

PN-ABG-965

69714

**A Review of  
"Re-defining National Security"**

by

**Dr. Philip Johnston  
for the Winrock Colloquium**

**October, 1988**

Prepared by

**Center for Research on Economic Development**

In partial fulfillment of

Contract #PDC-0180-0-00-8121-00

Bureau of Program and Policy Coordination

U.S. Agency for International Development

## Re-defining National Security

Dr. Philip Johnston

for the Winrock Colloquium

### OVERVIEW

In his address, Johnston, the Executive Director of CARE, presents a rationale for re-defining how we protect and enhance our national security. He supports the view that the greatest threat to our security in the 1990s will not be military in nature, but economic.

### HIGHLIGHTS

Three crucial factors need to be included in the equation used in determining national security policy.

1. The reality of a growing interdependence among nations. "We are less free to choose policies which may be advantageous for us but detrimental for others."
2. The expanding role that trade with developing countries will play in our economic well-being. Johnston cites the trail-blazing efforts of Land O'Lakes to build relationships with Third World countries which lead to commercial opportunities. "[It] is naive to assume that withholding [technical] assistance [from Third World countries] will somehow keep [them] from learning the latest technological advances."
3. The impact of population growth on the already unstable employment environment found in the developing world. The massive onslaught of immigrants may become the developed world's greatest motivation for helping developing countries stabilize their economies.

Johnston asserts that "America's national security ... will be enhanced in direct proportion to the efforts we make toward strengthening the economies of our global neighbors."

CARE believes that the priorities to be taken with each developing country are the provision of adequate nutrition, health care and primary education to every child, and environmental protection, particularly of topsoil, forests, and water supplies.

- / -

RE-DEFINING NATIONAL SECURITY

By Dr. Philip Johnston  
Executive Director of CARE

Prepared for the Topic:  
"Project on Cooperation with International Development;  
U.S. Policy and Programs for the 1990's."

Dr. Havener and Dr. Hardin, fellow presenters, ladies and gentlemen, I am delighted to be here in beautiful Arkansas and have the opportunity to see the Headquarters of Winrock International, a sister organization I have long admired. I congratulate the management of Winrock for joining with Michigan State University in pursuing this important examination.

CARE is delighted to participate in your deliberations, to learn as well as to contribute. The theme, "Project on Cooperation with International Development; U.S. Policy and Programs for the 1990's" is one in which we have great interest. I am confident that from such an impressive concentration of talent many useful ideas will emerge. The challenge will then be to have those ideas considered by the policy makers.

The contribution I seek to make is to present a rationale for re-defining how we protect and enhance our national security. Obviously this short address cannot be considered a full treatment of the issue. But it does represent what we at CARE believe are some important forces and trends which will become more pronounced in the years to come; and, hence, should be taken into account in determining our international development policies for the 1990's.

The rationale I propose is based on the belief that our policies and programs for the 1990's will be designed to protect U.S. national security. Most Americans perceive a strong link between military capability and maintaining national security; in fact, many believe that one provides the other. We need to re-define how our national security is maintained because in the 1990's and beyond, I believe, the greatest threat to our security will not be military in nature, but economic.

The need for re-thinking how our national security is maintained is based on the increasing importance of two crucial factors which need to be included in the equation used in determining policy.

The first is the reality of a growing interdependence among nations. With each passing year our nation becomes more closely bound to other nations in all facets of international affairs. Is there anyone in the audience who disputes the increasing reality of interdependence? I seriously doubt there is. Consider, for example, the degree of coordination between the central banks of the most industrialized countries in seeking to stabilize the value of each other's currencies. Can any one of us dispute the concept of global economic intertwining after the stockmarket crash of '87? Economists and businesspeople alike have acknowledged for some time the existence of a world economy. For years, manufacturers of products ranging from clothing to cars have sought cheap labor outside the United States. The drop in shipping costs has also contributed to this trend. Harvard Economics Professor Robert Reich cites these--along with the technological advances in computerization and satellite communications--as the main factors contributing to our one global community.

Take, for example, the automobile industry--a clear example of global manufacturing. With American car manufacturers chanting "Buy American!" it has become increasingly more difficult to do just that. According to Consumer Reports, the Ford Festiva, for example, is really a Mazda made in Korea and that a Mitsubishi Precis is a Japanese Hyundai, also made in Korea. The confusion, they tell us, doesn't end there. The Chevrolet Sprint is really a Suzuki and the Dodge and Plymouth Colts are made by Mitsubishi and all three are produced in Japan!

An important implication of interdependence among nations is that we are less free to choose policies which may be advantageous for us but detrimental for others; and conversely, that what happens to the well-being of one group of people will more and more directly affect the well-being of another. Our policies for the 1990's must reflect that awareness to ensure our own quality of life.

It is heartening to note, however, that in some areas of trade, insurance, banking, telecommunication and environment--to name just a few--we appear to be striving for consensus seeking the common good for humankind everywhere

The second factor our decision makers should consider when formulating policies for the 1990's is the expanding role that trade with developing countries will play in our economic well-being. Developing countries constitute the largest block of trading partners we have. At present, 40% of all of our exported goods and services are purchased by developing countries. To clarify even further, ten of our top twenty trading partners are from the developing world. When our decision makers ponder where our economic growth potential lies, how can they ignore that almost 3 of every 4 people on earth lives in a developing country. Our economic well-being is influenced by exports to and imports from developing countries and in the 1990's our dependence on that marketplace will increase enormously. Our capacity to create new jobs is closely linked to expanding the consumer markets in developing countries.

I recognize that trade with the developing world is currently receiving a great deal of attention because of the inability of many countries to service their international debt. These problems, severe as they are, should not prevent us from recognizing that it is in our own best interest to help these economies grow because our own growth is so closely linked to theirs. The reverse is also true: to write off the Third World would adversely affect our current standard of living.

If, as Professor Reich asserts, current trends are allowed to continue--that our children and theirs will not have the kind of income, housing or benefits we presently enjoy--then it is imperative that our national security, in all its ramifications, be re-examined. Reich's point is that our vision has to be changed to reflect a broader scope. It is his contention that farmers must be urged toward crop conversion and workers toward "new economic products and processes instead of investing in asset rearranging and casino-like financing. We ought to be investing in future products and processes that can meet world standards, and be competitive."

Certainly there are current examples of this. One such forward-thinking company is the cooperative, Land O'Lakes. In taking the long view, Land O'Lakes has been positioning itself with Third World countries in order to take advantage of opportunities as they arise in the global

marketplace and is looking to expand its markets by diversification. Land O'Lakes has led all other commercial ventures in assisting Third World farmers with technical assistance and sales of farm supplies. Land O'Lakes is building relationships which lead to commercial opportunities. It is their belief, and mine too, that it is naive to assume that withholding such assistance will somehow keep these countries from learning the latest technological advances. As developing countries' economies emerge, Land O'Lakes will be prepared to meet the growing demand. In short, companies like Land O'Lakes need to be and are involved to ensure the development of stable emerging economies which offer good market opportunities for U.S. products.

I've mentioned briefly the two most crucial factors which we at CARE feel strongly should be considered in determining policies which affect our national security. But there are other challenges of great impact which cannot be overlooked. Consider, if you will, the impact of population growth on the already unstable employment environment found in the developing world.

As populations increase in the Third World, the rate of job creation will become vastly more important than it is now. In fact, forecasters have projected that 800 million new jobs must be created by the year 2000 to meet the population's need for employment. What do you suppose will happen if those jobs are not forthcoming? I don't believe Americans understand the full import of this crisis.

By way of illustration, did you know it is estimated that shortly after the year 2000 Mexico City will have in excess of 30 million people; or, did you know that the average Kenyan today is approximately 14 years old? What will happen in the Third World, for instance, when most unemployed youth drift toward urban centers? Unless the situation changes drastically in the urban centers of most developing countries, they will find no jobs, high inflation and social unrest. Unless the tide is turned, these conditions will spawn huge numbers of economic refugees who will migrate away from the urban cities offering no hope to those which do. The urban cities which will probably be the recipients of these refugees are located in developed countries. How many people any given city can successfully absorb is anybody's guess.

This impending crisis was the focus of a recent New York Times article aptly named, "Old World Fearful of Third World's Silent Invasion." In it, an advisor of French President Francois Mitterrand refers to what may become the developed world's greatest motivation for helping developing countries stabilize their economies: the massive onslaught of immigrants.

To paraphrase his quote, "we [too] are threatened by [the] peaceful invasion." Traditionally, "the United States has prided itself in being a nation of immigrants. Yet, in some Americans the specter of an invasion across the Rio Grande touches the same fears the Western Europeans have when contemplating runaway population growth..." We, in the United States as well as all other developed countries, cannot ignore what is already a trend. Failure to do so will not only limit our own growth but tax our system's ability to provide for its citizens and increase the ever-growing pressure on our social services--a problem the countries of Europe are already facing.

Meanwhile, in the developing countries, failing to address this issue would ensure the likelihood of destabilization--and thus perpetuate the trend toward migration. The outcome of such a trend would be disastrous for everyone; no one wins. It is imperative that we understand just how directly related our stability is to our neighbors'.

I believe America's national security in the 1990's and well into the 21st century will be enhanced in direct proportion to the efforts we make toward strengthening the economies of our global neighbors.

Among the many U.S. Governmental policies that respond to the challenges of the 1990's and to strengthening the economies of our neighbors, CARE believes these two specific steps should be taken as a priority with each developing country:

1. That the United States should play a leadership role in mobilizing the world community to provide every child with adequate nutrition, adequate health care and a primary education.

2. That the United States should play a leadership role in mobilizing the world community to protect the environment of each developing country, particularly their topsoil, forests and water supplies.

The United States cannot be the only player in any world movement but we should provide a strong voice in the global forum. We need to join with others who recognize the validity of the concept of spaceship earth. We cannot survive economically or politically alone. Our survival or our national security is inextricably linked to the ability of others to prosper. It is foolhardy and unwise not to invest heavily in the future of our world.