

and conflict even in the post-historical world for some time to come. Even though I recognize its inevitability, I have the most ambivalent feelings for the civilization that has been created in Europe since 1945, with its north Atlantic and Asian offshoots. Perhaps this very prospect of centuries of boredom at the end of history will serve to get history started once again.

REVIEW QUESTIONS

1. How did Fukuyama use the word "history" in this essay?
2. According to Fukuyama, what kind of international conflicts were likely to occur in the post-Cold War environment?
3. Why did Fukuyama believe that the "end of history will be a very sad time"?

GEORGE BUSH

A New World Order (1991)

George Bush served two terms as Ronald Reagan's vice president and took advantage of Reagan's popularity to win the presidency in 1988. He inherited a thriving economy and a profoundly changing Soviet Union. The collapse of Soviet Communism in 1989 and the ending of the Cold War transformed America's role in world affairs. Yet international tensions did not disappear. Communists continued to rule in China, Cuba, Angola, Vietnam, and North Korea. The Arab-Israeli conflict continued to fester. And competing economic interests and contested borders continued to generate friction among nations. In a speech to the United Nations General Assembly in 1991, President George Bush outlined the framework for a post-Cold War foreign policy.

From George Bush, "The Challenge of Building Peace: A Renewal Of History," *Vital Speeches of the Day* 58 (1991):2-4.

My speech today will not sound like any you've heard from a President of the United States. I'm not going to dwell on the superpower competition that defined international politics for half a century. Instead, I will discuss the challenges of building peace and prosperity in a world leavened by the Cold War's end and the resumption of history.

Communism held history captive for years. It suspended ancient disputes; and it suppressed ethnic rivalries, nationalistic aspirations, and old prej-

udices. As it has dissolved, suspended hatreds have sprung to life. People who for years have been denied their pasts have begun searching for their own identities—often through peaceful and constructive means, occasionally through factionalism and bloodshed.

This revival of history ushers in a new era, teeming with opportunities and perils. And let's begin by discussing the opportunities.

First, history's renewal enables people to pursue their natural instincts for enterprise. Com-

munism froze that progress until its failures became too much for even its defenders to bear.

And now citizens throughout the world have chosen enterprise over envy; personal responsibility over the enticements of the state; prosperity over the poverty of central planning. . . .

Frankly, ideas and goods will travel around the globe with or without our help. The information revolution has destroyed the weapons of enforced isolation and ignorance. In many parts of the world technology has overwhelmed tyranny, proving that the age of information can become the age of liberation if we limit state power wisely and free our people to make the best use of new ideas, inventions and insights.

By the same token, the world has learned that free markets provide levels of prosperity, growth and happiness that centrally planned economies can never offer. Even the most charitable estimates indicate that in recent years the free world's economies have grown at twice the rate of the former communist world. . . .

I cannot stress this enough: Economic progress will play a vital role in the new world. It supplies the soil in which democracy grows best. People everywhere seek government of and by the people. And they want to enjoy their inalienable rights to freedom and property and person. . . .

The challenge facing the Soviet peoples now—that of building political systems based upon individual liberty, minority rights, democracy and free markets—mirrors every nation's responsibility for encouraging peaceful, democratic reform. But it also testifies to the extraordinary power of the democratic ideal.

As democracy flourishes, so does the opportunity for a third historical breakthrough: international cooperation. A year ago, the Soviet Union joined the United States and a host of other nations in defending a tiny country against aggression and opposing Saddam Hussein. For the very first time on the matter of major importance, superpower competition was replaced with international cooperation.

The United Nations, in one of its finest moments, constructed a measured, principled, de-

liberate and courageous response to Saddam Hussein. It stood up to an outlaw who invaded Kuwait, who threatened many states within the region, who sought to set a menacing precedent for the post-Cold War World. . . . We will not revive these ideals if we fail to acknowledge the challenge that the renewal of history presents.

In Europe and Asia, nationalist passions have flared anew, challenging borders, straining the fabric of international society. At the same time, around the world, many age-old conflicts still fester. You see signs of this tumult right here. The United Nations has mounted more peacekeeping missions in the last 36 months than during its first 43 years. And although we now seem mercifully liberated from the fear of nuclear holocaust, these smaller, virulent conflicts should trouble us all.

We must face this challenge squarely: first, by pursuing the peaceful resolution of disputes now in progress; second, and more importantly, by trying to prevent others from erupting.

No one here can promise that today's borders will remain fixed for all time. But we must strive to ensure the peaceful, negotiated settlement of border disputes. We also must promote the cause of international harmony by addressing old feuds. . . .

Government has failed if citizens cannot speak their minds; if they can't form political parties freely and elect governments without coercion, if they can't practice their religion freely, if they can't raise their families in peace; if they can't enjoy a just return from their labor, if they can't live fruitful lives and, at the end of their days, look upon their achievements and their society's progress with pride. The renewal of history also imposes an obligation to remain vigilant about new threats and old. We must expand our efforts to control nuclear proliferation. We must work to prevent the spread of chemical and biological weapons and the missiles to deliver them.

We can never say with confidence where the next conflict may arise. And we cannot promise eternal peace—not while demagogues peddle false promises to people hungry with hope; not while terrorists use our citizens as pawns, and drug deal-

ory" in
inter-
in the
end of

ls have
e been
r their
d con-
nalism

w era,
id let's

o pur-
Com-

ers destroy our peoples. We, as a result—we must band together to overwhelm affronts to basic human dignity.

It is no longer acceptable to shrug and say that one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter. Let's put the law above the crude and cowardly practice of hostage-holding.

The United Nations can encourage free-market development through its international lending and aid institutions. However, the United Nations should not dictate the particular forms of government that nations should adopt. But it can and should encourage the values upon which this organization was founded. Together, we should insist that nations seeking our acceptance meet standards of human decency.

Where institutions of freedom have lain dormant, the United Nations can offer them new life. These institutions play a crucial role in our quest for a new world order, an order in which no nation must surrender one iota of its own sovereignty; an order characterized by the rule of law rather than the resort to force. The cooperative settlement of disputes, rather than anarchy and bloodshed; and an unstinting belief in human rights.

Finally, you may wonder about America's role in the new world that I have described. Let me assure you, the United States has no intention of striving for a Pax Americana. However, we will

remain engaged. We will not retreat and pull back into isolationism. We will offer friendship and leadership. And in short, we seek a Pax Universalis built upon shared responsibilities and aspirations.

To all assembled, we have an opportunity to spare our sons and daughters the sins and errors of the past. We can build a future more satisfying than any our world has ever known. The future lies undefined before us, full of promise; littered with peril. We can choose the kind of world we want; one blistered by the fires of war and subjected to the whims of coercion and chance, or one made more peaceful by reflection and choice. Take this challenge seriously. Inspire future generations to praise and venerate you, to say: On the ruins of conflict, these brave men and women built an era of peace and understanding. They inaugurated a new world order, an order worth preserving for the ages.

REVIEW QUESTIONS

1. What did Bush see as the disadvantages to the collapse of Soviet Communism?
2. According to Bush, what kind of economic system would dominate the "new world"?
3. What role did Bush envision for the United Nations?

WADE HUNTLEY

Who Won the Cold War? (1993)

The end of the Cold War has generated a spirited debate about its demise. While Ronald Reagan, George Bush, and other Republican leaders have trumpeted their policies as the reason for the collapse of the Soviet Union, other politicians and scholars disagree. Dr. Wade Huntley is Program Director for Asia/Pacific Security at the Nautilus Institute for Security and Sustainable Development. A specialist in in-