remedy. A requirement of special treatment or attention to women and minorities similarly assures that they will be protected from the ''passions'' of today's majority, which, in the case of upper-level decision-makers, still consists overwhelmingly of white males.

It is true that the non-proportional Senate came about as the result of a political compromise. The small states extracted it as the price of their acceptance of the new national government. They had the right to withhold ratification of any constitution that did not satisfy their perceived needs.

Today's minorities, African-Americans in particular, do not have that power. Their ancestors were brought here involuntarily, without the ability to agree or disagree with the political or economic system. Certainly, though, there must be something about democracy that prevents us from saying that affirmative action was a one-time-only phenomenon, imposed only at the insistence of certain framers and never to be repeated for the benefit of future minorities. To accept that argument would transform constitutionalism from an enduring philosophy into little more than an 18th Century version of ''Let's Make a Deal.''

I do not want to make too much of this analogy. Many recent efforts at affirmative action have been ineffective or counter-productive. The wisdom or appropriateness of any particular program ought to be subject to continuous review. But when Sens. Orrin Hatch (R-Utah) or Alan Simpson (R-Wyo.) inveigh against affirmative action, they ought to do so with some sense of humility, if not irony. After all, they owe their Senate seats to affirmative action's first appearance in our national life.

It is simply wrong to say that affirmative action—as a tool for achieving political equity—is out of place in the American system. To the contrary, it is as American as the Constitution.●

SYMPOSIUM: UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD IRAN: FROM CONTAINMENT TO RELENTLESS PURSUIT?

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I am sure I know less about what is taking place in Iran than some members of the Senate. I have followed the news, but I have not tried to become as knowledgeable about Iran as I am some areas of Africa and other areas of the world. I read about a symposium in the publication Middle East Policy in which Ellen Laipson, Director of Near East and South East Affairs from the National Security Council, discusses the Iran situation with Prof. Gary Sick of Columbia University, and Prof. Richard Cottam of the University of Pittsburgh.

Ms. Laipson gives an administrational line on what is taking place in Iran. But coming from a base of limited understanding, it appears to me that Gary Sick and Richard Cottam make a great deal of sense. What I kept thinking, as I read the discussion, was that our attitude toward Iran is very similar to our attitude toward Cuba. There is no question that our Cuban policy has been counterproductive, appealing to the national passion rather than the national interest. I have the uneasy feeling that our policy toward Iran is the same.

I ask unanimous consent that their discussion be printed in the RECORD at this point and urge my colleagues to particularly read the discussion by Professor Sick and Professor Cottam.

The material follows:

SYMPOSIUM: U.S. POLICY TOWARD IRAN: FROM CONTAINMENT TO RELENTLESS PURSUIT?

(By Ellen Laipson, Gary Sick, Richard Cottam)

ELLEN LAIPSON, DIRECTOR OF NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIAN AFFAIRS FOR THE NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

It will come as no surprise that Iran has been a major challenge for the Clinton administration's foreign policy. Today's forum is well-timed, because it gives us a chance to review the recent debate over the policy and the changes that the president announced just about a month ago. I welcome the chance to discuss this important issue and hear your views as well, and to be able to bring those ideas back to the debate that we have within the government.

We all recognize the importance of Iran in the Middle East region—the complexity of its society, the richness of its cultural traditions, and the very troubled history of U.S.-Iran relations in recent years. I think no one would disagree with the proposition that the last decade and a half has been a difficult time in the relationship between Iran and the United States. But it is our view that the situation we're in today does derive from the conditions in the region and from our efforts to protect our critical interests there.

I will divide my remarks into three simple questions. First, what is the policy? Second, why did the president make the changes that were announced on April 30? And, lastly, where do we go from here?

To give you the current state of play in the policy, it's important to note that our approach focuses on Iran's actions—not the nature of the regime, not what they call themselves, not the Islamic character of the regime, but the specific actions that we have observed the Iranian government get involved in. These include, first and foremost, their involvement in terrorism, particularly that which undermines the peace process in the Middle East—and their pursuit of weapons of mass destruction. In addition, we focus a lot of our concern on their efforts to subvert friendly governments in the region, their unfortunate human-rights record, and their conventional arms buildup which could, if realized, pose real threats to small Persian Gulf states that are friends of the United States.

At the same time, we also have to focus on the long-term challenge from Iran—not just the actions of today, but the potential, the capability that Iran could have, if it were to fulfill its ambitions, particularly in the weapons area. We are not trying to argue that today Iran poses a major military threat to the United States, but we are working to prevent it from doing so. We are looking at Iran's ambitions and intentions, not just its current military capabilities.

The policy is trying to capture, on the one hand, our efforts to address Iran's behavior today and, on the other hand, to develop a strategy that tries to anticipate a future Iran that would be a stronger and more formidable player in the region. Our approach combines pressure with other measures. We are trying to give Iran's leadership a chance to make a strategic choice. They could change their policies in order to serve Iran's interests, which we believe are fundamentally, among other things, economic growth and political stability. We think that Iran's government has the chance to adapt its behavior in ways that would make it conform more with international norms.

There has been no change in our policy on the question of a dialogue. We are still willing to engage in a dialogue with authoritative representatives of the Iranian government. We believe that pressure and dialogue can go together. This would be normal. By the rules of diplomacy, it would be possible to have both.

Let me give you a little more detail on what the pressure tactics involve, since they have recently changed. The policy of containment, which was declared when the Clinton administration first came to office, involves a comprehensive series of unilateral measures and a series of multilateral efforts as well. Until recently, the dimensions of our economic policy towards Iran consisted of an arms ban, a ban on dual-use technologies, a total import ban on Iranian products coming into this country, controls on certain items for export to Iran, and a diplomatic position of blocking all lending to Iran from international financial institutions.

After four to five months of internal debate, the president announced on April 30, and signed on May 6, an executive order that is an important reinforcement or strengthening of our policy towards Iran. He announced that, from now on, we will prohibit all trade, financing, loans and financial services to Iran. We will ban U.S. companies from purchasing Iranian oil overseas, even if it is for resale overseas. And new investment by American companies in Iran is prohibited. The president's executive order also bans their re-export to Iran from third countries of those goods or technologies that are on controlled lists for direct export from the United States to Iran. In addition, it prohibits U.S. persons and companies from approving or facilitating transactions with Iran by their affiliates.

The executive order does not have exterritorial application to foreign subsidiaries of U.S. companies. It does not ban the import of informational materials from Iran. And it does not block Iranian assets or ban private remittances to and from Iran by private Iranian nationals.

As you can see, these are very strong, but not total, economic measures. They form part, but not all, of our policy effort *vis-á-vis* Iran. The economic pressure, in a way, has to be seen in both the political and diplomatic context that is our overall policy. We are working and will continue to work hard multilaterally to make sure that the arms ban, the limits on credit and aid, the ban on support for Iran from international financial institutions, and cooperation with Iran in nuclear matters continue. We have enjoyed, up until now, what we consider to be good support from most of the advanced Western countries in these areas, and we would like to see more.

We initially worked within the G–7 context. But as you know, in the past year, we have expanded our diplomatic efforts to include Russia, China and all other potential suppliers to Iran of these high-technology and weapons-related items.

President Clinton and President Yeltsin last summer announced an agreement that would involve the future ban of all Russian arms sales to Iran. I think you will see more of these kinds of agreements with others of Iran's would-be suppliers.

We also have political talks with out major allies, both in the West and in the Middle East, about Iran. These political talks, in and of themselves, form a kind of pressure because Iran is very aware of these discussions, and that we are sharing information about our concerns over Iranian behavior in these discussions. We hold the talks with the European Union, with Canada, with Japan, with Russia, with most of our Middle Eastern allies.

In these talks, we discuss the merits of our approach—an approach of economic pressure, and the approach of our allies. Some of our allies prefer critical dialogue, which is the formula that the European Union uses. Some prefer constructive engagement, which is, I think, how the Japanese would characterize their policy. And others would use other formulas to describe their approach to Iran. It is true that we all continue to believe that there's room for some disagreement over what is the best approach to Iran. But we are of the view that the president's recent measures have very much caught the attention of our allies and will create a new dynamic in our discussion on this important topic.

We also share our concerns about the long-term threat that Iran could pose if it achieved both its conventional and its non-conventional military objectives—the threat that it would pose to the Persian Gulf countries, and to the region as a whole. I believe the Middle Eastern allies, in particular, see the American military presence in the Gulf—which most recently has been in response to Iraqi aggression—as helpful to sending a deterrent message to Iran.

Let me address why the change. The Clinton administration began a review in the fall of last year that, in some ways, was a very thoughtful assessment as we approached the midpoint of the presidential term. We thought it was a natural time to do an assessment of what has worked and what hasn't, where the policy can be refined, where it can be improved or enhanced.

We examined how Iran has responded to American policy until now and whether Iran's behavior had changed in the areas that we had expressed greatest concern about. We identified that, while in some areas Iran's behavior was more or less as it had been a few years ago, in certain areas, we thought it had worsened. In particular, we believe that the rise in terrorism against the Middle East peace process that began in the fall of 1994 has some links to Iran, and is deeply disturbing to one of our principal objectives, not only in the region, but worldwide: the achievement of a comprehensive peace between Israel and its neighbors.

We also saw continuing and, in some ways, accelerating signs of Iran's efforts to procure the materials and technology needed for a weapons-of-mass-destruction program. So, in those two key areas, it was our judgment that the situation was in fact getting worse and required some new policy responses.

Second, I would cite, as a reason for the change, the increasing challenge from our allies. They saw and told us that they saw an inconsistency between our containment policy and the fact that we continue to trade with Iran. That charge—even if based on a misleading use of trade statistics—was harmful to our efforts to maximize the consensus among Western partners that we consider to be a key part of our overall policy success. We feel strongly that Iran should hear to the maximum extent possible, the same signal from the United States that it hears from its other Western trading partners. This would have the greatest impact of the calculation that Iran needs to make about how its economic interests are affected by its own policy choices.

Third, and more recently, we did witness some erosion in the domestic consensus that we have enjoyed over our Iran policy. We saw a domestic debate, initiated here in the halls of Congress, over the need to pursue a tougher policy towards Iran. Until now, I would say that we have enjoyed considerable domestic support for containment, and we wanted to restore that degree of support. It was our view that an unresolved debate, questioning whether the policy was effective enough, would limit our effectiveness in communicating with Iran.

The administration conducted a thorough review of the policy options, and they were debated with some vigor among both the national-security agencies and the economic-policy factors within the U.S. government. We tried to balance a complex and, I think, difficult set of considerations. We asked ourselves, how would new economic measures, new sanctions, affect Iran's behavior? Would they affect the Iranian government or the Iranian people? How would they affect American competitiveness and American jobs, and how would they affect the willingness of our allies to work with us in a coordinated fashion on the Iran problem?

It is true that no one of the options that we considered would maximize all of these factors. There were trade-offs. There were policy options that made some of these issues easier and some harder. But we took them all into account.

Let me just end with what we see as the next steps. We do not exaggerate our chances for any quick success on the dramatic announcement the President made on April 30. We don't have any illusions that, overnight, Iran will stand up and publicly say that it is changing its behavior. But we do see a number of important signs already. We know that the President's announcement has had an impact on Iran. And I think those of you who follow the currency market are well aware of the dramatic fall in the value of the rial since the President's announcement. We know that we have the attention of the Rafsanjani government—witness his invitation to prominent American media to try to explain the government's side of the story, denying charges of terrorism, denying that there is a weapons program, etc. To me, this very much manifests the Iranian government's concern with the perception of its behavior that the President's announcement has evoked.

We think this is a process, an ongoing process that will require a lot of diplomatic engagement, a lot of hard work, and we are certainly aware that it has had some costs to various interests. We will have to measure our success in careful ways. We will continue to look for the supplier restraint that we have already created, to a certain extent, and for some other indicators. Will Iran need to think hard about the trade-offs between what it wants economically and its political behavior? We certainly hope so. Will the allies accept, now, the firmness of our resolve and our commitment to a containment policy? Will the allies join us in similar measures? We hope and expect to see more restraints in aid to Iran—loans, credits—and hopefully more political convergence in our overall approaches.

We are doing a number of things. There are intensive diplomatic efforts leading up to the Halifax meeting [of the G–7] that will take place next week in addition to bilateral meetings in which the Iran question is almost inevitably raised. We are sharing more information with our allies about terrorism and their nuclear plans, since some countries have said that this will be a critical factor in determining whether they change their policies or not. We don't know whether this is a political posture for them or if they really mean it. But we will make the extra effort to share with them the information that we have found so compelling and so persuasive, and hope that they will agree to conduct an evaluation of their own policies and see what else is possible.

And immediately and within Washington, we are engaging with U.S. businesses to ensure a fair and prompt implementation of the president's executive order. We are aware that the policy has had some costs and has inflicted some short-term dislocations on some of our interests. The president made his decision because he believed it was commensurate with the threat—both in the short-term and the long-term—that Iran's behavior poses. We hope very much that this recent decision will enhance our ability to exercise leadership with our allies. It has already, in part, restored the domestic consensus over our Iran policy.

GARY SICK, DIRECTOR, GULF 2000 PROJECT AND ADJUNCT PROFESSOR, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

I agree with Ellen on many points. There are aspects of Iran's behavior that are indeed troubling and that we should try to change. Iran's record on human rights is deplorable. The bounty that the revolutionary organization has placed on the head of Salman Rushdie, which amounts to an incitement to murder, is detestable. Iran's opposition to the peace process is a complicating factor, and if that opposition takes the form of money, arms and training for terrorist operations, it is unacceptable.

The same holds true for the funding of terrorist operations in any other country. Iran's development of military capabilities that go beyond its legitimate needs for self-defense and which pose a potential threat to its neighbors is both destabilizing and unhealthy. No one wants to see Iran acquire nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction.

On these issues, there is agreement not only in this room, I think, and in Washington, but also in the capitals of virtually every country in the world. The question is how to pursue these objectives, and it is on that question that I disagree most vigorously with the policies that are being pursued by the Clinton administration.

There are two cardinal tests, it seems to me, that should be applied to any foreign policy initiative. First, is there a realistic prospect that the policy will accomplish its intended objective? Second, does it do more harm than good? Present U.S. policy fails both of these tests.

Economic sanctions are always problematic, as we've seen in the case of Iraq, where the entire international community is united. But unilateral sanctions do not work. The United States is a powerful country and arguably the sole superpower in the world. However, it cannot impose its will on Iran without the support of many other countries that maintain diplomatic and commercial relations with that country. At present, there are only two countries in the world that think the U.S. embargo strategy is a good idea; the United States and Israel. If you like, we can add Uzbekistan to that list. (Laughter.)

But not one of Iran's major trading partners has indicated a willingness to join in this embargo.

This was not a surprise. The U.S. government did not consult in advance with any other government before the signing of the executive order on May 6. We knew that no other government would support it, so we didn't bother. Although this is a form of economic warfare, we did not raise it at the U.N. Security Council because we knew our position would attract no support.

We took this very grave step for our own reasons in the certain knowledge that it would not have the kind of international support that would, in fact, make it successful.

The United States in the past has undertaken unilateral sanctions as a matter of principle, even when we were unable to forge an international consensus. One example is the grain embargo against the Soviet Union. However, in that case, there was a triggering event: The invasion of Afghanistan. In this

case, as Ellen just pointed out, there was no triggering event.

We knew other nations would not follow our lead—in fact, we counted on it. Although we have chosen not to purchase any Iranian oil, we really do not want to have Iran's 2.5 million barrels a day of exports withdrawn from the world market. That would create chaos in the oil markets and a very substantial increase in price that could affect our own rate of inflation as well as that of the rest of the world.

In reality, we have been hurting Iran very, very severely over the past several years. Oil, as you know, is denominated in dollars, and the decline in the value of the dollar has substantially reduced Iran's purchasing power. To put it another way, in recent years, the real price of oil for Japan has declined by over 70 percent because of the dollar's decline against the yen. This has a real effect on the Iranian economy but is inadvertent and unrelated to the sanctions we are adopting.

One of the weaknesses of our policy is its disproportionality. We are in the process of adopting much more stringent sanctions against Iran than we imposed against the Soviet Union, which was a real threat to U.S. national security, even at the height of the Cold War.

Let me give you a couple of small examples. Against all odds, the Coca-Cola Company managed to reestablish itself in Iran some years ago. Local soft-drink producers in Iran were outraged. Many of them are owned by parasitic revolutionary so-called foundations. This, they said, was a reintroduction of the Great Satan into Iran. Even worse, it cut into their profits. They asked their leader for a *fatwa* prohibiting good Iranians from drinking Coca-Cola, but he refused. However, the Clinton fatwa will succeed where the hard-line revolutionaries failed, by forcing Coca-Cola to withdraw from the Iranian market.

Tehran is holding its annual book fair this month. Several American publishers withdrew from the exhibition after hearing of the executive order. Frankly, I wish Iranians had access to American books. I think that's our loss.

Federal Express and UPS have both terminated their service to Iran. I was planning to send some materials to a colleague of mine in Iran, a political scientist, about a conference that we have planned, and I'm now going to have to find some other way to do it.

Can I subscribe to an Iranian journal or newspaper, or is that trade with Iran?

Although the executive order is not intended to interfere with normal academic contacts and freedom of expression, it's going to have a chilling effect in many little ways. It will impede or interrupt our few existing channels of reliable information about what is being said and though and done in Iran, and we need that information.

Our policy is also based on some false premises. I was struck by Secretary [of State Warren] Christopher's recent statement to an interviewer. He said, ''We must isolate Iraq and Iran until there is a change in their government, a change in their leadership.''

That statement recalls a very similar comment made by Defense Secretary [Casper] Weinberger some years ago, when he said, ''There must be a totally different kind of government in Iran, because we cannot deal with the irrational, fanatical government of the kind they now have.''

These offhand comments, calling, in effect, for the overthrow of the government, seem more consistent with U.S. actions and the reality of U.S. policy than the repeated official assurances that we heard this morning that we accept the Iranian revolution as a fact and that it is not our objective to try to overthrow it. The voices of our leaders suggest otherwise, at least when they are caught off guard.

Our policies do make Iran's life more difficult in many ways, but the notion that we're going to drive it into bankruptcy and thereby bring down the Islamic government are romantic and infantile pipe dreams. The Iranian government is under great stress due to its own mismanagement of its economy. About one-third of Iran's oil revenues this year will go to pay off its creditors as a result of a consumer import binge following the end of the Iran-Iraq War.

Iranians are dissatisfied with the economy and they are not shy about making their views known. There will be change, but it will take the shape of reforms to the existing system, not of collapse or overthrow. There is no viable political alternative to the present system. We may not like this regime, but we're going to have to live with it. We are not going to bring it down by an act of self-flagellation.

Our policy of demonizing Iran has affected our own credibility in a number of areas. For example, the recent State Department report on international terrorism in 1994 states that Iran is still the most active state sponsor of international terrorism. But if you read the report—and I have read it now three or four times—it is remarkably silent on evidence.

When Secretary Christopher recently claimed that Iran was responsible for the bombing of the Argentine-Israel Mutual Association in Buenos Aires last July, the Argentine foreign minister immediately wrote a letter to Christopher asking him for any verification or evidence that he had, but he said to reporters at the same time that he wrote the letter, ''We do not expect any news. There is no more information now than there was in December.'' There have been no arrests. The principal U.S. source, who was a paid informant of the CIA, has been discredited, and the Argentine government is resuming normal relations with Iran.

There are other major flaws in the terrorism report that in some respects, make it more of a propaganda tract than a serious statement of fact. The United States is reportedly spending $4 million on a propaganda campaign designed to destabilize Iran. It's one thing to conduct propaganda against another state, but there is a real danger if we start believing it ourselves.

The nuclear issue is simple. We do not want Iran to get the bomb, and on that we are joined by virtually every government in the world, notably including Russia, which does not want to see the emergency of a nuclear-weapons state on its southern borders. Again, the question is not the goal, but, rather, how we get there from here.

The United States, in my view, has manufactured an unnecessary crisis by focusing its attention on the sale of nuclear power stations to Iran. Granted, all of us might prefer to see Iran completely devoid of any nuclear infrastructure, but we have diluted our moral and political authority by attempting to deny to Iran a right that is enshrined in the very terms of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty [NPT] that we just recently fought so hard and successfully to sustain.

The NPT explicitly promises in Article IV that states in compliance with the treaty will have access to peaceful nuclear technology. Iran is in compliance. The power stations that Iran is buying from Russia and China are no different from those we are offering free to North Korea in order to gain their compliance with the NPT.

Our decision to focus on the sale of power stations is a case of superpower swagger. We suggest that the rules of international law apply only when we say they apply. That attitude is not popular even among those states which have good reason to fear Iran.

I believe that one of the reasons Iran is seeking nuclear power stations is as part of a broader effort to develop a nuclear infrastructure that would permit it to build a nuclear weapon. Iran fought a bloody eight-year war with Iraq, and I am sure that they were just as shocked as we were to discover how close Saddam Hussein had come to having a nuclear weapon, especially knowing that it most likely would have been used on them, just as chemical weapons were.

They may also have the mistaken notion that nuclear weapons will provide some form of insurance against superpower intervention, having watched Iraq go down to defeat with such apparent ease after they themselves had been beaten on the battlefield by that same army. The Iranians almost certainly wish to shorten the time required to build their own weapon if they see the threat again emerging on one of their borders.

It's worth noting in passing that we should be careful about using the argument that Iran does not need nuclear power because it has so much oil and gas. The two are really not mutually exclusive. Russia has the greatest gas reserves in the world. It also has the largest nuclear power industry in the world.

In reality, Iran is currently short of gas. Every bit of Iran's gas is being used domestically, and there is no surplus. It is also, increasingly, short of energy. Its domestic needs for electricity and heating are increasing faster than it can produce them.

In addition to nuclear power, which may be a silly solution, Iran is involved in major efforts to develop wind power, thermal power and hydroelectric power. I would note in passing that the Japanese loans that we are arguing so hard to try to stop are for a dam on the Karun River in the south that is designed to produce hydroelectric power.

The Conoco deal that we were so outraged about and interfered with was an attempt to develop a gas field in the south that would increase their supply of gas. I argue that we are shooting ourselves in the foot repeatedly. Our recent policies have tended to thwart Iran's development of non-nuclear alternative energy sources.

But these facts, regardless of one's interpretation, are not an argument for complacency about the nuclear issue. Instead, in my view, our policy should focus on the central issue of nuclear-weapons development. A sensible U.S. policy should have the following objectives: First, we and our allies and all prospective nuclear suppliers should convince Iran to renounce technologies that provide direct access to weapons fuel, specifically enrichment. That, of course, includes centrifuge technology and reprocessing.

To that end, we should pressure Russia to reaffirm its adherence to the nuclear suppliers' guidelines which go beyond the NPT in restricting export of these two dangerous technologies. We should also do everything in our power to tighten the international regime, the successor to COCOM, to prevent sale of long-range delivery systems which could be used with nuclear weapons.

Second, any training of Iranians should be limited to what it takes to operate a reactor, rather than providing broad access to nuclear technology.

Third, we should insist on clear-cut agreements about the disposal of spent fuel from the reactors. Iran has said that it would return the nuclear waste to Russia, but we need to ensure that there are safeguards at every stage to ensure that both the fuel is returned and that Iran exercises no control over that fuel once it has been returned—

again, a crucial point, and something that can be done in the agreements that Russia is signing with Iran.

Finally, we should take Iran at its word that it will permit frequent and intrusive inspections by the IAEA [International Atomic Energy Agency] on demand and with little or no advance notice. That should be an absolute condition of any continuing nuclear power assistance which Iran will require for the next decade or more. I would also add that might be useful to explore this idea that's been raised recently by the United Nations Association of a nuclear rapporteur who would conduct independent investigations to explore evidence of nuclear-weapons development around the world and report directly to the Security Council.

All of these steps are things that we could do, and a negotiating package that is composed of these elements and perhaps others of a more technical nature would be greeted by understanding and sympathy by most if not all of our friends and allies. It is consistent with international law and is in the immediate national interests of potential nuclear suppliers themselves. In short, it offers what our present policy does not: a workable strategy to achieve our most important objectives.

Our present policy is not really a strategy, since it lacks a definable endgame. It rails against Iran's behavior, but really doesn't offer anything like a credible roadmap for changing it. And pious hopes that Iran is suddenly going to change its spots really don't suffice, especially when we're making such stringent efforts as we are.

So, in closing, let me suggest a five-point framework for U.S. policy. I do so in the full understanding that any such suggestions are probably fated to fall on deaf ears in the present political climate in Washington.

First, we should cool the rhetoric for a while. At times lately, we have sounded more shrill and ideological than the ayatollahs. Let's put the thesaurus aside for a while. We don't need any more synonyms for rogue, outlaw, or even backlash, whatever that means.

Second, let's take some time to get our priorities straight. Iran may be bad, but it's not all bad, and some of the actions are worse than others. If the nuclear issue is at the top of our agenda, and that's where I think it should be, let's put together a strategy that addresses the central issues, rather than painting everything with the same brush.

Third, let's begin to develop a strategy that engages our allies and lets us work with them, instead of bullying them and ignoring their own legitimate interests. Despite what Ellen said, I think that's what we've been doing.

Fourth, we should adopt a policy of selective neglect. When we disagree with Iran or find its behavior outrageous and unacceptable, we should say so, but where we see improvement in their policies—and there are, in fact, areas of improvement that we could talk about—we should not be afraid to acknowledge them or at least to remain silent. Distorting the truth in the pursuit of a policy is demeaning to us as a nation and ultimately self-defeating.

Finally, we should apply the Waco test. Yes, we have over there what we perceive as an encampment of religious extremists. They propound ideas that offend us. They are armed, and they may represent a danger to the neighborhood. But we should never forget that no matter how bad it is, our policies, if misconceived, can make it worse for everyone concerned.

RICHARD COTTAM, UNIVERSITY PROFESSOR OF POLITICAL SCIENCE EMERITUS, UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

I want to talk about two things primarily: one, the long-run trends in Iran; two, Iranian intentions, as I see them.

I want to begin with something you all remember but I think need to be reminded of and that is in December of 1978, on a religious holiday, eight million people, journalists tell us, demonstrated in Iran against that shah's regime. That would be one out of every five, even though they knew that attack helicopters could be used against them. Two months later, the revolution was successful. It was without question, I think, the greatest populist revolution in human history.

In days following that revolution it began to unravel, and the liberal element, which was very important in the directorship of the revolution itself, began to desert or to be regurgitated. A terrible process began to take place that we haven't noted enough the development, wherever resurgent Islam appears, of a polarization of the populations with two sections of people, one religious and one secular, starting to dislike each other to a point of intensity that is almost genocidal. It takes place everywhere. In a better world, what we on the outside should want to do is to try to bring about some kind of reconciliation of these forces. Strangely enough, our policy in Algeria seems to show slight signs of doing exactly that.

Within a year of the revolution, the polarization was pretty well complete in Iran. There was a regime pole, which I would estimate, for what it's worth, at about 20 percent of the population. And that pole followed Khomeini's great leadership (that was their view of him). And within that group there were two major factions or tendencies as they called them, one you could call reform and one revolutionary. Khomeini's decisional style was such that he didn't allow either of these factions really to win and consolidate.

The result was that within the bureaucracy itself, many bureaucrats reported to very different elements in the revolutionary elite. Although there has been some consolidation of control, this is still a phenomenon and probably has a lot to do with explaining the assassinations of Iranian dissidents abroad.

An intransigent opposition developed that looked almost exclusively to the United States for salvation. And then there appeared the phenomenon of a substantial majority of the Iranians—a large acquiescing and accommodating majority of the country—who saw no alternative to the regime, accepted it and wanted to go on with their lives.

Fifteen years later, the change is very substantial. The radical leadership has been defeated. It was rather decisively defeated, although remnants, I believe, still are in the bureaucracy. Its support base has shrunk even further, I'm not allowed in Iran, one of the few Americans who is not acceptable there. But people whom I respect who go all the time have estimated that between 15 and 1.5 percent of the population really supports the regime. It's a very dangerously low level of support. I agree with Gary Sick that it's not likely that there will be any kind of revolution. But what is possible with this level of support is a spontaneous uprising against a miserable economic situation which could get out of control and go to something unpredictable.

I think the major failing, though, of the regime has been its failure to recruit a significant section of the intelligentsia. The revolution has lost its vitality. It is now a revolution striving to survive. [Ali] Khamenei, the supreme leader of Iran is, a sincere advocate of the Islamic movement, but he did participate in the defeat of the radical element. And the president, [Ali Akbar Hashemi] Rafsanjani, is, I believe, a realistic individual who's very interested in reconciliation and would move far in the direction of bringing people together if he had the latitude to do that.

The intransigent opposition, I think, can be largely disregarded. It's important in the expatriate community, but it seems to have virtually no real meaning within Iran itself. Center stage today is held by the accommodationists and the acquiescers. This is now a huge majority that dominates the universities to a striking extent, both faculty and student body. It dominates the progressive element of the economic community. It's omnipresent even in the bureaucracy and in the professions. It therefore has created a picture that is very different from what we've seen in the past and one that we should take seriously into account.

This large majority grants the regime very little legitimacy and in the past has been unwilling even to explore the possibility of engaging it and becoming part of the system. It is right now showing signs of a willingness to do that. The Freedom Front, for instance, has openly told American reporters that it's thinking of running for parliament in the elections. They certainly believe the liberalization process and the growth of pluralism are a real possibility in Iran.

In foreign policy, this group is very different from the regime. It has no interest in messianic Islam. It isn't interested in the peace process or the Arab-Israeli dispute. There is very little support from this large majority of the Iranian people for an activist policy in support of what we think the Iranian government is up to. I think this is a fact that is extremely important.

This majority is, however, extremely nationalistic. And those barren islands [Abu Musa and the Tunbs] sitting in the Gulf are more important to it than any of these other issues I've mentioned. We could easily offend this very nationalistic element of the population. It yearns for rapprochement with the United States and for a return to the international system. It doesn't like to be a pariah state. It wants to interact. it wants to become prosperous. It's deeply disappointed in U.S. hostility, finding it increasingly bemusing.

To return to the question of the regime's intentions, first, I would say, is to position itself favorably in the global economic system. A good competitive position for its oil is vital for the survival of the regime itself. I believe it will make that its first priority in its foreign policy.

Second, this regime believes that America, collaborating with Israel, is ineluctably hegemonic in its ambitions. The Iranian regime feels terribly threatened and believes that the danger is from us. When it thinks in terms of arming itself, it's almost pathetic. It can't seriously think in terms of deterring us if we took it on directly. It can only think in terms of deterring our puppets, as they see it, who might attack them.

The most difficult part for me in making this case to you, I believe, is this point: that as far as Islam is concerned, the regime has stopped talking about becoming the great leaders of an Islamic state. The *imam* of the *umah* was the title for Khomeini, the leader of the entire community of believers. In its place there is a much more defensive concern.

I don't mean to understate the importance of Islam for this regime. There are four external communities that it is particularly interested in helping, Islamic communities

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

KIDS PAY THE PRICE

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

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

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

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

The column follows:

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

KIDS PAY THE PRICE

(By Bob Herbert)

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

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

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

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

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

The program uses the terms children and kids in the broadest sense, so that they cover the entire period from infancy through the teen years. In 1992, the last year for which complete statistics are available, 37,776 people were killed by firearms in the U.S. Of those, 5,379 were 19 years of age or younger. Those are extraordinary number, and they have risen since 1992.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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