

# US INTELLIGENCE AND THE END OF THE COLD WAR

## TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

### PRESIDENT BUSH LUNCHEON REMARKS

#### Introduction by DCI George Tenet

Good afternoon. At this time of great sadness for everyone here at College Station, I want to first express the deepest sympathy of the men and women of the Intelligence Community. Like our fellow Americans, we, too, have been watching the unfolding tragedy here on television and have been touched by the magnificent way that everyone at the University, and in the town, have responded as one united community. We are all thinking especially about the families and friends of the injured, and of those who lost their very young lives. As a parent, I cannot imagine more devastating news than this. Our prayers—the prayers of the men and women of our Intelligence Community—are with them, and we wish that God grant them strength at this terrible hour and comfort them in their sorrow.

On behalf of the Intelligence Community, I also want to express my sincere appreciation to the George Bush School of Government and Public Service and Texas A&M University for co-hosting this conference with CIA's Center for the Study of Intelligence. You have managed to extend exceptional hospitality to us, even in the face of great tragedy, and so we feel an even deeper responsibility to ensure that this conference makes a significant intellectual contribution to the understanding of a pivotal period in our history.

The men and women of US intelligence are proud of the contributions that they made to defending the security of the Free World during the five grim decades of the Cold War. We believe that a careful study of our role in that great global struggle will show that, time and again, US intelligence provided American leaders with critical information and insights that saved American lives and advanced our most vital interests. During the perilous peace that was the Cold War, the stakes, the risks, and the uncertainties were higher than at any time in our history, with the possible exception of the Second World War. Keeping the Cold War from becoming a "hot" one was the overriding goal of American national security policy and US intelligence. An intelligence effort of such magnitude—and fraught with such great risk and uncertainty—was bound to have its flaws, both operational and analytical. But I believe the overall record, a record you have heard a little bit about this morning, is one of very impressive accomplishment.

Today, we look back on the Cold War from a temporal distance of ten short years. It is already a world away, replaced by a new and more hopeful reality in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. And it is separated from us by a new generation of young people who have no personal recollection of what it was like to have lived on either side of the Berlin Wall—that metaphor in reinforced concrete and barbed wire for totalitarian

repression. It was a time when all humankind lived under the appalling threat of nuclear annihilation. Those forced to live behind the cruel Wall, closed off from the rest of the world, knew constant fear and constant indignities. They struggled to keep hope alive. It was for us, the lucky ones living in liberty, to stand fast in defense of the freedoms that we cherish, and keep faith with the oppressed on the other side. Ultimately, after the sacrifice of millions of irreplaceable human lives and trillions of dollars in treasure, the human spirit on both sides of the Wall triumphed.

To the students of Texas A&M today who have grown up with practically unlimited opportunities to travel the globe and roam at will within the borderless world of the Internet, the Berlin Wall—and the physical, political and psychological barriers to the free flow of people, ideas, and information that it represented—must seem absolutely surreal. But for the generations who lived in its shadow, it was very real and very dangerous. No one knows better than the men and women here today who carried the heavy burden of high office during the Cold War decades. And no one carried a heavier burden than the President of the United States.

Every American President, from Harry Truman onward, knew that he would be tested in the crucible of the Cold War, and that he had better be ready to meet the challenge. Our country was blessed to have had leaders—Republicans and Democrats—who met the challenge. All of us here who have ever served in government remember raising our right hands and solemnly swearing an oath to support and defend the Constitution against all enemies. But after saying, "So help me God," only one of us here today was given the awesome responsibility of leading the Free World. And on Inauguration Day in 1989, none of us, including our new President, could have known that soon, far sooner than any of us imagined, we would be living in a world transformed. Nor could he or any of us know that his own Cold War crucible would be to help, as only the President of the United States could help, to bring that chilling war to a virtually bloodless conclusion.

This is a history conference. Many of you are historians. You are all familiar with the "Great Man Theory" of history. Our distinguished luncheon speaker does not subscribe to it—at least as it could be related to himself. By all accounts, he suffers from a severe genetic case of New England modesty. But if you were to view history as a succession of great moments to which leaders must rise or invite disaster, surely it will record that this man was equal to the great moment that came to him—that brief historical span, when in three short years, with astonishing speed, the Berlin Wall fell, political revolution swept through Eastern Europe, Germany reunified within NATO, and the Soviet Union collapsed. From the security of ten years of hindsight, it is hard to remember that not one, not one of those peaceful outcomes was inevitable.

If ever a man and a moment were made for each other, George Bush and the end of the Cold War were the perfect match. To meet his moment, President Bush drew on his vast experience in international affairs, on the instincts and judgments he had honed over a lifetime of service in war and in peace, on the decency and humanity at his very core, on a gifted national security team and the key personal relationships he had cultivated, and

last, but certainly not least, on the strengths of the greatest intelligence system that the world has ever known. Thus equipped, with skilled, quiet, statecraft, he wisely shaped the policies and guided the actions of the sole remaining superpower through some of the most dramatic, consequential, and dangerous years of the 20th Century. At such a momentous time, the American people were fortunate indeed to have George Bush as their President. Germany and America's other European partners were fortunate to have him as their ally. Mikhail Gorbachev was fortunate to have him as a counterpart. And the brave peoples of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union were truly fortunate that such a man as he was the leader of the Free World.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is now my honor and pleasure to present to you the only President of the United States to have served as Director of Central Intelligence, our 41st Commander in Chief, George Bush.

PRESIDENT BUSH: George, thank you, sir. Thank you very, very much. Thanks a lot for that welcome. Thank you. Thank you all, very, very much. Director, thank you, sir, for those very kind words.

You didn't get one thing quite right. The first day I was in the Oval Office, General Scowcroft and Bob Gates came to see me, and they said that at 10 o'clock on November 10th of this year, the Berlin Wall is gonna come down. Hey, don't say we didn't have good intelligence. I'm telling you.

Okay, so you got it right. None of us, none of us here—neither a layman like myself nor the professionals—understood exactly when it would happen. But because of the knowledge that the Community presented to the various Presidents, and because that knowledge led to keeping the United States of America strong, I think it was all but inevitable that that Wall would eventually come down.

Barbara and I love coming here. We have a little apartment upstairs. The kids on this campus are just about as decent and nice as you could have. We've had world leaders here. Lee Kuan Yew, and Giscard, and you name it, and a lot of business guys. And all of them go away saying, "We understand why you put your library at Texas A&M." Their questions are tough, and they're straight, and they're from the heart, and people actually ask a question because they want to know what the answer is.

Which reminds me that George Edwards asked if I'd take questions today, and I said, "Hell no. These guys, every one of them, know more about the subject than I do. I'm not going to take questions." Just have a little dessert and get out of here.

But I am really pleased to be here. Counting myself, six DCIs are here. George Tenet, Jim Woolsey, Bill Webster is here. Where is Bill sitting out there? I hope you've all had a chance to meet him. Bob Gates, of course. Dick Helms.

I'll never forget my first visit to Langley. I'd just been elected to Congress in 1966 from down the road here in Harris County, the first Republican ever to be elected from that area. Within the first couple of weeks Dick Helms got us out to CIA and gave us one hell of a snow job out there at Langley. He was the master, and he still is, and he's so widely respected in the Intelligence Community that we're just very fortunate he's here with us today.

Another guy who served with Jim Baker and me is now the Chancellor of the Texas A&M University system: Howard Graves—General Graves. Former Superintendent at West Point, too, I might add. We're so honored that he's heading up this vast network of some of the great universities in our state.

I want to thank George Edwards. This guy can really put on a show, especially if he has Lloyd Salvetti working with him. The results are going to be just great.

So I am very pleased to be here.

I might just single out one other. Thanks to the far-sightedness of our Director, we have here at A&M a visiting professor on intelligence, a CIA man named Jim Olson. His course is just about the most popular there is. He's awakening in a new generation the necessity of good, sound intelligence, and we are blessed to have him on this campus and grateful to the Agency for helping facilitate his being here.

Roman Popadiuk here is the head of the George Bush Library and Foundation. Anybody who wants to leave money here, he's the guy you talk to. And he was, as many of you remember, our Ambassador in Ukraine, and before that, was at Brent Snowcroft's and Bob Gates' side as he wrestled with the very inquiring press that we have in Washington. And, of course, my co-author here, General Scowcroft. There is nobody to whom I am more indebted than Brent for advice, for counsel, for wisdom, for caring. He's the very best.

So let me start by saying that having this conference sponsored by the Bush School and the CIA's Center for the Study of Intelligence is one of the highlights in a year that has been very, very special for the Bush family.

It started in January when, within a couple of weeks of each other, two of our sons were sworn in as Governors of the second and fourth largest state in our great country. Then in April, the CIA Headquarters in Langley was, as the Director said, renamed in my honor, which, to be honest, had Barbara scratching her head a little bit. She said, "Why would they name a building dedicated to intelligence for a 75-year-old guy who jumps out of perfectly good airplanes?" I brushed off that criticism from her. Actually, despite that harassment, I did make a parachute jump in June, landing right out here on the front lawn. You'll see it when you walk out, the big front lawn of this library. It was my third jump—the second of a voluntary nature. And, as you can see, it worked out okay.

Finally, yesterday at 4 o'clock in the morning, I returned from an eleven-day, eight-city tour of Europe including Warsaw, and Prague, and Berlin—the scenes of so much drama that the Director referred to a few minutes ago, the drama of ten years ago. And, as you might imagine, it was a very emotional experience. I wish every one of you people who have contributed, men and women, in one way or another, direct or indirect, to the intelligence of this country, could have been there just to feel first-hand the emotion. To be in Berlin, to celebrate the 10th Anniversary of the fall of the Wall. It was also an overwhelming experience to stand in free Poland next to the President as he thanked the United States of America for our steadfast support. Meeting all the other Polish leaders. Then to be in Prague to celebrate the Velvet Revolution with Havel.

It was overwhelming to visit with men whom I consider modern-day heroes and realize that, 80 years after the October Revolution brought its tide of tyranny, and after 40 years of occupation, Europe has experienced a rebirth of freedom. There isn't a total new world order, but there's a new world order of more freedom and more democracy, and in the future, I hope that many of the young people here, the Texas Aggies, when they go out in the world, will assume responsibility for solidifying and perfecting a new world order which the whole world benefits from the kinds of joys and blessings that we take for granted every day of our lives in the United States of America. As this audience knows, the revolution of 1989 marked the triumph of the many nations who coalesced around a single idea. It was an alliance of freedom that eventually carried the day.

Over the last couple of weeks I spent a lot of time with another historical figure who will be remembered kindly by future generations. He was at our side in Berlin, and then again in Prague. I'm talking, of course, about Mikhail Gorbachev. I don't think there's any doubt that none of what we saw happening in Eastern Europe ten years ago would have occurred as quickly as it did if Gorbachev had not had the courage to follow through on his *perestroika* and *glasnost* reforms. And, ultimately, he met the same fate as the other revolutionaries and a handful of others, myself included. He received what Winston Churchill called "The Order of the Boot." Hey, mine happened through an election; Gorbachev was just kind of shoved out the door.

In any event, he was unable to reform socialism and maintain its viability, but he did not crack down as country after country left the Soviet orbit. So I worried that there might be—and I think several on our on our team worried that there might be—there was no encore to the Prague Spring of 30 years ago.

This two-day conference offers a welcome opportunity to reflect on these and other events as the Cold War ended. Tomorrow, and, today, too. You've gathered the best in the business, including many of my respected former colleagues, to talk not only about how the superpower conflict subsided, but also what its ramifications are for the future.

In looking at the list of names that Lloyd sent me, and that George Edwards and I went over, I see that you've tapped, as panel members for your discussions people who really served the Presidents of this country with great honor and great distinction. I mentioned

Brent, of course, at our NSC, and I was blessed with a good, team, Jimmy Baker over at State; Arnold Kanter and Ginny Lampley here with us today; Dennis Ross; Condi Rice; of course, Bill Webster, by golly; and Bob Gates, who's now the Acting Dean of our School of Government and Public Service—I want to emphasize that last part. And, of course, Cheney and Powell, and my friend Dave Jeremiah, over at the Pentagon. Excellence describes the people I had at my side, and it was a joy, a blessing to work with each of them.

Make no mistake, they were good and decent people, but they were tough, too, with strong views, and they were mature men and women who understood that power had a purpose. And seeing them work together, it was clear that they respected one another.

As we debated one issue or another, they would often argue views very forcefully. But once the President made the decision, we closed up the ranks. That's the way it ought to be.

A President, given good intelligence, cannot, should not, be expected to put up with a lively debate after he makes the Presidential call and the Presidential decision, and I was blessed in that way.

Together, we confronted a world in the midst of turbulent change, and looking back, in many ways we're still struggling to understand the importance of the events that transpired during the summer and the fall of 1989 as we watched "the world wake up from history." Over in our library, there's an exhibit on the Cold War titled "The Longest Winter." And it's an apt description, because it was a bitter enmity that divided our world into two ideological camps—each one armed, each poised to strike down the other. But if the Cold War was an endless struggle against a relentless adversary, then CIA was certainly one of freedom's most vigilant defenders.

My strong views about the Agency, indeed the Intelligence Community, and its people, I hope, are well known to the professionals here in this audience. But one thing merits repeating. When it comes to preserving and defending the national interests of the United States of America around the world, there can be no substitute for the President having the best possible intelligence in the world, which means we still must rely on CIA and, indeed, the entire Intelligence Community.

Though our world has undergone a profound transformation over the last quarter century, my views about the importance of CIA and its work haven't changed one single bit. Every once in awhile you hear some nutty Congressman get up and say, "We ought to put the money in downtown Detroit," or, "We ought to forget about intelligence. There are no enemies any more." Well, the heck with them. They don't understand the realities of the world in which we are living.

When I went in as DCI nearly 24 years ago, I was well aware of the controversy that engulfed CIA. I was well aware that it would be a tough assignment. Détente had run its

course, and the Soviets were expanding their efforts to strengthen their military and to export revolution to the Third World. But as I wrote my three brothers and my sister Nancy before leaving China—it came to me out there, that the President wanted me to come back. I was riding my bicycle, going from the International Club to our Embassy, when a communicator appeared and said, “Mr. Ambassador, I have a message for you.” I said, “What is it?” He said, “You'd better sit down.” And it was a message inviting me to come back and take over as Director of Central Intelligence.

So I wrote my brothers and my sister, "Overriding all this is what I perceive to be a fundamental need for an intelligence capability second to none. It's a tough, mean world, and we must stay strong. When the cable came in, I thought of Dad. What would he do? What would he tell his kids? And I think he would have said, 'It's your duty.'" Of course, to tell you how smart I was, I wrote and told them I thought it was a political dead end, too.

It was a dangerous time for our country. But it merits noting that it was a particularly difficult time for the men and women who worked for the Agency. We all remember those days. Thanks to, among others, one Philip Agee, who tried to sue my wife when she wrote something nasty about him in the book. But have at it, Philip, because what I think is, I think he betrayed a solemn trust in helping to expose the identity of our undercover agents. And I can't think of anything that, in my book, is more traitorous or more offensive to the decency that is the American way. To this day, I believe he bears a moral responsibility for the lives lost in the wake of those actions. And, if I may add, that treachery by Agee, like that of Aldrich Ames or—Edward Howard, is a good reason why we must never let the guard down on our counterintelligence. The Agency's people are its strongest assets, a point every DCI sitting out here understands as well, if not better, than I do.

Needless to say, when I entered the Presidency 10 years ago, thanks to my brief time out there at Langley, I understood the value of intelligence and the need for intelligence.

In his memoirs, President Truman wrote, "A President has to know what is going on all around the world in order to be ready to act when action is needed. The President must have all the facts that may affect foreign policy or military policy of the United States."

Well, in my view Truman was describing one of the President's most important jobs, and I can understand why the DCI—I guess it was Admiral Souers, General Vandenberg, then—was usually Truman's “first caller of the day,” as he described. I think those are the words he called it: the “first callers of the day.”

As for me, the PDB, the President's Daily Brief, was the first order of business on my calendar, too. And I made it a point from Day One to read the PDB in the presence of a CIA officer and either Brent or his deputy. We tried to protect the distribution of the PDB because we knew very well that once it was faxed or put through a Xerox machine, then the people preparing it, with their oath to protect sources and methods, would be

inclined to pull back and not give the President the frankest possible intelligence assessments presenting the best possible intelligence.

So I made it a point to read it with the CIA officer and usually Brent Scowcroft, or sometimes his deputy, or sometimes both. This way, I could ask the briefers for more information on matters of critical interest, and consult with Brent on matters affecting policy. And I think it helped those who were working night and day out there in Langley on preparing the PDB to know that their product was being looked at by the President himself. I think it helped a little bit with the morale of that section of the CIA that works so hard to put this book together.

Knowing of my interest in the clandestine services, I remember particularly one event with Bill Webster and also with Bob Gates would occasionally bring someone in who had risked his or her life to gather critically important intelligence. I won't refer by name to the person Bill Webster brought in, but I'll never forget that meeting until the day I die. It was with a woman in the operations end of the business, who literally had her life on the line day in and day out in intelligence gathering—human intelligence. It brought home to me the necessity of protecting people like that and saluting them because they serve without ever getting the prestige or honor that they deserve. Without fail, I was impressed with their courage, and their patriotism, and the professionalism of those who served in the whole Directorate of Operations. They never get recognition, but they deserve it.

As we saw in the Agee and Ames cases, there's always a danger that they, or one of their comrades, could be killed if their cover is blown. Our people continue to serve with honor—and thank God for that.

I know I leaned very hard on CIA during my four years in office—four years during which we saw our world change in profound ways as the Cold War ended, Eastern and Central Europe and the Baltics were liberated, and a democratic Russia started emerging. Just as remarkable, was the way the world community stood shoulder to shoulder against Saddam Husayn's brutal aggression against tiny Kuwait, an act that insulted every standard of international law.

So much happened so quickly during those four years, and it was an incredible challenge to be a part of shaping some of the critical events that unfolded.

I wouldn't have wanted to try tackling any of the many issues that we confronted without the input from the Intelligence Community. Not for one second.

Today, ten years after the revolution of 1989, it is satisfying to look back and not only note the vital role intelligence played in our historic success, but also to see how far we've come, from a world divided to a world transformed. It is a safer world, free from the threat of nuclear annihilation, and yet it's also a world in which we face new threats to stability, and new enemies and perhaps greater unpredictability.

The superpower struggle is no more, but new dangers have emerged to take its place. Proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, terrorists, extreme religious fundamentalists, narco-traffickers, to say nothing of despots like Saddam Husayn and, at least at one point, at least in history, Qadhafi. All represent threats to the peace and stability that the international community seeks to build.

Another threat to security and stability are the forces of isolationism and rampant nationalism. They are not above political opportunism in their attempts to turn their countries selfishly inward and lamely away from the course of reform. These forces of defeatism feed off discontent, but they can strike anywhere, and, in my view, that includes our own great country.

Today here, there's kind of an odd coalition comprising elements of the political left and the right who want the US to withdraw from much of the world. They like to beat up on the UN. I like to do that, too, but not on every part of it. It had a useful role to play when Desert Storm came along, and we've got to figure out where it can be effective. They like to beat up on that. They like to pound on China and Japan. Some even like to bash the EU these days, and they want no more free trade agreements. I think these people are in the minority, but I worry that attacks by this vocal minority send a terrible signal to our friends around the world about our willingness to stay engaged.

And at the same time, our alliance is undergoing its own transformation of sorts to give more responsibility to our global partners to address regional issues. This is a good thing—unless, for example, it weakens the strong US-Europe ties that have helped keep the peace in Europe for much of the last half-century.

It is imperative that the United States not withdraw into some form of neo-isolationism or protectionism. By way of example, the only thing that concerns me about the new European Defense Initiative is that it may be seen in the United States as “Yankee, go home.” I was recently asked about this at a large gathering, in Paris of business people and foreign affairs experts. And I said, “fine, and if any other country wants to do more of the heavy lifting, that's fine too. But don't make it look like a ‘Yankee-go-home’ thing, or we're going to go home, and we're going to pull back from Europe.” In my view, that would be disastrous.

Somebody asked me about the French-US relationship. “What do you think? What's your summary of that?” I said, “You think we're arrogant, and we think you're French. That's the problem.” I told him that. I was amazed. I thought, “Well, this is off the record,” although I know nothing is off the record. So I told him this, and I was surprised when he said, “You got something there.”

Today leaders in Asia and Europe continue to face tough political and economic issues as the process of reform moves forward. Seeing their struggles reminds us that, though we're in an age of exhilarating change, we've still got a great big job to do. And the

stakes riding on the success of these ongoing reforms are just too high for us to get it wrong. That's why I really hope that the United States won't get tired of involvement. I hope we'll continue to lead.

As Bob Gates noted in his wonderful book, despite the turbulent changes we encountered during the Cold War, one thing stayed the same. The US was able to maintain a fundamental, bipartisan commitment to freedom, to winning the Cold War. He also noted that every President, Republican and Democrat, had stood faithful watch during the Cold War, and that each was able to build on the contributions of his predecessors.

For example, he pointed out that President Nixon's SALT negotiations built on the work of the Johnson Administration. Jimmy Carter became known for his advocacy of human rights after Jerry Ford had political courage in going to Helsinki. And clearly, Ronald Reagan's support for a strong defense was absolutely critical to our effort to manage the events that took place when I was President of the United States.

As we strive to build the next American century, I just hope that we can achieve a new consensus on our role in the world. I hope we can forge a new bipartisan way of addressing the many challenges that remain. And in that regard, conferences like this one, I believe, can serve a very useful purpose. The kind of give and take on display here this week is exactly the kind of big-picture, long-range thinking we need to solve the many new questions that have emerged in the wake of the Cold War.

To be honest, I'm not sure we've found our footing on this new path that we've taken. And at times I worry that we appear to be kind of a superpower adrift. But my time for contributing to this work in the public arena is now past, and I had my chance. And thanks to our team, we got some things right. And I expect history will say we may have screwed up some things, too.

Of course, the 1992 election did not work out the way we hoped. But I have tried very hard, and I think there's a good point here for the young men and women of Texas A&M, not to criticize my successor, understanding that his job is a difficult job, and that there are plenty of good people in the loyal opposition out there fighting for many of the beliefs that I share. They don't need one more back-bencher in Houston, Texas, saying, "Hey, wait a minute. Here's the way I used to do it."

We had our chance. Besides that, my two boys in the political arena don't need me doing that either.

So the torch of public service in our family has been passed, unless I can make a difference here in this little school. Unless I can help Roman Popadiuk, and Bob Gates, and George Edwards, and you name it, the professors that give of themselves to inculcate into these kids a sense of public service. Maybe then, if that's my public service, well, maybe it's not over. But it's been passed, in a broad sense, to George and Jeb, who make me and Barbara very, very proud every day that they're willing to be in there trying. I still

want to find a way to contribute, though, and the Bush School is a big part of that. We have great people here, and we have high hopes for what we are seeking to accomplish, and I want to help. I want to help where I can.

Last week in Berlin, I was proud to announce the formation of a new privately funded fellowship program along with Helmut Kohl—a Bush-Kohl Fellowship. It's going to enable young German and American professionals to spend up to 12 months working in business and government positions of leadership on the opposite sides of the Atlantic. And the goal is to build a bridge of even greater understanding and cooperation in a way that will strengthen US-German relations and better enable us to meet the challenges of the 21st Century.

Next month, Helmut Kohl will visit College Station to receive the first-ever Bush Award for Excellence in Public Service. I just hope we can repay some of the gracious hospitality that he and all Germans extended to Barbara and me last week.

If you don't think the work of the CIA matters, if you don't think the hard work of national security makes a difference, you should heed John Kennedy's advice. Go to Germany. The reception we received was unbelievable—a complete outpouring of friendship from the German people. I was the recipient, but the credit goes to all of those who vigilantly supported their cause of freedom. And, you know, it was exactly the same way in Warsaw, exactly the same way in Prague. As I said last week, we can never repay the debt that is owed to the brave men and women of Berlin and elsewhere who taught us the true value of freedom. But if we can help pass along their enduring legacy of courage and honor, then maybe, in some small way, we will be doing the Lord's work. Such is the work the CIA performs day in and day out, and I am grateful for this opportunity to salute everything you in the Community do.

So thank you for coming to this school, and good luck to each and every one of you, and may God bless Texas A&M University in its grief, and the United States.