Keynote speaker Henry Kissinger, left, and OU President David Boren welcome the distinguished participants and guests at the International Programs Center's Foreign Policy Conference.

Foreign Policy for the 21st Century
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**Question:**
Why did this stellar group of experts come to Norman, Oklahoma, to discuss U.S. foreign policy?

**Answer:**
Where else could they breakfast with Sam Nunn, lunch with Jeane Kirkpatrick and dine with Henry Kissinger?

In U.S. foreign policy discussions this fall, all roads led to the campus of the University of Oklahoma.

"Preparing America's Foreign Policy for the 21st Century" showcased OU's new International Programs Center. For the event, OU President David Boren and the center's director, former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Edward J. Perkins, assembled the year's most impressive array of diplomats; intelligence and national security experts; economic, business and legal analysts; scholars; and journalists.

The three days of major addresses, roundtables and panel discussions—September 12, 15 and 16—attracted approximately 6,000 individuals to 12 separate public events. In less structured environments, such as a reception, a private dinner, incidental encounters and late-night recaps, the participants interacted with faculty, students, University guests—and each other.

The celebrity of the principal speakers guaranteed venues filled to overflowing—former Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger, former U.N. Ambassador Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, former U.S. Senator Sam Nunn, economist Richard L. Sandor, journalist and former presidential adviser David R. Gergen, Chinese Ambassador to the United States Li Dayou, bestselling author and scholar Colleen McCullough. But the expertise at the roundtables provided some of the most stimulating give-and-take, both among the panelists themselves and with their audiences.

In a laudatory post-conference Washington Post article, Pulitzer Prize-winning columnist Jim Hoagland found the knowledgeable and insightful questions from students, faculty, community leaders and others to be the most intriguing part of the sessions—including the one in which he participated. "The State of the World as We Enter the 21st Century" was moderated by Yale University's Larned Professor of History Gaddis Smith. Hoagland shared the panel with former Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger, former U.N. Ambassador Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, former U.S. Senator Sam Nunn, economist Richard L. Sandor, journalist and former presidential adviser David R. Gergen, Chinese Ambassador to the United States Li Dayou, bestselling author and scholar Colleen McCullough. But the expertise at the roundtables provided some of the most stimulating give-and-take, both among the panelists themselves and with their audiences.

Experts in international trade, business and finance took center stage at the roundtable, "Trade Policy and Preparing America's Economy for the 21st Century," which built on the preceding two days of speakers and discussions. Ambassador Clayton K. Yeutter, former U.S. trade representative, chief U.S. trade negotiator and former secretary of agriculture, dealt with U.S. trade policy. John S. Wolf, U.S. ambassador to the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Forum, addressed trade organizations, while Wall Street financier Michael F. Price's topic was the strengthening of the U.S. economy for international competition. Kerr-McGee chairman, CEO and president Luke R. Corbett discussed the pluses and minuses of trade sanctions. Discussants were prominent Washington, D.C., attorneys W.
National security expert Peter Rodman, from the Nixon Center for Peace and Freedom, joined five former ambassadors, a history professor and a journalist to discuss the state of the world at the dawn of a new century.

Duren Zhou, a specialist on U.S.-China relations at Fudan University in Shanghai, offered his perspective to the panel discussion, "The U.S. and Asia," which also featured Michel Oksenberg, left, from the Asia/Pacific Research Center at Stanford.

George C. McGhee, right, former assistant secretary of state and U.S. ambassador to Turkey and West Germany, was one of the roundtable discussants at the OU Foreign Policy Conference.
OU Business Dean Richard Cosier, left, moderated the roundtable addressing the issue of trade policy, with expert opinions coming from participants such as Ambassador Clayton K. Yeutter, right, former U.S. trade representative and chief trade negotiator and former secretary of agriculture.

Jan C. Berris, right, original staffer to the historic "ping pong" diplomacy in U.S.-Chinese relations, was part of the Foreign Policy panel discussing "The U.S. and Asia." At left is the director of OU's International Programs Center, Ambassador Edward Perkins.

Wall Street fund manager Michael F. Price, an OU alumnus, raised the issue of "Strengthening the U.S. Economy for International Competition" during a Foreign Policy Conference roundtable. At left is John S. Wolf, U.S. ambassador to the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Forum.
A reception in the Great Reading Room of Bizzell Memorial Library gave conference attendees, which included many students, the opportunity to meet participants, such as Henry Kissinger, left, and OU President David Boren.

Devier Pierson and Max N. Berry.

Indicative of the unique nature and scope of this conference was the participation of the current CIA director and four former directors. True to the spirit of academic freedom—and to no one's surprise or consternation—a small group of demonstrators was on hand with their placards quietly protesting CIA activities and representation at the conference.

"With 21,000 students, you would almost worry if there were not a few people who expressed diversity," Boren commented.

Former CIA Director William Webster agreed, recalling similar incidents on other campuses. "They just wanted to make a point. Orderly expressions are healthy and never bothered me."

— Carol J. Burr

The Conference Keynoter

Kissinger. That single name, like that of others famous and infamous, conjures up not just the physical image of the person who answers to it but also a host of more abstract associations. In the case of super diplomat and international scholar Henry Kissinger, those associations include everything from his trademark speech pattern—heavily accented and quite deliberately paced—to his extensive knowledge about all things related to foreign policy.

As the keynoter delivering a pre-banquet speech at the University of Oklahoma's International Foreign Policy Conference, Kissinger captivated an overflow room of hungry people for almost an hour. In his prepared text titled "The Architecture of an American Foreign Policy for the 21st Century" and his answers to questions from students and guests, Kissinger shone in the beautifully redecorated Oklahoma Memorial Union Ballroom, site of this and several other conference events.

Using his dry wit and complete grasp of complex foreign policy issues in all regions of the world, Kissinger enthralled an audience that included such dignitaries as former presidential adviser and current "Lehrer News Hour" commentator David Gergen, former CIA Director Richard Helms and author and historian Colleen McCollough, also conference participants.

OU President David Boren delivered a powerful introduction of Kissinger—whose résumé includes the 1973 Nobel Peace Prize, the 1977 Presidential Medal of Freedom and the 1986 Medal of Liberty, as well as an impressive list of publications, most recently 1994's Diplomacy. Boren noted Kissinger's years of service as the 56th secretary of state from 1973 to 1977 and as assistant to the president for national security affairs from 1969 to 1975, ending with the impact Kissinger has had on international relations.

Expressing his profound admiration and respect for Kissinger, Boren said, "The keynote speaker is a man who in many ways dominated intellectual leadership in the field of foreign affairs and led the intellectual dialog about our relations with other nations for approximately three decades."

Beginning with an anecdote made all the more humorous by its deadpan delivery, Kissinger thanked Boren for a glowing introduction and commented that such pre-speech praise was both satisfying and anxiety-causing.

"Such an introduction puts me in the same position I found myself in at a reception," he said, "when a lady came up to me and said 'I understand you are a fascinating man.'" Kissinger paused for effect before delivering the punch line. "'Fascinate me,' she said." He paused again for the swell of
laughter to recede. "This turned into one of the least successful social confrontations I've had."

On a roll and clearly enjoying the response to his joke, Kissinger lobbed another crowd pleaser.

"David forgot to mention that at one time I served as national security adviser and secretary of state simultaneously," he said. He paused again for two beats. "I mention this only because never before and never since have relations between the White House and the State Department been as harmonious."

As the laughter subsided, Kissinger launched into a serious speech focusing on the United States' relationship with China and the importance of the upcoming visit of its president, Jiang Zemin—a visit that took place in late October/early November amid much media discussion of the very issues Kissinger addressed in his speech. Kissinger's primary point was one simple to summarize but difficult for many to accept: While the United States is the primary international power today, it cannot use its leadership role to impose its values and ideals on all other nations. The area of dispute is, of course, human rights in China, from the treatment of dissidents before, during and after Tiananmen Square to the Asian nation's continued control of Tibet.

"Some of you may know that the current administration was my second choice in the last election," he said. "Nevertheless, I strongly support the initiative they have taken concerning China. The Chinese historic experience is quite different from ours. They have 5,000 years of recorded history. They believe they have gotten through 4,800 years of this history without significant advice on their domestic structure from the United States. So it is not taken for granted that we are necessarily competent to teach them.

"Certainly, they have a different historical perspective. When I ask one of you when something happened in Ameri-
Former U.S. Senator Sam Nunn shared his expertise in national security affairs with a breakfast audience at the OU Foreign Policy Conference.

A National Security Wake-Up Call

The first breakfast speaker, former U.S. Senator Sam Nunn, attracted an early-morning audience dotted with his celebrated conference colleagues to hear "Protecting and Defining Our National Security in a Changed World." While contending that the opportunity for a peaceful and prosperous world is the greatest in history, he admitted that the end of the Cold War had changed the equation.

"We had a long, long period of very high risk," Nunn said, "but stability was also very high because the risk was so high... (Today) we have much lower risks, but we also have much lower stability because we no longer have two superpowers with proxies around the world that we control... There is no Soviet Union to restrain some of their clients."

In the breakdown of the Soviet Union, leaving an enormous arsenal of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons—and the scientific personnel and means to deliver them—Nunn sees the primary threat to national security.

The former senator agreed with several other conference speakers that North Korea is the area in which American ground troops are most likely to be engaged. He recounted a recent private trip to the North Korean capital of Pyongyang, where he saw nothing for sale, a people neither buying anything nor eating anything and clearly without energy. This is a nation, he warned, putting all its money into the military, a nation ready for war.

Nunn takes comfort in the fantastic U.S. capability in information warfare but admits that "we are much better at offense than we are at defense... The same things that are making us more efficient are making us more vulnerable," he said in discussing the increasing dependence on computer technology and networking in the economic sectors of telecommunications, energy, transportation, pipelines, finance, water supply and emergency human services.

"A 23-year-old with a personal computer," he concluded, "can do as much harm from his own living room today as hundreds of saboteurs and spies planted carefully in places around the country."

– Carol J. Burr

On Rethinking International Affairs

Addressing conference attendees at lunch on day two was Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick, the woman oft-mentioned when talk turns to viable women candidates for America's highest political offices. A third-generation native Oklahoman, Kirkpatrick served more than four years as the U.S. ambassador to the United Nations and as the first woman presidential cabinet member.

The Foreign Policy Conference offered opportunities for one-to-one exchanges between the students, faculty, staff and guests attending the sessions and the speakers, such as Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick, shown here following her luncheon address.
Kirkpatrick was introduced by Ambassador Edward J. Perkins, one of her successors at the U.N. post. "She made such a difference at the U.N.," he said. "She talked tough when it was necessary to talk tough. She made America's point in many different ways."

Kirkpatrick preceded her address with praise for OU President David Boren and Perkins, who had assembled a conference that "any university in the world would be proud to host. The International Programs Center can be not only a center of education but also a catalyst for the preparation of Oklahomans for full participation in this world that is ever more international. . . . Almost everything today is international and multinational, and Oklahoma must participate. . . . The International Programs Center will help."

Currently on leave from her positions as Leavey Professor of Government at Georgetown University and senior fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, the ambassador's remarks, "United States Relationships with Nations Emerging as World Leaders," outlined changes in the world and America's foreign policy brought about by the end of the Cold War.

"The Cold War was never the whole focus of our foreign policy, but it was the focus of a very large portion of it," she said. "We must rethink much of what we had thought about international affairs."

"The most important single process about that post-Cold War world was the challenge, hope, prospect of transformation and democratization in what we were still calling the Soviet Union, in Russia. That democratic revolution is so volatile," Kirkpatrick said. "We need, I think, to give a democratic Russia a very special status as the emerging government in the world that matters most to peace in Europe and the United States." She admitted that this notion is not in keeping with the traditional concept of emerging nations, those usually of middle class, size and influence.

Worthy of remembering, she stressed, is Richard Nixon's caution to Americans following his last visit to Moscow. Despite the demise of the Cold War, Russia remains the most important country in the world for America, if for no other reason than it alone holds the capacity "to destroy the United States in a matter of half an hour or so.

"Russia has on hand and essentially readily on target," the ambassador noted dramatically, "enough very powerful, very accurate, intercontinental ballistic missiles that we have a very special interest in the democratic revolution of Russia."

The worldwide spread of democracy is all-important, she said—in central and eastern Europe, the former Warsaw Pact states, those formerly part of the Soviet Union, Latin and Central America, in Asia and Africa and even what Kirkpatrick termed "inroads toward democracy and constitutional government" in the Middle East.

"Democracies such as ours can be ferocious in defense, but they do not invade and commit aggression against their neighbors." Thus democracies make good neighbors, good trading partners and good citizens of a peaceful world, she said, ample incentive for supporting the reinforcement and strengthening of democratic governments.

"Nothing is more important to the United States . . . ," Kirkpatrick said to the capacity crowd in the Union Ballroom, "than the established consolidation of those democratic governments in those diverse and far-flung areas of the world."

Shrinking the world somewhat by the reorganization and unification of Europe was another important process under way at the Cold War's end, she said. A united Europe, inclusive rather than exclusive, open rather than protectionist, would constitute an ideal partner in building a peaceful world.

However, the ambassador emphasized, the United
States has little input in the process she foresees will continue but "probably not quite in the form that has been anticipated. We must face the fact that other people may not call on us—as supremely qualified as we think we are—to help them resolve their problems."

Kirkpatrick then turned her attention to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, which, she noted, ironically was aided by the "breakdowns, reorientations and reconfigurations of the end of the Cold War." The parallel threat of Islamic extremism was probably the "least understood problem."

The internationalization of the Islamic extremist movement was a concern expressed regularly by her colleagues at the United Nations. Unfortunately, she said, "they have not, as I understand it, become less concerned since the time I left the UN."

Finally, the ambassador discussed the importance of the economic and military growth and development in Asia and China. The changes brought about in that part of the world by expanding democratic capitalism breed the development of democracy. Likewise, the openness necessary for investment and good export is encouraged by capitalism, which in turn fosters individualism and freedom.

"The countries that will advance most quickly, the true emerging nations, will be countries that have developed some of these qualities . . . that we associate . . . with democratic capitalism. I think that's the trend, and . . . I think China is an emerging modern country."

The status of the world today provides "a better opportunity to see emerge in the next year a world which more closely resembles our hope for the world. The world isn't wholly safe, and we're not wholly safe," she said.

Kirkpatrick fielded audience questions and addressed other worries, including the Korean peninsula, which harbors the "greatest potential" for war; and Libya, Syria, Iran and Iraq and all the places that make "our government's list of so-called terrorist states. But I believe we have arrived at that point where our state department can make its transition from focus above all on serious political problems to more focus on economic problems, and our government can make a transition from more focus on military problems to more focus on trade and travel.

"I think the American economy is wonderfully well suited for the world in which we live, and I think Americans are wonderfully well suited for our time. We are clearly the world's only superpower. We're the strongest, richest country in the world.

"I believe that our future is going to be even more brilliant than our past, but I think that's going to be widely shared in the new world. The first decade of the next century ought to be fantastic."

— Margaret French

The CIA: Past, Present and Future

"It's almost as if the world's geologic plates have shifted." George J. Tenet, current director of the Central Intelligence Agency, gave a lunch-time OU audience food for thought in assessing the dramatically changed world facing U.S. foreign-policy planners in the years and decades ahead.

Tenet was one of five prominent Americans with access to some of the darkest secrets of the world's past who came to OU in September to help shed light on the nation's prospects in the world of the future.

At the OU International Programs Center conference, "Preparing America's Foreign Policy for the 21st Century," Tenet was joined by former CIA directors Robert M. Gates, Richard M. Helms, William H. Webster and R. James Woolsey. In two separate sessions, the five addressed the hopes, challenges and dangers facing U.S. foreign policy in the post-Cold War era.

Three former CIA directors—from left, Richard Helms, James Woolsey and William Webster—joined OU President David Boren for a roundtable discussion telecast on C-Span.
Since the fall of the Soviet Union, the world is different, but it is not safe.

Tenet and Gates both spoke at a luncheon held in the Union Ballroom on the opening day of the conference. Tenet set the tone for the discussions that would dominate the remainder of the three-day conference.

Looking back, Tenet paid tribute to the 70 CIA agents who were killed in the line of duty during the agency's 50 years of existence. He recalled the "consuming passion" with which U.S. intelligence professionals assisted in resisting communist expansion abroad.

But since the fall of the Soviet Union, he warned, "the world is different, but it is not safe."

Tenet noted that "more wars are being fought within states than between them," and that greater world economic interdependence and political openness have had a price. "We confront lethal weapons, illicit drugs and dirty money flowing more easily across porous borders." Steadily rising world population and energy use also threatens potential instability, he warned.

In the face of these possible dangers, Tenet vowed that the CIA would "embrace the challenges and opportunities of the era ahead" and would "continue to help our leaders shape this new world and make it less threatening."

Former CIA Director Gates led the audience through the history of the CIA's efforts to provide American policymakers with reliable information during the Cold War, noting the agency's successes and failures—moral as well as material—during five decades of service.

"From the Berlin tunnel of the early 1950s to the very end of the Cold War," Gates said, "the CIA developed astonishingly imaginative and advanced techniques, devices..."
and technical schemes that yielded much information on the Soviet military and its operations."

Although battling communist forces in the Third World sometimes meant developing alliances with "unsavory" figures, and some projections of future Soviet strength were errant, "for a quarter of a century American presidents negotiated and made strategic decisions with confidence in our knowledge of the adversary's actual military strength."

U.S. intelligence information made arms control agreements possible and "helped keep the Cold War 'cold,'" Gates said.

A gathering of former CIA directors Helms, Webster and Woolsey took place on the second day of the conference, in which they and President Boren amplified on the themes discussed at the luncheon. The session was telecast on C-Span and moderated by the Close Up Foundation's John Milewski.

Boren, former chair of the Senate Intelligence Committee, joined his one-time colleagues in a plea for the American public to pay closer attention to world issues and for continued support of the U.S. intelligence community.

Helms, in particular, recalled that immediately following the end of the Cold War, he had hoped that "the United States would get really interested in the world out there and pay attention to other cultures, languages, religions and so forth." However, he said, "To my horror, the United States seems to be withdrawing into itself more than ever."

Woolsey agreed, adding, "During the good and easy times, whether it's the 'Roaring '20s,' or, you might say, the 'Roaring '90s,' this country tends to pull back into itself, tends to get relaxed, [and] tends to think it's made the world safe for its own way of life."

Boren commented on the popular misconception that the CIA and the "intelligence community" are synonymous, noting that the Department of Defense spends "considerably more" on intelligence than the CIA itself does. He said that, while the future might require eliminating duplication among different U.S. intelligence agencies in the armed forces and the executive branch, America inhabits "a world in which we still need intelligence desperately."

The conferees cited new challenges to American policymakers in the years ahead, coming from developments such as the continued influence of Islamic fundamentalism in the Middle East and a rise in nationalistic fervor in China.

In light of the "very changed world" that America now faces, Webster said, a major priority for intelligence-gathering in the years ahead could be summed up in "one simple word—relevancy."

An intelligence apparatus geared toward Cold War needs must be retooled, Webster added, not only to deal with different challenges to world stability, but also in recognition of new means of subversion, such as misuse of the Internet to disrupt the work of businesses and governments.

Woolsey said that technological advances in our time called for a more "interdisciplinary" approach in intelligence work. He said he foresaw a future in which "imagery engineers" and other technical experts who work with spy satellites and other high-tech forms of data gathering would be better trained in human espionage—while "case officers and managers" would be better trained to "understand something about how satellites work."

In addition, Webster emphasized that future intelligence gathered for policymakers be "absolutely objective [and] absolutely divorced from political agenda."

Perhaps, in the end, it was Helms who provided the most succinct definition of the intelligence community's mission in service to Americans.

"The mission," he explained, "is to save all your skins."

 Michael Waters

Financial Markets and the Environment

The power of economic speculation may someday solve the world's environmental problems. Financial markets already are cooperating with governments to make that happen, pioneering economist Richard Sandor said in an address at the OU foreign policy conference.

Formerly an economics professor at the University of California, Berkeley, and Stanford University and chief economist on the Chicago Board of Trade, Sandor originated the first spot and futures markets in environmental contracts.

Trading in futures contracts, Sandor said, once restricted to agricultural commodities and metals, grew more sophisticated in the 1970s when the government began regulating them. It was during the '70s that trading began in currencies and financial futures.
Sandor was at the forefront of developing futures and options contracts on Treasury bond and Treasury note interest rates. Today he concentrates on applying market-based solutions to social problems, such as protecting the environment.

Credit cards, pharmacy prescriptions and even cable TV networks are being stimulated by the sale of junk bonds traded in the futures markets, Sandor said. “Recently, the United States Auto Association issued a bond indexed to hurricanes. We’re at the dawn of an era when the most important commodities will be standardized—

the air we breathe and the water we drink.”

Acid rain, a phenomenon that kills plant life when precipitation combines with pollutants in the air, was eliminated in the Northeast when the problem created a commodity to be traded, he said.

Sandor helped establish futures contracts based on tradable sulfur dioxide emission allowances established by the 1990 Clean Air Act. The act required industrial plants to cut by 50 percent the emissions responsible for acid rain. Plants that did a better job at cleaning up their smokestacks were allowed to transfer or sell their emis-
China is a developing country. It will remain a developing country for a long time—at least the first 50 years in the next century...

seas by new members of Congress,” he said. “They represent the future leaders, and they are not very international.”

Gergen suggested regional newspapers have ignored international coverage, which is expensive and often dangerous to gather. The Internet is helpful but does not fill the information gap that occurs when the press becomes disengaged.

The casualties include a decline in the quality of our diplomatic corps, less of a sustained presence overseas and a growing chasm between the elite and the rest of the country.

“We have an increasing gap between those who are information rich and those who are information poor,” Gergen said. “Those who are information poor see the world as a threat.”

An adviser to four presidents, Gergen said the isolationist trend in the midst of the growth of democracies worldwide makes a paradox of modern society. “We have become the home of the revolutions that are changing the world. We are deeply imbedded as a leader of the world.”

Gergen cited telecommunications, culture, computer software and biotechnology as examples of American products that now have transcended the globe. Nearly a third of the U.S. economy is tied to international trade.

Like business, universities such as OU are becoming more international in their approach, Gergen said. “There is a high degree of synergy in international training of our young people.”

While Cullum and Romano insisted that both their newspapers stress international coverage, Dary, a former CBS White House correspondent, concurred with Gergen’s assessment of the press corps and the politicians they cover. He said fewer dollars for news coverage forces producers to opt for soft and easy issues often staged by Washington politicians.

Dary also blamed educators for failing to stress civics. “Too many students are not challenged by the educational system.”

— Andy Rieger

At right, columnist Lee Cullum, serving as a discussant on “The Media and International Relations and Foreign Policy,” insisted that her newspaper, the Dallas Morning News, still stresses international coverage.

Below, former presidential adviser David Gergen, now editor at large for U.S. News and World Report, refers to the OU student newspaper, The Oklahoma Daily, in his opening remarks at the Foreign Policy Conference.
The U.S. and China: Differences and Common Interests

While acknowledging the adversarial nature of the past relationship between the United States and the People's Republic of China, Ambassador Li Daoyu insisted to his foreign policy conference audience that the two nations now share the responsibility for maintaining peace and stability and promoting global economic prosperity.

"Though China and the United States have differences in social systems, culture and other aspects," he said, "our common interests far outweigh our differences."

Born and educated in Shanghai, Li Daoyu played a wide-ranging leadership role in his country's internal affairs before being named ambassador to the United Nations and in 1993, ambassador to the United States. He views the current opportunity for bilateral cooperation as a "unique moment" in history, when international organizations can function as they never could during the Cold War.

The ambassador sees commonality in the desire of both China and the United States "to maintain global and regional peace and stability and to continue strengthening the forces working for peace in the prevention of new wars." This mutual interest is most important on the Korean peninsula, where the need for peace, stability and creation of a nuclear weapon-free zone is paramount.

"North Korea used to be our closest ally in the Korean War," he admitted, "but we share nothing about nuclear with them. No nuclear material, no nuclear reactor, no nuclear technology and no nuclear experts. And how they got that? Russia. Not us."

Li Daoyu then listed as areas of shared objectives general disarmament to achieve non-proliferation of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction; promotion of Asian Pacific stability and economic prosperity; environmental protection; and cooperative efforts to combat international terrorism, drug trafficking and illegal immigration. The most important common interest, he insisted, lies in economic and trade ties, with the United States as China's second largest trading partner and China the fourth ranking trading partner for the United States.

The ambassador refuted predictions that the United States and China are destined for confrontation and conflict. He contends that China has no tradition of expansion, has never occupied a single inch of foreign soil nor stationed a single soldier abroad and has no intention of doing so.

"China is a developing country," he said. "It will remain a developing country for a long time—at least the first 50 years in the next century. . . . The Chinese leadership has their hands full . . . and desires most a peaceful international environment so that it can focus on that gigantic long-term economic development."

He characterized Japan, "a highly developed industrialized economy superpower," not China, "a developing country with a weak industrial base," as the United States' strong trade competitor. Claiming an overstatement of China's trade surplus, Li Daoyu said that more than 46 percent of China's exports is manufactured by foreign-funded enterprises or joint ventures, a large part of which is American. He described most of China's exports as "low valued laboring kinds of good that the U.S. stopped producing 10 or 20 years ago."

In discussing the contentious area of human rights, the Chinese ambassador fell back on arguments of differences in cultural, social, historical and economic values. He insisted, however, that human rights progress is being made in China.

Li Daoyu views the future of Taiwan as potentially the greatest obstacle to growth of good relations between China and the United States. "Taiwan is the question of our national dignity, national sovereignty," he said. "Taiwan is part of China."

In an obvious parallel, the ambassador alluded to the recent return of Hong Kong to the People's Republic of China. "Hong Kong was taken by Britain. This is a humiliation of the Chinese people for 150 years. But China wants no retaliation. We want a peaceful turnover, so the peaceful turnover happened. . . . We took back Hong Kong in dignity. It's a win-win situation."
A Historical Perspective

Many in the SRO audience undoubtedly came to see the author of the modern classic love story, *The Thorn Birds*, while others came to hear the author of the historical series, *The Masters of Rome*. What the participants encountered at this closing session of the foreign policy conference was a scholarly lecture that cut through preoccupation with the future with a disquieting lesson from the past.

Australian Colleen McCullough speaks with authority on ancient Rome. However, in addressing her topic—"The Lessons of the Roman Experience for the United States of America as a Superpower in the 21st Century"—she told the story and left to her audience to find the parallels.

McCullough traced the development of Rome from its roots as a tiny city-state on the south bank of the Tiber River, to a thriving, highly organized and complex republic and finally to the mighty Roman Empire, its people's democracy sacrificed to its superpower status.

"For the central thousand years of its (2,000-year) existence, it stood as a superpower, first in contention with another superpower, Carthage, then as the sole superpower in the basin of the Mediterranean Sea," McCullough said. "All truly Western nations are to some extent what Rome made them, for Rome left heirs to Roman thought and systems in commerce, politics and government, law and justice, and much more."

McCullough led her listeners through the Romans' concept of equality, both of opportunity and of social eminence and discussed the rise and fall of their republican form of government. Throughout her lecture, she alluded to the shifts in Roman foreign policy from its origins in non-expansionist exclusivity to conquest and world domination.

"The senate did have a foreign policy," she said of Republican Rome. "Namely that what was Rome's must remain Rome's... War was a last resort. Part of senatorial reluctance to make war arose out of the senate's shrewdness in realizing that while victorious war might be profitable in the short term, in the long term it was an expensive hobby for the state to indulge in... . The senate always preferred a treaty to a war."

But Rome with its "overwhelming military might backed by great resources" began to absorb its neighbors, McCullough related. Convinced that "Roman ways were better," the conquerors tidied up their provinces with the gift of Roman republican government as well as freedom from their old rulers.

Often, McCullough said, "the experiment didn't work. Not all peoples want to enjoy even limited democratic government; some are just too used to autocracy."

The republic disappeared as the empire gained world dominance under Julius Caesar and Augustus, McCullough said, but already the seeds were sown for a Rome in which "the army was the true ruler of the empire." Financing the massive military machine required the imposition of unacceptable levels of taxation on all classes of citizens. The importance of the city of Rome as the place that bred the ruling class lessened; the empire became increasingly less Roman.

McCullough ended her story with the beginning of the end, explaining, "In its decline, I see less relevance for America's situation going into the 21st century than I see in Rome's rise and zenith... . What lessons then should the Roman experience teach the United States... ? Whereabouts on the imperial evolutionary scale does America stand at this moment in time?"

"The greatest lesson of all is certainly that the systems, institutions, ethics and ideals of democracy must be preserved at any cost, even if that means they cannot always be propagated outside of America... ."

"When a superpower loses its innate concept of itself, it must decline, and that decline will be more devastating than if it suddenly loses all its material wealth," she concluded. "Let the United States of America remain true to the intentions and aims of its founding fathers, who were steeped in the classics and borrowed heavily from the legacy of Republican Rome. Let America continue to survive as a beacon for the world until time immemorial."