

UC San Diego Newsletters

Title

Newsletter Fall 1994

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/40h1p7qq>

Publication Date

1994-09-01

Roots of Conflict

All too many instances of fighting between ethnic groups in Bosnia, Rwanda, the Transcaucasia region of the former Soviet Union, and elsewhere offer tragic evidence that ethnic conflict has become a major threat to international security and human rights. The outbreaks of ethnic violence that seem to confront us every time we open a newspaper or turn on a television remind us that much about ethnic conflict remains poorly understood. Does ethnic strife grow out of ancient hatred, or is it a consequence of modern concepts of identity and nationalism? Does the disintegration of multinational states make ethnic conflict inevitable? Can neighboring nations, the United States, or the United Nations do anything to stop, contain, or prevent fighting between ethnic groups?

IGCC initiated its project "The International Spread and Management of Ethnic Conflict" to foster new approaches to the study of these questions. Funded by a grant from the Pew Charitable Trusts, this two-year project joins University of California researchers in political science, sociology, anthropology, and other disciplines with an international group of scholars and political leaders to examine how ethnic conflicts spread across national boundaries, how they affect the international environment (and vice



Canadian UN Peacekeepers ride a hay cart past their armored personnel carrier stopped by Bosnian Serb forces 35 miles outside the Muslim enclave of Srebrenica (Photo: AP, K. Thielker)

versa), and how they may be managed through the cooperation of governments and international organizations. The project is headed by David Lake, IGCC Research Director for International Relations, and Donald Rothchild, Professor of Political Science at the University of California, Davis.

At the first two meetings of the project's working group, held in La Jolla on May 13-14 and September 30-October 1 of this year, IGCC researchers explored several aspects of the complex problem of transnational ethnic conflict. Rogers

Brubaker of UC Los Angeles offered a new conception of the relationships between national minorities and "nationalizing states" in Eastern Europe, while Philip Roeder of UC San Diego examined the ability of ethnic "political entrepreneurs" to amass power and dominate the political agenda in many parts of Russia and the new Eurasian states.

The assembled scholars looked at ethnic conflict on a variety of levels. Will Moore of UC Riverside and David Davis of Emory University, for example, considered ethnic conflict

In This Issue:

Ethnic Conflict & Regional Relations:p. 1-6
Views: Csepeli & Pesic on Balkan Conflict...p. 4
Arms Control:p. 6-9
Feature: A Tolerable Answer: Beyond a CTBT and NPT by Herbert F. York,p. 7

Environment: International Compliance Monitoringp. 10
Asia:p. 12-13
IGCC Updatep. 13-15

as a global phenomenon, presenting preliminary results of a cross-national study of the effect of transboundary ethnic ties on international conflict. Anna Simons of UCLA, by contrast, studied how ethnic ties operate on a more personal level, examining the difficulties of democratization and conflict resolution in a society dominated by extended families and kinship ties. In future meetings, Stephen Krasner of Stanford University, Bruce Jentleson of UC Davis, and I. William Zartman of Johns Hopkins University will contribute their ideas on international and regional management of ethnic violence.

The October 1 meeting featured the first in a planned series of panel discussions designed to present a diversity of opinion on a specific policy issue within the project's overall agenda. Focusing on

ethnic conflicts in Eastern Europe, the panel included presentations by Gyorgy Csepeli of Eotvos Lorand University, Budapest; Ellen Comisso of UC San Diego; Ronald Linden of the University of Pittsburgh; and Vesna Pesic, former member of the Serbian Parliament and founder of the Center for Antiwar Action, Belgrade. The panelists' comments provoked lively exchanges on how the collapse of Communist institutions contributed to a resurgence of ethnic identity and how a history of ethnic violence can create self-fulfilling expectations of future conflict. (See *Views*, p.4.) Upcoming panel discussions will concentrate on ethnic politics in the former Soviet Union, the role of international organizations, and U.S. intervention in ethnic conflicts.

IGCC's ethnic conflict project will

continue through 1994 and 1995 as the working group studies the effects of demographic trends and information flow, the breakup of multinational states, and the implications of ethnic conflict for American foreign policy. The project's findings will be presented in an edited volume, a series of journal articles and IGCC policy papers, a teaching seminar, and policy briefings in Washington DC and on the west coast. As the impact of ethnic conflict on national politics and international relations appears likely to grow, IGCC hopes that its project will generate innovative ways to think about, alleviate, and manage ethnic conflicts in a more fragmented yet increasingly interdependent world.

See related articles pp. 4, 6.
Participants list, p. 3.

Comparative Fundamentalism

Two central and comparable aspects of modern politico-religious movements are often called "fundamentalist": their strong concern with political power and the centrality of attitudes and practices regarding gender relations. From April 21 to 23, 1994 IGCC and other UC organizations sponsored a hugely successful international conference at UCLA titled "Comparative Fundamentalism: Gender, Politics, and Beyond." The

conference viewed movements from India to the U.S., with participants from those countries and from Iran, Egypt, Israel, and the UK.

The keynote speaker was Martin Marty of the University of Chicago, with a response by Ninian Smart, UC Santa Barbara. Three sessions were held:

- Fundamentalism and Gender,
- Fundamentalism and Politics, and
- Fundamentalism and the Islamic World.

Nikkie Keddie, Dept. of History, UCLA coordinated the conference, and edits *Contention: Debates in Society, Culture, and Science*, which will publish the revised conference papers and additional related papers in the Winter, 1995 and Spring, 1996 issues.

Contact Professor Keddie regarding subscriptions at FAX (310) 206-9630.

Request for Proposals:

1995-96 Dissertation Fellowships and Faculty Grants

IGCC sponsors UC graduate students and faculty through an annual fellowship and grant competition. Proposals for the 1995-96 competition will be accepted for the following categories:

Dissertation Fellowships: Currently enrolled UC Ph.D. graduate students who have advanced to candidacy are eligible to apply for a \$12,000 nine-month stipend. Travel and research support may also be awarded for the first year. Fellows may apply for a one-year renewal of the stipend only. Students from all disciplines are welcome.

Research and Research Conference Grants: UC faculty from all disciplines are eligible to apply for up to \$15,000 in support, for up to three consecutive years. Special consideration will be given to projects that overlap IGCC research priorities.

Teaching Grants: Course development is a high priority at IGCC. IGCC offers seed money to prepare new course materials or incorporate new teaching methods. Eligibility is the same as for research grants.

Teaching Seminar Grants: IGCC sponsors two to four teaching seminars annually, one and one-half to two days in length each. They are meant to enhance undergraduate and graduate teaching of international affairs. Participants include faculty from all of the California state-sponsored universities and colleges. IGCC seeks UC faculty to submit proposals to organize and host future seminars. A separate RFP is available for this grant.

Applications will be available for all categories in mid-November. Except for teaching seminar grants, all proposals are due **February 1, 1995**. For applications or more information, contact the Campus Programs Coordinator, IGCC, University of California, San Diego, 9500 Gilman Drive, Dept. 0518, La Jolla, CA 92093-0518, or tel. (619) 534-7224.

NOTEWORTHY

We at IGCC were saddened to hear of the recent deaths of **Yehoshaphat Harkabi** and **Aharon Yariv**. Two of Israel's leading experts in the field of strategic studies, they advanced the cause of peace in the Middle East through a wide variety of scholarly endeavors, including contributions to several projects in IGCC's Middle East research program. They will be sorely missed and fondly remembered.

After serving for a year as IGCC Policy Researcher for International Security, **Fred Wehling** (B.Sc, USC; Ph.D., political science, UCLA) was appointed IGCC's Coordinator of

Policy Research in August 1994. Dr. Wehling will work with principal investigators and contributing researchers on IGCC's projects on regional relations, ethnic conflict, and nuclear nonproliferation.

The Brookings Institute has published IGCC Director **Susan Shirk's** latest book, *How China Opened Its Door: The Political Success of the PRC's Foreign Trade*, available in November 1994.

Former UCSD Chancellor and IGCC Director Emeritus **Herbert F. York** has been appointed to the U.S. Secretary of Energy Task Force on Alternative futures for the DOE National Laboratories (the "Galvin Committee"). The task

force will examine possible options for redirection, restructuring, and/or closure of parts of the DOE laboratory system.

Papers from the IGCC-sponsored conference on **Enforcement of International Environmental Agreements** (see *IGCC Newsletter 10:1, Spring, 1994*) have been published in a special issue of *The Journal of Environment and Development* (3:1, Winter, 1994).

Contact the *Journal* at UCSD-IRPS, 9500 Gilman Dr., La Jolla, CA 92093-0519 to subscribe.

The International Spread and Management of Ethnic Conflict

La Jolla, CA, 30 September–1 October, 1994

List of Participants

Mr. Alemseged Abbay
Berkeley, CA

Prof. Gerald J. Bender
School of Int'l Relations,
U. of Southern California



Prof. Rogers Brubaker
Dept. of Sociology,
UC Los Angeles

Prof. Gyorgy Csepeli
Eotvos Lorand U., Inst.
of Sociology,
Budapest, Hungary

Rogers Brubaker

Prof. Ellen T. Comisso
Political Science Dept., UC San Diego

Dr. Beverly Crawford,
Director of Research, Center for German
And European Studies, UC Berkeley

Prof. David Davis
Dept. of Political Science, Emory U.



Dr. Paula Garb, Asst.
Director, Global Peace And
Conflict Studies, UC Irvine

Prof. Stuart Hill
Dept. of Political Science,
UC Davis

Paula Garb

Ms. Armine Ishkhanian
Anthropology Dept.,
UC San Diego

Prof. Hasan Kayali,
History Dept., UC San Diego

Prof. Edmond J. Keller
Political Science Dept., UC Los Angeles



Prof. Gail Kligman
Dept. of Sociology,
UC Los Angeles

Gail Kligman

Prof. Stephen Krasner
Dept. of Political Science,
Stanford U.

Prof. Timur Kuran
Chair, Dept. of Economics,
UC Los Angeles



Prof. David Lake, IGCC,
UC San Diego

Stephen Krasner

Ms. Letitia Lawson
Dept. of Political Science, UC
Davis

Dr. Pearl-Alice Marsh
Project Director, Joint Center for Political
And Economic Studies, Washington, DC

Prof. Jeanette Money
Dept. of Political Science, UC Davis

Prof. Will H. Moore
Political Science Dept., UC Riverside

Prof. Vesna Pesic,
Faculty of Political Sciences,
U. of Belgrade, Yugoslavia



Ms. Tracy Price-Fahimi
Anaheim, California

Tracy Price-Fahimi

Prof. David C. Rapoport
Political Science Dept., UC
Los Angeles

Mr. Lawrence R. Robertson
Graduate School of Int'l
Studies, U. of Miami

Prof. Philip G. Roeder
Political Science Dept., UC San Diego



Prof. Donald S. Rothchild
Political Science Dept.,
UC Davis

Donald Rothchild

Prof. Stephen Saideman
Dept. of Political
Science, U. of Vermont

Prof. Gershon Shafir
Sociology Dept.,
UC San Diego



Anna Simons

Prof. Anna Simons
Dept. of Anthropology,
UC Los Angeles

Prof. Nirvikar Singh
Board of Studies in
Economics, UC Santa Cruz



Nirikar Singh

Dr. Fred Wehling
IGCC, UC San Diego

Prof. Irwin Wall
History Dept., UC Riverside



C.S. Whitaker

Prof. C.S. Whitaker
Director, Center for
Multiethnic and
Transnational Studies,
U. of Southern California

Prof. Stanley A. Wolpert
History Dept.,
UC Los Angeles

Viewpoints: Ethnic Conflict in Eastern and Central Europe



Gyorgy Csepeli and Vesna Pesic at the Working Group on International Spread and Management of Ethnic Conflict, 30 September–1 October, 1994, La Jolla, California

I would like to raise your ethnic awareness. The fastest growing minority group in Eastern Europe is the Americans.
—Gyorgy Csepeli

Balkan Disintegration and the Civic State

by Vesna Pesic

Why is it that at times we fight each other, and at other times we live together in peace? A survey taken in the early 1990's indicated that a large number of Bosnians were not concerned about the religion or nationality of potential partners, neighbors, friends, and colleagues. So how is it that we began so suddenly to hate with such brutality?

Which leads to a more general question: How can we, as historians, sociologists, political scientists, and concerned citizens, approach conflict resolution among multi-ethnic successor states such as in the former Yugoslavia? A look at a demographic map of the region shows clearly how difficult mediation can be if each ethnic community claims self-determination. Dismemberment of states according to some predetermined ethnic division or border drawn under the old Communist federations could go on without end: none of the republics of the former Yugoslavia was homogeneous except Slovenia. If new states define themselves as "national" in an ethnic, not civic sense, any claim to create "ethnic borders" causes violent conflict.

Two overlapping events help explain the Yugoslav crisis: (1) the breakdown of communism and (2) the elimination of the bipolar world.

From its creation at the end of World War I, there was conflict about Yugoslavia's organization. Serbs wanted a centralized, military state. Croats opposed this, offering federation. The more powerful Serbia imposed its vision; immediately thereafter arose the "Croatian question": Croats continued to advocate federalism or an independent Croatian state. Ensuing battles between Serbs and Croats led to Yugoslavia's dissolution in 1941 under axis attacks.

World War II left terrible memories of genocide committed against Serbs, Jews, and Gypsies in the puppet state of independent Croatia. Irridentist Hungary, Italy, Bulgaria and Austria took back "their" territories. Deep fears of extinction arose within ethnic communities.

In coming to power after World War II, the communist regime held multinational Yugoslavia together with a

A Serb politician is famous for saying, "We will eat roots!" One can invent all sorts of irrational ways to deflect sanctions—Vesna Pesic

Irrational Fears and Rational Politics

by Gyorgy Csepeli

Iwish to address an insidious and collective cultural fear. It is a stage upon which the actors appear rational, but in which the realm of motivation is full of irrational elements. It is a consensual paranoia, firmly rooted in past experience and transmitted through generations.

Manipulation of the inferiority complexes, collective jealousies and paranoid states of the subject populace are tools of the trade for "political entrepreneurs" in Eastern Europe. These entrepreneurs act rationally when exploiting the population, but their goals are irrational by design, playing on the classic source of fear and aggression among small Eastern European nations: the lack of correspondence between the development of the nation as a political framework (state) and as a psycho-cultural bond (national identity). Awareness of citizenship and nationhood tend not to meet in the individual's social identity, and discrepancies between the two are not tolerated. Political entrepreneurs exploit this discrepancy, transmitting conflict to succeeding generations.

Moreover, there are about 28 existing borders in Eastern Europe; two-thirds of them could be historically disputed, for, at heart, all of these nations nurture the idea of a greater homeland. If nations don't possess the stable character which an established border indicates, considerable insecurity can result.

Further, the collective imagination itself is contested. Walter Kolarz investigated the history of these countries and determined that even national heroes can be subject to rivalry. For instance, Nicholas Zrihyi, known in Hungary as a famous writer and general, is also claimed by the Croats as their own hero; they name him Zrinsu. Frequently, trans-generational conflict occurs over "holy" or "sacred" sites. For example, the city of Kosovo was a holy place for Serbs and Hungarians, but was inhabited by Albanians. All three nations claim to have fought (and lost) the Battle of Kosovo during the Middle Ages.

Names, as, powerful symbols, form an integral part of the collective identity—and thus are also disputed. A

repressive supra-national ideology. Yet national identity remained very important to the regime which repeatedly promised to resolve “national” questions; the Party created a federation composed of six republics, each, apart from Bosnia Herzegovina, based on the idea of “constitutive peoples” which had the “right” to statehood. Tito deliberately fueled conflicts between republics so that he could arbitrate and hold himself in a central position.

Still, official supra-national communist ideology banned nationalism, and after the breakdown of the Yugoslav communist regime that ideology no longer existed. Politics were relaxed; political pluralism in Yugoslavia became strongly colored by nationalism; parties representing nationalist programs won the first free elections in 1990. Old disputes over the state’s internal organization renew.

Slovenia and Croatia demanded the establishment of a looser confederation of internationally recognized states; Serbia insisted on “democratic federation” with a more important role for the central authorities. Unable to construct a loose confederation, Slovenia and Croatia insisted on establishing separate national states. The Serbs, unable to establish a “democratic federation,” turned to an even more radical alternative: the establishment of a Serbian national state which ignored existing internal “communist” boundaries between republics.

Old, unspoken fears of genocide were used to manipulate the population—by spreading propaganda from Belgrade, focused on Serbs in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina. Serbia, with the support of the Yugoslav People’s Army (JNA) succeeded in militarizing those Serbs; the JNA practically ran the war against Croatia, as it did later, joined by Croation forces, in Bosnia.

Thus, the people in Bosnia-Herzegovina are not fighting to *preserve* their own ethnic territories—the entire region was ethnically intermixed. Rather, the collapse of supra-national communism began the long and tragic division of Bosnia-Herzegovina by Serbs and Croats in order to *create* ethnic territories—as is proved by the victimization of civilians and the terrible phenomenon of “ethnic cleansing.”

Contributing to the Yugoslav crisis was the dissolution of the two-superpower world. Yugoslavia was a very important country during the Cold War; a favorite of both sides because of its strategic location between the West and East. When the Cold war ended, Yugoslavia lost its strategic importance. A new pragmatism in the international community meant that the crisis in Yugoslavia was not in itself of great interest. Those within the country interested in promoting war knew that they had *carte blanche*.

So how can we solve the Yugoslavian crisis? States that have a multiethnic identity survive only if national questions or ethnic values are not primary or definitive. States in the region should be constituted on civic principles treating all citizens equally, rejecting conflict-producing ethnic-national state institutions and ideology. But in the post-bipolar world, who will be the guardian of supra-national civic values? How can one “believe” in human rights? The UN charter states that states’ use of force to achieve their goals is forbidden. Yet in Bosnia, force is recognized as a legitimate means to achieve national and political ends. The UN charter is being abrogated in Bosnia. The implications for future international relationships are grave and uncertain.

Vesna Pesic is a professor of political science at the University of Belgrade

Transylvanian city called Kolozsvar by Hungarians is called Klansenburg by Transylvanian German; it once had a nice Romanian name: Cluj; and in order to demonstrate the folly of Daco-Romanian continuity and disdain Hungarians and Germans, the city has now been renamed Cly–Napoca. Personal names, too, can become contested political objects. For example, in Hungary a married woman’s name is the same as her husband’s. In Slovenia, however, a law was proposed requiring an additional “ova” be added to the name of a married woman. In Slovakia Nancy Reagan would have been addressed as Nancy Reaganova. Minority Hungarian women living in Slovakia thus were deprived of their names.

A classic fear is the fear of extinction. Hungarians have been particularly prone to this fear since German romantic nationalist Herder expressed the view that since the Hungarian language was so unique and remote, it could not possibly survive. But every other nation in the region is also afraid of extinction—at the hand of a neighboring nation. Slovaks and Hungarians, Hungarians and Romanians, Serbs and Croats all fear that they will be extinguished by one another.

There is another fear of extinction: the fear of being overwhelmed by internal minorities. Gypsies are the targets of this kind of fear in all Eastern European countries. They are perceived of as aliens who do not represent the genuine local national character, and therefore must be expelled. The problem is that there is no place to expel them, because the Gypsies don’t have a homeland.

Fear of colonization has re-emerged; a revival of fear of foreign intrusion. All Eastern European nations have been dominated by great empires; the last of these (the Soviet Union) has just dissolved. In the void a new empire has emerged: the United States, perceived of on the whole as benevolent—but already voices of fear rumble, anticipating a new, irresistible domination.

Eastern European fears of disputed borders; disputed heroes; disputed city names, family names and holy places; fears of extinction from without and within; and fears of domination paralyze peoples and nations and destroy their ability to cooperate. Old competitions revive; nations seek to prove that they will be the ones to defend Christianity and Western values against barbarians, Turks and Bolsheviks. Instead of relying on each other they compete for Western rewards. Each Eastern European nation struggles to prove that its members are the *real* Europeans, the *only* Europeans—and strives to be the next to be included in the European Union.

Fear has its remedies. First, these countries have to come to terms with compelling memories of past hostilities, and draw instead upon past experiences characterized by cooperation and peaceful co-existence. Second, they should practice common internationalism—they should open their borders and promote the free exchange of ideas, people and commodities. Third, superimposed economic goals will provide the best counterpoint to the hatred and prejudice which trouble Eastern Europeans. Economic cooperation is a democratic learning process which teaches nations how to quickly solve problems, so that the fears of the past will wither away.

Gyorgy Csepeli is a professor of sociology at Eotvos Lorand University, Budapest.

Regional Security: Africa

With grants from IGCC and the U.S. Institute of Peace, Edmond J. Keller, professor of political science and director of the James S. Coleman African Studies Center at UCLA, and Donald Rothchild, Professor of Political Science at UC Davis, hosted an international conference at UCLA February 7-19, 1994 titled "The End of the Cold War and the New African Political Order."

Participants agreed that a sea change is taking place in the way that African states address domestic conflicts that threaten to become regionalized. This brings reconsideration of the meaning of state sovereignty and norms of external intervention into domestic conflict on the continent. African leaders must become more effective in solving regional security problems without relying on superpower patrons or other external assistance.

Nigeria's Ambassador to the UN, Dr. Ibrahim Gambari Soloman Gomes of the Organization of African Unity, William Zartman of the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, Francis Deng of the Brookings Institution, and Margaret Vogt of the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs attended.

Regional Orders: Building Security in a New World

Patrick Morgan and David A. Lake's UC-wide regional relations working group has completed a major study of post-Cold War regional conflict and conflict management, including their roots in superpower rivalry.

The contributors argue that regions are now more salient features of international politics;

that the end of the Cold War has opened new possibilities for the cooperative management of regional conflict; that regions are distinct objects of study; and that the foreign policies of states with global reach, involved in the politics of more than one area, must be tailored to the individual circumstances of different regions.

While theories of international relations developed in other contexts can sometimes be applied to regional settings, we need general theories of regional relations to help us identify variations among regions. The quest for universal principles of foreign policy, often urged by critics of current policy (especially in the United States), is a chimerical and dangerous goal. Regions differ. Policy must accommodate these differences if it is to succeed within the varied circumstances of the post-Cold War world.

Publication of the volume is expected in January 1995.

Whither the Nomenklatura?

Whether the communist nomenklatura is able to convert its former political privileges and become the main beneficiary of post-communist transformation is hotly debated. To date, no one has reliable data on the extent to which the old elite has remained in influential positions since 1989.

UCLA Professor of Sociology Ivan Szelenyi has concluded a two-year study partly funded by IGCC which aimed to assess the impact of post-communist transformation on Eastern European social stratification and to analyze the changing patterns of elite recruitment in Eastern Europe and Russia after 1989.

During 1993-94, Szelenyi's team conducted personal interviews with 30,000 members of the general public in Russia, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, and Slovakia alongside an elite survey of 2,000 former nomenklatura position-

holders, large-firm CEO's, and current political incumbents in the same countries.

The team analyzed findings during a December, 1993 two-part workshop at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in Erdotarca, Hungary and at the University of Utrecht, the Netherlands, then discussed their papers at a further Budapest session in July, 1994.

Results will be published in two forthcoming volumes.

Treaty Monitoring

The Verification and Monitoring Analysis Department of Sandia National Laboratories hosted its first Workshop on Cooperative Monitoring July 17-21 in Albuquerque, NM. Organized by Dr. Arian Pregonzer of Sandia and co-sponsored by IGCC, the workshop brought scholars, military officers, and diplomats from seven nations together to consider how state-of-the-art treaty and environmental monitoring technology could facilitate regional security and cooperation agreements in the Middle East.

At the workshop, scientists and engineers from Sandia and the University of New Mexico introduced participants to a wide variety of monitoring systems and techniques, including seismic sensing, infrared and radar imaging, and air quality monitoring. Other U.S. specialists discussed how cooperative monitoring could be integrated with the use of national means for treaty verification, while regional experts discussed Arab and Israeli threat perceptions and examined how cooperative monitoring could be applied to the strategic and political context of the Middle East. The meeting was the first in a planned series of conferences which will study cooperative monitoring in South Asia, Northeast Asia, Latin America, and other regions.

For related work, see Dr. Pregonzer's contribution in *Practical Peacemaking in the Middle East*, v.1, Steven L. Spiegel, ed. (see p. 16).

Feature:

A Tolerable Answer: Beyond a CTBT and NPT

by Herbert F. York

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT)

The most important of the first attempts to control nuclear weapons (made immediately after the first nuclear bombs were used) was a plan named for Bernard Baruch, who presented it on behalf of the United States to the United Nations in 1946. The plan's substance was drafted by a group chaired by David Lilienthal, who soon became the first chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission. Robert Oppenheimer, the wartime director of the Los Alamos Laboratory, was one of the four other members. The authors knew full well that what they were proposing called for radical departures from current international practices, and they acknowledged that fact in the main text of the report itself. In words which I believe were authored by Oppenheimer, the report presenting the plan to the Secretary of State says:

The program we propose may seem too idealistic. It may seem too radical, too advanced, too much beyond human experience. All these terms apply with peculiar fitness to the atomic bomb. In considering the plan, as inevitable doubts arise as to its acceptability, one should ask oneself "what are the alternatives?" We have and we find no tolerable answer.

In retrospect, the plan was indeed "too radical, . . . too much beyond human experience."

In particular it called for intrusions on sovereignty that were totally unacceptable to the Soviets, then under Stalin's rule. The U. S. Senate would also have found the plan unacceptable, and would not have ratified it in those times. During the next dozen years other proposals were put forward—but none were realized under the then-prevailing international conditions.

Finally, in 1958, President Eisenhower and Chairman Khrushchev undertook the first serious negotiations designed to achieve a comprehensive ban on nuclear weapons testing. I cannot be certain of Khrushchev's motives, but I know that Eisenhower had two major goals and one minor one.

His first goal was to take a modest but decisive step down the long road leading to eventual elimination of the nuclear Damocles' sword. Earlier proposals for achieving some sort of control over the atom were rejected because they were too broad and much too difficult to verify ("General and Complete Disarmament," for example); required too much international intrusion on national sovereignty (the Baruch Plan); or seemed threatening in other ways (Eisenhower's "Open Skies" proposal). To Eisenhower, a CTBT, being both limited in scope and relatively easy to monitor, offered a good chance for getting the nuclear restraint process restarted.

Eisenhower's second major purpose was to begin

opening up the Soviet Union. From the start of the new negotiations, all parties recognized that an international observation and inspection system would be needed. Since visitors of any kind were still few and far between, the possibility of opening that vast territory to even modest international inspection seemed to be a useful foot in the door.

Eisenhower's minor goal was to eliminate atmospheric tests which were causing increasingly troublesome radioactive pollution. With the 1954 U. S. Pacific test site fallout accident, radioactive contamination had become a political issue both at home and abroad.

The minor goal was eventually reached through the Limited Test Ban Treaty of 1963. Achievement of a more comprehensive ban would have to wait for other major changes in the international political environment.

The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)

By 1970, the achievement of a CTB had taken on a new purpose and new importance. Through the mid 1960's, after the first five states had already tested and deployed nuclear weapons, treaty negotiations to stop further proliferation resulted in enactment of the Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT), calling on "each of the parties to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament . . . under effective international control." The NPT preamble and negotiating record make it abundantly clear that a comprehensive test ban was widely considered to be an

essential part of this process. Such a ban had become a part of the promise that nuclear weapon-owning states had made to other states, in order to persuade them to forever forego the acquisition of such weapons for themselves. No time limit was then set, but partial reversal of the arms race in the meantime notwithstanding, fulfillment of this particular promise is long overdue.

Today, the willingness to accept a CTB is still widely regarded as a principle measure of a state's attitude towards the NPT, as well as a measure of a state's seriousness toward the larger goal of eliminating nuclear weapons world-wide. A CTB has become, in sum, a necessary condition for any further progress towards eliminating the nuclear threat. The substantial reductions in superpowers' stockpiles called for by the various START agreements can, of course, be accomplished in the absence of a CTBT, but truly deep reductions by all nuclear states to levels in the

Testing is no longer necessary for building nuclear weapons. . . . The long term solution to the nuclear threat is the simultaneous establishment of three universal prohibitions: one on further proliferation, one on the threat of use, and one on actual use.

low hundreds, or even less, can be realistically achieved only in the context of other security arrangements, including not only a CTB but certain other major restraints.

What a Test Ban Can't Do

Necessary as a test ban may be for preventing acquisition of nuclear weapons by new states, it is not sufficient for that purpose, because testing is no longer a necessary prelude for developing and building nuclear weapons. Back in the 1940's nuclear weapons were completely new, and no one could be sure they could even be constructed. It took great teams of highly competent scientists to cope with the questions involved, and tests were absolutely essential in order to verify the scientists' ideas. In the 1950's, thermonuclear weapons developed from another set of radically new ideas, and tests continued to be necessary for verifying theories and calculations. By the 1960's and 1970's, at the apogee of the arms race, the nuclear weapons developers acquired both experience and confidence in their predictions, but testing remained necessary to explore radically new design criteria that were set by the awesome requirements for ever more sophisticated weapons that the superpowers saw as necessary to maintain mutual deterrence. Nuclear weapons were built that could fit into six-inch artillery shells. Others were built to fit into nose cones having restricted dimensions and greatly reduced weights, so that many independently targetable re-entry vehicles (MIRV), each containing a nuclear warhead, could be delivered by a single rocket.

With the passage of time and the end of the superpower arms race, the special testing requirements for new, extreme designs do not apply. Nuclear weapons more powerful than the one exploded over Hiroshima, weighing much less than a ton, and fitting into an external diameter of much less than a meter can be confidently designed and built without tests by any state having an indigenous modern technological base or by a less advanced state with enough money to buy the necessary technology. Such weapons can be easily delivered to distant targets by a wide variety of missiles and aircraft now readily available from commercial sources. Further, these weapons do not need tritium, which also makes their design, construction, and maintenance simpler. We need only consider the real world cases of Pakistan, Israel, and South Africa. All of them have designed and built nuclear weapons without prior tests, and while India did make a single test in the early 1970's, that was so long ago that it is probably no longer relevant to whatever weapons it may have today.

The NPT and the Next Big Step

Just as a CTB will not by itself prevent proliferation, neither will the NPT by itself do so—because as it is currently written, the latter is both voluntary and has the usual escape clause. *The long term solution to the nuclear threat is the simultaneous establishment of three universal prohibitions: one on further proliferation, one on the threat of use, and one on the actual use of nuclear weapons.* All of these prohibitions would be enforced under the authority of the United Nations' Security Council by means of

advance arrangements and final actions analogous to those so effectively used in the Gulf War of 1990–91.

An agreed-upon prohibition on further proliferation, could in most instances be successfully handled either by political and economic persuasion or, if those fail, by purely conventional means. It many cases it should also be possible to enforce the second and third prohibitions solely by conventional military means, but in some particularly difficult instances at least the realistic threat of nuclear retaliation—the threat that we have in the recent past called “nuclear deterrence”—may be necessary. The prohibitions contained in this proposal are not new, but the notion of linking them all together and enforcing them by means analogous to those used in the Gulf War has not yet been seriously studied.

Banning Proliferation

The Non Proliferation Regime, now voluntary, must be made compulsory. Such a change is novel and necessary—despite the objection that prohibiting some states from ever creating nuclear weapons while others continue to possess them is inherently “unfair” and “discriminatory.” This same objection was raised in connection with the NPT itself. There, it was solved—for the moment—by including article VI, in which the superpowers promised their best efforts to end and reverse their arms race. A long time passed before they even began to seriously fulfill that promise, but since the cold war ended a few years ago the arms race has in fact ceased, large reductions in stockpiles have been

The United Nations Security Council (UNSC) would pass resolutions spelling out each prohibition on possession, threats, and use, clearly declaring its intention to use whatever means necessary for their enforcement.

achieved and are continuing, and a CTB in sight. In this new case, a reasonable minimum commitment by the nuclear weapons states might be to reduce all remaining stockpiles to no more than one hundred warheads at the time the new arrangements go into force, combined with a clear promise to effectively reduce all stocks to zero as soon as suitable international conditions and arrangements are in place. (I am convinced that the total elimination of all weapons, especially including those possessed by the current nuclear powers, can only come after the world has had some experience with arrangements of the sort I describe here, and cannot be coincident with them.)

Combining the prohibition on further proliferation with the prohibitions on threat and use has several merits. The principle merit is that all of these prohibitions are desirable, logically connected, and the means for enforcing them is in general the same. Further, the second and third prohibitions do not suffer from the “unfairness” handicap; thus the whole package would be easier to sell than a free standing compulsory NPT.

Banning Nuclear Weapon Threats and Use

Since the end of the Cold War, the attitudes of most leaders in the declared nuclear states have changed radically. Formerly, such leaders commonly thought of nuclear weapons primarily as a solution to otherwise intractable security problems. Now the leaders of these same states recognize that the problems created by nuclear weapons in the hands of a growing number of other states override whatever advantages their own possession of them might still bring. These other states are, in general, smaller and

militarily weaker than the current overt nuclear weapons states, and their leaders evidently see the possession of nuclear weapons as the best, and often the only means for leveling the playing field in a confrontation with a larger and otherwise more powerful state. As a result of these changes in their thinking, the leadership of the nuclear states is now, or soon will be, on the threshold of being ready to accept a universal prohibition on the use of such weapons.

A universally agreed “no first use” policy for nuclear weapons would, in theory, have much the same effect as a universal prohibition on their use, but its practical effect and the possibilities for its being widely accepted would be very different. As commonly described, a “no first use” policy is voluntary and it is backed up only by “a piece of paper.” These two characteristics have made it seem too weak and too uncertain to be taken seriously by many governments.

In the “no use” policy I propose, well in advance of the need for any action, the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) would pass resolutions spelling out each prohibition on possession, threats, and use, clearly declaring its intention to use whatever means necessary for their enforcement. The Security Council would then make advance arrangements with all of its permanent members, and certain other major powers as well, to make the necessary means available. The forces needed would neither belong to the Security Council nor be commanded by that body. They would, as during the Gulf War, continue to belong to, be maintained by, and be commanded by individual states, but both the prior commitments and the final authority to use them would be in the hands of the Security Council. These forces would be primarily conventional in nature, but in order to be ready for a potential violation of the prohibitions banning both the threat of use and the actual use of nuclear weapons, a reserve of nuclear weapons in the hands of certain members of the Security Council, to be used only in the most extreme situations, would still be necessary.

In the scheme proposed here, the UNSC (and only the UNSC) would have the right to threaten the use of nuclear weapons, or, if the threat alone was not sufficient, to authorize their actual use by one or more of its members on its behalf. This is obviously very different from the circumstances we have lived with for most of the last fifty years. Throughout the Cold War the United States and its allies openly reserved the right to initiate the use of nuclear weapons under certain extreme conditions. This policy was commonly referred to as “extended deterrence.” A well known example was in the case of NATO, which made it clear that it would reply to a massive ground attack on Western Europe with nuclear weapons if, as seemed all too possible, other means of resistance failed. Other states, while usually denying such intentions, very probably had similar plans for meeting similarly extreme contingencies.

A Tolerable Answer

It must be made obvious to any potential transgressor; to any renegade state; that the international community is fully prepared to deal with the even the most intransigent cases. In general, the ban on further proliferation or use

could probably be enforced without the use of any military force. In most cases a realistic threat of universal and forceful political and economic sanctions would probably do the job. In some, the actual application of such sanctions may become necessary. And indeed, a few cases may prove to be so intractable that something more than sanctions and other external pressures would be needed. In such cases it may be necessary to actually destroy the infrastructure dedicated to the design and manufacture of nuclear weaponry. By employing a sufficiently large number of conventional “smart weapons,” it should be possible to permanently eradicate such facilities with minimal casualties among persons other than those working in them.

We must, however, be prepared to cope with the extreme case, the one in which conventional military forces alone are not enough either to deter or to respond to a prohibited act on the part of a renegade state. The civilized world must continue to maintain some residual nuclear forces for as long as such possibilities can still

become real. Like the conventional forces, these nuclear forces would remain in the possession of and under the immediate control of certain individual states—presumably those constituting the permanent members of the Security Council.

Many will find it unpleasant to contemplate such actions from the present quasi-peaceful

perspective, but contemplate we must if we are ever to eliminate the nuclear menace. Indeed, the existence of a firm and obvious political will to deal decisively with extreme cases is the most promising way to assure that they are unlikely to arise even once, and surely not a second time.

I realize full well that the proposals I am offering here go well beyond anything now being actively promoted by governments, let alone anything currently being negotiated. They are, obviously, meant for some future date that I hope will not be too long in coming. The remarks quoted at the beginning of this talk were made almost fifty years ago, in a very different time. Although much has been accomplished in the meantime, the problem we are dealing with here today remains, unfortunately, unresolved. Nuclear weapons still pose a threat to humanity that goes “beyond human experience.” We must develop and put in place a “tolerable answer.”

Herbert F. York, IGCC Director Emeritus, worked on the Manhattan Project during W.W.II. During the 1950's, he initiated the UC Lawrence Livermore laboratory. He was appointed director of Defense Research and Engineering by Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy. From 1979-1981 Dr. York served as US Ambassador to the Comprehensive Test Ban negotiations in Geneva.

Edited and condensed from a UNIDIR Lecture delivered May 17, 1994 at the Palais des Geneve (Geneva: UNIDIR, 1994). Used by permission.

¹ From “A Report on the International Control of Atomic Energy”, for the Secretary of State, by David Lilienthal, Department of State, Washington, D.C., 1946

² For recommendations on the use of international economic inducements to foster non-proliferation, see IGCC Policy Paper No. 9.

³ Another discussion of the conditions that must be fulfilled before nuclear weapons stockpiles can be reduced the low 100's, or ultimately even zero, is in “Further Reins on Nuclear Arms: Next Steps for the Major Nuclear Powers” by Andrew Goodpaster, former Supreme Commander of the NATO forces. (Washington, D.C.: The Atlantic Council, August, 1993.)

Trade, CBMs, and Impediments to International Compliance Monitoring

In this thoughtful commentary, Gordon MacDonald expands on the policy implications of our Spring '94 Environment and Trade conference, then outlines new directions for IGCC research.

NAFTA, GATT, and Enforcement

The world's trading system has grown rapidly as a generator of economic activity. Between 1950 and 1990, world trade increased more than ten-fold, to \$3.5 trillion: a rate of increase over twice as fast as the growth of total world product.

International trade affecting economic activity is closely linked to problems of the environment. In many countries, increased economic activity has been associated with environmental degradation. Therefore, world trade must be structured to contribute to sustainable, rather than unsustainable, economic and environmental practices.

The links between trade and the environment are many and complex. Numerous international environmental treaties have provisions that use trade sanctions for enforcement. In fact, the treaties themselves have altered trade practices. The Montreal Protocol, designed to phase out ozone-damaging chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), has irreversibly changed trade in these chemicals, and is in the process of altering products that have used CFCs.

These linkages became highly visible during the negotiations of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). During the last year of negotiations, the parties concluded an environmental side agreement that was critical to the U.S. Congress's approval of NAFTA. The side agreement contains numerous provisions designed to ensure environmental protection in Mexico, Canada, and the United States—and the failure, to date, to enforce its provisions, particularly along the U.S.–Mexico border, is a continuing source of contention regarding the net value of NAFTA itself.

An issue of particular concern to developing countries is whether the

environmental side agreement to NAFTA sets a standard for future trade agreements. As new countries join NAFTA, will separate environmental agreements be negotiated using the current environmental agreements as a model? To what extent will the environmental protection measures built into NAFTA be considered in restructuring the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT)? Will the United States continue in its attempts to use trade as a means of raising environmental standards throughout the world through its trade practices? Or will such side agreements merely flounder through lack of budgetary enforcement?

The U.S. has already applied trade measures in a variety of contexts to advance its foreign policy interests. In the national security arena, following suspected Libyan terrorist attacks at the Rome and Vienna airports, President Reagan in 1982 declared a national emergency and imposed a fairly comprehensive ban on trade with Libya. In March 1993, the House Foreign Affairs Committee held hearings to consider imposing trade sanctions against countries that violate international arms agreements. More recent and controversial is the practice of using trade sanctions to advance the cause of human rights. The United States has attempted to pressure China to improve its human rights policy by linking annual renewal of China's Most Favored Nation (MFN) trading status to its human rights record.

In the environmental area, the United States in 1990 banned canned tuna imports from Mexico under the authority of the Marine Mammal Protection Act. Mexico was accused of using a method of catching tuna that results in a high dolphin mortality rate. Mexico took

the tuna/dolphin issue to GATT. Since GATT rules specifically ban discriminatory trade measures that are based on production processes rather than on the product, the GATT dispute resolution panel ruled in favor of Mexico, noting that the product—tuna—was safe, and that the ban was based only on the process by which the tuna were caught. As it happened, Mexico itself then decided not to force the issue, largely because of concern that the dispute might lead the U.S. to vote against NAFTA.

In 1945, when nations were formulating the Bretton Woods institutions, the terms "environment" and "sustainable development" had not yet entered the international economists' lexicon. Twenty-five years later, environmentalists sought to bring their considerations into GATT. In December of 1990, at a summit meeting of parties to GATT, representatives of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) raised their concerns with GATT negotiators. These concerns centered on four points:

1. GATT rules undermine a country's right to set the highest possible standards. For example, the European Union is questioning the U.S. actions on the corporate average fuel efficiency standards for automobiles and the gas guzzler tax.
2. The dispute resolution process is biased in favor of trade. Traditionally, the dispute resolution panels have not included representatives with environmental concerns.
3. GATT has operated largely through secret negotiations, in contrast to the openness that marked the Rio Summit.
4. The GATT process is hostile to

sustainable development in lesser developed countries, since the emphasis on trade promotes the early use of natural resources without taking into account the long-term consequences of that use. (More on this point later.)

Given its implications for future GATT decisions, the controversial 1991 tuna-dolphin dispute ruling drew the attention of environmental organizations from all over the world. As a result, the Rio Earth Summit in June 1992 focused major concern on the relationship between trade and environment, even though governments and NGOs were often at odds in drafting the Summit's Agenda 21 document. NGOs emphasize that it was they, rather than governments, that first raised alarms about trade and the goal of sustainable development.

The dispute raised further considerations. As noted, under GATT rules, a country cannot impose trade restrictions on products due to the process by which they were produced. This implies that a country cannot impose tariffs or ban imports, even though the production process violates all applicable U.S. standards. GATT permits nations to apply their own health and environmental standards, without any pressure for lower standards, as long as they are not designed to restrict trade. But the operative clause in the GATT rules is "not more trade restrictive than required." It is important to note that the NAFTA agreement specifically does not include this language.

To some degree, therefore, the side agreements to NAFTA may reflect specific reactions against perceived shortcomings in the GATT regime. There are further differences between NAFTA and GATT. Under GATT, it is the exporting country that determines whether its standards are equivalent to those of the importing country. Under NAFTA, that responsibility lies with the importing country and, in trade and environmental disputes, the burden of proof falls on the challenging party. GATT requires the party defending the environmental measure to prove its case.

In December 1993, President

Clinton called for a new "Green" round of GATT negotiations to take into account environmental concerns, including:

1. Dumping domestically prohibited goods abroad.
2. Clarifying the right of international environmental agreements to use trade measures as a means of enforcement.
3. Widening rules to allow the use of restrictions based on the method of production, as well as on the character of the product.
4. Opening up the workings of the World Trade Organization, set up by the Uruguay Round of negotiations, to a much greater degree of public scrutiny.
5. Defining the role of NGOs in validating environmental enforcement practices.

Regional Economics and Security

As point four raised at the 1990 GATT summit shows, linkage of economic and environmental agreements extends beyond trade to include other institutional concerns. Research jointly sponsored by IGCC and UCLA's Center for International Relations shows the inextricable linkages among environmental protection, economic development, and security in the Middle East, where as part of the peace process multilateral environmental protection has become a confidence-building measure (CBM) in its own right. Steven L. Spiegel's *Practical Peacemaking in the Middle East V2* provides prescriptions for ambitious region-wide mechanisms to halt environmental agreement infractions. (See *IGCC Newsletter* 9:1; 10:1)

In Northeast Asia too, the prospect of multilateral cooperation on environmental issues (particularly in the context of economic cooperation) was an ice-breaking step in IGCC's dialogue series exploring avenues for long-term diffusion of security tensions in the region. (See *IGCC Policy Papers* Nos. 5, 6, and 9; *IGCC Newsletter* 10:1; and p. 12.)

Such regional successes have won IGCC a William and Flora Hewlett Foundation grant to establish a

research program exploring the role of regions in resolving environmental conflict and improving development of *effective* global environmental policy.

Institutional Impediments

As the outfall of NAFTA and GATT show, not all international institutions provide positive reinforcement (and some result in non-enforcement) of critical environmental agreements.

A main problem is that long-term global environmental issues are often considered a low priority in day-to-day politics. Economic and trade issues, on the other hand, perceived as being of immediate relevance to the national interest demand prime attention, and national decision-making on sustainable development is driven by other policy concerns.

The IGCC research will examine national institutional mechanisms dealing with sustainable development. A workshop is planned for early next year in Southeast Asia, with the objective of learning about governments' institutional responses to the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development. Thereafter, specific country case studies may develop.

New Environment Researcher



IGCC welcomes Raymond Gerard Cléménçon, who received his Ph.D. in international relations at the University of Zürich, then completed

postdoctoral studies in development economics and international trade at the Food Research Institute, Stanford University in 1989. From 1989-1994, he served with the Swiss Federal Office of Environment, Forests, and Landscape, where he was head of the Swiss delegation to the OECD Environment Committee and Global Environment Facility, and a member of the Swiss delegation to the 1992 UN Conference on Environment and Development.

Northeast Asia Cooperation Dialogue II



U.S. envoy former President Jimmy Carter with North Korean Prime Minister Kim Il Sung, Pyongyang, April, 1994. (Photo: Cable News Network, Inc. All Rights Reserved.)

Within the Asia-Pacific region, there is a new appreciation for the value of multilateral security discussions to supplement traditional bilateral relations. Asian cooperation already occurs in the economic sphere through APEC; it began in the security sphere in the post-ministerial conference (PMC) of ASEAN; and is assuming a concrete form through the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF). This leaves one major gap in the developing network of multilateral fora for discussion of security and other issues—Northeast Asia.

Since July, 1993, IGCC has conducted the Northeast Asia Cooperation Dialogue, which brings together, in an unofficial setting, participants from the six major countries in the region: China,

Japan, South Korea, North Korea, Russia, and the United States. On May 16-17, 1994, IGCC and the National Institute for Research Advancement co-hosted the second meeting in Tokyo, Japan.

National perspectives on Northeast Asian security, opinions about measures to improve a sense of confidence, specific confidence building measures (CBMs), and future meeting agendas were discussed, based in part on pre-prepared background papers. Participants included private researchers, Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Defense policy-level officials, and uniformed defense officers from each country. All government officials and military personnel participated in their private capacities.

Participants came to a common agreement regarding the need for mutual reassurance among the nations of this region. Military confidence-building measures (CBMs) were felt to be too narrow a concept for Northeast Asia, especially since they carry a strong connotation of European institutions and experiences that might not be applicable there. Instead, mutual reassurance measures (MRMs), designed to promote a base of mutual confidence and reassurance encompassing both military CBMs and broader measures, were felt to be better-suited to the region.

Unfortunately, North Korean representatives did not attend this meeting, although they did send a supportive note. All participants agreed that Korean peninsula issues are the most important security concerns in the region, and that multilateral security dialogues have real potential to address such issues. The participation of North Korea, which attended the founding organizational meeting in July, 1993, is indispensable to making this dialogue effective. The leading issue for future meetings is how to integrate North Korea into the dialogue as soon as possible.

A unanimous understanding was reached concerning the desirability of continuing the process, and the next dialogue is tentatively scheduled for early Spring, 1994.

Conference papers are available as IGCC Policy Paper No. 9.

IGCC Northeast Asia Cooperation Dialogue

Tokyo, Japan, 16-17 May, 1994 List of Participants

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA



Ji Guoxing

Mr. Guan Dengming, Counselor, Asia Dept., Min. of Foreign Affairs

Commander Guan Youfei, Staff for Arms Control and Disarmament, Min. of National Defense

Professor Liu Liping, Deputy Director, Division for Int'l Exchange, China Inst. for Contemporary Int'l Relations

Professor Ji Guoxing, Director, Asian-Pacific Dept., Shanghai Inst. for Int'l Studies

JAPAN



Sato Seizaburo

Mr. Nogami Yoshiji, Deputy Director General, Foreign Policy Bur., Min. of Foreign Affairs

Mr. Yamazaki Shinshiro, Director 2d Defense Intelligence Division, Bur. of Defense, Japan Defense Agency

Col. Yamaguchi Noboru, Joint Staff Off., Chief of Arms Control Section, J5, Japan Defense Agency

Professor Sato Seizaburo, Keio U.

Mr. Morimoto Satoshi, Sr. Researcher, Center for Policy Research, NRI Nomura Research Inst., Ltd.

REPUBLIC OF KOREA



Cha Young-koo

Dr. Cha Young-koo, Director, Arms Control Research Centre, Korea Inst. for Defense Analyses

Mr. Song Young-Oh, Sr. Coordinator for Policy Planning, Min. of Foreign Affairs

Maj. Gen. Kim Yong-Koo, Director, Arms Control Off., Min. of National Defense

Brig. Gen. Park Sung-Boo, Deputy Director of C5, Combined Forces Command

Prof. Ahn Byung Joon, Dept. of Political Science, Yonsei U.

Dr. Lee Chung Min, Fellow, The Sejong Inst.

Dr. Choi Kang, Associate Research Fellow, Arms Control Research Centre, Korea Inst. for Defense Analyses



Vassili Dobrovolski

RUSSIA

Mr. Vassili Dobrovolski, Deputy Director, 2d Asia Dept., Min. of Foreign Affairs

Lieut. Gen. D.K. Kharchenko, Chief of the Int'l Legal Dept., General Staff of the Armed Forces

Maj. Gen. A.N. Lukianov, Deputy Chief of the Int'l Legal Dept., General Staff of the Armed Forces

Dr. Alexander Savelyev, Vice President, Inst. for National Security and Strategic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences

Dr. Konstantin O. Sarkisov, Head of Center for Japanese Studies, Vice Director, Inst. of Oriental Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences

UNITED STATES

Amb. Peter Tomsen, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, Bur. of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, US Dept. of State

Maj. Gen. Arthur C. Blades, Deputy Commander, Chief of Staff, US Forces in Japan, US Marine Corps, Yokota Air Force Base

Prof. Robert Scalapino, Robson Research Professor of Government Emeritus, Inst. of East Asian Studies, UC Berkeley

Prof. Susan L. Shirk, Director, IGCC, UC San Diego

Dr. Arian Pregonzer, Physicist/Monitoring Analyst, Sandia National Laboratories

Mr. Ernest C. Downs, Deputy Director for Regional Affairs and Congressional Relations, Off. of the Secretary of Defense, Asian and Pacific Affairs, U.S. Defense Min.

OBSERVERS



Edward T. Fei

Mr. Suh Chung Ha, 1st Secretary, Political Affairs Division, Emb. of the Republic of Korea

Dr. Edward T. Fei, Director, Off. of Nonproliferation Policy, US Dept. of Energy

Mr. Timothy Betts, 1st Secretary, Political Section, Emb. of the US in Tokyo

Robert Kaneda, 2d Secretary, Political Section, Emb. of the US in Tokyo

Mr. Andlei Yefimov, Counselor, Emb. of the Russian Federation in Tokyo

China Circle Economic Working Group

As part of IGCC's multi-year project on The China Circle: Regional Consequences of Evolving Relations among the PRC, Taiwan, and Hong Kong-Macao, a group of senior economists specializing in China from Taiwan, Hong Kong, Singapore, and the United States met on September 1-3, 1994 in Hong Kong. Chaired by Professor Barry Naughton, the group clarified questions about China Circle economic relations and offered members feedback on their work.

Issues discussed included:

- What data is most appropriate to analyze the evolution of the China Circle?
- What is the nature of the long-term gains from China Circle interactions?
- What is the role of government policy in facilitating increasing China Circle interactions?
- Do the perspectives of each China Circle country provide special insight into the overall process?
- What are the limitations and future of China Circle interactions?
- What indicators best show restructuring of domestic economies?
- What kind of institutions (especially business forms) are important, how are they changing?
- What is the impact of GATT on the China Circle?
- What is the role of Japan in China Circle interactions?

The project will conclude on December 8-10, 1994, in Hong Kong, with a large conference to discuss papers on the impact of these findings. It will analyze the rapidly developing economic ties within the China Circle including the PRC, Taiwan, and Hong Kong; overseas Chinese and their business networks; Chinese and Asian identities and values; and the regional balance of power.

Four Campus Programs Appoint New Directors

Bettina Halvorson

Four IGCC campus programs welcomed new directors this fall.

Professor Michael J. Watts,



Geography Department, will serve as director for the Institute of International Studies (IIS), UC Berkeley. Professor Watts has taught at UCB since 1979, specializing in development in

Africa and Southern India. Among its various organized activities, this year IIS will commemorate the 50th anniversary of the UN Charter signing with a lecture series addressing the UN's role in the 21st century.

Professor Alan L. Olmstead,



professor of economics and director of the Institute of Governmental Affairs at UC Davis, has accepted responsibility for the IGCC campus program. He has initiated an innovative undergraduate fellows program: students will assist faculty on international conflict and cooperation research projects. IGA is widely recognized for its public policy research, and IGCC is proud of this new association.

Professor Mark Juergensmeyer,



Sociology Department, UC Santa Barbara, has accepted directorship of the Global Peace and Security Program. A former dean at the University of Hawaii, Juergensmeyer came to

UCSB in 1993, and also chairs the UC Pacific Rim Research Program. GSPS sponsors an interdisciplinary upper division scholars program and plans to sponsor a 1995 teaching seminar on religion and politics.

Professor Paul W. Drake,



Political Science Department, UCSD, will direct the Project in International Security Affairs. PISA will sponsor a year-long graduate colloquium on ethnic conflict and international relations and a conference on new forms of game theory.

IGCC Staff Update:

Asia Policy Researcher



Michael Stankiewicz, M.A., UCSD Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies, joined IGCC in July. Before arriving, he completed an internship at Nippon Fine

Chemical, then worked at Cambridge Transnational Associates, an international joint-venture consulting firm in Boston, MA, managing the firm's start-up year of European Community Law conferences co-sponsored by Harvard Law School's European Law Research Center.

Development and External Affairs Officer



Ronald J. Bee served as a foreign policy analyst at the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Congressional Research Service. While at Palomar Corporation, he co-authored *Looking*

the Tiger in the Eye: Confronting the Nuclear Threat (Harper & Row, 1988). As a Robert Bosch Foundation Fellow, he worked for the German Bundestag's Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Governing Mayor of Berlin. He consulted in Moscow for the Freedom Support Act, and will publish *Nuclear Proliferation: The Post Cold War Challenge* with the Foreign Policy Association this month.

Publications Coordinator



Jennifer R. Pournelle, M.A., Cornell U., joins IGCC from four generations of publishers and editors. Before becoming editor-in-chief for a cutting-edge software company, she taught

German Studies at the U. of Maryland, Berlin. A specialist in remote sensing for air defense and artillery operations, in 1989 she served as a military advisor on the U.S. delegation for Confidence-and Security-Building Measures of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, and in 1991 she ended her U.S. Army career as the army delegate to northern European NATO logistics negotiations.

IGCC Research, Research Conference, Teaching and Dissertation Fellowships Awarded For 1994 – 1995

DISSERTATION FELLOWSHIP AWARDEES—RENEWALS

Callan, Benedicte, UCB, *Who Gains from Genes? National Systems of Innovation and Strategic Alliance in Biotechnology*

Cetinyan, Rupen, UCLA, *Ethnicity and Ethnic Conflict in Interstate and Int'l Politics*

Kilroy, Bernadette A., UCLA, *The Integrative Role of the European Court of Justice: Judicial Independence or Politically Constrained Courts*

Raustiala, Kal L., UCSD, *Science, Domestic Politics, and the Provision of Multilateral Environmental Regulation: The Formation of Environmental Foreign Policy in the US and UK*

Sakamoto, Takayuki, UC Santa Barbara, *A Rational Choice-Cultural Approach to Japanese Policy-making*

Sonnenfeld, David A., UCSC, *"Brighter than White?" Int'l Conflict & Cooperation & the Greening of Paper Technology*

Tierney, Michael J., UCSD, *Cooperation Under Low Credibility: Western Assistance and the Attempted Integration of Soviet Successor States*

DISSERTATION FELLOWSHIP AWARDEES—NEW

Anno, Tadashi, UCB, *The Liberal World Order & Its Critics: A Comparative Study of the Rise of Anti-Systemic Movements in Russia & Japan, 1860-1945*

Arceneaux, Craig L., UCR, *Authoritarian Breakdown—Peaceful Transitions to Democracy or Instability in the Int'l System: An Institutional Approach*

Chakraborty Achin, UCR, *Inter-Country Comparison of Well-Being: An Input to Global Cooperation*

Chang, Michele M., UCSD, *Credible Commitments in Crises: Sources of Cooperation in the European Monetary System*

Cline, Mary K., UCLA, *Alternative Paths of Development: Understanding Regional Differentiation in the Russian Federation*

Fuller, Melissa, UCLA, *Dividing Nations: Ethnic Conflict in the New World Order*

Hallerberg, Mark S., UCLA, *Tax Competition, Political Institutions, and Democratization: The Development of Tax Systems in Wilhelmine Germany*

Lehmbruch, Barbara, UCB, *Privatizing Ministries: The New States, Business Associations and Intra-sectoral Economic Coordination in the Former Soviet Republics*

Lewis, Tammy Louise, UCD, *Land Conservation as a Strategy for Sustainable Development: The North-South Environmental Conflict*

Lin, Patricia Yu, UCB, *Extending Her Arms: Military Families & the Transformation of the British State, 1793-1815*

McHorney, Christopher A., UCR, *Int'l Trade Policy in the Post-Cold War Era*

Nielson, Daniel L., UCSD, *Trading on Nature:*

The Politics of Policy Reform & Sustainable Growth in the Developing World

Potter, Brian C., UCLA, *Int'l Fishery Access After Ocean Enclosure: Fisherman, Institutions, and Resource Management*

Williams, Paul A., UCLA, *Strategic Interaction in Upstream-Downstream Riverine Rivalry*

RESEARCH CONFERENCE GRANT AWARDEES—RENEWAL

Nelson, Keith L., UCI, *The Foreign Domestic Nexus in Soviet-American Relations*

RESEARCH CONFERENCE GRANT AWARDEES—NEW

Papayoanou, Paul A., UCSD, *New Games: Modeling Int'l Relations After the Cold War*

Stanfield II, John H., UCD, *Building Productive and Functional Multiethnic Societies*

Tetlock, Philip E., UCB, *Thought Experiments on World Politics: Logical, Methodological and Psychological*

RESEARCH GRANT AWARDEES—RENEWALS

Rocke, David M., UCD, *Coercive Compliance Strategies for Maintaining Int'l Agreement*

Stone, Alec, UCI, *Constructing a Supranational Constitution: The Case of European Integration*

Waltz, Kenneth N., UCB, *Int'l Politics: From Theory to Practice*

RESEARCH GRANT AWARDEES—NEW

Bollens, Scott A., UCI, *On Narrow Ground: Urban Policy in Ethnically Polarized Cities*

Frieden, Jeffrey A., UCLA, *The Politics of European Monetary Cooperation*

Gartner, Scott Sigmund, UCD, *Terrorism and Political Response: A Study of Strategic Interactions*

Money, Jeannette, UCD, *Economic, Political and Cultural Determinants of Immigration Policy*

Schurman, Rachel A., UCB, *Int'l Conflict and Cooperation in Implementing the Law of the Sea*

Solingen, Etel, UCI, *Domestic Determinants of Regional Cooperation: Bargaining in the Multilateral Middle East Peace Talks*

Talbot, John E., UC Santa Barbara, *Mind Wounds: War and Psychic Injury, 1860-1920*

Urban, Michael, UCSC, *The Rebirth of Politics in Russia*

Vogel, Steven, UCI, *Japan's Foreign Economic Policy: Domestic Forces and Int'l Pressures in an Era of Political Transition*

Wheelis, Mark, UCD, *An Analytical History of Biological Warfare*

TEACHING GRANT AWARDEE

Justice, Judith, UCSF, *The Political and Cultural Dimensions of Int'l Health Policy*

IGCC Fellows' Vital Research

Bettina Halvorsen

The work of four recent IGCC fellows is featured, along with new ideas and policy solutions.

Global Leadership Cools



"The 1992 eruption of Mount Pinatubo temporarily cooled the planet; it also cooled public interest and international action on global warming," says Craig Collins, 1992-93 IGCC

fellow and assistant professor of political science at California State University, Sonoma, who conducted a comparative analysis of ozone and climate change negotiations. "Many countries aren't convinced that global warming is serious, and others are afraid that the solution will cost more than the problem."

Collins interviewed NGO and international government agency leaders, diplomats from many nations, and Bush and Clinton administration policy makers. "The Clinton administration has become cowed by anti-environmentalists, conservative ideologues and the powerful energy and automobile lobbies," says Collins. "Instead of requiring industries to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions, the administration has opted for voluntary stabilization programs. By the time serious atmospheric disruptions shake the international community out of its complacency, it may be too late."

Lessons from Peripheral Wars



Even powerful states can face disaster if their militaries do not adapt to meet new threats. In her forthcoming book, *Political Institutions and Military Change: Lessons from Peripheral Wars*

(Cornell University Press, 1994), 1989-90 IGCC fellow Deborah Avant, assistant professor of political science at the State University of New York, Albany, compares the U.S. Army in Vietnam to the British Army during the Boer War and Malayan Emergency. She finds that unified civilian institutions in Britain created an army that was sensitive to civilian goals and responsive to civilian intervention. Conversely, divided institutions in the United States contributed to the U.S. Army's resistance to change.

Avant advises, "The division of authority between congress and the president

makes it hard for U.S. presidents to force military change in a crisis, so presidents should pay close attention to established military capabilities before committing troops to new missions abroad."

Sovereign States and Non-Violent Change

In *The Sovereign State and Its Competitors: An Analysis of Systems Change* (Princeton University Press, 1994), 1988-1990 IGCC fellow Hendrik Spruyt, assistant professor of political science at Columbia University, traces the emergence of sovereign territorial states and compares them to other forms of rule, such as feudalism, empire, theocracy, city-states and city-leagues. He argues that sovereign, territorial states are better at internally rationalizing their economies, reducing free riding, and credibly committing to international agreements. Moreover, through formal borders they can divide specific areas of jurisdiction.

His study offers prospects for nonviolent systems change. "Newly emerging states [like those in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union] are not just created through military conflict," says Spruyt, "but, also by new domestic coalitions reacting to economic opportunities."

Palestinian Economic Development

1991-1993 IGCC fellow Jennifer Olmsted, assistant professor of economics at the University of Michigan, Flint, studied the education and migration decisions of 250 Palestinian households in Bethlehem and the Occupied Territories. She found that when workers migrate to find employment, the local Palestinian economy suffers from the loss of skilled labor.

Olmsted focused on how individual decisions were affected by the 1990-91 Gulf crisis and war and the migration of Soviet Jews to Israel. She documented the economic hardships faced by Palestinian families who had relatives forced from jobs in Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, but were unable to return home. "It is very important that industrial investment is encouraged in the Palestinian areas," says Olmsted. "Future development efforts should focus on creating new jobs in the region, taking into account the highly educated Palestinian labor force."

Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation

University of California, San Diego
9500 Gilman Drive, (0518)
La Jolla, CA 92093-0518

Phone: (619) 534-3352 Fax: (619) 534-7655
E-mail: ph13@sdcc12.ucsd.edu

Director

Susan L. Shirk

Research Directors

David A. Lake, International Relations
Gordon J. MacDonald, International
Environmental Policy

Director Emeritus

Herbert F. York

International Advisory Board

Arnold Kanter, Chair

Morton Abramowitz, Alexei Arbatov, Dante Caputo,
Diego Cordovez, Randall Forsberg,
Marvin Goldberger, Helga Haftendorn,
Robert Jervis, Masao Kunihiro, Ronald Lehman,
Sally Lilienthal, Charles William Maynes,
Robert McNamara, Olara Otunnu, James Roche,
Enid Schoettle, Stanley Sheinbaum,
Stephen Solarz, John Steinbruner

Steering Committee

Randolph Siverson, Chair

Donna Bahry, David Belanger, Paul Chrzanowski,
Barbara Geddes, Tsuyoshi Hasegawa,
Steven Maaranen, David Mares, Martin McGuire,
Afaf Meleis, Alexander Rosenbaum,
Herbert York, John Zysman

Campus Program Representatives

Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, Harry
Kreisler, (510) 642-1106 **Davis:** Global Conflict
and Cooperation Program, Miroslav Nincic,
(916) 752-3063 **Irvine:** Center for Global Peace &
Conflict Studies, Patrick Morgan, (714) 856-6410
Los Angeles: Center for International Relations,
Richard Rosecrance, (310) 825-0604 **Riverside:**
International Economic Conflict and Cooperation
Program, Stephen Cullenberg (909) 787-5037
San Diego: Project in International and Security
Affairs, Peter Cowhey, (619) 534-2900 **San
Francisco:** Program in Health and Human Survival,
Christie Kiefer, (415) 476-7543 **Santa Barbara:**
Global Peace and Security Program, John Ernest,
(805) 893-4718 **Santa Cruz:** The Adlai
Stevenson Program on Global Security,
Ronnie Lipschutz, (408) 459-2833

Administration

Management Services: Susan Greer

Campus Programs: Bettina Halvorsen

Publications: Jennifer Pournelle

Photographers: Alan Decker, Judy Swanson

The IGCC Newsletter is published twice yearly by the
Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation to
inform scholars, policymakers, and the public
about IGCC-sponsored research, conferences,
publications, grants, and seminars. Single copies at
no cost are available on request.

Copyright © 1994

Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation

IGCC Policy Paper Series

New:

The U.S. and Japan in Asia
Edited by Susan L. Shirk and
Christopher P. Twomey
IGCC-PP No. 10, November 1994.

The Northeast Asian Cooperation Dialogue II
Edited by Susan L. Shirk and
Christopher P. Twomey
IGCC-PP No. 9, 86 pages, August 1994.

The Domestic Sources of Nuclear Postures
Etel Solingen
IGCC-PP No. 8, 30 pages, October 1994.

*Workshop on Arms Control and Security
in the Middle East II.*
Paul L. Chrzanowski.
IGCC-PP No. 7, 26 pages, April 1994.

*Northeast Asian Economic Cooperation
in the Post-Cold War Era*
Lu Zhongwei
IGCC-PP No. 6, 21 pages, October, 1993.

*Regional Cooperation and Environmental
Issues in Northeast Asia*
Peter Hayes and Lyuba Zarsky
IGCC-PP No. 5, 35 pages, October, 1993.

*Workshop on Arms Control and Security
in the Middle East*
David J. Pervin
IGCC-PP No. 4, 17 pages, June 1993.

Japan in Search of a "Normal" Role
Chalmers Johnson
IGCC-PP No. 3, 45 pages, July 1992.

*Climate Change: A Challenge to
the Means of Technology Transfer*
Gordon J. MacDonald
IGCC-PP No. 2, 51 pages, January 1992.

*Building Toward Middle East Peace:
Working Group Reports from
"Cooperative Security in the Middle East,"*
Moscow, October 21-24, 1991
IGCC-PP No. 1, 43 pages, January 1992.

IGCC Studies in Conflict and Cooperation

*Strategic Views from the Second Tier:
The Nuclear Weapons Policies of
France, Great Britain, and China*
Edited by John C. Hopkins and Weixing Hu
IGCC-SCC No. 3., 282 pages, 1994
Transaction Publishers, 1995, \$21.95
To order, call the publisher at
(908) 932-2280.

Beyond the Cold War in the Pacific
Edited by Miles Kahler
IGCC-SCC No. 2, 155 pages, 1991.

The Future of U.S. Nuclear Weapons Policy
Edited by David P. Auerswald and John
Gerard Ruggie
IGCC-SCC No. 1, 187 pages, 1990.

Ordering Information

To place an order, or to obtain
information on prices and avail-
ability, call IGCC Publications at
(619) 534-1979
or write to Publications
Coordinator, Institute on Global
Conflict and Cooperation,
University of California, San
Diego, 9500 Gilman Drive,
(0518), La Jolla, CA 92093-0518.

Other Titles

Practical Peacemaking in the Middle East
*Volume I: Arms Control and Regional
Security*, 262 pages.
*Volume II: The Environment, Water,
Refugees, and Economic Cooperation
and Development*, 425 pages
Edited by Steven L. Spiegel
Forthcoming from Garland Publishers, 1995.

Space Monitoring of Global Change
Gordon J. MacDonald and Sally K. Ride
California Space Institute, 56 pages, 1992.
Available from IGCC

The Arab-Israeli Search for Peace
Edited by Steven L. Spiegel
Lynne Rienner Publishers, 199 pages, 1992,
\$10.95. To order, call the publisher
at (303) 444-6684.

*Nuclear Deterrence and Global Security
in Transition*
Edited by David Goldfisher and Thomas
W. Graham
Westview Press, 199 pages, 1991, \$29.95.
To order, call the publisher
at (303) 444-3541.

*Europe in Transition: Arms Control
and Conventional Forces in the 1990s*
Edited by Alan Sweedler and Randy
Willoughby
119 pages, 1991.

Conventional Forces in Europe
Edited by Alan Sweedler and Brett Henry
102 pages, 1989.

University of California, San Diego
Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation, 0518
9500 Gilman Drive
La Jolla, CA 92093-0518 U.S.A.