

A New Covenant for American Security

By Governor Bill Clinton, D-Arkansas

The following is an edited version of a speech given by Governor Clinton at Georgetown University on 12 December 1991.

We have entered a new era where we need a new vision and the strength to meet a new set of opportunities and threats. We face the same challenge today that we faced in 1946 with the end of World War II - to build a world of security, freedom, democracy, free markets, and growth in a time of great change. Anyone running for President right now, Republican or Democrat, is going to have to provide a vision for security in this new era.

Given the problems we face at home, we first must take care of our own people and their needs. We need to remember the central lesson of the collapse of communism and the Soviet Union. We never defeated them on the field of battle. The Soviet Union collapsed from the inside out—from economic, political, and spiritual failure.

Make no mistake: foreign and domestic policy are inseparable in today's world. If we are not strong at home, we cannot lead the world we have done so much to make. If we withdraw from the world, it will hurt us economically at home.

We cannot allow this false choice between domestic

Make no mistake: foreign and domestic policy are inseparable in today's world.

policy and foreign policy to hurt our country and our economy. Our President has devoted his time and energy to foreign concerns and ignored dire problems here at home. As a result, we are drifting in the longest economic slump since World War II, and, in reaction to that, elements in both parties now want America to respond to the collapse of communism and the crippling recession at home by retreating from the world.

I have agreed with President Bush on a number of foreign policy questions. I supported his efforts to kick Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait. I support his desire to pursue peace talks in the Middle East. I agree with the President that we cannot turn our back on NATO. But, because the President seems to favor political stability and his personal relations with foreign leaders over a coherent policy of promoting freedom, democracy, and economic growth, he often does things I disagree with. For example, his close personal ties with foreign leaders helped forge the coalition against Saddam Hussein, but also led him to side with China's communist rulers after the democratic uprising of students. The President

forced Iraq out of Kuwait, but as soon as the war was over, he seemed so concerned with the stability of the area that he was willing to leave the Kurds to an awful fate. He is rightfully seeking peace in the Middle East, but his urge to personally broker a deal has led him to take public positions which may undermine the ability of the Israelis and the Arabs to agree on an enduring peace.

In the aftermath of the Cold War, we need a President who recognizes that in a dynamic new era, our goal is not to resist change, but to shape it. The President must articulate a vision of where we are going. The President and his administration have yet to meet that test—to define the requirements of US national security after the Cold War. The defense of freedom and the promotion of democracy around the world are not merely a reflection of our deepest values; they are vital to our national interests. The stakes are high. The collapse of communism is not an isolated event; it is part of a worldwide march toward democracy whose outcome will shape the next century. For ourselves and for millions of people who seek to live in freedom and prosperity, this revolution must not fail. Yet, even as the American Dream is inspiring people around the world, America is on the sidelines, a military giant crippled by economic weakness, with an uncertain vision.

We face two great foreign policy challenges today. First, we must define a new national security policy that builds on freedom's victory in the Cold War. The communist idea has lost its power, but the fate of the peoples who lived under it and the fate of the world will be in doubt until stable democracies rise from the debris of the Soviet empire.

Secondly, we must forge a new economic policy to serve ordinary Americans by launching a new era of global growth. We cannot do one without the other. We need a new covenant for American security after the Cold War, a set of rights and responsibilities that will challenge the American people, American leaders, and America's allies to work together to build a safer, more prosperous, more democratic world. The strategy of American engagement I propose is based on four key assumptions about the requirements of our security in this new era:

- The collapse of communism does not mean the end of danger. A new set of threats in an even less stable world will force us, even as we restructure our defenses, to keep our guard up.
- America must regain its economic strength to maintain our position of global leadership. While military power will continue to be vital to our national security, its utility is declining relative to economic power.
- The irresistible power of ideas rules in this age of information. Television, cassette tapes, and the fax machine helped ideas to pierce the Berlin Wall and bring it down.

•Our definition of security must include common threats to all people. On the environment and other global issues, our very survival depends upon the United States taking the lead.

Guided by these assumptions, we must pursue three clear objectives. We must restructure our military forces for a new era. We must work with our allies to encourage the spread and consolidation of democracy abroad. Finally, we must reestablish America's economic leadership at home and in the world.

Restructuring our Military Forces

Today's defense debate centers too narrowly on the size of the military budget. We can and must substantially reduce our military forces and spending, because the Soviet threat is decreasing and our allies are able to and should shoulder more of the defense burden. Our defense needs were clearer during the Cold War, when it was widely accepted that we needed enough forces to deter a Soviet nuclear attack, to defend against a Soviet led conventional offensive in Europe and to protect other American interests, especially in Northeast Asia and the Persian Gulf. The collapse of the Soviet Union shattered that consensus, leaving us without a clear benchmark for determining the size or mix of our armed forces. A new consensus is, however, emerging on the nature of post-Cold War security. It assumes that the gravest threats we are most likely to face in the years ahead include:

- the spread of deprivation and disorder in the former Soviet Union, which could lead to armed conflict among the republics, or the rise of a fervently nationalistic and aggressive regime in Russia still in possession of long-range nuclear weapons;
- the spread of weapons of mass destruction, nuclear, chemical and biological, as well as the means for delivering them;
- enduring tensions in various regions, especially the Korean peninsula and the Middle East, and the attendant risks of terrorist attacks on Americans traveling or working overseas;
- the growing intensity of ethnic rivalry and separatist violence within national borders, such as we have seen in Yugoslavia, India and elsewhere, that could spill beyond those borders.

To deal with these new threats, we need to replace our Cold War military structure with a smaller, more flexible mix of capabilities, including rapid deployment, nuclear deterrence/technology, and better intelligence. To achieve these goals, I would restructure our forces.

Now that the nuclear arms race finally has reversed course, it is time for a prudent slowdown in strategic modernization. We should stop production of the B-2 bomber.

That alone could save \$20 billion by 1997. Since Ronald Reagan unveiled his "Star Wars" proposal in 1983, America has spent \$26 billion in futile pursuit of a fool-proof defense against nuclear attack. Democrats in Congress have recommended a much more realistic and attainable goal: defending against very limited or accidental launches of ballistic missiles. This allows us to proceed with research and development in missile defense within the framework of the ABM treaty—a prudent step as more and more countries acquire missile technology.

Although the President's plan does reduce our conventional force structure, I believe we can go farther without undermining our core capabilities. We can meet our responsibilities in Europe with less than the 150,000 troops

Since Ronald Reagan unveiled his "Star Wars" proposal in 1983, America has spent \$26 billion in futile pursuit of a fool-proof defense against nuclear attack. I

now proposed by the President, especially as the Soviet republics withdraw their forces from the Red Army. We can defend the sea lanes and project force with ten carriers rather than 12. We should continue to keep some US forces in Northeast Asia as long as North Korea presents a threat to our ally, South Korea.

The administration has called for a 21 percent cut in military spending through 1995, based on the assumption, now obsolete, that the Soviet Union would remain intact. With the dwindling Soviet threat, we can cut defense spending a third by 1997.

We must also not forget about the real people whose lives will be turned upside down when defense is cut deeply. The government should look out for its defense workers and the communities they live in. We should insist on advance notification and help communities plan for a transition from a defense to a domestic economy. Thirty-one percent of our graduate engineers work for the defense industry. These engineers, technicians, and other highly skilled workers are a vital national resource at a time when our technological edge in a world economy must be sharper than ever before. I have called for a new advanced research agency — a civilian DARPA (Domestic Advanced Research Projects Agency) — that could help capture the brilliance of scientists and engineers who have accomplished wonders on the battlefield.

The defense policy I have outlined keeps America strong and still yields substantial savings. The American people have earned this peace dividend through 40 years of unrelenting vigilance and sacrifice and an investment of trillions of dollars. They are entitled to have the dividend reinvested in their future.

America needs to reach a new agreement with our allies for sharing the costs and risks of maintaining peace.

Helvidius

While Desert Storm set a useful precedent for cost sharing, our forces still did most of the fighting and dying. We need to shift that burden to a wider coalition of nations, of which America will be a part. One proposal worth exploring calls for a UN

President Bush too often has hesitated when Democratic forces needed our support in challenging the status quo.

Rapid Deployment Force that could be used for purposes beyond traditional peacekeeping, such as standing guard at the borders of countries threatened by aggression, preventing attacks on civilians, providing humanitarian relief, and combatting terrorism and drug trafficking. In Europe, new security arrangements will evolve over the next decade. While insisting on a fairer division of the common defense burden, we must not turn our back on NATO. Until a more effective security system emerges, we must give our allies no reason to doubt our constancy.

Promoting Democracy Around the World

As we restructure our military forces, we must reinforce the powerful global movement toward democracy. US foreign policy cannot be divorced from the moral principles most Americans share. We cannot disregard how other governments threaten their own people, whether their domestic institutions are democratic or repressive, or whether they help encourage or check illegal conduct beyond their borders. This does not mean we should deal only with democracies, or that we should try to remake the world in our image. Recent experience from Panama, Iran, and Iraq shows the dangers of forging strategic relationships with despotic regimes. It should not matter to us how others govern themselves. Democracies do not go to war with each other. The French and British have nuclear weapons, but we do not fear annihilation at their hands. Democracies do not sponsor terrorist acts against each other; they are more likely to be reliable trading partners, protect the global environment, and abide by international law.

President Bush too often has hesitated when democratic forces needed our support in challenging the status quo. I believe the President erred when he secretly rushed envoys to resume cordial relations with China barely a month after the massacre in Tiananmen Square, when he spurned Yeltsin before the Moscow coup, when he poured cold water on Baltic and Ukrainian aspirations for self-determination and independence, and when he initially refused to help the Kurds. The administration continues to coddle China, despite its continuing crackdown on democratic reforms, its brutal subjugation of Tibet, its irresponsible exports of nuclear and missile technology, its support for the homicidal Khmer Rouge in Cambodia, and its abusive trade practices.

In the Middle East, the administration deserves credit for bringing Israel and its Arab antagonists to the negotiating table. Yet, I believe the President is wrong to use public

pressure tactics against Israel. In the process, he has raised Arab expectations that he will deliver Israeli concessions and has fed Israeli fears that its interests will be sacrificed to an American imposed solution. We need a broader policy toward the Middle East that seeks to limit the flow of arms into the region, as well as the materials needed to develop and deliver weapons of mass destruction, promote democracy and human rights, and preserve our strategic relationship with the one democracy in the region, Israel. An American foreign policy of engagement for democracy will unite our interests and our values.

We need to respond more forcefully to one of the greatest security challenges of our time, to help the people of the former Soviet empire demilitarize their societies and build free political and economic institutions. Congress has allocated \$500 million to help the Soviets destroy nuclear weapons and for humanitarian aid. We can do better. As Senator Sam Nunn and Representative Les Aspin have argued, we should shift money from marginal military programs to this key investment in our future security. Together with our G-7 partners, we can supply the Soviet republics with the food and medical aid they need to survive their first winter of freedom in 74 years.

Just as President Kennedy launched the Peace Corps 30 years ago, we should create a Democracy Corps today that will send thousands of talented American volunteers to countries that need their legal, financial, and political expertise.

Restoring America's Economic Leadership

Our second major strategic challenge is to help lead the world into a new era of global growth. Any governor who has tried to create jobs over the last decade knows that experience in international economics is essential, and that success in the global economy must be at the core of national security in the 1990s. Without growth abroad, our own economy cannot thrive. US exports of goods and services will

When we depend on foreigners for \$100 billion a year of financing, we are not the masters of our own destiny.

be over a half-trillion dollars in 1991 — about ten percent of our economy. I believe the negotiations on an open trading system in the GATT are of extraordinary importance. I support the negotiation of a North American Free Trade Agreement, so long as it is fair to American farmers and workers, protects the environment, and observes decent labor standards. Every one billion dollars in US exports generates 20-30,000 more jobs. How can we lead when we have gone from being the world's largest creditor country to the world's largest debtor nation owing \$405 billion? When we depend on foreigners for \$100 billion a year of financing, we are not the masters of our own destiny.

I have spoken before of rebuilding our nation's

economic greatness, for the job of restoring America's competitive edge truly begins at home. I have offered a program to build the most well-educated and well-trained workforce in the world, and put our national budget to work on programs that make America richer, not more indebted. The private sector must maintain the initiative, but government has an indispensable role.

I have mentioned a civilian advanced research projects agency to work closely with the private sector, so that its priorities are not set by the government alone. We have hundreds of national laboratories with extraordinary talent that have put the United States at the forefront of military technology. We need to reorient their mission, working with private companies and universities, to advance technologies that will make our lives better and create tomorrow's jobs.

Now we must understand as never before that our national security is largely economic. The success of our engagement in the world depends not on the headlines it brings to Washington politicians, but on the benefits it brings to working middle-class Americans. Our "foreign" policies are not really foreign at all. We can no longer define national security in the narrow military terms of the Cold War, or afford to have foreign and domestic policies isolated from each other. We must devise and pursue national policies that serve the needs of our people by uniting us at home and restoring America's greatness in the world. To lead abroad, a President of the United States must first lead at home.

Half a century ago, this country emerged victorious from an all-consuming war into a new era of great challenge. It was a time of change, a time for new thinking, a time for working together to build a free and prosperous world, a time for putting that war behind us. In the aftermath of that war, President Harry Truman and his successors forged a bipartisan

We must devise and pursue national policies that serve the needs of our people by uniting us at home and restoring America's greatness in the world.

consensus in America that brought security and prosperity for 20 years. That is the spirit we need as we move into this new era. As President Lincoln told Congress in another time of new challenge, in 1862:

The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves and then we shall save our country. Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history.

Governor Clinton is currently seeking the Democratic Nomination in the 1992 Presidential campaign.

Second-Hand Smoke and Public Policy: It's Not Just Hot Air

By Eli Schulman

As long ago as 1890, the Supreme Court of Louisiana upheld an ordinance prohibiting smoking on streetcars, recognizing the "material annoyance, the inconvenience, and the discomfort" that smoking causes the majority of passengers, and further recognizing that, "there is not only discomfort, but possible danger to health from the contaminated air." [*State v. Hedenhain*, 7 SD 621 (1890)] Over 100 years later, an ever-growing body of scientific evidence continues to document the severity of health hazards posed by second-hand smoke, known in scientific circles as environmental tobacco smoke (ETS), inhaled by non-smokers, "involuntary smokers." While the scientific community has evaluated ETS, public policy has, to this point, lagged hopelessly behind. Public policy must accept the challenge of environmental tobacco smoke head-on, and work toward a ban on smoking in enclosed public areas. To best understand how public policy should evaluate ETS, it will be helpful to consider the dangers posed by environmental tobacco smoke, the paths through which public policy might seek to respond to these dangers, and the obstacles which policy efforts might encounter in confronting the problem.

The Dangers of Environmental Tobacco Smoke

A burning cigarette emits over 4,000 chemicals, including 43 known carcinogens. The impact of these toxins is severe; carbon monoxide and other gases interfere with the blood's ability to carry oxygen. Tar particles can accumulate in the lungs and may cause lung cancer. Although smokers face the greatest risk of disease, non-smokers inhale the same harmful substances in lesser quantities through environmental smoke. Sidestream smoke emitted from the end of a burning cigarette and the exhalations of a smoker constitute environmental tobacco smoke. Engineers confess that ventilation does not adequately remove tobacco smoke from indoor environments. In fact, many buildings' ventilation systems recirculate air in an effort to conserve energy, resulting in the further spread of carcinogens throughout the building.

Many non-smokers experience the effects of these carcinogens immediately. The World Health Organization, which monitors global health concerns and publishes reports on health issues like smoking, has identified many harmful effects of ETS. These respiratory symptoms include chronic coughing, reduced levels of lung functions, and the aggravation of asthma, as well as the simple irritation of the eyes, the nose, and the throat

A 1986 Surgeon General's report remains the