

Peacekeeping, And Peace Powers

By BOB DOLE

On May 3, 1994, President Clinton signed "Presidential Decision Directive 25" (PDD-25) after a protracted review of United States participation in United Nations peacekeeping. The final document was widely reported as a retreat from the "Assertive Multilateralism" proclaimed so boldly in the months before the October 1993 Somali disaster. In fact, PDD-25 simply ratified the status quo, and has led to little or no reduction in the administration's proclivity to rubber stamp United Nations peacekeeping.

Since PDD-25 was signed, the United States has voted to establish, extend or expand U.N. peacekeeping and other U.N. missions no less than 39 times (according to the State Department).

Since Sept. 27, 1993, when President Clinton declared that the United Nations must learn "when to say no," the United States has voted 68 times in support of peacekeeping operations.

The U.S. did not cast a single "no" vote.

And the expansion continues: In December 1994 a new operation was established in Tajikistan and a current operation was expanded in the Western Sahara while a dramatic expansion in Angola is just around the corner. It seems clear the United Nations hasn't learned when to say no, and the United States hasn't learned when to vote no.

The explosive growth of U.N. peacekeeping did not begin with this administration, but this administration made little serious effort to contain it. Between 1949-1988, 13

I Can —

(Continued From Previous Page)

was filled with Simpson grade school youngsters. The parking lot to the east held bleachers with Russell High School band and the school's Bronco Pops Choir. An adjacent bleacher contained members of the Hays Kennedy Middle School band.

The half-block of East Eighth Street was lined with bleachers containing more students. Directly south of the intersection, also in the center of Main Street, was a bleacher adapted for the use of network and area television crews. Several of the stations used satellite dishes to beam live broadcasts for network and home audience consumption.

Continuing around the impromptu arena, the Great Bend High School band was in a bleacher adjacent to the television crews' prime location.

A section at ground level to the west of the speakers' stand held chairs for visiting office holders and prominent party workers. At the left of the stand, another bank of folding chairs provided viewing for Dole family members. The press was provided an aisle from which to work immediately in front of the stand.

Four long overhead streamers, proclaiming Dole's race for the presidency were across East Eighth Street, along the south side of the street on either side of Main Street and a banner across Main Street above the location for TV cameras.

All of the area, outlined by the bleachers were filled with Dole fans, standing shoulder to shoulder. Adding to the color were small American flags, distributed before the program opened.

What seemed like hundreds of "Dole — 88" signs and banners were held aloft. Themes of the homemade signs varied from "Grandmas for Dole" to partisan indicators such as "Washburn Alumnus for Dole."

Many of the signs indicated caravans and special buses from other areas such as Kansas City and Wichita. There were more than 50 school buses bringing children from area towns.

One couple, Bill and Maxine Allen, Overland Park, drove their motor home to Russell late Sunday. They used an electrical outlet at a Fossil Street service station, plugged in their electric blanket and made an early appearance today for the announcement. Bill, a survivor of the Bataan Death March, has long been an admirer of Bob Dole, who also proudly wears his Purple Heart, attesting to wartime injuries.

Also in the crowd was Ovsanna Kellikan, widow of Hampar Kelikian, the Chicago surgeon.

In a surprise move, Senator Dole called Russell Mayor Randy Mai to the stand. He presented \$10,000 in \$100 bills given him "for the poor of Russell" by Sophie Vavletes, New York, "who wanted to show her appreciation for the way Russell has treated Bob Dole."

Emergency medical technicians and law enforcement personnel were busy during the one and one-half hour program. At least seven were treated for various causes, apparently due to the crush of people and the stress of the occasion. Five were admitted to the hospital.



U.N. peacekeeping operations were established. Since the start of 1988, 22 operations were established — eight in the past two years.

In 1988, the entire peacekeeping appropriation was \$36.7 million. This year, the U.S. will be assessed more than \$500 million for just one operation — UNPROFOR in the former Yugoslavia.

The U.S. Congress has been or will be asked to appropriate nearly \$3 billion for U.N. peacekeeping in 1994-95 — despite the rhetoric of restraint surrounding PDD-25.

Multiple GAO, congressional, and private studies have detailed massive shortcomings in U.N. peacekeeping: Waste, fraud and abuse; mismanagement; lack of coordination; poor planning and performance; lack of oversight, and financial controls. These failures are more serious — even life threatening — when the U.N. moves into peacemaking and the use of force.

When the U.N. — at the direction of its ever-ambitious secretary General and with the acquiescence of the Clinton Administration — ignores basic principles for the use of force such as unity of command, the result is the spectacle of international bureaucrats directing NATO pilots not to hit their targets in Bosnia — after U.N. warnings to the Serb aggressors that NATO was coming!

The administration's failure to live up to its own advertising and its promises of limitations and cost control in PDD-25 has prompted Senate action. Republicans have drafted legislation, S. 5, the Peace Powers Act of 1995, to address the severe shortcomings in the administration's peacekeeping policy since PDD-25. The Peace Powers Act unties the president's hands in the use of American force to defend American interests by repealing the War Powers Resolution of 1973, but imposes new restrictions on American involvement in United Nations peacekeeping.

The Peace Powers Act responds to the administration's out-of-control peacekeeping policy through four major provisions. First, it prohibits foreign command of U.S. forces in U.N. peacekeeping operations unless authorized by Congress or unless the president meets key conditions. No doubt about it, this raises the standard for putting American troops at risk under non-American command.

However, in my view, there should be a higher standard to delegate command and control of American fighting men and women to foreign nationals. The United Nations is not NATO; in light of the well-known deficiencies and dangers in United Nations peacekeeping operations, putting American forces under foreign command and control unnecessarily risks American lives.

Second, the Peace Powers Act requires credit for all Defense Department expenditures in support of United Nations peacekeeping operations. Currently, the administration does not even attempt to seek credit for billions spent by the Defense Department in support of peacekeeping. As Republicans lead the way toward a balanced budget and as defense readiness is decreasing to historic lows, it is strategically and financially foolhardy not to receive full credit for Defense Department contributions.

In Somalia, for example, after the United States spent nearly \$2 billion in a failed "nation-building" venture, the U.N. keeps submitting bills to us for the U.N. peacekeeping mission in Somalia — an additional \$150 million this fiscal year alone.

Furthermore, the administration does not even intend to seek credit for the costs of deploying 3,000 Marines to assist the final withdrawal of the U.N. mission from Somalia. Under the current policy, the administration meekly accepts the U.N. bills and tells the Congress that America "owes" the United Nations even more money. The Peace Powers Act would end the practice of "double billing" the American taxpayer, and would ensure full credit for U.S. contributions to peacekeeping.

Third, the Peace Powers Act requires the administration to identify how it will pay for operations before voting for them. In virtually all other U.S. government programs, financial obligations cannot be made by government officials before funds are appropriated by Congress. In the United Nations Security Council, however, U.S. "yes" votes are cast long after Congressional appropriations for peacekeeping have been exhausted. Rather than addressing funding shortfalls before votes are cast, the administration votes for more peacekeeping operations and then comes to Congress describing U.S. "arrearages" to the U.N. — arrearages created by fiscally irresponsible "deficit voting." The Peace Powers Act would require specific funding sources be identified in advance of votes to support United Nations peacekeeping.

Finally, the Peace Powers Act reaffirms the Congressional mandate to lower the U.S. share of U.N. peacekeeping to 25 percent — just as Congress led the way in reducing the U.S. share of the U.N. general budget to 25 percent in 1972. U.N. bureaucrats unilaterally tried to increase the U.S. assessment in 1993, and now are reported to be considering "late fees," "penalties" and/or "interest," in an effort to get even more from its largest contributor — the United States.

The Peace Powers Act makes clear that no matter what schemes the U.N. develops to squeeze more from the American taxpayer, the American Congress will require the 25 percent limit be observed.

The Peace Powers Act does not require the end of all peacekeeping, but it does require a new approach to peacekeeping. There may be cases where United Nations peacekeeping is in America's national interests — and there may be cases where non-U.N. peacekeeping arrangements are in our interests (as in the Multinational Force of Observers in the Sinai). What is not in America's interest is a continuation of the status quo in U.N. peacekeeping.

Despite the red herrings put out by some assertive multilateralists, the provisions of the Peace Powers Act would have no effect on operations conducted pursuant to United Nations resolutions such as Kurdish relief in Iraq, Operation Desert Shield/Storm or the U.S. presence in South Korea. Only approval, funding, and command arrangements of United Nations peacekeeping operations would be affected.

Nor does the Peace Powers Act require the U.S. to "go it alone or do nothing," as some administration officials have falsely claimed. Building coalitions of allies with shared interests — whether under U.N. authorization or not — is a diplomatic tool completely unaffected by the Peace Powers Act. It is not too late for the administration to realize Congress may accurately reflect the views of the American people and to join with us in acting decisively to rein in U.N. peacekeeping.

Dole's Remarks at the RNC Winter Meeting

Jan. 21, 1995

I've been a Republican for a long time. And like many of you, I can't recall all of the Republican National Committee meetings I've attended over the years. They seem to run together in my mind.

But the Winter Meeting of 1995 will be different. This one we'll remember. Because at this Winter Meeting we can finally say: The Republican Party is the majority party of the United States of America.

For the first time in a very long time, more Americans say they identify with Republicans rather than Democrats. As a result, we... the Republicans... are the majority in the United States Senate. We... the Republicans... are the majority in the U.S. House of Representatives. And, we... the Republicans... hold the majority of governors' seats in our state capitals.

And, if we remain true to our principles, I predict that when you hold your winter meetings in January 1997, you'll be hearing from a newly-inaugurated Republican president of the United States.

Up until last year there were many who thought a Republican majority in both houses of Congress would be nothing short of a miracle. And there might have been some divine intervention last November. But other forces were at work, too.

Years and years of hard effort by many Republicans — people like you — built the party up from the grass roots, all across the country. We had outstanding Republican candidates. And we had great party leadership — especially from people like Haley Barbour and Jeanie Austin.

But the most important force was, and will continue to be, the power of our ideas.

And that's what I want to talk with you about today. Republican ideas. How they are, at root, very American ideas. That's why we won. And the most powerful of these is the idea of limited government.

Americans are demanding a nation made more free by insisting on a government that is more limited. Limited taxing, limited spending, and no more unfunded federal mandates. Fewer federal programs, more power to the states, more freedom for our people. It's not complicated. More freedom, less government.

If we can remember that — if we can maintain our commitment to that idea — if we can keep the promises we made to the American people — we will return America to greatness and remain the majority party for many winter meetings to come.

However, our destiny is not yet set. The future of the Republican Party and our country is being wrestled out in the Congress almost as we speak.

We're struggling now over fundamental principles such as requiring the Congress to live under the rules it imposes, ending unfunded federal mandates, and passing a balanced budget amendment.

Despite our majority, it's not easy. The media wants to report the personalities, the small victories, the threatening defeats. They have made the Contract With America the issue, instead of the ideas the Contract represents. They are missing the story today, as they missed it in the months leading up to the election. But the American people understand, and they are watching.

I thank the American people for their trust and their call to action. Their wishes could not be more clear, and as a party we must act on them. My mandate as Senate Majority Leader will be to rein in our government, and I hope it will be the purpose and the principal accomplishment of the 104th Congress.

To accomplish that goal, we Republicans will dust off my favorite amendment — the 10th Amendment — the one that reads: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people." You can find that amendment in the Bill of Rights.

Democrats, however, seem to discover a new "right" every time they stumble across something that's wrong.

The trouble is, liberal Democrats seem to think America is what's wrong, and we think America's biggest problem is having a government run by liberal Democrats.

They think "rights" are things a government gives to the people. We think our Founding Fathers discovered enough rights, that they are already enumerated in our Constitution, and they are the rights of private citizens to be free from government, not to be provided things by it.

If there is a litmus test, this is it: Are you more free if you are guaranteed certain resources that are determined and measured by a governing elite, or are you more free if you are guaranteed that government will not interfere with



your ability to pursue what you choose? We think it is the latter.

That's why, in this session of the Congress, we will propose and pass legislation to protect the rights of private property owners, and to cut the tangle of red tape forced upon America's small businesses and women.

And that is why, in this session, we will cut taxes. There seems to be a growing bipartisan consensus to cut taxes, which we Republicans should welcome, and which makes me think we should be able to act on a tax cut fairly quickly.

But the philosophical divide between the parties is especially visible here. I, for one, strongly object to President Clinton, who I assume still speaks for his party, labelling Americans according to "class" on this issue.

We must not create factions of Americans competing against one another for the favors of government. Instead, we should lead by instilling hope and restoring freedom and opportunity for all our people.

By cutting taxes we will reduce the government's take of private wages — worthy unto itself. But if tax cuts are also to have the effect of limiting government and providing for long term prosperity, then they also must be matched by real cuts in government spending.

Despite what the Democrats will tell you, deficit spending is not under control — unless something dramatic is done, deficits will begin to balloon dramatically again in 1999. Like a family examining its finances after a Christmas that was too rich, we must make hard decisions and endure sacrifices to make ends meet.

Along with prohibiting unfunded mandates, cutting taxes, and requiring a balanced budget — and no doubt about it, the best Balanced Budget Amendment, if we can get it, is one that requires a three-fifths vote to raise taxes — we have another very effective means of limiting government: Cutting government spending.

With the exception of Social Security, every bureaucracy and bureaucrat, every government program and federal expense must be considered ripe for reduction or elimination.

In this Republican Congress, we will roll back federal programs, laws and regulations from A to Z — from Amtrak to Zoological studies — working our way through the alphabet soup of government.

Our guide will be this question: Is this program a basic function of limited government, or is it an example of how government has lost its faith in the judgments of our people and the potential of our markets?

I believe that, more often than not, the answer to this question will justify less federal involvement, fewer federal rules and regulations, a reduction in federal spending, and more freedom and opportunity for our states and our citizens.

Finally, let me touch a moment on America's place in the world. Here, too, are important differ-

ences between the parties. One of these is highlighted by the apparent willingness of this president to place the agenda of the United Nations before the interests of the United States. Haiti springs to mind. Another example is his willingness to subordinate American principles and beliefs to the straitjacket of global opinion. Bosnia springs to mind.

Although the responsibilities of our national government are limited, its primary function is to protect the freedom and well-being of our people.

We must never forget that America has been the greatest force for good the world has ever known.

We must never be reluctant about our greatness or ashamed of our strength.

America's success has fueled a global revolution of liberty, shining light where it was thought totalitarian darkness would always reign. Our government's responsibility to protect our freedom must be reflected in the unapologetic assertion of our interests in every agreement, every pronouncement, every action we take, anywhere in the world.

Let me end with where I began — in a discussion of the future of our party and how it is intertwined with the future of our country. And let me quote Ronald Reagan, whose words still ring clearly and true for us today:

"In this present crisis, government is not the solution to our problem. Government is the problem. From time to time, we've been tempted to believe that society has become too complex to be managed by self-rule, that government by an elite group is superior to government for, by, and of the people. But if no one among us is capable of governing himself, then who among us has the capacity to govern someone else?"

You and I are leaders of our party during a defining moment. Some in the media like to characterize the debate going on in Washington as a squabble among special interests. Instead, a great contest is being waged right now over the principles by which America will govern itself in the years ahead.

Democrats and Republicans embrace profoundly different ideas about government's proper role and size and intrusiveness in our lives. We disagree about some fundamental, social values. We have a different understanding of America's place in the world, and her history and future in it.

It turns out that as much as our political opponents assert to the contrary, we are the party of the people — and that must be our future.

As long as our disagreements with Democrats continue to be about philosophy and not about who divvies up the spoils — as long as we remain true to our beliefs in our campaigns and in our governance — we will keep winning the debate because we will remain on the side of the American people.

The Olde Tower

Welcomes...



Antiques & Refinishing Crafts Folk Art Decor

Bob Dole Souvenirs

David and Barb Pitcock

913-483-3322

119 E. Wichita Ave. Russell, Kan. 67665