many fronts at once, we will only make progress over time, in small victories, through patience, persistence and pragmatism. These are not evidence of indecision: they are the hallmarks of determination -- of a nation engaged in the long struggle for democracy and the freedom and tolerance it brings.

* Mr. Lake is Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs. This article is adapted from remarks he delivered to the Council on Foreign Relations on September 12, 1994.
To: Tony Lake
From: Tony Blinken

Tara informs me that the companion piece to your op/ed will take us to task on Bosnia. She suggested inserting a graf to lessen the blow. I've done so. If you want to do more, please keep in mind that the Times is serious about enforcing a "No Write Zone" beyond 1000 words, and we are at about 1080 (which we can get away with).

P.S. (9/21/94 at 2 pm)
I've modified to take into account your comments on the margins of the earlier draft. You will want to focus now on the Bosnia graf.

⇒ Somalia
⇒ CND
The Purpose of American Power

By Anthony Lake*

To many Americans, the predictable divisions of the Cold War have given way to a confusing tangle of problems that prevent us from setting clearly defined goals for our foreign policy. These include "traditional" aggression by regional bullies; transnational dangers like over-population and refugees; a global economic and information free-for-all that produces fear and uncertainty; and terrible ethnic conflicts.

Beneath the surface, however, there is an enduring truth about this new world. The same idea that was under attack by fascism and then by communism remains under attack today. Now, as then, we are defending an idea that comes under many names -- democracy, liberty, civility, pluralism -- but has a constant face. It is the face of the tolerant society, in which leaders and governments exist not to use or abuse people, but to provide them with freedom and opportunity.

Far from reaching the end of history, we are at the start of a new stage in this old struggle. This is not a clash of civilizations. Rather, it is a contest that pits nations and individuals guided by openness, responsive government and moderation against those animated by isolation, repression and extremism. The enemies of the tolerant society are not some nameless, faceless force. They are extreme nationalists and tribalists, terrorists, organized criminals, coup plotters, rogue states and all those who would return newly free societies to the intolerant ways of the past.

For all its dangers, this new world presents immense opportunities -- the chance to reshape and create international structures that are adapted to post-Cold War realities, and specifically designed to consolidate the victory of democracy and open markets.

We are not starry eyed about the prospects for spreading democracy. But we know that enlarging the community of democracies serves our interests. Democracies create free markets that offer economic opportunity and they make for more reliable trading partners. They tend not to abuse their citizens' rights. And democracies are far less likely to wage war on one another.

The Clinton Administration has made a good start at building security and economic institutions designed to create the conditions in which democracy can flourish. In Europe, for example, we are deeply engaged in transforming NATO to fulfill President Clinton's vision of an
integrated continent. We have taken the lead in establishing Combined Joint Task Forces for peacekeeping and crisis management, and the Partnership for Peace to begin the process of expanding security in Europe eastward.

The new global economy requires that we design structures that produce tangible benefits for our citizens and turn their fears into hope. That is why President Clinton went to the mat for NAFTA, which has dramatically accelerated the exchange of goods and ideas between the United States, Mexico and Canada. That is why he hosted the first ever gathering of the Organization for Asian-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) leaders and helped to set a pro-trade agenda within the fast growing Asian-Pacific economies. And that is why our successful completion of the GATT world trade talks was so important -- it promises to make a real difference in real lives by creating jobs and raising wages.

The challenges we face also demand the patient application of diplomacy and the measured exercise of power.

We use diplomacy to pursue peace. But peace is not just an end in itself: It also creates conditions necessary for democratic values to thrive. Thus, when we support and foster peace in the Middle East or Northern Ireland or South Africa, we are promoting the tolerant society as well.

Effective diplomacy depends not only on the skill of our diplomats, but also on power. Nothing better demonstrates this proposition than our approach to Haiti. There, we have relied on diplomacy backed by power -- the real threat of the use of force. The Cedras regime only agreed to step down because of the credible and imminent prospect of a massive U.S.-led invasion. As a result, we are accomplishing a goal that this Administration -- and its predecessor -- have pursued for three years: the restoration of democratic government to Haiti. And we are doing so peacefully, with less risk to our troops -- whose presence will guarantee that the Haitian military keeps its word.

\[ \text{also} \]

The progress we have made in Bosnia came when power was tied to diplomacy. The Sarajevo ultimatum succeeded because the threat of NATO air power was judged real. The ultimatum also sparked the agreement on a federation between the Croats and Muslims. And it
was the threat of further action by NATO, combined with the effect of our sanctions, that led
Serbia to close its border with the Bosnian Serbs when they rejected the recent peace plan.

It cannot and must not be the responsibility of the international community or this nation
finally to resolve all deeply-rooted conflicts. But where practical, we can save lives, as in
Rwanda, and we can offer conflicted societies a breathing space in which to sort out their own
affairs. Whether or not they do so must, ultimately, be their own responsibility.

These explosions within states are also exacerbated by transnational problems -- refugees,
population growth; an endangered environment; a noxious nexus of crime, terrorism and
weapons of mass destruction -- whose dimensions have been more clearly exposed by the end of
the Cold War.

Several times in recent weeks, police seized nuclear materials smuggled through Europe.
Cooperation among intelligence services helped police intercept this deadly cargo. Now we
must turn our energy toward securing nuclear materials at their source, improving our
intelligence sharing with allies, and conducting joint anti-terrorist training.

We must also contend with regional rogue states like Iran, Iraq and Libya who seek to
traffic in the weapons of mass destruction, who support terrorism, who are dedicated to the
destruction of the tolerant society. For that reason, President Clinton is determined to maintain
and modernize the finest military in the world so we can deter aggression -- and counter it when
the need arises. We also have developed a strategy of "dual containment" of Iraq and Iran. And
we will maintain our commitment to South Korea even as we negotiate a solution to the nuclear
issue with the North.

Because we must fight on so many fronts at once, we will only make progress over time,
in small victories, through patience, persistence and pragmatism. These are not evidence of
indecision: they are the hallmarks of determination -- of a nation engaged in the long struggle for
democracy and the freedom and tolerance it brings.

* Mr. Lake is Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs. This article is adapted
from remarks he delivered to the Council on Foreign Relations on September 12, 1994.
September 14, 1994

To: Tony Lake
   Tara Sonenshine

From: Tony Blinken

Attached, the draft of an op/ed piece adapted from the CFR speech.
The Purpose of American Power

By Anthony Lake*

To many Americans, the predictable divisions of the Cold War have given way to an incomprehensible complex of problems that prevent us from setting a clearly defined goal for the exercise of American power and diplomacy. "Traditional" threats of aggression by regional bullies. Emerging transnational dangers like over-population and refugees. A global economic and information free-for-all that increases wealth and opportunity, but also produces fear and uncertainty within all nations. And the carnage of terrible ethnic conflicts.

Our vision need not be so clouded, for there is an enduring truth about this new world. The same idea that was under attack by fascism and then by communism remains under attack today, but on many fronts at once. Now, as then, we are defending an idea that comes under many names -- democracy, liberty, civility, pluralism -- but has a constant face. It is the face of the tolerant society, in which leaders and governments exist not to use or abuse people, but to provide them with freedom and opportunity, to preserve individual human dignity.

Today, those societies -- from the fragile to the mature -- remain under assault. Far from reaching the end of history, we are at the start of a new stage in this old struggle. This is not a clash of civilizations. Rather, it is a contest that pits nations and individuals guided by openness, responsive government and moderation against those animated by isolation, repression and extremism. The enemies of the tolerant society are not some nameless, faceless force. They are extreme nationalists and tribalists, terrorists, organized criminals, coup plotters, rogue states and all those who would return newly free societies to the intolerant ways of the past.

For all its dangers, this new world presents immense opportunities -- the chance to reshape and create new international security and economic structures that are not merely adapted to post-Cold War realities, but are specifically designed to consolidate the victory of the idea of
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democracy and open markets. These structures must also be built on a foundation of democratic values. If they fail to meet these tests, they will collapse in the face of the centrifugal forces at work within and among nations.

We are not starry eyed about the prospects for spreading democracy -- it will not soon take hold everywhere. But we know that enlarging the community of democracies serves our interests. Democracies create free markets that offer economic opportunity and they make for more reliable trading partners. They tend not to abuse the civil and political rights of their citizens. And democracies are far less likely to wage war on one another. Civilized behavior within borders encourages it beyond them.

Over the past twenty months, we have made a good start at building the security and economic institutions that can take us into the next century. In Europe, for example, we are deeply engaged in transforming NATO to fulfill President Clinton's vision of an integrated continent. We have taken the lead in establishing Combined Joint Task Forces for peacekeeping and crisis management, and the Partnership for Peace to begin the process of expanding security in Europe eastward.

The new global economy also demands that we design structures with the every day, real interests of Americans in mind. They must produce tangible benefits for our citizens and turn their fears into hope.

That is why President Clinton went to the mat to secure passage for NAFTA, which already has dramatically accelerated the exchange of goods and ideas between the United States, Mexico and Canada. That is why the President hosted the first ever gathering of the Organization for Asian-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) leaders and helped to set a pro-trade agenda within the fast growing Asian-Pacific economies. And that is why our successful completion of the GATT Uruguay Round was so important. Lowering barriers to trade promises to make a real difference in real lives by creating jobs and raising wages.

The challenges we face demand not only construction, but also the patient application of diplomacy and the measured exercise of power.
We use diplomacy to pursue peace. But peace is not just an end in itself. It also creates conditions necessary for the habits of democracy and community to thrive. Thus, when we support and foster peace in the Middle East or Northern Ireland or Southern Africa, we are promoting the tolerant society as well.

Effective diplomacy today — as throughout human history — depends not only on the skill of our diplomats, but also on the power that lies behind it.

Our approach to Haiti has relied on diplomacy backed by power — the power of our sanctions as well as the real threat of the use of force. For almost twenty months we have vigorously pursued every diplomatic avenue available to achieve a peaceful transfer of power from the coup leaders back to the democratically elected government. We have tightened sanctions all we can without crushing the Haitian people. Our efforts have failed to move the military leaders. Their brutality, if anything, gets worse.

When diplomatic efforts are exhausted, power then becomes the only alternative. United Nations Security Council Resolution 940 authorizes the use of all necessary means, including force, to restore democracy to Haiti. More than twenty countries from around the globe — all democracies — have told us they will join the international coalition in some form, and others are considering it.

The United States has a particular interest in curbing gross abuses of human rights when they occur so close to our shores. Murder, rape and intimidation are a systematic part of this regime’s reign of terror. The victims are women, children, orphans and even priests. Failure to stop the violence and reverse Haiti’s economic free-fall threatens to provoke a mass exodus that could de-stabilize the region and prove difficult for us to contain. At the same time, the new wave of democracy sweeping over this hemisphere is not irreversible. Haiti is a critical test of our commitment to defend democracy, especially where it is most fragile. Finally, the essential reliability of the United States and the international community is at stake. Having exhausted all other remedies, we must make it clear that we mean what we say. Our actions in Haiti will send a message far beyond our region — to all who seriously threaten our interests.
It cannot and must not be the responsibility of the international community or this nation finally to resolve all deeply-rooted conflicts. We cannot force a reversal of centuries of ethnic hatred in a few years. But where practical, we can save lives, as in Rwanda, and we can offer conflicted societies a breathing space in which to sort out their own affairs. Whether or not they do so must, in the end, be their own responsibility.

These explosions within states are also exacerbated by the so-called transnational problems -- mass migration and refugees; the population explosion; an endangered environment; a nefarious nexus of crime, terrorism and weapons of mass destruction -- whose dimensions have been more clearly exposed by the end of the Cold War.

Several times in recent weeks, police seized nuclear materials smuggled into Germany from Russia. We should be thankful that cooperation among various intelligence services -- including our own -- allowed police to intercept this deadly cargo. But we should also be concerned. The amount of plutonium needed to make a bomb is no bigger than a can of Coke.

So we have greatly enhanced our intelligence sharing with allies and through Interpol, increased regular consultations, and engaged in joint anti-terrorism training. Most recently, in July, FBI director Louis Freeh visited several Eastern European countries and Russia, where he stressed the risks of nuclear proliferation through the efforts of organized crime and proposed new cooperative initiatives in response.

We must also contend with regional rogue states like Iran, Iraq and Libya who seek to develop and traffic in the weapons of mass destruction, who support terrorism, who are no less dedicated to the destruction of the tolerant society than were the defeated leaders of fascism and communism. For that reason, President Clinton is determined to maintain and modernize the finest military in the world so we can deter aggression -- and counter it when the need arises.

Because we must fight on, so many fronts at once, we will only make progress over time, in small victories, not only through the exercise of our power but also through patience, persistence and pragmatism. These are not evidence of indecision: they are the hallmarks of determination.
In the end, choice, not chance, determines destiny. After World War I, we chose withdrawal, leaving a vacuum that was filled by the forces of hatred and tyranny. After World War II, we chose engagement, creating the institutions that guaranteed 50 years of freedom and prosperity.

Today, at this century's third major turning point, the Clinton Administration has chosen—rather than throw up our hands in despair at the complexities of the post-Cold War era, we have thrown ourselves with determination into the long struggle for democracy and the order it brings. In so doing, we take up the challenge previous generations met so well. Inspired by their example, aware of the responsibility they left, we are helping to create a world where tolerance, freedom and democracy prevail.
The Purpose of American Power

By Anthony Lake*

To many Americans, the predictable divisions of the Cold War have given way to an incomprehensible complex of problems that prevent us from setting a clearly defined goal for the exercise of American power and diplomacy. "Traditional" threats of aggression by regional bullies. Emerging transnational dangers like over-population and refugees. A global economic and information free-for-all that increases wealth and opportunity, but also produces fear and uncertainty within all nations. And the carnage of terrible ethnic conflicts.

But there is an enduring truth about this new world. The same idea that was under attack by fascism and then by communism remains under attack today, but on many fronts at once. Now, as then, we are defending an idea that comes under many names -- democracy, liberty, civility, pluralism -- but has a constant face. It is the face of the tolerant society, in which leaders and governments exist not to use or abuse people, but to provide them with freedom and opportunity, to preserve individual human dignity.

Today, those societies -- from the fragile to the mature -- remain under assault. Far from reaching the end of history, we are at the start of a new stage in this old struggle. This is not a clash of civilizations. Rather, it is a contest that pits nations and individuals guided by openness, responsive government and moderation against those animated by isolation, repression and extremism. The enemies of the tolerant society are not some nameless, faceless force. They are extreme nationalists and tribalists, terrorists, organized criminals, coup plotters, rogue states and all those who would return newly free societies to the intolerant ways of the past.

For all its dangers, this new world presents immense opportunities -- the chance to reshape and create new international security and economic structures that are not merely adapted to post-Cold War realities, but are specifically designed to consolidate the victory of the idea of
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democracy and open markets. These structures must also be built on a foundation of democratic values. If they fail to meet these tests, they will collapse in the face of the centrifugal forces at work within and among nations.

We are not starry eyed about the prospects for spreading democracy -- it will not soon take hold everywhere. But we know that enlarging the community of democracies serves our interests. Democracies create free markets that offer economic opportunity and they make for more reliable trading partners. They tend not to abuse the civil and political rights of their citizens. And democracies are far less likely to wage war on one another. Civilized behavior within borders encourages it beyond them.

Over the past twenty months, we have made a good start at building the security and economic institutions that can take us into the next century. In Europe, for example, we are deeply engaged in transforming NATO to fulfill President Clinton's vision of an integrated continent. We have taken the lead in establishing Combined Joint Task Forces for peacekeeping and crisis management, and the Partnership for Peace to begin the process of expanding security in Europe eastward.

The new global economy also demands that we design structures with the everyday, real interests of Americans in mind. They must produce tangible benefits for our citizens and turn their fears into hope.

That is why President Clinton went to the mat to secure passage for NAFTA, which already has dramatically accelerated the exchange of goods and ideas between the United States, Mexico and Canada. That is why the President hosted the first ever gathering of the Organization for Asian-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) leaders and helped to set a pro-trade agenda within the fast growing Asian-Pacific economies. And that is why our successful completion of the GATT Uruguay Round was so important. Lowering barriers to trade promises to make a real difference in real lives by creating jobs and raising wages.

The challenges we face demand not only construction, but also the patient application of diplomacy and the measured exercise of power.
We use diplomacy to pursue peace. But peace is not just an end in itself. It also creates conditions necessary for the habits of democracy and community to thrive. Thus, when we support and foster peace in the Middle East or Northern Ireland or Southern Africa, we are promoting the tolerant society as well.

Effective diplomacy today -- as throughout human history -- depends not only on the skill of our diplomats, but also on the power that lies behind it.

Our approach to Haiti has relied on diplomacy backed by power -- the power of our sanctions as well as the real threat of the use of force. For almost twenty months we have vigorously pursued every diplomatic avenue available to achieve a peaceful transfer of power from the coup leaders back to the democratically elected government. We have tightened sanctions all we can without crushing the Haitian people. Our efforts have failed to move the military leaders. Their brutality, if anything, gets worse.

When diplomatic efforts are exhausted, power then becomes the only alternative. United Nations Security Council Resolution 940 authorizes the use of all necessary means, including force, to restore democracy to Haiti. More than twenty countries from around the globe -- all democracies -- have told us they will join the international coalition in some form, and others are considering it.

The United States has a particular interest in curbing gross abuses of human rights when they occur so close to our shores. Murder, rape and intimidation are a systematic part of this regime’s reign of terror. The victims are women, children, orphans and even priests. Failure to stop the violence and reverse Haiti’s economic free-fall threatens to provoke a mass exodus that could de-stabilize the region and prove difficult for us to contain. At the same time, the new wave of democracy sweeping over this hemisphere is not irreversible. Haiti is a critical test of our commitment to defend democracy, especially where it is most fragile. Finally, the essential reliability of the United States and the international community is at stake. Having exhausted all other remedies, we must make it clear that we mean what we say. Our actions in Haiti will send a message far beyond our region -- to all who seriously threaten our interests.
It cannot and must not be the responsibility of the international community or this nation finally to resolve all deeply-rooted conflicts. We cannot force a reversal of centuries of ethnic hatred in a few years. But where practical, we can save lives, as in Rwanda, and we can offer conflicted societies a breathing space in which to sort out their own affairs. Whether or not they do so must, in the end, be their own responsibility.

These explosions within states are also exacerbated by the so-called transnational problems -- mass migration and refugees; the population explosion; an endangered environment; a nefarious nexus of crime, terrorism and weapons of mass destruction -- whose dimensions have been more clearly exposed by the end of the Cold War.

Several times in recent weeks, police seized nuclear materials smuggled into Germany from Russia. We should be thankful that cooperation among various intelligence services -- including our own -- allowed police to intercept this deadly cargo. But we should also be concerned. The amount of plutonium needed to make a bomb is no bigger than a can of Coke. So we have greatly enhanced our intelligence sharing with allies and through Interpol, increased regular consultations, and engaged in joint anti-terrorist training. Most recently, in July, FBI director Louis Freeh visited several Eastern European countries and Russia, where he stressed the risks of nuclear proliferation through the efforts of organized crime and proposed new cooperative initiatives in response.

We must also contend with regional rogue states like Iran, Iraq and Libya who seek to develop and traffic in the weapons of mass destruction, who support terrorism, who are no less dedicated to the destruction of the tolerant society than were the defeated leaders of fascism and communism. For that reason, President Clinton is determined to maintain and modernize the finest military in the world so we can deter aggression -- and counter it when the need arises.

Because we must fight on so many fronts at once, we will only make progress over time, in small victories, not only through the exercise of our power but also through patience, persistence and pragmatism. These are not evidence of indecision: they are the hallmarks of determination.
In the end, choice, not chance, determines destiny. After World War I, we chose withdrawal, leaving a vacuum that was filled by the forces of hatred and tyranny. After World War II, we chose engagement, creating the institutions that guaranteed 50 years of freedom and prosperity.

Today, at this century’s third major turning point, the Clinton Administration has chosen. Rather than throw up our hands in despair at the complexities of the post-Cold War era, we have thrown ourselves with determination into the long struggle for democracy and the order it brings.

In so doing, we take up the challenge previous generations met so well. Inspired by their example, aware of the responsibility they left, we are helping to create a world where tolerance, freedom and democracy prevail.
The Purpose of American Power

By Anthony Lake*

To many Americans, the predictable divisions of the Cold War have given way to a confusing tangle of problems that prevent us from setting clearly defined goals for our foreign policy. These include "traditional" aggression by regional bullies; transnational dangers like over-population and refugees; a global economic and information free-for-all that produces fear and uncertainty; and terrible ethnic conflicts.

Beneath the surface, however, there is an enduring truth about this new world. The same idea that was under attack by fascism and then by communism remains under attack today. Now, as then, we are defending an idea that comes under many names -- democracy, liberty, civility, pluralism -- but has a constant face. It is the face of the tolerant society, in which leaders and governments exist not to use or abuse people, but to provide them with freedom and opportunity.

Far from reaching the end of history, we are at the start of a new stage in this old struggle. This is not a clash of civilizations. Rather, it is a contest that pits nations and individuals guided by openness, responsive government and moderation against those animated by isolation, repression and extremism. The enemies of the tolerant society are not some nameless, faceless force. They are extreme nationalists and tribalists, terrorists, organized criminals, coup plotters, rogue states and all those who would return newly free societies to the intolerant ways of the past.

For all its dangers, this new world presents immense opportunities -- the chance to reshape and create international structures that are adapted to post-Cold War realities, and specifically designed to consolidate the victory of democracy and open markets.

We are not starry eyed about the prospects for spreading democracy. But we know that enlarging the community of democracies serves our interests. Democracies create free markets that offer economic opportunity and they make for more reliable trading partners. They tend not to abuse their citizens' rights. And democracies are far less likely to wage war on one another.
The Clinton Administration has made a good start at building the security and economic institutions for the next century. In Europe, for example, we are deeply engaged in transforming NATO to fulfill President Clinton's vision of an integrated continent. We have taken the lead in establishing Combined Joint Task Forces for peacekeeping and crisis management, and the Partnership for Peace to begin the process of expanding security in Europe eastward.

The new global economy requires that we design structures that produce tangible benefits for our citizens and turn their fears into hope. That is why President Clinton went to the mat for NAFTA, which has dramatically accelerated the exchange of goods and ideas between the United States, Mexico and Canada. That is why he hosted the first ever gathering of the Organization for Asian-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) leaders and helped to set a pro-trade agenda within the fast growing Asian-Pacific economies. And that is why our successful completion of the GATT world trade talks was so important -- it promises to make a real difference in real lives by creating jobs and raising wages.

The challenges we face also demand the patient application of diplomacy and the measured exercise of power.

We use diplomacy to pursue peace. But peace is not just an end in itself. It also creates conditions necessary for democracy to thrive. Thus, when we support and foster peace in the Middle East or Northern Ireland or South Africa, we are promoting the tolerant society as well.

Effective diplomacy depends not only on the skill of our diplomats, but also on the power that lies behind it.

Nothing better demonstrates this proposition than our approach to Haiti. There, we have relied on diplomacy backed by power -- the real threat of the use of force. The Cedras regime only agreed to step down because of the credible and imminent prospect of a massive U.S.-led invasion. As a result, we are living toward a goal that this Administration -- and its predecessor -- have pursued for three years: the restoration of democratic government to Haiti. And we are doing so peacefully, with less risk to our troops -- whose presence will guarantee that the Haitian military keeps its word.
It cannot and must not be the responsibility of the international community or this nation finally to resolve all deeply-rooted conflicts. But where practical, we can save lives, as in Rwanda, and we can offer conflicted societies a breathing space in which to sort out their own affairs. Whether or not they do so must, ultimately, be their own responsibility.

These explosions within states are also exacerbated by the so-called transnational problems -- refugees, population growth, an endangered environment, a nefarious nexus of crime, terrorism and weapons of mass destruction -- whose dimensions have been more clearly exposed by the end of the Cold War.

Several times in recent weeks, police seized nuclear materials smuggled through Europe. We should be thankful that cooperation among intelligence services allowed police to intercept this deadly cargo. Now we must turn our energy toward securing nuclear materials at their source, improving our intelligence sharing with allies, and engaging in joint anti-terrorist training.

We must also contend with regional rogue states like Iran, Iraq and Libya who seek to develop and traffic in the weapons of mass destruction, who support terrorism, who are no less dedicated to the destruction of the tolerant society than were the defeated leaders of fascism and communism. For that reason, President Clinton is determined to maintain and modernize the finest military in the world so we can deter aggression -- and counter it when the need arises.

Because we must fight on so many fronts at once, we will only make progress over time, in small victories, through patience, persistence and pragmatism. These are not evidence of indecision: they are the hallmarks of determination -- of a nation engaged in the long struggle for democracy and the freedom and tolerance it brings.
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The Purpose of American Power

By Anthony Lake*

To many Americans, the predictable divisions of the Cold War have given way to a confusing tangle of problems that prevent us from setting clearly defined goals for our foreign policy. These include "traditional" aggression by regional bullies; transnational dangers like over-population and refugees; a global economic and information free-for-all that produces fear and uncertainty; and terrible ethnic conflicts.

Beneath the surface, however, there is an enduring truth about this new world. The same idea that was under attack by fascism and then by communism remains under attack today. Now, as then, we are defending an idea that comes under many names -- democracy, liberty, civility, pluralism -- but has a constant face. It is the face of the tolerant society, in which leaders and governments exist not to use or abuse people, but to provide them with freedom and opportunity.

Far from reaching the end of history, we are at the start of a new stage in this old struggle. This is not a clash of civilizations. Rather, it is a contest that pits nations and individuals guided by openness, responsive government and moderation against those animated by isolation, repression and extremism. The enemies of the tolerant society are not some nameless, faceless force. They are extreme nationalists and tribalists, terrorists, organized criminals, coup plotters, rogue states and all those who would return newly free societies to the intolerant ways of the past.

For all its dangers, this new world presents immense opportunities -- the chance to reshape and create international structures that are adapted to post-Cold War realities, and specifically designed to consolidate the victory of democracy and open markets.

We are not starry eyed about the prospects for spreading democracy. But we know that enlarging the community of democracies serves our interests. Democracies create free markets that offer economic opportunity and they make for more reliable trading partners. They tend not to abuse their citizens' rights. And democracies are far less likely to wage war on one another.
The Clinton Administration has made a good start at building the security and economic institutions for the next century. In Europe, for example, we are deeply engaged in transforming NATO to fulfill President Clinton’s vision of an integrated continent. We have taken the lead in establishing Combined Joint Task Forces for peacekeeping and crisis management, and the Partnership for Peace to begin the process of expanding security in Europe eastward.

The new global economy requires that we design structures that produce tangible benefits for our citizens and turn their fears into hope. That is why President Clinton went to the mat for NAFTA, which has dramatically accelerated the exchange of goods and ideas between the United States, Mexico and Canada. That is why he hosted the first ever gathering of the Organization for Asian-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) leaders and helped to set a pro-trade agenda within the fast growing Asian-Pacific economies. And that is why our successful completion of the GATT world trade talks was so important -- it promises to make a real difference in real lives by creating jobs and raising wages.

The challenges we face also demand the patient application of diplomacy and the measured exercise of power.

We use diplomacy to pursue peace. But peace is not just an end in itself. It also creates conditions necessary for democracy to thrive. Thus, when we support and foster peace in the Middle East or Northern Ireland or South Africa, we are promoting the tolerant society as well.

Effective diplomacy depends not only on the skill of our diplomats, but also on power.

Nothing better demonstrates this proposition than our approach to Haiti. There, we have relied on diplomacy backed by power -- the real threat of the use of force. The Cedras regime only agreed to step down because of the credible and imminent prospect of a massive U.S.-led invasion. As a result, we are moving toward a goal that this Administration -- and its predecessor -- have pursued for three years: the restoration of democratic government to Haiti. And we are doing so peacefully, with less risk to our troops -- whose presence will guarantee that the Haitian military keeps its word.

The progress we have made in Bosnia came when power was tied to diplomacy. The Sarajevo ultimatum succeeded because the threat of NATO air power was judged real. The
ultimatum also sparked the agreement on a federation between the Croatians and Muslims. And it was the threat of further action by NATO, combined with the effect of our sanctions, that led Serbia to close its border with the Bosnian Serbs when they rejected the recent peace plan.

It cannot and must not be the responsibility of the international community or this nation finally to resolve all deeply-rooted conflicts. But where practical, we can save lives, as in Rwanda, and we can offer conflicted societies a breathing space in which to sort out their own affairs. Whether or not they do so must, ultimately, be their own responsibility.

These explosions within states are also exacerbated by transnational problems -- refugees, population growth, an endangered environment, a nefarious nexus of crime, terrorism and weapons of mass destruction -- whose dimensions have been more clearly exposed by the end of the Cold War.

Several times in recent weeks, police seized nuclear materials smuggled through Europe. Cooperation among intelligence services helped police intercept this deadly cargo. Now we must turn our energy toward securing nuclear materials at their source, improving our intelligence sharing with allies, and conducting joint anti-terrorist training.

We must also contend with regional rogue states like Iran, Iraq and Libya who seek to traffic in the weapons of mass destruction, who support terrorism, who are no less dedicated to the destruction of the tolerant society than were the defeated leaders of fascism and communism. For that reason, President Clinton is determined to maintain and modernize the finest military in the world so we can deter aggression -- and counter it when the need arises.

Because we must fight on so many fronts at once, we will only make progress over time, in small victories, through patience, persistence and pragmatism. These are not evidence of indecision: they are the hallmarks of determination -- of a nation engaged in the long struggle for democracy and the freedom and tolerance it brings.
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To many Americans, the predictable divisions of the Cold War have given way to a confusing tangle of problems that prevent us from setting clearly defined goals for our foreign policy. These include "traditional" aggression by regional bullies; transnational dangers like over-population and refugees; a global economic and information free-for-all that produces fear and uncertainty; and terrible ethnic conflicts.

Beneath the surface, however, there is an enduring truth about this new world. The same idea that was under attack by fascism and then by communism remains under attack today. Now, as then, we are defending an idea that comes under many names — democracy, liberty, civility, pluralism — but has a constant face. It is the face of the tolerant society, in which leaders and governments exist not to use or abuse people, but to provide them with freedom and opportunity.

Far from reaching the end of history, we are at the start of a new stage in this old struggle. This is not a clash of civilizations. Rather, it is a contest that pits nations and individuals guided by openness, responsive government and moderation against those animated by isolation, repression and extremism. The enemies of the tolerant society are not some nameless, faceless force. They are extreme nationalists and tribalists, terrorists, organized criminals, coup plotters, rogue states and all those who would return newly free societies to the intolerant ways of the past.

For all its dangers, this new world presents immense opportunities — the chance to reshape and create international structures that are adapted to post-Cold War realities, and specifically designed to consolidate the victory of democracy and open markets.

We are not starry eyed about the prospects for spreading democracy. But we know that enlarging the community of democracies serves our interests. Democracies create free markets that offer economic opportunity and they make for more reliable trading partners. They tend not to abuse their citizens' rights. And democracies are far less likely to wage war on one another.
The Clinton Administration has made a good start at building the security and economic institutions for the next century. In Europe, for example, we are deeply engaged in transforming NATO to fulfill President Clinton's vision of an integrated continent. We have taken the lead in establishing Combined Joint Task Forces for peacekeeping and crisis management, and the Partnership for Peace to begin the process of expanding security in Europe eastward.

The new global economy requires that we design structures that produce tangible benefits for our citizens and turn their fears into hope. That is why President Clinton went to the mat for NAFTA, which has dramatically accelerated the exchange of goods and ideas between the United States, Mexico and Canada. That is why he hosted the first ever gathering of the Organization for Asian-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) leaders and helped to set a pro-trade agenda within the fast growing Asian-Pacific economies. And that is why our successful completion of the GATT world trade talks was so important -- it promises to make a real difference in real lives by creating jobs and raising wages.

The challenges we face also demand the patient application of diplomacy and the measured exercise of power.

We use diplomacy to pursue peace. But peace is not just an end in itself. It also creates conditions necessary for democracy to thrive. Thus, when we support and foster peace in the Middle East or Northern Ireland or South Africa, we are promoting the tolerant society as well: Effective diplomacy depends not only on the skill of our diplomats, but also on power.

Nothing better demonstrates this proposition than our approach to Haiti. There, we have relied on diplomacy backed by power -- the real threat of the use of force. The Cedras regime only agreed to step down because of the credible and imminent prospect of a massive U.S.-led invasion. As a result, we are moving toward a goal that this Administration -- and its predecessor -- have pursued for three years: the restoration of democratic government to Haiti. And we are doing so peacefully, with less risk to our troops -- whose presence will guarantee that the Haitian military keeps its word.

The progress we have made in Bosnia came when power was tied to diplomacy. The Sarajevo ultimatum succeeded because the threat of NATO air power was judged real. The
ultimatum also sparked the agreement on a federation between the Croats and Muslims. And it was the threat of further action by NATO, combined with the effect of our sanctions, that led Serbia to close its border with the Bosnian Serbs when they rejected the recent peace plan.

It cannot and must not be the responsibility of the international community or this nation finally to resolve all deeply-rooted conflicts. But where practical, we can save lives, as in Rwanda, and we can offer conflicted societies a breathing space in which to sort out their own affairs. Whether or not they do so must, ultimately, be their own responsibility.

These explosions within states are also exacerbated by transnational problems — refugees, population growth, an endangered environment; a nefarious nexus of crime, terrorism and weapons of mass destruction — whose dimensions have been more clearly exposed by the end of the Cold War.

Several times in recent weeks, police seized nuclear materials smuggled through Europe. Cooperation among intelligence services helped police intercept this deadly cargo. Now we must turn our energy toward securing nuclear materials at their source, improving our intelligence sharing with allies, and conducting joint anti-terrorist training.

We must also contend with regional rogue states like Iran, Iraq and Libya who seek to traffic in the weapons of mass destruction, who support terrorism, who are no less dedicated to the destruction of the tolerant society than were the defeated leaders of fascism and communism. For that reason, President Clinton is determined to maintain and modernize the finest military in the world so we can deter aggression — and counter it when the need arises.

Because we must fight on so many fronts at once, we will only make progress over time, in small victories, through patience, persistence and pragmatism. These are not evidence of indecision: they are the hallmarks of determination — of a nation engaged in the long struggle for democracy and the freedom and tolerance it brings.
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September 20, 1994 - 10 p.m.

To:      Tony Lake
From:    Tony Blinken

Tara informs me that the companion piece to your op/ed will take us to task on Bosnia. She suggested inserting a graf to lessen the blow. I've done so. If you want to do more, please keep in mind that the Times is serious about enforcing a "No Write Zone" beyond 1000 words, and we are at about 1080 (which we can get away with).
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To many Americans, the predictable divisions of the Cold War have given way to a confusing tangle of problems that prevent us from setting clearly defined goals for our foreign policy. These include "traditional" aggression by regional bullies; transnational dangers like over-population and refugees; a global economic and information free-for-all that produces fear and uncertainty; and terrible ethnic conflicts.

Beneath the surface, however, there is an enduring truth about this new world. The same idea that was under attack by fascism and then by communism remains under attack today. Now, as then, we are defending an idea that comes under many names -- democracy, liberty, civility, pluralism -- but has a constant face. It is the face of the tolerant society, in which leaders and governments exist not to use or abuse people, but to provide them with freedom and opportunity.

Far from reaching the end of history, we are at the start of a new stage in this old struggle. This is not a clash of civilizations. Rather, it is a contest that pits nations and individuals guided by openness, responsive government and moderation against those animated by isolation, repression and extremism. The enemies of the tolerant society are not some nameless, faceless force. They are extreme nationalists and tribalists, terrorists, organized criminals, coup plotters, rogue states and all those who would return newly free societies to the intolerant ways of the past.

For all its dangers, this new world presents immense opportunities -- the chance to reshape and create international structures that are adapted to post-Cold War realities, and specifically designed to consolidate the victory of democracy and open markets.

We are not starry eyed about the prospects for spreading democracy. But we know that enlarging the community of democracies serves our interests. Democracies create free markets that offer economic opportunity and they make for more reliable trading partners. They tend not to abuse their citizens' rights. And democracies are far less likely to wage war on one another.
The Clinton Administration has made a good start at building the security and economic institutions for the next century. In Europe, for example, we are deeply engaged in transforming NATO to fulfill President Clinton’s vision of an integrated continent. We have taken the lead in establishing Combined Joint Task Forces for peacekeeping and crisis management, and the Partnership for Peace to begin the process of expanding security in Europe eastward.

The new global economy requires that we design structures that produce tangible benefits for our citizens and turn their fears into hope. That is why President Clinton went to the mat for NAFTA, which has dramatically accelerated the exchange of goods and ideas between the United States, Mexico and Canada. That is why he hosted the first ever gathering of the Organization for Asian-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) leaders and helped to set a pro-trade agenda within the fast growing Asian-Pacific economies. And that is why our successful completion of the GATT world trade talks was so important — it promises to make a real difference in real lives by creating jobs and raising wages.

The challenges we face also demand the patient application of diplomacy and the measured exercise of power.

We use diplomacy to pursue peace. But peace is not just an end in itself. It also creates conditions necessary for democracy to thrive. Thus, when we support and foster peace in the Middle East or Northern Ireland or South Africa, we are promoting the tolerant society as well.

Effective diplomacy depends not only on the skill of our diplomats, but also on the power that lies behind it.

Nothing better demonstrates this proposition than our approach to Haiti. There, we have relied on diplomacy backed by power — the real threat of the use of force. The Cedras regime only agreed to step down because of the credible and imminent prospect of a massive U.S.-led invasion. As a result, we are moving toward a goal that this Administration — and its predecessor — have pursued for three years: the restoration of democratic government to Haiti. And we are doing so peacefully, with less risk to our troops — whose presence will guarantee that the Haitian military keeps its word.
It cannot and must not be the responsibility of the international community or this nation finally to resolve all deeply-rooted conflicts. But where practical, we can save lives, as in Rwanda, and we can offer conflicted societies a breathing space in which to sort out their own affairs. Whether or not they do so must, ultimately, be their own responsibility.

These explosions within states are also exacerbated by the so-called transnational problems -- refugees; population growth; an endangered environment; a nefarious nexus of crime, terrorism and weapons of mass destruction -- whose dimensions have been more clearly exposed by the end of the Cold War.

Several times in recent weeks, police seized nuclear materials smuggled through Europe. We should be thankful that cooperation among intelligence services allowed police to intercept this deadly cargo. Now we must turn our energy toward securing nuclear materials at their source, improving our intelligence sharing with allies, and engaging in joint anti-terrorist training.

We must also contend with regional rogue states like Iran, Iraq and Libya who seek to develop and traffic in the weapons of mass destruction, who support terrorism, who are no less dedicated to the destruction of the tolerant society than were the defeated leaders of fascism and communism. For that reason, President Clinton is determined to maintain and modernize the finest military in the world so we can deter aggression -- and counter it when the need arises.

Because we must fight on so many fronts at once, we will only make progress over time, in small victories, through patience, persistence and pragmatism. These are not evidence of indecision: they are the hallmarks of determination -- of a nation engaged in the long struggle for democracy and the freedom and tolerance it brings.

* Mr. Lake is Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs. This article is adapted from remarks he delivered to the Council on Foreign Relations on September 12, 1994.
September 22, 1994 - 2:30 p.m.

To: Tony Lake
From: Tony Blinken

The Times is enthusiastic about the piece and wants very much to run it on Saturday. Their page layout requires that we cut 12 lines from the typeset draft, which I attach.

I have cut the 12 lines by tightening the APEC sentence on page 2 and by deleting the crime-smuggling-nukes graf on page 4. I don't think the latter is much of a loss, because you at least raise the issue in the preceding graf.

If you have other cuts instead, or if you prefer to kill the piece, please let me know. But I think it reads well, and that we should go with these minor cuts.
Anthony Lake is President Clinton's national security adviser. This article is adapted from remarks to the Council on Foreign Relations on Sept. 12.

To many Americans, the Cold War divisions have given way to a confusing tangle of problems that prevent us from setting clearly defined goals for our foreign policy. These problems include aggression by regional bullies, transnational dangers like overpopulation and refugees, a global economic and information free-for all that produces fear and uncertainty, and terrible ethnic conflicts.

Beneath the surface, however, there is an enduring truth about this new world. The same idea attacked by Fascism and Communism remains under attack today. Now, as then, we are defending an idea that comes under many names — democracy, liberty, civility, pluralism — but has a constant face. It is the face of the tolerant society, in which leaders and governments exist not to use or abuse people but to provide them with freedom and opportunity.

We are at the start of a new stage in this old struggle. This is not a clash of civilizations. Rather, it is a contest that pits nations and individuals guided by openness, responsive government and moderation against those animated by isolation, repression and extremism. The enemies of the tolerant society are not some nameless, faceless force. They are extreme nationalists and tribalists, terrorists, organized criminals, coup plotters, rogue states and all those who would return newly free societies to the intolerant ways of the past.
For all its dangers, this new world presents immense opportunities to reshape and create international structures that are adapted to post-cold-war realities and designed to consolidate the victory of democracy and open markets.

We are not starry-eyed about the prospects for spreading democracy, but we know that to do so serves our interests. Democracies create free markets that offer economic opportunity, and they make for reliable trading partners. They tend not to abuse their citizens' rights or wage war on one another.

The Administration has made a good start at building security and economic institutions designed to create the conditions in which democracy can flourish. In Europe, we are deeply engaged in transforming NATO to fulfill President Clinton's vision of an integrated continent by establishing Combined Joint Task Forces for peacekeeping and crisis management and the Partnership for Peace to begin expanding security in Europe eastward.

The new global economy requires that we design structures that produce tangible benefits for our citizens and turn their fears into hope. That is why President Clinton went to the mat for the North American Free Trade Agreement, which has dramatically accelerated the exchange of goods and ideas between the United States, Mexico and Canada. That is why he was host at the first gathering of the Organization for Asian-Pacific Economic Co-operation leaders and helped to set a pro-trade agenda in the fast growing Asian-Pacific economies. And that is why our successful completion of the GATT world trade talks was so important: it promises to make a real
difference in real lives by creating jobs and raising wages.

The challenges we face also demand the patient application of diplomacy and the measured exercise of power. We use diplomacy to pursue peace. But peace is not just an end in itself. It also creates conditions necessary for democratic values to thrive. Thus, when we foster peace in the Middle East, Northern Ireland and South Africa we are promoting the tolerant society as well.

Effective diplomacy depends not only on the skill of our diplomats but also on power. Nothing better demonstrates this proposition than our approach to Haiti. There we have relied on diplomacy backed by power - the threat of the use of force. The regime agreed to step down because of the credible and imminent prospect of a massive U.S.-led invasion. As a result, we are accomplishing a goal that this Administration - and its predecessor - have pursued for three years: the restoration of democratic Government. And we are doing so peacefully, with less risk to our troops - whose presence will guarantee that the Haitian military keeps its word.

The progress we have made in Bosnia came when power was tied to diplomacy. The Sarajevo ultimatum succeeded because the threat of NATO air power was judged real. The ultimatum also sparked the agreement on a federation between the Croats and Muslims. And it was the threat of further action by NATO, combined with our sanctions, that lead Serbia to close its border with the Bosnian Serbs when they rejected the recent peace plan. Now, we are firmly committed to increasing the pressure on the Bosnian
Serbs to accept the plan, partly by enforcement of the ban on heavy weapons around Sarajevo and Gorazde.

It cannot and must not be the responsibility of the international community or this nation finally to resolve all deeply rooted conflicts. But where practical, we can save lives, as in Rwanda and Somalia, and we can offer conflicting societies a breathing space in which to sort out their own affairs. Whether or not they do so must be their own responsibility.

These explosions in states are also exacerbated by transnational problems—refugees; population growth; an endangered environment; a nefarious nexus of crime, terrorism and the weapons of mass destruction—whose dimensions have been clearly exposed by the end of the cold war.

Several times in recent weeks, police seized nuclear materials smuggled through Europe. Cooperation among intelligence services helped police intercept this deadly cargo. Now we must turn our energy toward securing nuclear materials at their sources, and proving our intelligence-sharing with allies, and conducting joint anti-terrorism training.

We must also contend with regional rogue states like Iran, Iraq and Libya, which seek to traffic in the weapons of mass destruction, support terrorism and are dedicated to the destruction of the tolerant society.

For that reason, President Clinton will maintain and modernize the finest military in the world so that we can deter aggression — and counter it when the need arises. We also have developed a strategy of dual containment of Iraq and Iran. And we will...
uphold our commitment to South Korea even as we negotiate a solution to the nuclear issue with the North. Because we must fight on so many fronts at once, we will make progress only over time, in small victories, through persistence and pragmatism. These are not evidence of indecision; they are the hallmarks of determination, of a nation engaged in the long struggle for democracy and the freedom and tolerance it brings. <ws>[OBX]

(END)
The Reach of Democracy

Tying Power To Diplomacy

By Anthony Lake

WASHINGTON

To many Americans, the so-called divisions have given way to a confusing tangle of problems that prevent us from setting clearly defined goals and policies. The problems include aggression by regional bullies, transnational dangers like overpopulation and refugees, a global economic and the instability free-for-all that breeds fear and uncertainty, and terrible ethnic conflicts.

Beneath the surface, however, there is an enduring truth about this new world. The threat remains, but it is no longer by Fascism and Communism. It remains under attack today. Now, as then, we are defending an idea that comes under many names—democracy, civil society, but also a lingering belief in the power of the individual.

The challenges we face today demand an appreciation of diplomacy and the measures of power. It is not about diplomacy. It is about power and the open exercise of liberty. And it is about the responsibility of the international community.

The new enemies, new opportunities.

The progress we have made in Bosnia came when power was tied to diplomacy. The Sarajevo ultimatum succeeded because the threat of NATO air power was judged real. The ultimatum also marked the agreement on a federation between the Iranians and Russians. And it was the threat of further action by NATO, combined with our sanctions, that led Serbia to close its border with the Bosnian Serbs when they rejected the recent peace plan. Now, we are firmly committed to increasing the pressure on the Bosnian Serbs to accept the plan, partly by enforcement of the ban on heavy weapons, but also by negotiations and peace talks.

It cannot and must not be the responsibility of the international community or this nation finally to resolve all deeply rooted conflicts. But we can do so, and it is time to begin.

Anthony Lake is President Clinton's national security adviser. This article is adapted from remarks to the Council on Foreign Relations on Sept. 12.
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By Anthony Lake

WASHINGTON

To many Americans, the new divisions have given way to a confusing tangle of problems that prevent us from setting clearly defined goals for our foreign policy. These problems include aggression by regional bullies, transnational dangers like overpopulation and refugees, a global economic and information order that produces fear and uncertainty, and terrible ethnic conflicts.

Beneath the surface, however, there is an enduring truth about this new world. The Cold War ended by Fascism and Communism remains under attack today. Now, as then, we are defending an idea that comes under many names — democracy, liberty, freedom, pluralism — but has a constant face. It is the face of the tolerant society, in which leaders and governments exist not to use or abuse people but to provide them with freedom and autonomy.

We are at the start of a new stage in this old struggle. This is not a clash of civilizations. Rather, it is a contest that pits nations and individuals guided by openness, responsiveness, government and moderation against those animated by isolation, repression and extremism. The enemies of the tolerant society are not some nameless, faceless force. They are nations, nationalists and tribalists, terrorists, organized criminals, coup plotters, rogue states and all those who would reassert the cold war and the intolerant ways of the past.

For all its dangers, this new world presents immense opportunities to reshape and create international structures that are adapted to post-cold-war realities and designed to consolidate the victory of democracy and open markets.

We are not starry-eyed about the process of spreading democracy, but we know that to do so serves our interests. Democracies create free markets that offer economic opportunity, and they make for reliable trading partners. They tend not to abuse their citizens' rights or wage war on one another.

The Administration has made a good start at building security and economic institutions that are adapted to post-cold-war realities and designed to create the conditions in which democracy can flourish. In Europe, we are deeply engaged in transforming NATO to fulfill President Clinton's vision of an integrated continent by creating the conditions in which democracy can flourish. In Europe, we are deeply engaged in transforming NATO to fulfill President Clinton's vision of an integrated continent by creating the conditions in which democracy can flourish.

For that reason, President Clinton will maintain and modernize the finest military in the world so that we can deter aggression and counter it when the need arises. We have also developed a strategy of dual containment of Iraq and Iran. And we will uphold our commitment to South Korea even as we negotiate a solution to the nuclear issue with the North. Because we must fight on so many fronts at once, we will also contend with regional rogue states like Iran, Iraq and Libya, which seek to traffic in the weapons of mass destruction, support terrorism and are dedicated to the destruction of the tolerant society.

For that reason, President Clinton will maintain and modernize the finest military in the world so that we can deter aggression and counter it when the need arises. We have also developed a strategy of dual containment of Iraq and Iran. And we will uphold our commitment to South Korea even as we negotiate a solution to the nuclear issue with the North. Because we must fight on so many fronts at once, we will also contend with regional rogue states like Iran, Iraq and Libya, which seek to traffic in the weapons of mass destruction, support terrorism and are dedicated to the destruction of the tolerant society.

Our strategies are being tried in the Balkans, where the promise of democracy in a reignited Europe now requires us to face up to the problem of refugees, a mass of people who have been cast adrift like the seas of history by the breakdown of Yugoslavia and its neighbors.

The progress we have made in Bosnia came when power was tied to diplomacy. The Sarajevo ultimatum succeeded because the threat of NATO air power was judged real. The ultimatum also sparked the agreement on a federation between the Croatians and Muslims. And it was the threat of further action by NATO, combined with our sanctions, that led Serbia to close its border with the Bosnian Serbs when they rejected the recent peace plan. Now, we are firmly committed to increasing the pressure on the Bosnian Serbs to accept the plan, partly by enforcement of the ban on heavy weapons around Sarajevo and Gorazde.

It cannot and must not be the responsibility of the international community or any nation finally to resolve all deeply rooted conflicts. But where practical, we can take steps, as in Rwanda and Somalia, and we can offer conflicting societies a breathing space in which to sort out their own affairs. Whether or not they do so must be their own responsibility.

These explosions in states are also exacerbated by transnational problems — refugees, population growth, an endangered environment, a nefarious nexus of crime, terrorism and the weapons of mass destruction — whose dimensions have been clearly exposed by the end of the cold war and whose challenge we must meet.

We must also contend with regional rogue states like Iran, Iraq and Libya, which seek to traffic in the weapons of mass destruction, support terrorism and are dedicated to the destruction of the tolerant society.

Anthony Lake is President Clinton's national security adviser. This article is adapted from remarks to the Council on Foreign Relations on Sept. 12.