His Excellency

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev

Former President of the

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Foreword

The ongoing discussion of the new situation with which the world has been faced is acquiring fresh urgency. This should not be surprising, for the problems that we inherited from the past have been compounded by the profound changes that have occurred over the past few years. What is more, we are still far from having found, or even sketched out, realistic solutions to those old and new problems. Failure to find such solutions should be of increasing concern, as we watch new developments and fresh problems—often troubling and sometimes of tragic proportions.

This book is a capsule reflection of those daunting problems. It contains thoughts, assessments, and proposals for action coming from persons whose credibility, experience, and record of achievement have made them known throughout the world. For that reason alone, this book deserves close attention and thoughtful reading.

It is not my intention here to characterize or evaluate the various ideas and suggestions contained in the contributions that follow. That, after all, is up to the readers. But there is one point that must be made. This book reflects both the inherent unity and the great

and growing diversity of the world community, which is faced with common problems and processes. Hence both the striking similarity in many aspects of the broad view of the past and the future and the equally evident differences in the solutions that are being proposed.

I see nothing tragic in those differences. They are rooted in objective realities. The task, as I see it, is to find a common denominator for the interests that they reflect. If we are to find a way out of the current situation, we must address this task together.

I am convinced that in searching for a way out of the current state of world affairs we should first of all take due account of the lessons of the recent past, when collective efforts put an end to the Cold War. The Cold War ended primarily because of the realization, on both sides of the wall dividing the East and the West, that its continuation would spell death for all. This realization — that change is vitally necessary — played an important and in many ways defining role.

Another essential factor was political will. It, too, was shown by both sides, leading to specific and resolute steps. Even those steps, however, would not have had the desired effect if they had proceeded from the assumptions of a “zero-sum game,” with both sides believing that what is good for one of them is thereby bad for the other. A very different approach, one based on a search for a balance of legitimate interests, helped to resolve many issues that seemed beyond solution if viewed from the perspective of the old confrontational mentality.

All this, taken together, made possible — perhaps not always but in most cases — genuinely collective action by the international community, focusing its energies on constructive efforts to come to grips with the most intricate problems of world politics.

This led to effective and mutually acceptable decisions, with a necessary element of compromise, that have changed the world. And, however critical the approach that we may take in analyzing the recent past, a number of positive shifts cannot be denied:

- An end has been put to the confrontation between military alliances.
- International relations have become more democratic and more homogeneous.

- The arms buildup, particularly the nuclear arms race, has been halted and partly reversed.
- The few remaining totalitarian, militaristic regimes are declining.
- A number of regional conflicts have been settled.

The world is not the same as before. International relations have objectively reached a new dimension. Mankind has a new window of opportunity—a new chance for survival. But have we achieved all that we sought? We have not. Indeed, in place of old problems and difficulties we see new, unexpected ones. What we have today can hardly be called a New World Order. So far, it is rather a “world disorder.”

Why have things turned out this way? I think that on top of objective difficulties arising from the end of confrontation and the removal of Cold War constraints from problems that were left unsolved for years and even decades, other factors have also played a role.

One of them deserves particular mention here. It is that the international community and the many nations that play an important political role have in effect retreated from the principles that guided their joint efforts to end the Cold War. The lessons of recent history have been largely forgotten.

The instantaneous and large-scale growth of freedom of choice in the post-confrontational period was used, in many cases, not for focusing all efforts on a search for collective solutions but for asserting and demonstrating ethnic and national ambitions, often unrelated to real and legitimate interests. The principle of painstaking search for a balance of interests is, more and more frequently, being forgotten, making fruitful collective efforts impossible.

The future hinges largely on whether new global politics becomes a reality in time to respond to the new challenges of the approaching new millennium. However different and difficult may be the tasks faced today by individual nations, new global policies can be developed—but only if there is agreement on certain essential priorities.

We need to respond to these global challenges:

- the challenge of interdependence;
- the challenge of the nuclear danger;

- the challenge of the environmental crisis;
- the challenge of society's moral decline.

No one will be able to avoid these challenges. But are we capable of responding to them effectively?

The current state of world affairs, and the state of the Earth we inhabit, give no cause for optimism. Our civilization, which has evolved over centuries, is exhausting its vitality. Crises are developing everywhere. The demons of the past and the perils of the future haunt the lives of nations and of the world community.

Nevertheless, I see no reason to lose hope. The lessons of ending the Cold War are proof positive that, today too, the world community can cope with the problems confronting it.

We face, above all else, the challenge of interdependence. How shall we respond to it?

It is obvious to me, as I believe to many others here, that we need international interaction in order to curb spontaneous processes and establish a certain degree of control over the course of events.

The question, however, is this: can we hope to have global interaction if we fail to prevent new global divisions?

We have to speak about this because, while the politico-military confrontation has become a thing of the past, we see, even in Europe, symptoms of a new kind of divisions — economic, political, and even religious. They manifested themselves again last December at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) summit in Budapest.

Contrary to the concept of a united Europe from Vancouver to Vladivostok, which was adopted by all parties to the CSCE process, we are being presented with ideas implying two or three Europes, which would have different rights and different roles, among other things, in the security area. This, however, would condemn us to relive the past, albeit in modified form.

Furthermore, no genuinely collective action by the world community is possible unless new relations are built between North and South, bridging the confrontational divide between these two vast parts of the globe. Already, a “theoretical” rationalization of this division is being put forth — that is, the idea that the clash of civilizations is inevitably coming to replace the conflict of ideologies.

It is true that mankind's universal civilization incorporates various regional or national civilizations that have always existed and will continue to exist. But globalization must manifest itself in an intense interaction of all nations, with each one retaining its own identity. Anything else would condemn the world to countless cataclysms and endless confrontation.

Careful attention should be given to the regional, national, and civilizational specificities of the South. Having broken with its colonial past and grown disillusioned with attempts to emulate models from the West or from the East, the South is now looking for its own ways to the future. The results have been mixed: among other things, we have seen extremism, various kinds of fundamentalism, and other negative and even tragic phenomena.

Overall, however, the South has ventured on a search that is historically quite positive, and it would be disastrous if the West responded to it with a fundamentalism or intolerance of its own. What is needed is understanding, solidarity, sensitivity, and, of course, effective support—and where necessary direct assistance of a kind that helps each nation to exercise its free choice, as is its right.

Furthermore, if we are to act in full awareness of the world's interdependence and diversity and gradually learn to control global processes, attempts at hegemony of any kind must absolutely be excluded. This requires a psychological and political breakthrough similar to the one that occurred at the ending of the Cold War. As international relations are being reshaped, no nation or group of nations may claim the right to “be in command” or, even less, to impose their will on other countries.

A real and important requirement of our time is to enhance the role of the United Nations. As I see it, the underlying principles of this unique world organization remain generally valid. But let us not forget that they were formulated half a century ago. Since then the world has changed beyond recognition, and I therefore feel that there is a need today for certain amendments to the U.N. Charter that would make it fully consistent with the challenges of the future.

Moreover, the United Nations needs a concept of action or, if you will, a comprehensive strategy of global partnership. The Agenda for Peace put forward by the U.N. secretary-general is an important step toward the development of such a strategy, but to complete this task the United Nations would probably need the help of some kind of Council of Sages—eminent

persons not beholden to any authority who could offer a systematic and realistic vision of what the organization needs.

As an important component, the concept of global partnership should include a carefully devised set of procedures making it possible to predict conflicts and stop them at an early stage — before they develop into a tragedy.

I want to repeat what I have said before: the United Nations can be effective only if it succeeds in combining its own global efforts with those of regional organizations that promote security and cooperation, including, of course, those in Europe. This must become a rule everywhere.

Finally, over the past decades public movements and organizations have been playing an increasingly active role, virtually becoming new subjects of world politics. I feel that the time is ripe for the United Nations to develop a closer working relationship with those forces and organizations, with the world of science and culture, which represents a vast and potentially inexhaustible resource.

The awesome challenge of the nuclear danger is a dreadful and continuing threat to our future. It is a direct consequence and essential manifestation of a centuries-old cult of force. But in a world of interdependence, interaction, and cooperation, the use of force, and particularly of nuclear weapons, must be ruled out as a matter of principle.

This point bears repetition, for although the Cold War has been relegated to the past, confrontational political thinking and methods of force in domestic and international politics have not. What is even worse, the past few months have provided new evidence of the persistence of power politics, when weapons were used readily and often without any justification — and, I would add, with no result whatsoever.

Overcoming confrontational, power-politic mentality is essential if we are to have a peaceful future. Above all else, mankind must do everything possible — even what seems impossible — to enter the twenty-first century on a steady course toward a nuclear-free world. I therefore call for the following vitally needed steps:

- further real cuts in nuclear weapons, leading ultimately to their complete elimination;
- as a first step toward that goal, immediate and complete cessation of nuclear testing;

- substantial strengthening of the nuclear nonproliferation regime, including tough sanctions against its violators;
- the establishment, under the aegis of the United Nations and with full participation by the International Atomic Energy Agency, of an effective global system of ground, air, and space inspection that would rule out any attempt to prepare for using the energy of the atom for the purposes of war.

After the nuclear challenge, the challenge of the environment is the most dangerous reality of our time.

Nature is already punishing us severely for our arrogant and domineering attitude to its existence, laws, and needs. New technologies that would reduce the damage inflicted on nature are therefore clearly necessary. But technology, in and of itself, cannot provide a solution, for the problem lies primarily with the modern concept of production and consumption or, speaking more broadly, of man's existence as a whole. Hence a radical improvement requires a dramatic change in that concept, in our traditions and in the way we live. We need to ecologize global production and a certain self-restraint on the part of people in rich countries, putting an end to the prevailing cult of excess.

Finally, it is vital to develop a conscious collective policy of the solidarity of world community. Market economics, with its newly acquired global reach, should form the basis for an ecological and social economy, an economy of solidarity. There has been a growing recognition of the need for this, but so far, mostly on the theoretical level. We must begin to put it into practice.

To that end, mankind needs a Global Environmental Charter or, even better, a universally binding United Nations Environmental Code.

Furthermore, science and education at all levels and in all regions should be dedicated to the mastering and consistent application of moral principles in relations between man and the rest of nature. This is all the more necessary since the increasingly urgent problem of global population is ultimately one of general culture, education, and upbringing, which must be reoriented toward a civilized utilization of man's potential.

In the final analysis, the key to the problem lies in man's ability to re-think his relationship with the rest of nature. The current crisis of the environment stems, psychologically and politically, from the idea that "man is the king of nature," inherited by the present generations from the Age of

Enlightenment. We need a new paradigm that would bring us back to reality. In other words, we must recognize that man is but a part of nature, that his own destiny and that of planet Earth, depends on his attitude to the world around us.

The challenges of the coming millennium discussed here therefore impose a profound change in the mentality and psychology of humankind, a genuine revolution in the minds of men — a spiritual revolution.

One question, however, may be legitimately asked: when did man live in accordance with the spiritual values truly reflecting his better nature?

Indeed, man has never behaved in full accord with those values. What is worse, today we witness everywhere acts of utter contempt for even the most elementary moral and ethical norms that have evolved over many centuries, contempt for human life, for compassion and tolerance, solidarity and mutual respect, honesty and decency.

As for the so-called new values imposed by the current way of life and instilled in millions of people by the mass media, many of those are in fact the antithesis of genuine values. They inspire selfishness, greed, cruelty, and contempt for one's fellow man. They engender indifference to the suffering of others and to the fate of future generations, even that of our own children.

Affirming genuine universal values means to work everywhere against whatever runs counter to them. It means to act everywhere against all that demeans and damages the individual dignity of man and to assert true respect for the individual in deeds and not just in speeches from the high rostrum.

The reader may ask whether I have perhaps set my sights too high and whether the global challenges described here really have much to do with solutions to the problems so painfully felt by many people and nations. To this question, the answer can only be positive.

In this day and age, when the world is becoming increasingly interdependent, global challenges have a direct and immediate bearing on solving even the most specific problems. Again and again we have to recognize the truth of the old maxim: if we fail to sort out matters of general principle, we will be helpless in confronting problems even on an apparently smaller scale.

So it is quite appropriate that each of the articles contained in this volume explores in some way or degree those major issues of our time, examining the more specific tasks through that perspective. I wanted to call readers' attention to this valuable feature of the book and also to share with them my own views, based both on my practical experience and on the analysis of the unfolding process of change—one that is full of contradictions but, ultimately, profoundly rejuvenating.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK