Reflections on the post-Cold War era:
The George Chaplin Lecture

By Robert C. Maynard

December 15, 1992
East-West Center

I must begin with a compliment. My good friends and colleagues of the East-West Center are to be congratulated for your exquisite timing and forecasting. This lecture and topic were arranged months ago. Yet I could not imagine a more appropriate subject for today. Even as we speak, a new era in international relations is aborning' on the Horn of Africa. The promise and the peril loom large. I call your timing exquisite for more reasons than one. I mean no idle pun when I say our first post-Cold War adventure on the Horn of Africa places our nation on the horns of a great dilemma. On one hand---dare I say one horn?---our humanitarian mission could not be clearer. I, for one, do not see how we could have stood by idly for much longer while hundreds of thousands of people, mainly children, starve to death. That side of the equation, the moral side, is painfully and palpably clear. Our sons and daughters are in harm's way this Christmas half way around the world. Yet the cause that carries them there is noble. Many Americans, I believe, accept that risk.

Indeed, some of our citizens can embrace that risk more readily than they could an even greater risk two years ago on the Arabian peninsula. The issue there, at rock bottom, was preserving our sources of cheap energy. The issue today is the sanctity of human life. You know and I know that we have been on far less noble military adventures within the time of our own memories in this room today.

All the same, Operation Restore Hope presents us with a great dilemma. The other side of the equation, the other horn of the dilemma, is the pragmatic side. It is enough to keep us awake at night. It will provide us with enough troubled sleep to last through this operation and beyond. Perhaps this troubling side is most appropriately stated as a series of questions. I know you have thought of them yourself. They are writ large before us today. They go to the core of the subject you have so thoughtfully assigned me:

1. How long will we stay?
2. How long should we stay?
3. When will we know for sure our mission is accomplished?
4. Even as we leave, whenever that is, can we articulate to ourselves and the rest of the world what policy threshold compelled us to go to Somalia in the first place?
5. Even as we struggle for that policy articulation, how many more troubling circumstances around the globe can now, or soon will be able to, lay similar compelling claim on our solicitude?

These five questions alone should tell you why I regard this as an exquisite moment in our history. I cannot imagine a more poignant or troubling subject than the one to which you have assigned me as your George Chaplin lecturer. I feel deeply honored and in your debt for so exceptionally well timed an opportunity. At the same time, I cannot recall an occasion on which I have felt myself more deeply challenged. One need only take a moment to think of how little we know compared to how much we need to know.

It is my intention today to do three things to try to fulfill your most daunting assignment.

First, I wish to take us on a brief tour of the post-Cold War globe. My purpose is to put the Somalia mission into its larger and much more perilous perspective.

Second, I wish to take advantage of our venue here in the middle of the Pacific to think aloud about our present day bilateral relationship with an important neighbor, Japan. In the Cold War era, it went without saying that our most important bilateral relationship was with the USSR. Now, to paraphrase that old song, the USSR ain't the USSR anymore. There is no question in my mind that Japan-U.S. relations now deserve our utmost attention. This is a relationship filled with promise and fraught with peril. There is room for great cooperation for the benefit of each nation and for the world at large. Just as surely, I believe a failure on either side to nurture that relationship carries risks for each nation and, consequently, for all nations.

My third thought for the day concerns a theme with which some of you are already familiar. I know my old friends George Chaplin and Dick Halloran won't be the least bit surprised to hear me return to this subject. It concerns the United States as a world power and the risks to that role from within. My thesis, already familiar to some of you, is this: In the post-Cold War era, much of our military might must be transformed into moral and economic might. The key questions are these: First, can we be a persuasive moral power and an effective economic power if we remain a house divided? Second, if the answer to the first question is no, can we repair our divided house? When Abraham Lincoln used that term to describe our nation more than 100 years ago, he referred to a single subject: slavery. When I use the term in 1992, I have much more in mind than race alone. I think we are divided along five great and perilous fault lines. Race, of course, is one. Class is the second. Gender is the third. Generations is the

fourth, and geography is the fifth. As each or all deepen, our position as a world leader is threatened. Threatened, I must emphasize, from within.

Let me pause here on that ominous and portentous note. First, let us look at the world the Cold War has left behind. Then we will turn our attention to Japan. And, finally, we will return home to America.

Let us briefly revisit the dawn of the Cold War. In 1946, at Westminster College in Fulton, Mo., Winston Churchill called the West to arms. He declared, "From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an Iron Curtain has descended across the Continent."

In short order, the Iron Curtain and The Bomb concentrated our minds. We were, it seemed, only 30 minutes from doomsday for nearly a half century. The chill winds of the great ideological war fixed our focus on the big issues of planetary survival. In such a climate, we thought in terms of one massive East Bloc. That encompassed the great super power of the Soviet Union, not 15 or so highly individualistic republics. Even less did we think of the centuries' old ethnic and religious enmities that smoldered within them. Similarly, when we thought of such components of the Soviet empire as Czechoslovakia or Yugoslavia, we did not think of them in terms of Czechs who hated Slavs or Serbs who hated Bosnian Muslims or Croats with little use for either one.

In the Cold War climate, those visionaries who dreamed of a day the Soviet empire would collapse, did not envision the treacherous consequences we see around us today.

Russia itself is in the throes of ideological, political and economic turmoil. Its current circumstance can be likened to a gigantic, three-ring circus: In one tent, ring master Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin is struggling to transform totalitarianism into democracy. In yet another, former command economy hardliners are trying to shed their old skin and don the new apparel of the free

market. Just up the fairway apiece, watch a one time multinational empire try dancing to the tricky new music of the nation-state.

It is on that last act that I wish to have us dwell for a moment. Unrest and civil war plague the former empire from Eastern Europe to the Ukraine, across the vast expanse of Mother Russia and south of there as well. Consider Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan. All are embroiled in ethnic or religious strife. All this is fueled in no small measure by the inexorable spread north of Muslim fundamentalism. It is boiling up out of Iran, Afghanistan and Pakistan. All this strife in turn enmeshes the trans-Caucasian republics of Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Tajikstan and Kyrgyzstan. The cry for "ethnic cleansing" is in the air everywhere.

Needless to say, these are too many civil wars to keep track of, much less to know what we, the last super power, can do to help. Make no mistake though, millions upon millions of hapless citizens are caught in the crossfire as this unrest rolls across the once enormous empire from the Baltic to the Bering Sea.

Just outside the orbit of the broken Soviet empire, are multitudes of still endangered Kurds in northern Iraq, nearly 200,000 of whom have been slain in the last several years by Saddam Hussein's rough, ready and ruthless regime.

Now that the Cold War cap has popped off the bottle, the genie of self interest is loose upon the globe. You saw what it led to in Kuwait. Saddam Hussein, armed by us as one of our vaunted bulwarks against communism, turned on one of his neighbors. It took a mighty international coalition, stitched together by the U.S. with the fig leaf cover of the UN, to pry him out and assure the free flow of oil. Now we are in Somalia to secure the flow of food to the starving masses. Somalia, remember, served at different times as a client state of both the USSR and the U.S. Indeed, many of those 50 caliber machine guns with which the technicals have been menacing their starving fellow citizens are

nothing less than your tax dollars still at work. In that sense, it seems altogether fitting that we should help rescue that beleaguered populace. Not too far away, those same services might soon be justified in Mozambique. Four million there rely on outside assistance for their daily sustenance. And what shall we say to the starving South Sudanese? Their own government withholds food in the hope of starving a rebellion into submission.

We will continue to deny we are the policeman of the world, we the now lonely super power, we the victor in the Cold War. Others see us as their only hope, and more are certain to mount their claim on our humanitarian or protective services.

You might recall those five questions I asked at the outset. The essence was this: How do we decide what standard determines when we send our military into another country on a humanitarian mission? Several members of the Bush administration and influential voices in Congress tried to address this with respect to Somalia. If you listened carefully, you heard this: We cannot see 1,000 people starve to death every day and do nothing. The problem with that is that it is not a policy standard. It is at best a cry of the heart. Even though it is a cry that resonates throughout the land, it tells us nothing about the future in this suddenly uncertain world. Does that mean that if 800 people a day are starving in some other country, that predicament does not meet our standard for intervention? But does it conversely mean that 1,200 is automatically the firebell in the night?

What about death by means other than starvation? Suppose 1,000 Armenians a day perish at the hands of the Azebaijanis. More pressing and to the point, even as we speak, what about 1,000 Bosnians a day at the hands of the Serbs? When should we go in and stop it? When do we say, enough is enough? What standard can we broadcast to the world as Article One of the

New World Order for military intervention?

These questions are not intended merely to be provocative. These are the very real issues we must address in this new and perilous age that has emerged from the ice floes of the old Cold War.

This new era requires, I believe, new international order. The U.S. cannot shoulder this burden alone. We must create a climate for true international cooperation. It is in that spirit that I believe we must view a deepened bilateral relationship with Japan. These two societies, so profoundly different and yet with such striking similarities, must establish a partnership of cooperation and mutual trust for the 21st century.

Even though the trade and commerce between our two countries is brisk today, the foundations of our relationship can be described as shaky at best.

Commodore Perry's arrival in Edo Bay (now called Tokyo) in 1854 shattered a calm isolation that had settled over Japan for most of the previous two centuries. Hideo Ibe, in his most perceptive analysis of Japanese-U.S. relations ("Japan Thrice-Opened") says of the Perry mission:

"If it had not been for this unfortunate start in Japanese-U.S. relations, the great sacrifices of the Pacific war might not have been necessary before the two civilizations could come to an understanding of each other."

Now, whether you are in Hawaii speaking with Americans who remember Pearl Harbor or in Japan speaking with Japanese who remember Hiroshima, you cannot fail to note one profound reality. These two societies, with their deep suspicions of each other, have had profound and searing impact on each other's national psyche. Yet they share some striking similarities of taste and interest.

On more than one occasion, Nancy and I have spent hours at a time in places such as Ginza, Tokyo's upscale version of Times Square. We watch the shopping patterns and the choices and we have a hard time fathoming, from that

perspective, how two peoples could be so different and so similar at the same time. There are, of course, many differences. In some instances those differences have been so profound as to account for war when there could have been peace. In the interest of time today, I will not burden you with a detailed discussion of the differences between Western approaches to decision-making and adherence to abstract principle and the Japanese approach to that same set of issues. I will only say two things for now. First, those who believe, as I do, that deepening the understanding between our two cultures is vital to a stable world future, should be willing to devote more time to that aspect of our relationship. Second, those who may wish to explore that subject in greater depth will find a great deal of assistance in Hideo Ibe's work. I only wish we had more time to devote to it today.

Those who spend time in Japan or on the subject of Japan are almost always helped by the work of Ruth Benedict ("The Chrysanthemum and the Sword") and by Edwin O. Reischauer, especially "The Japanese Today: Change and Continuity." Reischauer, as you might know, is what he himself calls a "B.I.J." Those initials stand for "Born in Japan."

E.O.R., as he has been affectionately called by his Harvard colleagues, speaks with warmth and love of his birth and rearing in Japan in his elegant memoir, "My Life Between Japan and America." It is both a sad and a hopeful work. The sadness is derived from a realization that comes over him, as it does all B.I.J. There is an impenetrable barrier that presents itself to virtually all strangers in Japan. An American born in Japan is as much a stranger, ultimately, as a non-Japanese born any place else. You are, Reischauer says simply, either Japanese or you are not. And to be Japanese in that sense is to be born and raised in Japan by Japanese parents.

Reischauer spent as much time thinking about the U.S.-Japanese relationship as any American with whom I am familiar. In addition to his birth and rearing there, he was probably our single most distinguished ambassador to Japan. He arrived in 1961, at a difficult time in our bilateral relationship. When he left five years later, the relationship had been transformed. No one familiar with the history of that period doubts Reischauer made the crucial difference.

Toward the end of his life, Reischauer made an observation that is most appropriate to the issue before us, the burden sharing necessary by the world's two greatest economic powers. This is what he said:

"Much depends on Japan's choice between continued separateness and a genuine internationalization of its attitudes. Its own stable democracy, smoothly operating social system and commitment to peace, when combined with its tremendous economic power, can do much to help solve the problems the world faces. However, if it continues to be resented by the less developed countries and to be seen an uncooperative by the advanced ones, economic frictions could escalate and bring on a genuine decline in international relations. In these days of growing complexity, such a decline could all too easily end in catastrophe."

The great challenge for Japan, Reischauer goes on to say "is to become a fully cooperative member of world society, serving as a leader in helping to develop a peaceful world order. To do this will require...greater efforts to help the less developed countries, a bolder stance on world peace, and sacrifices of some economic advantages to create a more smoothly operating international economic system...Even the most flagrantly self-confident Japanese realize that increased international cooperation is the only hope for Japan's future success. It is quite clear to everyone that a prosperous Japan can exist only in a prosperous world."

In my own personal experience, the most hopeful sign in this regard occurred at an event in Tokyo several weeks ago hosted by Ambassador Michael Armacost. I spent a good deal of the evening with a Japanese businessman who wanted to discuss American philanthropic institutions. He noted my affiliation with Rockefeller and other foundations. Japanese business, he said, needs to develop the ethos and the knack of international philanthropy.

True, but more important, the Japanese government and politicians need to recognize the importance of burden sharing, as Reischauer said. We can help. The new administration should work to change the climate created in the Bush administration. This lame approach to "trade equity" in automobiles should be recognized for what it is, apologia for protectionism. When Americans make cars Americans want to buy, the trade imbalance in that sector, at least, will right itself. There are more difficult and sensitive issues, especially in agriculture, but the French farmers are busily demonstrating that those awkward internal issues bedevil international trade on many levels.

Washington must keep its eye on the main issue concerning our relationship with Tokyo. That issue is the importance of an equal partnership in forging a world consensus for order, for decency toward dissent and the rights of minority and disadvantaged populations.

A high mutual priority should be given to strengthening international organizations and enhancing the ability of the UN to become an effective agency to keep the peace in troubled lands. The Cold War prevented the UN from becoming an effective international agency for peace and security Now, with the Cold War behind us and the need for an effective international organization never greater, Japan and the U.S. can make the UN a new force in the world. Obviously other nations, including our NATO allies, should be drawn into this consensus. The key to its success is a visible and vital U.S.-Japan partnership.

Earlier on, I listed those many troubled places on the globe precisely to suggest that international order is the only answer. Effective international order can only occur if the wealthiest nations are front and center to help set the tone and carry their share of the load.

If Washington forcefully sends that message to Tokyo, I believe Tokyo will heed it.

I should not make that statement sound so categorical. It deserves to be conditioned. Two conditions especially must be noted here. The first is that Japan is a society in which most major decisions are arrived at through consensus. If we are to gain Japanese cooperation, we must be prepared to share in a confidence-building and consensus-building process. It must be open on both sides of the Pacific.

The second issue is more difficult. It concerns moral authority. Japan is not the only relationship to which it applies. Indeed, I will argue that it applies to virtually all our international relations in this new and challenging era. This is that all-important question I raised at the beginning: Can we be truly strong abroad, if we are not first strong at home?

The short answer is no. Well, you might say, how is it we have done so well as world leader so far? Remember all those former components of the Soviet empire now raging with internal fury? To some, this outbreak of the virus of hate might appear to be pathogenesis, a spontaneous outbreak. I think otherwise.

I believe the overarching weight of the Cold War held certain passions in check. I believe that as the fear and the weight of doomsday wear away, we will see more and deeper challenges to our moral authority. This, I believe, will be evidenced at home and abroad, near and far. The end of the Cold War and the onset of a new century, indeed a new millennium, have combined to place a

marker in the sands of time. A new moral order is straining to be born. In the United States, I believe that moral order has three basic elements: First, human dignity for all. Second, genuine equality of opportunity for all. Third, a search for the realization of a true American community. I think these three quests are best seen in the light of our enormous and sometimes peace-shattering (if not downright threatening) social fault lines.

I mentioned those fault lines briefly at the very beginning. Let me list the five principal ones again. They are race, class, gender, generations and geography. Now you might call these five areas I have listed something other than fault lines. You might just call them areas of social concern. Why do I call them fault lines? I do so in part because I am a Californian. We Californians live with earthquakes. We know the damage fault lines can do to the surface of the earth. We also know something else about fault lines. You cannot change them.

As you know, we experienced a devastating earthquake in Northern California in October of 1989. It registered 7.1 on the Richter scale, knocked down a huge freeway in Oakland, with hundreds of motorists on it, and caused several serious fires in San Francisco. We felt lucky to escape with fewer than 50 fatalities. All the same, this event left an indelible impression, especially on children. Our youngest was a month shy of his 10th birthday when the Loma Prieta earthquake occurred. He came padding into my study late one night shortly afterward. He said he could not sleep. He had been thinking about the earthquake and about the fault lines, one of which runs nearly beneath our back yard. He said he had an idea. Why not, he asked, get all the cement mixers in the world, line them up by each major fault line and keep pouring concrete until we had filled up the fault line? No more earthquakes, right? I walked him back

to bed, assuring him that at breakfast I would explain why his thoughtful solution would not work.

The truth about fault lines, both geological and social, is that they cannot be filled in or papered over. That does not mean nothing can be done to ameliorate their impact. We know that on the day the freeway fell, huge buildings in Oakland and San Francisco swayed with the shifting earth without losing so much as a pane of glass. Why? Because they had been built to withstand enormous seismic pressure. That, I submit, is our societal challenge as well.

Our institutions of law and governance must be made to reflect the fact that we have enormous differences of perspective based on race, class, gender, age and location. To me, the meaning of the creation of the American community is the achievement of healthy accommodation of our differences. It does not mean pretending those differences do not exist. It does not mean attempting to fill in our fault lines with cement. It means instead celebrating our diversity as a strength. It means building a society of equity and inclusion to replace one replete with inequality and exclusion.

Racial bigotry and exclusion remains one of America's most enduring and demeaning realities. Discrimination in employment, education, housing and law enforcement are responsible for enormous social burdens borne by virtually all elements of our society. There was a time when we thought the burden of racism fell only on those against whom discrimination was practiced. We now have volumes of evidence to show that racism hurts everyone, even though it still hurts the immediate victim most of all. A pervasive pattern of exclusion of people of color from the corridors of opportunity destroys initiative, increases costly forms of dependency and weakens our social fabric and thus our moral standing. Most of all, discrimination still deprives the whole society of the

benefits of the talents of those excluded. As President-elect Clinton said often in the recent campaign, our society cannot afford to lose the contributions of a single citizen.

Even though class and race are inextricably bound, you and I know that too many Americans of every color are still held back by the station of their birth. I mentioned Bill Clinton a moment ago. His life story is an inspiring example of a young man born in rural poverty who transcended to become a Rhodes scholar and a Yale Law School graduate. His story is so compelling because his journey is so rare. He is literally one in a million. The small towns and the big cities are filled with men and women from backgrounds identical to his. They are among the heart-broken, the disenchanted, the left behind and the left out. An American community that seeks to be inclusive must not forget the reservoir of talented men and women of all ethnic backgrounds untouched by the transforming power of good education and career opportunity.

For most of 1992, we have been hearing that this was the political year of the woman. After much media ballyhoo, there are now 39 women in the U.S. House of Representatives and five elected women in the U.S. Senate. Since women are more than half the population, you might ask what all the fuss was about. More important, when we look at the wages of women, they remain about two thirds of those of their male counterparts. Worse still, a significant number of women report egregious instances of work place discrimination, including sexual harassment. These cases, many hidden until now, are forcing their way into public view. A community of equality, I trust you will agree, is one in which women are accorded the dignity to pursue their careers. They are entitled to be free of the pressure of being made sexual objects. They should not have to endure being the targets of power games. These have no place in a fair and inclusive society.

Age discrimination is still rampant in the United States. It exists in employment, housing and even in public accommodations, particularly hospitals and long-term care facilities. At the same time, there has been a significant shift of generational wealth distribution, from children to those past age 65. These two competing sets of reality have spawned what some describe as intergenerational warfare. As medical science continues to extend natural life cycles past the century mark, those intergenerational tensions will worsen. Government, in my view, must be the honest broker between the generations. As matters now stand, political power in the hands of the elderly creates certain opportunities for wealth retention. In California, that resulted in Proposition 13, which permitted older citizens to retain more of their wealth, but denied educational and recreational opportunities to many young people.

Many of those young people now engage in recreational violence. Violence against whom? The elderly. The result: Older people have more wealth and less freedom. They remain locked behind closed doors, cringing in fear of the idle young.

Community means bringing the generations together to strengthen the bonds of family and community.

I do not mean to suggest by that pouring cement into the fault lines. I mean instead durable bridges across them. I mean intergenerational connection on common ground.

The main geographic fault line to which I wish to call your attention today does not concern North versus South or East versus West. Those still exist. They are real. They present difficulties of all sorts in apportioning our national resources. You see the tensions created, for example, over such environmental provisions as the Endangered Species act. The Northeast, as in Washington, D.C., and the Northwest, as in Oregon and Washington State, view each other

through a prism of great hostility, focused, of all things, on the spotted owl. Those tensions deserve more attention than we can accord them today.

I want instead to touch on the serious geographic tension between rural America and urban America. The issue is guns and gun control. Guns claim one life on our city streets about every 20 minutes. Since we began here this morning, three Americans in cities from Oakland to East Orange have lost their lives. Those of us who live in cities want to see legislation and regulation to curb this carnage. Americans in rural areas of such places as Texas, Montana and Idaho will hear none of it. They and their spokespersons in the National Rifle Association fear that any restriction on gun ownership means the beginning of gun confiscation. In my opinion, the Second Amendment has been bent out of all relationship to its original intent. Emotion on both sides has triumphed over reason. Here is a fault line in desperate need of a bridge for the sake of the safety and health of our whole nation.

Well, when we come to gun control in Boston versus Boise, we are indeed a long way from Mogadishu. That is where we started today. Are we really all that far? If the issue is getting guns out of the hands of irresponsible young people on the streets of cities, maybe we haven't come that far after all. Ultimately, the issues in Mogadishu and Manhattan have this in common: To achieve a credible basis for the maintenance of order, the peace-keeper must have moral authority. That authority is based at bottom on two things. First is the material ability to prevail. The second is the moral right to prevail. Moral imperative must be based, if it is to last, on a foundation of fairness and even handedness. That, in turn, is rooted in dignity and respect for the individual wherever he or she is found.

It is for that reason that I argue that we can only fulfill our super power role successfully if we set our own house in order and then work to establish a

world order based on consensus with other governments. I place Japan at the top of that list. Churchill called the West to arms in 1946, urging us to confront a potential international terror. And it was a nightmare half century. This post-Cold War era has been ushered in with new nightmares aplenty. My thesis here today rests on this simple proposition: If these nightmares are to be transformed to a new, acceptable and civil reality, the transformation must begin with ourselves.

Thank you again for this great privilege.