

Originally Processed With FOIA(s):

S

FOIA Number:

S

FOIA MARKER

**This is not a textual record. This is used as an
administrative marker by the George Bush Presidential
Library Staff.**

Record Group/Collection: George H.W. Bush Presidential Records
Collection/Office of Origin: Speechwriting, White House Office of
Series: Speech File Backup Files
Subseries: Chron File, 1989-1993

OA/ID Number: 13771
Folder ID Number: 13771-003

Folder Title:
U.N. Address 9/23/91 [OA 8328] [3]

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
G	26	21	6	3

September 19, 1991

MEMORANDUM FOR TONY SNOW

FROM: JENNIFER GROSSMAN

SUBJECT: OUTLINE

Tony, here's a regurgitation of the outline you gave me over the phone:

OUTLINE

themes: now is the time when the UN's charter and universal declaration of human rights can be taken seriously; up to now it's efficacy has been stymied by the Cold War.

I. salutations, intro, different kind of speech because different kind of world

- A. End of the Cold War, demise of the old world order
 - 1. proof given during Gulf conflict when Sovs signed on joint effort.
 - here we can stroke UN, UN at its best, working
 - here we can fit in any Iraq updates as needed.

II. Future

- A. Defining challenges
 - 1. Regional disputes
 - 2. Trade disputes
 - GATT
- B. Values
 - the time has come to retract the shameful "Zionism is Racism"
 - other anachronistic, reprehensible resolutions
- C. The Individual as the New Unit
 - Croatia
 - 1. Individual rights
 - 2. Power rests with the people, not with the governments

III. This is not, and cannot be Pax Americana

- it is an order in which individuals must take responsibility for monitoring government
- we don't want to meddle in the internal affairs of other states, unless under extreme situations of abuse (?)

NY Pro-Advances UN

→ Peace Statue done by a Soviet artist

Station on home base

Staying in danger

that are nuclear

weapons

→ seeking to do another

a gift (not like Statue of Liberty)
- ports stopped by others
of the Americans

→ joke? sit, but space station

- after NY has off to New Jersey

- Ambassador George Moose

- Dorothy Sampson, Admin,
USUN (212) 415-4320

23, 24 September

- morning arrival 23rd

- call on Sec General & ~~General~~ ^{see}

[speech] of the Gen Assembly

- Afternoon: Bilateral mtgs at
the Waldorf

- Reception in Ballroom ^{late afternoon}
~~that~~
evening? RON

24th Bilaterals, perhaps

using time for fast & lunch

- late afternoon to Newark

- Night → bk to Washington

Mrs. BUSH WILL BE HERE

T5:

- NWO speech
- freedom, requirements for democracy
- UN Reform
-

UN: flags of all the nations
and govt

Ali Teymour, Chief of protocol

- do flags include observer nations
- do they have position -
- Gen Assembl hall, random selection of a letter & the rest follow for seating

VSVN faces UN

- Moore starting
- artwork & artifacts
for around the
walls

Picasso's

- ring of Guernica
- will be the 4th time he comes to
address the General Assembly
- addressing the world on by the
these processes
- POTUS will be the 2nd speaker
- 40 minutes??
- courtesy call 2 see some of

Reference & Research
Seated at the
Miss

Veri Mendenhall
(Miss # 915 9144)

See Kaitlyn
(Chapman & Miss)
35 years)

Mr. Chapman receives 1015, 1115
pt x of See Gen
- up stairs, midday/See 915

UN HALL

President of the General
Assembly will inform
the student

Reception will be held in
the Empire room of the A.T.
-any police here?

17854

212
635
4339

[
Fenuia Sabas
833 9860
Council -
~~822 0989~~
]

833 9860 Mr Valdez

Refugia Nalente

3 2 8 0 0 0 0 1 0 2 1

UNITED STATES MISSION
TO THE UNITED NATIONS

RELEASE ON DELIVERY.

2:30 P.M., SUNDAY, MAY 9, 1971

Press Release USUN-55 (71)

May 7, 1971

Address by Ambassador George Bush, United States Representative
to the United Nations, at Gloucester County Community College,
Gloucester, New Jersey, Sunday, May 9, 1971

I'm sure many of you have studied the United Nations, and if so you know something about how it all began at the end of the Second World War. You know the vision that was in the minds of the UN's founders -- how they dreamed of a new age when the great powers of the world would cooperate in peace as they had as allies in war, and would take the lead in stopping aggression and settling disputes. The Security Council was even supposed to have armed forces, including air forces, at its immediate call to stop an aggressor. The UN was designed to make it possible for man's ancient dream of world peace to come true at last. But there was one big "if" -- the major powers had to cooperate.

And I'm sure you have also read about what actually happened. The optimists had a rude awakening from the dream of peace. The big-power cooperation that we all hoped for disappeared almost overnight. Military defense alliances were formed to resist communist pressure in Europe and many other places. The UN became famous not as a center of cooperation but as an arena of attack and counterattack in the cold war. A lot of pessimists in those days thought the UN was about finished.

-more-

3 2 8 0 0 0 0 1 0 2 2

BUSH

-2-

But this time the pessimists were in for a surprise. The UN did not die. It did fail to bring a stable world peace or disarmament, but it accomplished a lot of very important things. It helped to defeat a major military aggression against South Korea. It sent peace observers and larger peace forces to help prevent large-scale war in Kashmir, the Middle East, the Congo, Cyprus and other places. And while those events were grabbing the headlines, the UN was also, rather quietly, serving as a world center for cooperation on an immense number of common interests that affect the nations of the world -- teaching people to read, giving children enough to eat, finding refugees a new place to live, stamping out endemic diseases like malaria and smallpox, coordinating disaster relief of the floods and earthquakes, promoting trade and communications and economic and social progress in every part of the world. That is still today the big untold story of the United Nations -- the part of its work that takes up more than 80 per cent of its money and talent but gets very few headlines in the press.

So the UN is still in business, more than 25 years after its founding. After only a couple of months as United States Representative there I can assure you that it still has plenty of headaches. The pessimists still have plenty of evidence for predicting, just as they were doing 20 years ago, that the UN is on its last legs. The international development program of the UN, which has worked for more than a decade to help the low-income countries, has been having serious growing pains and needs a major overhaul. The UN has a serious financial deficit because the Soviet Union and some others won't pay for past peacekeeping costs. The future ability of the UN to create peacekeeping forces is a question mark. There is too much talk and too little action. The 127 nations that make up the General Assembly are very unequal in power. The result is that majority votes in the Assembly often express strong emotions but don't reflect what can actually be done by the nations with the power to act.

And basically, it remains true today as it has been from the beginning, that the UN can only accomplish what its members are ready and able to do together. On some days, on some issues, that doesn't seem to be very much.

Really, if you are a born pessimist -- if you "got up on the wrong side of life," as somebody put it -- it's no trouble at all to prove that the UN, this time, is about through.

But I, for one, just don't believe that. I believe the UN will gradually overcome its difficulties. I expect it will continue its economic and technical and humanitarian programs and that these will be made more efficient. And I further hope and expect that the UN will play a very important part in helping the nations of the world to meet some of the new and emerging challenges of our technological age.

-more-

3 2 8 0 0 0 0 1 0 2 3

BUSH

-3-

Let me say a word about the impact of technology. It is changing the world faster than some of us realize. Radio and jet travel have made the world a smaller place in which people of different nations and cultures know more about each other and tend to share the same aspirations. Modern medicine and public health have dramatically lengthened the life span of people in the low-income countries -- thereby solving one big problem and creating another one, a very great one, which we call the population explosion. Space science has given us fantastic new powers to discover hidden earth resources, to detect areas of pollution and crop diseases, to see hurricanes beginning to form, and before long to make reliable long-range weather forecasts which will be of immense economic value for agriculture. Underwater engineering technology is enabling us to find and use resources of petroleum and metals far beneath the surface of the seas, and far beyond the jurisdiction of any nation.

Technology thus brings us both new opportunities and new problems and dangers. The same nuclear energy that could, if it ever got loose, pretty much destroy civilization, can also be, as President Eisenhower once said, "consecrated to man's life" -- a source of power for the economies of the whole world. The same jet planes that make international contact so easy can be perverted to use for the international drug traffic; they can also be hijacked by people with some personal or political motive. The same industrial technology that has made modern Americans materially richer than kings of ancient times has also led to widespread and dangerous pollution -- so dangerous that the control of that pollution must now be undertaken on an international and even a world scale.

Every single one of these problems and opportunities of modern technology is on the active agenda of the United Nations today. Cleaning up the world environment. Reducing the dangerously rapid growth of population in many countries. Finding an orderly arrangement for nations to cooperate in mining the wealth that lies under the oceans. Preventing and punishing hijacking. Controlling and ending the vicious international drug traffic. Turning nuclear energy toward peaceful use. Putting the detection powers of the newly devised earth resource satellites into service for international development, and in the fight against pollution.

This is one frontier of international cooperation -- the technological frontier -- that makes the United Nations an exciting and indispensable center in the modern world. We are constantly aware that the powers that science and technology gives us -- and which they will continue to give us during your lifetime -- can be used for either good or evil, either to build or to destroy. The choice depends to a great extent on what the governments of the world decide to do; and the UN is the place where some of these decisions are going to be made in the years ahead.

--more--

3 2 8 0 0 0 0 1 0 2 4

5.1

BUSH

-4-

Let me add that the UN today is very conscious of the need to enlist young people in its work. We have a newly established International Corps of Volunteers, a kind of "international peace corps", which has just begun to set up shop in the UN Development Program so that young volunteers can find a constructive place in helping the developing countries of the world. In the UN Secretariat itself, new emphasis is being placed on recruiting talented young people into the international civil service. Maybe some of you will be interested in such a career.

I know very well, of course, that some people in your generation are very, very skeptical about institutions created by their elders. The United Nations is not immune to your skepticism, I'm sure, and it shouldn't be. I mentioned some of its problems and weaknesses, and I could list some more. It has done very little indeed to help solve the tragic problems of Vietnam and Southeast Asia. Its greatest single peacemaking effort today, in the Middle East, still hangs in the balance after more than 20 years. The UN is still today, as it has been from the beginning, no stronger than its 127 members, with all their age-old misunderstanding and distrust and different interests, are willing to see it become.

And let me assure you that distrust among nations is not something you can wave away with a magic wand. You have to work away at it, constantly talking and listening, constantly probing for new openings and hoping to find some new common ground even in the most difficult situations. In this game you don't have for perfect peace; you feel very lucky indeed if conflict can be kept short of violence and if new, limited programs of cooperation can be opened up. I am enough of an optimist to believe that as international programs of cooperation grow, embracing all these new fields of technology, and involving ordinary people from countries all over the world, nations will realize more and more what tremendous interests they have in common. And that realization will help to let the steam out of the dangerous conflicts and hatreds of the past.

Some young person here may be saying that hope isn't good enough, and that the United Nations itself isn't good enough. You have a right to that opinion, but I would ask you just one question as I conclude: Have you got a better idea?

* * * * *

YUGOSLAVIA

Brokaw reports the civil war has moved into Croatia's capital. Fighting was fierce, even though the ink still was wet on the latest in a series of cease-fire agreements. (CBS-6, NBC-9)

UN/FLAGS

Jennings reports the flags of seven new members were raised at the UN today. They belong to the three Baltic states, Micronesia, the Marshall Islands, South Korea and North Korea. (ABC-8)

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

Rather: A new veto showdown is shaping up between President Bush and those in Congress who want to help the unemployed. The issue: a bill passed by the House today that would provide jobless benefits to the long-term unemployed.

CBS's Susan Spencer: The Democratic bill declares unemployment an emergency, something Mr. Bush so far refuses to do, and is designed both to provide money for those long out of work and to provide as much embarrassment as possible for the President.

(Rep. AuCoin: "It's time, Mr. Chairman, that the people became one of this Administration's leading economic indicators. Let's put this bill back on George Bush's desk.")

But if this bill comes to his desk, Mr. Bush vows to veto it as a budget buster.

(TV coverage: President Bush at meeting.)

Democrats insist the priorities are all wrong.

(Rep. Downey: "We have in this House voted billions of dollars to bail out the savings and loans. We've helped the Kurds in Turkey. We've helped the Bangladeshis. It's time to help Americans.")

The bill would extend benefits up to 20 weeks for the estimated 3 million Americans whose checks have run out. Money would come from a surplus in the unemployment trust fund, and down the road, from an employer tax. That idea set off Republicans.

(Rep. Walker: "I would suggest that what this House ought to be considering today is ways of creating jobs, not ways of creating more spending and more taxes in order to fund people who have been victimized by Democratic spending in the past.")

But the White House today signalled it could accept a scaled-down version taking shape in the Senate.

(Chairman Boskin: "Sensible unemployment-insurance benefit extension that was fully paid for in an acceptable manner would be something that he would support.")

Of course, accepting any compromise would challenge Mr. Bush's continuing claim that the economic recovery is well under way.

Rather discusses the issue with Spencer:

Rather: President Bush has played it pretty hard and tough on this issue so far. Why might he be prepared to compromise now?

Spencer: Well, I think if unemployment doesn't start dropping soon, he may simply have no choice. And secondly, a compromise could look a lot more appealing than listening to Democrats go around the country charging that he cares more about people overseas than he cares about people here at home. And that's exactly what Democrats are prepared to do. (CBS-3)

Braver continues:

(Charles Lawrence, Stanford University: "He has been an eager spokesperson for the agenda of the radical right. One cannot help but wonder what this history of accommodation has done to Clarence Thomas' character. In always striving to please those who have been his benefactors, has he lost himself?")

Thomas also drew fire for refusing to back abortion rights.

(Patricia King, Georgetown University: "If women cannot control their own bodies, it is difficult, if not impossible, for them to fight for or enjoy the other rights to which they are entitled.") But the committee heard from plenty of Thomas supporters today, including the nun who taught him in eighth grade.

(Sister Mary Virgilius Reidy: "Judge Thomas has not forgotten his roots.")

And a college president.

(Niara Sudakasa, Lincoln University: "Judge Thomas looks at all sides of issues, when others might be content to examine only one.")

But perhaps the oddest support for Thomas came from the dean of his own law school, who disagrees with Thomas on many issues, but believes he'll change.

(Guido Calabresi, Yale University: "Many a justice has changed his mind dramatically since going on the court. I hope and believe that Judge Thomas has these qualities.")

For senators still sitting on the fence, that seemed cold comfort, especially when 43-year-old Clarence Thomas could sit on the Supreme Court for decades to come. (CBS-13)

IRAQ/CEASE-FIRE

Rather reports the U.S. has lodged a strong protest with Saddam Hussein about shots fired at U.S. aircraft from northern Iraq. Last Sunday, two American pilots reported seeing flashes of anti-aircraft fire as they were patrolling the skies in the operation to protect Kurds. Neither plane was said to be hit. (CBS-2)

BALTIC LEADERS

Rather reports President Bush met today with the presidents of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia. They're concerned about the presence of 30,000 Soviet troops in their nations. Bush said he will back their demand for a speedy withdrawal.

(TV coverage: President Bush with Baltic leaders.) (CBS-8)

SECRETARY BRADY/CHAIRMAN GREENSPAN

Jennings reports Secretary Brady and Chairman Greenspan arrived in Moscow tonight for high-level talks on the Soviet economy. They will try to discover how the U.S. can help. (CBS-9, ABC-9)

SOLZHENITSYN

Jennings reports exiled Soviet writer Alexander Solzhenitsyn says he is ready to go home, now that he no longer faces charges of treason. The chief Soviet prosecutor said there is no way the Nobel Prize winner ever betrayed the Soviet Union.

(CBS-7, NBC-4, ABC-10)



UNITED STATES MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS

PRESS RELEASE

799 UNITED NATIONS PLAZA
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10017

FOR RELEASE AT 6:30 P.M., EDT
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 16, 1971

Press Release USUN-85(71)
June 16, 1971

Address by Ambassador George Bush, United States Representative to the United Nations, at the Annual Dinner Inaugurating the 1971 National UN Day Program, New York Hilton, June 16, 1971.

* [Oliver Wendell Holmes put it this way -- "behind any scheme to make the world over lies the question, 'what kind of world do you want?'"

The men who shaped the UN Charter, fresh from the agonies of a devastating world war, had no trouble in giving their answer -- they wanted quite simply a world at peace or as the UN Charter puts it . . . "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind."

That was 25 years ago --

25 years of frustration --

A quarter of a century during which the failures of the UN have become crystal clear to the American people. Its successes have been much quieter -- less spectacular, sometimes obscure.

Let me outline for you what I'll bet many of your complaints are about at the UN.

First, that the UN is not reflective of the real world.

The biggest complaint has to do with the fact the General Assembly does not in its voting reflect the real world.

-- Not in popular representation.

-- Not in power.

-more-

BUSH

-8-

We at USUN and UNA desperately want you to feel a part of all of this. We want you to participate, to share in the grief and in the dreams as well. Carl Schurz put it this way.

"Ideals are like stars, you will not succeed in touching them with your hands, but like the seafaring man on the desert waters, you choose them as your guides, and, following them, you reach your destiny."

The ideals of the Charter are valid today.

What we need now is a rededication to reaching these ideals.

* * * * *

UNITED STATES DELEGATION
TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FOR RELEASE ON DELIVERY
CHECK TEXT AGAINST DELIVERY

Press Release USUN-152(72)
December 5, 1972

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR GEORGE BUSH, UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE
TO THE UNITED NATIONS, IN PLENARY, ON THE SITUATION IN THE
MIDDLE EAST, DECEMBER 5, 1972.

Mr. President:

Since the tragic war of 1967, a torrent of words on the Middle East has engulfed this and other U.N. chambers. Bitterness and invective have characterized many statements, and these have contributed little to finding the road to a durable peace.

For this reason the United States believed that unless there was a specific practical objective which clearly could have moved the area nearer to peace, it would have been wise to forego yet another debate and resolution on the Middle East at this General Assembly. Others did not agree, and the debate is on. It is now for us -- all of us -- to do our best to see that what emerges from this debate contributes directly to an improvement in the atmosphere in the Middle East and to the prospects for peacemaking, or, if this is not possible, to ensure that opportunities for diplomacy in the months ahead are not seriously set back.

Secretary Rogers outlined the views of my Government during the general debate. He cautioned that "the momentum toward a peace settlement must be regained..neither side has permanently closed the door to future diplomatic efforts. We believe that forces favoring a peaceful settlement still have the upper hand. Our task is to do everything possible to see that they are supported."

-more-

The basic framework for the long-sought peace has been in existence since 1967. So many pro forma and perfunctory references have been made to Security Council Resolution 242 in recent years that we tend to forget the landmark quality of that guideline to peace. It is a carefully balanced document, evolved with extraordinary care to address the concerns of the parties involved as well as to serve as a basis for reconciling interests and laying the foundation for a peaceful settlement which will endure. We would do well to bear always in mind that it is the essential agreed basis for United Nations peace efforts and that this body and all its members should be mindful of the need to preserve the negotiating asset that it represents.

The heart of this resolution is that a just and lasting peace in the Middle East should include the application of two -- not one, but two -- principles: withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the 1967 conflict; and termination of all claims or states of belligerency and respect for, and acknowledgment of, the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area, and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force.

Clearly, the inability of the countries in the area to move forward toward a settlement, despite determined efforts by a distinguished statesman, Ambassador Gunnar Jarring as the Secretary General's Special Representative, has resulted from varying interpretations of the principles contained in Resolution 242. The issues are complex, and have deep historical and emotional roots. While my Government regrets that more progress has not been made, we are also convinced that these difficulties are not insurmountable and that further efforts must be made to bring the benefits of a peaceful settlement to all the peoples of the Middle East. We know that each side is convinced of the justice of its cause and we know that each side is concerned about its future security. We believe that a political settlement, based on mutual accommodation, could assure both.

Mr. President, the United States Government and the American people have an important, substantial interest in maintaining peace in the Middle East, preserving the cultural heritage and political independence of all its peoples, and in helping to create stable conditions in which they may freely pursue their own material and social development. We attach great importance to our relations with all the states and peoples of the area -- relations which have deep and abiding roots. We are particularly pleased that in the last year cordial and fruitful relations have been reestablished between the United States and some Arab states. We on our part are determined to conduct ourselves in a manner which will contribute to this trend of improving relations with old friends.

For this reason we supported -- and continue to support -- Security Council Resolution 242 and the mission of Ambassador Jarring. For this reason we welcome -- and continue to welcome -- the establishment of a ceasefire in much of the area, which has reduced the lives and resources and has given time for constructive reflection on the future of the area.

-more-

BUSH

-3-

And what of that future? How is it to be assured in peace and harmony for the countries of the Middle East? We are still faced with the problem of the "how" -- "how" to get a reasonable process of discussion and accommodation under way, so that the peoples of that area may enjoy the benefits of a more tranquil environment?

All of us are aware that progress on the great political issues of our time has come slowly and -- in most cases -- in small steps or stages. My government has long been convinced that the most hopeful and practical means of initiating a reasonable process of discussion and accommodation on the Middle East was through practical, interim steps, such as those involved in the so-called interim Suez Canal agreement. The United States has publicly and privately indicated its willingness to play a role in helping the parties negotiate such an agreement if they so desire, and we remain available for this purpose.

Mr. President, the problems in the Middle East area are indeed complex and deeply rooted. But other problems around the world are also complex, or the product of deep historical, cultural or political divisions.

For our part, we are negotiating with the Soviet Union on the complex matter of nuclear arms and other matters. We have taken the first steps toward reducing two decades of accumulated tensions between us and the People's Republic of China. We are talking to North Vietnam about peace in Southeast Asia.

In Central Europe, the Federal Republic of Germany initiated a process that has led to the initialing of a basic treaty with the German Democratic Republic and to improved relations with the other neighbors to the East. The countries of North America and Europe are now engaged in a process of discussion of the issues that have divided Europe for almost three decades.

Others have not been inactive in trying to bridge old animosities. Parties to the Cyprus dispute are participating in intercommunal talks. In South Asia, discussions are continuing among countries who only one year ago were engaged in active hostilities. In Korea, representatives from both sides of the armistice line are engaged in exploring the prospects for greater peace and stability on their peninsula.

It seems to us that all members of this Organization have a strong interest in getting such processes started also on the problem of the Middle East. President Nixon recently indicated that a peaceful settlement in the Middle East will have a high priority for the United States.

-more-

BUSH

-4-

The guidelines for negotiations between the parties have already been established in Security Council Resolution 242. This Assembly must preserve the measure of agreement that already underlies this resolution. It cannot seek to redefine the essentials for peace in the Middle East. It cannot seek to impose courses of action on the countries directly concerned, either by making new demands or by favoring the proposals or positions of one side or the other. These approaches simply will not work and may in fact endanger the relative calm that has existed since 1970.

This Assembly must instead ensure that its conclusions will reinforce the willingness of all parties in the months ahead to enter into a diplomatic process which alone can lead to the just and lasting settlement which is our common objective.

* * * *

The question of my lack of professional diplomatic experience came up. If I were to replace Yost, a career diplomat, there was sure to be criticism. But the fact was that most U.S. envoys up to that point, like Austin, Lodge, and Arthur Goldberg (and since that time, Pat Moynihan, Andrew Young, Jeane Kirkpatrick, and Vernon Walters) hadn't been diplomatic careerists.

My reading from the meeting was that having no diplomatic experience—other than overseas contacts as a businessman—wouldn't stand in the way of my being considered for the job. Nixon viewed the U.N. as a forum for world opinion. To him, the U.S. ambassador's job was as much a political as a diplomatic assignment. That made my political experience an asset, not a liability in his eyes.

The announcement of my appointment came December 11, 1970. Reaction started coming in immediately. The news was well received on Capitol Hill (with one exception, Senator Adlai Stevenson III, who waited three months, until the day before I took office, to say I was "totally unqualified" and my appointment "an insult" to the U.N.).

Editorially, most response was favorable. The Pittsburgh *Post-Gazette* liked it ("In naming [Bush], President Nixon has done more than provide for a lame-duck Congressman. He has also found a man with the interest and capacity to fill an important job with distinction.") But the *Star* and *New York Times* didn't ("[T]here seems to be nothing in his record that qualifies him for this highly important position.")

Which leads to the second thing to be said for going into a job with skeptics doubting you can do it: It gets my competitive instincts going. They laid down a challenge. I was determined to prove them wrong.

Like most Americans who had idealistic hopes for the United Nations when it was created in 1945, I'd undergone a sea change in attitude by the early 1970s. As "the last best hope for peace" the U.N. was another light that failed.

What many Americans find hard to accept is that even if it doesn't live up to its original expectations, the U.N. still

serves a valuable purpose. It may be largely ineffective—and sometimes counterproductive—in the political area. But U.N. peace-keeping forces have performed well, from Korea in the early 1950s to the Middle East in the 1970s and '80s. And the organization's efforts in science, medicine, agriculture, and space technology—not to mention its humanitarian work providing for refugees and feeding the hungry—have been indispensable.

Nevertheless, when I reported to work as U.S. ambassador in early March, 1971, after intense briefings, I had no illusions about the U.N.'s limitations or my role as America's chief representative at the "glass palace." I was there as an advocate—not an apologist—for my country's policies. As I told *Houston Post* reporter Fred Bonavita at the end of my first full day on the job, "I've hit the ground running."

And I had . . . right into a stone wall named Yakov Malik.

I'd remembered Yakov Malik as the poker-faced, unbending Soviet spokesman at the United Nations Security Council during the Korean war years, when Security Council debates were regularly shown on television. Malik was one of the early Cold War Russian diplomats who made the word "nyet" known to the English-speaking world. He continually used a Big Power veto to block any U.N. action opposed by the Soviets.

It was Malik's walkout at the U.N. in 1950 that allowed the organization to pass the resolution—without veto—that made the defense of the Republic of Korea an international, not just an American undertaking.

More than twenty years later, Malik was once again at the U.N., his hair now white but the man himself unchanged, as I learned at our first official meeting.

The Russians have a predictable style of greeting newcomers to the international scene, whether U.S. Presidents or ambassadors. They test the newcomer, sometimes deliberately provoking a confrontation to see what reaction they'll get.

I'd hardly settled into my office after presenting my

wise, nothing had changed. I was still working overtime to prove myself in a new job. *Could a Texas oilman-politician make it as U.S. ambassador to the United Nations?*

There are two things to be said for going into a job with skeptics all around doubting you can do it and asking why you were ever appointed.

First you have nowhere to go but up. A "lame-duck Congressman with little experience in foreign affairs and less in diplomacy" won't be expected to launch any great peace initiatives.

But having said that, why *was* I picked for what the *Star* called "the nation's highest ambassadorial post?" For the same reason most U.S. ambassadors to the U.N. before me were picked—political reasons that weren't likely to raise any eyebrows among experienced "U.N. watchers" or on Capitol Hill.

It's always been understood that the U.N. is a diplomatic pulpit, and every President since Harry Truman has wanted his own foreign-policy sermon delivered by his ambassador there. During the early days of the Cold War, Truman's man at the U.N. was Warren Austin, one of the President's friends and former colleagues in the U.S. Senate.

President Eisenhower named one of his original political backers, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., who'd lost his Senate seat to John F. Kennedy, as his U.N. spokesman. To upgrade the job, Ike gave Lodge Cabinet status.

When Kennedy became President, he viewed the U.N. job as a means of solving a political problem. Kennedy named an articulate spokesman in Adlai Stevenson, but JFK's real purpose was to deny Stevenson the job he really wanted, Secretary of State. Kennedy, wrote Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., "privately questioned Stevenson's capacity for decision and no doubt also did not want a Secretary of State with whom he feared he might not feel personally comfortable."^{*}

The politics behind my appointment began with President Nixon wanting me to run for the Senate against Ralph Yarborough in 1970. In our first conversation on the subject,

^{*} Schlesinger, *A Thousand Days: John F. Kennedy in the White House*.

he said he recognized that I'd have to give up a safe House seat to do it, but after the election he planned some Cabinet changes, and if I lost the race I'd be considered for a high post.

My answer was that if I decided to run against Yarborough it would be because I wanted to do it, and the President wouldn't be obligated, regardless of the outcome. What's more, I told him, I didn't plan to lose to Yarborough. And, of course, I didn't, losing to Bentsen instead.

Not long after the election, H. R. Haldeman, the White House chief of staff, telephoned my Longworth Building office and asked me to come by the White House. Haldeman was a strong chief of staff, who precisely reflected the thinking of the man he worked for. When he talked, you knew you were listening to the President. He told me Nixon was moving forward with some major Cabinet changes. My name had come up in connection with the United Nations job.

Nixon was looking for someone to replace U.N. Ambassador Charles Yost, a holdover from the Johnson administration. Yost had run a low-profile U.S. diplomatic mission in New York. But going into the last two years of his term—and gearing up for his 1972 re-election campaign—the President wanted his own people around at Cabinet meetings. Yost ran a nonpartisan office but was a Democrat. I had the feeling that he wasn't entirely happy with Nixon's policies, and I knew that Nixon wasn't happy with Yost's handling of the U.N. job.

Sitting in Haldeman's choice office in the west wing, the chief of staff and I discussed what the White House would be looking for in a U.N. ambassador. Obviously someone who didn't overestimate his role: the U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, while working closely with the White House and State Department, doesn't make policy, he carries it out. I commented that even if somebody who took the job didn't understand that, Henry Kissinger would give him a twenty-four-hour crash course on the subject. But I added that a U.N. ambassador should have input into policy and access to the President in order to be effective. Haldeman agreed.

credentials to U.N. Secretary U Thant when my deputy, Christopher Phillips, came in to report that Malik had called for a special meeting of the Big Four ambassadors—Sir Colin Crowe of Britain, Jacques Kosciusko-Morizet of France, Malik, and me—to take up the issue of immediate Israeli withdrawal from Arab territory occupied during the 1967 Six-Day War. The issue was already on the U.N. emergency agenda, but Malik chose this particular time to push for quicker action.

No sooner had the session begun than Malik launched into a harangue, accusing the United States of taking orders from Israel on the withdrawal question. I said that the charge was too ridiculous to deserve an extended reply, adding that the Soviets couldn't be too serious about wanting a Middle East peace settlement if that was the way they went about it.

It was my initiation ceremony, Malik's way of saying "Welcome to the world of diplomacy."

As chief representative of the host country, I'd get more than my share of Soviet-style diplomacy during my years as a U.N. ambassador. Malik was on the phone constantly with some protest about the Russians being inconvenienced or harassed by U.S. citizens.

Sometimes, even when the complaint was legitimate, the Soviets had a way of pushing their point too far.

For example, there was an ugly incident when a shot was fired into an apartment in the Soviet mission. I was at a dinner with the Belgians when a call came in from our mission, reporting what had happened. Together with Dick Combs, one of our Soviet experts, I headed for the scene. We were greeted by one of their KGB people. He rushed us to the eleventh floor, then into the room, where he showed us the damage. A window was shattered, the bullet having creased the refrigerator and entered the wall. A hard-bitten New York City detective was closely examining the bullet hole in the wall.

Then, after showing me the terrified family that lived in the apartment, the person in charge—it wasn't Malik, but someone down the line—tore into me, claiming that this was

a deliberate provocation that couldn't possibly have happened without our complicity.

By that time I'd adopted a routine policy of taking the offensive in dealing with outrageous Soviet charges. "That's untrue and you know it," I said (though he probably didn't, since "incidents" don't happen in Russia without government knowledge). Then, pointing to the detective taking fragment samples from the wall, I added, "You see that officer there? He's America's best ballistics expert. We've assigned him to the case because we intend to find out who did this and bring whoever it is to justice."

That seemed to placate the Russian. It couldn't have displeased the New York City detective, either, though I'd never seen him before in my life.

But the essential fact was that the New York police were on the case. Not long after, they made an arrest, charging a member of the Jewish Defense League with possession of the rifle used in the shooting.

In that case the suspect was released by the courts, but the Jewish Defense League was involved in other violent incidents during my term at the U.N. I could sympathize with their cause—protesting the persecution of Soviet Jews—but made it clear to the JDL's leader, Rabbi Meir Kahane, that I didn't think he served that cause well.

Kahane had appeared at the U.S. Mission one day, demanding to see me. I was about to leave for the U.N. building. Some members of my staff, noting that Kahane was an expert at provoking headline-making confrontations, suggested we go out the back way. I decided against it.

As I moved toward the front door, Kahane, waiting in the reception area, stood up to block my way.

"Why won't you talk to me?" he demanded. "All I want is a dialogue."

"Because I've seen your idea of a dialogue—those shots fired into the Soviet embassy," I told him as I headed toward the street, "and I don't condone your group's violence any more than violence directed at Jews by Arab terrorists."

One of the worst of these Arab terrorist acts, the murder of Israeli athletes at the Munich Olympics, led to my casting the second American veto in U.N. history, against a

1972 Security Council resolution that condemned Israel for attacking Palestinian bases in Syria and Lebanon but failed to condemn the Munich atrocity that led to the attack.

It was a one-sided, irresponsible resolution, typical of what was happening to the U.N. As Third World countries attained a majority in the General Assembly, baiting the West—particularly the United States—became the order of the day. Meanwhile, this country continued to pick up nearly one third of the total U.N. budget, a fact that President Nixon never failed to note when some new incident of U.S. baiting occurred.

In the fall of 1971, the United States suffered its most serious setback in the General Assembly—up to that time—when the Third World majority voted to expel our Taiwanese allies from the United Nations. As U.S. ambassador I led the lobbying effort to permit Taiwan to keep its U.N. seat as part of what was called the “Dual Representation” plan.

The plan originated when it became clear that the United States could no longer muster the votes needed to keep the General Assembly from recognizing the Beijing (then Peking) government as the official representative of the Chinese people. Our “Dual Representation” policy was a fallback position. It accepted the inevitable—Beijing’s entry into the U.N.—while still maintaining our country’s commitment to our friends in Taiwan.

The actual vote came on a procedural question. Our lobbying was intense among U.N. delegates from Latin American, African, and Asian countries. On the other side, Communist and other anti-Western states lobbied equally hard in favor of Taiwan’s expulsion. For a while our delegate head count showed we had the votes to win; but in the event, on October 25, 1971, what we thought were committed votes turned into abstentions. Some delegates who’d promised their support didn’t show up. The final count was 59–55, with 15 countries abstaining. To this day I still remember the countries that promised to vote with us, then broke their word.

After that procedural vote, the General Assembly went on to admit the Beijing government and expel Taiwan by a

sizeable margin. It was a turning point in the history of the U.N., the first time the anti-Western bloc (including Communist countries) had defeated the U.S. when American prestige was on the line. For some delegates—who literally danced in the aisles when the vote was announced—Taiwan wasn’t really the issue. Kicking Uncle Sam was.

The mark of the professional diplomat is never to let personal feelings affect the way one looks at the job. I wasn’t a professional, however. Sitting there in the U.S. ambassador’s chair, I could feel not only bitterness but disgust at the scene taking place. One of the governments that had helped found the U.N.—the Republic of China—had been expelled from the international community, and the event was being celebrated on the floor of the General Assembly. If this was “the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world,” then the world was in deeper trouble than I thought.

A short while before, when it became apparent that Taiwan’s days at the U.N. had run out, I let personal feelings take over as I saw Liu Chiegh, the Taiwan ambassador, walk out of the hall with his delegation for the last time. Leaving my chair, I caught him before he reached the door, put an arm on his shoulder, and expressed regrets for what had happened. He felt he’d been betrayed by the organization his country had helped found and supported over the years.

From Liu’s perspective, the United States hadn’t done all it could to support the Taiwan government. America’s position regarding his country’s status was changing. The U.S. delegation had worked hard to get a “Dual Representation” policy through the General Assembly, but in the end it was a different kind of “Dual Representation” policy—Washington’s ambivalence on the question of recognizing Beijing—that had undercut the case we tried to make to save Taiwan.

In the summer of 1971, Henry Kissinger had made the secret visit to Beijing that first signaled the change in U.S. policy. Then, not long before the debate on Taiwan’s status in the General Assembly, Washington announced that President Nixon would visit China in 1972.

The news was seen in the White House and State De-

partment as a historic breakthrough. But at the operational level of U.S. policy in the U.N., we were asking neutral nations to stand firm against Beijing, while softening our own policy toward Mao's regime.

Despite my personal feelings about Taiwan's expulsion, the long-range wisdom of having the People's Republic of China in the U.N. and of opening diplomatic contacts with Beijing was obvious. I understood what the President and Henry Kissinger were trying to accomplish. What was harder to understand was Henry's telling me he was "disappointed" by the final outcome of the Taiwan vote. So was I. But given the fact that we were saying one thing in New York and doing another in Washington, that outcome was inevitable.

The delegation from the People's Republic of China arrived in New York City in their drab gray Mao jackets* on November 11. It was my first direct exposure to the Communist Chinese. I was in for some geopolitical surprises.

It came as no surprise when the P.R.C.'s Deputy Foreign Minister, Qiao Guanhua, denounced the United States in his first formal address to the U.N. General Assembly. But while knowing that the two Communist powers had serious differences, I didn't appreciate the antagonism the Chinese felt toward the Russians, until he spent an equal amount of time denouncing the Soviet Union. A cartoon appeared in the next day's paper showing Malik and me at our desks, grimacing while Qiao dumped a bucket of rice over both our heads.

Qiao's speech was only the beginning of my education into the true state of Chinese-Soviet relations, however. The

* Actually, "Sun" jackets, after Sun Yat-sen, the father of modern China. A few years later, when I was U.S. envoy to Beijing, I made some mention of "Mao jackets" and was corrected by a Chinese, who quickly informed me that Sun, not Mao, was the first to wear them. The fact that both the Taiwan government and Beijing government claimed Sun as the founder of their movements points up the complexity of Chinese politics and the danger of trying to jump to easy conclusions about Chinese policy and intentions at any given time.

real surprise—that they merely disliked us, but despised the Russians—came when China's U.N. ambassador, Huang Hua, attended his first informal session of the five permanent members of the Security Council.

The session took place at the apartment of the French ambassador, Jacques Kosciusko-Morizet. Huang Hua and I had already met in one of those carefully planned scenarios laid out by State Department protocol experts. Because the United States didn't formally recognize the Beijing government, my meeting with representatives of the P.R.C. would have to appear casual, not preplanned.

I seated myself in the U.N. delegate's lounge, at a place where Qiao Guanhua and Huang Hua would have to pass on their way in. Then, as they came by, I rose, extended my hand, and introduced myself—cordially but not effusively.

They each shook my hand, cordially but not effusively. The "spontaneous" introductions over, we went our ways; but it was important that the Chinese ambassador and I talk to each other occasionally, because our two countries, despite having no formal diplomatic relations, had areas of common interest.

Now Kosciusko-Morizet, having greeted Huang Hua at the door of his apartment, was ushering him into the living room, where Sir Colin Crowe, Yakov Malik, and I were waiting. Huang was introduced to Sir Colin, shook his hand, then to me, and shook my hand. Then Malik held out his hand. I saw Huang Hua put his hand forward; but on hearing the words "Soviet ambassador," he jerked it back, pivoted, and walked away.

The insult couldn't have been more calculated. Huang knew before he came that Malik would be there. He was giving the Russian a strong taste of the medicine Malik liked to dish out on meeting newcomers—except that the Chinese weren't merely probing to see how far they could push the Russians. I realized Huang's act was a deliberate, open display to the other major powers that the Chinese considered Soviet "hegemony"—even more than American "imperialism"—the greatest threat to their country's security.

Malik, his hand extended in midair, turned a livid shade of purple. It was as if Huang had struck him with the

back of his hand. At that moment—it couldn't have been more than a few seconds, though it seemed longer—the tension in the room was impossible to describe. Not a word, just heavy breathing. Then our French host, in full flap, moved rapidly toward the dining room, waving and calling out, "*Allons, allons*, let's begin the meeting."

The five of us took our places at the table—the two Communist ambassadors seated a safe distance from each other—and we went on to have a relatively civil discussion. But years later, when I was sent to Beijing as U.S. envoy, the impact of that meeting stayed with me.

The last time an ambassador had refused to shake hands with a Soviet diplomat had been when Henry Cabot Lodge turned away from Foreign Minister Andrei Vishinsky in the 1950s, at the height of American-Russian Cold War tensions. What I learned in the French ambassador's living room was that no matter what the state of détente between the United States and the Soviets, there was another Cold War taking place in the world—one between the world's two biggest Communist powers.

Dad had been on vacation in Maine when he developed a cough that he didn't seem to be able to shake. He was finally persuaded to go to Sloan-Kettering's Memorial Hospital in New York for a thorough checkup. The diagnosis was lung cancer. He didn't despair, but the disease spread rapidly.

Mother stayed with us at the ambassador's residence in the Waldorf-Astoria, spending most of her time at Dad's bedside. He died October 8, 1972. It was a real blow for me, for all his children. We had lost a best friend.

I served as U.S. ambassador to the United Nations until January 1973. On leaving to return to Washington, I was asked by a reporter whether my experience there had changed my opinion of the organization.

My answer—then and now—was yes. It made me more critical of the U.N. than I'd been before, seeing its flaws and

limitations firsthand, but also more supportive, because I'd seen what the organization can do in humanitarian, social, and other areas, where ideological differences can be held to a minimum.

Politically the U.N. is and always will be a reflection of, rather than a solution to, the tensions that exist in the world. I remember the most compelling speech made to the Security Council during the 1971 session. It was delivered by Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, then the Deputy Prime Minister of Pakistan, who'd flown to New York City to ask for U.N. action to stop the Indian invasion of East Pakistan.

Bhutto made an impassioned appeal, but it was futile. What I was watching reminded me of the dismal scene at the League of Nations in 1936, when Haile Selassie flew to Geneva to ask for help when his country had been invaded by Mussolini's Italy.

The members of the League of Nations had sat on their hands in 1936. Now, in 1971, the members of the United Nations, called on to stop a war between two member states, were sitting on their hands.

"Here you are," said Bhutto as he concluded his speech, "here you are with your three wines and your grand dinners, and your '*Oui, monsieur*' and '*Non, monsieur*,' while my country is being ripped asunder by war." And with that he dramatically picked up the yellow sheets he'd been reading from and tore them to pieces, letting the paper shreds fall onto the table—at which point Israel Byne Taylor-Kamara of Sierra Leone, the presiding officer of the Security Council, as if to underscore Bhutto's message, stirred awake to say, "We thank the distinguished gentleman from Pakistan for his most helpful remarks."

Clearly, the United Nations has much to be said for it, but it still has a long way to go before it can ever achieve its early promise as "the world's last best hope for peace."

The President wanted to see me at Camp David. When the call came in, I knew our days in New York City were drawing to a close.

full disclosure of everything we owned and owed. Then I introduced an Ethics and Disclosure resolution in the House.

Q: *What happened to it?*

GB: The same thing that happens to most bills introduced by freshmen in Congress. It didn't get very far. But ethics is a nonpartisan issue that won't go away—one of the issues of the 1980s, more important than ever. Scams on Wall Street, scams in government—it's up to Washington to set the ethical standard for the country. I'm a great believer in Grover Cleveland's maxim "a public office is a public trust."

Q: *Your next job was at the U.N. Any recommendations there?*

GB: I start with the idea that for all its shortcomings, the U.N. serves a valuable purpose at the agency level, working on problems like agriculture, the environment, and health. But because votes in the General Assembly are influenced by regional grouping and bloc voting, U.N. resolutions tend to be irrelevant. One recommendation, if the money were available, is for the General Assembly meetings to be rotated to different parts of the world, every so often first in New York City, then, say, Moscow. Operating in the political environment of the Soviet Union at regular intervals might be just the tonic needed for U.N. diplomats like those who used to call me at all hours to criticize New York.

Another recommendation: When I left that job, I wrote a memorandum to President Nixon, advising that the U.S. ambassador to the U.N. shouldn't have full cabinet status. Let me explain why. President Eisenhower elevated the job to Cabinet level in order to give his ambassador, Henry Cabot Lodge, greater stature. It looked like a good idea on paper. But in practice this creates unnecessary tension with the Secretary of State. As a full Cabinet member, a U.N. ambassador is perceived as having equal status with the Secretary of

State—not working under him but directly under the President. The result was that on occasion I'd get one policy direction from the State Department; then a little while later Henry Kissinger, the NSC adviser, would call from the White House invoking the President's name, to tell me to ignore the State Department's instructions and do something else. Foreign policy is risky enough without having two conflicting voices in the Cabinet, talking to the world in two different ways. Our ambassador to the U.N. ought to report to the Secretary of State and the President, the way other ambassadors do.

Q: *You mentioned foreign policy. Let's get specific. Any recommendations or thoughts about U.S.-China relations, based on your experience there?*

GB: Yes, our relations with China are important in their own right, not in terms of what some have called a "card" in the U.S.-Soviet relations. There has to be a peaceful resolution to the Taiwan question, of course, but tensions in that area aren't as great now as they were in past years. Beyond that, there's every reason our relations with China should grow and prosper in the years ahead because it is important to both our countries, strategically, culturally, and economically.

Q: *Your last stop before the vice presidency was the CIA. Any added thoughts about covert actions, in light of Iran-Contra?*

GB: It's hard for people in a free society to accept the fact that covert action is often necessary for a world power to survive. An American President faced with a potential threat to national security should have some alternative between doing nothing and waiting for a crisis to blow up in our face. The answer is covert action—but it has to be conducted along strictly legal guidelines. When I was CIA director, I helped put President Ford's executive order governing covert actions into effect. That order provides for congressional oversight of covert activities. The order also makes clear that the

FROM JOHN BOLTON

President's Speech to the UN

I am happy to be here before you today. Indeed, I can not think of a single General Assembly in the history of the U.N. which I would have addressed with greater pleasure and pride.

The world has changed immensely in the three years since I was inaugurated president of the United States -- and most of those changes have been to the good. There is a new wave of freedom sweeping over the world. In virtually every corner of the world, repressive governments have been swept aside by this tide. In their place have sprung up democracies -- fragile democracies, admittedly, which must be nurtured in order to withstand the daunting difficulties they confront. But democracies nonetheless, affirming the rights of the individual, while truly responding to the collective will of the people.

The changes of the past three years have also brought to an end the superpower rivalry which had poisoned the international scene for generations. The elimination of this rivalry has in turn made it possible for the United Nations to assume its proper role on the world stage -- the role envisaged by its founders over 45 years ago. At that time, the founding nations set out a series of goals for the new organization:

- saving mankind from the scourge of war;
- reaffirming faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person;
- promoting respect for international law; and
- contributing to mankind's social progress and material prosperity in freedom.

These are lofty goals, but goals which the U.N. has worked constructively towards in recent months.

A little over a year ago, all the progress which had been made in constructing a safer, more peaceful world was threatened -- threatened by a megalomaniac who ruthlessly invaded and occupied a smaller neighbor. In times past, the U.N.'s response to such a provocation likely would have been tentative and indecisive. This time, however, the response was clear and unequivocal -- the U.N. would not let naked aggression go unpunished. This message will doubtless be remembered by future dictators who covet the territory of others -- as well as by those who seek the rule of international law.

Even after suffering an enormous military rout, Saddam Hussein continues to act as if he believes he can outlast the

- 1 -

will of the international community expressed in Security Council Resolution 687. This mandatory resolution, among other things requires Iraq to divulge all aspects of its programs to develop and produce nuclear, chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction, and that these weapons, along with ballistic missiles capable of delivering them on innocent civilian populations throughout the Middle East, be destroyed. Iraq must understand that it is required to do this and that the international community will insist that it is done.

We are entering a period of unprecedented hope for the future of mankind. The material progress which the world has seen throughout this century is finally being matched by spiritual progress. The shadow of totalitarianism is being lifted from large portions of the globe. In this regard, I must pay special tribute to the brave people of the Soviet Union and their legitimate leaders. By defeating an isolated gang of coup makers who would have plunged their great nation back into the darkness of Stalinism, the Soviet people brought hope to oppressed people everywhere.

If the promise of this moment is to be fulfilled, however, the U.N. must play an active and constructive role. From the sands of the Sahara to the jungles of Central America, the U.N. has shown itself willing to shoulder its appropriate share of the burden in building a safer, saner world.

To translate this willingness into solid accomplishments will, however, be difficult. We will have to broaden and strengthen the spirit of cooperation which allowed the U.N. to respond so effectively to Saddam's invasion of Kuwait and to the suffering of Iraqi Kurds and Shiites after the war. We will have to continue our efforts to reform and streamline the U.N. bureaucracy, eliminating the waste and duplication which have hamstrung this great organization's efforts. We will have to weed out the anachronistic, confrontational attitudes which continue to be common in much of the committee work of the General Assembly and in the Specialized Agencies. Perhaps most important, we will have to find the most capable, dedicated individual possible to replace my good friend and respected colleague, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar.

Before I turn to some of the more specific challenges facing the U.N, I would like to discuss two of the more important functions which the U.N can fulfill in helping us all to build a safer and more just world -- peacekeeping and electoral assistance.

PEACEKEEPING

- 2 -

The world in the last few years has seen the increasing value of United Nations peacekeeping operations. The number of peacekeeping missions has grown tremendously and many of the missions have fulfilled their mandate with startling success.

Still, not every conflict situation is amenable to UN intervention. In most instances, regional organizations should take the lead in trying to resolve local conflicts. In this regard, I pay tribute to the efforts of the EC and the CSCE to help the Yugoslavs work out their problems. More generally, the UN cannot become involved without the full agreement of the parties concerned, and their unreserved commitment to a peaceful situation.

Unfortunately, we still see conflicts in which these basic conditions for a UN role are not met.

DEMOCRACY AND UN ELECTORAL ASSISTANCE

In recent years we have witnessed the resurgence and strengthening of democracy on all continents. As an expression of UN Charter values, as well as the fundamental freedoms set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, these transitions renew our hopes for a peaceful world. Authoritarian governments, history shows us, are more likely to be aggressive than democratic ones.

With sensitivity toward local needs and conditions, the UN has demonstrated its expertise in observing elections in various countries. Electoral assistance to Haiti made possible an historic peaceful and democratic transfer of power.

Now we have reached a critical juncture. The United Nations has the opportunity to further worldwide democratization. I proposed at the 45th General Assembly to structure more formally the UN role with respect to electoral assistance; many share our view that electoral assistance activities--at the request of the Member State--will become a new UN priority.

We look forward to receiving the Secretary-General's report on suitable approaches which will permit the organization to respond to requests from member states for assistance in the conduct of free and fair elections.

I would now like to turn to some of the specific issues confronting the U.N.:

- 3 -

MIDDLE EAST:

We are encouraged by the growing acceptance of the idea of an international Middle East peace conference. We hope that all parties can come to an agreement, based on UNSC resolutions 242 and 338, that will bring peace to this strife-torn region.

IRAQ:

We are justly proud of the massive and successful response by the u.n. to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait and, later, to the dire need of Iraqis fleeing the brutality of Saddam Hussein's

regime. I salute all those who participated in Operation Provide Comfort. I congratulate the Secretary General and his executive delegate Sadruddin Aga Khan for their tireless efforts to bring relief and comfort to all vulnerable groups in Iraq. We remind Iraq that it must comply with the resolutions of the UNSC, and with all of its freely undertaken obligations. Saddam Hussein should stop his efforts to deceive and mislead his people and the UNSC. He should comply fully and completely with the letter and spirit of UNSC res 687, and surrender all of his weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles.

The task of establishing a stable peace in the Gulf region is, however, not yet complete. Iraq still holds Kuwaiti citizens and it has blatantly violated the provisions of UNSC Resolutions 687, cynically attempting to conceal and preserve its capability to produce weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles. These violations alone affirm the need to maintain strict sanctions against the Iraqi regime. Iraq's treatment of the Shia in the South, its failure to come to agreement with the Kurds in the North and its willful diversion of food from vulnerable groups throughout Iraq attest to the need for tight UN control over any new humanitarian assistance reaching Iraq. This control is indispensable if help is to reach the truly needy.

In the aftermath of the Gulf crisis, the states in the region are beginning the work of building their own arrangements to assure the future peace and stability of their region. We applaud their efforts and pledge to assist at their request.

DISARMAMENT:

- 4 -

Iraq's blatant attempts to conceal from the Security Council the true nature and extent of its programs to build weapons of mass destruction highlight the need for stronger measures in all areas of arms control. Both the UNSC and IAEA need to ponder and act on the lessons from Iraq's willful violations of its obligations under NPT and IAEA safeguards agreement. The US supports the proposal made by UK PM Major and Japan PM Kaifu for the creation of an international conventional arms transfer registry, patterned after the annual reports now made made by member states to the UN of defense budgets. We also set great store by the efforts of the UNGA-endorsed, Geneva-based Conference on Disarmament as it seeks to bring to a rapid conclusion the draft comprehensive Chemical Weapons Convention.

CYPRUS:

Under UN mediation, talks to bring about political stability and reunify the divided island and nation of Cyprus are beginning to bear fruit.

ASIA:

It's time for the Cambodians to end their 16 year war. The P5 plan provides a workable framework for progress. The establishment of a viable Supreme National Council (SNC) in Cambodia is a significant step on the path to the establishment of a representative government. We seek continued adherence to the framework agreed to by the Perm five.

We heartily welcome both Koreas to this Assembly. We also welcome the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands. We are proud that the U.S. administration of these two former UN Trust Territories helped them to now become member states of the UN.

LATIN AMERICA:

ONUSAL, created to oversee the forthcoming cease-fire and monitor human rights in El Salvador, has begun its deployment. We are confident that the UN-monitored talks between the GOES and the FMLN will resume shortly. We salute the commitment by the Secretary General to become personally involved in these difficult -- but important -- negotiations. We urge both sides to rapidly conclude work on a cease-fire agreement and on guidelines for the reintegration of the FMLN into Salvadoran society.

- 5 -

AFRICA:

UNAVEM has begun monitoring the ceasefire in Angola as that country prepares for free and fair elections. If UNAVEM successfully carries out its mandate, it will have helped end a bitter civil war which has brought untold suffering to an entire generation of Angolans.

Regarding the Western Sahara, the US has, along with the other permanent members of the Security Council as well as other UN members, agreed to participate in MINURSO, where the UN will prepare and conduct the referendum that will determine, peacefully, the status of the Western Sahara. This is yet another example where the UN has responded to a call for a peaceful alternative to international conflict.

Having eliminated the legal basis for apartheid, South Africa is looking to rejoin the community of nations. A strong example of this new inclination is Pretoria's signing of the NPT. By so doing, South Africa foreswore the possibility of developing or owning nuclear weapons, an important step towards the creation of a genuinely nuclear weapons free Africa. We also welcome the progress made by all parties in South Africa to establish a climate for negotiations leading to a democratic, non-racial government. The UN should recognize and encourage this process.

FOURTH COMMITTEE:

We hope that the committee on decolonization and non-self-governing territories will along with the rest of the UN system reject rhetoric in favor of constructive dialog and action. We note with particular dismay that, in contravention of previous General Assembly resolutions, the Committee continues to raise the issue of Puerto Rico .

- 6 -

ELEMENTS FOR THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH

Repeal the Zionism is Racism Resolution

-- We believe strongly that it is time to repeal General Assembly Resolution 3379, the odious resolution which equates Zionism with racism. Based on a despicable lie, this resolution has seriously undercut the moral authority of the U.N.

New Secretary General

-- We attach great importance to the search for a new Secretary General. We seek the most capable, dedicated individual possible, irrespective of his or her country of origin.

-- Most important, the new Secretary General will have to be able and willing to implement the reforms necessary to lead the U.N. into the 21st century.

Unitary U.N.

-- The U.N. system as a whole desperately needs reform and restructuring.

-- We believe that the concept of the unitary U.N. provides the best vehicle for reform of the organization. The U.N. system of organizations should be treated as a coherent whole, with each organization having assigned roles in carrying out programs consistent with their respective charters. Such an approach would lead to the elimination of an enormous amount of waste and duplication within the system.

-- We do not seek greater central control by the U.N. bureaucracy. Rather, member states must play a more active role in preventing the proliferation of overlapping programs.

-- We hope that a large number of member states will join us in endorsing the truth and eliminating this resolution.

Arms control

-- We warmly endorse the efforts of our close friends, the EC and Japan, to establish a U.N. arms transfer registry. We will work closely with them to ensure the passage of a resolution designed to bring needed transparency to the global arms trade.

Election Assistance

-- We believe that the U.N. can play an important role in furthering democratization around the globe by providing electoral assistance to those countries which specifically

- 7 -

request it. We look forward to the Secretary General's report on U.N. electoral assistance and hope to work with other member states in sponsoring an appropriate resolution on the topic.

→ For Joe
Duggan

John R. Bolton

Current
Policy
No. 1191

91 SEP 18 1991 The Concept of the "Unitary UN"



United States Department of State
Bureau of Public Affairs
Washington, D.C.

Following is an address by John R. Bolton, Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs, before the Geneva Group consultative-level meeting, Geneva, June 29, 1989.

It is a special pleasure for me to participate in this my first meeting of the Geneva Group consultative level. This forum, especially through the 1980s, has provided an important and useful opportunity for exchanging views and coming to conclusions on budgetary, financial, and administrative issues affecting the organizations of the UN system. I look forward to working with all of you in continuing our efforts to assure that the significant resources, we as a group invest in the UN system, are put to good use.

Together, the members of the Geneva Group represent over 70% of the contributions to the assessed budgets of the UN system. Were we to add our voluntary contributions to the extra-budgetary activities of the UN agencies, and to the operational programs such as UNDP [UN Development Program], UNICEF [UN Children's Fund], UNHCR [UN High Commissioner for Refugees], and the WFP [World Food Program], the percentage would be at least as high. It is incumbent on members of the Geneva Group to fulfill our responsibilities to our taxpayers and to other members of the organizations by continuing to provide the leadership required for adapting the UN system to its growing responsibilities. With

your indulgence, I will take a few moments at the opening of the meeting to discuss with you our concept of the "unitary United Nations."

"The unitary United Nations concept provides us with a basis to deal coherently with the UN system on both budgetary and policy grounds. We have all noted the proliferation of committees, councils, conferences, and meetings, all of which cover essentially the same issues."

In the course of formulating the Bush Administration's diplomacy toward the UN system, it struck me that we should have a policy that treated the United Nations comprehensively. (Let me say at the outset that this analysis does not in any way implicate the IMF [International Monetary Fund], IBRD [International Bank for Reconstruction and Development], or GATT [General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade].) Instead of a series of unrelated policies toward each UN component, I felt that we needed to address the UN system in much the same way as the U.S. State Department's regional bureaus interact with the governments in their respec-

tive regions. Just as an action taken toward one specific country affects overall regional relationships, by analogy, so, too, do the actions of individual UN agencies affect the operation of the entire system. For example, the handling of UNDP support costs, which we will discuss, has a direct bearing on the assessed budgets of the specialized agencies.

The unitary United Nations concept provides us with a basis to deal coherently with the UN system on both budgetary and policy grounds. We have all noted the proliferation of committees, councils, conferences, and meetings, all of which cover essentially the same issues. Numerous governing bodies (however denominated) all spend precious time and fiscal resources discussing precisely the same issues, often in several different cities. Moreover, almost all components of the UN system have expanded their programs beyond their originally intended missions and are now duplicating each other's work. Moreover, there is always the risk of creating even more new organizations, with substantial budgetary claims, when existing agencies could handle emerging problems.

Following the unitary United Nations concept would provide us with a principled rule of decision to prune the thicket of UN governing bodies. It would also permit us to redefine the proper limits of each UN component's responsibilities and help avoid both empire building and turf fighting. By adhering to the original intent underlying

the creation of each UN component, we should achieve not only budgetary savings but also create a greater sense of political responsibility among member governments and secretariats.

Under a unitary United Nations concept, even if some elements of the UN system were to take on new responsibilities, we are not suggesting that the Geneva Group abandon its policy of zero real growth. Indeed, the possibility of added responsibilities increases the need for maintaining tight budgetary discipline. In fact, I view the unitary United Nations concept as a logical next step beyond the policy of zero real growth, which is now only applied component by component. But in implementing a policy of zero real growth, we must recognize that there will be instances where some agencies must grow to respond to new and emerging developments. Otherwise they will stagnate, and initiatives will be taken by other organizations which do not have the expertise or qualifications to do so in the most effective way possible. Any such growth, however, must be offset by reductions in other organizations so as to maintain zero real growth throughout the UN system. Difficult choices must be made not only by the secretariats but by us, the member governments; ultimately, the burden of identifying and enforcing priorities rests with us. As we have seen, it is not easy to achieve cutbacks in agency functions, but if we want to strengthen the UN system, it is incumbent upon us to take a hard look at the various components in order to rationalize and harmonize their operations.

My reference to the concept of the unitary United Nations should not be misinterpreted. I am not now suggesting a change in the mandate of the Geneva Group. I well understand that the Geneva Group does not address the whole of the UN system, and that its mandate explicitly is limited to concern for administrative, budgetary, and financial issues related to the basic infrastructure of the UN system, i.e., the regular assessed budgets of the specialized agencies and the IAEA [International Atomic Energy Agency]. However, we must recognize that this infrastructure influences, and is influenced by, a much larger whole. We believe more attention must be given to this larger whole in order to be effective in addressing our concerns about the basic infrastructure.

Let me also make clear that my use of the concept of the unitary United Nations does not mean that I am advocating central control in the UN sys-

tem. I fully recognize that many of our substantive interests in the UN agencies are fostered and protected by the pluralism of the UN system. I am familiar with the longstanding efforts of some to do away with this pluralism in order to allow the whole of the UN system to be tightly orchestrated by a politicized majority in the UN General Assembly. It is because of the pluralism of the UN system, and our interest in maintaining this pluralism, that I urge the concept of the unitary United Nations. The lack of effective central control in the UN system increases the need for us, the member governments, to guide our participation in the different UN agencies with an eye on the overall system.

"...the United States looks forward to important opportunities in the UN system for dealing with critical world problems. The renewed confidence in the UN system must be further strengthened and maintained; we must guard against allowing the expected return of financial stability to result in renewal of wasteful practices."

One example of the concept of the unitary United Nations at work is in deciding upon the appropriate role of the UNDP for the 1990s. We believe that the UNDP should play a more vigorous coordinating role. Over the years, UNDP has been weakened considerably, since agencies are taking it upon themselves to do what is properly in UNDP's realm. Indeed, if the Geneva Group is to be effective in assuring the best use of resources by the United Nations' technical agencies, it will be essential that we assure a clearer division of labor between the UNDP and the technical agencies. Further, there needs to be improved communication among the major donors on the relationships between bilateral and multilateral assistance programs. The current state of play, all too often, means that resources are wasted or that we work at cross purposes in the management of a unitary UN system.

This is important because we recognize the great and growing need for the work of the UN system. In addition to the recent major increase in UN peacekeeping activities, still more can be expected. More directly related to our work at this meeting are the significant transnational problems increasingly being addressed. Certainly, the UN system has the potential to help deal with issues such as drug control, terrorism, refugees, AIDS [acquired immune deficiency syndrome], human rights, and the host of environmental problems.

Based on the reforms initiated in the United Nations and in the major specialized agencies, and on the important UN peacekeeping activities recently undertaken, President Reagan decided last year to seek restoration of U.S. financial support to the United Nations and its affiliated agencies. He included in the fiscal year (FY) 1990 budget essentially full funding for U.S. assessed contributions to the organizations of the UN system. As indicated in our paper, President Reagan also included in the FY 1990 budget the first step in a multiyear plan for payment of outstanding U.S. arrearages. This commitment to restore U.S. financial support for the UN system has been strongly endorsed by President Bush. Final approval of the budget requests by Congress remains uncertain, but we are hopeful for support of President Bush's program on Capitol Hill.

In conclusion, I want to stress that the United States looks forward to important opportunities in the UN system for dealing with critical world problems. The renewed confidence in the UN system must be further strengthened and maintained; we must guard against allowing the expected return of financial stability to result in renewal of wasteful practices. This will require continued vigor by the Geneva Group in insisting on value for money. However, building on what we have achieved in recent years, we must go a step further in identifying and enforcing priorities for the UN system as a whole in order to be sure that our financial resources are being well used. I urge that—within our own governments—we all place more emphasis on what I have called the unitary United Nations. ■

Published by the United States Department of State • Bureau of Public Affairs
Office of Public Communication • Editorial Division • Washington, D.C. • July 1989
Editor: Sharon R. Haynes • This material is in the public domain and may be reprinted without permission; citation of this source is appreciated.

From Nancy Dyke
NSC

KEYNOTE FOR A NEW ERA OF COOPERATION -
ADDRESS TO THE 46TH UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Setting: The President will be standing on the world stage as the undisputed world leader, as the Cold War has clearly ended and we are on the threshold of a new era. Everyone is looking to the President for a State of the World speech with vision and his definitions of the New World Order. He need not give firm definitions but rather should set out the parameters or elements of a New World Order. He would not dictate specifics but would suggest an agenda of opportunities made possible by the new era of cooperation and invite others to join in shaping the New World Order. The statesmanlike approach of leading while including all nations in responsibility for the task should be well received by the UN audience and the world audience. And the agenda of opportunities should be an irresistible bipartisan approach here at home.

Speech objectives:

-- Demarcate clearly between Cold War and new era of cooperation that all together can shape if we shed Cold War mentality.

-- Set forth a vision of the new world as a world community of nations/New World Order to be built by all, including building blocks.

-- Counter suggestions of US hegemonic ambitions.

-- Increase understanding and support for New World Order by broadening it to include social and economic aspects.

-- Indirectly rally domestic support for an active foreign policy and counter the false choice raised by Administration critics who assert the country needs a "domestic president" in 1992.

-- Chart a general course for the UN and its specialized agencies, along with the international financial institutions (primarily IMF and World Bank) to reach the potential envisioned when they were created.

Major themes:

-- Hallmark of the new era: The role of government is to serve of the people, by the people, and for the people. The role of governments is not to test the limits of government's rights but to advance the cause of individual rights.

-- Opportunities exist for building world community of nations to the benefit of all mankind based on shared interests and shared values of democratic principles, market economics, concern for people, and the peaceful resolution of disputes --

within and among states. Accomplishing this is the hard work of freedom.

-- Reaching goal requires all to work together. We must overcome the Cold War mentality and divisions to be successful.

-- The New World Order is meant to be a collective aspiration (no Pax Americana) encompassing political, social, and economic elements.

-- There are major challenges known now and others unforeseen to come. We must move steadily forward based on principles.

I. Courtesies

II. Introduction/Historical Context

- Extraordinary world changes have given rise to genuine optimism about the future. We are at a turning point in history, as events move rapidly to overturn the old order.
- Forty years of Cold War, of confrontation over two separate views of governance. This test of wills and principles dominated the world order and policies and greatly limited the potential for international cooperation.
- Now tremendous change brought about by people around the world subscribing to the principles of democracy and freedom.
- Overarching lesson of the 20th century is the political, social, economic, and moral failure of the modern totalitarian state. Realization is sweeping the world that there must be limits to the powers of governments and people can bring this about.
- The overarching lesson for the future is that governments must be accountable to the people.
- The prospects of the 21st century are freedom and democracy, limits on the state, and advancement of the individual.
- We all -- peoples and governments and institutions -- have an opportunity and challenge to build a world community of cooperation based on shared values and interests. Will require shedding Cold War way of thinking.

III. Defining Moments - Soviet Union

- Profound events and change is final and total death of idea that state knows better and can govern without the consent of those it governs.

- This defining event presents major opportunity for international cooperation, spread of democracy and free enterprise. Success of democracy in the Soviet Union will have great benefits to Soviet people and in making a better world.

- Now challenge of effecting a transition. As change is effected there through the will of the people, it is not up to world community or US to dictate or interfere; US is not committed to a particular set of institutions but rather principles. Five crucial principles regarding change set out by Secretary Baker at historic Moscow CSCE human rights conference: peaceful change and self-determination, non-violent resolution of conflicts, respect for human rights, and adherence to obligations under international law.

- In the near term, US will work together with others to be certain humanitarian needs are met.

- For the longer term, US strongly encourages IMF to take the lead in coordinating the international financial institutions in structuring a program and responding to opportunities presented to us by the Soviet people as they carry forward their reforms.

- US will continue to work with responsible government on problem solving such as Afghanistan, other regional conflicts, arms control, cooperation on Middle East peace.

IV. Defining Moments - Resisting Iraq's Aggression

- In terms of solidly entering a new era of cooperation, we have already taken the crucial step of setting a standard of principled response to aggression. We - the world collectively - did not let aggression stand. Crucible of a New World Order.

- Still work to be done - Iraq violating UN Security Council. Saddam clearly determined to rebuild arsenal. Means sanctions will remain in place as long as this regime stays in power.

- Have provided for humanitarian needs with UN mechanism.

- Look forward to day when Iraq has new leadership and can be integrated back into the world community.

V. New World Order

- No longer a bipolar world, but not unipolar. Moving to a community of nations because victor is set of ideals.

- Vision of building to a world community of nations based on democratic principles, market economics, peaceful resolution of conflict, and concern for individuals.

o Tackle problems of international peace and security by bringing to bear concerted diplomacy and peacekeeping, including preventive diplomacy, where possible and effective collective military action where necessary. Pursue arms control and insist on observance of arms control agreements. Improve international support for international efforts to curb proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

o Some situations born of the Cold War conflict now present opportunities. Primarily regional conflict, and there is hopeful progress on these. Can dare to hope that as a result of solutions underway that half of the world's 16 million refugees can return to their countries by middle of decade.

-- Building a New World Order will not be simple, quick, or easy. World remains a dangerous place, still with tensions and conflict, ethnic rivalries, spreading weaponry, and lingering authoritarianism. Must continuously work for peace and stability worldwide.

o In dealing with these problems, some of which are resurfacing after many years, we must apply the principle of seeking diplomatic, peaceful solutions. Key role of regional organizations - UN cannot and should not do it all. World community should deal compassionately with the human dimensions of these problems (such as ethnic rivalries).

-- **Promote and consolidate democratic values**, including insisting on upholding of Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Need to assist in transitions to democracy. Devise ways to advance democracy and help build democratic institutions which accompany them, without dictating specifics.

-- **Promote market economics**, however difficult the transitions may be from centrally-controlled economies.

-- **Improve individual well being**. Free market economies, a sense of community, and a spirit of caring can begin to address problems of well-being, leading to better lives. The international community can only benefit by strengthening the well-being of the people, economies, and societies of all its members. Will require continued international assistance programs. Renew commitments undertaken at World Summit for Children.

-- **Reduce global/transnational threats**. Threats to our environment and health, social and criminal problems of drug trafficking, acts of terrorism should not be allowed to undermine the New World Order.

VII. United Nations - Fulfilling the Original Vision

- UN at historic juncture. Cold War over for UN too. UN engaged in many peacemaking and peacekeeping activities in addition to resistance to aggression in Gulf (and the necessary followup).

-- On eve of electing new UNSYG, UN is on threshold of rising to the vision of its founders. In NWO, the UN must enhance collective security and address political, economic, social, and humanitarian issues that confront us. True measure of success must be improvements in the lives of the people of the UN, not strengthening of member governments.

-- Suggestions for UN on UN reform, emergency humanitarian response, preventive diplomacy, UN peacekeeping, arms control, and UN election assistance.

Ending: Come back to world community of cooperation and government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Invite all to work together to make the dream a reality.