

agreement, and much, much more, are swept away in an instant.

Fifth, all trade agreements should relate to the question of whether they contribute to this country's national security.

These are the values that I think make sense for this country to discuss and consider as it tries to seek a new consensus on trade policy.

Once again, those who do the autopsies on failed public policies, including fast track during this last week, should not miss the cause of death. The reason fast track failed was because, as President Wilson once said, the murmur of public policy in this country comes not from this Chamber and not from the seats of learning in this town, but it comes from the factories and the farms and from the hills and the valleys of this country and from the homes of people who care about what happens to the economy of this country, and the economy of their State and their community.

They are the ones who evaluate whether public policy is in their interest or in this country's interest. They are the ones, after all, who decide what happens in this Chamber, because they are the ones who sent us here and the ones who asked us to provide the kind of leadership toward a system of trade and economic policy that will result in a better country.

Finally, Mr. President, I hope that as we discuss trade in the days ahead, it will be in a thoughtful, and not thoughtless, way. We do not need a discussion by those who say, "Well, fast track is dead, the protectionists win." That is not what the vote was about. It is not what the issue was about, and it is not the way I think we will confront trade policies in the future.

I will conclude with one additional point. There is an op-ed piece in the New York Times today which I found most interesting. I ask unanimous consent to have this op-ed piece printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURNS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, this is an op-ed piece by Thomas Friedman. I commend it to my colleagues. He talks about the new American politics and especially about fast-track trade authority. He said we have a trade debate among people divided into four categories:

The Integrationists: "These are people who believe freer trade and integration are either inevitable or good, and they want to promote more trade agreements and Internet connections from one end of the world to the other, 24 hours a day."

There are the Social Safety-Netters. "These are people who believe that we need to package global integration with programs that will assist the 'know-nots' and 'have-nots.'"

Then there are the Let-Them-Eat-Cakers. "These are people who believe

that globalization is winner-take-all, loser-take-care-of-yourself.

He provides an interesting statement of where he thinks all of the current key players in the debate find themselves.

Now everyone in the fast-track debate is in my matrix: Bill Clinton is an Integrationist-Social-Safety-Netter. Newt Gingrich is an Integrationist-Let-Them-Eat-Caker. Dick Gephardt is a Separatist-Social-Safety-Netter and Ross Perot is a Separatist-Let-Them-Eat-Caker.

If that piques your interest, I encourage you to look at this particular piece by Thomas Friedman in which he describes his interesting matrix of trade policy and the need to build a new consensus.

Finally, I want to say that what this country needs most at this point is to understand there is not now a consensus on trade policy. I say to the President and I say to the corporations and labor unions and the people in this country that it is time to develop a new consensus. I am interested, for one, in finding a way to bridge the gaps among all of the competing interests in trade to see if we might be able to weave a quilt of public policy that represents this country's best interest in advancing our economy and our American values.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Nov. 13, 1997]

THE NEW AMERICAN POLITICS

(By Thomas L. Friedman)

Well, I guess it's official now: America has a four-party system.

That's the most important lesson to come out of Monday's decision by Congressional Democrats to reject President Clinton's request for "fast track" authority to sign more international free-trade agreements. I see a silver lining in what Congress did, even though it was harebrained. Maybe now at least the American public, and the business community, will fully understand what politics is increasingly about in this country, and will focus on which of America's four parties they want to join.

Me, I'm an Integrationist-Social-Safety-Netter. How about you?

To figure out which party you're in let me again offer the Friedman matrix of globalization politics. Take a piece of paper and draw a line across the middle from east to west. This is the globalization line, where you locate how you feel about the way in which technology and open markets are combining to integrate more and more of the world. At the far right end of this line are the Integrationists. These are people who believe that freer trade and integration are either inevitable or good; they want to promote more trade agreements and Internet connections from one end of the world to the other, 24 hours a day.

Next go to the far left end of this line. These are the Separatists. These are people who believe free trade and technological integration are neither good nor inevitable; they want to stop them in their tracks. So first locate yourself somewhere on this line between Separatists and Integrationists.

Now draw another line from north to south through the middle of the globalization line. This is the distribution line. It defines what you believe should go along with globalization to cushion its worst social, eco-

nomic and environmental impacts. At the southern end of this line are the Social-Safety-Netters. These are people who believe that we need to package global integration with programs that will assist the "know-nots" and "have-nots," who lack the skills to take advantage of the new economy or who get caught up in the job-churning that goes with globalization and are unemployed or driven into poorer-paying jobs. The Safety-Netters also want programs to improve labor and environmental standards in developing countries rushing headlong into the global economy.

At the northern tip of this distribution line are the Let-Them-Eat-Cakers. These are people who believe that globalization is winner-take-all, loser-take-care-of-yourself.

Now everyone in the fast-track debate is my matrix: Bill Clinton is an Integrationist-Social-Safety-Netter. Newt Gingrich is an Integrationist-Let-Them-Eat-Caker. Dick Gephardt is a Separatist-Social-Safety-Netter and Ross Perot is a Separatist-Let-Them-Eat-Caker. That's why Mr. Clinton and Mr. Gingrich are allies on free trade but opponents on social welfare, and why Mr. Gephardt and Mr. Perot are allies against more free trade, but opponents on social welfare.

As I said, I'm an Integrationist-Social-Safety-Netter. I believe that the technologies weaving the world more tightly together cannot be stopped and the integration of markets can only be reversed at a very, very high cost. Bill Clinton is right about that and Dick Gephardt and the unions are wrong.

But Mr. Gephardt and the unions are right that globalization is as creatively destructive as the earlier versions of capitalism, which destroyed feudalism and Communism. With all its positives, globalization does churn new jobs and destroy old ones, it does widen gaps between those with knowledge skills and those without them, it does weaken bonds of community. And the Clinton team, the business community and all the workers already benefiting from the information economy never took these dark sides seriously enough.

One hopes they now realize that this is one of the most fundamental issues—maybe the most fundamental issue—in American politics. You can't just give a speech about it one month before they vote, you can't just have your company buy an ad supporting it the day before you vote, you can't just summon a constituency for it on the eve of the vote. You have to build a real politics of Integrationist-Social-Safety-Nettism—a politics that can show people the power and potential of global integration, while taking seriously their needs for safety nets to protect them along the way. Build it and they will come.

Mr. GLENN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

VETERANS DAY

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, earlier this week, we celebrated a national holiday, Veterans Day. We were not in session on that day, November 11, so I want to make a few comments about that day and what it means to our country.

Veterans Day comes from the Armistice Day that ended World War I in 1918. The armistice was signed that day at 11 o'clock in the morning with the hope that that would be the war to end all wars. As we look back on what has happened since that time, we know

that that is not what happened, however, that is the way World War I was billed at that time.

Later, Armistice Day was changed to Veterans Day to better represent all the conflicts that this country has ever participated in. I think it is good that we have a day where we can reflect on, and commemorate those who took part in those wars.

However, sometimes on that day, we are reminded that appreciation for the military, and for their sacrifices, does not get its proper attention. I am reminded of the old Kipling poem where he talks about how the lack of appreciation for our military occurs, or seems to occur, in those time periods when they are most needed.

Kipling was British, and in Britain, GI's were called tommies. In his famous poem Kipling wrote:

It's Tommy this, an' Tommy that,
an' "Chuck him out, the brute!"
But it's "Savior of 'is country"
when the guns begin to shoot.

We tend to forget about the sacrifices our military personnel when peace breaks out. History shows us that over the last 100 years or so, we have had approximately 17-year cycles of war and peace. It is amazing, almost uncanny, how our military buildups and downgrades fit into that 17-year cycle. In fact, the only conflict that occurred outside of that pattern was World War II, which was only about 4 years off the 17-year cycle. I can only hope that our current period of peace will break that 17-year cycle.

On Veterans Day, we recognize those who have gone through these cycles before us. It is a time to point out some of the sacrifices they made, the devotion to duty that they were required to perform, and the courage that they exhibited. It is a time to say, "The professionalism of our military saved lives."

Veterans themselves, do not need a special day, because they remember their own experiences in the military. They do not need a special day because those times are forever etched in their memories. They remember the people that they were associated with, their friends, people of all walks of life. They remember the rich, the poor, the advantaged, the disadvantaged; all tossed together, rubbing elbows, in what is the finest military in the world. They remember the places where they were stationed, their training, and they certainly remember their days in combat, which is forever etched on their memory, like nothing else out of their past.

Some survived and some did not. Veterans Day is a time to go back and remember those people. It is time, not just for veterans, but for all Americans, to remember that this country was built on the sacrifices of the brave men and women who served in the military, and protected our country. It is a day to remember and appreciate what made this country, the greatest nation in the world.

Mr. President, another important day occurred early this week and I would like to make a few remarks about it also.

THE MARINE CORPS' 222D BIRTHDAY

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, Monday, November 10, was the 222d birthday of the U.S. Marine Corps. That day is celebrated by marines, and former marines, wherever they are, wherever they may go.

Last year, on the Marine Corps birthday, I was on a plane with our minority leader and several other Senators, on a trip to the Far East. We were on our way to visit Ho Chi Minh City, Hong Kong, and Taiwan. We had just left Japan, and I was sitting there with my wife, Annie, when I remembered that it was the Marine Corps birthday. Because it is a ritual for marines to celebrate their birthday, no matter where they are, I told Annie that I was going back to the galley to get something to be our Marine Corps birthday cake. I know this may sound silly to some people, but to marines, it does not sound silly at all.

So, right as I was getting ready to head back to the galley, other people on the flight started gathering around where we were sitting. It turned out that they also had remembered how important this day was to me, and my fellow marines. Not only did they know what the 10th of November was, they had brought a cake along with them. It was a beautiful cake and was decorated with the Marine Corps emblem. So probably like a lot of other isolated marines in the world, we had our own party. It was a very memorable celebration.

This year I had the chance to participate in the Marine Corps birthday ball here in Washington, at the Marine Barracks. Once again, we had a wonderful celebration.

The corps remains proud of the role it has played in the history of our country—as the 911 force, the emergency force that is always available when requirements dictate that the most best is needed now.

The Marine Corps remains unique to the other services, in the respect that it has all elements of supporting arms in one unit. It has supplies for 60 days of combat. It has infantry, air, armor, and artillery. It has all the elements wrapped up in one unit, necessary to go in and be a very tough, hard-hitting organization for a short period of time.

This was vividly illustrated in the Persian Gulf during Desert Storm. The Marine Corps came in with two divisions, completely equipped, and set up a blocking position, to give our other forces time to build up—a build up that over a several-month period came to number over 520,000 Americans.

This was typical of the role that the U.S. Marine Corps has played as the ready force. And there isn't a Marine unit in existence that does not have some of its expeditionary gear, some of its combat equipment boxed and ready to go now and move within hours. If the Marine Corps ever loses that kind of readiness, I believe it will have lost its reason for being.

So in their 222d year of existence, the marines continue to celebrate the tra-

ditions of the Marine Corps. They honor and remember the sacrifices of marines who fought in places like Belleau Wood, Guadalcanal, Tarawa, Bougainville, Iwo Jima, Pork Chop Hill and the Chosen Reservoir, and Khe Sanh.

One thing that has remained the same though out the Marines history, and something that I am proud of, is in the way in that the Marine Corps recruits people. The Marine Corps recruits people to serve. They do not recruit on a promise of "Here's what is good for you, or here's what you'll get out of it yourself", they recruit by asking the question, "Are you good enough to serve your country?" And it is here, and later where they are trained, that the attitudes required to prepare them for battle, are instilled. It calls for each person to devote themselves to a purpose bigger than themselves, a purpose to each other, a purpose to the unit, a purpose to the corps, and a purpose to this country of ours.

This was well spelled out in a Parade magazine article last Sunday, November 9. This article said so much about the training that is going on in the Marine Corps today, training that continues to be updated from one war to the next.

This article was not written by some Marine Corps public relations person, it was written by Thomas E. Ricks, a writer for the Wall Street Journal. Mr Ricks starts out in the first part of this article by saying, "What is it about the Marine Corps that makes it so successful in transforming teenage boys and girls into responsible, confident men and women? He goes on to show how ordinary "Beavis and Butt-heads" can be molded into effective leaders. And he says of himself, "I majored in English literature at Yale, and, like everybody with whom I grew up and went to school with, I have no military experience. Yet I learned things at Parris Island that fascinated me."

He talks about "Lessons From Parris Island" that are instilled into these young people coming into the Marine Corps which are—first, "Tell the truth;" second, "Do your best, no matter how trivial the task;" third, "Choose the difficult right over the easy wrong;" fourth, "Look out for the group before you look out for yourself;" fifth, "Don't whine or make excuses;" and, sixth, "Judge others by their actions and not their race."

By my way of thinking, those are some pretty good objectives for anybody in our society to follow. And they are the building blocks that are instilled in all U.S. Marines as they go through boot camp.

Mr. President, I will not read this whole article this morning. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows: