

**ON THE THRESHOLD OF THE NEW WORLD ORDER:
THE WILSONIAN VISION
AND
AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY IN THE 1990'S AND BEYOND**

U.S. SENATOR JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR.

**Addresses in the United States Senate
Washington, D.C.
June 29, June 30 and July 1, 1992**

- I. On the Threshold of the New World Order**
- II. An American Agenda for the New World Order**
 - A. Cementing the Democratic Foundation**
 - B. Forging a New Strategy of Containment**
 - C. Organizing for Collective Security**
 - D. Launching an Economic-Environmental Revolution**
- III. Fulfilling the Wilsonian Vision:
America's Opportunity and Permanent Task**

Two years ago, an act of aggression by an Arab despot against a tiny Arab sheikdom led the President of the United States to invoke a magisterial phrase. He spoke, in rare visionary terms, of a "New World Order" in which wrongs would be put right through collective action.

My purpose today is to examine that portentous phrase and to elaborate on the immense potential -- and, still more, the imperative -- I believe it holds for American foreign policy in the 1990's and beyond.

**THE THRESHOLD OF THE NEW WORLD ORDER: THE WILSONIAN VISION AND
AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY IN THE 1990'S AND BEYOND (Senate - June 29,
1992)**

[Page: S9098]

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I will this week, on three separate occasions, seek the indulgence of the Senate to speak for the better part of an hour on each occasion. The reason is that I believe we are on the threshold of a new world order, and the present administration is not sure what the order is. But I would like to suggest how we might begin to reorganize our foreign policy in order to realize the full potential embodied in the phrase `new world order.'

Two years ago, an act of aggression by an Arab despot against a tiny Arab sheikdom led the President of the United States to invoke a magisterial phrase.

He spoke, in rare visionary terms, of a `new world order' in which wrongs would be put right through collective action.

My purpose today is to examine that phrase and to elaborate on the immense potential--and still more, the imperative--I believe it holds for American foreign policy in the 1990's and beyond.

AN UNCERTAIN BEGINNING

Although President Bush called the new world order a `big idea,' circumstances surrounding his proclamation of this august concept were less than auspicious.

Indeed the crisis that occasioned the President's use of the phrase resulted from a sustained act of appeasement constituting a colossal foreign policy blunder--

Having propped up Saddam Hussein with loans;

Having disregarded evidence that Saddam illegally used American aid to buy arms;

Having ignored Saddam's genocidal slaughter of his own Kurdish citizens;

Having fostered trade with Iraq even as Saddam provided safe haven for the world's most infamous terrorists;

Having overlooked Saddam's manifest quest for chemical and nuclear weapons;

Having supplied Saddam with military intelligence almost until the eve of his invasion;
and

After first responding that the United States contemplated no military action--

The Bush administration suddenly summoned itself to assemble a multinational coalition under U.N. auspices to evict Saddam from Kuwait and restore the Kuwaiti Emir to his royal throne.

Unfortunately, as it basked in the heroic light cast by men and women of the American Armed Forces, who performed the assigned task with gallantry and pride,

The administration failed to realize the fruits of their brave endeavor in two critical respects.

First captivated by a bizarre concern to maintain Iraq's territorial integrity, the President failed to drive Saddam from power, instead ordering our forces to stand idle while Saddam--whom the President had equated to Hitler--regrouped his defeated army to massacre tens of thousands of Kurds and Shiites who had been inspired by our President's rhetoric to rise in rebellion.

The administration then failed further, and far more sweepingly by doing nothing in the many months thereafter to give even preliminary meaning to the grand concept of a new order, which it had used so fervently as a rallying cry for war.

One may surmise that the President did not follow through with the concept of a new world order because he had not thought it through--

just as the administration has consistently lacked any guiding principle that would give coherence to its policy toward Iraq.

The new order may have been characteristically no more than an expedient slogan--a rhetorical device as useful and expendable as a Willie Horton Commercial.

Nonetheless as a consequence of its double failure, the Bush administration has betrayed its own express policies and achieved, in each case a result opposite to what is both possible and necessary.

Saddam's heinous and still-dangerous regime lives on while the promise of breathing new life into world institutions of collective action has been allowed to wither.

Both failures must eventually be reversed. But my focus today is on the larger question of American purpose in the world.

It is I believe, imperative that the gulf war's ambiguous outcome not be allowed to jeopardize the momentous concept the President associated with the war.

Instead, I shall urge that we revive the concept of a new world order, rescue the phrase from cynicism, and invest in it a vision that should become the organizing principle of American foreign policy in the 1990's and into the next century.

AN AMERICA READY FOR RENEWAL AND CHANGE

To be more than merely utopian the American agenda for a new world order must not only aspire to realistic goals internationally;

It must also be grounded in the only feasible foundation for the foreign policy of our democracy, a sound base of public support.

We must begin, therefore, by asking do we have a base of public understanding that will with resolute leadership sustain such a policy?

My answer is emphatically in the affirmative;

Indeed, I believe the American people stand ready today for far more visionary change than the current administration is capable of providing.

With the end of the cold war, a great awareness has swept the United States: A powerful, national realization that a time of decision is upon us and that profound change is both possible and essential.

The American people recognize that we are poised at a great turn in history and that we are urgently in need of renewal, both in our domestic life and our international role.

On the one hand, the end of superpower rivalry--through the swift collapse of our superpower rival--has inspired hope for a less dangerous and burdensome era in world affairs.

But more deeply and less optimistically, Americans share a painful recognition that the path they once assumed our Nation to be upon--a path of ever-broadening prosperity, of ever-increasing cultural harmony and racial unity, of unchallenged supremacy on the world stage--has not carried us to the expected destination.

Thus, for reasons both grim and hopeful, Americans today understand that we must chart a new direction at home and abroad.

Victory in the cold war has freed us to see our current plight more clearly.

Beset by foreign competition and our own economic mismanagement, the American standard of living has stagnated.

Despite White House efforts to divert us, we can no longer ignore mounting evidence of the multiple, menacing stresses that our own Nation and others are placing on the natural environment.

Despite major strides, we have failed to reconcile the seething differences among our own people.

Rather than narrowing, income disparities and racial divisions have widened over more than a decade in which selfishness and social neglect became implied themes of Presidential leadership.

But most worrying, we seem paralyzed in taking necessary political decisions within a democratic system that has long been our pride.

Many among the American people now share the harsh judgment of Walter Lippmann, who in his 1955 book, 'The Public Philosophy,' observed that:

With exceptions so rare that they are regarded as miracles and freaks of nature, [our] politicians are insecure and intimidated men.

They advance politically once as they placate, appease, bribe, seduce, bamboozle or otherwise manage to manipulate the demanding and threatening elements in their constituencies.

Perhaps, in recalling that such observations have a long American lineage, we can draw mild consolation. A healthy skepticism about politicians is an American strength, ingrained in our people.

It is a skepticism embodied by our Constitution in a system that is intended to grind slowly, precisely in order to protect us against the foibles of both our leaders and our led.

But prolonged inaction in the face of clearly needed change--still worse, a prolonged failure of our Nation's Chief Executive to articulate even a compelling set of goals, much less a path to their attainment has today carried skepticism to the brink of despair. We have reached a national crisis of confidence.

To surmount this crisis, and launch a new era of American success, will require both a vision of renewal and the will to bring concept to reality.

Central to this vision of renewal, I submit, is a clear conception of a new world order, though not because foreign policy is our preeminent concern--domestic renewal must be the highest American priority.

But the purpose of foreign policy is to promote an international environment in which our Nation may conduct its affairs in security and in harmony, and without unnecessary diversion of scarce and vital resources.

When circumstances change dramatically as they now have, we must reconsider, and revise, how best to advance our interests in the world arena.

For the past half-century, American foreign policy has been dominated by a single imperative: the containment of an expansionist, antidemocratic ideology centered in Moscow and Beijing--the one, headquarters of the world's last empire; the other, capital of the world's largest Nation.

The containment strategy shaped the lives of two generations of Americans and its success will remain a source of legitimate national pride. We did what had to be done, and for the most part well and honorably.

But a half-century of anticommunism has taken its toll. It gave us the Korean war; at least one brush with Armageddon in the Cuban missile crisis; the Vietnam war with its searing divisions and pain; a myriad of costly overseas commitments; and, still today an enormous nuclear and conventional arsenal sustained by a vast military-industrial complex that we will convert to civilian ends only after severe economic and social dislocation.

The cold war also extracted a domestic cost in eroding political civility and skewing our politics, sometimes to the point of perversity.

This distortion appeared not just in the excesses of McCarthyism, but more pervasively.

After the Vietnam war, conservatives devised a demonology of liberal pacifism that allegedly reposed in the democratic party.

For their part, liberals looked to their right and saw a dubious interventionism, fervidly advocated with what Hemingway called `that beautiful detachment and devotion to stern justice of men dealing in death without being in any danger of it.'

Over time, as the lines of domestic battle hardened, support for a particular weapon system or the dispatch of United States troops to a Caribbean Island came to be portrayed as definitive litmus tests of American patriotism.

So fundamentally did cold war politics deform our priorities that eventually we found ourselves consumed in debt and still placing greater budgetary priority on the fantasy of an antinuclear umbrella called star wars than on salvaging our desperate cities or housing our Nation's poor.

Today, as we look to a new era, our pundits and pollsters tell us that the American people seem weary of international involvement and are tempted by a so-called neo-isolationism.

But this is a false construct. The slogan `America first' no doubt holds appeal--it does to me. But, as most Americans well understand, we could not hide from the world if we tried.

The last 50 years have yielded a technological revolution in information, communication, transportation, medicine, manufacturing, and world trade.

For better or for worse, this revolution has transformed the elemental character of civilization on our planet.

Within and among nations, people today are interconnected by fast and affordable travel, instant electronics, shared images, and standardized products.

All of us, meanwhile, encounter an overwhelming flood of data--news, facts, opinions, advertising, and entertainment which we must struggle to interpret with an unchanged allotment of human wisdom and judgment.

For Americans, who for much of our history enjoyed a sense of separateness from the world, global interdependence is no longer an academic abstraction; we experience it daily.

The imperative America learned from World War II--that we cannot preserve our own well-being in isolation from the world's--has now been compounded by technology.

No longer is it sufficient to band together with other nations solely to resist the designs of an expansionist dictator.

The full panoply of threats to our future security and prosperity, the proliferation of deadly high-tech weapons, the accelerating degradation of our planetary environment, economic protectionism and unfair competition, overpopulation and migration, narcotics and AIDS all require global solutions.

Fortunately, the American people comprehend the reality; and precisely for that reason, they expect to see the strong hand of American leadership in world affairs.

The great choice facing us then is not between isolationism and internationalism. Our challenge is to determine the nature of American internationalism.

Must we continue to relate to the world as we recently have with a stumbling myopia, a denial of real and looming problems and a fear of bold commitment?

Or can we, with the cold war behind us, discern a coherent and principled new agenda that will guide our conduct, and successfully serve our Nation's global interests, as we move toward the third millennium?

My answer is that the moment is upon us to define a compelling concept of a new world order to commit ourselves to it, and to lead the world in its realization.

The founding of a new order is daring business, no doubt. But it is hardly an unfamiliar role for the American people.

It is in fact the very role by which, for more than two centuries, we have defined ourselves as a nation.

It is a role which traces to our national origins and in which we have an illustrious, though still incomplete, record in this century.

To this generation of Americans it now falls to build upon that legacy of our forefathers by leading the world once again in a constructive reordering of human affairs.

The first new order was the revolution of American democracy.

Our Founders were assuredly modest in their expectations of human nature, but there was nothing meek in their aspiration for the democratic nation they envisaged.

The great seal of the United States declared our goal: E Pluribus Unum, the creation, from diverse peoples, of a nation in unity.

Our great seal announced, too, the unprecedented means by which the Founders determined to pursue that goal: Novus Ordo Seclorum, 'a new order for the ages.'

The new order proclaimed by the American Constitution concerned nothing less than the cardinal principles on which a nation should be founded. The essence of this new order was liberty:

Political liberty to protect men and women against the abuse of power;

Economic liberty to unleash human creativity;

Spiritual liberty to permit man's moral fulfillment.

Looking back to 1787, we find a remarkable, though unremarked coincidence that captures exquisitely just what this new order meant.

It was in that year that the dominant statesman of imperial Russia, Prince Potemkin, decreed that thousands of serfs be conscripted for forced labor.

Potemkin's purpose was to erect false but impressive facades to adorn towns that Catherine the Great and visiting European royalty would pass during a boating excursion into the Crimea.

With this act of supreme monarchial arrogance Potemkin gave birth to a perfect metaphor for Europe's old order of privilege, illusion, brutality, and deceit.

He created too a powerful symbol of contrast for at that very moment in history the American framers were assembled in Philadelphia to found a new order of democratic freedom based upon the principles of human equality and inalienable human rights.

Two years later as George Washington took office with the simple title 'President,' the French Revolution sent the first tremors through Europe's old order.

And in the ensuing two centuries that order would crumble and succumb to the democratic ideals the American Constitution had enshrined

In Russia where czar gave way to commissar the democratic revolution would come slowest.

There in a new form arose the Potemkin villages of Soviet Communist utopia and not until Christmas of 1991 would a man named Boris Yeltsin finally proclaim a Russian democracy.

When this son of peasants and communism came before the U.S. Congress 6 months later to extend the hand of democratic partnership his outstretched arm represented the closing of a great circle of history.

Americans in the 19th century felt no need for a new world order holding instead to a proud but limited concept of world purpose. In the words of Daniel Webster America's 'true mission' was:

Not to propagate our opinions or impose upon other countries our form of Government by artifice or force, but to teach by example and show by our success, moderation and justice, the blessings of self-government and the advantages of free institutions.

Such world order as did exist was shaped by two seminal events in Europe.

The first, in 1805, was Britain's naval victory over the French and Spanish fleets at Trafalgar. Lord Nelson's triumph gave Britain an unchallenged supremacy on the seas that was to last a century.

During this period of relative calm among the major nations--the 'Pax Britannica' which followed the Napoleonic wars--the British empire became the largest in history comprising one-quarter of the world's land surface and one-quarter of its population.

The second seminal event resulted from Napoleon's defeat at Waterloo in 1815. Led by Austria's Metternich the ensuing Congress of Vienna served to delineate on the European Continent a landscape of nation-states.

That would, for the most part, hold for 99 years--until the fateful events of 1914.

But if this was a world order, it was a tenuous one. The continental balance of power, from which Britain stood aloof in 'splendid isolation' offered far less than a guarantee of full tranquility.

It could not suppress the domestic revolutions of 1848, which heralded an end to rule by monarchs and forced Metternich himself to flee his country.

Nor could it suppress major war. In 1871, as Otto Von Bismarck headquartered in the Hall of Mirrors at Versailles while German guns pounded Paris into submission, no Frenchman could have vouched for the 'balance of power.'

To be sure, Europe's two alliances--Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy counterpoised against France and Russia--gave Europe some semblance of stability.

But the interlocking gears of these alliance systems also held the potential for a grim and terrible momentum.

In August 1914 those gears went into motion. Four years later, the old order--the 'proud tower' of the European monarchs--lay in blood-soaked ruin.

Throughout the 19th century, America had concerned itself primarily with westward expansion, fulfilling what many saw as our 'manifest destiny.'

We had paused but once: to wage, among ourselves, the first modern war--as the devastating price of purification from the Nation's original sin of slavery.

Only at the century's end had we surged briefly into overseas adventure, in an exuberant but minor war with Spain.

But Europe's monumental act of self-annihilation drew America fully and inexorably onto the world stage.

Now grown to continental size, and possessed of commensurate strength and rising confidence, the United States came to the war in Europe reluctantly. But eventually with strong purpose.

At war's end the American President Woodrow Wilson, was determined that the grievous failings of the past--

the system of international rivalry that had turned Europe into a sprawling graveyard should never be allowed to recur.

When the peace conference convened at Versailles in 1919, Woodrow Wilson presented, to a world desperately eager to hear it, America's second vision of a new order.

The first American vision--the Founders' vision--had concerned the establishment of a just new order within nations through institutions of democracy.

The second American vision--Wilson's vision--concerned the establishment of a just new order among nations through institutions of cooperation.

Wilson's vision of involvement diverged from America's prevailing philosophy of the 19th century, but was not at odds with the vision of the Founders. Rather, the two visions were harmonious.

The Constitution had affirmed the law of nations as integral with American law. Now, in Wilson's view, it was imperative that the United States embrace new commitments under the law of nations.

In building upon the vision of the Founders, Wilson's vision was no less revolutionary.

To Wilson and the millions of Americans who supported him, it was clear that the growth of nations and technology, and the shattering horror of the great war, had ended any reasonable belief that the world's nation-states could live separately and securely in isolation.

George Washington's warning against entangling alliances still held--if alliances meant nothing more than American participation in a cynical game of nations.

But Wilson and his followers recognized that if a nation wished to protect itself and its way of life in the 20th century, its defenses must consist not merely in its own armed strength but also in reliable mechanisms of international cooperation and joint decision.

For a world in dire need of a new order, the Wilsonian promise was sweeping:

That rationality might be imposed upon chaos and that principles of political democracy, national self-determination, economic cooperation, and collective security might prevail over repression and carnage in the affairs of mankind.

This was, it seemed, an idea whose time had come.

When Woodrow Wilson went to Paris in 1919, the tens of thousands who cheered him represented the millions worldwide for whom America's President embodied a transcendent hope.

For one extended and luminous moment, he became the best known most popular leader the world had ever seen ascending to a political stature attained by no other person before or since.

A future Republican President, Herbert Hoover, described it thus:

For a moment at the time of the armistice Mr. Wilson rose to intellectual domination of most of the civilized world.

With his courage and eloquence he carried a message of hope for the independence of nations the freedom of men and lasting peace.

Never since his time has any man risen to the political and spiritual heights that came to Woodrow Wilson.

Modern-day conservatives who are instinctively frightened by the Wilsonian vision have propounded a mythical image of Woodrow Wilson as a dangerously naive idealist.

Idealist he was. But there was no naivete in the Wilsonian vision. As history soon proved the danger lay in a failure to implement what Wilson proposed.

Summarizing the aspirations Woodrow Wilson embodied for the world, William Butler Yeats wrote these words in a poem called 1919:

We pieced our thoughts into a philosophy and tried to bring the world under rule.

Wilson himself spoke similarly to the nations assembled at the Paris Peace Conference, when he said:

What we seek is the reign of law based upon the consent of the governed and sustained by the organized opinion of mankind.

How is it, then, that the United States failed so conspicuously and so fatefully to join the League of Nations that woodrow Wilson himself had designed and advanced as the ultimate protection against future cynicism and future cataclysm?

This question is distinctly pertinent today as we confront a comparable test of world leadership.

Some attribute the failure to Wilson's unwillingness to compromise but this is misleading because Woodrow Wilson did compromise.

He compromised with allied leaders on many issues, boundaries, colonies and even reparations, which he rightly feared could prove excessive.

He compromised with critics at home, obtaining changes in the draft document that former President Taft assured him would make Senate approval certain.

Where Wilson could not compromise was on the most fundamental question embodied in article 10 of the covenant of the League of Nations.

This was the commitment to collective security: A commitment by all parties to defend the territorial integrity of each. It was an obligation the United States would eventually accept but not until 30 years later in NATO.

Wilson called this commitment the backbone of the whole covenant. Without it he said, the League of Nations would be hardly more than an influential debating society.

Wilson's defense of article 10 was born of intellectual conviction and something more.

He felt a powerful moral obligation--in his words, 'eternal bonds of fidelity'--to those whom he had sent to war. He had told them they were fighting not just for peace but for a certain kind of peace.

What later would seem a cliché tinged with irony--a war to make the world safe for democracy, was for that American President no mere slogan.

If this was moralism it was far from pacifism--in fact the opposite. Woodrow Wilson was convinced that a collective security system must be backed by a willingness to use military force.

In the absence of a system that would reliably employ that ultimate sanction he believed that another great war would follow.

That is why he could not accept the so-called Lodge reservations proposed in the Senate, of which the most important was the removal of any American commitment to act against aggression.

One of history's most compelling questions is what might have happened had Woodrow Wilson not, in the fall of 1919, suffered a paralytic stroke. We know only what did happen.

Warren Harding ran for President in 1920 on a Republican platform that favored American membership in some kind of association of nations for the maintenance of peace.

This pledge was formally endorsed by the major Republican leaders of the day, including Herbert Hoover, who asserted that carrying through on that promise was nothing less, in his words, than 'the test of the entire sincerity, integrity and statesmanship of the Republican Party.'

And yet, when elected, Harding interpreted the result as a mandate against any league membership.

His administration, and the two that followed, would carry America backward--from bold commitment to dangerous complacency.

With that turn of history, the League of Nations was doomed, a new world was born, but not a new world order.

Within two decades, the nations had descended again--this time into an even greater conflagration that spanned the entire globe, produced the ultimate horror of the Holocaust, and ended at Hiroshima in the inferno of a mushroom cloud.

Mr. President, I believe history summons us to dwell on the events of 1919.

For it was then that the United States faltered as it must never again at a crucial moment of world challenge and responsibility.

As we reflect on that moment I believe we can see today a clear and present mission: to finish the job that Woodrow Wilson began for America and the world three-quarters of a century ago.

The first steps toward fulfillment of the Wilsonian dream came 25 years later.

By then, President Franklin Roosevelt, a giant in his own right and a Wilsonian in world view, had revived and nurtured among the American people a widening acceptance of the concepts of collective security and collective responsibility.

As America emerged from the Second World War, the supreme legacy of Franklin Delano Roosevelt was an economic and military superpower with a will to lead.

Those in the Truman years who sought to resume Wilson's work the work of building a true world order brought historic statesmanship to the task--the United Nations, the World Bank, the International Monetary fund, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the Marshall plan, the World Health Organization and a host of other worthy U.N. agencies, the Fulbright Exchange Program, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization the Organization of American States and later the European community--became their monuments.

But the founders of these postwar structures succeeded in realizing the Wilsonian promise only in partial measure because Europe, much of the rest of the world and even the new institutions of multilateral cooperation, fell prey to the polarizing effects of the cold war.

For two full generations, international cooperation has been weakened by a global clash of ideologies that brought with it a militarist orientation and a steady drain on precious human and material resources.

As we emerge from this period of history, we need allow no implication that its travail was somehow the result of a grand misunderstanding, as recently suggested by Mikhail Gorbachev.

Whose contribution to history--in ending the Soviet empire--must be respected more than his contribution to historical analysis.

In the great test between communism and free-market democracy, there never was moral symmetry between the adversaries.

Nor, one must add, was there every in America a common view to that effect, notwithstanding the persistent distortions of our assiduous conservative myth makers.

The nations of the west had no sound alternative other than to stand together against the power and ambition of the Soviet empire until inevitably, it disintegrated under the accumulated weight of the human depredations it so brutally imposed.

That collapse came slowly, painfully and then in a pent-up rush to freedom.

Our task today--the duty of the western democracies, led by the United States--is to see, and seize upon, the implications of that collapse.

For with the dissolution of Soviet communism. And as the Chinese Communist leadership counts its numbered days, we see evaporating before us what should be the final barrier to the Wilsonian dream.

This opportunity, thought it has arrived more quickly than any of us could have imagined, comes none to soon.

For across the planet today, we find ourselves confronted not by an ideological threat or the expansionist designs of a military power.

By a rising tide of global problems that threaten mankind's very survival.

We face a tidal change we can hope to manage only through the spirit, and mechanisms, of international cooperation that Woodrow Wilson first urged upon the world.

We stand now at this century's third Wilsonian moment, inspired by the legacy of Woodrow Wilson's vision; warned by the consequences of our earlier failures to realize that vision and the dangers if we should fail again; strengthened by the work of latterday Wilsonians, who in the wake of the Second Great war, struggled to lay foundations for international cooperation; and sobered, as we look to the future, by the gravity and complexity of the problems that loom before us.

We stand challenged to resume, and this time to complete, the building of a world in which cooperating democracies will face their problems together.

Our challenge demands that we conceive a new world order that encompasses, and builds upon, the concept of collective security that Woodrow Wilson first advanced to a nation and a world not yet ready to comprehend its necessity.

Our circumstances today leave no choice: America must propound a new and expansive form of the Wilsonian vision and then lead the world in bringing that vision to reality.

Tomorrow, I shall outline what I conceive to be a sound and compelling American agenda for this new world order.

[Page: S9102]

Mr. CRANSTON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIDEN. I will be happy to yield to my friend from California.

END

**AMERICAN AGENDA FOR THE NEW WORLD ORDER: A. CEMENTING THE
DEMOCRATIC FOUNDATION; B. FORGING A NEW STRATEGY OF CONTAINMENT
(Senate - June 30, 1992)**

[Page: S9173]

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, yesterday, in the first of three addresses on the new world order, I sought to cast that concept in historical perspective.

Today I shall begin to describe a four-part American agenda that I believe can give meaning to this concept in the decade that will carry us into the 21st century.

The construction of a cooperative world order, I argued yesterday, is a quintessential American idea that traces to the grand vision championed by President Woodrow Wilson, whose revolutionary proposals were in turn rooted in the precepts of our Founding Fathers.

It seems appropriate for me that the Presiding Officer is the Senator from Pennsylvania, whom I have known for years as a practitioner, as an academic, as a university president, and now a U.S. Senator. He has labored long and hard in the vineyard of international relations in an attempt to lay out for this country what the world order should look like and what role the United States should play in it. So, I am particularly pleased that Senator **Wofford** happens to be in the chair today to give some assessment to what the Senator from Delaware has to say.

I hold that it falls to this generation of Americans to complete the task that Woodrow Wilson began.

Although President Bush introduced the phrase new world order into our vernacular some 2 years ago, he has behaved as if the concept is alien.

Our current President and his administration have shown neither the aptitude nor the will to infuse this idea with meaning through coherent agenda for action.

My theme is that we must rescue this concept from negligence and pursue an active new world order agenda.

For the opportunity America confronts today--to fulfill Wilson's vision of a world of cooperating democracies--comes to us not as a luxurious option we can forgo with impunity, but as an imperative without alternatives.

As mankind advances toward the third millennium, we face problems on a planetary scale, problems arising from the spread of industrial technology and the spread of humanity itself.

These problems--of daunting magnitude and complexity--pose a challenge that mankind can meet only through rigorous cooperation among nations.

The imperative to cooperate carries with it another imperative: that America lead the world into the 21st century as boldly as it led the West in a half-century of cold war.

In the decisive years ahead--years that will determine the very nature of life on our planet--international cooperation on the scale necessary will succeed only if the world's preeminent nation assume that mantle of visionary leadership.

Conservatives who are instinctively disdainful of the very idea of multilateral cooperation can be relied upon to contort the concept into the specter of a multinational, socialistic bureaucracy that would steal our sovereignty, regulate our lives, and depress our economies. These habitual distortions must be overcome.

The call for cooperation is precisely that, a call for intensified, global cooperation: in scientific research and education; in the establishment of agreed standards, incentives, and procedures relating to the preservation of animals, plants, and vital resources; in treaties to control dangerous arms and dangerous pollution; in international peacekeeping and the deterrence and defeat of military aggression; in the development and transfer of sound technologies for sustainable economic growth.

Cooperation does not mean the loss of American sovereignty. It means exercising our sovereignty in joint actions to protect our interests and ultimately American's survival as a flourishing society.

Where cooperation takes us on a difficult path, we must liken that choice to the decision to wage war when we choose sacrifice now so that our Nation may later be secure for its children.

Three-quarters of a century ago in the wake of the great war that devastated all of Europe, Woodrow Wilson advanced the concept of collective security not as a utopian ideal. But as the only practical means by which nations could in the modern age ensure their own security.

Wilson's predominant aim was to defend the principles of democracy and self-determination by enacting a multinational barrier against potential aggressors--those who would impose their will upon others by military force. President Wilson's warnings proved tragically prescient and his concerns remain relevant today.

But on the eve of the 21st century basic facts of life on Earth--alarming facts we may wish to deny but which are undeniable--require us to expand our understanding of security.

Collective security today must encompass not only the security of nations but also mankind's security in a global environment that has proven vulnerable to debilitating changes wrought by mankind's own endeavors.

Collective security today must mean security against direct assault--and security against indirect assault through environmental degradation.

Thus, in setting an American agenda for a new world order, we must begin with a profound alteration in traditional thought--in the habit of thinking embodied in the terms 'political,' 'military' and 'economic.'

Politically, we must learn to gauge our national policies in their effect on global cooperation, and to evaluate our national leaders in their capacity to engender that cooperation.

Militarily, we must think of national defense as relying on strong American Armed Forces, but also, in equal measure, on our ability to generate actions of prevention and response by the entire world community.

And, most fundamentally, we must now see economics not only as the foundation of our national strength but also as embracing the protection of our global environment, for economics and the environment have become inseparable.

No longer can the world's environment be an afterthought for national leaders a rhetorical grace note embellishing themes of public policy, that are viewed wrongly--as more fundamental.

The concepts of ecosystem and biosphere, far from being esoteric, must become integral to all national policies and be accorded the highest priority on the international agenda.

Even if we cannot detect it in the behavior of the Bush administration, the conclusive litmus test of our success in achieving a new world order will be our ability to manage, through multilateral cooperation, the panoply of threats to the global environment.

With that preface, I propose today the outline of a four-part American agenda: directed, politically, at cementing the democratic foundation of a new world order; directed, militarily, at protecting world peace through a new strategy of containment designed to

stop the proliferation of dangerous weapons; directed, again militarily, at fortifying this containment strategy with an expanded commitment to secure the peace by collective military action where necessary; and, finally, directed, in the economic-environmental realm, at launching a concerted, full-scale multilateral effort to promote and reconcile--the broadening of global prosperity and the preservation of our global environment.

[Page: S9174]

CEMENTING THE DEMOCRATIC FOUNDATION

The first part of our agenda, 'cementing the democratic foundation,' consists primarily in overcoming the geopolitical legacy of communism.

The components of this central task are twofold: to buttress stable democracy in the former Soviet empire and to champion the cause of democracy in China.

To focus on the great Communist tyrannies is not to ignore, or even discount, the cause of democracy elsewhere.

Nor is it to accept the absurd conceit embraced by the Reagan administration: that rightwing dictatorships are more benign than those of the left and uniquely able to evolve toward democracy.

Perhaps the sturdy Reaganauts lacked a perspective they might have gained from closer exposure to the torture chambers of the world's military juntas and other bastions of the right.

The Reaganauts may even have reconsidered after witnessing the spontaneous collapse of the Soviet empire and its dissolution into 20 independent nations, most of them emerging democracies.

Priority attaches to the two great citadels of communism for the very reason that America waged the cold war: because that dangerous and debilitating ideology has controlled nations of tremendous geopolitical weight.

Today, with the Communist world engaged in, or on the brink of, democratic change, we must advance to the policy that was always implicit in our strategy of containment.

Whereas our goal over 40 years was to check and repel, our aim now must be to include and integrate.

If successfully accomplished, the integration of these states into the community of democratic nations would establish solid bedrock on which to build the new world order.

The joining of the second world to the first would complete the new order's foundation: Bringing the world's major nations into a concert of cooperating democracies.

As to China, global statistics underscore the potential significance of a democratic transition in that nation.

By the analysis of Freedom House, a widely respected source, the world's present population of 5.4 billion divides along a political fault line--between some 68 percent of people living in conditions that can be described as 'free' or 'partly free,' and 32 percent who are unprotected by basic institutions of democracy.

Were China to undertake the democratic reforms that huge numbers of its citizens so clearly crave, the percentage of the planet's population living in full or partial democracy would rise to the historically unprecedented, almost astonishing, level just under 90 percent.

Until such change occurs, China will remain history's final bastion of the totalitarian idea.

Its pathetic gerontocracy, brutally in control of one-fifth of humanity, hovers on the world scene as an anachronistic menace, possessed of a nuclear arsenal unconstrained by international commitment, unreliable as a diplomatic partner, and recklessly dispensing on the world market advanced weapons technology that may yet produce an international catastrophe.

For their part, the countries of the former Soviet empire--the eight nations of Central and Eastern Europe and the 12 former Soviet Republics--have already escaped the nondemocratic category defined by Freedom House.

But success in this transition is by no means assured. Plagued by decades of economic mismanagement and lacking strong democratic traditions, these countries remain vulnerable to relapse into tyranny. Their future is pivotal to our hope for a new world order and American security.

With a successful transformation to free-market democracy, these states will be joined in a fabric of European civilization extending from the Atlantic to the Urals and beyond, across the continental sweep of the Russian Republic.

If transformation fails, the world community faces not only lost opportunity, but also the direct danger of chaos and civil war--perils rendered incalculable by the same Soviet nuclear arsenal that for years has posed a threat to all humanity.

Our priority on democracy in the former Soviet empire and China does not, it bears emphasis, entail neglect of democracy's cause elsewhere.

Where America can be influential, we should employ that influence as a matter of principle as well as geopolitics--and with vigor, generosity, and confidence.

A prominent moral imperative is South Africa. There, the monstrous stain of apartheid has, at long last, begun to dissolve--

A process hastened by the economic sanctions imposed by Congress over the adamant objection of a Reagan administration that had adopted a collaborationist policy called constructive engagement.

Elsewhere in Africa, and in Asia and Latin America as well, the United States should never fail to align itself with, and help to propel, history's continuing winds of change.

With new democracies that have only tentatively taken root we should foster active partnership.

Against the world's remaining dictatorships, we should take our stand with none of the exceptions or equivocations of past realpolitik.

But Mr. President, if American foreign policy once compromised these principles in the name of cold war competition, such compromise no longer has any rationale.

In the Middle East, the cause of democracy warrants particular American concern.

There, our interest in regional stability--the kind of long-term stability only democracy can ensure--is both moral and practical, centering on a humanitarian interest in Israel's security and an economic interest in world oil supplies.

Great words, including new world order, were spoken as the United States went to war against Saddam Hussein, and in the war's aftermath, the administration undertook the grand objective of Arab-Israeli peace.

Yet, with Kuwait's Emir safely restored to his throne and notwithstanding its efforts to foster Arab-Israeli dialog, the administration has pursued a policy hardly more complicated than more pressure on Israel and more arms sales to the Arabs.

Having saved the oil monarchs the President has failed to exercise even the power of suasion to induce them to distribute their wealth more wisely or to introduce the most gradual democratic reforms.

Nor is the failure simply a matter of omission. It is a conscious and purposeful policy.

Last year I offered a modest proposal that would have required the President in connection with major arms sales to the Middle East, to certify to Congress that the purchasing country had made progress in the building of democratic institutions.

Although I included a so-called 'national security waiver' that would have enabled the President to make sales even without progress, the White House threatened to veto this measure.

The Bush administration was adamant in opposing any effort to highlight the question of democracy in the very countries for which Americans had just been sent to fight and die.

So veiled have been our values, so perverse the aftermath of the war that Kuwaiti officials now dare to reproach the American Ambassador for his mere mention of democracy.

As this simple travesty symbolizes, we are--in the most volatile of the world's regions--engaged in the classic mistake of statecraft, and that is accepting the short-term status quo at the cost of our values and our long-term interests in stability.

But, Mr. President, it is in the central arena--American policy toward the former Soviet empire and China--that the Bush administration has been most glaringly weak in purpose and in action.

[Page: S9175]

THE FORMER SOVIET EMPIRE

The collapse of the Soviet empire, beginning in central Europe and culminating in the disintegration of the Soviet Union itself, ranks among history's great watersheds--a moment that has challenged us to shape the future flow of world events.

As I hear some of my friends tepidly debate aid to Russia as if it is such a dangerous thing to suggest to the American public I am reminded of all those in this Chamber who hailed the brilliant architects of our cold war strategy resulting in the collapse of the Soviet empire. I listen to those men and women on this Chamber floor who herald the brilliance of the creation of NATO, the Marshall plan, the world economic institutions and say therein were the seeds planted for the destruction of the Soviet empire and then lack the courage to come forward and make the case in stark terms that the interest of our children are at stake in the survival of democracy in the former Soviet Union.

I am reminded, Mr. President, only as a student of history, not a participant, in the late forties of a President, who, having great courage, stood before the American people and said: We are about to give massive amounts of aid to the country that just killed your son, your father, your brother, your daughter, your wife, your husband.

How popular must that have been? Where would the world have been had we had a President with the same conviction or lack thereof, that we have today, running the country in 1947, 1948, 1949, and 1950? How many of you think he would have gone back home to you and said, with only 16 percent of the American people supporting the Marshall plan, we must for the good of America and the safety of the world invest in the very nations we just spent billions of dollars decimating? Where would we have been but for the men and women, Republican as well as Democrat, with the courage to lead in a time of monumental change?

Mr. President, a half century ago, the Roosevelt and Truman administrations responded to such a moment with greatness; they were 'present at the creation' as architects of a new era. The Bush administration, if not absent, has been little more than an onlooker. The

administration's indecision in the face of historical challenge cannot be attributed to outside resistance. On the contrary, there has been a virtual consensus, within the United States and among our allies, as to the ends and means of a sound Western policy in the former Soviet satellites and the former Soviet State.

The central and agreed premise is that the great engine of transformation must be private initiative, and that our goal must be to foster the conditions and institutions necessary for a free economy and a free body politic to thrive.

In this task, there has been unanimity among western governments to rely primarily on the multilateral financial institutions. Led by the International Monetary Fund, and including the World Bank and the new European bank for reconstruction and development.

But reliance upon these agencies will leverage the American contribution, draw upon valuable technical expertise, and help integrate the aid-recipient States within Western economies.

Reliance on these agencies will leverage the American contribution, draw upon valuable technical expertise, and help integrate the aid-recipient States with Western economy.

There is also consensus that the United States and others should supplement multilateral aid with direct assistance, primarily educational and professional exchanges, which can be cost-effective in building democratic institutions, and accelerating privatization through such fundamentals as the establishment of legal codes governing business practice, taxation, and property ownership.

The problem is one of implementation: Despite much talk of action, little has been done. Belying his claims to acute foreign policy skill, the President has been negligently slow--slow to see the revolution that Mikhail Gorbachev had begun.

The President was slow, once he did see it, to conceive and implement programs of transitional support for Eastern Europe and later the Soviet Republics.

Finally, this administration was slow to disengage from its embrace of Mikhail Gorbachev once it became clear that others, not Gorbachev, sought full democracy.

Only by sheer inadvertence, it seems, did President Bush possibly help to accelerate constructive change, when he delivered what one pundit dubbed as his `chicken kiev' speech. This speech to the Ukrainian Parliament, aimed at discouraging centrifugal forces, could only have inspired the reactionaries who just days later led the failed coup of August 1991.

It was the coupmakers' effort to prevent the independence of the Republics that brought Boris Yeltsin to the top of a tank and yielded the full and sudden collapse of the entire Soviet empire.

Meanwhile, both multilaterally and bilaterally, the administration has presented a portrait of listlessness, invoking prudence as a mask for lethargy and bureaucratic gridlock.

On the multilateral front, where the United States can pool its contribution with others for such key purposes as currency stabilization, the President has failed to exhibit the leadership simply to elicit congressional approval--including a majority in his own party--for our now 2-year-old pledge to the IMF to support that organization's basic functions.

The American share is a reasonable 19 percent of \$60 billion in world contributions, much of which could be used for post-Soviet aid. Rather than leading the IMF, the United States is the only major Nation now deficient, an embarrassing impediment at the very moment this organization is being called upon to perform a critical role in undergirding the post-Soviet democratic governments.

Bilaterally, the administration has been equally dilatory, not least in its near-paralysis in getting organized.

Consider this, from a Nation spending \$300 billion each year on national defense: as recently as February 1992, the United States had no diplomatic presence, formal or informal, in any of the former Soviet republics except Russia--none of the 11 others--with the sad exception of two lonely Foreign Service officers assigned to an apartment in Kiev.

Not until this spring did the President finally appoint a full-time coordinator for U.S. policy on the post-Communist transition.

The administration's frail response to Soviet collapse is evident also in its bilateral programs.

For 2 years, the Foreign Relations Committee has tried to grant the President authority to run low-cost exchanges throughout the crumbling Soviet state--to expand human contacts and knowledge of free-market democracy.

Yet, Mr. President, the administration steadily resisted, apparently in thrall to its two most dreaded fears: rightwing criticism and congressional initiative.

Even after submitting his own belated aid request this year, the President has only tepidly called for enactment.

Meanwhile, our only serious bilateral undertaking thus far--a program proposed by Senators **Nunn** and **Lugar** to subsidize the dismantlement of Soviet nuclear weapons targeted on the United States--was enacted last fall in the face of determined indifference on the part of the administration.

Although the President later chose to claim credit for this initiative, the administration's actual implementation has been plodding.

Ultimately, in the emerging post-Soviet states, our most compelling purpose is to foster job-producing commerce--to prevent economic free-fall in the short term and to promote economic partnership in the long term.

To these ends, I have for 2 years urged creation of a network of American business centers, beginning in central Europe and extending eastward, as a cost-effective means to facilitate trade and investment in a challenging new environment.

Yet not until March of this year did the first American business center open in Warsaw.

Whereas the President reportedly plans no more, a vital administration would create a dozen in Russia alone.

[Page: S9176]

CHINA

But if the Bush administration's post-Soviet policy has lacked energy, its China policy has lacked principle.

For the last 3 years, the Butchers of Beijing have had little to fear from Washington.

Seeking to keep open channels of communication, the President has opposed serious congressional effort to impose serious sanctions--or even to link trade to more reasonable Chinese policies on human rights and the sale of dangerously destabilizing arms to the Middle East.

In resisting what could be a rewarding use of American economic leverage, the administration has rekindled a rare passion.

One it displayed earlier in opposing similar congressional efforts to enact sanctions against Saddam Hussein during the 2 years before the gulf war.

Future historians may well observe that opposition to sanctions against tyrants was the one subject that excited the Bush administration as much as its obsession with a cut in the tax on capital gains.

No one can expect that trade sanctions against Beijing would yield a sudden transformation of that regime.

But American foreign policy should leave no doubt, and the Bush administration has left much doubt, that the United States stands squarely on the side of China's brave and aspiring democrats.

Eventually, they will prevail--the democratic idea today is too powerful to resist--and we should do all possible to promote their early accession to power.

Our means may be limited, but this is a purpose we can well advance by helping to spread awareness of democratic values, and accurate news of contemporary events, among a vast Chinese public now denied such basic knowledge.

It is to this end that I wrote legislation creating the commission that is now studying the logistics of launching a Radio Free China.

In Europe, Freedom Radios played an historic role as instruments of information and inspiration, a role extolled by Vaclav Havel, Lech Walesa, and other champions of liberation, as they attest, that constant current of reliable reporting--the steady breath of truth--helped to fan the flame of democracy in the hearts and minds of citizens throughout Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, a flame that suddenly in 1989 became a torch and then a wildfire.

The China Commission's report to Congress this summer will set the stage for the enactment of legislation I will introduce this week--the Radio Free China Act--that will commence similar broadcasts into the People's Republic of China.

(Mr. LIEBERMAN assumed the chair.)

Modeled on Radio Free Europe and unlike worldwide networks such as the BBC and the Voice of America, the new radio will emphasize factual reporting about events within China.

Support for these broadcasts will place us where we belong:

On the right side of history, and unequivocally on the side of those Chinese democrats who will ultimately accede to power and with whom we must hope to cooperate in the building of a new world order.

Although we cannot cement the foundation of a new world order until democracy is secure in both China and the former Soviet Empire, we need not wait in beginning to shape the structure that will rest atop that foundation.

For even as they struggle to consolidate democracy, Russia and its neighbors have demonstrated a genuine interest in upgrading and mobilizing the institutions of the United Nations system.

Within the United Nations, the center of gravity has shifted dramatically in favor of cooperation.

For its part, as the sole remaining nondemocracy on the Security Council, China seems disinclined to highlight its status by acts of conspicuous obstructionism--and,

where it is obstructionist, China should be challenged.

We therefore have both incentive and latitude to advance both incentive and latitude to advance now on the three other parts of our new world order agenda.

[Page: S9177]

FORGING A NEW STRATEGY OF CONTAINMENT

In the military realm, our agenda for a new world order is twofold:

To impose strict worldwide constraints on the transfer of weapons of mass destruction and to regularize the kind of collective military action the United Nations achieved ad hoc against Saddam Hussein.

Both items on this agenda--more effective prevention and more effective response--are rendered feasible by the close of the cold war.

The end of the expansionist Soviet threat enables us to refocus our energies on forging a new strategy of containment.

Directed not against a particular Nation or ideology, but against a more diffuse and intensifying danger--the danger that nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, and ballistic missiles to propel them, could pass into the hands of rogue-states or terrorists.

At the same time, Moscow's reincarnation as the capital of a democratic Russia raises the prospect of systematic big-power cooperation, under United Nations auspices, in deterring and defeating threats to world peace.

In short, the kind of expanded commitment to collective security envisaged by the United Nations' founders but blocked heretofore by cold war polarization.

Our pursuit of the first of these goals--a new strategy of containment--must begin with a concerted effort to be rid of the enormous nuclear arsenals the cold war begot.

Soviet nuclear warheads are perhaps best understood as more than 10,000 potential Hiroshimas.

Until they are safely dismantled or placed under new controls, the risk that civil strife in the former Soviet Union could lead to a diversion or misuse of even a few of these devices will pose a severe hazard to the world.

Acting boldly to cope with this risk can yield dual benefit.

By joining with Moscow to demonstrate a post-cold war will to curtail our own immense armaments.

The United States can acquire added moral authority to lead others to accept the unprecedented constraints that a new strategy of containment will entail.

For both reasons--to reduce the threat that still inheres in the Soviet arsenal and to set an example that enhances the stature of American leadership in arms control worldwide--we must act decisively.

Curtailing existing arsenals of devastation must underpin a containment strategy aimed at preempting the menace of new arsenals.

The framework for this effort is the START Treaty, on which the Bush administration has for several months been engaged in clarifying obligations of the former Soviet Republics where nuclear weapons are currently deployed: Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan.

The outcome of these discussions--embodied in the so-called Lisbon protocol--has been satisfactory, assuming it can be implemented:

Russia will become the only nuclear power of the four Republics, and the other three are pledged to join the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and thereby forswear nuclear weapons acquisition.

The question, then, is how Russia and America will handle their cold war nuclear arsenals.

As both sides recognize, the START Treaty is only what this acronym connotes, for the treaty's ceiling, limited each side to some 7,000-9,000 nuclear warheads, are as obsolete today as a statue of Lenin on a square in St. Petersburg, Budapest, or Prague.

Over recent weeks, both Russia and the United States called for further reduction, with the Bush administration proposing common ceilings of 4,700 and Moscow offering 2,500.

At the Yeltsin-Bush summit this month, the two Presidents compromised by agreeing to a second START Treaty. This new treaty--START II--would lower the two arsenals to levels of some 3,000-3,500 by the year 2003.

This step was constructive and, on the American side, much-heralded, since President Yeltsin agreed to ban land-based ICBM's with multiple warheads.

These missiles, the heart of the Soviet arsenal, have long been regarded as highly destabilizing because they combine extreme lethality with vulnerability to preemptive attack.

But the compelling issue is whether this scope of reduction--and this pace of reduction--are adequate.

Is it wise, in the post-cold-war era, to maintain this level of nuclear armament? And is it wise to set an entire decade as a timetable for reduction?

By placing ourselves now on this positive but modest path of reduction, are we incurring an avoidable danger and surrendering the opportunity for much more dramatic and valuable progress in curtailing the worldwide nuclear threat?

On the question of timing, it is true that the task of nuclear reduction is complicated by sheer technical difficulty.

Massive nuclear dismantlement has never before been on our agenda, and we lack the technology to accomplish it quickly.

But the principal barrier to deep cuts--the ideological animosity and distrust that characterized the cold war--has disappeared, yielding virtually unlimited opportunity if we will seize it.

For their part, Russian leaders seem willing to negotiate far deeper reductions than the President has yet been willing to contemplate.

They, more than the Bush administration, appear open to the kind of drastic cuts that would represent a fundamental reorientation away from excessive military expenditure and away from an illusory concept of power--a reorientation by which Moscow and Washington could together lead the world toward a more rational focus on mankind's truly menacing problems.

Unfortunately, the Bush Pentagon appears driven by an unreconstructed desire for unilateral advantage and a conviction that--even in a post-cold war world and regardless of whether others are willing to cut--the United States will have good use for literally thousands of nuclear warheads.

As a consequence, the new obstacle we face in achieving truly deep cuts in the Soviet nuclear arsenal, and containing the growth of other arsenals, is the Pentagon's rigid attachment to its own.

While this phenomenon was perhaps predictable, we cannot afford complacency while Pentagon planners develop new post-cold war rationales for maintaining what they will undoubtedly call a 'robust U.S. nuclear arsenal for the 21st century.'

Instead, our actions should be as revolutionary as the circumstances in which we find ourselves.

Seen from this perspective, the agreement to cut the START levels to a combined total of 7,000 warheads within a decade seems more a defense of existing arsenals than a radical change: The creation of a high floor rather than a low ceiling.

Our goals, I submit, should be far more ambitious:

We should seek a steady, mutual drawdown to a common ceiling of no higher than 500 warheads, a goal we should waste no time in announcing.

We should propose the elimination not just of ICBM's with multiple warheads but most or all ballistic missiles, based on land and sea.

We should cut the gordian knot of difficult dismantlement by acting immediately to sequester all warheads to be eliminated.

We should act promptly to include Britain, France, and China in negotiations directed toward codification, under U.N. auspices, of a multilateral treaty stipulating limits and obligations for all nuclear states.

And we should announce our willingness to join in a comprehensive test ban treaty and a global ban on the production of weapons-grade fissile material.

As to the size and composition of the American and Russian arsenals, neither side should now hesitate to embrace the concept of minimum deterrence--that is, maintaining only the nuclear forces necessary to inflict a devastating retaliatory strike on any nation that might use weapons of mass destruction.

One of the saddest and costliest truths of the past half-century has been the systematic exaggeration of the utility of nuclear weapons. How else can one explain to a child the size of our current Armageddon arsenals?

American possession of a nuclear monopoly could not prevent the Soviet takeover of Eastern Europe in the 1940's, and nuclear weapons proved of no avail through our long agony in the Korean and Vietnam wars.

In the Cuban missile crisis, we prevailed not due to our so-called nuclear superiority, but because we held the upper hand in conventional force in our own hemisphere.

The definitive demonstration of nuclear impotence was the collapse of the Soviet Union.

Veritably brimming with missiles and warheads, the Soviet Army could not prevent the total dissolution of the very nation that had generated the world's most extravagant nuclear arsenal.

Indeed, it was the grand distortion of priorities embodied in that arsenal, as much as the inherent inefficiencies of the Communist economic system, that hastened the break-up of the Soviet empire.

Weapons that were presumed to confer strength instead contributed to fatal national weakness.

Ultimately, nuclear arms have a single value: Deterrence. But, for both America and Russia, this legitimate function clearly requires far fewer weapons than the vast arsenals we have accumulated.

Many of our nuclear theologians will be quick to denounce the notion of only 500 nuclear warheads on each side as a capitulation to naive thinking.

But I am not prepared to concede that the capacity to create 500 Hiroshimas in a single day is inadequate for retaliation.

What, I might ask, would they have us do on the second day, if we had more?

The elimination of most or all ballistic missiles would support the move to minimum deterrence, depriving both sides of a lightning-strike offensive capability but depriving neither side of the ability to retaliate using advanced aircraft.

In the past, the major rationale for a very large number of warheads was the danger that ballistic missile attack could preempt many of our missiles and aircraft before launch or takeoff.

Sharply reducing the role of ballistic missiles would enable each side to be confident of its retaliatory capacity--and accomplish the aim of minimum deterrence--at even lower warhead levels.

Full elimination of ballistic missiles would almost surely require a multilateral treaty and global compliance.

But if the question is whether the United States would be better off in a world with no ballistic missiles capable of reaching our shores--the cost being the elimination of our own--surely the answer in principle is a resounding 'Yes.'

The safe sequestering of Russian and American warheads in special repositories could speed the arms reduction process.

This isolation of nuclear warheads could be accomplished by designating special sites on Russian and American territory, sponsored by the United Nations and guarded by U.N. forces including troops from both Russia and the United States.

The creation of these neutral holding points for weapons slated for dismantlement would not mean endangering sensitive technology.

These sites could be designed to give the host country full control over access to its own weapons during the dismantlement process.

Nor would it mean acting on trust. U.N. inspectors would join Russian and American inspectors in monitoring the pace of dismantlement, and U.N. troops would join Russian

and American troops in acting, in effect, to quarantine the warheads so that they could never be removed, at least not without a use of force by the host government constituting a blatant act of treaty abrogation that would signify a total breakdown in relations.

With the innovation of U.N.-sponsored neutral storage, we would eliminate any argument, from Moscow or our own Pentagon, that prompt, deep reductions are technically impossible; we would hasten by years the transfer into safe hands of vulnerable Soviet warheads; and we would more quickly empower ourselves to insist that all other nuclear states become parties to a multilateral regime of strict controls.

Unfortunately, such boldness seems a stranger to the Bush administration, which still rejects the idea of any agreement on warhead destruction.

Ebullient in cold war victory, the Bush Pentagon is so determined to deny Russian inspectors even a look at United States facilities that the American position now constitutes the major obstacle to an agreement on verified warhead dismantlement.

In the same vein, the administration insists, even now, on continued nuclear tests and continued production of the material of which nuclear weapons are made.

By traditional argument, testing helps to perfect the reliability and safety of our weapons. But at this juncture, what is our need for more reliable nuclear warheads?

Surely our safety lies not in maximizing the utility of our own arsenal but in minimizing the dangers posed by nuclear weapons in the hands of others.

Can anyone seriously argue that the United States would derive greater benefit from further nuclear testing than from seeing all other nations cease to do so?

As to fissile material, we have more than we know what to do with--a surplus that can only increase as weapons dismantlement proceeds.

Beyond the budgetary benefits, an American willingness to ban production would yield both valuable symbolism and the practical ability to challenge nations now on the edge of nuclear-weapons status to fulfill long-standing pledges to join in an enforceable global ban.

Achieving such agreement could begin with India, which has already pledged to join, and Pakistan, which has pledged to participate if India agrees.

Israel has made a similar pledge, as have most of the moderate Arab States.

Thus, simply by stating our readiness to forgo the production of fissile material for which we have no need, we could begin a diplomatic process of immense potential value.

The President of the United States should delay not a day in making two major announcements:

That America stands ready to join in a comprehensive test ban, and in a global ban on production of weapons-grade fissile material.

A demonstration of American leadership in sharply cutting our own arsenal, and forgoing further nuclear testing and further production of fissile material, would set the stage for a new nuclear era of cooperation and collective restraint, in which we could build on the notable achievements of recent years.

During the cold war, nonproliferation was deemed a second-order priority, and its institutions have been little known or appreciated.

But now, with the containment of proliferation as our top national security priority, we must raise the profile of these efforts and reallocate resources from the building of weapons to preventing their spread.

The Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, the Nuclear Suppliers Group, the Missile Technology Control Regime, the Chemical Weapons Convention, the Biological Weapons Convention, the Coordinating Committee on Export Controls, and the Australia group that has imposed curbs on the sale of chemical and biological technology.

These dry names represent potent purposes. They are the essential tools of a global strategy of containment.

Intensification of these regimes--backed by teams of inspectors and a will to impose sanctions against violators--constitutes our best defense against the appearance of a new Saddam Hussein or the nightmare of terrorist blackmail.

Erecting this defense will require multiplying our financial support for such institutions as the International Atomic Energy Agency,

whose inspectors we must regard as the front-line troops in a campaign of weapons containment as critical to our new era as was the containment of communism during the cold war.

But financial support is not enough. IAEA inspectors must be confident that the U.N. Security Council will take whatever action is necessary to enforce their inspection demands.

Most important, if containment fails, we must be prepared to use force to stop rogue nations like North Korea from presenting the world with a nuclear fait accompli.

The reality is that we can slow proliferation to a snail's pace if we stop irresponsible technology transfer, and fortunately nearly all suppliers are finally showing restraint.

The maverick is China, which has persisted in hawking highly sensitive weapons and technology to Syria, Iran, Iraq, Libya, Algeria, and Pakistan--even while pledging otherwise.

While a nondemocratic China is unlikely to cooperate voluntarily in a strategy of containment, we have at hand the necessary lever to induce satisfactory Chinese behavior.

We may safely surmise that the Beijing government will not dissolve itself in response to a threat of economic sanctions.

But a targeted approach--tying continued Sino-American trade specifically to more responsible Chinese behavior in the sale of advanced weapons and weapons technology--would be a linkage that works.

This linkage would force Beijing to choose: between a third world arms market worth millions of dollars, and open trade with the United States from which China will enjoy as much as a \$20 billion surplus this year.

Although we have convincing intelligence evidence that China's leaders fear, and would respond to, such leverage, President Bush has refused to challenge Beijing.

Until that policy is reversed, our strategy of containment will be vulnerable to dangerous leakage.

To buttress a new strategy of containment, we also need multilateral restraint in the conventional arms market.

Advanced technology has blurred old distinctions by rendering even so-called conventional weapons ever more lethal.

Recognizing this, Congress mandated the Bush administration in the aftermath of the gulf war to pursue negotiations toward a multilateral arms suppliers regime, an objective consistent with the President's rhetoric.

But what Congress cannot mandate is success, or even sincerity, in negotiations.

Talks among major suppliers--specifically, the U.N. Security Council's five permanent members--have thus far yielded no more than a trivial pledge to share information about sales already made, and a further demonstration of China's refusal to cooperate.

Meanwhile, what appeared after the gulf war as an opportunity to reduce transfers of armament to the Middle East has been converted by the international arms industry into an opportunity to sell even more.

The Bush administration itself is manifestly conflicted on conventional arms.

Directly amid American-sponsored talks on curtailing the sale of advanced conventional arms, the Pentagon began to subsidize the marketing of such weapons by U.S. industry.

In the past year alone, American arms sales to non-NATO countries totaled some \$38 billion, as government-to-government sales nearly doubled from the previous year.

This schizophrenia is plainly incompatible with the coherent United States leadership necessary if the world is now to rein in the proliferation of arms.

On advanced conventional arms as well as weapons of mass destruction, our concept of a rigorous containment strategy has far exceeded the Bush administration's actual conduct of policy.

Although largely a matter of will, this deficiency is in part a matter of organization.

Combating proliferation has never held priority in American foreign policy, as it now must.

Accordingly, the responsibility to promote, as well as the power to thwart, a concerted policy is dispersed among various agencies.

In hope of rectifying this defect, I will this week introduce the Weapons Proliferation Containment Act--legislation to consolidate central authority in the executive branch in what will amount to a nonproliferation czar.

Having first established central coordination and authority within the U.S. Government, this legislation then gives teeth to our nonproliferation policy

by mandating that the American representative in each major multilateral organization vote to deny assistance to any nation that has violated specified standards or prohibitions in the supply or acquisition of weapons of mass destruction, ballistic missiles, and advanced conventional arms.

Our goal must be to imbue in American foreign policy--and to instill in the international community--a pervasive principle: that proliferation-supporting behavior by companies or nations is anathema, and subject to rigorous measures of detection and punishment.

Tomorrow, I shall describe another military dimension of America's new world order agenda: The need to organize more effectively to sustain an expanded commitment to collective military action--an idea first introduced to the world by Woodrow Wilson and rejected first by this Congress at the end of World War I, then put on hold by a cold war that made its implementation impossible, but now as a consequence of that cold war holds great promise for the future of the world.

And then, the final and most expansive part of our agenda: the launching of a worldwide economic-environmental revolution.

I thank my colleagues for listening. I thank my friend from Massachusetts, Senator **Kerry**, for waiting.

I yield the floor.

[Page: S9179]

Mr. KERRY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Massachusetts is recognized to speak for up to 5 minutes.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed in morning business for such time as I may need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Hearing no objection, that will be the order.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I begin by congratulating my friend and colleague, the Senator from Delaware and colleague on the Foreign Relations Committee, for his very thoughtful analysis of a real new world order. The Senator has been leading the effort really to analyze the START agreement, and in his role as chairman of one of our subcommittees has long been watching and interested in the issue of an appropriate arms balance and a distribution of forces.

I think his statement is a very thoughtful one about the terrible inconsistency and almost hypocrisy of our current policy, at one time talking about arms proliferation but engaging in the very policies that undercut it.

He is absolutely correct in having laid on an agenda for arms limitation, as well as control, as well as nonproliferation, as well as for peacekeeping. I congratulate him on his thoughtful speech.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for his comments. I appreciate them very much.

END

July 1, 1992

**AN AMERICAN AGENDA FOR THE NEW WORLD ORDER C. ORGANIZING FOR
COLLECTIVE SECURITY D. LAUNCHING AN ECONOMIC-ENVIRONMENTAL
REVOLUTION -- (Senate - July 01, 1992)**

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, in two previous addresses on the new world order, I began by placing this concept in historical perspective and then proposed a four-part agenda that I believe this Nation must pursue in order to realize the full potential inherent in that momentous phrase.

It is my contention that we must look to history for inspiration in this task: To the vision of Woodrow Wilson and the subsequent achievements of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman in laying the groundwork for fulfillment of the Wilsonian vision.

It is, I believe, the duty of this generation of Americans to complete the task that Woodrow Wilson began.

Today, I shall describe the third and fourth parts of America's agenda for a new world order: organizing for collective military security, and launching a worldwide economic-environmental revolution.

In advancing, on a new world order agenda, toward an expanded commitment to the collective use of armed force, where necessary.

We have two, related avenues for progress.

The first avenue involves a new role for NATO; the second, a more regularized exercise of the enforcement power of the United Nations Security Council.

The collapse of the Soviet empire would by itself require that we reexamine NATO's premises; the Atlantic alliance was created to deter a threat that no longer exists.

But this task is given urgency by the endemic violence now scarring the European landscape.

How do we prevent such conflicts?

And how do we respond, should they erupt?

By inviting the former states of the Warsaw Pact into a new North Atlantic cooperation council--the so-called NAC-C [Nack-See].

NATO has wisely moved beyond the cold war to create an all-European consultative body that can play a useful educational and advisory role on matters of security.

But consultation is not enough.

NATO's integrated planning and command structure constitutes an asset unique in the world.

Of all the world's multinational institutions--a veritable alphabet soup--only NATO has the ability to bring coordinated, multinational military force to bear.

But if this asset is to be relevant to post-cold war realities, it must be reoriented to serve the current security interests of alliance members.

Militarily, NATO has not yet adapted to the post-cold war era. Even as it now develops a new strategy that will accommodate reduced force levels, its military orientation remains unchanged: It remains the defense of allied territory against direct attack.

This military posture is an anachronism.

Instead of tiptoeing toward a revised mandate, NATO should make a great leap forward--by adopting peacekeeping outside NATO territory as a formal alliance mission.

Two steps are essential: First, alliance political leaders must task NATO's military commanders to undertake the requisite preparations in both planning and force reconfiguration, second, alliance members must agree on a new political framework under which forces would be committed.

Ideally, this framework will provide that NATO assets would be used if requested by either of two legitimate political authorities--the U.N. Security Council, or the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe [CSCE].

It should not be NATO's aspiration to become the world's police force.

But NATO does offer, uniquely, what in some circumstances may be crucial:

A core of military forces that can act rapidly, cohesively, and with considerable power.

If NATO can not summon the will and solidarity to perform this function, then the question must soon arise, in this body and among the American people:

What further role is there for the North Atlantic Alliance?

Unfortunately, for some months now, the Bush administration has allowed itself to be diverted by a comparatively petty concern--arising from the initiative of France and Germany to form a small Euro-force.

Over time, military cooperation between these two historic rivals could conceivably provide the core for an independent all-European security force, no longer reliant upon the United States to provide the cement for collective defense.

But why the Bush administration regards this as an alarming specter can be explained only by postulating that the administration has little concept of historic change.

There are two possibilities: either the Franco-German initiative will fizzle, as have all previous attempts to breathe life into west European security cooperation;

Or such efforts will finally, in the post-cold war era, bear fruit.

But even if all-European defense cooperation does succeed, it will evolve only slowly--and only as West European leaders and publics reach a conclusion they are not yet even close to reaching:

That Europe would be better off relying on Germany and France--without the United States--for leadership in collective defense.

Meanwhile, far more urgent and serious business lies in rendering NATO relevant to real needs in the immediate post-cold-war period.

The United States remains the leader of the alliance and should act like it.

A transformation is required, and the Bush administration has not yet supplied the leadership to accomplish it.

In Europe under CSCE auspices, or worldwide under the auspices of the U.N. Security Council, NATO forces should henceforth be available for peacekeeping or intervention when either of those political authorities, in which our own voice will be prominent, has reached a collective determination to act.

The second avenue toward expanded readiness for collective military action is to equip the U.N. Security Council to exercise the police and enforcement powers set forth in the U.N. Charter--but rarely used.

Progress on this avenue involves changes in membership and in the availability of forces.

A reordering of the Security Council--the most prestigious and potent of U.N. organs--is necessary because the present structure of permanent membership--America, Britain, France, Russia, and China--reflects the outcome on the battlefield of World War II and is as outdated as NATO's current security posture.

Since then, Japan has become an economic superpower and Germany the dominant power in a unifying European community that did not then even exist.

From a global perspective, these nations, together with the United States, are now the leading powers of the industrialized north.

India, a colony when the second world war ended, is now the world's largest democratic state and--with one-sixth of all humanity--the leading voice of the scores of less-developed nations that comprise the south.

The absence of such countries from the organ embodying the U.N.'s most solemn responsibilities has become an unacceptable anomaly in an organization we must seek to empower.

In the 1990's and beyond, economic strength and political leadership will be the currency of power in a world no longer divided by ideology but still plagued by real and pressing problems of security--problems encompassing poverty, ethnic conflict, migration, disease, environmental degradation, as well as an age-old source: human aggression.

The U.N. Security Council must reflect the reality of world power and the reality of world problems; it must comprise those countries with the resources--both material and human--to address the full range of global security concerns.

Negotiation of membership changes will be arduous; but the clear goal will be to reconcile two objectives:

Enhancing the Security Council's stature through a broadened membership, while avoiding the chronic stalemate that could result from increased participation.

The very process of membership change can also be used to promote an objective central to our new strategy of containment.

At present, as it happens, the five permanent members of the Security Council are the world's five acknowledged nuclear powers.

Yet nuclear weapons--as the case of the now-defunct Soviet Union demonstrates--confer power in only the most limited sense.

As this permanent membership is broadened to include such non-nuclear states as Japan and Germany--and border-line nuclear states such as India--the delegitimization of nuclear arms should be made a formal and affirmative policy.

The price of new membership on the U.N. Security Council should be an unconditional pledge to remain or become non-nuclear.

With this policy, we accomplish two objectives simultaneously: modernizing the Security Council's membership and further demonetizing nuclear weapons as the currency of international power.

In the case of Japan and Germany, this will entail only the perpetuation of existing policy and treaty commitments. For India, it would mean acceding to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, accepting rigorous international inspection of its nuclear facilities, and giving up an ambiguous status that has, in reality, provided little benefit to that nation and entailed much risk.

The inclusion of Germany, Japan and India as permanent non-nuclear members of the Security Council would validate new conceptions of power in the post-cold war world.

India's membership under the non-nuclear condition would have the additional advantage of ending south Asia's dangerous nuclear arms race, since Pakistan has already agreed to sign the NPT if India will so agree. India's accession to the Security Council could thereby become a catalyst for progress on security problems that have plagued, and squandered the resources, of the Indian subcontinent.

These nations and others deserve a place in the U.N. commensurate with their size and significance, and the process of reorganization can confirm and uphold larger aims.

Catalyzing this transition will require the good offices--and the sustained leadership--of the United States. Rather than holding back, in the style of the Bush administration, America should initiate this change--with a sense of magnanimity and purpose befitting the U.N.'s predominant power.

A more pressing need, on which we should act without awaiting the negotiation of membership change, is to further empower the Security Council through the standing availability of military forces.

One remarkable development of recent years--a true precursor of the new world order--is the U.N.'s active and competent role in fostering the settlement of conflicts in Namibia, Angola, Western Sahara, El Salvador, and Cambodia.

This momentum in collective action must be sustained, and its purpose widened to include combat interventions where principle and justice warrant.

As well as blue helmets to preside over cease-fires, actual combat units should be at the Security Council's disposal--and not merely on an ad hoc basis where the process of assembling a consensus, followed by troop commitments, may be too slow to meet urgent need.

The coalition-building process that proved successful in the Gulf War does not constitute an adequate paradigm for all interventions the U.N. may deem necessary.

Future crises may require greater speed, and we should strive to create circumstances that do not impose upon the United States the onus either to act unilaterally, or to galvanize a U.N. action in which we supply the preponderance of military power.

It was precisely this preference that Pentagon planners exhibited in the recent strategy document that envisaged, with some relish, the exercise of worldwide American military hegemony in the post-cold war era.

Once leaked, this concept--which I dubbed ``America as globo-cop"--was repudiated by the Bush administration as an embarrassment.

But in truth, the unilateralist mind-set continues to blind this administration to our new and expensive opportunity to involve other nations more fully and systematically in international security.

To realize the full potential of collective security, we must divest ourselves of the vainglorious dream of a pax Americana--and look instead for a means to regularize swift, multinational decision and response.

The mechanism to achieve this lies--unused--in article 43 of the United Nations Charter, which provides that:

All members undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

Article 43 provides that the agreement or agreements shall be negotiated as soon as possible. But for 47 years that condition was not met: the cold war polarization that beset the United Nations made it impossible for such force commitments to be negotiated.

The agreements envisaged by the U.N. founders--under which nations would designate specific units to be available to the Security Council--have never been made.

Article 43, at present, is a promise unfulfilled. The time has come: the United States, in conjunction with other key nations, should now designate forces under article 43 of the United Nations Charter.

Let it be underscored, for all who would quaver at this proposal, that such action does not require a leap of faith: it does not mean the entrusting of American security--or the entrusting of American troops--to a collective body of questionable reliability.

The assignment of United States and other forces to the United Nations means only that specifically designated troop units are committed,

First, to participate in advance planning for coordinated use, and second, to be available for action pursuant to a U.N. Security Council decision to which the United States itself must be a party.

If deployed under U.N. auspices, a designated American unit or units--a force that might number some 3,000-8,000 troops--would be used only in conjunction with other forces--and for a purpose agreed to by the United States as a leading member of the Security Council.

The essence of such an arrangement is not to increase the probability of American casualties in combat.

On the contrary, our purpose in proceeding under article 43 is to build multilateral institutions in which collective force can be reliably used without constant dependence on American Armed Forces.

The United States would designate forces under an article 43 agreement only if it entailed similar and substantial commitments by other powers.

Thus, by designating a relatively small contingent of American forces, we would draw other nations into obligations of military responsibility.

In sum, the assignment to the U.N. Security Council of American and other military units would enhance one valuable instrument of American foreign policy--that is, participation in collective military action--without increasing the overall risk to American forces and without the slightest detriment to our ability to act alone if necessary.

Stated conversely, if we do not move to realize the potential of collective action under article 43, we consign ourselves to future dependency on the kind of ad hoc, American-led response that characterized the Gulf war.

That model may be attractive to some, in that it gives us primacy of place. But in my view, it is unfair, unnecessary, and unwise.

Article 43 represents a means by which the United States can enhance the efficacy of collective security while reducing the likelihood that future crises will compel the men and women of the American Armed Forces to bear a disproportionate burden in collective security. To encourage negotiation of article 43 commitments by the United States and other powers, I will this week introduce the collective security participation resolution.

This joint resolution would affirm congressional support for the consummation of an article 43 agreement; and it would reaffirm the intent of Congress expressed in the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, in three important respects: first, an article 43 agreement shall be subject to the approval of the Congress by appropriate act or joint resolution. Second, the President shall not be deemed to require [further] authorization of the Congress to make available to the Security Council on its call the military units designated in the agreement. Third, this authorization may not be construed as authorization to use forces in addition to those forces designated.

Clearly, the enactment of this measure would be only a first step. But it is intended--and I believe it could serve--to create momentum.

What the collective security participation resolution would signify is congressional acceptance, in advance of any article 43 negotiation, of the premise of article 43: that the major powers should be positioned to act, without further delay, once the U.N. Security Council has achieved a consensus to use predesignated forces.

As a dedicated defender of the war power as a shared constitutional power, I stress that this arrangement, if achieved, would not represent an abdication by Congress of its responsibilities.

Rather, it would be a judicious congressional exercise of the war power: the delineation by statute of conditions under which the President has limited authority to use force.

Enactment of the collective security participation resolution, while not necessary as a matter of legal technicality, would be valuable as a matter of political reality.

For four decades--beginning with the Korean war and extending through the Vietnam war to the gulf war--

we have engaged in an agonizing constitutional struggle over the war power.

Against that background of chronic dispute, in which I myself have been a dedicated participant, I believe it important that the Congress of today render a modern affirmation concerning the war power: By endorsing a principle of collective security--and the mechanism to carry it out--that the founders of the United Nations and the Congress of 1945 were prepared to affirm nearly half a century ago.

By doing so, we can encourage presidential initiative within the United Nations and provide a solid footing for American leadership in strengthening the U.N. as an instrument of collective security.

By enacting the collective security participation resolution, Congress would affirm its support for a sound article 43 agreement as integral to a serious American agenda for a new world order.

The potential value of enhanced institutional preparedness for collective military action is underscored by the ongoing disaster in Yugoslavia.

There, a barbarism unexpected in modern Europe has unfolded in the face of outside disbelief and a growing recognition of the world's unreadiness, even after the Gulf war, to act decisively with collective military force.

For some months, Western nations--all in hope of minimizing the violence--disagreed on the tactics of whether and when to recognize the former Yugoslav Republics as they declared independence. But this disagreement has now been replaced by common horror at the wanton brutalities being inflicted by Serbian forces.

Were the U.N. Security Council or the CSCE adequately equipped, both by political disposition and the ready availability of military forces, the question of intervention could now be addressed on its merits, without the impediment of massive institutional complexity.

The question of intervention in Yugoslavia instructs us: If our multinational bodies are to act when needed, we must first prepare them to act.

If we are to find any gain from the tragedy of Yugoslavia, it must be in the momentum it provides in moving us more swiftly down both paths of expanded commitment to collective military action--

The formal adoption by NATO of a peacekeeping and intervention role, and a more formal commitment by key U.N. members to military action under the auspices of the United Nations Security Council.

Just as Neville Chamberlain's trip to Munich in 1938 stands as a permanent warning of the futility of appeasement, the unabated slaughter in Bosnia offers a new lesson: If we do not prepare for collective action, the end of the cold war could usher in not a new world order but an era of endless interethnic bloodletting.

American leadership to achieve this expanded commitment to collective security will serve, together a new strategy of weapons containment, to complete the military dimension of our new world order agenda.

The fourth part of America's agenda for a new world order encompasses all we must do in the Herculean task of sustaining and broadening mankind's prosperity while preserving the global environment.

The two elements of this task are related: first, to maintain and further perfect the system of open world trade; second, to infuse this system with revolutionary new priorities--developmental and environmental--reflecting the global opportunities and perils we clearly foresee already in the 1990's and beyond.

The world system of free trade--though we have come to take it for granted, perceiving mainly its flaws--is among the salient achievements of the postwar era, embodying a lesson learned harshly during the downward spiral of protectionism in the 1930's.

America's bedrock economic task today, as the world's leader and leading trader, is to preserve this system and mold it wisely, as the key to prosperity for ourselves and our allies and as the lifeline for growth in the developing world.

This task centers on the most ambitious trade negotiations ever undertaken: the current phase of GATT talks, known as the Uruguay round.

Trade experts project that, if successful, the Uruguay round will increase world output and demand by \$5 trillion over the next decade. That equates to \$500 billion per year, or \$100 annually for every man, woman, and child on the planet.

Our aim in these negotiations--in defense of United States interests as well as broader principles--is to open new markets to American producers and to American service industries such as banking and insurance.

This objective entails the continuing toil of determined diplomacy--to identify and eliminate unfair trade practices, whether they be discriminatory barriers to our exports or services, or illegal subsidies to foreign goods competing with our own.

The highest American priority is the domestic market of Japan. In the GATT and in direct bilateral negotiations that must be as candid as may prove necessary, we must weed out the welter of nontariff barriers facing Americans and others who wish to export to a large Japanese market that is permeated with impediments to penetration.

A priority only slightly subordinate is the European Community. There we must continue to fight the excessive barriers and subsidies that protect and over-incentivize European agriculture; and we must ensure that the final stage of economic unification--the internal tariff elimination and regulatory harmonization known as EC-92--does not yield, in any industry, a ``fortress Europe" impregnable to those outside.

A GATT objective of longer-term priority is to incorporate the emerging nations of the former Soviet empire fully into the GATT system, thereby opening Western markets to their products and quickening the pace of Western investment in their industries.

Our simultaneous task, in continuing to open markets, is to complete work on a regional trade pact--the North American Free-Trade Agreement--that would create our own common market with Canada and Mexico.

All three parties can gain--but only with stipulations on Mexican wage rates and environmental standards that ensure against a rush of northern industry to the south.

No principle of efficiency would be served by abetting the rise of a low-wage pollution belt across the Mexican border.

Soundly conducted, these trade negotiations can benefit the United States and all other parties at once--a philosophy the Bush administration correctly affirms.

Where danger lies is in the Bush administration's excessive dedication to the principle of laissez-faire. Not only is the administration committed to noninterference in the world trade, it has exhibited precisely the same ideological commitment to noninterference in the full range of issues in American domestic policy--issues that bear directly on improving American competitiveness in the free trade system.

A principle wisely applied in one realm has yielded a vacuum of leadership in another, and the two do not stand alone. Free trade is dependent on public support for free trade, and public support for free trade is dependent on public confidence in free trade.

Today the American people have grown acutely aware of the decline in our educational standards, our industries, and our cities, and they discern quite clearly that the Bush administration lacks any strategic plan whatsoever: either to correct these deficiencies--or to promote American competitiveness in the world economy in the years ahead.

We have national deficits in budget and trade; we have a national deficit in investment in research, infrastructure, and human capital--and we have a national deficit in leadership to correct these fundamental shortcomings that are propelling us into a downward spiral.

By failing to inspire any confidence among the American people that our country will remain adequately competitive in the post-cold war period, and indeed by pandering to fears that it may not, the Bush administration has undermined American public support for the free trade system.

Until American confidence, American competitiveness, and the American trade balance are restored, not only will the United States remain in jeopardy as a stable society; so too will a global system of free trade that depends upon American leadership. But the Bush administration's pervasive laissez-faire philosophy--perhaps better described as pervasive inaction--is a liability not simply in maintaining open world trade.

More injurious still is the administration's determined resistance to performing America's crucial leadership role in reorienting world production and trade--to meet developmental and environmental needs that bear upon America's future and all of mankind's.

The hazards of the Bush administration's abdication of world leadership were on vivid display last month at the United Nations Conference on the Environment and Development--the Earth summit--in Rio de Janeiro.

The issues in Rio were as broad as this administration's horizons are narrow: the effect of man on Earth, and the ability of man to rescue himself from the adverse consequences of his own creativity--and fecundity.

Through the centuries, both religion and hope have led us to expect that the marvelous web of life--the interaction of living beings with land, air, and water--is infinitely resilient and immune to the meager actions of man. This comforting myth has been shattered forever.

Scientists now know--and citizens of the world are beginning to understand--that mankind rivals the great forces of nature as an agent of global change. A great realization has dawned worldwide that manmade changes, in their aggregate, are profoundly perilous for man himself.

The President, and his apologists take refuge in the contention that the ambiguities of scientific evidence render predictions uncertain. But as the world's leaders gathered in

Rio were quick to understand, the President's sophistry was a mask for his courting of domestic corporate and ideological interests: Corporate interests averse to the very idea of environmental rules, and ideological interests possessed of a visceral disdain for their own countrymen, and others in the world, called environmentalists.

The Environment Minister of Germany put it candidly in stating that the Bush administration, in its search for politically divisive themes, appears determined to find a new "ism" to replace the bogeyman of communism, and has apparently alighted on the idea of "ecolo-gism" as the new menace against which it will courageously take its stand.

H.L. Mencken, a seasoned cynic who could have learned still more from the Bush administration, said that the whole purpose of politics is to keep the electorate riled up by imaginary hobgoblins.

The Bush administration's new "hobgoblins" are Third World bureaucrats who would pick our Nation's pocket while regulating us into poverty. Someday, perhaps in retirement, the President may wish to contemplate just how other leaders--great American presidents and current leaders from the world's other prosperous nations--have managed to govern without such phony demons.

The great linkage under discussion in Rio--explicit in the name of the Conference and implicit in all that was said--is the connection between world development and the environment.

The unifying principle is sustainability: the imperative that future economic growth in all countries be conducted in a manner that can be sustained within limits imposed by the Earth's environment. This imperative derives from truths that are not under scientific dispute and cannot be dismissed even by the most irresponsible political leaders:

The Earth's population, which has doubled in my lifetime, will double again in the lifetime of my children. This trend cannot be sustained.

The Earth's forests, great engines of the biosphere and bounteous as sanctuaries for plant and animal life of incalculable value, are fast disappearing. This trend cannot be sustained.

The Earth's oceans are rapidly becoming fouled by a ceaseless flow of human garbage that is poisoning all sea-life, and fish not yet poisoned are being harvested from the seas more quickly than they can reproduce. These trends cannot be sustained.

The Earth's supply of fresh water, only one drop for each gallon of salt water and crucial to man and many other species, is declining. This trend cannot be sustained.

The Earth's diversity of life--animal and plant life in its multitudinous forms--is being extinguished at a rate that will see the disappearance of one-fourth of all species within the next 40 years. This trend cannot not be sustained.

The stratosphere above the Earth continues to accumulate tons of man-made carbon gases that will inevitably, and perhaps disastrously, affect the entire global climate. This trend cannot be sustained.

These trends appear inexorable, but they are not.

Someday they will end--the only question is how.

Will they end through man's rational containment and redirection of his own activities? Or will they end in human catastrophe beyond our current imagination? This was the question under discussion in Rio de Janeiro--in an unprecedented global forum that constituted the largest assemblage of world leaders in human history.

To this assemblage the Bush administration brought little but braggadocio and contempt. In Rio, the President of the United States uttered two truths--but both in a perverse context. His presentation gave new meaning to a century-old observation by William James, the venerable American philosopher: "There is no worse lie," said James, "than a truth misunderstood."

The first truth recited by the President, who deployed it as an excuse for withholding support for global action, is the record of American environmental achievement over the last two decades. This record, although flawed by the world's highest rate of carbon emissions into the atmosphere, is indeed substantial.

But our attainments center on domestic pollution control--the clean-up of America's air, water, and toxic waste--actions that support current global imperatives but, even if emulated by all nations--will be insufficient to prevent catastrophe. America's record demonstrates that individual nations can take concerted action.

What the President refused to accept was the need to establish obligations among all nations to take not only the first steps that America has helped to pioneer but the many more steps required if we are to curb national actions with severely adverse global consequences.

The second truth articulated by the President was the connection between environmental protection and economic growth--a fact also undisputed, since this was the very theme of the Earth summit. But here Mr. Bush took truth--and turned it on its head.

In the implied demonology described by our President, the choice is between the environment and growth, which he caricatured by portraying the issue as "jobs." But this is a false choice. The real truth, undistorted--is that we can not continue economic growth--in America or in a developing world desperate to advance out of poverty--without reorienting the process of growth to encompass environmental protection. Growth can continue only if it is sustainable--this is a tautology that must become the guiding principle of America's domestic and international economic policy.

If Rio generated despair, it was because the President of the United States--alone among the major participants there--appeared not to understand and accept this principle.

A common and pertinent observation about the Rio Conference was the failure of the conferees to come to grips with the overwhelming issue of world population. The reasons for this are not obscure and reflect genuine political impediments rather than hypocrisy.

Although all concerned recognize the burgeoning of human numbers as a fundamental source of global poverty and environmental degradation, efforts to limit population growth run afoul--as Americans themselves are well aware--of deep-seated religious, cultural, and ideological belief.

What cannot be disputed is the inevitability of dramatic change in human patterns of procreation in the decades ahead. This will occur in one of three ways: As a result of catastrophe involving enormous misery, through Draconian measures imposed by societies, or--the one palatable possibility--by a voluntary change in human behavior.

By all past evidence of human conduct, a noncoercive behavior change--a voluntary stabilization of human numbers--occurs only in societies that are developed. Whereas poverty yields multiplying numbers as families try to grow to survive, prosperity yields population stability. Therefore, the single scenario not horrible to contemplate entails development as the key to limiting the inexorable growth in global population.

But if economies must grow in order for populations to stabilize, the necessity of an economic-environmental revolution is underscored, for if the billions of people in the Third World follow the development path of the millions in the first world, emulating our patterns of resource exploitation and pollution, the Earth will fast approach the threshold of uninhabitability.

Thus, the question of population carries us back immediately to the necessity of sustainable economic growth and the environmental concerns that go with it.

In assessing the Bush administration's debacle in Rio, historians are likely to conclude what already seems apparent: that the blunder was both tactical and strategic.

Tactically, there was little need for the administration's negativism on the two major treaties awaiting signature.

The treaty the President insisted on weakening--designed to protect the global climate through limits on the emission of greenhouse gases--contained targets and timetables that the United States is very likely to meet even without a treaty obligation.

Thus, the President's achievement in eliminating obligatory targets and timetables consisted primarily in relieving all other nations of what would have been a strict and immensely valuable commitment.

Similarly, on the treaty designed to slow the extinction of diverse animal and plant life, there was scant need on the merits for the President's ostentatious refusal to sign.

The treaty's pledge to support biodiversity, and its mandate that biotechnology companies share the proceeds of genetic wealth with the countries in which they find it, was sufficiently flexible that all other major nations found it possible to join. Only the United States, with the White House plainly in search of an us versus them confrontation, withheld support.

But the administration's strategic failure in Rio de Janeiro was even more pronounced.

The climate and biodiversity treaties will go into effect, and eventually a more enlightened administration will seek to recover the ground lost by the President Bush in Rio.

But in the meantime, the President will have foregone a singular opportunity--not only to help reorient the world economy but also to educate the American people as to a new and promising role they may play within it.

The President wished to convey to his political constituency that he was, in effect, saving the American economy from an unpleasant dose of castor oil.

But in truth--a truth the American people are fully capable of grasping--environmentally sound technology holds great promise for the American economy.

There is, first, the underlying principle that the adoption of more energy-efficient technologies will eventually render all American industry more competitive.

But beyond that principle is the vast industry of environmental technology itself--technology in which the United States is already a world leader.

As the world makes its necessary turn toward the use of such technology, America is well positioned to dominate this exponentially expanding global market.

In Western Europe alone, the market for environmental services in which the United States is a world leader--air pollution control, water treatment, waste management, and ground decontamination--is expected to approach \$200 billion per year within this decade.

Already, European industries in need of services are turning to American firms that have established themselves on this technology's cutting edge.

A visionary American President would not be rejecting the advent of an economic-environmental revolution.

He would be promoting the revolution, as a world need and an American economic opportunity.

In allowing himself to be eclipsed at the Earth summit, even by allied leaders who tried not to do so, the President seemed oblivious to the competitive implications of the global revolution for which the Earth summit will be the launching pad, with or without the Bush administration.

When the Japanese Government pledged generous levels of global environmental assistance,

did the President comprehend that this pledge not only boosted Japan's diplomatic stature--but that the assistance itself will boost Japanese industries in competition with our own for an enormously lucrative global market?

In contrast to the President's cramped and narrow view of environmentalism, the American people must take the broadest possible view, recognizing that the needs of the future environmentally can be the wave of the future economically.

For the United States, it should become a paramount priority, pervading all future trade and assistance policy, to promote American environmental technologies and services around the world.

To that end, I will introduce the Environmental Aid and Trade Act--legislation designed to establish this priority in the organizational structure, and actions, of every Federal agency involved in U.S. trade and aid: the Department of Commerce, the Agency for International Development, the Trade and Development program, the Export-Import Bank, and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

Our own prosperity and environment, and the world's will be the beneficiaries of such a concerted American strategy.

By no means does an emphasis on technology suggest that current planetary trends are susceptible to an easy fix.

As human numbers explode, pressing hard already against earthly limits, we have every reason to be sober.

In the face of current global statistics and projections, even an inveterate optimist could easily conclude that our own generation, or at best our children's, will be the last on this planet to enjoy the natural magnificence--and munificence--we have known.

But it is not our need to choose between optimism and pessimism--in what we must begin to regard as a race to save our planet.

What is necessary is to choose action over denial.

Only a fool--or a national leadership out of touch with all reality--could be persuaded that these problems will solve themselves.

At this moment of deep disappointment among many Americans--an overall disappointment at the failure of their national leadership and a specific disappointment at the President's abject failure to lead at a world summit of historic import--Americans may find value in the words of one of their great authors.

As William Faulkner accepted the 1949 Nobel Prize for literature, just as America had assumed world leadership of a renewed quest for Wilsonian cooperation, he spoke of the ultimate fate of mankind:

It is easy enough to say that man is immortal simply because he will endure:

That when the last dingdong of doom has clanged and faded from the last worthless rock hanging tideless in the last red and dying evening,

That even then there will still be one more sound: That of his puny inexhaustible voice, still talking.

I refuse to accept this. I believe that man will not merely endure: He will prevail.

He is immortal, not because he alone among creatures has an inexhaustible voice,

But because he has a soul, a spirit capable of compassion and sacrifice and endurance.

Today the American people are challenged, as much as at any moment in their history, to summon the spirit of which William Faulkner spoke.

In revitalizing our own society, as by a looming environmental crisis, we are challenged to endure and to prevail.

Our task in achieving a sustainable prosperity for mankind requires a revolution in human thought--and deed.

We need, first, a worldwide consensus on a revolutionary new direction, a consensus of which America must be a part; and the world must then act on that consensus, with America in the lead. In this--indeed, in all four parts of America's new world order agenda--the gap between what the Bush administration is doing and what we need to do is monumental.

To outline an American agenda directed at cementing the foundation for--and erecting--a new world order in the 1990's and beyond is to see both the compelling promise of the concept and the sad vacuity of the present administration's professed support for it.

It has for some time been taken as a given that the Bush administration's strong suit is foreign policy.

But mere acquaintance with foreign leaders, accompanied by stasis in the realm of action, is not a foreign policy.

Indeed, if the criterion of a sound foreign policy is that it comprise coherent initiatives and responses in the world arena--directed at promoting well-conceived national interests--then the Bush administration is perilously close to being without a foreign policy.

President Bush began his administration with the homily that America has more will than wallet.

But this administration has demonstrated that its limitation is quite the reverse.

We are a wealthy and gifted Nation, in danger of squandering its human and material resources, and abdicating our duty to lead the world, because of a failure of our national leadership to galvanize our national will.

With the imperatives now building around us, we can no longer afford an American foreign policy of denial and drift.

Taken together, the five legislative measures I am offering to support America's new world order agenda can, I am confident, be an asset to an activist President.

But no legislation can substitute for the Presidential leadership so urgently required if America is now to fulfill the role history offers.

As we look back on the century now ending, and all of its dazzling change, we see three events to which I would attach surprising significance: the great war, the Holocaust, and the collapse of the totalitarian idea.

The great war shattered what the Austrian dramatist and philosopher Stefan Zweig, One syllable: S-WHY-G, called ``the world of yesterday"--but opened new horizons for democracy and collective responsibility.

The Holocaust, wrought by the deadly combination of human evil and human neglect, demonstrated the bottomless horror into which mankind might fall if it failed to accept the challenge--and realize the opportunities--to which Woodrow Wilson had given eloquent voice.

Now, as the century nears its close, the near-universal repudiation of the totalitarian idea has removed the last great obstacle to the Wilsonian vision.

The paramount question facing us today, as Americans in an interdependent world, is whether we will seize our opportunity--or fall prey again to the same lapse of vision, judgment, and will to which this Nation succumbed some 70 years ago.

Next year a new memorial--the Holocaust Memorial Museum--will open in our Nation's Capital.

It is rising now, just across the Tidal Basin from the sublimely beautiful memorial to the author of the Declaration of Independence--and just steps from the great obelisk honoring our first President.

Some will question why the Mall in Washington should be the site for the formal remembrance of a barbarism half a world away.

For me there is a good answer.

This new memorial will join with those around it as an abiding caution against neglect--a trenchant warning that the ideals of America's founders, which have inspired the world, have no earthly hold except in the courage of each generation to protect and maintain a society in which those ideals can flourish.

It will stand, too, but its presence here, as an affirmation that America has accepted Woodrow Wilson's recognition that the task of upholding a civilization based on those ideals--requires of us, in the 20th century and beyond, a commitment to world leadership.

We confront today, in the 20th century's last decade, the monumental challenge of revitalizing our own Nation.

But to meet that challenge, we must bring an equal measure of determination to constructing the kind of new world order envisaged by our 28th President as the century began.

The Nobel Peace Prize awarded to President Wilson in 1919 has, for decades, been cloaked with tragic irony--a veil we can, at long last, remove by fulfilling his vision.

In our own interest, and mankind's, we must now advance with confidence and resolution on the path of world leadership that Woodrow Wilson recognized as America's great obligation.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

END