

The U.N. Under Scrutiny

**Midge Decter
Edwin J. Feulner, Jr.
Ambassador Jeane J. Kirkpatrick
Burton Yale Pines
Leonard J. Theberge**

ISSN #0272-1155

© 1982 The Heritage Foundation

Table of Contents

Introduction	v
The U.N. and the Free Enterprise System	1
by Burton Yale Pines	
The U.N. and Press Freedom	9
by Leonard J. Theberge	
The U.N. and U.S. National Interests	19
by Midge Decter	
The U.N. and the U.S.	22
Ambassador Jeane J. Kirkpatrick	
The Search for a Lasting Peace	28
by Edwin J. Feulner, Jr.	
Are We Serious About Disarmament?	32
by Burton Yale Pines	

Introduction

By any standard, the United Nations is an imposing organization. Its 46,000-person staff and scores of agencies oversee hundreds of projects throughout the world. The United States supports these efforts enthusiastically and most generously—in 1980 contributing \$866 million of the organization's \$2.4 billion budget.

Is this generosity warranted? The General Assembly chamber resounds with attacks on the free enterprise system—the very system that enables the United States to be so lavish in its support. The West and the private sector are vilified at every turn as Third World nations tout the bankrupt nostrums of the so-called New International Economic Order.

It is no wonder, therefore, that sober and responsible critics are questioning the role of the U.S. in the U.N. To address this, The Heritage Foundation United Nations Assessment Project assembled in New York City a panel of experts for a half-day conference on June 7, 1982. Their remarks, reprinted here, mirror Americans' deep and growing concern over the perils and problems facing the U.S. at the U.N.

Reprinted also are the formal presentations to the U.N.'s Second Special Session on Disarmament by Heritage Foundation President, Dr. Edwin J. Feulner, Jr., a member of the United States delegation, and Heritage Vice President Burton Yale Pines.

The U.N. and The Free Enterprise System

BURTON YALE PINES

By any standard, the United Nations is an imposing organization—a 1982 budget of \$2.4 billion, headquarters in at least a half-dozen cities, a payroll of \$46,000 and scores of agencies overseeing hundreds of projects. The U.S., this year, will contribute about \$850 million to the U.N. budget—a hefty sum even if we weren't struggling to trim federal spending. Over the years, the U.S. consistently has been the most generous and one of the most enthusiastic U.N. boosters.

Has such enthusiasm and generosity been warranted? The closer I look at the U.N., the more I wonder. Indeed, in recent months, I've been taking a very close look as the Heritage staff studies and probes U.N. As such, I have learned, for example,

***that the Center on TransNational Corporations has a subsidiary created, among other things, to encourage developing countries to battle and restrict multi-national corporations;

***that the U.N. Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) has taken action which could restrict severely the health programs in developing countries that now are carried on by private pharmaceutical companies—even though study after study shows and officials in developing countries privately admit that the only functioning health care systems in their countries are those designed and maintained by the private firms;

***that the U.N. is developing for firms with international operations a Code of Conduct which would be binding and enforceable under law and which would erase many of the long-established principles and procedures of international law that have fostered trans-national economic development.

These cases are not unique, not an aberration. They are, alarmingly, just a few examples of similar and increasing behavior at the U.N., in the General Assembly, at its committees, in its agencies. What has been happening, in fact, is that the U.N.—a body conceived and created to work for world peace—seems to be declaring an all-out war, a war on the free enterprise system.

Burton Yale Pines is Vice President of The Heritage Foundation and a former associate editor of *Time* magazine.

In almost every U.N. body, and almost always in the General Assembly, seldom is an opportunity lost to attack the free enterprise system. These assaults come on many fronts:

§§As attacks directly on the Western industrial democracies, the main capitalist nations—as last September (1981) when 93 Third World nations endorsed a document accusing the U.S. of being the only threat to world peace;

§§As attacks on individual industries through increasing regulatory efforts going under such names as Codes of Conduct, Restrictive Practices Codes and others;

§§As attacks on the most successful of the capitalist enterprises, the corporation which has grown beyond the boundaries of the country in which it was founded and in which it is headquartered. These firms are often called multinational corporations or transnational corporations—MNCs and TNCs. They are denounced for “flying no flag but profit” and for causing the “decay and de-skilling of industrial economies.” The pharmaceuticals are attacked, for example, for being “harmful to public health and welfare” and for marketing both the “cause and cure” of illness. The international firms are blamed for causing inflation, unemployment, poverty and political repression in Third World countries. So persistently vilified are the large international enterprises that the very terms MNC and TNC themselves have become tainted, burdened with opprobrium and used not unlike cuss words;

§§And there are the attacks on the very essence and philosophical base of the free enterprise system. It is an attack which argues—almost always without supporting evidence—against the notion that the dynamo of growth and economic expansion is individual initiative, creativity and the incentive provided by profit-maximization. This kind of attack, amazingly, typically even repudiates the notion of economic growth and, in its place, raises to the level of gospel a number of naive and economically suicidal precepts.

For example, their argument advocates the redistribution of wealth rather than the creation of wealth; it endorses the omniscience of government planners rather than the efficiency of the impersonal marketplace; it champions the idea that all have an equal claim to the fruits of man’s output rather than having rewards distributed according to merit; and it rests on the naive faith that wealth—goods, crops, minerals, technology—simply exists in nature rather than being produced through creativity, risk capital and hard work.

The U.N.'s attacks on the free enterprise system are occurring with increasing frequency. I cite seven examples:

1) It happens at the World Health Organization, which at one time was concerned almost entirely with encouraging medical research and planning and executing health programs. In recent years, however, WHO has moved dramatically into the field of regulation and has become politicized on the all-too-familiar lines of the developed North versus undeveloped South or Third World. Thus WHO now advocates the creation of a Third World purchasers "cartel" to deal with the pharmaceutical manufacturers.

2) There are efforts underway to regulate the international flow of data. If the Third World has its way, restriction will be placed on a company's access to information stored in its subsidiary or its headquarters if they are in different nations. And there will be taxes imposed on the movement of data into and out of countries.

3) The International Telecommunications Union, for decades an agency concerned only with the technical problems of transmitting communications between nations, is becoming increasingly politicized. Within the ITU, the Third World majority is now demanding that underdeveloped countries be granted a very large share of the world's radio frequencies, no matter that they do not now have and may never have the technological ability to use them. This Third World majority is also insisting that rents be paid for the geo-stationary orbital slots in which satellites are parked. Rents paid to whom? And set by whom? Why not charge rents for ships using ocean lanes? Or for planes using air lanes?

4) The U.N. has inspired something called an "Agreement Governing the Activities of States on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies." It establishes a U.N.-affiliated regime to govern exploration and extraction activities in outer space and endorses guidelines favoring state-owned agencies at the expense of private enterprise.

5) The U.N. has created the Center on Transnational Corporations which is preparing a "register" of profits as a key step towards regulating the activities of international firms.

6) The General Assembly has approved the Code of Restrictive Business Practices (1980). When enforced, it would compel multinational corporations to sell their technology and know-how at punitively low prices in Third World markets. Nowhere in the Code will you find acknowledgment of the widely recognized con-

tributions made by the multinationals in spurring the development of economically backward states.

7) There are moves to limit the force of patents to allow Third World nations to exploit new technology without paying for it.

Much of the flavor of the U.N.'s war on the free enterprise system will be evident next month (July 1982) in Mexico at the World Conference on Cultural Policies. The innocent sounding name of the gathering masks what Third World literature is welcoming as a major opening shot in an attack on Western-style advertising. Through international consumerist groups wielding enormous clout with U.N. agencies, a campaign is underway to regulate advertising by forcing firms, primarily international companies, to include something called a "social criterion" in their ads. What this means, according to the advocates of such a scheme, is that ads for products in Third World countries must describe, among other things, the availability of competitors' cheaper alternatives to the advertised product.

Although there is no carefully coordinated or centrally directed grand conspiracy at the U.N. to undermine the free enterprise system, there is a well-formulated blueprint or manifesto, a kind of grand strategy enthusiastically endorsed by just about all of the 120 or so underdeveloped states and even accepted (with reservations) by a number of West European industrial nations. This strategy is known as the New International Economic Order and was adopted in 1974 at the plenary meeting of the main Third World body, the U.N. Council on Trade and Development—or UNCTAD.

Officially called the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, the NIEO is a blueprint for assuring that the free enterprise system never takes root in the Third World. It is a blueprint designed to penalize not only capitalist firms and capitalist states, but also the citizens of capitalist societies. The NIEO won powerful champions over the years, such as key Carter Administration officials like Cyrus Vance and Andrew Young. Promoting adoption of the NIEO is the sole purpose of the Brandt Commission, headed by the former Chancellor of West Germany, Willy Brandt, and endorsed by a number of American groups like the ODC. In short, what NIEO wants to do is to force the transfer to undeveloped countries of the wealth, technology and research from those industrial nations which have created this wealth, technology and research. The transfer is to be mandatory and perpetual; there

will be only limited, if any, compensation for the enormous assets involved.

The NIEO is not going to be enacted *in toto* or enforced *in toto* on the industrial West. But the underlying philosophy of the NIEO provides the conceptional rationale and guidance for the U.N.'s attack on the free enterprise system. It is a blueprint providing a checklist of specific anti-free enterprise measures which the U.N. and its agencies individually and gradually can enact. The NIEO is a call to battle and a strategy which the defenders of the free enterprise system can ignore only at their peril.

There are, in fact, at least two critically important areas in which the NIEO already is close to enactment.

The first is what is called the New International Information Order. It is an attempt to restrict the operations of the Western press and give legitimacy to the state-controlled press of the Communist countries and most Third World nations. You will hear more about this shortly.

But I want to stress that it is not only the matter of press freedom at issue in the New International Information Order. The UNESCO Declaration advocating the New Information Order is explicitly biased against the private sector. It calls for preference to be given to non-commercial forms of mass communication. The reason for this, states the Declaration, is to "reduce the negative effects [of] the influence of market and commercial considerations."

The second important area in which the NIEO is already close to enactment is in the Law of the Sea Treaty. After nearly a decade of negotiations, during which the Carter Administration made some devastating concessions, the Treaty draft last month reached what may be its final stages. The U.S., as you know, refuses to sign the draft—so far. What is important for us to keep in mind is that the Law of the Sea Treaty is a statement repudiating the free enterprise system. It establishes a Third World-dominated cartel; it is designed to control the marketplace; it discriminates against private deep-sea mining ventures; and it declares that those intrinsically valueless metallic nodules at the seabed, which are transformed into useable and valuable resources only through the costly mining technologies developed by private firms—that these are somehow part of what is called the Common Heritage of all mankind. As such, Third World nations insist that they are entitled to a large share of the financial proceeds of the mining. And as such, the pioneering technologies and state-of-the-art know-how of deep-sea mining are to be given to developing countries.

There are many other problems with the Law of the Sea Treaty beyond its assault on the free enterprise system. But not the least of its dangers is that it is designed to serve as a model treaty for other issues, a model by which the industrial West is to be coaxed and intimidated into surrendering a portion of its national sovereignty and to undermine its economic system for the sake of the underdeveloped world which prefers to strive to get a share of the West's wealth as a kind of welfare transfer payment rather than to work at creating its own wealth.

Why does the majority controlling the U.N. make this choice? Why does it choose the economically catastrophic model of a Tanzania rather than the economically booming model of a Taiwan or Singapore? Why has the U.N. majority made the free enterprise system its enemy rather than embracing the one economic system with a proven record of success?

In large part, I suspect, it is ignorance. Daniel Moynihan has written that many leaders of the countries which once were colonies—the majority of U.N. members—were educated in West European universities, such as the London School of Economics, where they learned the economics of socialism. As leaders in their own nation's drive against colonial rule, they apparently became intoxicated with the heady rhetoric of socialism, rejected much of what their colonial rulers stood for and swallowed Lenin's contention that imperialism was a direct stage in the development of capitalism—an assertion for which there is no evidence. Indeed, the major imperialistic power of the past quarter-century has been the Soviet Union.

To a great extent, therefore, the Third World knows little about how capitalism works and how capitalism succeeds. The U.N., moreover, does little to enlighten the Third World. The economic studies and analyses produced by U.N. agencies and departments, including the New York-based Department of Public Information, have a strong anti-free enterprise and pro-socialist bias.

The U.N. majority also opposes the free enterprise system, I believe, because the Third World is influenced by the Soviet Union and its clients, such as Cuba, and their often successful maneuvering at the U.N. Moscow's role and successes at the U.N. are inexplicable—and a topic for another talk and for a Heritage Foundation Study—but they are a fact.

Lastly, I think that the U.N. majority wars against the free enterprise system because the free enterprise system is rightly seen as a threat—not as a threat to a developing nation or society, but

a threat to the authoritarianism of the regimes running these societies. Capitalism is the best guarantor of liberty yet devised. About this there can be little dispute. Irving Kristol points out: "Never in human history has one seen a society of political liberty that was not based on a free economic system—a system based on private property, where normal economic activities consisted of commercial transactions between consenting adults. Never, never, never. No exceptions."

The free enterprise system permits the emergence of important centers of independent power which successfully rival and check the power of the state. To regimes whose only legitimacy is their monopoly of the state's coercive power, existence of the independent power centers of the large corporation, the free trade union, the business association are unacceptable. The U.N. opposes the free enterprise system because a majority of U.N. members would be threatened by the political and social pluralism concomitant with free enterprise.

What is to be done about the U.N.'s war on the free enterprise system? What can you do?

First, you must insure that you remain aware of how developments at international organizations can affect the free enterprise system. In some instances, these international bodies can actually legislate for us and restrict us. At the least, they provide a forum for anti-free enterprise ideas. Participating officially in U.N. proceedings are such anti-free enterprise groups as the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility, the Institute for Policy Studies, the World Council of Churches, the National Council of Churches and similar organizations. They swell the anti-capitalist chorus. And, as we have seen, their ideas gradually take hold. Do not underestimate the power of ideas; they have enormous consequences. Do not support those ideas. Do not fund those organizations supporting those ideas.

Second, you must pressure Washington to resist the ideas and arguments coming from the anti-free enterprise majority at the U.N. You must support the Reagan Administration's efforts at limiting the U.N.'s technical and economic bodies to technical and economic matters. The White House needs help in its fight against the politicization of U.N. bodies.

This is much more difficult than you may imagine. Few things seem to have more power within government than bureaucratic inertia. Once a process begins and a bureaucratic vested interest emerges, it is very difficult to stop the process.

Cyrus Vance, Andrew Young and other Carter Administration

officials endorsed the U.N.'s anti-free enterprise rhetoric. The State Department is filled with professional negotiators who seem to relish the very process of negotiating. And then they fight tenaciously for the treaty or agreement which emerges as the product of their negotiations. They are a powerful lobby within government which urges compromise and accommodation when compromise and accommodation are not warranted. They are a lobby which, in terms of many of the issues relating to the Third World demands, argues that, if you can't get a whole loaf, you should settle for a slice, or the crust—or a crumb. The White House always needs pressure from outside to counter the career accommodators at the State Department.

The place for you to start is with pressure against the Law of the Sea Treaty. You must help stop it. While it may not affect you directly, it is a model for an anti-free enterprise strategy which eventually will affect your own industry, your own company—and certainly your nation's economy. Be aware of similar U.N. activities, innocent sounding—as the cultural conference in Mexico is or the upcoming Third Decade of Development or UNESCO's educational programs—innocent titles and rhetoric which may be masking a hidden anti-free enterprise system agenda.

Be aware that the U.N. majority has made you its enemy.

You ignore this at your peril.

The U.N. and Press Freedom

LEONARD J. THEBERGE

There is no issue more contentious and potentially destructive confronting the United Nations today than UNESCO's handling of freedom of the press within the context of its New World Information and Communications Order (NWICO). The ownership and control of information networks mirror the economic and social system within different countries. Three distinct models can be discerned. One model reflects the open society in the United States and other liberal democratic societies where there is a minimal involvement of the government in the affairs of the press. The opposite model is the Soviet Union and other totalitarian nations where there is total government control of information and communications. And the third model is a hybrid which reflects societies that permit a free and independent press but with considerable government authority and intervention in directing and controlling the flow of news and information.

Particular countries have chosen one model or another because that model suits their economic and social system. The United Nations claims that it respects the values of pluralism in information and communications. However, UNESCO has been actively engaged in encouraging the totalitarian and authoritarian models and has been attacking the Western media and the values of Western journalism on the assertion they undermine economic and social development.

My presentation today will explore the political question of whether UNESCO's efforts to bring about a NWICO poses a danger to a free press and an open society. In order to answer the question we need to understand the genesis and philosophical underpinning of a NWICO as it relates to the press. Also, we need to understand the charges made against the Western press and the flow and presentation of news in the West. And finally, an examination of UNESCO's activities during the past decade will provide some insight into that organization's intent and the response it has caused.

Perhaps the most difficult task is to define the NWICO, also known as the New World Information Order, also known as the

Leonard J. Theberge is president of the Media Institute in Washington, D.C.

New International Information Order. First of all, it is neither new nor an order. The debate about information, and its appropriate use, has been going on in the United Nations since the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) in 1948. The UDHR came out four square for the free flow of information and for individual freedom of expression and use of the media.

Issues involving press freedom have been with us since the first political ruler recognized the potential for "mischief" in an independent source of criticism that could be widely disseminated. In a way, the NWICO recalls the struggles in the 17th and 18th centuries when Western rulers sought to control the press through taxation, alien and sedition laws and licensing of printers.

Nor is the NWICO an order. There is no charter or document or set of international agreements that one can examine. In fact, it is an aspirational list of what many Third World nations believe are necessary conditions to achieve economic and social development. It is also closely linked with a set of overlapping aspirations contained in the New International Economic Order, another concept championed mainly by Third World nations.

A word of caution is in order. Many of the terms used in discussing global issues are bound to be imprecise and "Third World nations" is one of them. Third World nations differ greatly in size, resources, gross national product and levels of communications. We use that term advisedly, in recognition that many, but not all, of them share a common belief that the Western media, technological developments and the free flow of information are a hindrance rather than a help to their social and economic development.

If the term NWICO is unclear, what do we mean when we use that term? Let us examine the writings of some of the prominent spokesmen in UNESCO and the United Nations to help define, if not a clear meaning, at least their usage of the term.

According to Narinder K. Aggarwala, Regional Information Office, Asia and Pacific United Nations Development Programme, the NWICO embraces everything from politics to technology:

The New Order deals with the totality of information, technical, political, social and economic. It covers all means of information—media, books, films, data banks, documentaries and all kinds of instructional material. It encompasses all aspects of information tech-

nology—communication satellites, press cable rates, telecommunications as well as national and international press regulations. Media, print and electronic, are but a small—though admittedly most controversial—part of NIIO which its protagonists envision as a process for “intellectual decolonization” of the Third World.¹

The “totality of information” is a term that suggests that NWICO covers control of the flow of all news and information to, from and within any country. The need to control the flow of news is based on what the Third World considers “imbalances, inequalities and inequities” in that flow as it now exists.

Mr. Doudou Diene, Director of UNESCO, New York office, sees the problem in cultural terms:

A few major communication industries [read the Western communications industries] with enormous material and technical facilities under their control are spreading more and more generally the use of standardized products which make for world-wide uniformity of cultural models and consumer networks. Mass-produced messages originating from a few centers are commanding increasing attention in all other countries. This is already leading to a weakening of national and local forms of expression, and to growing repression of the potential for creative participation among peoples, who are often reduced to the role of passive recipients of messages.²

The overarching complaint of cultural and commercial dominance, articulated by Doudou Diene is, of course, the easiest flow to control. Since most broadcasting outlets are state controlled, even in the West, no government is compelled to purchase “standardized products” it finds objectionable. The reason they purchase Western programs is because that is what their people find amusing or entertaining.

1. Narinder K. Aggarwala, “An Introduction to the New International Information Order,” *The Crisis in International News*, Columbia University Press (forthcoming book).

2. Doudou Diene, *UNESCO and Communications in the Modern World*, Trustees of Columbia University, 1982.

On the news front, Western journalists are accused of reporting only sensational and negative news—political instability, human rights violations, natural disasters and corruption. The result, it is alleged, is a poor international image that impairs trade and other economic relations that would stimulate development.

Favorable images are considered a key to national development and have given rise to “development journalism” which we would call in the West “public relations journalism.” UNESCO’s call for a “responsible media” and a “balanced flow of information” is based on the belief that Western commercial media monopolize the flow of news, have a cultural bias, emphasize negative news, and thus undermine social, economic and political values essential for development. The role of the media in the West as independent watchdogs and critics of government and other institutions is widely perceived as a luxury poor nations cannot afford.

The four international news agencies—United Press International, Associated Press, Reuters, Agence France-Presse—which circulate about 85 percent of the international news come in for the bulk of criticism. They are accused of failing to provide a truly international service because too little news about developing countries appears in the Western media. By selecting news in terms of Western attitudes and interests and by “selling” their news product as a commodity, the news agencies are accused of imposing “alien perspectives” on Third World affairs.

It is undoubtedly true that Western news reporting about the Third World could be improved. We know from experience that news reporting about the events with which we are familiar could be improved. But Western news sources properly deny the charges that they ignore the Third World.

As a matter of fact, many of the assertions made by UNESCO and its supporters about imbalances in the flow of information do not bear critical scrutiny. The four world news agencies do not operate in a vacuum. In addition to Tass, the Russian world news agency, “there are more than 120 regional and national news agencies including major ones such as the Deutsche Presse Agentur, Japan’s Kyodo or China’s Hsinhua which all have extensive international networks. . . .”³ While the four Western agencies clearly outweigh the others in size, manpower and technology, there is no lack of alternate sources of information.

3. Rosemary Righter, *Whose News? Politics, The Press and the Third World*, Times Books, 1978, p. 50.

The real problem is the inability to absorb and use available information. Sergio Lepri of Italy's ANSA news agency believes it is a false proposition to talk about the need to increase the flow of information. As he puts it, "ANSA receives, on merely average equipment working only fifteen hours a day, 220,000 words from socialist countries; 110,000 from the Third World and 250,000 from international agencies. A third of our output is foreign news. It stands to reason that most of what we receive goes into the rubbish-bin. . . ."⁴

A recent study by Professor Wilbur Schramm, "Circulation of News in the Third World—A Study of Asia," examined Asian development news reported by the four Western agencies, and found a high output on those development issues that the Third World claim are not adequately reported. The problem is that local newspaper editors in the Asian papers surveyed do not use the material. Newspaper readers in the Philippines, at least their editors believe, are not interested in a new dam or irrigation project in India. Independent news judgments around the world tend to be similar.

Another study, titled *Assessment of the New World Information Order*, by Professor Kenji Kitatani, found that international affairs coverage by the seven major television networks in Japan, Great Britain and the United States was extensive. As Professor Kitatani found:

Despite the widely accepted view that the First World media do not treat Third World affairs on the same level as First World affairs, there is evidence that the Western media neither inform less frequently or spend less money and effort to report the news stories about the Third World. Three findings support this conclusion: (1) the Japanese and British networks appear to spend as much or perhaps more money and effort to report on events in developing nations than on events in the developed nations; (2) the American networks provide a higher number of news stories on the Third World than on the First World; and (3) the American networks spent as much or more money to report on events in the Third World as on events in the First World.⁵

4. *Ibid.*, p. 51.

5. Kenji Kitatani, *Assessment of the New World Information Order*, Department of Communications, Washington State University, 1981.

The charge of cultural bias is undoubtedly true to some extent, but what the effects are is not so apparent. Audiences in the Third World are not the "passive recipients of messages," Mr. Doudou Diene asserts, unless they differ completely from audiences elsewhere. Many development economists argue that economic and social developments will only occur with profound shifts in attitudes and cultures within developing countries. Isolation from cultural developments elsewhere may discourage the development process. It has been tried with disastrous consequences in Burma and China. Whatever benefits those countries gained from complete isolation from Western information and culture was outweighed by the destruction to their economies, which after all is what UNESCO claims its NWICO is supposed to help develop.

And finally, when the Third World charges that Western news agencies are incapable of providing an objective news service either about their own development or about Western news, the news agencies reply that their standard must be one of objectivity if news is to be acceptable in countries of left and right with different social and legal principles, who may be at war or near war with one another. But to respond in this fashion does not meet the underlying issue of who is to direct and control news which is the essence of UNESCO's NWICO.

The words one hears over and over again in UNESCO and by Third World leaders are "dominate" and "commercial." The Western media dominates the world. It dominates cultures; it dominates political events; it dominates all other social and economic forces at work in any society. And it does this "commercially" for profit and not for the "good" of society. The hollow intellectual jargon one finds frequently used by Western left wing radicals, one finds in abundance at UNESCO. Mr. Christopher Nascimento, former and now honorary Minister of Information in Guyana and currently a special consultant at UNESCO, has stated, "The truth is that the cherished Western concepts of media ownership and communications freedoms die hard...but die they must." Mr. Nascimento's country followed his advice and eliminated a free, independent and commercial press. The benefits it has reaped are extremely difficult to discern.

The political process within UNESCO feeds upon real and imagined inequities between developed and developing countries and contributes to the problem. UNESCO is a legitimate world forum for political discussions and a multinational agency for ad-

ministering projects in education, science, culture and information. The problem in this forum is that the U.S. and other nations that share a common set of values about an independent media are in a very small minority. The result of this real political "imbalance" is that evidence, the analysis of issues and the testing of the truth through vigorous debate are meaningless. The majority constituency UNESCO is faithfully representing has an unshakable, one-dimensional view of the Western media that is both hostile to liberal democratic societies and sympathetic to totalitarian and authoritarian societies of left and right.

Gerald Long, former managing director of Reuters, now managing director of *The Times* of London, sees the problem as an extension of "two fundamentally different views of the role of information in society." The first, according to Long, sees information as a carrier of freedom. The best expression of that view is the United States Constitution and, in particular, the First Amendment. The second view is that information is a carrier of power, and must be used by governments as a way of carrying out their policies. Long charges that UNESCO, and by implication, the NWICO, want to transfer media technology to the countries that do not have it, while encouraging them to use that technology to control information for the purpose of government.

If Long's view is correct, and I believe it is, we are getting very close to the answer to our question, "Does UNESCO pose a danger to press freedom?" Monopoly control and direction of the content of news, whether by a government, a single corporation or a single individual, is an obvious threat to press freedom. More importantly, it poses a danger to the pursuit of truth upon which liberal democracies are dependent. As Dr. Johnson, a hard-pressed and poverty stricken journalist for most of his adult life, observed: "If nothing may be published but what civil authorities shall have previously approved, power must always be the standard of truth. . . ."

Rosemary Righter, a British journalist who has written a thought-provoking book, *Whose News? Politics, the Press and the Third World*, finds:

Most of those who attack the existing structure insist that they do not seek to block the free flow of information. On the contrary, they seek to make it genuinely free—free of domination by the powerful few, free of Western "ethnocentric prejudices," free "to defend the

interests of society as a whole, and the rights of entire peoples to make known...their preoccupations, their difficulties and their aspirations for a better life." Free of the distortions of the market and thus able to "respond to the real development needs of Third World countries."⁶

According to Righter, the political force behind the NWICO stems from the nations which made up the Non-Aligned Movement in the 1950s and 1960s. From a small group of radical, anti-colonial and socialist nations, it has grown in the 1970s to become an established force in international politics, including most of the Third World nations.

At the Fourth Summit of the non-aligned governments in Algiers in 1973, a Yugoslav initiative established a link between economic coordination and international information structures. The seventy-five heads of government in Algiers stated it to be "an established fact that the activities of imperialism are not confined solely to the political and economic fields, but also cover the cultural and sociological fields, thus imposing an alien ideological domination over the peoples of the developing world." To meet 'the cultural alienation and imported civilization imposed by colonialism and imperialism', the non-aligned governments resolved to effect a 'repersonalization by constant and determined resources to the people's own social and cultural values which define it as a sovereign people.' The search for an alternative model had begun."⁷

One can follow the genesis of the NWICO in UNESCO when, in 1972, the Soviets prepared a "Draft Declaration on the Use of the Mass Media," which tacitly supported state control of the media. For the first time in UNESCO, the press was being discussed as a "tool" of the state with a political agenda. In 1974, the Soviet draft declaration became a divisive issue when a number of Western delegates walked out in protest against anti-Israel language that had been incorporated into the increasingly politicized proceedings. As a result, in 1975 the United States cut off funds to UNESCO.

By the 1976 UNESCO General Conference, U.S. funding was restored and the contentious Soviet proposal postponed until 1978. The resolution adopted by acclamation at UNESCO's 1978

6. Rosemary Righter, *Whose News?*, p. 99.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 104.

General Conference in Paris was sanitized and received a new title, "Declaration on Fundamental Principles Concerning the Contribution of the Mass Media to Strengthening Peace and International Understanding, to the Promotion of Human Rights and to Countering Racism, Apartheid and Incitement to War." But the issues were not put to rest and a spin-off of these media debates was the creation of the UNESCO International Commission for the Study of Communication Problems, commonly known as the MacBride Commission after its chairman, Sean MacBride, who uncommonly holds both the Lenin and Nobel Peace Prizes.

The MacBride report was noted at UNESCO's 1980 General Conference in Belgrade and none of its 82 resolutions were adopted. The report was essentially a compromise which contained something for everyone. For example, it recommended the right of journalists to have access to news services both private and official; it denounced censorship and opposed measures for protection of journalists, an international code of ethics and an international right of reply and rectification. On the negative side, the MacBride report exhibits bias against private ownership of news media and suggests studies to reduce the negative influences of the marketplace.

The ebb and flow of the political agenda at UNESCO took a turn for the worse in February 1981 when, in spite of its claims to the contrary, UNESCO organized a meeting to discuss plans for a new international organization for the protection of journalists. This meeting was originally a closed session limited to Eastern Bloc and Third World invitees and revealed, for anyone willing to see, UNESCO's real agenda. When the secret meeting came to the attention of the U.S. State Department, our government insisted that Western representatives participate and the proposal for a UNESCO commission to issue identity cards was derailed.

While UNESCO has been pursuing with single-minded determination an avenue to establish statist news and communications policies, the U.S. proposed a practical result-oriented program for less developed nations to improve their news and communications development. Now, a part of UNESCO, the international program for the development of communications (IPDC) could become a vehicle for channeling UNESCO and other resources into areas of technical training and advice and provision of equipment and technology and hopefully away from non-productive

ideological approaches. The U.S. has adopted a cautious attitude because of the past activities at UNESCO and has not committed funding directly to IPDC.

It is too early to tell what the final outcome of the NWICO will be. UNESCO is committed to an ideological program for communications that separates it from the mainstream of Western values about the nature of the media. UNESCO's activities have raised deep concern in Congress and amendments to the funding bills for UNESCO could cut off U.S. support for that organization.

UNESCO has not, however, achieved any of its objectives for Western journalists that would put it into a direct confrontation with its Western members and the U.S. Congress. There are no identity cards, ethical rules, or commissions to enforce them.

The NWICO continues to be an evolutionary and continuous process which could lead either to much-needed assistance and improvements in communications or to a blind alley of closed societies maintaining the status quo while preaching radical change. It is clear that U.S. participation in UNESCO has helped to preserve the values of press freedoms that we believe are essential to free and democratic societies. It has been accomplished with some pain and compromise, but it is likely the results would have been worse without the effort. I believe our Department of State has earned and deserves a "well-done."

The U.N. and U.S. National Interests

MIDGE DECTER

The United Nations itself as an institution was an effort to sell American values, American political values, to the world. It was an invention of the United States, and one might say in admiration of this country, and also in despair for the quality known as American innocence, that only the United States *could* have invented such an institution as the United Nations. For it was an effort to offer to the world a model of the liberal parliamentary order. A parliament of nations. And unlike earlier parliaments of nations, this one, said its inventors, was going to be truly representative. Therefore it included a body, the General Assembly, which gave equal voice and equal representation to all the sovereign nations. This resulted in its being unable to reflect the realities of power in the world, which is undoubtedly one of the reasons why it has been unable to function really as a peacekeeping organization. I am not going to go through a taxing history, but what has become of this American liberal invention we know. It has been turned around 180 degrees into a center for the articulation and the legitimization of tyranny, in the names of "justice," "freedom," and all those other words which we contributed and which daily in that institution get perverted.

We find ourselves now in a peculiar predicament. We are not only the founding spirit behind this organization, we are its major funder. It sits, appropriately to its initial intention, in the city of New York, the symbol in this country of the uplifting of the formerly downtrodden (which was surely the impulse behind the creation of the institution), and it sits in the city that in this country typifies that process. And yet its major role in the world now is to be the center for agitation against the values by which, under which, it was created. The U.N. is a center of agitation against the democratic order, not to say American society, and certainly not to say American national interest. How have we gotten ourselves into this spot, where we are the host and the major funder of an institution most of whose deliberations, and particularly those to which the press and the public pay no attention, are inimical not only to our interests and not only to our survival but to the

Midge Decter is Executive Director of the Committee for the Free World in New York.

very things that we and this institution itself stand for? Well, we do not have to discuss now the process by which this happened. The question is, what should we do about it? Ambassador Lichtenstein said he was not going to address himself to the question of taking the U.N. seriously because Jeane Kirkpatrick is going to do that. I think that I am undoubtedly going to preempt her and I am undoubtedly in agreement with her, when I say that one of the ways we have allowed this process to happen under our very noses is that we have not taken the United Nations seriously. We have paid for it; we have genuflected before it; we have been unfailingly polite toward it. We have sent children out with little boxes every Halloween. We have not taken it seriously. By not taking the U.N. seriously I mean we have not, certainly not as a nation, sufficiently attended to what was being said there, to what was being put into the documents of that institution. That we now have a Mission to the United Nations which *does* take it seriously in this way, which exercises the right of reply, which makes the argument, is unusual, possibly unique. But this cannot be counted on in the long political future because it very much depends on who is at the Mission. And it seems to me, I hope that my friends who are members of USUN will not misunderstand the spirit in which I say this, it seems to me somewhat like locking the barn door after the horse has been stolen. The damage has been done.

A major damage—and it is a major damage to a democratic society—has been the corruption of language. This is also a subject about which Ambassador Kirkpatrick feels very strongly. The corruption of language, the distortion of the word justice, even distributive justice, that lies behind the notion of the New International Economic Order, the New World Information Order—and who knows what other new world orders lie in store for us—the notion that the free nations of this world are to be lectured to and hectorred and made demands of by some of the most tyrannical nations on Earth, in the name of justice, is a perversion of language and thought that we have permitted to happen and that has left us all in a state of deep and dangerous befuddlement. The result is it takes us ages simply to sort out a question before we can even begin to address ourselves to it. Having said this, I suppose it will not surprise you to hear me offer, with all the seriousness I can command, the proposition that it is possible that the course of peace and the course of justice, not only here but throughout the world, would be best served if the United States left the United Nations.

Of course, as Frank Shakespeare suggested about the salutary effect on UNESCO that Elliot Abrams had when he threatened it with a shaky future, merely proposing that the U.N. should leave New York City might exercise a great and salutary disciplinary influence on the delegates, and particularly on members of the secretariat to the United Nations, who get to live here all the time regardless of what happens in their governments.

The Heritage Foundation is putting out a series of papers telling us what has been going on in this institution with our passive collusion over the years: among other nice things, the support for terrorism and the house room given to Soviet intelligence agents. So I am not being frivolous, nor am I being a little old lady in tennis shoes, when I say to you that for the sake of international relations, as well as the sanity of American thought, we ought to confess our error to ourselves and get out. I know the argument is made that there is great value for us in remaining at the U.N. and talking to its delegations and continuing to conduct dialogue with them. But I think that genuine dialogue is impossible when people do not agree even on first principles and so I have come here today to propose that it is time for us to reconsider our membership in, which is to say, the future assured existence of, what has proven to be a ghastly institution.

The best example of the linguistic corruption I referred to is the invention and dissemination and complete acceptance of something called the "Third World." I submit that there is no such thing as the Third World, and I submit that all our pieties toward this non-existent construct have not conduced to the welfare of the people living in the countries that are supposed to be included in it. There is really no such category. What can you say about an idea that includes Taiwan and Uganda? What you can say about it is that it is an intellectual confusion and a linguistic perversion, and that aside from what it has done to our capacity to think through our problems has undoubtedly contributed in immeasurable ways to the further immiseration of the world. This is not what we had in mind, and I think the time has come for us no longer to participate in the process. Thank you.

The U.N. and The U.S.

JEANE J. KIRKPATRICK

I understand that the previous speaker has just called for U.S. withdrawal from the United Nations. I disagree. I know, indeed no one knows better, that the United Nations poses a problem for the United States. It's expensive, it's often ineffective, it seems particularly inclined to push policies that we do not desire to adopt, decisions from which we dissent, agreements with which we disagree. My analysis of the causes and the possible cures of these problems at the United Nations has undergone significant evolution during my nearly 18 months now at Turtle Bay. [According to our statistical analysis, the median and average (social scientists distinguish between those two) tenures of U.S. permanent representatives to the United Nations is about 18 months. I am right now in the middle of my eighteenth month.]

In that eighteen months I have not become an expert on that institution. Eighteen months is not long enough to become expert about any complex institution, and God knows the United Nations is a complex institution. Eighteen months, however, is long enough to have observed a full cycle of U.N. activity. It took a while to become sufficiently acclimatized to understand a bit about what we were seeing. Eighteen months is long enough to have observed at first hand the relative powerlessness of the United States at the United Nations, to have felt in virtually all the arenas of that body our lack of influence, long enough to have watched others—the Soviets, the ASEAN states, Syria, PLO, and most recently, the British—exercise influence that we cannot even hope to approximate. We have observed in that eighteen months the operation of bloc politics, and, equally interesting, we have observed from time to time, the virtual paralysis of the blocs. We have observed the power of the Soviets and their principal clients, and from time to time their inability to shape outcomes in ways that they desire. We have watched the political ineffectiveness of the Latin Americans and thought about how it compares with the effectiveness of the ASEANS. Above all, I have been occupied, preoccupied, with our own American incapacities, our inability in

Jeane J. Kirkpatrick is U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations.

this organization to find reliable allies, to make persuasive arguments, to put together winning combinations.

To avoid possible misunderstanding, I desire to emphasize that the lack of influence of the United States in the United Nations does not represent some sort of worldwide revulsion against the Reagan Administration or even against me. The fact is that we have been virtually powerless in the United Nations for more than a decade. Our friend, the senator from New York, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, wrote in his book, "A Dangerous Place," that in 1974 the U.S. was frequently reduced to voting in a bloc of three, alongside Chile and the Dominican Republic. Since then, we have lost Chile and the Dominican Republic as reliable voting allies. The analysis of voting patterns at the U.N. reveals that the decline in U.S. influence, which began around 1966 or 1967, continued precipitously for about five to seven years at which point it reached a low level around which it has stuck ever since through both Republican and Democratic administrations. This low level of influence persisted through the administrations of Andrew Young and Donald McHenry as well as those of Daniel Patrick Moynihan and Jeane Kirkpatrick. That is another way of saying it has persisted through changes in U.S. permanent representatives, ideologies and styles. Throughout, we have continued to be the largest financial contributors, paying first 30 percent, then 25 percent of the operating expenses of the organization.

There was a time when I believed that our impotence was a kind of inevitable consequence of the changed character of the membership of the United Nations. Certainly that composition changed. When the United Nations was established, there were approximately fifty members, and though they were not all democracies, most of the members were stable, older nation states, experienced in international affairs, democracies who had some sort of commitment to international law and to liberal principles.

There was a degree of falsification introduced into the United Nations from the very beginning because of the presence of the Soviet Union, certain of its client states, and selected autocracies into an organization committed to the principles of freedom and democracy and self-determination. But that degree of falsification was relatively small and the facts of the United Nations were not too far from the principles enunciated in the Charter.

Today there are some 157 members of the United Nations. There have been three members admitted during my eighteen months there. Most of the nations that have been admitted since

the U.N.'s establishment are new nations, former colonies. The big influx of the former colonies into the U.N. occurred alongside the beginning of the decline of U.S. influence. Someone noted that 1964 was a watershed year. During that year seventeen new nations were admitted to membership, some fifteen of whom were African nations. Many of these new nations have unstable boundaries, their whole national history has been lived out in the post-war period during which the United Nations has been an important arena of international action. They have never known a world without the U.N. Most of these nations are, to paraphrase my friend, Dick Scammon, unrich, unpowerful and unhappy. Most are miserably poor; most of them are non-democratic, in the sense that they do not enjoy democratic political institutions. Some do but most have had a great deal of trouble establishing and maintaining democratic institutions.

These nations have had two overriding preoccupations which have dominated the U.N. agenda since then: decolonization, since they have been involved in establishing their own national independence; and economic development. Now, in principle, the United States should be the last country in the world to have problems with an organization whose agenda is dominated by decolonization and economic development.

As a former colony, we have been involved with decolonization literally all our national life. We have regularly, in the period before and after World War II, supported national independence and aspirations to independence of the colonies of our best friends. We have not been a colonial nation. We have no apologies to make to the world for our colonial past. We do not share the colonial guilt of many European allies. Similarly, with economic development. Many of us think we practically invented economic growth as a process of internal transformation which is continually at work in our own society—destroying traditional barriers of class and caste, achieving a good life for all. We almost invented economic development assistance with President Truman's Point Four Program in the post-war period. (A little noticed fact, by the way, about the Point Four Program was that it was enunciated in President Truman's Inaugural Address, of which Point One was that the United Nations would serve as the foundation of American foreign policy henceforth.) Decolonization, economic development, and development assistance are utterly consistent with our national experience, our values and our practices.

Why would we have problems with an organization most of

whose members are concerned with them? It is an interesting question on which I have been reflecting for months now, and I have concluded that it was not the influx of new nations that accounts for the U.S. position at the United Nations. It is not the changed composition of the United Nations that accounts for our fall from influence to impotence.

I have also examined the hypothesis that the bloc system accounts for the absence of American influence in the United Nations. Certainly it makes its contribution. The United Nations functions a lot like a legislature with a multi-party system and the parties in that system are the overlapping blocs, some of which are cohesive such as the Soviet bloc, the ASEAN states, and the EC-10. Some of the blocs are loose and not cohesive, such as the Non-Aligned Movement which embraces some 96 nations, or the G-77 (once a group of 77) which is today a group of 126. Some of the blocs are based on geography like the Organization of African States, some on culture like the Islamic Conference. We are a country without a party in the United Nations and that fact, that absence of a party, certainly is relevant to our impotence in that body. But I do not think it explains the whole problem.

Yet another hypothesis with which I have attempted to explain U.S. impotence is the structure of the United Nations itself: the rules, especially the practice of applying in the General Assembly the principle of one-man-one-vote to an international assembly of terribly unequal nations. Under that practice, one nation-one vote, we have one vote, Vanautu has one vote. Obviously, that kind of principle creates a disjunction between power and responsibility because some of the nations who have the power to influence decisions, financial decisions for instance, or the nations who have the resources to implement decisions, are not identical with those who have the power to vote to make them. An extreme example of that was the Golan Heights Resolution, passed at one of the many recent Special Sessions of the General Assembly. It was a particularly obnoxious resolution which laid the framework for a challenge to Israel's credentials. Some 86 nations voted in favor of that resolution. Though I have not verified it, I am informed by a reliable assistant that the financial contributions of all 86 of the nations who voted for the resolution do not equal that of the United States. It is argued that only Third World countries get a good deal from the U.N. Nonetheless, I do not believe this or any other basic structural flaw accounts for our impotence.

There is, I fear, another explanation, which was implicit in the

drama I saw acted out on the issue of the Falklands. Watching the British Permanent Representative, an enormously skillful diplomat, operating in relationship to the Falklands crisis was tremendously impressive. It was almost traumatic, because in his conduct I have seen what a Western democratic nation could do inside the United Nations. The British have done it. They have made the organization function in ways that are responsive to their interests and their policy goals, and the fact they have been able to do it means it can be done. Why, then, haven't we been able to achieve our goals inside this organization?

My tentative conclusion is that it is due to our lack of skill in practicing international politics in multilateral arenas. It is also part and parcel of the decline of U.S. influence in the world. It is, I believe, a direct reflection of what has been a persisting U.S. ineptitude in international relations that has dogged us all our national life; an ineptitude that has persisted through centuries, through administrations headed by different parties, through different presidents, and is especially manifest in our multilateral politics. It has persisted more recently through administrations that brought to the United Nations different styles of operations.

We have not been effective in defining or projecting in international arenas a conception of our national purpose. Through decades, we have not been good at politics at the United Nations.

It is a political arena and we have not understood it accurately or adequately as a political arena. We have not, therefore, been able to take an effective part in the politics of the United Nations. We have treated it as though it were something other than a political arena. It is a strange thing that we Americans who are very gifted at clubhouse politics, statehouse politics, the politics of voluntary associations, at legislative politics in Washington and presidential politics, should be so inept at international politics in multilateral arenas like the United Nations. It is a strange thing, really. The more one reflects upon it, the stranger it becomes.

I believe that we have not understood that the same principles of politics that apply in our national life apply in multilateral international institutions as well.

We have also suffered from too rapid turnover, for example, in our Permanent Representatives. (I hasten to say that I am not making an application for long tenure; I couldn't stand it.) But I believe, in principle, that we ought to have Permanent Representatives who stay there long enough to come to know the scene. When a freshman Senator goes to Washington, we do not expect

that he is going to be effective quickly in the U.S. Senate, we don't expect that he will become a power in the Senate until he has learned the rules and the players, and how to make the rules work for him and how to make the players responsive. But we keep changing U.S. Permanent Representatives. We also keep changing Assistant Secretaries of International Organizations. Their tenure is no longer than our Permanent Representatives. This means the two principal policymaking offices of our international organizations operation are involved in musical chairs—not staying long enough to really get to know the job well.

Another consequence of ignoring the political character of the U.N. is that we operate as though there were no difference between our relations with supporters and opponents, with no penalties for opposing our views and values, and no rewards for cooperating. We have also operated as though we had no persistent, coherent national purposes which link issue to issue. We act too often as if we changed our minds and basic national interests as issues change, and certainly as administrations change. We have not cultivated reliable voting alliances in the way, for example, the British carefully have nurtured Commonwealth relations, or the French nurture relations with their former colonies. By not really learning the rules, the players, the game, we have often behaved like a bunch of amateurs in the United Nations. Unless or until we approach the United Nations as professionals—professionals at its politics—with a clear-cut conception of our purposes and of the political arena in which we operate, knowledge of the colleagues with whom we are interacting, and of their goals and interests, then we won't ever know whether the United Nations could be made a hospitable place for the American national interest. Until then it would be unreasonable even to think about withdrawing from the United Nations.

that he is going to be effective quickly in the U.S. Senate, we don't expect that he will become a power in the Senate until he has learned the rules and the players, and how to make the rules work for him and how to make the players responsive. But we keep changing U.S. Permanent Representatives. We also keep changing Assistant Secretaries of International Organizations. Their tenure is no longer than our Permanent Representatives. This means the two principal policymaking offices of our international organizations operation are involved in musical chairs—not staying long enough to really get to know the job well.

Another consequence of ignoring the political character of the U.N. is that we operate as though there were no difference between our relations with supporters and opponents, with no penalties for opposing our views and values, and no rewards for cooperating. We have also operated as though we had no persistent, coherent national purposes which link issue to issue. We act too often as if we changed our minds and basic national interests as issues change, and certainly as administrations change. We have not cultivated reliable voting alliances in the way, for example, the British carefully have nurtured Commonwealth relations, or the French nurture relations with their former colonies. By not really learning the rules, the players, the game, we have often behaved like a bunch of amateurs in the United Nations. Unless or until we approach the United Nations as professionals—professionals at its politics—with a clear-cut conception of our purposes and of the political arena in which we operate, knowledge of the colleagues with whom we are interacting, and of their goals and interests, then we won't ever know whether the United Nations could be made a hospitable place for the American national interest. Until then it would be unreasonable even to think about withdrawing from the United Nations.

The Search for a Lasting Peace

EDWIN J. FEULNER, JR.

Mr. President:

Let me express to you the admiration of my delegation for the way you have presided over our deliberations, and through you to express our sincere and deeply felt appreciation to Ambassador Adeniji who guided the work of this conference with sensitivity, dedication, and most of all wisdom.

My delegation has been an active participant in these vital discussions. We believe that the words that come out of this Session should be considered soberly—and not merely as another rhetorical exchange. It was because of our commitment to this Session that President Reagan addressed this body on June 17; that our delegation was composed of Senators and Congressmen from both political parties and representatives from other sections of American life. It was because we wanted to reach an enduring consensus on these critical questions of war and peace that we—along with many other delegations—labored long into the night.

Sadly, we were unable to achieve that full consensus we all so ardently hoped for. But we shall continue to work in this forum as well as others in search of the goal of lasting peace.

As we look back over these past weeks, we must look at both our successes and failures and carefully consider the tasks that lie ahead. But first we must review the lessons of the past.

In 1978 the First Special Session produced a Final Document which embodied many of the aspirations of the world community. But why have we not at this Session been able to come to a consensus on the implementation of that Document?

Let's look at the historical record. Shortly after the First Special Session, one major power violated the most fundamental principles of the U.N. Charter, and invaded its non-aligned neighbor. They continue to occupy that hapless country. A war of aggression continues in Southeast Asia; other regional conflicts rage unabated; subversion is being exported to Central America, Africa, and other areas; and the quest for freedom is still suppressed in Eastern Europe. In short, the world increasingly lives in fear.

Edwin J. Feulner, Jr., is President of The Heritage Foundation. He delivered this address as representative of the United States to the Second Special Session on Disarmament.

Small wonder, then, that the implementation of the lofty goals of the Final Document has remained a distant and illusive dream.

Given their transgressions against the most sacred tenets of the U.N. Charter since the First Special Session, it is not surprising that some nations argued against language recounting the history of the past four years.

But we must now look to the future. The major project before this conference was, as President Reagan noted, "To chart a course of realistic and effective measures in the quest for peace"—a Comprehensive Program of Disarmament. Progress was made, but the task remains unfinished. We have all reaffirmed the validity of the Final Document and pledged ourselves to renewed efforts toward disarmament. Let me restate that pledge today for the United States.

The United States is proud of its record in disarmament. President Reagan has outlined a clear program to deal with the most pressing and dangerous problems. We have called for real and militarily significant arms reductions, particularly in the field of nuclear weapons. We have called for a one-third reduction in strategic ballistic missile warheads, the elimination of all land-based intermediate range missiles, and new safeguards to eliminate the risk of accidental war. Moreover, just two days ago, the United States and its allies introduced a comprehensive draft treaty in the Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction Talks in Vienna. This proposal calls for a substantial reduction of ground forces on both sides and the implementation of a package of associated confidence-building and verification measures. In all these negotiations, we have offered neither unverifiable measures nor meaningless rhetoric, but rather concrete proposals for major reductions in the arms and armed forces of the United States and of the Soviet Union.

Make no mistake. We are not satisfied with the current international situation and intend to do our part for peace and stability on this small planet.

Mr. President, at this Special Session on Disarmament, we have been considering the most important issue facing mankind—how to prevent war. Or, to put it in a more positive sense, how to establish a secure peace. Regrettably, there is no magic formula or instant panacea to attain that peace we all so fervently desire; it cannot be mandated by committees or by resolutions.

We have heard, again today, the reiteration of the Soviet "no-first-use" of nuclear weapons pledge. Our policy goes far beyond

this pledge. The Soviet representative attempted to denigrate the NATO policy. But he cannot. As the leaders of NATO declared at their recent Summit, "None of our weapons will ever be used except in response to an attack." This is our pledge and our policy.

But we believe there is a better way, and we will continue to seek it as we have done at this Session.

During the past weeks we have offered concrete proposals and initiatives on a wide range of issues.

We are dedicated to a real World Disarmament Campaign. We believe that the open and universal availability of information on disarmament matters is vital. Excessive secrecy can only create mistrust and misunderstanding among the peoples of this world; such secrecy is a true enemy of peaceful relations among nations. The United States, as an open society, publicly makes available vast amounts of information on the momentous issues of war and peace.

We have no illusions as to the serious obstacles which have frustrated the objective of a free flow of information in the past. We are all well aware that while hundreds of thousands demonstrated openly and peacefully for disarmament in the streets of New York and other cities of the world, seven people who dared unfurl a banner calling for "Bread, Life, and Disarmament," were arrested in Moscow. It is a sad commentary that to some societies these words are considered "anti-state" when used domestically, but are considered "state policy" when used internationally.

In the spirit of open discussion, President Reagan has offered President Brezhnev the opportunity to address the American people on our TV on the vital questions of peace and disarmament in exchange for a chance to address the Soviet people. In this Session, we have offered specific proposals for similar multilateral discussions and regional seminars throughout the world. We believe that an informed world public is the best guarantee for peace and understanding among nations.

In addition to our proposals regarding the World Disarmament Campaign, we have offered other concrete initiatives at this Session. During the past several years, disturbing reports have reached the outside world that toxins and other lethal chemical weapons are being used in conflicts against people in remote regions of the world. Unfortunately, the borders of these regions remain sealed to the world community. We have therefore urged that the General Assembly call on the Soviet Government, as well as the Governments of Laos and Vietnam, to grant full and free access to

areas where chemical attacks have been reported so that the U.N. Group of Experts can conduct an impartial investigation.

We have also called for the convening of an International Conference on Military Expenditures. Such a conference would build on past U.N. efforts calling for universal adherence to a common reporting and accounting system on military expenditures. The frightening reality of vastly increased military budgets has been documented by recognized centers for disarmament throughout the world. Yet for the past ten years, one superpower has provided a manifestly ridiculous figure for its military budget to the world community. This universally discredited figure underscores the need for an International Conference on Military Expenditures.

As we conclude our work of this Second Special Session on Disarmament, I am again struck by the awesome task before us. Never have so few been responsible for the fate of so many. Let us not forget or shirk this responsibility as we continue our search for a true and lasting peace.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Are We Serious About Disarmament?

BARTON YALE PINES

I welcome the opportunity and am grateful for the honor that I, on behalf of The Heritage Foundation, am being allowed to address this United Nations gathering on disarmament. Disarmament is a very serious matter. That the nations of the world should devote fewer resources to weapons and more to meeting mankind's social, cultural, economic and political needs is the very serious desire of all civilized peoples. How to reduce military arsenals is a very serious challenge. Of this there can be no question.

What is questionable, however, is just how serious is this Second Special Session on Disarmament. All that can be done here for five weeks is talk. And while words can be powerful weapons, they can be so only if they are spoken and taken seriously. The question is: Are we here engaging in serious discussion or merely playing a ritualistic parlor game? I wonder.

A serious discussion of disarmament must be willing to abandon slogans and confront the most urgent problems affecting peace today. How can we talk about preventing future wars without first raising our voices in outrage at current wars? How can we talk about future disarmament treaties without first condemning violations of existing treaties? How can we focus almost exclusively on nuclear and other exotic weaponry, which have taken absolutely no lives since World War II, without exhausting our efforts to limit and even reduce the arsenals of those conventional weapons which, since 1945, have been used in more than 100 wars and have killed tens of millions of our fellow men?

For those serious about disarmament, no issue can be higher on their agenda than those weapons which today—at this minute—are being used against innocent populations. Can there be any higher priority for this gathering and for a serious disarmament effort, therefore, than to halt the two-year-long Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the unprovoked, brutal killing of Afghan women, children and men by Soviet troops.

Can there be any higher priority for this gathering than to find a means for stopping the Soviet Union from further use of chemical and biological weapons in Afghanistan, Kampuchea and Laos. Hundreds of reports from refugees, freedom fighters, defectors, doctors in refugee camps and newsmen provide the undeniable

and its East European allies have been spending more of their gross national product on arms than have NATO members on average. Why indeed has the Soviet Union, for more than a decade, been amassing arms at a historically unprecedented sustained rate and been building its arsenal to unprecedented levels of destruction? During almost the entire period in which this has been occurring, the U.S. had frozen or even was reducing its arsenal. Why also are Nicaragua, Cuba, Libya and India amassing arsenals far greater than needed for defensive purposes? At a time when we hear so much touching rhetoric about the tragic hunger, poverty and illness that chronically plague much of the Third World's populations, why do these Third World nations spend so much of their scarce resources on instruments of violence?

Certainly a serious conference on disarmament would be most concerned with the world's most rapidly expanding arsenals.

I have been listening to and reading the statements emanating from this podium and from the other platforms at this Special Session. I have been visiting the exhibits and closely examining the literature being distributed by organizations in and around these buildings. And I am shocked that these questions and issues almost universally are being ignored.

I realize that these are tough issues to address and tough questions to ask. Perhaps they are too tough for a conference restricted by diplomatic conventions and by the chronic limitations of the United Nations system. But unless these issues are confronted and questions are raised, I cannot take seriously any disarmament conference. I doubt if many of my fellow Americans will either.