



Max M. Kampelman Papers

Copyright Notice:

This material may be protected by copyright law (U.S. Code, Title 17). Researchers are liable for any infringement. For more information, visit www.mnhs.org/copyright.

**UNION OF
CONCERNED
SCIENTISTS**

882016
4/26/94

March 28, 1994

Ambassador Max Kampelman
Washington, DC
FAX: 639-7008

Dear Ambassador Kampelman,

This letter is to enquire whether you would consider being lead-off speaker at a Washington conference of the Gorbachev Foundation, USA at 9:30 a.m. Tuesday, April 26, 1994 on the subject of "Prospects for the UN—The Next Decade." The aim of the Washington conference (the second in a series after a Moscow session last year) is to formulate a global security program which can be publicly presented by Mikhail Gorbachev at a meeting in New Delhi this September and subsequently at the UN, and appropriately publicized thereafter. Much of the content of the draft program, which I will send you with a letter copy of this fax, deals with the UN. However, your talk would not have to mesh with the draft program in any way.

The participants in this session, which will take place at the Vista Hotel at 1400 M Street, include senior experts from the Gorbachev Foundation, Moscow and the Rajiv Gandhi Foundation, New Delhi, as well as several Americans well known for their work on international relations, arms control and peacekeeping, including former Senator Alan Cranston, Sidney Drell of Stanford, James Leonard, Ralph Earle, John Rhinelander of Washington, Richard Falk of Princeton, and Jeremy Stone of the Federation of American Scientists. I myself am helping to organize the conference program.

If you would be willing to participate but your calendar is blocked for the morning of April 26, we could move the presentation to that evening at 8:30 p.m. We hope that you can make this presentation for us; it would give our discussions a very good start.

Most sincerely,



Jonathan Dean
Arms Control Adviser

Jonathan Dean
Arms Control Adviser
Union of Concerned Scientists
Suite 310
1616 P Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 332-0900

March 10, 1994

Revised to show a few changes in titles of papers and to fill out the roster of authors.

DRAFT OUTLINE OF GLOBAL PEACE PROGRAM FOR THE GORBACHEV FOUNDATION

Objective: Lowering the Global Level of Violence

Mikhail Gorbachev's great achievement as leader of the Soviet Union was to effect political change of historic dimensions almost entirely free of violence and bloodshed. It is unparalleled in human experience that change of this significance—major dismantlement of the Cold War nuclear confrontation, elimination of Stalinism in the USSR, and withdrawal of Soviet forces from Eastern Europe—should take place without armed conflict.

This achievement made possible the sudden emergence of a functioning if rudimentary global security system based on the United Nations bolstered by regional security organizations. It can also inspire the nations and peoples of the world to renew efforts to move toward the old dream of a world without war.

In the past, most people thought of war between nations and organized armed violence inside nations as a natural disaster, like earthquakes, floods or forest fires, a disaster to which people would react and seek to cope with after it happened. But our century, largely because it has been the bloodiest in the history of humanity, has broken with the tradition of accepting war as an incurable affliction of humanity. A very broad range of measures has been developed to prevent conflict, to reduce the effects of conflict if it occurs, and to end conflict. The spectrum includes confidence-building and transparency measures, restrictions on deployment and activities of armed forces, negotiated force reductions and limitations, control over weapons production and proliferation; also conflict prevention, mediation and conflict resolution, and multilateral peacekeeping. Even applying these measures more widely and systematically than heretofore, it will probably not be possible to end all armed conflict. But it has become feasible to think of preventing an increasing number of potential conflicts and of gradually lowering the level of organized violence throughout the world.

Plan of this Paper

With that objective in mind, this paper seeks to describe the main components of a possible security program which could be promoted worldwide by President Gorbachev and the Gorbachev Foundation. It combines ideas developed in the September 1993 Moscow discussion with some additional elements.

As we visualize the Foundation security program, it should consist of a series of individual components which are directly related to the objective of lowering the global level of violence, which have some degree of originality, can be briefly presented, and are such that they can be understood readily by a non-specialist public. Suggested components of the program are presented below (arabic numbered items).

It is intended that each suggestion should be backed by a brief descriptive paper which, together with the overall program, will form the basis for discussion at the April workshop in Washington—discussion intended to clarify the individual proposals, to identify potential errors in them and to strengthen their argumentation.

We will then ask authors to revise their contributions where indicated and will prepare an overall document based on them for presentation and sponsorship by President Gorbachev at the conference planned for New Delhi in September 1994.

The three main components of the suggested program are: better control over nuclear and conventional weapons; new security and peacekeeping arrangements, including measures designed to strengthen the authority of the United Nations and other international institutions; and new approaches to preventing armed conflict through mediation and conflict resolution.

I. CONTROLLING ARMS

1. Short-Range Actions Aimed at Extending the NPT

Nuclear weapons remain the greatest threat to the security of all nations. An international system composed of twenty or more nuclear weapons states ceaselessly competing with one another to maximize their security would make impossible the development of a global security system based on increasing effectiveness of the UN and regional security systems. Such a system would be more dangerous because less predictable than the Cold War nuclear confrontation.

Consequently, the priority task for all governments is to strengthen the nonproliferation regime. In coming months, this means supporting conclusion of a comprehensive test ban, a treaty ending production of fissile material for weapons

placing all installations capable of such production under international safeguards, and agreeing to extend the Non-Proliferation Treaty indefinitely.

The nuclear weapons states should energetically work toward this outcome. But, beyond this, they must show through their actions that they are moving toward more effective control over a decreasing number of weapons.

Consequently, it is proposed (picking up a suggestion from James Leonard) that the United States and Russia should invite the three other declared nuclear weapons states to meet before the NPT review conference begins to discuss how they can in future meet their Article 6 NPT obligations to negotiate in good faith toward nuclear disarmament. Actual negotiation among the five would take place after the NPT review conference has ended, but the five will at least have given a signal of constructive intentions and they may also be able to agree and publish an agenda for their negotiations before the NPT review ends.

Next, the five nuclear weapons states should sponsor a Security Council decision that pledges the Council to take joint action without fear of veto against any state or group initiating the use of nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction. This positive security guarantee, based on the commitment of the five governments not to make first use of nuclear weapons (perhaps difficult but not impossible for Russia now) would provide important reassurance to non-nuclear states and thus support extension of the NPT.

2. Eliminating Nuclear Weapons

President Gorbachev presented a detailed plan for elimination of nuclear weapons in January 1986 and among world political leaders he is perhaps most closely identified with this idea. It is therefore appropriate to lead off the substantive part of the Global Peace Program with a review of the current status of this goal and how to get there (Richard Falk).

3. A Post-START Nuclear Arms Reduction Agreement

Based on ideas developed at the Moscow discussion, a program on the next, post-START phase of nuclear arms control might be developed by Senator Allen Cranston and Sidney Drell. This approach could assume, despite the existence of many serious uncertainties, solution of problems with Ukraine and North Korea, the successful implementation of both START treaties, conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty, agreement on long-term extension of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and conclusion of a treaty ending the production of fissile material for weapons and placing all installations capable of such production under international safeguards. The new paper would describe a concept for the next post-START phase of nuclear arms

control, which would combine reductions with measures designed to make them irreversible. This approach might include further deep cuts in US and Russian arsenals, possible agreements for international monitoring of existing stocks of warheads and fissile material, efforts to engage the three remaining nuclear weapons states in negotiated reductions, agreements to dismantle all reduced warheads, verified arrangements to downgrade highly enriched uranium and to transfer plutonium to international custody, and arrangements for international safeguards over stockpiles of plutonium for civilian energy production.

4. The Final Stage of Nuclear Arms Control

Even if we wish to eliminate nuclear weapons totally, it is very unlikely that the nuclear weapons states will agree to give up their weapons completely until there is a functioning system of world security with a proven record of achievement and a non-proliferation regime of recognized comprehensive effectiveness. What is needed now to give long-term purpose and direction to nuclear arms control is an approach which will define an end point of nuclear arms control which is practical enough to be carried out following the post-START phase of radical reductions by all the nuclear weapons states described above, an approach which would neutralize remaining arsenals of nuclear weapons both politically and militarily, and which would recognizably be the last stage of nuclear arms control prior to possible decisions to eliminate the weapons or to hand them over to a much-strengthened UN.

This stage, "the final phase of nuclear arms control," might be achieved through an agreement among the five nuclear powers to reduce their arsenals to no more than 300 warheads each and to place these warheads under multilateral control on the territory of the owner states. In this phase, the three undeclared nuclear weapons states would be expected either to relinquish their weapons or to place them under the same type of international safeguards (Jonathan Dean).

5. A Global Missile-Warning System Open to All Countries

Unconstrained development of anti-missile defenses, whether against strategic-range or tactical-range missiles, could motivate dangerous competition and block further reduction of offensive weapons.

A partial answer is a cooperative global missile observation system open to all governments established through US and Russian cooperation. Such a system is within range of present technology. This system would provide information on missile tests worldwide and deter attackers by confronting them with the possibility of immediate international knowledge of their actions. Would it also be possible to make the weapon components of an anti-missile system available worldwide? It is suggested that Gorbachev Foundation-Moscow contribute a paper on this subject.

6. Instituting Control Over Production and Transfer of Long-Range Delivery Systems

Long-range delivery systems—missiles and combat aircraft—can be used to deliver nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and conventional weapons. The international community should move toward effective worldwide control over their manufacture and sale. This section will contain proposals for limiting production and transfer of high performance combat aircraft (Randall Forsberg, 6A) and for a worldwide convention banning production of long-range missiles except for verified space purposes (Jeremy Stone, 6B). The major producing countries should consider a five-year moratorium on production and transfer of modern combat aircraft and missiles of over 100 km range as a first step towards negotiation of an agreement to end or restrict production of these weapons.

7. Instituting International Control Over Transfer of Conventional Weapons

There are far too many conventional weapons in the world. A realistic long-range scheme for restricting their production and transfer is much needed. One possibility is voluntary reductions by agreement among main producers. A second is to negotiate a system of international controls over transfers operated through the UN Arms Registry, which would license all sales and purchases after a specified cut-off date on the basis of criteria aimed at radical reduction of total turnover (Saul Mendlovitz).

II. STRENGTHENING THE UN AND INSTITUTIONS OF REGIONAL SECURITY

Peacekeeping by the UN and regional security institutions must move beyond reacting to conflict after it happens to preventing conflict through mediation, conciliation, preventive deployment and conflict containment.

8. Establishing a UN Observer and Mediation Corps; Establishing a UN Readiness Force

The UN needs a career Observer and Mediation Corps of about 500 highly trained men and women. For these purposes, the Secretary General now has only a handful of Secretariat officers, plus personnel borrowed from member state foreign ministries.

It takes from three to six months to gather together the personnel and initial financial support for a UN peacekeeping operation. By that time, conflict has often broken out and intensified so that efforts to deal with it require major military force.

A highly trained UN readiness force in being is needed which can be deployed within 24 hours after a Security Council decision for the purpose of preventive

deployment to head off conflict and containment of initial stages of conflict if it breaks out. Such a force, with two brigades stationed in Asia and two in Europe, should consist of all volunteer personnel and have its own permanent bases and air transport. It should also have its own sources of financial support through the proceeds from a tax on international air travel collected by member states and turned over to the UN (Jonathan Dean).

9. Expanding and Strengthening a Worldwide Network of Regional Security Organizations

An effective world security system requires a network of functioning regional security organizations linked to the United Nations. With increasing capability, these regional organizations should in time perform the bulk of conflict prevention and peacekeeping missions, leaving only exceptional cases to be tackled by the UN itself. There already are such regional organizations in the Western Hemisphere, Europe and Africa. These organizations must be deliberately strengthened, among other things through improved decision-making based on the UN model of majority voting in the General Assembly and Security Council. Each should organize peacekeeping capability of its own, to include a small standing conflict prevention force. These regional conflict prevention forces too should have their own source of financing through an international tax.

In Europe, this role should be carried out by the CSCE. Asia has only one small regional organization, ASEAN, not highly suitable for expansion. Because of Asia's size, at least two new regional security organizations are needed in Asia, one for South Asia (including India, Pakistan, China, Russia, and possibly USA), and one for East Asia and the Pacific (including China, Japan, Russia and USA). If it is interested in doing so, an outline plan describing the composition, organization and functions of the South Asian organization might be prepared by the Rajiv Gandhi Foundation (9A). The Gorbachev Foundation, if willing, might do a paper on the East Asia organization (9B).

10. Establishing a UN Advisory Assembly

The UN needs a direct link to the people. All UN personnel—Secretariat, General Assembly and Security Council—are officials, most of them designated by member governments. The UN should therefore have a directly elected Advisory Assembly. Member countries might be divided into four categories according to population size, with the largest countries sending four directly elected representatives to the Advisory Assembly and the smallest ones sending one representative. (Two- to three-page paper—Saul Mendlovitz)

III. CONFLICT RESOLUTION

Of the more than 100 conflicts currently raging around the world, the overwhelming number are not conflicts between nations but conflicts within nations between various ethnic and religious groups.

This is important to note for two reasons: first, because local conflicts are increasingly taking on regional and global significance; and second, because our international institutions have been designed principally to deal with conflicts between nations, not within nations. Somalia marks the first time that the United Nations has become involved in what is essentially a civil war.

In this situation, the work of the private sector, in particular specialists in the field of conflict resolution and acknowledged statespersons willing to bring to bear their own moral suasion and wisdom, is not only needed but is in many cases the only realistic mechanism for beginning the peace process. This is particularly true in the 'pre-mediation' phase of conflict, when there are no formal discussions between governments or groups but an awareness that a situation is getting out of control.

Conflict resolution as an essential and active tool of diplomacy is particularly important as totalitarian regimes give way to democratic institutions and processes. Democracy is essentially a method of resolving conflicts and disagreements without recourse to violence. It is as much a way of life as a process of governance. It requires a commitment on the part of the citizenry toward public debate, the toleration of differing points of view and the imperative for compromise. The capacity to resolve conflicts peaceably is the cornerstone of democracy and freedom.

11. This paper will seek to identify world trouble spots where mediation by a leaders team to include President Gorbachev would be useful and relatively little activity is underway. It will describe possible patterns of collaboration in mediation between President Gorbachev and other world statesmen. It will also describe training programs focussed on long-term attitudinal and societal shifts necessary to make democracy a functioning way of life (Joseph Montville).

"PROSPECTS FOR THE U.N. - THE NEXT DECADE"

REMARKS BY

MAX M. KAMPELMAN

THE GORBACHEV FOUNDATION

Washington, DC

April 26, 1994

It is a privilege for me to appear at this opening session of the Gorbachev Foundation's symposium. My task is to provide a keynote perspective for our discussion, putting our concerns about the world in which we find ourselves today not only in an historic perspective, but also in the context of how better to understand and face the dramatic challenges we face.

It is appropriate that I do so by first acknowledging the vital role played by President Gorbachev in making it possible for us to acknowledge that the immense opportunities for a better world that we face today would not have been possible without his leadership.

The American people and the government of the United States believed that Communist totalitarianism was a failure and unable to survive in the rapidly evolving modern age of science and technology, no matter how talented its scientists and engineers. We knew that a totalitarian government required a monopoly of information for it to achieve the loyalty of those it governed; and we knew that the communications revolution, with its faxes, satellites, electronic mail, super computers, laser printers, optical disk, cellular telephone and the like made

information power accessible in all parts of our globe, putting totalitarian governments at a serious disadvantage.

· We believed all that. But very few of us believed that the Warsaw Pact would disintegrate in our lifetime without violence -- Mikhail Gorbachev made that possible.

· Very few of us believed that the Communist Party in the Soviet Union would lose its monopoly without putting up a violent struggle -- Mikhail Gorbachev made that possible.

· Very few of us imagined that the Soviet Union itself would abandon imperial objectives and divide itself into component parts -- Mikhail Gorbachev laid the foundation which made that possible.

· Very few of us conceived that the Cold War would end peacefully and that we would be seriously discussing how to create a meaningful political and international partnership between the Russian people and the American people -- Michael Gorbachev's leadership made that possible.

Like Moses who could not lead the Children of Israel into the promised land, President Gorbachev did not have the opportunity to lead his people into their new world. It sometimes requires 40 years in the desert for new thinking and vitality to replace the old. But, President Gorbachev's imagination and vision, with all the limitations of his environment, will give him a place of great distinction in the history of modern civilization.

It is for that reason that I was pleased to accept your invitation to be with you this morning.

There is some danger that my introductory words may lead you to believe that I look upon our world with unwarranted optimism, with rose-colored glasses. That is not so. Let me, therefore, elaborate.

Following my retirement from government service in January, 1989, I was called back to government service on five different occasions to deal with the Helsinki Final Act and our country's relationship to the substance and mechanism for Europe's security and cooperation. From 1980 to 1983, under Presidents Carter and Reagan, I headed the U.S. Delegation to the successful Madrid CSCE follow-up meeting, which led to the new assignments.

In November, 1990, I had the privilege of being part of the American Delegation, led by President Bush, to a heads of government Summit in Paris. The mood of that day was one of euphoria and self-congratulation. The Berlin Wall had been shattered; Communist regimes were falling; the Warsaw Pact was disappearing; the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was in shambles; democracy seemed to be spreading like wildfire. I had just completed serving as head of the U.S. Delegation to the Copenhagen CSCE meeting on the human dimension where all of Europe unanimously agreed that political democracy and the rule of law, not as slogans, but with clear detailed specificity, were indispensable prerequisites to assure European security and cooperation. There was no doubt. We were entering a "new world order."

Nineteen months later, in June, 1992, I again had the privilege of being a member of the American Delegation to the next heads of government Summit in Helsinki. The mood was decidedly different. Europe felt depressingly impotent, obsessed with challenges it could not face.

It was not just that Saddam Hussein remained in power. It was also the savagery in too many areas of the world, with ethnic strife and xenophobia dividing people, villages, neighborhoods. It was growing anti-Semitism, even where there were few or no Jews. It was the human race once again demonstrating its capacity for cruelty, with hundreds of thousands of refugees displaced from their homes; and the words "concentration camp" reappearing in our consciousness and consciences. The ironic reappearance of Sarajevo as a symbol of war brought back awful reminders of yesterday. And all of this was accompanied by a seeming inability to stop the violence and brutality.

That depressing feeling of impotence in the face of continued and recurring Serbian aggression and defiance of responsible international behavior remains with us today as the prospect for intensified war in Europe becomes conceivable. Meanwhile, commentators now openly wonder whether Bosnia will be for the United Nations what Abyssinia meant for the League of Nations, a lack of credibility followed by irrelevance.

The question may well be asked: Are we entering an age of democracy, a new world based on human dignity, or an age of disorder which repeats the hatreds and divisions and savageries of yesterday? Is it in our power to influence the answer to that question?

Francis Fukiyama, using Hegel's historical analysis, optimistically called the post-Cold War period "The End of History," meaning that the direction in which we were heading was making it clear that democracy and liberty were our destiny, given their obvious superiority as systems of governance. Harvard University's Sam Huntington, on the other hand, did not see how we could escape an inevitable violent clash of civilizations on perhaps a worldwide scale. I have found it personally helpful if I place these profound issues in a broader context of change.

During my early childhood, one lifetime, there were no vitamin tablets; no anti-biotics; no television; no dial telephones; no refrigerators; no FM radio; no synthetic fibers; no dishwashers; no electric blankets; no airmail; no transatlantic airlines; no instant coffee; no Xerox; no air-conditioning; no frozen foods; no contact lenses; no birth control pill; no ball-point pens, no transistors. The list can go on.

In my lifetime, medical knowledge available to physicians has increased perhaps more than ten-fold. More than 80% of all scientists who ever lived, it is said, are alive today. The average life span keeps steadily increasing. Advanced computers, new materials, new bio-technological processes are altering every phase of our lives, deaths, even reproduction.

No generation since the beginning of the human race has experienced and absorbed so much change so rapidly -- and it is only the beginning. As an indication of that, more than 100,000 scientific journals annually publish the flood of new knowledge that pours out of the world's laboratories.

These developments are stretching our minds and our grasp of reality to the outermost dimensions of our capacity to understand them. Moreover, as we look ahead, we must agree that we have only the minutest glimpse of what our universe really is. We barely understand the human brain and its energy; and the endless horizons of space and the mysteries found in the great depths of our seas are still virtually unknown to us. Our science is indeed a drop, our ignorance remains an ocean.

It has been said that necessity is the mother of invention. I suggest the corollary is also true: Invention is the mother of necessity. Technology and communication are necessitating basic changes in our lives. The world is very much smaller. There is no escaping the fact that the sound of a whisper or a whimper in one part of the world can immediately be heard in all parts of the world -- and consequences follow.

But the world body politic has not kept pace with the dramatic scientific and technological achievements. Just as the individual human body makes a natural effort to keep the growth of its components balanced, and we consider the body disfigured if one arm or leg grows significantly larger than the other, so is the world body politic disfigured if its knowledge component opens up broad new vistas for development while its political and social components remain in the Dark Ages.

In this context let me introduce the reality that in this decade of the 1990's, a larger part of the world's population is living in relative freedom than ever before in the history of the world. I suggest to you that what we may be

observing and experiencing in the growth of democratic influence is a necessary effort by the body politic to catch up with the world of science and technology.

What we have also been unexpectedly observing is a fierce resistance to that change. It is as if a part of us is saying: "Not so fast. Stop the world. We want to get off. We are not ready. We are not prepared for this new world we are being dragged into. You are threatening our beliefs. We will resist the changes. We will hold on tight and with a determined frenzy to the familiar, the tribal, the traditional!" This phenomenon cannot in the short run be dismissed, as fundamentalism, nationalism, race, and ethnicity make themselves increasingly felt.

I suggest that the explosions we hear are frequently the sounds of escaping steam as the lids of repression are removed from boiling kettles. Fingers and faces that are too close get scalded. But there are stronger and more urgent sounds of impatient hope and expectation not to be neglected. We must harness the energy of that boiling water into a samovar of refreshing tea. The promises and realities of modern technology for better living cannot be hidden and their availability cannot long be denied. The communication age has opened up the world for all to see. The less fortunate are now aware that they can live in societies, including their own, which respect their dignity as human beings. From radio and television they know that such societies, which provide advantages of better health, improved sanitation, adequate food and water, economic opportunity, leisure for self-enrichment, are only hours away. They want that dignity and better living for themselves and for their children -- and they don't wish to wait.

Keeping up with scientific and technological opportunities requires openness to information, new ideas, and the freedom which enables ingenuity to germinate

and flourish. A closed, tightly controlled society cannot compete in a world experiencing an information explosion that knows no national boundaries. Peoples now trapped in the quagmire of ancient ethnic and national grievances and enmities will soon come to recognize that they are thereby dooming themselves, their children and their grandchildren to become orphans of history, lost in the caves of the past. There is room for ethnic, national, religious, racial and tribal pride, but if that drive for self-identification is to produce respect and self-realization for the individual and the group, that drive must be peaceful and in harmony with the aspirations of others in our evolving inter-related world community.

As national boundaries are buffeted by change, the nations of the world become ever more interdependent. We are clearly in a time when no society can isolate itself or its people from new ideas and new information anymore than one can escape the winds whose currents affect us all. National boundaries can keep out vaccines, but those boundaries cannot keep out germs, or thoughts, or broadcasts. They are also often unable to keep out terrorists or refugees.

This suggests, among many other implications, the need to reappraise our traditional definitions of sovereignty. The requirements of our evolving technology are increasingly turning national boundaries into patterns of lace through which flow ideas, money, people, crime, terrorism, nuclear missiles -- all of which know no national boundaries. One essential geo-political consequence of this new reality is that there can be no true security for any one country in isolation. Insecurity and instability are contagious diseases. Neighbors are likely to suffer the consequences of that disease. We must learn to accept in each of our countries a mutual responsibility for the peoples in other countries.

None of this is to suggest the disappearance of the nation-state, which is showing resilience as an important focus of national pride and ethnic cultural preservation. Nations appear unwilling to renounce the flag, abandon language, or forget history. This is one reason there has been increased interest in federalism and regional confederation.

Our task is to strengthen global and regional political interdependence. It is to help influence the constructive energies of the emerging democratic societies so that they are channeled into the full peaceful realization of their aspirations. It is in our interest to fulfill that task with determination. If we fail to fulfill that responsibility, we will be condemned by our children and grandchildren who will pay the price for our failure to assure the peace and human dignity that is at hand.

The argument is frequently made in the United States that we cannot be the policeman of the world. I respectfully suggest that no community -- and this nation is an integral part of an economic, technological, scientific and political world community -- can survive, let alone flourish, without a police force. We have an obligation to be part of such a force, with diplomacy our first responsibility and with the clear readiness to use our military as a last resort when necessary.

The argument is also heard that our effort to foster democracy in other geographic areas is a misguided and doomed effort to transfer the values of our Western culture to other cultures not hospitable to those values. Our Western values, it is said, particularly by defenders of Middle East and Asian authoritarian systems, are unique to our culture alone. I believe this to be an over-simplified cop-out.

Our human rights differences with China, for example, are not based on the Confucianism of China's despots. It is their Leninism that is at the root of our differences. All dictators, whether in the East or West, fear and resist the spread of freedom. Mainland China signed a variety of international conventions and pledged to subscribe to them when it joined the United Nations. Unless the civilized world takes these commitments seriously and insists on compliance, they will become irrelevant footnotes of history.

My friend and former partner, Richard Schifter, now a special advisor to the President at the National Security Council, who served as our Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs during the Reagan and Bush administrations, told me of an exchange he recently had with a Chinese colleague on this subject. Mr. Schifter's explanation went something like this:

"During the last 250 years the West produced two sharply differing systems defining the relationship between government and the governed, namely the ideas of democracy and human rights associated with the Enlightenment, on the one hand, and Leninism, on the other hand. Your bad luck has been that you chose the Western system that doesn't work."

It is true that the modern idea of political democracy originated in the West. But Christianity and Islam originated in the Middle East and those ideas spread to all parts of the globe. The ideas of the Enlightenment need not be confined to Western Europe and North America. Mr. Schifter asks: "Do Westerners carry a democracy gene?" We know that the ideology of the Enlightenment has established a bridgehead in all of the non-Western civilizations. Young people of today's Japan, for example, are in many ways culturally closer to their American

and European contemporaries than they are to their grandparents. Japan has increasingly become part of the democratic West.

It is true that militant Islam today rejects the principles of the Enlightenment. It looks upon life in a free society as a direct threat to the core values of its faith. It looks upon Western society as decadent and sinful, an enemy to be fought so as to purify life, protect the family, and be deserving of ascent to heaven. Militant Islam, however, is not all of Islam. Turkey, unmatched in the Muslim world in economic growth and cultural achievement, as well as Pakistan remain committed to the strengthening of democracy; and elections are becoming more of a factor in different parts of the Middle East.

Last month, I had dinner with a Saudi Arabian friend, a Ph.D. in political science. He was indignant over what he believed to be a prevailing Western view that he, his people, his culture, his values were incompatible with the political principles of human dignity and liberty.

The struggle for human dignity is a continuing one. Aristotle taught us that all forms of government are transitional and vulnerable to the corrosion of time, new problems, and missed opportunities. Are we in the U.S. wise enough to know how to assist the historic developments now underway? Do we have the insight, discipline, unity and will to fulfill our responsibilities?

We have, regrettably, not yet shown the maturity to fulfill those responsibilities and provide the leadership that the world requires. Our indecisiveness in many areas, but particularly with respect to the former Yugoslavia, has permitted Serbia, the aggressor, to shift the international discussion to the question of how much of the illegally and cruelly seized territory

it can keep in a peace treaty, thereby making it clear to other potential aggressors that military aggression can be profitable -- a formula for catastrophe. Dr. Brzezinski sharply reminds us that the slogan "never again," which was originally meant as a call never again to permit another Holocaust, has now been diluted into a slogan for the opening of museums while we watch genocidal slaughter on television and concentrate on our creature comforts. Is it because it is Moslems that are the victims, not "one of us," not quite deserving of our commitment, just as Jews were not quite deserving of commitment during the Nazi regime?

Our ambivalent uncertainties, furthermore, have encouraged anti-democratic and anti-reform communists and fascists in the former Soviet Union. When reformers were in the position to influence events in Russia, we made promises of financial assistance that we did not deliver. It should not surprise us that this led to a repudiation of the reformers by a disgruntled people.

Equally disturbing, we respond to threats from the Russian military by slowing the entry of Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic into NATO membership, thereby inadvertently legitimizing a special Russian interest in decisions affecting former Warsaw Pact countries and misleading the military into believing that Yalta may be revalidated.

We can do better. We must understand and fulfill our responsibility to champion globalism, democracy and the cause of human dignity. Science and technology are today globalized, and the results have been awesome in their benefits to the human race. Our economies are rapidly moving toward globalization, and that, too, shows promise of dramatic improvement in the human

condition. It is only the world of politics that lags behind and impedes our ability to absorb successfully the benefits of science, technology and economics.

What does this mean for the United Nations and its future? We are all aware of its accomplishments in preparing and monitoring elections, helping to write democratic constitutions, encouraging independent judiciaries, training to reform police forces, providing humanitarian aid, monitoring human rights. Those efforts in Cambodia, El Salvador, Namibia, Nicaragua, Eritrea, Angola, Mozambique, represent constructive activity. But it is also true that the most profound influences toward globalism have been those of modern science, technology, communication, economics -- influences that did not depend on the United Nations for their development or impact. The United Nations, we must acknowledge, found its political influence, until quite recently, decidedly limited by becoming a pawn in the all-absorbing Cold War. Its reputation was also adversely affected by the realization that most of its member states were authoritarian rather than democratic governments and did not represent their peoples. Its "Zionism is racism" resolution also de-legitimized its efforts to play a constructive role in negotiations between Israel and its neighbors.

All of this obviously brings to mind the vital importance of a democratic non-aggressive Russia, one that can join the United States and our allies in a dedicated effort to restore and maintain the dignity and relevance of the United Nations Charter as well as the Helsinki Final Act.

With a mature cooperative relationship between us, there is no room for repression or aggression. With such a relationship, there is room for hope that the human race can realize the common aspiration of all peoples, cultures and religious

faiths for human dignity. The United States and Russia both belong to the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) undertaking, along with China and Japan. This could be turned into the most important regional community on earth. In Europe, our two countries have been actively cooperating with our friends in the CSCE Helsinki process. The challenge is evident: We must dedicate ourselves to the revitalization of the United Nations which, with the chaos in Yugoslavia, continues to lose credibility among many peoples.

The United States and the Soviet Union came to an agreement in 1988 which totally eliminated all intermediate-range and shorter range nuclear missiles in both of our arsenals. Why not have the United States and Russia join in submitting to the United Nations a draft treaty under which the world joins us in totally eliminating all intermediate range nuclear weapons? This is not a dream. It can work, and if the world subscribes to it, it can be a safer place.

President Ronald Reagan suggested to President Gorbachev in 1987 that our two massive nuclear powers agree to eliminate all nuclear ballistic missiles. In 1986, President Gorbachev urged the elimination of all nuclear weapons. Why not have us jointly propose to the United Nations a treaty under which, at a minimum, all nuclear ballistic missiles in the world will be eliminated? We can develop a plan for the total international elimination of those weapons of mass destruction; and we'd all be the safer for it.

It is also time for the U.S. and Russia to propose a joint program to the United Nations for effective ground and space-based international defenses against missiles capable of carrying nuclear, chemical and bacteriological weapons. This would call for joint cooperative research and development among all of us. The

United States and Russia are independently on the road toward developing such defenses either at the boost phase, immediately thereafter at the ascent stage, or in the descent phase. Russian initiative in this area by President Yeltsin at the United Nations should be pursued by the U.S. At a time when the future of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty is uncertain as new states stretch to join the unholy club, it can be helpful to international stability for effective defenses to be developed which make the success of nuclear attack uncertain and potentially self-inflicting should attacking missiles be destroyed at the boost or ascending phases while over the territory of the attacker.

The Gorbachev Foundation and others should be encouraged to explore these and other proposals. It is essential that the United Nations have its excess bureaucratic weight and carbuncles removed so that it is equipped to deal with the challenges and opportunities ahead. In the meantime, our task in the United States is to achieve the firm sense of purpose, readiness, steadiness, and strength that is indispensable for our effective and timely foreign policy decision-making. Our political community must resist the temptation of partisan politics and institutional rivalry as we develop the consensus adequate to meet the challenge. The United States is today the oldest continuing democracy in the world. Our political values and our character traits have helped us build the most dynamic and open society in recorded history, a source of inspiration to most of the world. We must come to appreciate what the American dream means to the world and the burden that puts on us to advance the cause of democracy and human dignity for those who do not today enjoy that blessing.

Thank you.