

**THE CENTER FOR
STRATEGIC AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES**

**“THE NEW REALISM
AND THE REBIRTH OF AMERICAN LEADERSHIP”**

FEATURING:

**THE HONORABLE BILL RICHARDSON,
GOVERNOR OF NEW MEXICO**

INTRODUCTION:

**DR. JOHN HAMRE,
CSIS PRESIDENT AND CEO**

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2007

*Transcript by:
Federal News Service
Washington, D.C.*

DR. JOHN HAMRE: Okay, ladies and gentlemen – forgive me, I’m trying to get the attention of the governor. (Laughter.) Ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much for coming today. And, Governor, thank you. We’re delighted that you’re here.

Let me just say by way of introduction, first, my name is John Hamre. I’m the president here at CSIS. And we’re doing something today that’s unusual for us. We have been – we’re a bipartisan think tank and our philosophy through the years has been a passive bipartisanship, and we realized this last year that wasn’t going to work. We need to become proactively bipartisan. And what do I mean by that? I mean if we want to be engaged – ideas enter the public debate through politics in this country, and if we want to be engaged in that, we have to reach out and work with the politicians.

And so we’re going to be proactive in doing that, and we’ve launched a series – and this is a part of – this is the centerpiece, the “Decision 2008,” the new approach for us, and that’s to reach out to candidates who are running for president of the United States and ask them and invite them to come here to speak to the American people through this venue. This is our first, and I can’t tell you how pleased I am that Governor-Ambassador-Secretary Richardson has chosen to come here to be our first.

I say that because he is a very serious candidate, in both dimensions. He is a serious candidate as a political contender, and he’s also a serious intellect. You’re going to see that today, and I’m delighted that he’s been willing to come. And this is the first kicking off our series. We’re going to be inviting all of the candidates – we have invited all the candidates. I’m very pleased that he was the first to accept.

Now, I won’t take long, but just a brief highlight. You all may know about Governor Richardson. He’s currently the governor of New Mexico, of course – was elected 69 percent of the vote, I think, which is – landslides used to be 55 percent, so I don’t know what you’d call 69 percent of the vote. Before that, however, I got to know him when he was secretary of Energy, and before that of course he was our ambassador to the U.N.; he was in the Congress.

So this is a man who has seen American politics from every conceivable vantage point, and the one thing I can say that characterizes his tenure in every one of those positions is active energy. He brought energy to every single thing he did. And so it’s this – I’m sensing this active energy today as he has come today to speak to all of us in his candidacy for president of the United States.

So I introduce to you Governor Bill Richardson.

(Applause.)

GOVERNOR BILL RICHARDSON: Thank you, John. Thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you very much, John. I totally agree with that introduction. (Laughter.) And I want to just say to everybody here, thank you for being here. If I'd known this was such an important group, I would have written a good speech. (Laughter.)

I want to just say thank you to CSIS for putting on these forums. I believe that the next challenges for America – the number one challenge is America's role internationally: how we get out of Iraq, how we restore America's leadership. And this excellent organization, bipartisan, is the right forum for these ideas to be debated. I'm very pleased that I'm the first candidate to accept. I challenge all the other candidates to accept immediately. (Laughter.)

And I want to just say I've had a very good briefing from members of the staff here, brilliant individuals. Many of them worked for me. I wish they were as smart when they worked for me as they are now. But I wanted, again, to John Hamre, who is a great public servant, I appreciate the very nice words. A todos ustedes, se que hay mucha televisión de Latino America. Un placer estar con ustedes. Je suis enchanté d'être. No, I'm just – (laughter).

All right, so here – let me just say, you know, in recent years American foreign policy has been guided more by dogma than by facts, more by ideology than by history, more by wishful thinking than by reality. This administration's lack of realism has led us to a dangerous place. In an era of terrorism, they've squandered our military power, undermined our diplomatic leverage, and depleted our Treasury. They've emboldened our enemies and isolated us from our friends. They've confused our moral compass and compromised our national security.

So America needs to take a different path, a path based on reality, not unilateralist illusions; a path that understands that the gravest dangers that threaten us today do not only threaten us, and that therefore to pursue our national interests and meet those challenges, we must work with our friends, our enemies and everyone in between. This is a path not of hard words, but of hard work; a path of moral strength and not pious judgments; a path of strong diplomacy backed up by a strong military and strong alliances. This is the path of American leadership; a path that I believe can lead to an access of reason to confront urgent global problems.

The president doesn't seem to understand that success and foreign policy requires both a strong military and smart diplomacy, because while diplomacy without power is weak, power without diplomacy is blind. Before I became governor, I'd been a congressman, America's ambassador to the United Nations, and secretary of Energy. In the last 15 years I've also led many diplomatic missions with some of the world's toughest customers, including Saddam Hussein, Fidel Castro, North Koreans, and most recently the Sudanese leader, President Bashir. I've gotten all these tough guys to do basically what I wanted because I put my disdain for them aside and talked to them. You need to know your enemy if you want him to cooperate. I know that even bad guys will

listen to you when you hold a big stick in one hand and a carrot in the other and you show them a face-saving way out of the dilemma you have just created for them. Talking to people is no guarantee of success, but refusing to talk to them is usually a precursor to failure. As JFK said – great American Democratic president – “We should never negotiate out of fear, but we should never fear to negotiate.”

I’ve also worked closely with some extraordinary leaders, such as President Clinton, Kofi Annan, Nelson Mandela. I know that great leaders are guided by shining ideals, but they are never blinded by ideology. They know that to pursue a vision to make the world a better place, you first must see the world as it really is. To restore American leadership, we need to reject dogma and to embrace what I call a new realism in our foreign policy – an enlightened and ethical realism for the 21st century; a realism that looks at the world through cool eyes but also inspired by ardent principles. Here is the new realism that I propose:

America is a great nation that knows how to defend itself. We’re also a nation that has been willing to pay in blood as well as in coin for what we believe is the right thing to do. And we have a sense that in order to do right by ourselves, we must be ready to do right by others. We defend ourselves most effectively when we lead others, and it has been our willingness to seek and find common ground, to blend our interests with those of others, which has been the key to our long history of effective leadership.

Realists like Presidents Truman and Eisenhower understood that defending Europe and ourselves from the Soviets required a strong military, but they also understood that we cannot lead our allies if they did not wish to follow. These and subsequent American presidents knew the importance of moral leadership. Our remarkable military and our prosperous economy gave us that power to lead, but our commitment to human dignity, including our willingness to struggle against our own prejudices inspired others to follow.

So if America is to lead again, we need to remember this history and to rebuild our overextended military, increase the size of our Army, revive our alliances, and restore our reputation as a nation which respects international law, human rights, and civil liberties. There is really no time to lose, for we live today in perilous times in which policies shaped by fantasy and wishful thinking have already wreaked havoc and court further disaster.

There are six trends that are transforming our world. We need to understand them and we need to respond to all of them simultaneously. One trend of course is fanatical jihadism bursting from an increasingly unstable and violent greater Middle East. This trend has been growing for years, but the invasion and collapse of Iraq has fueled its growth.

A second trend is the growing power and sophistication of both non-state and state-linked criminal and terrorist enterprises capable of disrupting the global economy and trafficking in weapons of mass destruction. Together, these two trends raise the

terrible specter of nuclear terrorism. We know that al Qaeda has tried to get nuclear weapons. We know that Pakistan's A.Q. Khan sold nuclear materials to rogue states. And we know there are former Soviet nuclear weapons which are poorly secured. The existence of a black market in nuclear materials is well documented. The proliferation of nuclear weapons to new countries has increased further the opportunities for jihadists to obtain them.

A third trend in our rapidly transforming world is the rapid rise of Asian economic and military power, above all in China and India.

And a fourth trend is the reemergence of Russia as an increasingly assertive global and regional player, with a large nuclear arsenal, control over energy resources, and tempted also by militant nationalism. The simultaneous rise of Russia, India and China requires our thoughtful attention and strategic leadership so that these powerful nuclear armed nations may be integrated into a stable global order.

A fifth trend transforming our world is the simultaneous increase in global economic interdependence and financial imbalances, unaccompanied by the growth of institutional capacities to manage these realities. Globalization has made our economy more vulnerable to resource constraints and financial shocks originating beyond our borders. I'm particularly concerned about the possibility of a global energy crisis or a potential collapse of the U.S. dollar.

And the sixth trend we face is that of urgent and worsening health and environmental problems, which are truly global in scope. Global warming and pandemics like AIDS do not respect national borders. And poverty, ethnic conflict and overpopulation also spill over borders, feeding what Moises Naim has called the five wars of globalization: drugs, arms trafficking, money laundering, intellectual property, and alien smuggling.

Now, these six trends present us with problems which are international in their origin and which will require international solutions. And they cry out for American leadership. If the world succeeds in preventing nuclear terrorism, defeating jihadism, integrating rising powers into a stable order, protecting global financial markets stability, and fighting pandemics and global warming, America surely will deserve much of that credit. If the world is to meet these challenges, America just as surely will deserve much of the blame.

So we must confront all of these challenges with all of our resources, from our military to our economy to our capacity to inspire others to follow us – to inspire. So this new realist vision for re-launching American leadership in the 21st century will entail several steps, which I will now outline.

Number one: First and foremost, we must repair our alliances. This means restoring respect and appreciation for our allies all over the world, in Europe and Latin America and Asia and Africa, but also those democratic values which unite us.

Number two: We must renew our commitment to international law and multilateral cooperation. This means expanding the United Nations Security Council to reflect international realities. And it means ethical reform at the U.N. so that this vital institution can meet the challenges of the 21st century. It means more third world debt relief and a World Bank focus on poverty reduction. It means shifting aid from loans to grants for the poorest countries. It means reviving the Doha round of trade talks and seeking trade agreements which seriously address wage disparities, worker rights, and the environment. It means more resources for the IMF so that it can protect the international economy from financial panic and shock. And it means respecting the Geneva Convention and joining the International Criminal Court.

The United States once was, and again must be, a human rights example to which others aspire. We must be impeccable in our own behavior, and we must reward countries with respect the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, and we must negotiate constructively but firmly with those who do not.

Because we care about human rights, we need to start taking Africa seriously. The two most horrendous recent genocides have taken place in Rwanda and now Darfur. I was just there. History teaches us that if the United States does not take the lead on genocide, no one else will. We need to step up to the plate in Darfur, as does the United Nations, and let the world know that when genocide threatens, the United States will lead the world to stop it.

Number three: The United States also must be the leader, not the laggard, in global efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. You saw that startling scientific report that basically said it's manmade causes that have brought us this crisis. We must join the Kyoto Protocol on global warming, and then go well beyond it; make up for lost time. We must lead the world also on energy security and national security with a man-on-the-moon effort, not little energy bills here and there, to improve efficiency and commercialize clean alternative technologies. We must cut our fossil fuel consumption dramatically and rapidly and get others like China and India to follow us in a sustainable energy future, with diplomacy.

Number four: We need to stop treating diplomatic engagement with others like a reward for good behavior. The Bush administration's refusal to engage bad regimes has only encouraged and strengthened the most paranoid and hard-line tendencies. The futility of this policy is most tragically obvious in regard to Iran and North Korea, who responded to Washington snubs and threats with intensification of their nuclear program. And we should be talking to Syria too about Hezbollah and a Middle East peace – American leadership talking even with regimes we don't like so that we can show them the real costs and benefits that will result from their choices. Sometimes diplomacy demands that you talk tough, but to do that, you have to at least be talking. We also need to engage Russia and China more effectively, more strategically and systematically than we have as we encourage them to work with us to build a stable, peaceful world.

Number five: We need to focus on the real security threats from which Iraq has so dangerously diverted our attention. Our obsession with Iraq has cost us to lose focus on the real threats to this country. This means doing the hard work to build strong coalitions to fight terrorists and to stop nuclear proliferation. Most urgently, we need to lock down all of the world's fissionable material quickly before terrorists get their hands on a nuclear bomb. And to accomplish this, we should increase funds and commitment to the Nunn-Lugar program to secure former Soviet nuclear weapons, and we must work aggressively with our Pakistani allies to make sure that no matter what happens in the future, Pakistan's nuclear arsenal cannot fall into the hands of jihadists.

We need better human intelligence and better international intelligence, and law enforcement coordination to prevent nuclear trafficking. And we must do the hard diplomatic work, including Russia and China, to contain the nuclear ambitions of Iran and North Korea as we provide these nations with incentives and face-saving ways to renounce nuclear weapons. And we want other countries to take the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty seriously. If we're going to do that, we need to start taking it seriously ourselves. This means leading a global effort – a new global effort to reduce the number of nuclear weapons in the world, including our own. And we need to upgrade and tighten the MPT, modernize it to prevent states from legally developing their nuclear capabilities, and then opting out of the treaty as they rush to build bombs.

We must also open an ideological front in the war against jihadism. There is a civil war between Islam, within Islam, between extremists and moderates, and we need to stop helping our enemies in that civil war. We need to start showing, both through our words and our deeds that this is not, as the jihadists claim, a clash of civilizations; rather it is a class between civilization and barbarity. We need to present the Arab and Muslim worlds with a better vision than the apocalyptic fantasy of the jihadists – a vision of peace, prosperity, tolerance, and respect for human dignity.

For this to be credible, we need to live up to our own ideals as Americans. So prisoner abuse – Abu Ghraib, torture, secret prisons – eavesdropping, evasion of the Geneva Convention must have no place in America's foreign policy. If we want Muslims to open up to us, we should start by closing Guantanamo. We also need to pressure Egypt, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and other friends to reform their education system, which five years after 9/11 are still incubators of anti-Americanism. And we must give a louder, more systematic voice to moderate American Muslims so that they can speak the truth about us and be heard. And we need to reengage the Middle East peace process so that we can deprive the jihadists of their most effective propaganda tool. Every American president, Republican and Democrat, have had a Middle East peace envoy to bring stability and at least negotiation to the Middle East. We have not had one in the last six years. We must not waiver in our support for Israel as we use all our carrots and sticks to strengthen Palestinian moderates and promote a two-state solution.

Today we're spending \$2 billion per week on Iraq, but we're not doing nearly enough to protect our cities, our nuclear power plants, our ports and shipping from terrorist attacks. We must spend more to recruit, equip and train more first responders,

and we must drastically improve our public health facilities, which five years after 9/11 are not ready for a biological attack. And we need to allocate homeland security dollars where they're needed: to population centers and facilities that we know are targeted. It is unpatriotic and irresponsible to turn homeland security dollars into pork.

Number six: The United States also needs to start paying attention to the Americas, to Latin America, our own backyard. The legal trafficking of drugs and persons across the Mexican border threatens America's national security, so we need better border security and comprehensive immigration reform – reform that provides for a guest worker program with a realistic and earned path to legalization for the 12 million undocumented workers that are in the United States.

And we must abandon the ridiculous notion of building a fence along the border. I remember President Reagan – I was a freshman congressman: Mr. Gorbachev, turn – get that wall down. “Tear down that wall.” I remember that – (laughter) – and now – you know, it's been about 17 years, but I remember that. What is America doing with our neighbor? A wall. No fence ever built has stopped history, and this won't either. It just won't work. Let's use those funds for the border for real border enforcement, and I propose doubling the number of border guards to do just that.

I live with this issue every day as a border governor. Real security, real results with a fraction of the financial and political cost of building a fence is critically important. And to reduce both illegal immigration and anti-American – by the way, this is the Univision thing. You guys owe me. (Laughter.) And to reduce both illegal immigration and anti-American populism in Latin America, we must work with reform-minded governments to alleviate poverty and promote equitable development. We need to strengthen energy cooperation in the region as well as we foster democracy and fair trade.

And fostering democracy must include Cuba. We should reverse Bush policies restricting remittances and travel to visit loved ones – family reunification. Raúl Castro has started to make some overtures towards the United States. Let's challenge him to show his sincerity by releasing Cuban political prisoners.

Number seven: America needs to lead the global fight against poverty, which is the basis of so much violence. We must promote equitable trade agreements, create more jobs in all countries, and through our example and our diplomacy, we must encourage all wealthy countries to honor their U.N. Millennium Goals commitment. A commission on implementation of sustainable development goals, composed of world leaders and prominent experts should be created to recommend ways of meeting these Millennium commitments.

America needs to lead donors on debt relief, shifting aid from loans to grants, and a greater focus on primary health care and affordable vaccines. We should pressure pharmaceutical companies to allow expanded use of generic drugs, and we should stimulate public/private partnerships to reduce costs and enhance access to anti-malarial

drugs and bed nets. Most importantly, America should spearhead a Marshall plan for the Middle East and North Africa. For a small fraction of the cost of the Iraq war, which has made us so many enemies, we could make many friends.

A crucial effort in fighting terrorism must be support for public education in the Muslim world, which is the best way to mitigate the role of madrassas that foment extremism. Development alleviates the injustice and lack of opportunity that proponents of violence and terrorism exploit. To those who say we cannot afford an aid program, a foreign assistance program to rebuild pro-American sentiment in the developing world, I say we cannot afford not to.

So the challenges facing America today are great. We need to learn from failure – open our eyes and see the world as it is so that we can lead efforts to make it a better, safer place. This is the new realism that I have brought forth to you today; a new realism for the new century. I believe that we can do it. America must earn back the trust, respect and admiration of the world. I'm optimistic about this country. I'm patriotic. I'm positive we can turn it around. And I believe that I can do it. I know that's a little partisan, but that's the end. (Laughter.) We can and will once again be the respected leader of nations. Our national security and our future depend on it.

I thank you for listening. I thank you for being here. And I hope in the days ahead, in a long campaign that's a year from now – there should be no early coronation – this is a campaign that is going to test the issues and the vision of leaders to bring America's restoration as a moral leadership in the world. Thank you.

(Applause.)

DR. HAMRE: Ladies and gentlemen – I don't have to say it, but thank you, Governor. That was very inspiring and it gave a lot of us lots of information for us to think through.

We have a brief amount of time for the governor to take questions. Please raise your hand. Yes, sir, I'm going take for you – I mean, wait until we get a microphone down. Bring the microphone down to this man right here, third row. And please identify yourself because the news media will want to know who you are. Please.

Q: My name is Joe Duckert (sp). I'm a long-time energy analyst. And, Governor, I have to say you really would have wowed us if you had taken time to write that better speech that you had in mind. (Laughter.) That was marvelous. But one phrase you didn't use was "energy independence." And before declaring your candidacy, you were quoted as saying that U.S. energy independence would be the number one issue in the 2008 campaign. Now, you're a former secretary of Energy, so I wonder if you could give us some specifics in defining U.S. energy independence. Does it mean cutting off all imports? Does it apply to natural gas as well as oil? And what timeframe are you talking about – 10 years, 15 years, 20 years?

GOV. RICHARDSON: Okay. I thought I did, but maybe – I did mention it, but let me expand on it. Let me repeat: I believe that energy independence is not just energy security; it's national security too. It is perhaps the most urgent domestic priority in this country. I stand behind that.

Here is what I propose: 65 percent of our fossil fuels come from imported oil. That threatens our national security and our energy security. What would I do as president? I would lead a man-on-the-moon effort, a Marshall Plan, an Apollo plan that would make that dependence go from 65 percent to 10 percent in 15 years. And it's got to involve every American. This is how you do it: massive public and private investment in renewable technologies. I think the shift in the future are towards renewable technologies: solar, wind, biomass, fuel cells, distributed generation, ethanol. I believe we need to have more fuel efficient vehicles. I would go to 40 miles per gallon. I would also make sure that America becomes green in our buildings, in our schools. To do that, you need incentives. To do that you need to use the tax code to reward those that take the right steps.

I would also recognize the importance of conservation. And as president, I would say to the American people, it's in our national security and energy security interests for us all to participate in conserving energy, in having more efficient air conditioning, more efficient lighting, more efficient washing machines. I would say to the American people, we're in this together. And I might ask them to sacrifice for the better good.

This has to be led by a president. It can't be done by little energy bills here and there that extend the wind credit for another three years. It's a massive effort. Do we want our dependence to continue with OPEC, with countries that might produce an oil shock? The answer is no. I think the future too is natural gas. I think – nuclear power I believe has to be part of the mix, but it should not be given preference as the energy bill did – nuclear, coal and oil – with subsidies. It should be an equal playing field. And I believe it's important to recognize that domestic production of oil and gas is important, but not in ecologically sensitive areas. We must have a balance also of being energy efficient and making sure that we protect our resources, our wildlife.

Global climate change has to be part of that effort too. We should have an all-out assault, led by the United States, not just to rejoin the Kyoto Treaty, but to make up for lost time. My state proudly observes the Kyoto Treaty. So what you need is mandated cap and trade emissions goals that this country should pursue, in cooperation with other nations. You're going to say, well, why doesn't China and India – they have to be part of this. Well, you bring China and India through diplomacy, through recognizing that this is a global problem, that it's a manmade problem, that there's already an effect on our oceans and our climate, and so therefore we must redouble those efforts.

DR. HAMRE: Right down here.

Q: Governor, I'm Tom Reckford with the World Affairs Council here in Washington. You have visited Cuba and you discussed Cuban policy a bit in your talk.

Do you favor restoring diplomatic relations with Cuba? And do you favor ending the embargo that has lasted almost 50 years?

GOV. RICHARDSON: John, I thought I wouldn't get all these questions right now. I mean, I'm in my 11th day. But I'll answer that. (Laughter.)

Our most important objective with Cuba right now is how can we positively influence the transition to democracy? That should be short term. Do we take the embargo out now? No. But what I would do is I would challenge Cuba. Raúl Castro is sending messages: We want normalization of relations. Okay, here's something that you might do: release political prisoners – journalists, dissidents. Those are the steps that I would take. But what I would also do is I would have a plan for that democratic transition. I hope the Bush administration has one. Because I believe as the Cuban people get more American contact and travel and all kinds of initiatives – I don't understand the Bush administration saying, we're going to cut down on travel – family travel and remittances. People-to-people contacts strengthen nations.

So those are the steps that I would take. Taking the embargo off I believe is premature. I think there has to be a negotiation. I would get leaders of foreign – former presidents of Latin America to help me visualize a policy for a post-Castro Cuba where you push for a democratic transition, where you push for democracy, where you push for fair elections, where you push for long-term viability of that country and reintegrate it into the Americas.

DR. HAMRE: Down here in the front. Right to your –

Q: My name is Martin Apple. I'm president of the Council of Scientific Society Presidents. The vision for energy that you just proposed, and the environment, is the kind of bold vision that our national leaders ought to have. The question I'm going to ask is not that simple. Across the world, the industrial nations are having rapidly aging populations and non-renewal from younger populations – very small families. That will change the capacity of the industrial societies to create economic growth within themselves. In the United States, we have a rapidly aging population bulge reaching entitlement age. That's going to change the capacity of the United States to do almost everything. How are you going to solve this?

GOV. RICHARDSON: I don't have the answer to that. What is the answer? I don't know. What would you say? I don't know.

Q: I think we're going to have to shift our belief in what we do with our resources, particularly our tax resources. My own personal view would be having enough tax to cover it, both entitlements which we have paid in and to also be sure that the people who have paid in get back what they paid for. But I think the difficulty in this country is not the only one; it's across the whole world with this rapidly aging phenomenon. Opening our borders to people who need to immigrate into the United

States may create an age balance that will help us in the future, besides providing a productive economy in the future.

GOV. RICHARDSON: You know, that I agree. Let me deal with that, because immigration is a critically important issue, and my concern is that the Congress, the easiest thing to do is to do nothing on immigration. This is an issue dividing our county that requires attention. I would secure the border. I would not build that fence. I would also deal with the legalization plan for the 12 million that are here – find ways to – if they speak English, if they pay back taxes, if they pass background checks, if they don't get in front of the line of those that are trying to get here legally, if they embrace American values. I think that's the basis of a legalization plan.

But the last plan that you mentioned I would favor. I would increase the quotas of legal immigration to countries and individuals that the workplace and America needs. And that means basically European, India. I think we're not only a tolerant nation; we should be a practical nation, and what's happened with our legal immigration quotas is it's backlogged and red tape and bureaucracy. They don't have enough staff. There's inefficiencies. The law needs to be changed. I would do that as president because I believe we're not just a nation of immigrants but we want skilled workers in our workplace to compete. Why is it that American high school graduates test substantially lower than high school graduates in science and math in China and India? Why do those two countries produce more engineers than we do? That's an achievement gap. That's competitiveness.

And what we need in this country – and I'm going to talk about this in this campaign – education. We must improve our schools. We should start early with preschool for every child under four. We should revitalize our high school curriculums to be more competitive: science, math, languages. We should find ways to have universal education. Community college – not every child is going to go to college, but you've got community colleges, vocational training. What are we doing about nontraditional students that might be able to go back? I would take the \$600 billion we've spent in Iraq and educate and give the opportunity to educate every American. I think we can do that. And to do that, it's competitiveness, it's globalization, to make sure that our country is prepared.

DR. HAMRE: (Inaudible) – Deborsgrei (ph).

Q: (Inaudible) – Deborsgrei, CSIS, Governor. You mentioned Iran. What do you think we should be doing in Iraq that we're not doing today?

GOV. RICHARDSON: In Iraq?

Q: Yes, sir.

GOV. RICHARDSON: I knew that one would come. (Chuckles.) Here's what I would do with Iraq: I would get out this calendar year, but I would couple that with three

other steps: one, diplomacy, American leadership; bring together a reconciliation conference among the ethnic groups – the Shi'a, the Sunni; find a way that that reconciliation conference, using the leverage of a withdrawal, brings forth a coalition government, a sharing of oil revenues, a sharing of Cabinet ministries, and a Dayton-type accord similar to Dayton – not a division, a splitting up of the country, that would bring territorial integrity and respect to the religious groups in Iraq. I would couple that – Dr. Deborsgrei – this guy is a great thinker, so I'm thinking. (Laughter.)

I would couple that too with a regional conference of the following nations: Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Moslem countries, NATO, and Iran and Syria, to look at issues relating to territorial integrity, stability, security and reconstruction. Now, is that going to guarantee success? Is that going to guarantee the stoppage of a civil war and sectarian conflict? It won't guarantee it, but I believe it will be an important step to make things better. We're already in a sectarian conflict, in a civil war. I believe we must use diplomacy, coupled with building international support for this effort. That's what I would do.

DR. HAMRE: Right here in front.

Q: Christian Wilp from N-TV, the German news channel. Governor, you spoke about expanding the U.N. Security Council. Recently an effort by Brazil, India, Germany and Japan failed. Would you have supported those countries or do you think of some other nations?

GOV. RICHARDSON: Well, this is what I would do. There's five members of the Security Council. We know who they are: China, India, France, Britain, the United States. And by the way, the IMF, the World Bank, Asian Development Bank, IDB, they were all institutions created after the Cold War. They need to all be revitalized to reflect current reality.

What would I do on the U.N. Security Council? I would add Germany and Japan as permanent members. I would not give them veto power because veto power, there is five – you know, we've invested in that. Why should they get veto power? But they should be members of the Security Council. I would also say to Asia and Africa and Latin America, you deserve a seat too, but you figure out, perhaps on a rotating basis, who represents Africa, Asia and Latin America. So I would expand the Security Council – it's now five – to those 10.

I believe that in Asia, India and Pakistan make the dispute as to who should be the representative. That should be settled among Asian countries. In Latin America it's Brazil and Mexico and others. You guys decide. The ambassador of Chile is here. I mean, since you showed up here, I'd put Chile there. No, I'm just – (laughter). Or, you know, in Africa – see, John, take care of Chile, will you? (Laughter.) But in African it's either Nigeria, South Africa. You know, so I think the nations of that region should settle it themselves.

What else would I do at the U.N.? Obviously it's got to find ways to rid itself of financial improprieties, of bureaucracy. It needs a real revitalization, you know? A lot of bureaucracy, a lot of staff, a lot of patronage, a lot of corruption – the U.N. needs to move faster. I was just with the new secretary general in New York yesterday. It'd been to Darfur. And there this is a human tragedy, but it requires the U.N. to move faster. We've got a special envoy; there should be a permanent U.N. presence in Darfur. And the special envoy should stay there until there's peace, until there's a ceasefire.

We negotiated with the Save Darfur Coalition a 60-day ceasefire. It's very fragile. You've got to talk to the rebels; you've got to talk – a constant presence. There's 200 U.N. troops, blue helmets, non-fighting troops that have been authorized for Darfur. Only 70 have arrived. The U.N. needs to move faster. And the U.N. and the international community should move dramatically more effectively and rapidly to have the entire peacekeeping force, or a good part of it, U.N. peacekeepers because the African unions are not enough. They need about 20,000 troops.

Why is it that when there are tragedies in Africa, we forget about them? Why are there Rwandas and why are there the Darfurs? We care about Bosnia, we care about the Middle East, Europe, Asia, but what about Africa where the human suffering is unimaginable? We need to give attention – not just the United States, everybody here, to what happens there.

DR. HAMRE: Governor, as long as you're admitting Chile to the Security Council, you also have to admit Argentina, Austria – (laughter) – Australia, New Zealand, Kazakhstan. We've got a bunch of other countries that want to be admitted as well.

GOV. RICHARDSON: Oh, I understand.

DR. HAMRE: Okay. Harlan Ullman.

Q: Governor, Harlan Ullman here at CSIS. Good to see you again. You lay out a number of really quite dramatic aims and intentions in your policy, but it seems to me we have a federal government that's badly broken. Have you given any thought about how you might repair a government that would be able to implement some of these policies?

GOV. RICHARDSON: You know, the most innovative policies that are happening in this country are happening in the states: renewable energy, health care, education – Massachusetts, California covering all their citizens in health care. New Mexico, California being the clean energy states – renewable portfolio standards that say, well, maybe the Congress isn't going to require renewable energy in our electricity but we're going to be 10 percent, 20 percent and do better.

That has caused, I believe, a huge voter apathy and hostility and division in this country over what our Congress and our executive offices do and whether they can deal

with issues instead of punting on immigration or health care, on massive deficit or improving our schools, and getting nothing done.

What I believe this country needs is for somebody to bring the country together, to find ways that we don't think of ourselves just as Republicans and Democrats, but as Americans; not as red states and blue states, but red, white and blue states; that we find ways that we make this dysfunctional executive and congressional branch work together.

Now, what I like to say is that, you know, there are a lot of candidates out there; they give speeches about renewable energy, they give speeches on changing the world and negotiating. I've done it. You know, I've done some of these things, and they've succeeded. Some haven't.

My point is that I think we need a unity of purpose as a country. We're a good country, and I believe it's important that that leadership reflect the need to resolve problems. That's all I can say. You know, does it take change of how you structure Congress? No. Can't do it. Won't happen. The executive branch? You know, maybe so. Some of the work I heard today on homeland security – which the most important task of any government is to protect its people. And what I've heard, just from a lot of experts, is we can assure that to the American people, that we have the kind of policies that will protect them from anthrax attacks or terrorist attacks.

And so I would say that a very urgent task would be to fix some of those problems that – the fundamental task of any government is to bring safety to its people.

DR. HAMRE: I'm sorry, we've run out of time. One last question here in the back and then we'll let the governor go by 11:00. Right back here. And I apologize to all those that have asked for questions. I just don't have time.

Q: Pablo Sencus (ph) from Univision. That wasn't our microphone.

GOV. RICHARDSON: That wasn't your mike? (Laughter.) Yeah, that was Telemundo's, no? (Laughter.)

Q: You got it.

Brevemente, en español, ¿qual es su posición sobre Latino America involucrar Latino America, y que - (inaudible) - con Cuba en términos de normalizar la relación?

GOV. RICHARDSON: Usted no oíste? (Laughter.) Ya dije.

Q: Okay.

GOV. RICHARDSON: Yo le podría mas atención at Latino America. Yo iniciara initiatives que trayen una transición de democracia a Cuba. Lo que es importante para mi es permitir visitas, permitir más contacto con el pueblo Cubano. Y si Raul

Castro verdaderamente quiere decir a Los Estados Unidos que quiere mejorar la relación, que permita salir a prisioneros politicos de Cuba, eso es lo que yo haría. Pero a Latino America es importante tener politica que reconoce el populismo de la democracia. Me gustaría tener mas cooperación energética, pero tambien resolver el problema de inmigración que es clave para tener una mejor relación, no no mas con Mexico, pero con Los Estados Unidos. Je suis enchanté o si. (laughter)

Q: Muchas gracias, I think. (Laughter.)

DR. HAMRE: Muchas gracias, I think. (Laughter.) It's actually a fascinating thing to have an American president's press conference end with a Spanish question, but I think it's emblematic of how America is changing.

Governor, thank you. We were delighted to have you here with us. (Laughter.)

GOV. RICHARDSON: Thanks, John.

(Applause.)

(END)