

UNOFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT FULL 90 MINUTES

AMERICA ABROAD MEDIA

"THE NEXT PRESIDENT: A WORLD OF  
CHALLENGES"

TAPED MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2008

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY,

LISNER AUDITORIUM

MODERATORS: FRANK SESNO AND CHRISTIANE

AMANPOUR

INTERVIEWEES: HENRY KISSINGER, MADELEINE

ALBRIGHT, WARREN CHRISTOPHER, JAMES BAKER,

COLIN POWELL

FRANK SESNO:

00:00:03:00 And welcome to the Lisner  
Auditorium on the campus of the George  
Washington University in the heart of  
Washington, DC. Thanks for joining us.  
I'm Frank Sesno.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

00:00:16:00 And I'm Christiane Amanpour.  
The next President of the United States  
will inherit a very troubled world, with  
the US fighting two wars, facing a  
global economic crisis, and rising  
powers to the east.

FRANK SESNO:

00:00:30:00 There are opportunities of--  
too, of course, but many challenges. To  
look ahead to these challenges and now  
the next president must respond to the,  
we have an extraordinary group, as you  
can see. Five former Secretaries of  
State whose experience spans four  
decades.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

00:00:49:00 From detente with the  
Soviets to opening the door to China,  
from humanitarian interventions to full-  
scale war, and from trying to spread

democracy to defeating terrorism, these former secretaries have confronted it all.

FRANK SESNO:

00:00:57:00 So, joining us, Warren Christopher, who served in the first Clinton administration. Henry Kissinger, who served in the Nixon and Ford administrations, and Madeleine Albright, who served in the second Clinton administration as Secretary of State.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

00:01:07:00 And also, James Baker, who served the first President George Bush, and finally, General Colin Powell who served the second President George Bush. Thank you all for being here. And today, we're not looking for pat, party line talking points. We're sure we're not going to get any of that. What we really want is for candid, robust, meat and

potatoes advice for the next president,  
no matter who he might be. Our futures,  
your future, depends on it.

FRANK SESNO:

00:01:22:00 So, let's launch. And  
welcome to all of you, thank you for  
joining us. Okay, it's inauguration day,  
2009. You're all invited to the  
presidential ball. You pick one, and you  
go. And while you're there, the  
president brushes by you. And he says,  
"General Powell," to all of you, what's  
my biggest worry in the world. Besides  
the US Congress. (LAUGHTER) What do you  
tell him?

COLIN POWELL:

00:02:03:00 You've obviously never been  
to an inaugural ball. (LAUGHTER) I would  
say to the President that you'll be  
facing many challenges and there will be  
a lot of opportunities coming your way.

And one of the first things that you have to do as president is to start to restore a sense of confidence in the United States of America. Let all of our friends and allies around the world know that America is reaching out to them. We wanna hear them and we wanna listen to them. And that we wanna do everything we can to strengthen those relationships and the friendships that we have with our allies. And tell them we're gonna work in unison.

00:02:38:00 We always reserve the right to act when we feel we have to act in our own interest. But we understand the importance of allies and alliances. I would also communicate to the American people that we may have some difficulties in Afghanistan, Iraq, or wherever we might have difficulties in

January. But we're Americans. We should have confidence in ourself (SIC), confidence in our system, reach out to the rest of the world. And it would be important for the president to convey this message to the American people and to the rest of the world.

FRANK SESNO:

00:03:02:00 Secretary Albright, what would you say? My biggest worry in the world?

MADELINE ALBRIGHT:

00:03:06:00 Well, I think,-- first of all, I'd say, "Remember you wanted this job." (LAUGHTER) And that there are a tremendous number of challenges and opportunities. I do think-- I agree with Colin that it is very important to give the sense of confidence. But also, to understand that the issues that are out there are primarily the kind that can

only be solved in cooperation with other countries.

00:03:35:00 And therefore, the idea that you reach out to other countries has to be a different way of operating. I think that's gonna be one of the really important parts. And the American people need to understand that if you work with other countries, it's actually a sign of strength. And-- and I think that is a very important message.

FRANK SESNO:

00:03:57:00 Warren Christopher.

WARREN CHRISTOPHER:

00:03:58:00 Well, I agree with Colin. You know, the President will have a limited amount of time, the new president, whoever he is. And it has to be something he starts doing right away to get our friends around the world as

well as our adversaries to know that this is not "with us or against us" administration. But now we wanna try to incorporate them into the problem solving. So many of our transnational problems require countries getting along together, cooperating together. And so, I think that is project number one.

FRANK SESNO:

00:04:38:00 Do you point to one place-- do you point to one place in particular or one cluster of issues or problems in particular and say, "That's the one you have to watch most closely?"

WARREN CHRISTOPHER:

00:04:45:00 I think we have to deal with the two wars we're dealing with at the present time. They're draining our economy in an enormous way. I-- I found when I came into office that our economy was in some difficulty. The first year,

the President got through the deficit reduction act. They just improved things so much.

00:05:00:00 So, I think the President needs to begin to work on that to give the world confidence that we can manage our own economy, and thus, that we're a trusted partner.

FRANK SESNO:

00:05:07:00 Secretary Baker?

JAMES BAKER:

00:05:10:00 Well, (THROAT CLEARING) I think I might say that throughout most of our modern history, America has been respected by its allies and feared by its adversaries. We wanna make sure that that continues. And there are two things, I think, that the President ought to focus on in the very beginning. And the first is to structure his

national security apparatus. His, used to say, or hers, but now I would say his, in a way that-- that-- provides clear lines of authority and responsibility. So that it can work together as a team. And so that everybody is singing from the same sheet of music. That is extraordinarily important--

FRANK SESNO:

00:05:55:00 Is that a change? Are you suggesting that hasn't happening?

JAMES BAKER:

00:05:59:00 It-- it-- in some administrations it's been good, in some administrations it's been not so good. But it is really critical to the formulation and implementation of a solid foreign policy. The second thing I have to say is-- that we need to use all of the elements of national power when

we're formulating and implementing our foreign policy. Not just-- our military, but also our diplomacy, our political-- elements, the-- the force and strength of our ideas, the promotion of-- of free market democracy-- around the world.

And that means strengthening the elements of America's soft power.

FRANK SESNO:

00:06:24:00 Dr. Kissinger. Toughest problem?

HENRY KISSINGER:

00:06:29:00 I'd probably answer the question by saying the first thing you ought to do is to get your principle advisors together and see whether you can achieve a consensus on these issues: Where are we? What are we trying to do? Can we do it? And then, I would invite the rest of the world to-- come in. But one of the problems early in an

administration is a jockeying for position among various advisors who come in with strong opinions and then the president winds up in the position of adjudicating practical disputes that arise all the time.

FRANK SESNO:

00:07:17:00 Competition within the administration, imagine that. Right?

HENRY KISSINGER:

00:07:23:00 Well, competition, it's good. But it has to be resolved in-- to lead in a-- agreed direction.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

00:07:31:00 And what--

HENRY KISSINGER:

00:07:35:00 And-- and-- and then we can talk with conviction. To the rest of the world. I agree with what my colleagues have said about the importance of reaching out to the rest of the world.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

00:07:52:00 And the world is watching, as all of you know. This is not just the US election, but for many in the world, is it an election that will affect their futures, their destinies, as well. The United States' influence in the world is at a historic low. And in order to be able to act with colleagues and with-- allies, to be able to cooperate, there's going to be needing-- some changes. Let's have a look at where the US stands in the world right now.

00:08:28:00 (VIDEO)

00:09:17:00 So, what should the new American president do to regain America's respect around the world? Of course it's not a popularity contest. This is not just about being liked. It's being able to get America's business done. Here's an email question

that I want to read out. "America is at a crossroads," says Diana, from a viewer, "we have a stretched military and tarnished, if not destroyed, relationships with other powers in the world. Do you think," she asks, "that the bully attitude is possible, as American leaders move forward? What would enable America to gain respect?" Secretary Christopher can the United States continue to be the demander in the world?

Warren Christopher:

No, I think we have to take a much more cooperative attitude than we have been in the past, listening to other countries, recognizing our strength, but moving forward in a way that makes other countries feel like they like to be on our side, helping us.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

General Powell, it's not just about like is it? It's about being able to get things done. America is the strongest nation in the world, but a new intelligence report is going to tell the next president that America's dominance is not going to be as supreme as it was. So, what do you tell the next president about how to regain respect?

COLIN POWELL:

00:09:48:00 I think the elements of international power are changing. It isn't just the size or strength of the military. It's the size and strength of your economy. And we have to recognize that there are other nations in the world now whose economic strength is growing, and therefore, their political influence is growing. I don't know that we should be afraid of this or see that

as a threat to us.

00:09:58:00 Isn't this what we were working for all these many decades? We wanted them to rise up and join the international economic community, and that's what's happening. Now, there's no question about it, you just showed the statistics on the screen that we have lost a lot in terms of that favorable rating over the last ten years. I think Iraq is part of it, the Middle East peace process that we haven't been able to see progress, is part of it.

00:10:14:00 And there has been an impression created that America tends to act solely in a bully, unilateral way, to use your term. But we're working multilaterally to solve the Iranian problem, the North Korean problem. We

have worked with the world to increase funding for HIV/AIDS, we've doubled the amount of money we're putting into development assistance around the world.

00:10:30:00 So, I think the case can be made that-- we can build on that strength, and the new president with a different approach to things, with a different attitude to the rest of the world, can reverse this. I don't think it's as dire as those numbers suggest. Because those numbers were much higher just ten years ago. And I think they can go back up to being higher.

00:10:55:00 Because in every one of those countries that you had such a low number, if you go visit our embassy and consular office, you would find people lined up. And what do they want? A visa

to go to the United States of America.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

00:11:10:00 That's very true.

COLIN POWELL:

00:11:13:00 And so, we are still that open nation of immigrants. And we should not sell ourselves short. Our culture, our economic system, our educational system, our innovativeness, are still among the most powerful forces at work in today's world.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

00:11:27:00 And yet, as we said, even those embassies in the heart of Europe, the key ally, London, Britain, has a fortress now around it. What are three key points that the next president might have to do to regain at least America's image in the-- in the short term?

JAMES BAKER:

00:11:48:00 Well (THROAT CLEARING) as I

said earlier, one of the things I think is to-- is to understand the need to use all of the elements of national power. And-- and that means diplomacy and the political elements and the economic elements. And our-- and our principles and values. But look, I think that-- as we all know, a poll is nothing more than a snapshot. A picture of what conditions are at this-- at the present time. And-- and frankly, as Colin indicated, a lot of progress has been made just over the last year. In turning around-- attitudes, particularly among our former Western European allies, who were much more-- disaffected, let's say, eight or nine months ago, than they are today.

FRANK SESNO:

00:12:30:00 How about some-- how about some tangible things that the next administration, the next president can

do, to change policy or send a signal that will address these issues.

COLIN POWELL:

00:12:38:00 Close Guantanamo.

MADELINE ALBRIGHT:

00:12:37:00 Close Guantanamo.

JAMES BAKER:

00:12:41:00 Yeah, close Guantanamo. We - we were on a panel together several months ago, we all agree. One of the best things that could happen would be to close Guantanamo, which is a very serious blot upon our reputation.

MADELINE ALBRIGHT:

00:12:58:00 I think-- if I might say on these polls, I've followed the Pew Polls for quite a long time, and the numbers have not been good. They've improved slightly, in the last poll, but generally, there is a sense that the United States is on the wrong side of a

whole host of issues. And one of the issues is that there is a growing gap between the rich and the poor in the world. And there is the feeling that the United States is contributing to that gap.

00:13:28:00 And since dealing with that division is something that I think is a major issue here, because we know that the haves and the have-nots argue with each other, I think that we have to do what Colin was saying in terms of-- helping on HIV/AIDS and what Jim was talking about in terms of using various elements of our power. The trick in this, and what's hard, is how to have confidence, and at the same time, have some humility.

00:14:05:00 And that's not easy, if

you're in office. And in terms of trying to speak to the American people about the importance of confidence and at the same time, saying, "We need your help, we can't do everything by ourselves."

And I think that's why how the next president immediately talks to the American people is gonna be very important and realize that when he's talking to the American people, he's also talking to a foreign audience.

FRANK SESNO:

Secretary Christopher?

WARREN CHRISTOPHER:

00:14:23:00 There are two specific things that I think ought to be done, and a president could do it quite promptly. First, is to outlaw torture in a meaningful way.

FRANK SESNO:

00:14:27:00 Outlaw torture.

WARREN CHRISTOPHER:

00:14:27:00 Outlaw torture. In the same way it's outlawed in our military. Have that extend to all agencies.

FRANK SESNO:

00:14:29:00 Water boarding, all of that business?

WARREN CHRISTOPHER:

00:14:32:00 Water boarding (UNINTEL).

FRANK SESNO:

00:14:33:00 Make a clear statement to the international community.

WARREN CHRISTOPHER:

00:14:32:00 Absolutely.

FRANK SESNO:

00:14:34:00 (UNINTEL) that.

WARREN CHRISTOPHER:

00:14:36:00 Right away. And second, I think that a new administration ought to take a forward-leaning position on climate change. We ought to be leaders

there rather than hanging back. You know, we've had a sort of dog in the manger position in the past. We haven't been willing to move until China moves. We haven't been willing to move until India moves. I think the United States needs to be in a position of leadership to do the next thing after Kyoto in a very meaningful, effective way. I think if we did those three things, Guantanamo, torture, and climate change, we'd be off to a very good start.

FRANK SESNO:

00:15:07:00 Did you want to jump in--  
Dr. Kissinger?

HENRY KISSINGER:

00:15:10:00 (THROAT CLEARING) I would--  
say-- actively-- I wouldn't tackle the  
issue in terms of a popularity poll  
around the world. I, of course, we have  
to be concerned about what these polls

show. But-- the thing we have to understand, first of all, is, as I said before, what is the world in which we live. How, and in what direction, can it be changed and should it be changed? Now that there's a host of issues which Warren mentioned and which others have mentioned, that require global cooperation.

00:15:46:00 Proliferation, climate, energy, and there, we can-- of course we should put forward-- and must put forward, forward-looking, comprehensive policies. There's a-- another set of issues that is affected by the conditions within the countries. Take the problem of American popularity in Europe. One of the changes that is taking place in Europe is the fact that the state which used to be the

repository of national loyalties, is--  
it's giving up its sovereignty to a  
larger unit. But that--

FRANK SESNO:

00:16:14:00 European union.

HENRY KISSINGER:

00:16:16:00 To the European Union. But  
Europe finds itself between its past,  
which it rejected (PH), and the future,  
which it hasn't yet reached. So that the  
European Union is more capable of acting  
on the basis of what we call soft power  
than on the basis of hard power.

00:17:05:00 America, in the nature of  
its possession, has had to be concerned,  
maybe excessively, but anyway, has had  
to be concerned with global security,  
which it is very difficult for Europeans  
to ask their people to make sacrifices  
for. So-- we have to understand that not

everything that affects public opinion in the world is necessarily-- our fault. We would become totally paranoid.

JAMES BAKER:

00:17:46:00 Right. Can I just (THROAT CLEARING) jump in here one minute and say I really support what Chris said about climate change. And I support it because we were in office when Kyoto first came down the pike. We thought it was a bad treaty for the United States. I still think that. So, we didn't sign it. But America is gonna have to lead the effort to get a global climate change treaty. It's a global problem, it's gonna have to be solved globally. We are gonna have to bring all these other countries in. They can't be excluded, China, India and others, but only America is gonna be able to lead that charge.

FRANK SESNO:

00:18:10:00 Secretary Baker, you just were talking about climate change and you've experienced a little climate yourself in Houston with the hurricane that came through.

JAMES BAKER:

Indeed.

FRANK SESNO:

How's your-- damage in your own home? Are you o.k.?

JAMES BAKER:

Yeah, well-- we have a little damage. But we're insured Frank.

FRANK SESNO:

Whatever that means anymore. And speaking of--

JAMES BAKER:

You know a good lawyer?

FRANK SESNO:

Do I know a good

insurance company? So you, you--  
experienced a hurricane in Houston but  
we've got a hurricane going up on Wall  
Street. You were Treasury Secretary.  
Bear Stearns, Lehman Brothers, Freddie  
Mac, Fannie Mae. You've got one after  
the other here. What is happening and  
what does this mean for this next  
president and the relative strength,  
economic strength and the strength as a  
- financial capital of the world of the  
United States of America?

JAMES BAKER:

So much of America's  
strength derives from its economy. The  
world's largest economy, the most  
successful economy through the years, we  
represent today, even with these  
problems, 25 percent of total GNP around  
the world. But this is a really serious  
problem and I'm not sure we've seen

anything like this-- in our history or at least not in the last one hundred years.

FRANK SESNO:

What does it mean? Where is going?

JAMES BAKER:

Perhaps, perhaps not--

FRANK SESNO:

If you were Treasury Secretary today what would you be doing?

JAMES BAKER:

We don't know. We don't know--

I think I would be doing exactly what the Treasury Secretary today is doing and that is not bailing out anymore Wall Street investment, banks, and putting the burden on the tax payers. I think we had to bail out Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae, because the

consequences of their failure would have been so dramatic and so systemic, it might have really impacted the economy in an extraordinarily harsh way. We're gonna have to find our way through this-- you know for many years we used to lecture the Japanese about the solvency of their banks and the problems in the banks and we used to say, "You know the free market says banks have to fail if they get in trouble. They make bad loans, they fail." Well, we have to live by that same measure--

FRANK SESNO:

Does this going to take us to a global recession or worse?

JAMES BAKER:

Well this could very well affect global economy, *will* affect the global economy. It will affect it negatively. The United States economy,

historically, has been the real engine of growth in the global economy and this is going to adversely impact our economy further. Now that's just part of it though, let me-- you know, you still have these systemic problems. You got the problem of the fiscal deficit, you got the problem of the trade deficit, you got the problem of our currency and this subprime mortgage crisis, which is creating such hell in the financial sector, is going to adversely impact all three of those structural imbalances.

MADELINE ALBRIGHT:

I point that I think it goes to whether we care whether we're popular or not. I don't care whether we're popular but it goes to the point that Jim Baker was telling you about-- we are ultimately a part of a global system and I think-- or it doesn't

matter whether we're popular but whether we're respected and whether other countries will want to work with us. So, it's not just a matter of do they love us but if you look at this very specific problem, it is going to have to take international cooperation and our image, therefore, does matter in terms of how other countries want to work with us on an issue that affects every American.

FRANK SESNO:

Whether climate or economy?

MADELINE ALBRIGHT:

Yeah.

FRANK SESNO:

We're gonna take a quick break. When we come back, we'll start to get specific and peel back a bit of the map. Russia, and Iran, the Middle East, right after this.

(BREAK IN TAPE)

FRANK SESNO:

00:18:13:00 Dr. Kissinger, you go way back with this whole question of how to engage the Russians, then the Soviets. There's been talk about kicking Russia out of the G8 or stiff-arming them on the World Trade Organization. Or making them pay. The-- the Europeans wanna keep this train very much on the tracks. What does the next president do about this Russia?

HENRY KISSINGER:

00:18:29:00 Well, first, he has to decide what you mean by "this Russia." If it's a Russia that is trying, that it's like the Soviet Union trying to overturn the international system. Or if it's a Russia that is more assertive than it has been in the last 20 years in crisis that arose-- more or less

locally.

FRANK SESNO:

00:19:01:00 What do you think?

HENRY KISSINGER:

00:19:03:00 I think-- I think-- we need--  
- we have a number of common issues that  
we have to-- to settle, if possible,  
with Russia. We need Russia for a  
solution of the Iranian problem. We may  
need Russia if Pakistan evolves in--  
some of the directions that it might.  
And it is helpful to cooperate with  
Russia, not just on the proliferation  
question, but on the issues of energy.  
Is that possible? It is-- an effort that  
should not be decided by what happened  
in Georgia.

00:19:48:00 We have to face the fact  
that the first shot in Georgia was fired  
on the Georgian side. Now Russia-- rea--

reacted in an excessive manner. But we should not make the whole relationship depend on the pictures that you-- showed. And I would urge the new president, that as emerging as president, to explore the possibilities of cooperation and be very sure before we go the route of cutting off WTO and the other international measures for which cooperation with Russia may be very important. And I think also that this Russia is not democratic, but is also not-- what it was before. And that one must permit some evolution to take place.

FRANK SESNO:

00:20:55:00 Secretary Baker?

JAMES BAKER:

00:21:01:00 Well, I told-- I agree with what Henry said. (THROAT CLEARING) I think it was-- it was interesting to

note what Secretary Gates said-- just last week when he said the Unit-- the administration has come to a unified position on how to deal with the Russia and Georgia problem. And that is to look at it in a strategic contest-- context-- and not tactically.

00:21:30:00 You know, South Ossetia and Abkhazia, when the Soviet Union broke up and Russia-- I mean Georgia became an independent country back there in 1991, neither of those enclaves wanted to join (LAUGHTER) Georgia.

FRANK SESNO:

00:21:37:00 You were there.

JAMES BAKER:

00:21:39:00 I was there. And they wanted to be-- they wanted to be with Russia, they didn't wanna be with Georgia. And so I-- I guess what I'm saying is we

have some-- we have some-- some big picture issues that we need to be conscious of when we think about our future with Russia. And we ought to cooperate with them where we can, where it makes sense.

00:21:49:00 But we ought to also be willing to confront them where our vital interests are involved. We are committed to independence of these former republics of the former Soviet Union. And that should continue to be our position. That doesn't mean we ought to send the 101st airborne in to-- guard the South Ossetian border. I mean that would not make very good sense and that's not the kind of thing we ought to be (LAUGHTER) speculating about.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

00:22:06:00 But can we just cut to the

chase here? Both the Clinton administration and the current Bush administration have pushed for NATO expansion eastwards and right to the-- former Soviet Republics. Georgia they want in NATO. Ukraine they want in NATO. Now, you've got Russia invading Georgia. Is the advice to the next President of the United States, "Therefore, you have to go to war against Russian in order to-- to protect your NATO ally?"

MADELINE ALBRIGHT:

00:22:33:00 Well, first of all, I think we have to understand what NATO expansion was about. It was trying to erase an artificial line from the Cold War and was not, as we saw it, anything that was anti-Russian. It was not a NATO-- it was a new NATO, theoretically, against a new-- Russian that was there,

that we even talked about Russia being a part of it.

00:22:57:00 So, it is not-- it should not be viewed that way. And I also think the countries have the right to choose whatever lines (PH) they wanna be in. And the main thing, while I fully agree that we can't go back to the Cold War and have a-- a-- really-- very bad adversarial relationship with Russia, Russia cannot think that independent countries on its border are a threat to them. So, I think, I personally believe, that we need to go forward with the-- membership action plan for Georgia and for Ukraine. And keep explaining that it is not a threat.

FRANK SESNO:

00:23:31:00 Except for, General Powell, it-- basically hopes that Russia is not

going to be the aggressor. And if Russia is, and you have to-- you know, keep your NATO ally security, aren't you then committed?

COLIN POWELL:

00:23:46:00 Under Article Five of the Washington Treaty, which is a NATO treaty, when one member of the alliance is attacked from abroad, meaning, outside the NATO-- geographic limits, then all members of NATO treat that as an attack. Doesn't mean that all NATO members then start sending troops to the country that's been invaded. Each country decides what its response would be.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

00:24:12:00 And yet--

COLIN POWELL:

00:24:14:00 Article Five has only been invoked once in the history of the--

alliance. And that was on the twelfth of September, 2001, when it was invoked in our favor, when the whole NATO alliance said we were attacked, the alliance was attacked on 9/11. Now, in the current situation, the Russians acted brutally, I think they acted foolishly, but it was also absolutely predictable, what the Russians would do.

00:24:45:00 You could see them stacking up their troops. And I think it was foolhardy on the part of President Sakashvili (PH) in the Georgian government, to kick over this can, to light a match in-- in a room full of gas fumes.

FRANK SESNO:

00:25:00:00 But you're saying the Georgians provoked this.

COLIN POWELL:

00:25:01:00 They did. I mean there was a lot of reasons to have provocations in the area. But the match that started the conflagration was from the Georgian side. And that's a given.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

00:25:12:00 And yet-- and some of the debate in the presidential elections have basically been, "We are all Georgians now." What does that mean?

COLIN POWELL:

00:25:16:00 One candidate said that--

FRANK SESNO:

00:25:16:00 It's the same as was said after 9/11.

COLIN POWELL:

00:25:17:00 --and I'll let the candidate explain it for himself. (LAUGHTER)

FRANK SESNO:

00:25:22:00 You can help a little if

you'd like.

COLIN POWELL:

00:25:22:00 No, the fact of the matter is, you have to be very careful in a situation like this. Not just to leap to one side or the other until you've taken a good analysis of-- of the whole situation. And I think if-- if we had seen--

FRANK SESNO:

00:25:28:00 But if your-- your advice to the next president is, "Don't side with the Georgians." Isn't that what you just said?

COLIN POWELL:

00:25:30:00 No, I did not say that. I said take a look at the whole situation. Nice try, Frank. (LAUGHTER) But look, this is something that might have been avoided if people had looked at the Russian troops that were stacked up. If

people had realized that the Russians were serious about South Ossetia and Abkhazia, and if perhaps more guidance and suggestions had been given to President Sakashvili, beyond those that he received, it might have been avoided.

00:25:50:00 But it wasn't, it's over.

The Russian are the offenders right now and we have to see that. We cannot say to the Russians we are not gonna allow the-- Georgians or Ukrainians or anyone else, to start down the path toward NATO membership. It's not for the Russians to decide that. But I think it is wise for us to look at the whole strategic situation, and all of our equities before deciding how fast that should happen. And whether it's the time to do it right now.

00:26:23:00      The Russian Federation is not gonna become the Soviet Union again. That movie failed at the box office. But they do have interests. And we have to think carefully about their interest. And frankly, they believe that we have been sticking it in their eye now for the past ten or so years, with the continued expansion of NATO, with-- missile defense system in Poland and the Czech Republic.

00:26:46:00      And then we add patriot missiles to the deal in Poland. And the Russians know that system is not aimed at Iranians. And so, you'd have to be very, very careful. There are ways to deal with that-- you have to really-- you have to be able--

FRANK SESNO:

00:26:51:00      Do you want the next

president pull those out?

COLIN POWELL:

00:26:52:00 You have to be able--

FRANK SESNO:

00:26:51:00 Do you wanna pull--

should the next president pull--

COLIN POWELL:

00:26:52:00 You have to--

FRANK SESNO:

00:26:53:00 --those patriot missiles

out?

COLIN POWELL:

00:26:54:00 I didn't say that, Frank?

You keep putting--

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

00:26:51:00 But should he?

COLIN POWELL:

00:26:55:00 No, why should we? We've

done it. It's a done deal. America

does something, we've done it. but we

have to not pull them out but recognize

what the Russian reaction is going to be in that kind of a step. You have to deal with the Russians in a straightforward, candid, no-holds-barred way. The first action that happened to us with the Russians, when I came into office, was we discovered that they were cheating on the number of intelligence personnel they had in the country.

00:27:09:00 And the FBI came to see me and said, "We gotta do something." So, I called in the Russian ambassador, said, "Tomorrow morning we're throwing out 52 of your people. We're PNG-ing all of them" He couldn't believe it. And the next morning I got a call from the Russian foreign minister. "Are you really gonna do this?" "Yes." "You know what we're gonna do?" "Sure, I know what you're gonna do, you're gonna throw

out 52 Americans from Moscow." And he said, "Are you gonna do anything after that?" I said, "No, let's get on with business." (LAUGHTER)

00:27:30:00 And so you-- you deal with these people in an honest, straightforward, sensible way. We got out of the ABN treaty. We wanted to abrogate it. Everybody thought it would be a crisis. Turned out to be no crisis. And six months after we abrogated our responsibilities in the ABN treaty, we signed a treaty at Moscow reducing the number of nuclear weapons.

00:27:53:00 So, you have to treat Russia as a proud country that lost a lot of its pride, some 15, 16 years ago, and it's restored with a political leadership that is enormously popular in

the country, and with a level of wealth they've never had before, and with concerns about their near abroad. And treat them in a straightforward, businesslike, objective way, and not emotionally.

JAMES BAKER:

00:28:23:00 And may I sway just one further thing? Do it strategically and not tactically. You're gonna-- you have these-- you're gonna have these border conflicts all around the periphery of the former Soviet Union. They're there. Stalin created it-- ethnic tensions. And these are little flash fires that-- that we need to be aware of and deal with promptly, but it's-- that should not be a cause for rupturing the entire big relationship unless we can't make-- keep that big relationship together to deal with non-proliferation, to deal

with environment, climate change, you name it.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

00:29:03:00 Secretary Baker, you just talked about strategically, not tactically. Let's talk about Iran, which has been a strategic and tactical headache for the United States over the last 30 years. Let's say in the few weeks after the inauguration of the next president, a message comes from Iran, that the Iranians are ready to do a deal, all conditions on the table. Is the advice to the next American president to once again put conditions to expect Iran to cry uncle, or to engage? In other words, do we isolate as the US has over the last 30 years or does the US now engage with Iran? Secretary Albright?

MADELINE ALBRIGHT:

00:29:34:00 I believe we need to engage with Iran. I think the whole point is you try to engage and deal with countries that you have problems with. And take the relationship--

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

00:29:45:00 So, what do you advise the president when he gets this message across his desk, or he comes to the state department?

MADELINE ALBRIGHT:

00:29:49:00 That the--

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

00:29:52:00 That the Iranians are seeking feelers?

MADELINE ALBRIGHT:

00:29:54:00 You begin to look at what level to talk about. And actually, something like that happened when we were in office. And you begin to find

the right level. I would begin probably with some lower level person at the state department but have the secretary of state involved in it. And I think it's one of the most important relationships that we need to work on. We are not gaining anything by this. And I-- while there are many issues, ultimately Iran has benefited the most from the war in Iraq. And I think we need to deal with them.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

00:30:24:00 The intelligence assessment that's going to be given to the next president says that Iran, they believe, will continue to seek to enrich uranium, but at the moment, they don't see evidence of building a weapon. Can the United States, despite all that's been said up to now, can the world live with a nuclear Iran?

COLIN POWELL:

00:30:36:00 The president will need the intelligence assessment. The Iranians are telling us that they are developing a nuclear program, and they're doing it for civilian use and for power generation. Once you know how to do that, at five percent enrichment, you can scale it up to 90 percent enrichment and make a weapon.

00:30:49:00 Now, all of the conversations we've been having with the Iranians for the last two years haven't stopped them in the slightest. They're marching right ahead. So, I agree with Madeline and I suspect my other colleagues, that we should start to talk to them. Don't wait for a letter coming from them. Start discussions. We were talking to them up to the middle of

2003.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

00:30:58:00 So, take the initiative?

COLIN POWELL:

00:30:58:00 Yeah, why shouldn't we?

What are we afraid of?

JAMES BAKER:

00:31:01:00 We did.

COLIN POWELL:

00:30:59:00 We did.

JAMES BAKER:

00:31:02:00 We did--

COLIN POWELL:

00:31:02:00 We-- we were--

JAMES BAKER:

00:31:04:00 In our administration, way  
back in '91.

COLIN POWELL:

00:31:05:00 We were talking to them  
through 2003 at a low level. And then it  
was-- stopped. And so find a way. And

don't make it-- let's get together and talk just about nuclear weapons or just about this or just about that. Start a dialogue at a low level and let it grow over time.

FRANK SESNO:

00:31:26:00 So, let me play this scenario a little bit out, just one more step, Secretary Christopher. The feeler comes through from Iran, conversations are underway, but the Israelis pick up the phone and they say, "Wait a minute, this is not tolerable. We've said that we will not allow nuclear knowledge, nuclear know-how in the neighborhood, and we will not live with this waste of time while they continue to march forward." Might the next president have to have a showdown with his-- Israeli allies to tell them to hold back?

WARREN CHRISTOPHER:

00:32:03:00 Well, Frank, let's go back a step. I think the first thing you do when you get a message from the Ar-- Isr-- Iranians, is to find out whether it's authentic or not. When I-- when I was negotiating with them over the hostage release, we had a number of messages that were not authentic.

00:32:21:00 So, I think there needs to be a somewhat authentic-- authentication of that message. Then, I think you have to move forward. And I must say, our relationships with Israel need to be strong enough so we can say to them, "Look, we want to have a comprehensive dialogue with the Iranians, we can't be complacent about the nuclear possibilities in Iran, but nevertheless, we cannot afford not to have a comprehensive dialogue to see if

it can be stopped."

00:32:46:00      Because frankly, the  
military options here are very, very  
poor. And if-- that's what the Israelis  
are advocating, I think that we have to  
tell them, "We think their military  
options are-- are very poor, and we  
don't wanna go down that route."

FRANK SESNO:

00:32:57:00      Well, neither candidate,  
neither-- neither of the men who would  
be president has taken the military  
option with respect to Iran off the  
table.

00:33:03:00                   (OFF-MIC  
CONVERSATION)

COLIN POWELL:

00:33:05:00      I didn't say to take them  
off the table--

00:33:06:00                   (OFF-MIC

CONVERSATION)

JAMES BAKER:

00:33:07:00 Can I just say one-- one more thing? When we-- when I was in office, we had a standing policy with the Iranians. We were ready to talk to them, provided it would be done at an official level, at the level of the Secretary of State. And-- and they did-- they wouldn't-- they didn't have enough domestic political support for that, having-- vilified us as the great Satan for so long, they couldn't get the domestic political support necessary-- to meet with us.

00:33:36:00 So, it wasn't a case of our isol-- we hadn't been isolating Iran from that standpoint. We offered to meet with them at the level of Secretary of State. Second point I wanna make is

this, you never hear anything (THROAT CLEARING) today about the potential for containment. Now, I realize people would tell you these are nuts. These-- mullahs or ayatollahs are crazy. They don't-- they won't understand containment. We contained the Soviet Union for 40 years. An overwhelming conventional threat against-- against Western Europe, through the strength of our strategic nuclear deterrent.

00:34:11:00 We don't need that nuclear deterrent anymore for Western Europe. And I think a well-placed quiet, private-- private phone call to the Iranian leadership, if you can find out which leaders to talk to, Chris makes a good point, to the effect, "Look, if you do so much as aim a missile or anything else toward Israel or toward us, our

strategic nuclear deterrent can be re-  
aimed in 20 seconds." They would  
understand that, I think. (LAUGHTER)

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

00:34:27:00 I'm sure they would.

(LAUGHTER) The-- the question is, do you  
want to change the policy and do you  
want to actually try to engage for  
strategic reasons?

JAMES BAKER:

00:34:32:00 You ought to engage.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

00:34:31:00 To use them for help in--

JAMES BAKER:

00:34:31:00 Yeah.

00:34:31:00 (OFF-MIC CONVERSATION)

COLIN POWELL:

00:34:32:00 I think we're all saying  
yes.

JAMES BAKER:

00:34:32:00 We're all saying you ought

to engage, I think. I don't know-- I haven't heard-- heard Henry. He may not.

(LAUGHTER)

HENRY KISSINGER:

00:34:42:00 I'm in favor of-- negotiating with Iran. And-- one utility of negotiation is to put before Iranian our vision of a Middle East-- of a stable Middle East. And our notion on-- nuclear proliferation at a high enough level, so that they have to study it. And therefore, I actually prefer doing it at the Secretary of State level, so that we-- know we are dealing with authentic-- with authentic--

FRANK SESNO:

00:35:28:00 So, you'd put it at a very high level, right out of the box.

HENRY KISSINGER:

00:35:34:00 Sec-- initially, yes. And I-- I-- am a believer. But this is a

question-- each of us may have different views. I-- always-- always believed that the best way to begin a negotiation is to tell the other side exactly what you have in mind. And what you are-- what the outcome is that you are trying to achieve. So that they have something-- that they can-- react to. Now, the permanent members of the security council, plus Japan and Germany, have all said nuclear weapons in Iran are unacceptable.

00:36:33:00 They've never explained what they mean by this. So, if we go into a negotiation, we ought to have a clear understanding of what it is we're trying to prevent. What it is we're going to do-- if we can't achieve what we are talking about. With respect to nuclear weapons in Iran, there are really three

problems. One is, the symbolic effect of Iran defying the whole world community, as it has expressed itself, and going ahead and doing it anyway. What the impact of this will be on other countries that were going-- a similar direction.

00:37:00:00 Secondly, it is-- so, it's a proliferation question. Not only what Iran can do to us. Sec-- and secondly, that-- it's an issue of the-- leakage of-- as-- as weapons proliferate, of the leakage of these into non-state actors (PH). So, the issue of proliferation is one of the fundamental problems that the new administration must face. And it must deal with it both with respect to Iran and on a global-- basis, and we-- it has to make-- understand how much time we have, and what the-- what the

possible (PH)-- outcome should be.

00:38:02:00 But-- I do not believe that we can make conditions for the opening of negotiations. We ought, however, to be very clear about the content of negotiations and work it out with other countries and with our own government.

MADELINE ALBRIGHT:

00:38:22:00 I think also, we need to make clear that what we're doing is not counterproductive. At the moment, I think we don't understand Iranian society. It is not monolithic, there are various aspects of the fact that Ahmedinejad is not particularly popular. There are economic issues. And the more that we go around vilifying them, we create-- put him in a stronger position. And so, not only should we do these-- steps that the others have been talking

about, but we have to make sure that we're not undercutting what we wanna do by creating a bigger problem.

COLIN POWELL:

00:38:47:00      Can I-- two quick points. I agree with Jim on the case for deterrence. Even the wildest of political leaders is not suicidal. And as long as we have the power that we have, they know that any such use of such weapons is suicidal. I had one meeting with the Iranian foreign minister while I was Secretary of State. We had a social gathering. We sit-- we sat together at dinner for a couple of hours. And we were both being exceptionally careful. We weren't sure which of us could get in more trouble with our government by having an open dialogue. (LAUGHTER)

00:39:06:00 But I said to him, in order not to put him on the spot, I said, "What's the major problem facing Iran today?" And he looked at me and almost immediately said, "We have a young population, we have to create 600,000 jobs a year." Now, that's something we can work with and do something about.

00:39:42:00 It is not just nuclear weapons and terrorism. They have some serious internal economic and demographic problems and they have to come out sooner or later and join the international economic community or Iran will be left behind.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

00:40:02:00 So, it looks like there's possibly some different advice to the next president. And on that note, we're

going to take a break. When we come back, we're going to discuss Afghanistan, Iraq, Pakistan, and the war on terrorism.

00:40:13:00 (BREAK IN TAPE)

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

00:40:14:00 Welcome back to the Lisner Auditorium on the campus of the George Washington University. I'm Christiane Amanpour.

FRANK SESNO:

00:40:14:00 And I'm Frank Sesno. And we're discussing what advice these five former Secretaries of State have for the next president. Our panel includes Warren Christopher, Henry Kissinger, Madeline Albright, James Baker, and Colin Powell. Christiane?

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

00:40:22:00 We're gonna talk about Afghanistan. We've seen that the surge

is making some effect in Iraq and actually at the same time, the other hot war that the United States is involved in in Afghanistan is heating up even further, and more and more Allies and Afghans are being killed over there. The Pentagon believes that the Iraq war has begun winding down. As I said, Afghanistan begun-- beginning to ratchet up. And the General, your successor-- one of your successors, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has said, "I'm not convinced that we're winning in Afghanistan," but he adds that we can win. What does the next President of the United States have to do to make sure that Afghanistan, six years later, actually is winnable?

COLIN POWELL:

00:41:04:00 Well, he has to-- has to first ask Admiral Mullen (PH) what he

meant and what does he need to keep that from happening.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

00:41:10:00 Well, he said more troops, that's for sure.

COLIN POWELL:

00:41:14:00 More troops is one thing. And of course, General Petraeus is now responsible for that-- theatre as well. That sub-theatre, as we call it. And-- more troops is one thing to do, but I think we also have to get into the Afghan government. It is not functioning as effectively as it must if it going to create a solid democracy. There's a great deal of corruption. you've gotta do something about the drug problem in Afghanistan. But perhaps the problem that is causing the most difficulty now, is the tribal areas in Pakistan, which are free-zone right now

for the Taliban.

00:41:59:00      And so the Taliban has been able to re-create itself and grow itself in those areas and so one of the major challenges for the next president is to create a relationship with Pakistan. Where we can get their full cooperation and their activity to help bring that border area under control. Otherwise, there is a sanctuary there that can be violated or crossed constantly and create problems in Afghanistan.

00:42:23:00      Afghanistan, I think, is an extremely complicated problem. The surge has reduced the military problem in-- Iraq. Now we have to see if the political surge continues and gives us what we were looking for. But I think

the attention does shift now to Afghanistan. And when you look at Afghanistan, you have to consider Pakistan. They're interrelated.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

00:42:40:00 You say Pakistan. Does there have to be a new Pakistan policy right now, or up until now, until he was basically booted, the Pakistan policy was a Musharef-- policy.

JAMES BAKER:

00:42:51:00 Yeah, but-- but-- you now have a new government in Pakistan but I think the policy is not-- should not change much. But as-- as Colin pointed out, we've got to get the Pakistan government to go-- together with us, take control, of those tribal areas. But-- let me go back to something I said in the very first question you asked me. We need to beef up the elements of soft

power for this country. We need more-- we really need more civilian-- when you talk about reconstructing, beyond the provision of more troops, you gotta get ci-- civil reconstruction teams in there, economic development.

00:43:38:00      You need more-- actually we need more foreign service personnel. You know what we have today? I think, active foreign service officers, maybe 6,500. Not as many as there are on one aircraft carrier. We need more there. We need more foreign assistance. That has been diminishing every year for the past, probably 15 years. So, how can we-- how can we reconstruct these countries if we don't have the-- elements of soft power that we need to do it?

FRANK SESNO:

00:43:56:00      So, it's not just the  
military--

JAMES BAKER:

00:43:55:00      It's not just the  
military--

FRANK SESNO:

00:43:58:00      And yet these are exactly  
the functions--

JAMES BAKER:

00:43:58:00      The military--

FRANK SESNO:

00:43:56:00      That the military are  
doing.  They're the ones who are digging  
the wells and trying to get these  
countries put back together.  Secretary  
Christopher, what do you tell that next  
president, if he's going to build on  
these elements of power and win in  
Afghanistan, what's the winning strategy  
or combination?

WARREN CHRISTOPHER:

00:44:07:00      Ironically, Secretary Gates, the strongest spokesman for having more support on soft power, you know that--

FRANK SESNO:

00:44:14:00      Can I stop you right there? May I stop you? Because you mentioned Secretary Gates. I don't know if we have that piece of tape teed up, but we actually were drawn to a comment that Secretary Gates said. Take a look at what he said.

Robert Gates:

00:44:27:00      Based on my experience serving seven presidents, as a former director of CIA and a-- now as Secretary of Defense, I am here to make the case for strengthening our capacity to use soft power. And for better integrating it with hard power. One of the most important lessons of the wars in Iraq

and Afghanistan is that military success is not sufficient to win.

FRANK SESNO:

00:44:54:00 Secretary Christopher, there he is, the Secretary of Defense saying that military force is not sufficient to win. So, how do we win?

WARREN CHRISTOPHER:

00:45:06:00 Well, that's-- that's a terrific statement by him. You know, the-- military budget is about 20 times the state department budget. I have nothing against lawyers but there are more lawyers in the Pentagon than there are foreign service officers. Just amazing. If we want-- if we really believe in negotiation, if we believe in diplomacy, we have to strengthen that arm of our government. So, I would make the case to the president that he much-- enormously strengthen that, and change

those budgetary priorities. Budgetary disproportion.

HENRY KISSINGER:

00:45:44:00 May I say something on this issue? I agree that-- building a society requires all the measures that have been talked about by Colin and by Warren. But in Iraq, it was a middle class. There was-- much wider system of education. Afghanistan, it's a much longer term problem, if you-- you-- go-- through, which is the-- only route by which we can eventually--

FRANK SESNO:

00:46:17:00 So, how do we win that?

HENRY KISSINGER:

00:46:17:00 Well, we win it. We have to do the military measures that-- the augmentation of our military forces. And secondly, we have to-- educate the people of the world that are involved

here, that this is a long term effort.

FRANK SESNO:

00:46:35:00 Get more people involved?

More countries involved?

HENRY KISSINGER:

00:46:35:00 No and--

FRANK SESNO:

00:46:36:00 Is that what you're

calling--

HENRY KISSINGER:

00:46:38:00 --it will take a much

longer time.

FRANK SESNO:

00:46:40:00 That we have to have--

(OVERTALK)

HENRY KISSINGER:

00:46:41:00 (IN PROGRESS) in a much

more primitive-- position. Now, when

we talk about the tribal areas in--

Pakistan, the fact is, that throughout

recent-- I mean the last few centuries,

both during the British empire, during every phase of Pakistan-- the tribal areas have not been governed by central authority. The tribal areas were governed by a combination of driving the local chiefs and reprisals (PH), when-- they got out of line. And the-- therefore, it's-- in a way-- unfair to ask the Pakistan government to do something that they have never been able to do in all of history.

MADELINE ALBRIGHT:

00:47:40:00 I think that what we're doing--

HENRY KISSINGER:

00:47:32:00 But we have to do something, therefore, and-- there's no way to avoid it.

MADELINE ALBRIGHT:

00:47:36:00 Can I-- generally, as we look at these issue, we are-- you're

asking us (THROAT CLEARING) questions about individual countries. And I think what has to happen is we have to see things more regionally. This is not just a problem of Afghanistan. Or even just of Pakistan, which combines everything to give you an international migraine. But there also has to be-- India has to play a role, Iran could be helpful here.

00:47:54:00 And we need to look at areas in a much more-- in a larger regional context. It's true when you're talking about Iran. It's true if you're talking about Russia. And I think one of the parts in the 21st century is to begin to look at things in a different way than just-- bilateral relations with one country.

COLIN POWELL:

00:48:07:00 I have one point. We often talk about hard power and soft power. And I certainly agree with everything that-- Bob Gates said. But the reality is when you go into a place like Iraq or a place like Afghanistan, before your soft power becomes useful and effective, you've got to create conditions of security. That's what we did not do in Iraq in the spring and summer of 2003 and that's what General Petraeus has been trying to do over the past yeah.

00:48:39:00 In Afghanistan, we did not create conditions of security in the early years. And so, soft power has a role to play and it's complimentary to hard power. But don't underestimate the need to do the first thing that all governments have to do, and that is to

provide security for the region.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

00:49:00:00      Okay, just-- just-- just to be-- you know, call a spade a spade, Afghanistan was on the way to success. And you were there, your administration was there. I would say the consensus is that the eye was taken off the ball and it went to Iraq. Now, you face what could have been a success and an example and a stabilizing phenomenon in that region, you know, you need to snatch back vict-- victory from the jaws of defeat.

00:49:34:00      So really practically, pragmatically, what do you tell the next Secretary of State-- the next president, as a diplomat and as a military man? What do you tell him? How do you get back Afghanistan?

COLIN POWELL:

00:49:44:00      If we have provided a level of security in Iraq with our troops, those that are remaining as well as the proving Iraqi forces, shift your attention, shift your hard power attention and your soft power attention to Afghanistan. Because I think the-- the risks in Afghanistan almost outweigh the risks we've been facing for the last few years in Iraq.

FRANK SESNO:

00:50:04:00      I wanna-- I wanna direct a question to Secretary Albright and Secretary Baker here for just a minute. *Charlie Wilson's War*, you saw that? Well, Charlie Wilson wrote an Op-Ed not long ago called *Charlie Wilson's Peace*. And in it, he said, "Had we remained engaged in Afghanistan, investing in education, health, and economic

development, the world would be a very  
b--different place today."

00:50:22:00      And he went on to point  
that the-- the-- federal budget on  
development and aid is one percent.  
It's actually less than one percent, is  
my understanding. And 22 percent we  
spend on military and weapons. Now,  
you're all saying spend more on  
development and aid. But the next  
president is going to run into a country  
that says, "My roads aren't getting  
fixed, my school isn't getting fixed,  
I'm losing my 401K or whatever else it  
is." That's a hard case to make. How  
does the next president make that sale?  
How should these candidates running for  
office make a sale?

MADELINE ALBRIGHT:

00:50:59:00      I think it's very hard,

and before what just happened with Hurricane Ike, I used to talk about the Katrina effect. (THROAT CLEARING) Because when I went down there, people would say exactly what you're saying, "Why are you spending money on some country we don't even know where it is, when we need help ourselves." But I think that the job of the president actually, is to explain these issues to the American people and explain how they affect us on a day to day basis.

00:51:20:00 Colin talked about the drug problem in Afghanistan.

Ultimately-- that comes back in some way to the United States. Or, people having to fight in places or die-- because we haven't paid enough attention. And the truth is, we are a rich country. That's how we started this discussion. And

it's not a matter of cutting the pie up,  
it's of growing it. And I think that we  
should be able to do all of the above,  
but it does require a somewhat different  
tax policy.

FRANK SESNO:

00:51:34:00      Pretty small pie.

JAMES BAKER:

00:51:36:00      The president has the  
bully pulpit. There used to be a  
consensus (THROAT CLEARING) for the idea  
of foreign assistance. I think that--  
the new president can re-establish that,  
particularly when he's talking about  
Afghanistan. Where the-- the threat is  
terror. Terror that came home to us on  
9/11. And there's another area where  
the president's gonna have to use the  
bully pulpit to rally the American  
people, and that is the fact that we've  
lost the consensus for free trade.

00:52:03:00 Liberalized trade and investment no longer enjoys any support on the left of the democratic party or the right of the republican party, where it used to be very, very strong. And we're-- sitting here facing the prospect of a failed Doha Round, we don't have the-- free trade agreement for the Americas, which President Clinton talked about back in 1996, and-- and-- and-- you know, for 60 years, America has pushed the idea of democracy, liberalized trade, free market democracy, liberalized trade, and investment.

00:52:40:00 Many countries have moved toward that, but in the last ten years, the consensus for that has-- has evaporated. And nothing would do more

to resolve those imbalances in the US economy I mentioned earlier, than-- than some free trade agreements and greater prosperity, economic growth, from trade. That's one of the major responsibilities of the new president.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

00:53:01:00 We'll talk more about some of the major responsibilities including some of the leads that the next president can take, climate change, energy, and indeed, we're gonna talk a little bit about the Middle East, which has burned so many administrations.

00:53:13:00 (BREAK IN TAPE)

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

...President of the United States. We've talked a lot about Iraq, Afghanistan, Iran, the-- basically the greater Middle East. Israel, Palestine has been a challenge for

American administrations since it first began. Is there, Secretary Baker, a deal to be made anywhere there? Israel, Palestinian, Syrian, anywhere?

JAMES BAKER:

I-- (THROAT CLEARING)

today I don't think there is but I think there could be for the new president.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

What would you advise the new president, for instance, on Syria?

JAMES BAKER:

Well-- well, I, I would advise the new president to engage fully and completely with Syria. I happen to be one who thinks that we could flip Syria away from Iran. I think her serious marriage to Iran is a marriage of convenience. I think she'd much prefer to be on good terms with the United States again, or reasonably good

terms with the United States, and back on good terms with her Sunni Arab friends, the Egyptians and the Jordanians, and the Saudi Arabians. And therefore, I think it's ridiculous for us to say we're not going to talk to Syria and yet, the Israelis have been negotiating peace with them for the last six or eight months. Now, because of the situation domestically within Israel and the Israeli politics, I don't think they're going to reach an agreement, but I think there is a Syrian deal to be had and it is much, much easier to do that deal than it is to do a deal with the Palestinians.

FRANK SESNO:

00:53:15:00 Secretary Christopher, let me flip over to you for a minute and go to Iraq, back to Iraq for a minute. It is commonly accepted that the surge

and other activities on the ground have produced progress. The next president is gonna wanna keep that progress moving because it's certainly not in the interest of the United States-- to do otherwise. There's been debate on the campaign trail about whether the troops stay for 100 years or leave after 16 months. Forget politics for a minute. What should the next president do to assure success and continued progress in Iraq?

WARREN CHRISTOPHER:

00:53:39:00 I think the next president ought to put a lot of pressure on people in Iraq to try to come to some political conciliation. They really have not made any progress down that road at all. I think in order to do that, I think the president needs to put pressure on them, indicating that we are

about to have an orderly withdrawal from Iraq. And I think that's essential.

Otherwise, I think we get no pressure on the Iraqis to make political progress.

00:54:02:00 But I think the number one thing that needs to be done in Iraq is to try to, one way or the other, through either pressure or incentives, to try to encourage them to come to some-- some political reconciliation, which they're a long ways from. All the developments on that front in the last two or three weeks have discouraging rather than encouraging.

FRANK SESNO:

00:54:27:00 General Powell, I'm wondering whether you agree with that and agree with putting a timetable out there and what kind of-- you're a military man as well. So, how does that

work?

COLIN POWELL:

00:54:39:00 Well, I-- I agree with--  
Chris that we have to put more pressure  
on the Iraqi political leaders to move  
on with reconciliation. That ultimately  
is the answer and to build up their own  
security force.

FRANK SESNO:

00:54:42:00 Timetable for leaving?

COLIN POWELL:

00:54:46:00 They're giving us a  
timetable. They're telling us when they  
want us out. They don't want us to stay  
a day longer than necessary. So, I  
would not wanna put down an artificial  
timetable, but I would make it clear  
that the drawdown will continue. I  
wouldn't use the word--

FRANK SESNO:

00:54:55:00 What does that mean-- you

don't put down an artificial timetable?

I'm not sure what that means.

COLIN POWELL:

00:54:58:00      Artificial timetable  
means that it is a timetable that I can  
establish now, notwithstanding what the-  
-

FRANK SESNO:

00:55:00:00      So, 16 months, for  
example, as an artificial timetable.

COLIN POWELL:

00:55:02:00      Notwithstanding the  
conditions that might exist over the  
period of that time.

FRANK SESNO:

00:55:04:00      But any given-- any  
specific, finite period of time, is an  
artificial timetable?

COLIN POWELL:

00:55:08:00      No, because that kind--  
that kind of timetable is wonderful for

batting back and forth in political circles. But any timetable ultimately should be-- conditioned on what's going on on the ground. If things are getting a lot better, then expedite it. If things are getting a lot worse, then slow it down. And I would--

FRANK SESNO:

00:55:19:00      Sounds like you're telling Barack Obama that he's gotta back off on that.

COLIN POWELL:

00:55:22:00      No, I'm talking about President Maliki (PH), who said he wants us out by date certain. And let's try to give him what he has asked for. But at the same time, let's do it in a sensible way. And if conditions are getting better, then increase the rate of draw down. If conditions are getting worse, then stop and pause and make sure

we don't lose what we've gained.

FRANK SESNO:

Secretary Baker--

HENRY KISSINGER:

00:55:48:00 We, we-- (UNINTEL)

FRANK SESNO:

00:55:49:00 Sorry, go ahead.

HENRY KISSINGER:

00:55:49:00 We shouldn't get such total unanimity here. When-- we-- we have to consider of why the Iraqi president would ask for a deadline. He-- he watches the political debate here. He knows that-- one of the parties is strongly advocating a fixed deadline. He-- he thinks they might even win and they-- therefore he might have to deal with them. So, it would be prudent for him not to start out with a new president by rejecting the i-- idea of a deadline.

00:56:33:00      The disadvantage of a deadline is that then it-- it gives every opponent an opportunity to-- to-- wait until that deadline is achieved. It makes us define the internal structure of Iraq entirely in terms of the pressure we put on the government. And therefore, makes it much more difficult to have a-- a-- wider (PH) negotiation. I think the right outcome is to continue on what we'll-- what we are doing.

00:57:23:00      To withdraw troops as we can and if there has been a-- if there has been a genuine progress, and at some point in that progress, to call an international conference on the international status of Iraq, which would permit-- them-- an arrangement of

some of the-- of the surrounding issues  
and to give some legitimacy to a--  
continuing effort.

00:57:46:00 But, we should not put  
this in terms of a-- of-- of pressure  
that we need to put on the government in  
order for achieve a reconciliation with  
groups that have been fighting each  
other, which is essentially Sunnis and  
Shias for hundreds of years.

FRANK SESNO:

00:58:10:00 You agree with that?

MADELINE ALBRIGHT:

00:58:09:00 I mean I do think that  
the--

FRANK SESNO:

00:58:13:00 Don't put pressure on the  
parties?

MADELINE ALBRIGHT:

00:58:15:00 We have to put pressure

because they're-- our military has been brilliant. They have done what they were supposed to do. But the political reconciliation has not worked-- until we began to say that we would not be there forever. And that there does need to be a systematic withdrawal. I think it's very important not to get the positions of the candidates involved or mixed up here, frankly.

00:58:33:00 I mean, what has been going on is a-- an idea that the troops need to come out on a systematic basis, leaving some small residual force there. I agree with Henry completely on the fact that there has to be a diplomatic solution. And, it gets to Jim's point that Syria needs to be a part of it. Because the defense minister of Iraq several months ago said Americans had to

stay till 2018 because the borders were porous to horrible people and bad weapons.

00:58:50:00      So, the bottom line is that Syria needs to be a part of it. Now, this doesn't happen to me very often, but I am the youngest of the Secretaries of State here. (LAUGHTER) By a month-- by a month. And, I soon will not be. But for the moment--

FRANK SESNO:

00:59:02:00      Soon-- is something happening here that--

MADELINE ALBRIGHT:

00:59:01:00      Well, I will ultimately be a new former Secretary of State.

FRANK SESNO:

00:59:04:00      Oh, I see. So, next year we'll have a--

MADELINE ALBRIGHT:

00:59:07:00 Another woman up here.

And-- (LAUGHTER)-- but I do think, from my vast experience of my youth, I do think that it is important, in fact, to put some pressure here on-- on the government to move. And the Sunnis and Shias, I think, ultimately have to sort it out, and we need to be able--

HENRY KISSINGER:

00:59:31:00 No, Madeline, the issue isn't pressure. The issue is, do we threaten to withdraw at a fixed date, as-- as our means of pressure. That is the issue. Of course we will recommend and urge and-- and use-- even-- economic-- measures. But the key issue is do we say we will get out at a fixed date in order to exercise that pressure. And that, I think, that is-- what should not happen.

FRANK SESNO:

01:00:19:00      So-- so answer him.

                  MADELINE ALBRIGHT:

01:00:25:00      Well, I-- there is a  
different between saying we have to move  
our troops out in 16 months, and saying  
that by X minute we will be out. And if  
you listen carefully, what's been  
happening is to say that the troops have  
to come out in a systematic way, a  
residual force will stay there. And lo  
and behold, the current administration  
has all of a sudden decided that that's  
actually okay.

                  FRANK SESNO:

01:00:50:00      Christiane?

                  CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

                  The other big thing we  
were talking about in terms of advice to  
a new president is climate change. Can  
we first know whether there is a  
consensus amongst all of you that

climate change has a lot to do with  
mankind? That man is contributing to the  
global warming. We all agree?

MADELINE ALBRIGHT:

Except in Alaska.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

Now, now.

COLIN POWELL:

You broke the rule. You  
broke the rule.

MADELINE ALBRIGHT:

But I didn't say  
anything.

JAMES BAKER:

That's breaking of the  
rule. It's a nonpolitical gathering  
here.

MADELINE ALBRIGHT:

Totally, I agree.

FRANK SESNO:

It's just coincidental,

right? I see, yeah, uh huh.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

So it's a gathering of like minds on the origin of climate change and perhaps what we have to do about it. What does the United States need to do to take the lead on something that is so vital globally?

JAMES BAKER:

Kill all the cows 'cause most of it comes from cow farts.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

We're leaving that in.

(LAUGHTER)

FRANK SESNO:

How very diplomatic of you. (LAUGHTER)

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

Cows against Bakers.

JAMES BAKER:

(LAUGHTER) That's right.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

Seriously--

JAMES BAKER:

Well, I've said it earlier Christiane, I think that the United States needs to lead an effort, global effort. It's a global problem to round up all the countries that have to be-- major countries that, that-- put carbon dioxide in the air- that have to be a party to any treaty. You're not gonna get it done if the President of the United States doesn't lead the charge and it's gonna be very difficult because as you know, China and India are saying, "Well look, you've been polluting all these years. We get now to pollute as much as your polluting and then once we've done that then we'll agree to a treaty with you." So it's one of the major responsibilities of the new

President to do something about that but do it in a way that doesn't destroy our economy and that is not-- detrimental to the United States like the Kyoto Treaty was, where you exclude some of the biggest polluters.

FRANK SESNO:

You invoke China and India, China and India rising powers, changing the scene and stage for which the next President will play. We'll talk about that after this.

01:00:48:00 (BREAK IN TAPE)

FRANK SESNO:

01:00:49:00 And welcome back to our conversation with five former secretaries of state. Christiane Amanpour and I are pleased to be here at the campus of the George Washington University. Secretary Christopher,

India and China. Rapidly rising powers. Changing the landscape in so many ways. All you had to do was watch the Olympics to see that. How does that affect the next president's job? Is he dealing in a fundamentally different-- from a fundamentally different place? That is to say, as some think, America's power relatively speaking, is declining.

WARREN CHRISTOPHER:

01:01:10:00 Well, we're in a multi-polar world, and the equivalences are compounding (PH) much closer than they were before. United States's enormous power is diminished, at least from an economic standpoint.

FRANK SESNO:

01:01:16:00 It is diminished.

WARREN CHRISTOPHER:

01:01:15:00 Diminished from an economic standpoint. We're still the

largest engine in the world, but nevertheless, China and India are coming along very rapidly. And we shouldn't try to fight that. We ought to make sure that they remain our-- not adversaries, but competitors, perhaps in an economic sense.

FRANK SESNO:

01:01:34:00 Secretary Kissinger, not fight it. You opened up China and yet you've got Taiwan, Darfur, human rights, Tibet. It is a competitive relationship.

HENRY KISSINGER:

01:01:48:00 The most important aspect is that the center of gravity of international affairs is gonna move from the Atlantic to the Pacific. That is a fact of life. Now, when you list each category, Taiwan is-- a-- situation that existed when relationships with

China were opened. Darfur is a disagreement, as to methods.

01:02:26:00 But the fact is, of course, we will not necessarily agree with China on every policy. The question is whether we can imagine and work on a world in which China and the United States do not look at each other as adversaries. But it's possible, possibly-- cooperating. There will be issues on which we disagree, but it would be a catastrophe if-- if, in China, an anti-Western nationalism, will replace the previous Communist philosophy because we-- we and other countries were not able to find a mode of-- of-- dealing with them. I am fairly optimistic about relations-- long-term relations with China. With many intense disagreements.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

Africa-- all we ever really hear is certainly in our business is about the crisis, the famines, the extended hands of the West, in terms of humanitarian aid. Can the next president of the United States have a-- a trade relationship? A political relationship? A different relationship with Africa?

COLIN POWELL:

Of course, and-- and he should, he should work on it. But the current president, President Bush, has done a good job in Africa. We have, in fact, doubled overall foreign assistance in the last eight years and quadrupled development and other assistance to Africa and the president's program for AIDS, HIV AIDS relief, 15 billion dollars, most of that heading to Africa. The Millennium Challenge Account, which

invest in those countries that are moving properly and put in democratic systems, we've done a lot. And I think all that should be continued. The African Growth Opportunity Act, all that should be expanded. We resolved conflicts in a number of places. Liberia, we got rid of a terrible dictator. America hard powered-ed that and now soft powers are coming in behind. And we stabilized quite a few places. But the need is great, with respect to poverty reduction, HIV AIDS, clean water, infectious diseases that it has to be a party for the next president. And I would submit that Latin America, we've got a pretty good record there in recent years, yes we have the Hugo Chavez's and the Evo Morales' of the world but most of the nations in Latin America when you compare it to the

way it was twenty or thirty years ago when we were in office, when they were being run by generals and juntas and Castros undercutting everybody-- Latin America is coming along and joining this wealth creation system of the world.

FRANK SESNO:

01:03:11:00      Should we go to the floor? Let's go to the floor now. We have some questions from the floor. And we'd like to ask you to stand and-- give us your name and address your question to us-- as directly as you can. Go ahead.

Student #1:

Hello. My name is Harris Davidson and I'm from Greenwich, Connecticut. Many members of the media has suggested that electing the first African American to our nation's highest office would send a powerful image to

our allies overseas. Do you think electing Senator Obama would send the same message abroad as electing Senator McCain would?

FRANK SESNO:

Secretary Baker do you want to start?

JAMES BAKER:

I didn't hear anything.

FRANK SESNO:

The question is-- that many people feel electing first African American president would send a powerful message abroad. Would electing Senator Obama have the same message as Senator McCain?

JAMES BAKER:

Well, I think electing the first African American president would send a powerful message not just abroad but within this country as well.

Having said that, I have, of course,  
endorsed Senator McCain.

MADELINE ALBRIGHT:

Can I speak to this? Let  
me just-- we just came from the  
Democratic Convention and I'm chairman  
of the board of the National Democratic  
Institute and we had over 500 foreign  
visitors there. About--more than half of  
the visitors there were people of color  
and I think it would send a huge message  
in terms of what America stands for and  
in terms of diversity and potential, and  
I, of course, am supporting Senator  
Obama. You, you said you were supporting  
Senator McCain!

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

We have to ask you.

COLIN POWELL:

Yeah, I think there's no  
question that it would send that kind of

a message. I think it would be electrifying. But at the same time-- we have to make a judgement here, within our country, as to which of the candidates brings the right measure of experience and judgement to the task and which would be best for America. I have been watching both of these individuals. I know them both extremely well and I have not decided who I'm going to vote for yet and I'm anxious to see what the debates are going to be like, because we gotta get off this lipstick on a pig stuff and get into issues.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

Which is in fact one of the reasons why you've all agreed to be here, to talk about the issues--

FRANK SESNO:

Can I follow up? Ok, so you're supporting--

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

You don't want to talk  
about pigs?

FRANK SESNO:

I don't-- never want to  
talk about pigs and lipstick. No, we  
won't do that-- but, you said you're  
supporting McCain, you said you're  
supporting Obama, you say you're on the  
fence and you're waiting.

COLIN POWELL:

Said I haven't decided  
who to vote for.

FRANK SESNO:

Then you haven't decided.  
How will you decide?

COLIN POWELL:

I will decide-- when I  
have seen everything. I've now seen who  
the vice presidential candidates are.  
I've seen the conventions. I am looking

at the platforms that the various parties are putting forward and I want to see some of the debates and then I will decide.

FRANK SESNO:

How much harder, if I may, how much harder is this for you as the first African American Secretary of State-- this has to personal--

COLIN POWELL:

I'm-- I'm an American, first and foremost, and I'm very proud-- I said to-- I said to my beloved friend and colleague John McCain, a friend of 25 years -John, I love you- that I'm not just gonna vote for you on the basis of our affection and friendship and I've said to Barack Obama, "I admire you, I'll give you all the advice I can but I'm not gonna vote for you just 'cause you're black." We have to move beyond

this and I hope that's the American people-- look at these two individuals, you can't deny who Mr. Obama is or what he is, you can't deny the heroism, that-- just heart of John McCain's makeup.

But who's gonna have the best economic policies for our country, who's gonna inspire the most confidence in the country and around the world, our first question. And who will keep us safer? And who brings the best judgement and experience to-- to the task? And that's what I'm going to make a judgement on between now and the second Tuesday of November.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

Should we go to our next question?

Student #2:

My name is Colby Anderson, from Charlotte, North

Carolina. I have a question-- has the president's political communication team or public opinion ever gotten in the way of you doing your job to the best of your ability?

FRANK SESNO:

Hmmmm.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

Hmmmmm.

FRANK SESNO:

Who wants to start?

JAMES BAKER:

Stop squirming guys.

(LAUGHTER)

COLIN POWELL:

NO.

MADELINE ALBRIGHT:

I have to say no--

JAMES BAKER:

I say no.

MADELINE ALBRIGHT:

But I also-- I think in

listening to all of us, what is very clear to me is that one of the big things for the next president of the United States is to select a Secretary State-- who has a lot of energy and who wants to go to all these different places and spend a lot of time, but also, one who is committed to a bipartisan foreign policy. Because I think that's the part that, in terms of our discussions here is so evident no matter what we're saying about the elections, ultimately, I do think we all are Americans and that that's the part that is important and as Secretary of State you were the Chief Diplomat of the country and you have to do your job to do that and not let the communications teams get in the way.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

Should we go to one last

question?

FRANK SESNO:

From the floor.

Student #3:

01:03:15:00 My name is Michael Herman, and I'm from Minneapolis, Minnesota. And I was wondering, how do you see the US responding to humanitarian crises? Like the situation in Darfur?

FRANK SESNO:

01:03:22:00 Humanitarian crises, how should the United States respond to humanitarian crises such as the situation in Darfur? Secretary Christopher?

WARREN CHRISTOPHER:

01:03:25:00 I think we have to be very conscious of those and do all that we can. But I think we probably also have been somewhat sobered by the Iraq

experience. We can't move into those situations until we know that we can accomplish something there, that we can execute the policy that we have a proper exit strategy. And when you look at some of the problems around the world, we need to work through the other-- other countries of the world, and other regional organizations.

01:04:01:00      And that's especially true in Darfur. It's a very demanding, appealing crisis. But I'm not sure putting a lot of American troops in there without thinking through those other issues makes a lot of sense for us.

COLIN POWELL:

01:04:26:00      I-- I couldn't agree more with Chris. You look at something like Darfur and it just breaks your heart.

Though, when you start to look, is there a hard power military solution for this, you're not gonna find it in Europe, you won't find it in the United States. The place is almost the size of Texas. So, you do what you can working through non-profit organizations, you do what you can working through the UN. And we have done a lot. We spent a lot of money trying to help the people of Darfur and you do what you can to put pressure on the government in Khartoum.

01:04:39:00 But the ultimate solution to the crisis in Darfur is political solution between the rebels and-- the government in Khartoum.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

01:04:46:00 Well, not to--

COLIN POWELL:

01:04:45:00 We've done a lot, though,

with humanitarian support in other places.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

01:04:46:00     Yeah, not to put too fine a point on it, it's the same that was said about Bosnia, Rwanda, and et cetera. Since all of you have presided over these-- periods in American history and global history, can we pin you down? The United States has called it genocide, what's happening in Darfur. Secretary Albright, what should the next president do?

MADELINE ALBRIGHT:

01:05:03:00     Well, I think it's in US national interest, in fact, to do something about humanitarian situations that lead to or are genocidal. And the question is, how you get the will of the American people behind it. It is not easy. But, I'll say this. Is, if

you're the United States, you're damned if you do, or damned if you don't. We intervened in Somalia and people thought that was a mistake. We didn't intervene in Rwanda and people thought that was a mistake. And what has to happen is for us to be clear about the extent to which humanitarian intervention and humanitarian assistance is in US national interest.

01:05:48:00      And if it is, as I believe it is, is to have the various resources that are necessary for it and explain it to the American people as a national security issue.

JAMES BAKER:

01:06:02:00      When you-- when you formulate and implement foreign policy, and I betcha everybody here would agree with this, you have got to take

America's principles and values into consideration. We're talking here now about principles and values. But you also have to have a healthy dose of national interest involved. Because otherwise, you lose the support of the American people. Your foreign policy can only be sustained as long as you bring the American people along with it. They are the final arbiter of foreign policy in our democracy. We cannot be the policemen for the world, shouldn't be asked to be, couldn't be if we wanted to.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

01:06:39:00      Okay, so, many, many people on campuses all over the United States have distinguished themselves by creating a grassroots movement for Darfur. If I remember, you and your administration said that we don't have a

dog in this fight about-- about the  
Balkans, about Bosnia and--

JAMES BAKER:

01:06:46:00 That's not actually what  
I said, but it's not out there in the  
ether and you'll never get rid of it.

(LAUGHTER)

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

01:06:49:00 What did you say?

JAMES BAKER:

01:06:51:00 I didn't say that. I  
didn't (PH) say that it was reported  
that I said that, but I didn't say--

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

01:06:53:00 Okay, but nonetheless, we  
didn't do anything at that time. So,  
the question is, should the American  
president--

JAMES BAKER:

01:06:54:00 Well, we didn't do  
anything for about four or five years

after that, if I'm not mistaken.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

01:07:00:00      Okay, should the American president lead on these issues of vital human rights interests?

JAMES BAKER:

01:07:01:00      He should lead, but he should lead wisely and not commit American lives to a-- to a task that is not going to be supported by the American people. We should do what Colin said: work through private voluntary organizations, do what we can diplomatically with countries that are involved in Dar-- in Darfur, particularly the government of Sudan. The government of China, and others, to bring about a solution to the problem.

01:07:26:00      But don't start talking about sending troops on an issue like

that all the way around the world,  
because you're gonna lose the American  
people, then you'll lose the policy.

MADELINE ALBRIGHT:

01:07:43:00 Then we should not have  
declared it genocide. Because once it's  
declared genocide--

JAMES BAKER:

01:07:58:00 I didn't declare it  
genocide.

COLIN POWELL:

01:08:00:00 I did.

MADELINE ALBRIGHT:

01:08:01:00 Well-- you did?

COLIN POWELL:

01:08:04:00 I did. (LAUGHTER)

(APPLAUSE) No, I did. I sent teams over  
to see what was going on, and-- the  
reports came back in. And it was a  
judgment call on my part. Based on what  
I saw, the Janjaweed doing, under the

leadership of the Khartoum regime, and how it was affecting the people. And I visited the area. I felt that it met the standards of being called genocidal. And, our responsibility when we make such a declaration, is to report it to the UN, for the UN to make a judgment independently. Under the law. This is the international law. And the UN made their analysis and did not judge it to be genocide. We pretty much stand alone in the international community calling it that.

01:08:31:00      And I still think it is. But we do not have the resources or the capability to go put an American army that will stand around in the desert of Darfur, not particularly fighting anybody, but just being there. Nor do I think, as Jim says, that you would get

the support of the American people, for such an investment of our troop strength and the costs associated with it.

01:08:54:00      You don't see the Europeans forming a European army to go, because they can't do it either. All you can do is try to get this UN force, which has pretty much been ineffective. Because it's a matter of getting troops with a huge logistic capability to stand around and hope that that will solve the problem. The problem has to be solved politically, between the government in Khartoum, and the rebels.

FRANK SESNO:

01:09:21:00      If I may just follow up briefly on that, then, Secretary Albright. Is not there then an important point to be made by the United States and the world going on record and

saying this is genocide? Recognizing the limitation as you've just established them? It does clearly establish-- a point, an important historical point, does it not?

MADELINE ALBRIGHT:

01:09:49:00 I think it does. But also, there are so many aspects to this, we need to figure out how to prevent genocide. And one of the things--

FRANK SESNO:

01:10:01:00 What you're saying is you shouldn't declare it if you can't back it up with your troops if it's happening?

MADELINE ALBRIGHT:

01:10:07:00 Well, I think there is an issue in terms of it isn't just our troops. It's a matter of whether we provide logistical assistance to those who might wanna go in, strengthen the

African Union. Decide whether there should be a no-fly zone--

FRANK SESNO:

01:10:13:00 Do something.

MADELINE ALBRIGHT:

01:10:18:00 But I-- I-- I have to say, I anguish over this, because I know how difficult it is. And we didn't do anything about Bosnia for a while. But we actually did, in the end. And we won, and we did it in Kosovo, and it was the right thing to do. And I think we have to figure out where our-- resources are. And when you say it's up to the President of the United States, I agree. And that's why we have to figure out what the role of the United States is. That is what this election is about.

01:10:32:00 And trying to explain all this instead of talking about lipstick,

we really do need to talk about what is-  
- what does the next president see as  
the role of the United States in the  
21st century? Is our economy  
strengthened by doing things abroad? Is  
it weakened? Those are all the huge  
issues, which is why this is such a good  
discussion.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

01:10:45:00      And which is what we're  
going to ask you-- and-- when we come  
back, because we are almost out of time.  
But this is so important, as you've  
said. What do people need to hear from  
the candidates. Because they're not  
hearing it now. And what do you want  
from this debate and from this campaign,  
when we come back.

01:10:59:00                   (BREAK IN TAPE)

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

It is extraordinary that

George Washington University and we've been able to convene these five former Secretaries of State. The question is why have you agreed to come here? Is it because there are issues that are not being talked about? And is it because there are issues you wish were being talked about? Do you, General Powell, for instance, feel that the candidates should be addressing something that they're not at the moment?

COLIN POWELL:

You know in this wonderful world that-- you and Frank have created.

FRANK SESNO:

(LAUGHTER) That's a lot of credit.

COLIN POWELL:

--of the media.

Unfortunately, we're being driven,

increasingly, to the little gotches and the little celebrity aspects of political life. And-- you see the cable shows in the evening and they thrive on it, they get market share on it. It's all about getting market share and who can be more outrageous than the other person. This doesn't serve the American people that well. We oughta be talking about our economic problems. We oughta be talking about educational problems. My wife, Alma is here in the audience and we're working on a problem where a third of high school kids are dropping out, 50% are minority. The drop out rate in Detroit is 74%. Now that affects our national security and our economic well-being more than just about anything else that we've discussed this afternoon. I'd like to hear more about our economy, about education, about energy and what

we're gonna do about energy, because those are linked, economy, education, energy, and global-- global emissions--

FRANK SESNO:

Secretary-- Secretary

Christopher?

WARREN CHRISTOPHER:

Well, you know an election is not a political science class and I think it's a wonderful thing if they do talk more about issues that we do talk about here but, but frankly, I think the debates are yet to come and I think the campaign is getting to that point where the American people insist on them-- talking about the issues of great importance. We've come through perhaps a bit of a silly period with the two conventions but-- now I think we're going to get a much more serious point of view as we go forward with the

debates and the remaining seven weeks of the campaign.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

Secretary Baker?

HENRY KISSINGER:

I think also that is a--

JAMES BAKER:

Well, I think that the--  
no, go ahead.

HENRY KISSINGER:

--to blame the candidates. I think the-- the 24 hour news cycle and these constant demands produce the necessity on the candidates of pretending they have an answer to every problem while the fact the matter is some of these problems will take a long time to resolve. Then they get encapsuled into phrases like, "Some candidates are going stay for a hundred years." You don't know what no candidate

wants to stay a hundred years.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

Yeah, but they're grownups. I mean they say these things, so you can't really blame the media.

HENRY KISSINGER:

But that's exactly the debate that shouldn't take place.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

But still Secretary--

HENRY KISSINGER:

I think that candidates, on both sides, are torn by the following: they want to give a number of series of speeches that require enormous effort and get a lot of expertise. Then, focus groups that tell them what words the public allegedly prefers to hear. Then they have to appear X number of times on various talk shows. So, slowing down the system, which I don't think is

possible, would certainly contribute to a better debate in the nineteenth century that one shouldn't talk about, but in big debates where candidates talk for hours both in England and the United States--

FRANK SESNO:

That was before cable.

HENRY KISSINGER:

That was before the cable, the internet, and so, so, its fair-- its not correct to blame the candidates for not spelling out for the program.

JAMES BAKER:

The point I'd like to make-- and I've had a fair amount of running presidential campaigns-- there's nothing unusual what's happening this year. This is the complaint you get every time. We're not talking enough

about the issues, we're dealing with these peripheral ideas and things. This is the exactly the way the last, I betcha, ten or twelve presidential campaigns have gone and as Chris points out, there's gonna be debates coming up, one of 'em in all probability be on foreign policy and we do need to talk more about energy and education and the economy given what's happening on Wall Street and I'll betcha the candidates will be talking a lot about energy, education, and environment as we move forward. So, I don't think it's a problem of handling, we shouldn't be wringing our hands. This is a pretty darn unique presidential campaign we got going on out here, a very good one as a matter of fact.

FRANK SESNO:

You get the last word.

MADELINE ALBRIGHT:

Well, I do think that the time is now shorter and the minds will be focused on this. And I do hope that the debates are good and I also do think, since the media does play some role in this, in terms of asking the questions in the debates, and so I hope it's more than whether someone's wearing a flag pin or not. I do think that it's important the media asks the questions, so that the debates can, in fact, show what are the differences are.

FRANK SESNO:

Well, let the records show that I haven't complimented on your lapel pins today but they are very nice

MADELINE ALBRIGHT:

Thank you.

FRANK SESNO:

--and precisely the

reason we're having this conversation.  
And precisely the reason we framed it as  
it is. Is to expose our audience and  
viewers to a more detailed and--  
discussion on these issues, driven by  
people who have been there and who have  
helped to drive the decision making  
process in history.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

01:11:02:00      And unfortunately, we are  
out of time now. And we'd like to thank  
our panel. Once again, the former  
Secretaries of State: Warren  
Christopher, Henry Kissinger, Madeline  
Albright, James Baker, and Colin Powell.  
Thank you all very much for being here.

(APPLAUSE)

FRANK SESNO:

01:11:34:00      And we'd-- we'd also like  
to thank-- we'd also like to thank, if I  
may, we'd also like to thank the

organizations that made this possible. The School of Media and Public Affairs and the Elliot School of International Affairs, here at the George Washington University. The Center for a New American Security. The James A. Baker-- Inst-- The Third-- Institute for Public Policy at rice University, and the Colin Powell Center of Policy Studies at the City College of New York.

01:11:58:00 Thanks to you and to your organizations as well. (APPLAUSE) I would-- I would also like to thank our media partners, including CNN and America Abroad Media who have made this possible. Finally, many thanks to all the women and men at all of these organizations, GW and beyond, who have helped to assemble these wonderful people here today and make this event

possible. I'm Frank Sesno.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR:

01:12:17:00 And I'm Christiane

Amanpour, thanks for joining us.

(APPLAUSE)

\* \* \*END OF AUDIO\* \*

\*

\* \* \*END OF

TRANSCRIPT\* \* \*

FILENAME Document15

FILENAME Document15