

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