

that it sees as under attack. These are the Shia communities of Iraq and Lebanon, the Palestinians and the Bosnian Muslims. It sees its support for all four of these as an integral part of the same policy.

It understands that some of these groups resort to the tactics of terror, but I have not seen evidence to indicate that Iran ever pinpoints any appropriations, any money that it gives, for that purpose. It would trivialize the communities we're talking about to assume so. Iran does not see itself as supporting terrorism. It sees itself as supporting regimes that are fighting for their lives or for the return of their property, of their territory. And it's a sincere belief. They are bemused, again, by our depicting all of this as support for terrorism.

I want to quickly give Iran's rationale for opposing the peace process because I think it is underestimated and misunderstood. It's not an irrational position. They argue thus: one, the Arab-Israeli conflict is obviously highly asymmetrical, and that asymmetry in Israel's favor is declining. The reason for this is the appearance of major popular movements. Hezbollah and the intifada in particular, have improved the overall power picture in the relationship between Israel and the Palestinians. Given this favorable trend, this is the wrong time for peace negotiations.

Second, the negotiations are being mentored by Israel's protector, a country that promises the Israelis eternal superiority in dealing with the Arabs. This adds to the asymmetry and is not a format that the Iranians think they would like to participate in.

Third, there has been no effort in this major movement to deal explicitly with Islamic spokesmen in a process that affects their lives intensely. This seems to indicate that this large and vital movement is to be disregarded. Iran's position, therefore, I believe, is exactly the same as the position of resurgent Islam everywhere, and it isn't one they can just bargain away. That's not a possibility for them. They believe that even if there is a resolution between Israel and the Palestinians, it will not last, because too much of the population has been disregarded in the process.

At the same time, if you look in terms of man hours spent on diplomacy, Iran is expending extremely little effort in opposing the process. It has, in effect, said that if [Syrian president Hafiz al-] Asad makes an agreement with the Israelis, it will think it's a mistake, but it will go along with the agreement.

I need to spend also just a minute on a very big subject which Gary Sick has talked about: nuclear weaponry. I do not believe the United States has seriously addressed the problem of Iran, the Arab states and many other countries in the world on this issue. There are many states that believe they may someday be given a nuclear ultimatum with no possibility of support from another nuclear power.

In the Middle East, the nuclear power that they expect the ultimatum from is Israel. And no one in that area believes for one second that the United States or any other nuclear power would help them if Israel were to issue an ultimatum. Consequently, since they think this is a realistic scenario, they are going to try to defend themselves against it. I think they have done very, very little in that direction so far. They've made clear that they want a nuclear-free zone in the area, but I would assume that any Iranian government, including a future Iranian nationalist government, would have to develop nuclear weapons unless this point is dealt with by the international community. I do not believe we have been serious on this issue at its most fundamental level.

In summary, then, I'm arguing that the United States has misread Iran's intentions. Much more seriously, it has misread basic fundamental trends in Iran, most of which are favorable to American goals, and is taking actions that are likely to reverse those trends. The worst case in my view is for American policy ultimately to so anger Iranian nationalists that they will become as hostile to the United States as Iranian nationalists were under the shah's regime. Therefore, the policy that I would prefer is the policy Gary Sick calls "playing it cool."

I don't think dialogue means much at all. There are too many misperceptions of each other's intentions. To have people who totally misunderstand each other talking doesn't seem likely to produce much. But let's just stop punishing Iran gratuitously and allow trends that are moving in the direction of a real change in the area to proceed as they're proceeding.●

#### KIDS PAY THE PRICE

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, we still are not doing what we should to control the proliferation of weapons in our country, despite the overwhelming evidence of the need to do that.

The Bob Herbert column in the New York Times recently was powerful evidence once again of the need to face up to these problems.

I commend him, I commend Oprah Winfrey, I commend Paul Newman, and anyone else who has played a part in putting together what, apparently, is a powerful, two-part program on "The Oprah Winfrey Show."

I ask unanimous consent that the Bob Herbert column be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The column follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 30, 1995]

#### KIDS PAY THE PRICE

(By Bob Herbert)

Paul Newman, in the 30-second television spot, is reading from a newspaper: "Matilda Crabtree, 14, jumped out of a closet and yelled 'boo' to scare her parents." He pauses very briefly before adding, "And was shot to death when her father mistook her for a burglar." Mr. Newman continues: "Matilda was supposed to be sleeping at a friend's house but decided to sneak home and play a joke on her family. Her last words were, 'I love you, Daddy.'"

This is followed by a stark message displayed full-screen against a black background: "A gun in the home triples the risk of homicide in the home."

We then hear Mr. Newman say, "Before you bring a gun in the house, think about it."

The Newman spot is one of many compelling moments in a special two-part Oprah Winfrey program devoted to the terrible toll that gun violence is taking on young people, especially children. The first part airs today.

The program opens with Ms. Winfrey standing in front of a blackboard that says 15 children are killed by guns in the United States every day, and that a teen-ager commits suicide with a gun every six hours. "If we were to build a memorial" to the kids killed by gunfire in the last 13 years, Ms. Winfrey says, "the names on that memorial would outnumber" the American lives lost in Vietnam.

The program uses the terms children and kids in the broadest sense, so that they cover the entire period from infancy through the teen years. In 1992, the last year for which

complete statistics are available, 37,776 people were killed by firearms in the U.S. Of those, 5,379 were 19 years of age or younger. Those are extraordinary number, and they have risen since 1992.

And yet we pay very little attention to the problem of guns and children, in part because of denial, and in part, as Ms. Winfrey points out, because "the frequency of death has numbed us to what the death of one child really means."

Today's show takes a step toward remedying that. For example, we see glimpses of the exuberant life of Kenzo Bix from home videos and a photo album and the comments of his mother, Lynn. We see him as a toddler, and in that angelic guise peculiar to the first grader, and romping as a teen-ager,

"He was kind of whimsical," his mother said. She shows us a Mothers Day memo he posted: "Do not go in the kitchen. Your gifts are in there."

"That was actually the year just before he died," she said.

When he was 14, Kenzo was accidentally shot and killed by a friend who was playing with a gun.

One of the things that comes through in Ms. Winfrey's program that is usually missing from news accounts of homicides and suicides is the sheer suddenness of the absence of the one who dies. Those who knew the child, were close to the child, loved the child, cannot believe that he or she is gone, and gone for good—gone irrevocably because of the absurdity of the pulling of the trigger of some cheap and deadly mechanism, usually for some cheap and stupid reason.

Larry Elizalde, 18, was a high school track and football star, and Olympic team hopeful, who was shot to death on the street in Chicago by gang members who mistook him for someone else.

Mr. Elizalde died in the arms of a young seminarian, a stranger named Doug Mitchell, who happened to have witnessed the shooting. Mr. Mitchell, in an interview with Ms. Winfrey, said he did not want "the hatred of the gun, the violence of the gun" to be the last thing that mortally wounded youth would experience, but rather the love and concern of another human being."

This was clung to as a blessing by Mr. Elizalde's anguished mother, Lynette, who at first had harbored the desperate fear that her son had died alone.

Throughout the program, Ms. Winfrey offers us evidence of the humanity that is sacrificed—not just the lives lost, but the humanity in all of us that is sacrificed by our acceptance of the mass manufacture, mass sale and mass use of firearms in this country.

She tries to lift at least a corner of our blanket of denial to disturb and maybe even awaken us.

After all, she seems to be saying, children are dying.●

#### CAN AMERICA'S RACIAL RIFTS BE HEALED BY A BLACK PRESIDENT?

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, one of the finest journalists in our Nation today is David Shribman.

He writes a column that appears, among other places, in the Chicago Tribune.

He recently had a column that suggests solving the problems of race in our country cannot be done dramatically by any one leader or person.

That does not suggest that a President, Senator, Governor, or leader in

any capacity cannot have an impact. But his column reflects on the depth of the problem that we have in our country, and I would urge my colleagues to read it.

I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the RECORD.

The column follows:

**CAN AMERICA'S RACIAL RIFTS BE HEALED BY A BLACK PRESIDENT?**

(By David Shribman)

WASHINGTON.—Yes, there is a national political angle to the O.J. Simpson murder trial. And yes, it's as troubling as the social angle, the criminal-justice angle, the media angle and the commercial angle.

It's this: Next year's election is going to be conducted in a country that is so racially divided that one side can't comprehend why the other side sees things the way it does. And the irony is that the greatest imponderable in this landscape of confusion is an African-American man.

Right now, as O.J. Simpson begins a new life, retired Gen. Colin L. Powell contemplates his plans. Both are embarking on uncharted paths. Both will be watched carefully by the public. Both will in no small way shape the country we become in the next century.

Simpson and Powell, to be sure, have so little in common that it's almost stilted to connect them. One is a star athlete, man about town, a bit of a libertine: fast on his feet, fast in his life. The other is a war hero, a man of probity, a paragon of discipline: slow to judge, slow to rile.

But the murder trial of the one has opened up racial rifts so wide that the temptation is to say that the steely drive of the other might help the healing.

American voters know that the risk of hiring President Powell isn't substantially different from the risk of hiring President Dole or the risk of rehiring President Clinton. But there is something about the Powell boomlet that carries echoes from the tortured and tortuous American life of Orenthal James Simpson. And those echoes are warning signals.

Colin Powell can't fix everything.

But that's not what you're hearing from the commentators, handicappers, analysts, instant experts and grandstand big mouths who proclaim their opinions on national politics much the way they proclaim their opinions on, say, the National Football League.

Many of them suggest that a Powell campaign could be the George Washington Bridge of modern American politics, a wonder of political architecture spanning wide distances—between Republicans and Democrats, between liberals and conservatives, above all between blacks and whites. It's an appealing, even an intoxicating, notion: Bring centuries of racism, violence, suspicion and repression to an abrupt end by electing a black president.

But listen, too, to the undertow of the American conversation. This is what many whites say about Colin Powell: He doesn't seem black. He moves so easily between the races. His accomplishments are so vivid that they are without color content.

That's what some blacks say, somewhat warily, about Powell as well: Not really black. Moves between the races. Without color content.

And that, of course, is what everyone said about O.J. Simpson. He was black but not too black. He was everybody's favorite golf partner. He was the most fabulously appealing black corporate spokesman of his time. When O.J. ran—and I saw this myself two decades ago, at Buffalo Bills training camps in Niagara Falls and again in Rich Stadium

in Orchard Park, N.Y.—the whites cheered as lustily as the blacks.

Everybody said that Simpson transcended race. He didn't. Everybody says that Powell transcends race. He doesn't.

The wounds of America's centuries-long signature struggle are too deep to be bandaged by one man. Winning the respect of George Bush, who is privately urging Powell to run, isn't enough to end tensions that have been festering since the early days of colonial Virginia. It's a start, but it isn't a finish.

Now that the trial of O.J. Simpson is over, the nation's newspapers and television networks can start chronicling another American drama: the 1996 presidential campaign. The first subplot is Powell's decision, expected next month, about whether to run for president.

One thing, however, is sure: A Powell candidacy can't become a feel-good experience—or an excuse for not talking about race.

Everyone now knows—press your TV remote and you'll see it reinforced on O.J. retrospectives, talk shows, town meetings and news broadcasts—that racial misunderstanding and mistrust can't be overestimated in this country.

And so the Simpson trial isn't irrelevant to the campaign. It tells us that race is more than skin deep, and so is racism. It tells us that the leader who takes America into the 21st Century will have to understand these gaps, not paper them over. It tells us the president will have to say something about things that, for many years, were better left unsaid—about racism, injustice, fear. It tells us that, after all these years, we still must summon what Lincoln called the "better angels of our nature."•

**THE UNITED NATIONS AT 50: LOOKING BACK AND LOOKING FORWARD**

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, in response to a question I asked Dr. Jessica Mathews about an op-ed piece that appeared in the Washington Post, she sent me a speech made by Foreign Minister Gareth Evans of Australia.

I took the trouble to read the speech, and it is a good summation of where the United Nations is, where it has been, and where it should go.

Foreign Minister Evans points out the successes of the United Nations, like El Salvador, Cambodia, and Mozambique, as well as areas where there are deficiencies. He calls upon the nations to move quickly on a chemical weapons convention, and I hope the United States would join in that effort.

Of no small significance is his comparison of the costs of running the United Nations compared to other entities.

Note these sentences from his address:

The core functions of the U.N. (involving the Headquarters in New York, the Offices in Geneva, Vienna and Nairobi, and the five regional Commissions) cost just \$1.2 billion between them: to take just one comparison last year the annual budget of just one Department in one United States city—the New York Police Department—exceeded that by \$600 million.

The total number of personnel needed to run those U.N.'s core functions is around 10,700; compare the local administration of my own national capital, Canberra—again just one city in one of the U.N.'s 185 member

states—which employs some 22,000 people on the public payroll.

The cost of the U.N.'s peace operations last year—in Cyprus and the Western Sahara and the former Yugoslavia and thirteen other locations—was \$3.2 billion: that's less than what it takes to run just three New York City Departments (Police, Fire and Corrections).

Add to the core functions of the U.N. all the related programs and organs (including UNDP, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNICEF, UNCTAD and International Drug Control) and you are talking about a total of around 33,000 people and a total budget (including both assessed and voluntary contributions) of \$6.3 billion: that sounds like a lot, but not quite so much when one considers, for example, that the annual global turnover of just one international accounting firm, Price Waterhouse, is around \$4.5 billion.

Go further, and add to the core functions and the related programs all the other specialized programs and agencies of the entire U.N. family—that is, add agencies like the FAO, ILO, UNESCO and WHO, plus the IABA, and put into the equation as well the Bretton Woods Institutions (the World Bank group and the IMF, which between them employ nearly 10,000 people and spend nearly \$5 billion annually) and you are still talking about total U.N. personnel of just around 61,400 and a total U.N. system dollar cost of \$18.2 billion.

He also praises Canada's leadership in suggesting that we have a more effective system of responding to world emergencies, and I join him in lauding what Canada has done.

I ask unanimous consent that the full statement be printed in the RECORD.

The statement follows:

**THE U.N. AT FIFTY: LOOKING BACK AND LOOKING FORWARD**

(Statement to the Fiftieth General Assembly of the United Nations by Senator Gareth Evans, Foreign Minister of Australia, New York, 2 October 1995)

Mr. President, I congratulate you on your election to the Presidency of this great Assembly. Your election is a tribute both to you and to Portugal, and Australia will work with you to ensure that this historic Fiftieth Session is as memorable as it could possibly be. And I join in warmly welcoming, as the UN's 185th member state, our fellow South Pacific Forum member, Palau.

If we are to effectively prepare for our future we must first be able clearly to see our past. If we are to see where we must go, we must know where we have been: we must be conscious of our failures, but we should be proud of our successes.

The structure of today's world community—of sovereign, self-determined, independent states working together on the basis of equality in a framework of international law—simply did not exist before the Charter of the United Nations. There were imaginings of it in the minds of many for a very long time, and we saw emerge, between the World Wars, a pale approximation of it with the League of Nations. But it was at that special moment in San Francisco, fifty years ago, that today's concept of a community of nations was first truly born. And that concept has passed the test of fifty years of life.

Gifted though the authors of the Charter were, they would I think be awed to see how very much their vision of a globalised world has now been answered, and exceeded. Today's world is one world, a world in which no individuals and no states can aspire to solve all their problems or fulfill all their dreams