

News from Senator

BOB DOLE



(R - Kansas)

SH 141 Hart Building, Washington, D.C. 20510

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
January 23, 1990

CONTACT: WALT RIKER
(202) 224-5358

U.S. DEFENSE POLICY IN THE 1990s
DOLE HIGHLIGHTS 4 KEY ISSUES AFTER
BI-PARTISAN MEETING ON DEFENSE

YESTERDAY, I HELD A MEETING WITH A SMALL BIPARTISAN GROUP OF SENATORS AND DEFENSE EXPERTS TO DISCUSS THE CRITICAL ISSUE OF THE DIRECTION OF U.S. DEFENSE POLICY IN THE 1990s. IN LIGHT OF THE DRAMATIC CHANGES IN EASTERN EUROPE--AND AROUND THE GLOBE-- AND IN VIEW OF U.S. DEFICIT PRESSURES, DECIDING THE DIRECTION OF UNITED STATES DEFENSE POLICY IS ONE OF THE MOST PRESSING MATTERS THE ADMINISTRATION AND THE CONGRESS WILL FACE THIS YEAR.

IN MY VIEW, THE UNITED STATES NEEDS TO REACH A CONSENSUS ON DEFENSE PRIORITIES, AND MOST IMPORTANTLY, ON STRATEGY, EARLY IN THE BUDGET PROCESS. I AM VERY PLEASED THAT THE FOLLOWING DISTINGUISHED GROUP OF EXPERTS, WITH EXPERIENCE IN THE NIXON, FORD, CARTER AND REAGAN ADMINISTRATIONS REACHED A CONSENSUS ON MANY KEY ISSUES:

--DR. RICHARD ALLEN, FORMER NATIONAL SECURITY ADVISOR, CURRENTLY PRESIDENT OF RICHARD V. ALLEN COMPANY, AN INTERNATIONAL CONSULTING FIRM;

--DR. AL CARNESALE, SERVED ON THE SALT I DELEGATION, CURRENTLY DEAN AND PROFESSOR AT THE JOHN F. KENNEDY SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT AT HARVARD UNIVERSITY;

--AMBASSADOR ROBERT ELLSWORTH, FORMER MEMBER OF CONGRESS, SERVED AS THE U.S. AMBASSADOR TO NATO FROM 1969-71 AND AS DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FROM 1975-77;

--MR. JOSEPH FROMM, A VETERAN OF 39 YEARS WITH U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, WHERE HE SERVED AS A FOREIGN CORRESPONDENT AND EDITOR, CURRENTLY A FOREIGN AFFAIRS CONSULTANT;

--DR. KIM HOLMES, DIRECTOR OF FOREIGN POLICY AND DEFENSE STUDIES AT THE HERITAGE FOUNDATION WHERE HE IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE MANAGING AND EDITING OF ALL FOREIGN POLICY AND DEFENSE STUDIES;

--DR. FRED IKLE, UNDERSECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR POLICY FROM 1981-1988, AND FORMER DIRECTOR OF THE U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY, CURRENTLY HOLDS THE POSITION OF DISTINGUISHED SCHOLAR AT THE CENTER FOR STRATEGIC AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES.

--DR. PHILLIP KARBER, SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT FOR NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS AT BDM INTERNATIONAL WHERE HE DIRECTS BDM'S WORK IN STRATEGIC AND CONVENTIONAL ARMS CONTROL POLICY, VERIFICATION, AND REGIONAL AND GLOBAL MILITARY ASSESSMENTS.

--MR. JAMES THOMSON, FORMER MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL STAFF FROM 1977-JANUARY 1981, CURRENTLY PRESIDENT AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF THE RAND CORPORATION.

DESPITE THEIR RANGE OF EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE THESE EIGHT DEFENSE EXPERTS REACHED CONSENSUS ON THE FOLLOWING KEY ISSUES:

(1) FIRST AND FOREMOST, THE UNITED STATES NEEDS TO DEVELOP A STRATEGY. THIS STRATEGY SHOULD DEFINE A VIEW OF THE FUTURE U.S. ROLE IN EUROPE. IN APPROACHING OUR DEFENSE BUDGET, WE NEED TO LOOK AHEAD AT WHERE WE WANT TO BE FIVE YEARS FROM NOW, AND NOT PLOD ALONG CUTTING HERE AND THERE.

(2) THE U.S. APPROACH MUST BE CAUTIOUS. WE ARE IN A PERIOD OF UNCERTAINTY AND POTENTIALLY GREAT INSTABILITY, PARTICULARLY IN EASTERN EUROPE AND THE SOVIET UNION. IT WOULD BE VERY UNWISE TO DISMANTLE OUR FORCE STRUCTURE AND WITHOUT A PLAN OR STRATEGY.

(3) REDUCTIONS OF U.S. TROOPS AND/OR WEAPONS SYSTEMS SHOULD BE PURSUED WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF ARMS CONTROL NEGOTIATIONS AND VERIFIABLE AGREEMENTS. UNILATERAL CUTS MUST BE RESISTED.

(4) WE NEED TO REORGANIZE AND RESTRUCTURE OUR FORCES TO RESPOND TO THE CHANGES IN THE THREATS WE FACE. IN ADDITION TO MAKING OUR FORCES MORE MOBILE AND FLEXIBLE, WE NEED TO CONTINUE TO INVEST IN NEW TECHNOLOGIES AS A HEDGE AGAINST NEW THREATS AND THE POSSIBILITY FOR A REVERSAL OF REFORM IN THE SOVIET UNION.

I HOPE THAT THESE VIEWS WILL BE HELPFUL TO MY SENATE COLLEAGUES AS WE BEGIN THIS SESSION. I BELIEVE THAT ONE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT RESPONSIBILITIES I HAVE AS A UNITED STATES SENATOR IS TO PROVIDE THE NECESSARY RESOURCES FOR AMERICA'S DEFENSE.

DURING THE PAST DECADE, WE MADE AMERICA STRONG AGAIN. WE CONFRONTED COMMUNISM WITH STRENGTH AND AS A RESULT, DEMOCRACY IS ALIVE AND SPREADING THROUGHOUT THE WORLD.

MR. PRESIDENT, I URGE MY COLLEAGUES NOT TO PUT THESE DRAMATIC GAINS AT RISK IN AN EMOTIONAL PURSUIT OF ILLUSIONS SUCH AS THE "PEACE DIVIDEND." INSTEAD LET US APPROACH THE 1990s WITH CAUTION AND COOL HEADS.

###

COUNTRIES ON EVERY CONTINENT, IN EVERY REGION, BESET WITH EVERY POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PROBLEM. OUR MESSAGE: YOUR NEEDS ARE LEGITIMATE, OUR INTERESTS ARE REAL -- BUT OUR POCKETS ARE EMPTY. IT'S THE WRONG MESSAGE TO SEND, AT THE WRONG TIME.

IT'S FLIES IN THE FACE OF OUR RHETORIC AND OUR RESPONSIBILITIES. IT MEANS THROWING AWAY ENORMOUS OPPORTUNITIES. IT UNDERMINES AMERICA'S INTERESTS.

WHAT'S THE ANSWER?

I DON'T PRETEND TO HAVE THE WHOLE ANSWER.

SOME HAVE SUGGESTED WE NEED TO LOOK INTO QUESTIONS LIKE AID "PIPELINES" -- THAT'S WORTH A LOOK, BUT I'M NOT YET CONVINCED IT IS AS REAL AS IT IS APPARENT.

WE MAY BE ABLE TO DO SOMETHING ABOUT REPAYMENT ON EXISTING LOANS, AS CONGRESSMAN HAMILTON AND OTHERS HAVE SUGGESTED.

SO THESE IDEAS, AND OTHERS, HAVE TO BE EXPLORED.

BUT I DO THINK I HAVE PART OF THE ANSWER. OR PERHAPS I SHOULD SAY: TWO PARTS OF THE ANSWER.

IMMEDIATE NEEDS: FY '90

ONE PART RELATED TO OUR IMMEDIATE NEEDS -- OUR SHORTFALL IN FY 90.

ONE PART RELATED TO OUR LONGER TERM NEED -- FOR GREATER PRESIDENTIAL FLEXIBILITY IN ALLOCATING OUR FOREIGN AID DOLLARS IN FY 91 AND BEYOND.

FOR FY 90, I HAVE URGED A 5% ACROSS-THE-BOARD CUT IN ALL THE LARGE AND EARMARKED FOREIGN AID ACCOUNTS. AS MANY IN THE SENATE ALREADY KNOW, I MADE THAT PROPOSAL IN AN "OP ED" IN THE NEW YORK TIMES. AND I ASK TO HAVE THE TEXT OF THE OP ED INCLUDED IN THE RECORD.

I SHOULD ALSO TAKE THIS MOMENT TO STRESS THAT THE HEADLINE -- WRITTEN BY THE TIMES -- HAS MISLEAD SOME. SO LET ME STRESS AGAIN: MY PROPOSAL IS FOR AN ACROSS-THE-BOARD CUT IN ALL THE LARGE AND EARMARKED PROGRAMS.

AS A MATTER OF FAIRNESS, AND SIMPLE ARITHMETIC -- TO GET ENOUGH MONEY SO THAT YOU CAN ADDRESS THE REAL NEEDS THAT EXIST -- I DON'T BELIEVE YOU SHOULD EXCLUDE, OR FENCE, ANY LARGE RECIPIENT COUNTRY FROM THE CUTS.

A 5% ACROSS-THE-BOARD CUT WILL YIELD ABOUT \$400 MILLION IN FY 90. SOME HAVE POINTED OUT THAT WE ACTUALLY NEED MORE. I AGREE. BUT I JUST DON'T BUY THE ARGUMENT THAT, SINCE IT IS NOT ENOUGH TO DO EVERYTHING, IT IS MEANINGLESS. THAT IS LIKE SAYING A PROPOSAL WHICH WOULD HOUSE 25% OF THE HOMELESS MAKES NO SENSE, SINCE 75% WOULD STILL BE ON THE STREET.

\$400 MILLION DOWN PAYMENT

I JUST DON'T SEE \$400 MILLION AS A TRIVIAL AMOUNT, NOT WORTH THE EFFORT. \$400 MILLION STILL MEANS SOMETHING IN KANSAS, WHERE I COME FROM.

MORE IMPORTANT, \$400 MILLION CAN MEAN A LOT -- A WHOLE LOT -- IN OUR FOREIGN AID BUDGET.

IT CAN MAKE UP NEARLY 2/3 OF THE SHORTFALL I MENTIONED EARLIER, BETWEEN THE PRESIDENT'S REQUESTS AND THE DISCRETIONARY MONEY LEFT FOR HIM.

WE'VE ALREADY FUNDED A BIG PROGRAM FOR POLAND AND HUNGARY. TO PUT THAT \$400 MILLION IN PERSPECTIVE, IT IS ENOUGH TO PAY FOR THE POLAND PROGRAM WE HAVE; THE HUNGARY PROGRAM WE HAVE; AND STILL HAVE OVER \$170 MILLION LEFT OVER, FOR MANY MORE "HUNGARY-SIZED" PROGRAMS IN EASTERN EUROPE, AND TO ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF A DOZEN OR MORE CRITICAL COUNTRIES AROUND THE WORLD.

THAT IS NOT "NONSENSE," AS ONE COMMENTATOR CALLED IT -- BUT IMPORTANT DOLLARS AND CENTS, TO ADDRESS IMPORTANT NEEDS.

SO I STRONGLY BELIEVE AN ACROSS THE BOARD, 5% CUT IN FY 90 MUST BE PART OF THE ANSWER.

PRESIDENT NEEDS FLEXIBILITY

BUT THE BOTTOM LINE ISSUE IS STILL THERE: THE PRESIDENT HAS NO FLEXIBILITY. AND SO ANOTHER PART OF THE ANSWER MUST BE REAL, LONGER-TERM CONGRESSIONAL RESTRAINT ON EARMARKING. WHEN WE WENT HOME IN NOVEMBER, POLAND WAS BEING RUN BY A DRUG-RUNNING DICTATOR; ROMANIA WAS BEING RUN BY A MEGALOMANIAC AND HIS FAMILY; EVERY DAY WAS BRINGING DRAMATIC NEW CHANGES IN EAST GERMANY AND BULGARIA; AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA'S AND YUGOSLAVIA'S COMMUNIST LEADERS WERE STILL LOOKING FOR WAYS TO TURN BACK THE TIDES OF HISTORY.

NOW, 60 DAYS -- 60 DAYS -- LATER, THAT WORLD HAS TURNED UPSIDE DOWN.

AND WHAT RESOURCES -- DOLLAR RESOURCES -- DOES THE PRESIDENT HAVE TO RESPOND?

ZERO.

THE PRESIDENT HAS ZERO DOLLARS. AND THAT MAKES NO SENSE.

NOW WE WILL NOT BE ABLE TO ANTICIPATE ALL FUTURE NEEDS. THINGS HAVE MOVED SO FAST, AND PROBABLY WILL CONTINUE TO DO SO, THAT WE WILL STILL HAVE TO KEEP PLAYING "CATCH UP BALL."

WE MAY NEED TO REPROGRAM MONEY FROM OTHER ACCOUNTS. WE MAY AT SOME POINT NEED TO CONSIDER A SUPPLEMENTAL. BUT THE FACT IS -- WE CAN ADDRESS AN IMPORTANT PART OF THE PROBLEM NOW, IN THIS SESSION, IN OUR NORMAL AUTHORIZATION AND APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS. WE CAN DO IT BY SHOWING MUCH MORE RESTRAINT ON EARMARKING. I KNOW SECRETARY BAKER INTENDS TO DISCUSS THAT WITH KEY CONGRESSIONAL LEADERS IN THE DAYS AHEAD.

NO POLITICAL MESSAGE

LET ME ADDRESS ONE OTHER CRITICISM SOME HAVE MADE OF MY PROPOSAL. THEY HAVE SEEN IT -- TOTALLY INACCURATELY -- AS SOME KIND OF POLITICAL MESSAGE TO THOSE COUNTRIES WHOSE AID WOULD BE CUT IF EARMARKS ARE REDUCED.

LET ME BE AS CLEAR AS I CAN: I OFFER THIS PROPOSAL SOLELY TO MEET THE PROBLEM -- TOO MANY FOREIGN AID NEEDS, AND NOT ENOUGH FOREIGN AID RESOURCES.

I THINK MY TRACK RECORD IS PRETTY CLEAR. IF I HAVE SOME CRITICISM OF ISRAEL -- OR ANY OF THE OTHER COUNTRIES THAT WOULD LOSE SOME AID UNDER MY PROPOSAL -- I MAKE THAT CRITICISM OPENLY AND ABOVE BOARD.

IF I WANT TO SEND A MESSAGE TO ISRAEL OVER THE MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS, I WILL SEND IT -- LOUD AND CLEAR. IF I WANT TO SEND SOME MESSAGE TO TURKEY, GREECE AND CYPRUS OVER ISSUES WHICH AFFECT THEM -- I WILL SEND IT, LOUD AND CLEAR.

IF I WANT TO SEND SOME MESSAGE TO PAKISTAN, OR THE PHILIPPINES, OR EL SALVADOR OF SOME OTHER COUNTRY -- YOU CAN COUNT ON IT: BOB DOLE WILL SEND THE MESSAGE, LOUD AND CLEAR.

(MORE)