

**Bob Dole**



**NEWS**

**U.S. SENATOR FOR KANSAS**

**FROM:**

**SENATE MAJORITY LEADER**

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE  
Monday, September 18, 1995

Contact: Clarkson Hine  
(202) 224-5358

**NEWSWEEK FORUM ON NATIONAL SECURITY**  
**SENATE MAJORITY LEADER BOB DOLE**  
**REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY**

Good afternoon. Columnist Jack Kilpatrick once wrote that "Washington, D.C. is a great place for doing, acting, achieving, moving and shaking. The city is constantly meeting, voting, hearing, deciding, confirming, passing, rejecting, sustaining and overriding. Washington is a perfect place for all these things. But it is not much of a place for thinking."

I want to thank Washington Post and Newsweek for proving those words wrong, and for providing an opportunity for all of us to do a little thinking about the most important duty of our government--national security.

I know you've already had an interesting morning, and heard from national defense experts both in and out of the Senate, on topics including defense spending, force structure and readiness.

**The Challenge of Remaining a Superpower**

No doubt about it, these are critical issues. But, decisions on force structure, readiness, and defense spending depend on how we answer the following fundamental question: Does America want to enter the next century as a superpower?

To some this may appear to be a simple, or even, unnecessary question. After all, since the end of the Cold War, America has been the world's only superpower.

But, in my view it is an essential question that must be answered -- now. We cannot assume -- indeed it is naive to assume -- that America will remain at the pinnacle of global politics, without effort, without forethought, without planning, or without leadership.

My answer to the question is that America must remain a superpower into the next century. For only as a superpower can we ensure that our interests and ideals are fully promoted and protected.

**Six Core National Security Interests**

America's Cold War victory has not changed what I believe are our six core interests. They are:

1. Preventing the domination of Europe by a single power;
2. Maintaining a balance of power in East Asia;
3. Promoting security and stability in our hemisphere;
4. Preserving access to natural resources, especially in the energy heartland of the Persian Gulf;
5. Strengthening international free trade and expanding U.S. access to global markets; and
6. Protecting American citizens and property overseas.

These interests cannot be protected without American involvement in the world.

**Interests & Ideals Should Converge**

In addition to our interests, America has core ideals that we have supported throughout our history: freedom, democracy, the rule of law, the observance of human rights, and deterring and responding to aggression.

Contrary to some, I believe that our interests and ideals, can and should converge. By preventing Soviet expansion in Europe during the Cold War we stopped the domination of the continent by a hostile power -- and prevented the enslavement of millions of more Europeans.

(more)



### Clinton Administration's Lack of Leadership

Does America want to enter the next century as a superpower? Unfortunately, the Clinton administration's answer to this question is "no." The administration -- from day one -- has been uncomfortable and apologetic about America's lonely superpower status.

As such, it is not surprising that U.S. foreign policy under this administration has been marked by a lack of assertiveness, a lack of credibility, and a lack of resolve -- in sum, a lack of leadership.

From day one, the Clinton administration has been content to have the United Nations in the driver's seat. While I have long been a skeptic of the administration's Haiti policy, just as troubling was the fact that the administration sought U.N. approval to act in pursuit of what it termed our national security interest.

### Bosnia Arms Embargo

The United States continues to adhere to an illegal and unjust arms embargo on the sovereign country of Bosnia and Herzegovina. While acknowledging that the arms embargo has only punished the victims of aggression, the administration's defense is that the U.N. Security Council supports the embargo and the United States is only one of five permanent members.

According to U.S., British and French officials, the arms embargo was supposed to limit the conflict. In reality, it prolonged the war by giving the Serbs a military advantage so great that negotiations were meaningless -- essentially a public relations exercise for the Bosnian Serbs, as well as Western leaders. For those of us not participating in the so-called Contact Group, it was no surprise that diplomacy divorced from the credible threat or use of force yielded no results.

The administration continues to say that this war will not be won militarily, but at the negotiating table. Yet, the recent NATO air strikes -- although extremely limited in their military impact -- together with Bosnian and Croat advances demonstrate that diplomacy only succeeds with leverage. With no disrespect to our U.S. negotiators, the fact that the Bosnians and their Croatian allies are finally regaining lost territory has more of an impact on prospects for a settlement than the skills of our diplomats.

The bottom line is that if the arms embargo had been lifted three years ago -- this war would have been over by now -- with far less suffering.

### NATO Air Strikes

Before I leave the subject of Bosnia, I want to talk a little about the recent NATO air strikes -- because I believe that the manner in which this operation has been executed provides considerable insight into the Clinton foreign and defense policy.

In an unprecedented move -- whose full consequences are still unknown -- the administration facilitated the subordination of the world's strongest military alliance -- NATO -- to the dictates of the U.N. bureaucracy.

Last week, NATO suspended its long overdue air campaign in Bosnia. Although the so-called dual key arrangement was modified, it is still in place, and has ensured that over the skies of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the U.N. is leading NATO. The zone of operation, the targets, and the timing of any air strikes cannot be determined without the approval of U.N. commanders or the U.N. Security Council.

As such, the air strikes were limited largely to non-strategic targets in the Sarajevo area and eastern Bosnia. The airfield, military aircraft, and weapons factories around Banja Luka all escaped the wrath of NATO air power. Ever in the pursuit of evenhandedness between aggressor and victim, the U.N. did not want to tip the military balance in favor of the legitimate government of Bosnia and Herzegovina. If by Wednesday, the Bosnian Serbs do not meet NATO's conditions and a more aggressive air campaign against strategic targets would be desired, a decision from the North Atlantic Council would not suffice -- Boutros Boutros-Ghali would have to grant his approval.

In my view, this is not the way NATO should be operating. This is not U.S. leadership.

(more)



### Allocating Defense & Foreign Policy Dollars

The primacy of multilateralism in the Clinton approach is also reflected in the choices made by this administration on how to allocate its defense and foreign policy resources.

For example, the administration has spent almost \$3 billion for nation-building in Somalia and Haiti -- hardly strategically crucial areas. The administration has funded U.N. peacekeeping at record levels -- the U.N. Protection Forces in Bosnia alone cost the American taxpayer about half a billion dollars a year.

Sure enough, balancing the budget requires tough decisions. But, the debate over the foreign aid budget is not just a question of numbers, it is also a question of priorities. In addition to putting American interests first, we need to make reforms in our way of doing business.

### Reforming Foreign Policy Bureaucracy

Eliminating duplication in our foreign policy bureaucracy is a good way to stretch our limited foreign aid dollars. The Chairmen of the Foreign Relations and International Relations Committees have proposed budget-conscious legislation that would fold the Agency for International Development, the United States Information Agency, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency into the State Department.

Furthermore, Republicans are prepared to make radical reforms in how America gives foreign aid. Study after study, for example has identified waste and incompetence in the Agency for International Development.

In his attack on the Senate mark-up of the State, Commerce, Justice Appropriations bill -- which cut funding for U.N. activities, including peacekeeping -- Secretary Christopher said that "America can't lead on the cheap."

I agree wholeheartedly. As I've said many times, leadership isn't free. It comes with a price. America cannot lead on the cheap. But let me also suggest that the administration's actions speak louder than its words.

### Strong Military & America's Interests

While accusing Republicans of isolationism, the Clinton administration has sought to slash American defense spending by \$127 billion over five years. Although this is not the only test of the administration's commitment to internationalism, it seems to me that it is a better measure than the number of foreign aid grants or subsidies for questionable multilateral activities, such as the U.N.'s Conference on Women in Beijing.

Indeed, a strong military is far more important to our nation's ability to protect our global interests and to maintain our leadership role. A strong military is a measure of the U.S. commitment to freedom. A strong military is essential to retaining America's superpower status.

Just as our foreign aid spending must be linked to American interests, our defense spending should protect these interests, and keep America prepared to confront not only the threats of today, but the threats of tomorrow.

The military forces of the United States have protected our global interests when they have been threatened. Our armed forces did what needed to be done in Iraq. Desert Storm confirmed that our military is second to none.

But as we approach the next century, we have to recognize that some of these threats are coming closer to home.

### Defending America: Missile Defenses

Only a few weeks ago, the Iraqis admitted that they had filled nearly 200 bombs and warheads for ballistic missiles with germ agents. In addition to the shockingly advanced nuclear weapons program discovered earlier, Iraq now says it ran a second program to develop a nuclear weapon by April 1991 with material diverted from nuclear power reactors.

These revelations should serve as a wake-up call. We must prepare to defend America at home.

In just three to five years, the North Korean Taepo-Dong II intercontinental ballistic missile could reach American soil.

Let us recall the words of Saddam Hussein, "Our missiles cannot reach Washington. If they could reach Washington, we would strike if the need arose."

In my view, it is time to change the Cold War era regime established by the ABM Treaty -- which currently leaves the American people vulnerable to missile attack from any country capable of developing or buying a long-range missile.

(more)



However, instead of responding to this growing threat, the Clinton administration is still clinging to the 1972 ABM Treaty - in the desperate hope that the doctrine of "Mutual Assured Destruction" or MAD, will protect America.

The Senate and the House are working to confront this dangerous challenge. Despite staunch administration opposition, the Senate and House-passed defense authorization bills make significant strides towards this critical goal. The Senate bill requires -- as U.S. policy -- that the Secretary of Defense develop for deployment by 2003, a missile defense system that is composed of ground-based interceptors -- at multiple sites -- fixed ground-based radars, and spaced-based sensors for a defense of the United States.

Once the two bills are reconciled and sent to the White House, it will be up to the President to decide whether or not he supports defending America.

I firmly believe that there is no greater task ahead in terms of our national security than defending our citizens and our soil. Indeed, this is the defining task for the United States as the world's only superpower. Should we fail in this endeavor, our children and our children's children will pay the price.

Thank you very much.

###