

development. Lyn always preached for strengthening cooperation among China, the United States, and Russia, especially in the field of infrastructure construction. In this sense, Lyn could be also considered as a precursor of China's Belt and Road Initiative (BRI).

Today, as we are commemorating Lyn's centennial, we should consider Lyn's political legacy seriously, for it has told us that we can only make progress for man-

kind by promoting technology innovation, by promoting international cooperation, but not by confrontation.

If we let today's world [be] controlled by those who can find their interest behind the wars and escalation of geopolitical tensions, we will be dropped into a vicious spiral, and end up with our planet's destruction. So, we should stand up and say, "No," to those warmongers.

Thank you very much.

Clifford A. Kiracofe

America Alone in a Changing World?

This is the edited transcript of the presentation of Clifford A. Kiracofe to Panel 1, "How To Inspire Humanity To Survive the Greatest Crisis in World History," of the Schiller Institute's Sept. 10-11, 2022 Conference, "Inspiring Humanity To Survive the Greatest Crisis in World History." Mr. Kiracofe is a former senior staff member of the U.S. Senate on Foreign Relations and is currently President of the Washington Institute for Peace and Development.



Schiller Institute

Clifford A. Kiracofe

I would like to thank the Schiller Institute for inviting me to speak at this important conference. Over the years, from memorable lunches with Lyn at his home in Virginia to conferences in Berlin with Helga, the intellectual atmosphere has been stimulating amidst kind and thoughtful hospitality.

Today, my topic is "America Alone in a Changing World?" There is a question mark in this title because it remains to be seen whether Washington will change its policies from confrontation to constructive engagement with the international community. By "international community" I mean the sovereign states represented in the United Nations General Assembly. The United Nations must be strengthened and its commitments put at the core of the international system.

The international system today is rapidly changing from a U.S.-dominated unipolar system to a pluralist multipolar system. We see the rise of China, the return of Russia, the emergence of countries such as Iran, Indonesia, Mexico, Egypt, and Brazil, and the increasing influence of various formats and organizations such as

BRICS [Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa], ASEAN [Association of Southeast Asian Nations], SCO [Shanghai Cooperation Organization], and the EAEU [Eurasian Economic Union]. Then we have the new situation in Europe with the Ukraine war and its economic and diplomatic impact not only on Europe, but on the world as a whole.

I would also add that the China-Russia relationship is a key factor and the February 4 joint statement this year by Presidents Xi and Putin marks a new stage in the develop-

ment of international relations.

An increasingly belligerent and irrational United States may well find itself isolated and alone as never before in a changing world that seeks peace and development.

The Taiwan and Ukraine issues are salient at this time.

The visit of House Speaker Nancy Pelosi to China's island of Taiwan increased tensions. Pelosi's escapade occurred in the context of Washington's proxy war against Russia in Ukraine and its empty-handed "diplomacy" in the Pacific, Asia, and Africa.

Pacific island states, ASEAN, and African states politely have rebuffed U.S. efforts to enroll them in the crusade against China and Russia.

European leaders entangled in the NATO alliance follow Washington's diktats. The economic and social fallout from Washington's Ukraine war takes its toll on Europe, as we see every day. No doubt political instability will develop as European publics experience the

effects of their leaders committing economic suicide by supporting the American proxy war in Ukraine and supporting U.S. sanctions against Russia and China.

The United States lost the Korean, Vietnam, Afghan, and Iraq wars. It now appears that it will lose its Ukraine proxy war. Did Washington become a rogue state since the World War II victory over German Naziism and Japanese militarism? Not a few scholars and observers would say so.

Does the U.S. promote world peace, cooperative diplomacy through the United Nations, and international law? It is hard to hide the fact that Washington does not, critics say.

The Pelosi whirlwind tour through Asia was intended to reinforce Washington's anti-China policy. But no one was biting. Significantly, the South Korean leader chose to have dinner with friends rather than to see Pelosi. ASEAN members politely reminded Washington that they do not want to choose sides in an American zero-sum game in the Asia-Pacific region.

U.S. Secretary of State Tony Blinken similarly was rebuffed on his recent Africa tour aimed against Chinese presence in Africa—that's what he was aiming at. It is no surprise that South Africa took a dim view of his effort. That country is a member of the BRICS group.

BRICS today is expanding its reach as a number of countries are knocking at its door seeking admission. There are good, practical reasons to become a member of this organization: because it supports economic development and cooperation between members in various fields, and it respects members' sovereign right to choose the development model most suitable to their culture.

Washington's Strategic Mistakes

U.S. national strategy and foreign policy made three grave and irreversible mistakes over the past six decades: the Vietnam War, post-Cold War policy of hegemonism, and the Afghan-Iraq wars. U.S. leaders learned nothing from their mistakes and failures.

The old Cold War was terminated through diplomacy and an agreement between U.S. President Ronald Reagan and the late Soviet Union President, Mikhail Gorbachev. But U.S. ruling circles, during a multi-year bipartisan project, prepared the New Cold War during a series of high-level conferences in 2004, 2005—almost 20 years ago.

The purpose of the policy project was to restart the old Cold War and to reestablish a bi-polar bloc system,

if not a unipolar system. The old two-bloc Cold War system, between the "Free World" and the "Communist World," was converted, and a new phrase was established, that is the "democratic" world and the "authoritarian" world—again, a bipolar approach.

It is notable that this project, called the "Princeton Project," was headed by George Shultz for the Republicans and Tony Lake for the Democrats. It included a number of high officials, think tank persons, academics, and so forth. It issued its final report to the public in 2005. The co-director of the project staff, Anne Marie Slaughter, went on to head the Policy Planning Staff of the U.S. State Department under President Barack Obama and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton

I want to show the continuity between the Obama Administration, the Trump Administration, and the Biden Administration, in terms of this foreign policy of "containment," we can say, of Russia and China.

It is notable that this policy group included such participants as Japanese diplomats and scholars as well as Australian intelligence officials. Thus, the Quadrilateral Security Dialogue ["Quad": U.S.-Japan-India-Australia] anti-China alignment and the more recent Australia-UK-U.S. [AUKUS] anti-China alignment should come as no surprise. The Quad concept was embodied in the late Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe's "Diamond" strategy against China.

Because the policy project was bipartisan, it was logical that it would carry forward during the next administrations. Biden continues the elite U.S. foreign policy consensus. In fact, the Biden administration pushed the consensus policy to a level of belligerence sharper and more intense than under either Barack Obama or Donald Trump before him. The explanation is simple. Throughout his career in politics in the U.S. Senate, and as the Vice President under Obama, Joe Biden followed the Establishment's foreign policy consensus.

So, Biden's New Cold War policy should have come as no surprise. Some foreign capitals, academics, and observers may be surprised that Biden's policy is not more moderate than Trump's. But after a year and a half of the Biden administration foreign policy, perhaps they should reflect on any mistaken perceptions and analytical methods.

What's Ahead for Washington?

Evidently, it is not reasonable to expect a change of heart in the U.S. Establishment and its foreign policy any time soon. Of course, the American people desire

peace and development, but this is not the approach of the U.S. Establishment. So, the New Cold War will go on although it is a dead end for the United States and its European NATO allies. How long it takes to hit the dead end is an open question.

It is reasonable to expect that because of the inexorable shift toward a multipolar world, the United States will become more isolated, if it does not drop its belligerent and bellicose policy of hegemony. U.S. policy, with its continuing features of neo-imperialism and neo-colonialism, serves only to increase U.S. isolation over time. The international community rejects that type of behavior, increasingly, and a counter-weight to

that policy is in the process of forming a new multipolar international system.

Washington's politicians must make an agonizing reappraisal of U.S. foreign policy and drop hegemonism and Cold War thinking. Otherwise, the American people in the future may find their country alone in a changing world.

In conclusion, only through a constructive engagement by Washington with the international community can a new paradigm emerge that promotes peace through development and a positive and optimistic vision of an international community with a shared future.

Thank you for your attention.

Raymond McGovern 'Never Give Up'

This is the edited transcript of the presentation of Ray McGovern to Panel 1, "How To Inspire Humanity To Survive the Greatest Crisis in World History," of the Schiller Institute's Sept. 10-11, 2022 Conference, "Inspiring Humanity To Survive the Greatest Crisis in World History." He is a former senior analyst for the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, and a founding member of Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity.



Schiller Institute

Raymond McGovern

Thank you for inviting me. It's a profound crisis indeed. It is unique, but there was something similar back in the days that I was born, in the 1930s in Germany. We survived that, and we could survive this one, too.

Thinking back, I remember a young lawyer in Berlin named Raimund Pretzel, who went by the pen name Sebastian Haffner. Later when his diary was discovered—he was in Berlin during the worst of it—I remember that he was trying to make his peace with what was going on. I want to quote a few sentences in English from the English version which is called *Defying Hitler*; the German version is called *Die Geschichte eines Deutschen*. Here's Haffner:

The individual who is opposed to fascism, [is] just an ordinary man with many weaknesses,

but he enters the duel with a quiet determination not to yield. You will have to admit that, for someone who is neither a hero nor a martyr, he manages to put up a very good fight. Will you see him compelled to abandon the struggle?

Well, Haffner had to say the following about that:

No. The Germans lost. And why? I do not see that one can blame the majority of Germans who, in 1933, believed that the Reichstag Fire was the work of the Communists.

Or, for that matter, parenthetically, can you blame most of the Western people who are subjected to propaganda that the invasion of Ukraine was "unprovoked"? Says Haffner:

What one can blame them for, is that with sheepish submissiveness, the German people accepted that as a fact. The fire was a fact, and they lost their little personal freedom as though it was necessary. The Communists burned down the Reichstag? It was perfectly normal that the government would take "decisive