



ECAAR NewsNetwork

The Newsletter of Economists Allied for Arms Reduction

Fall/Winter 1995

Volume 7, Number 3

Are We Missing a Window of Opportunity?

By Frank von Hippel

Prepared statement for the 50th anniversary of the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists at which the "doomsday clock's" hands were advanced into the danger zone, as a result of continued "old thinking" since the end of the Cold War.

The Cold War ended six years ago with the fall of the Berlin Wall. Yet Washington has been strangely hesitant to downsize the doomsday machine that the Cold War created.

Gorbachev was interested in deep cuts in the nuclear arsenals—even to zero, he said. Yeltsin endorsed the same goals. President Reagan was interested but unable to give up the Strategic Defense Initiative. President Bush went surprisingly far, initiating the denuclearization of the Armies and surface Navies and in agreeing to cut the number of deployed strategic nuclear warheads by two thirds in START II. These agreements justified pushing back the minute hand of the Doomsday clock into new optimistic territory.

Some Progress

But the Clinton Administration—of which I was a part—was not able to take full advantage of its opportunities. To its credit, the Administration reversed the Reagan-Bush opposition to a Comprehensive Test Ban and has dismantled one by one the obstacles that its own officials have thrown up to progress toward a CTB. The Administration also

(Continued on page 8)

Frank von Hippel is Professor of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University; Director, Cooperative Research Project on Nuclear Disarmament and Nonproliferation, Federation of American Scientists; and Assistant Director for National Security, White House Office of Science & Technology Policy (1993-4).

ECAAR's UN 50th Anniversary Symposium: Economic Resources for Peace

By Alice Slater

To a packed audience at the UN's Dag Hammarskjöld Auditorium, President Oscar Arias elaborated on his proposal to launch an International Code of Conduct for the Arms Trade, while James Tobin explained his "Tobin tax" on international currency transactions to raise additional resources. Moderated by John Kenneth Galbraith, with ECAAR Co-Chair Lawrence Klein providing a road map of trends in military spending and the arms trade, and Inge Kaul of the UN Development Programme indicating the needs to be met, this brilliant panel captured the rapt attention of NGOs, UN, and diplomatic staff in attendance, engaging in dialogue with the audience and each other which will be available shortly in transcription and has been captured on video for public access TV.

Kaul announced that Tobin's tax, proposed in 1972 to dampen currency speculation, and now seized upon as a source of revenue for international development, will be the subject of a serious study by the UNDP to see what practical steps would be needed to make the tax a reality. Arias' Campaign 2000 to Redirect Military Spending for Human Development was launched following the Symposium and includes a call for the appointment of special UN envoys to organize demilitarization talks in various regions of the world to address threat reduction, conversion, landmine clearance, community reconstruction, and demobilization of armies. Arias also suggests that industrialized nations condition foreign aid to promote demilitarization including the exchange of debt forgiveness for military conversion efforts, providing special funding

(Continued on page 9)

Alice Slater is Executive Director of ECAAR.

The approximately 100 million landmines planted in 64 countries will cost \$33 billion to remove.

See The Land Mine Crisis

on page 5

inside...

| | |
|---|----|
| Rogue States: A review by William Hartung | 2 |
| Nuclear Wastelands: A review | 3 |
| On Expanding NATO | 4 |
| South African Diary | 6 |
| ECAAR Panels at the AEA | 10 |
| Affiliate News | 11 |

Rogues' Gallery

Rogue States and Nuclear Outlaws: America's search for a new foreign policy

By Michael Klare

(New York: Hill and Wang, 1995)

Reviewed by William D. Hartung

Excerpted from In These Times.

When Bill Clinton announced recently that he was planning to reduce the federal deficit to zero over the next 10 years *without cutting a dime from the defense budget*, I had the queasy, irrational feeling that I was watching a sequel to *The Invasion of the Body Snatchers*. Clinton had, after all, only just returned from his junket to New Hampshire to make nice with Newt Gingrich. It seemed as though Gingrich's love of all things high-tech—especially nifty new weapons systems—had rubbed off on our impressionable commander-in-chief.

Of course, Clinton has long been in thrall to the Pentagon and its military contractors. Indeed, the absence of any real debate between the major parties on defense spending is a national scandal, on a par with Watergate or Iran-Contra. The Clinton administration wants to spend about \$260 billion a year on the military, in perpetuity—a figure right around the average Pentagon budget during the Cold War. The Republican-controlled Congress, meanwhile, thinks that's too little and would like billions to keep afloat goldplated systems like the B-2 bomber—which the Pentagon has disavowed any need for—and a new, improved version of Ronald Reagan's "Star Wars" missile defense system. So with no Soviet threat, and indeed no Soviet Union, and with the United States spending more than twice as much as all its potential adversaries *combined*, the defense budget debate only revolves around questions such as whether tax-payers should continue to fund a few big-ticket items the Pentagon doesn't even want. And given the current mania for budget-cutting, the obeisance our government pays to the defense leviathan lurches from the ludicrous to the obscene. It goes without saying that every dollar wasted on Cold War weaponry will come directly out of programs that feed, educate, house or provide health care for the most vulnerable members of our society.

Michael Klare, a professor of world security studies at Hampshire College, is able to survey this dismaying and absurd spectacle with remarkable discernment and rigor. In *Rogue States and Nuclear Outlaws*, Klare shows himself to be ahead of the curve in decoding and debunking U.S. doctrines on military strategy. The book engages a simple, but largely neglected, question at the heart of the U.S. security issues: Does the Pentagon actually have a plan for the post-Cold War era, and if so, what is it? Klare describes in detail how the Pentagon, deprived of its familiar Cold War enemy, the Soviet Union, scrambled to come up with a new set of enemies—heavily armed Third World regimes hot on the trail of their very own weapons of mass destruction. Every Third World despot has now been deemed a possible Saddam-in-the-making, and the Pentagon is now awash in visions of refighting the Gulf War—or at least

William D. Hartung is a fellow at the World Policy Institute of the New School for Social Research and author of And Weapons for All.

being funded at levels sufficient to refight the Gulf War—at a moment's notice.

Klare has brought to the task of distilling reams of government analysis a striking knack for getting to the bottom of U.S. strategic thinking by asking questions Pentagon planners often seem to overlook. For example, Klare takes a credible first cut at the questions that should be motivating U.S. strategy in the post-Cold War era: 1) What are the major causes of the current rash of ethnic and territorial conflict?; and 2) What kinds of conflicts will U.S. troops likely be fighting in the foreseeable future? Klare's answers to these questions make it abundantly clear that the Pentagon's plan to be ready to fight an endless round of Iraq-style conflicts is as misguided as it is dangerous.

First and foremost, Klare makes it emphatically clear that the current Pentagon strategy is not the result of some sober assessment of the current world scene, or even the result of worst-case scenarios run amok. The Pentagon was busy searching for a post-Cold War justification for its largesse several years before Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait in 1990. Luckily for the U.S. military, Saddam Hussein challenged them on the ideal terrain for displaying its new strategy—and new weaponry—in the best possible light. This, in turn, fueled a false sense of security regarding the fitness of the "rogue doctrine" for approaching other emerging conflicts.

From the start, Klare argues, the idea had been to devise a scary enough scenario to justify spending levels that could support the Pentagon and its contractor base in the lavish style to which they had grown accustomed. Indeed, several other prospective foundations for America's defense policies had been assessed and found wanting: terrorism, guerilla warfare, refugee flows and environmental degradation, to name but a few. As Klare notes, these all failed the critical test: they provided little or no rationale for building the new generation of weaponry that the Pentagon had waiting in the wings. Only a heavily armed "regional hegemon" like Iraq or North Korea could even begin to supply enough of a "threat" to justify spending more than a quarter of a trillion dollars per year on the U.S. military—and even this scenario required considerable overstatement of the actual threats the United States might face, as Klare ably demonstrates.

This critical Pentagon planning effort took the form of Joint Chiefs of Staff study overseen by its then-chairman Colin Powell. Powell has spearheaded an aggressive effort to breathe life back into the bloated hell of the Cold War defense colossus.

From Powell's anti-rogue strategy to Les Aspin's scenarios for fighting multiple "Iraq-sized" contingency wars to Clinton's now-familiar capitulation to every Defense Department fantasy, Klare argues persuasively that as long as the Pentagon is allowed to maintain that it is reasonable to be prepared to fight two regional wars simultaneously, there is no further hope for the reduction of defense spending.

Klare also provides plenty of empirical evidence to dispel the Pentagon's geopolitical hobgoblins. He notes, for example, that there aren't even two "Iraq-sized" adversaries available to fight. Iraq itself has had its military forcibly "downsized" as a result of the Gulf War and the ensuing United Nations sanctions. North Korea, which has forces that come close to what Saddam Hus-

(Continued on page 9)

Nuclear Wastelands

Nuclear Wastelands: A global guide to nuclear weapons production & its health and environmental effects

Edited by Arjun Makhijani, Howard Hu & Katherine Yih
(Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1995)

Reviewed by Eyal Press

French President Jacques Chirac's decision to resume nuclear testing in Polynesia indicates that, even with the Cold War well behind us, governments will continue playing power politics with nuclear weapons to the detriment of human health and the environment. Anyone who scoffs at the concerns of Australians, New Zealanders, and others in the South Pacific would do well to consider the findings amassed in *Nuclear Wastelands*, the first comprehensive guide to the health and environmental damage caused by the production, mining and testing of nuclear bombs. The 666-page study — produced jointly by the Nobel Prize winning International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW) based in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research (IEER) in Takoma Park, Maryland—provides a timely overview of the harm and destruction already wrought. The nuclear age, says the study, has been responsible for releasing tons of toxic waste and radioactive material into the earth's air, water and soil, and has caused severe health problems for thousands of civilians, particularly uranium miners, members of the armed forces, and communities situated in and around production and testing sites.

"Nuclear establishments across ideological lines," notes Dr. Arjun Makhijani, president of IEER and principal editor of the book, "have been ready to harm the very people whom nuclear weapons were supposed to protect." While the authors admit that it is impossible to calculate the exact health and environmental impacts (since much data remains shrouded under state secrecy laws) and that little is known about places like Israel and China, they nevertheless arrive at informed estimates based on what is available, including much that has only recently been revealed.

In the U.S., where information is most accessible, as of the late 1980s, roughly 220 million metric tons of mill-tailings had accumulated from uranium production for nuclear weapons and power plants. Runoff from these tailings-piles has contaminated streams and rivers in dozen of locations, including Durango, Colorado and Shiprock, New Mexico, where a study of Navajo children revealed statistically significant levels of birth defects, still births, and deaths from illness during infancy.

At nuclear production and test sites throughout the U.S. and other countries, hazardous substances have been released in massive volumes into surrounding air, soil, surface water, and groundwater. In Hanford, Washington, where the U.S. government has produced weapons-grade plutonium for over four decades, 800 billion liters of low-level radioactive waste has been discharged directly into the soil; groundwater is contaminated with a variety of pollutants at levels far exceeding drinking water standards; and 68 tanks storing high-level radioactive

wastes are leakers or potential leakers, meaning worse may be ahead. At the Nevada test site, just northwest of Las Vegas, repeated underground and above-ground nuclear testing has left huge quantities of plutonium, cesium and other radioactive material underground, and has spread radioactive fallout far beyond the test site.

The study shows that governments have repeatedly lied or intentionally deceived the public in the name of national security as they built and tested nuclear weapons. In Russia, doctors invented diagnoses like "weakened vegetative syndrome" to disguise the number of people dying due to radiation exposure. In the United States, at the Fernald, Ohio uranium processing plant, internal radiation doses caused by uranium inhalation were recorded as "zero" year after year. An independent estimate made by IEER found that more than half of the workers there were overexposed.

In another case, the Atomic Energy Commission ignored a study by the U.S. Public Health Service recommending measures to correct hazardous conditions for uranium miners. An AEC official complained that "communist propagandists" would use evidence of such conditions to "adversely affect our uranium supply." By 1960, nine uranium miners had died of lung cancer in Colorado, at which point state and federal agencies finally took steps to improve ventilation and reduce harmful radon exposure.

Russian data on health effects are unreliable, say the authors,

The prospect for preventing the creation of new waste has dimmed. Despite President Clinton's highly acclaimed pledge for a Comprehensive Test Ban, plans are now underway to perform six "sub critical" nuclear tests, in which plutonium will be subjected to the impact of a non-nuclear explosive 980 feet under the desert at the Nevada test site. The first nuclear test, REBOUND, is scheduled to be detonated on June 18, 1996.

but occupation mortality studies of U.S. and Canadian miners indicate a two- to six-fold increase in lung cancer risk for workers, meaning that overall uranium mining "has led to thousands of excess lung cancer deaths."

Negligence has also affected "downwinders" and others living near test sites. The authors unearthed a 1945 document showing that after the very first Trinity test on July 16, 1945 in New Mexico, Colonel Stafford Warren, a physician with the Manhattan Project, found that the blast caused "potentially a very dangerous hazard over a band almost 30 miles wide, extending almost 90 miles northeast of the site," and that a family which was not evacuated, including a child, had received high radiation doses. Stafford's recommendation that future tests should not be conducted within 150 miles of human habitation, however, was flagrantly ignored.

Cleaning up the nuclear mess will cost taxpayers dearly. At the Fernald, Ohio plant alone, the Department of Energy estimates \$2 billion in expenditures over the next five years. Of course, much contamination of soil and water is irremediable. And not a single

On Expanding NATO

By Alice Slater

Clinton Administration plans to expand NATO up to the Russian border by including Eastern European nations among its members has engendered a most unwelcome response from Russia. *Jane's Foreign Report* notes that "Russia's right-wing daily *Seodnya (Today)* has published what purports to be a high-level leaked document giving contingency plans for a Russian re-occupation of parts of the ex-Soviet Union if the borders of NATO are about to move eastward." Proposed measures include "deployments of missiles in Kaliningrad, near Norway and in Crimea, Abkhazia, Georgia and Armenia; intensified deployment of Russian forces in Belarus; re-occupation of the Baltic States to stop them from joining NATO [on the grounds that] the admission of the Baltic States to NATO would be as threatening to it as the Soviet missiles in Cuba were to America; ill treated ethnic Russians in Estonia and Latvia had a right to turn to Russia for armed support; the Baltic States are ruled by the mafia and live off smuggling and crime. In similar circumstances in Panama, the United States intervened—and set an important precedent." (*Jane's*, 12-7-95, p.7)

At ECAAR's 50th UN Symposium, the question was raised to our distinguished panel about the appropriateness of NATO expansion. James Tobin replied, "The idea of expanding NATO to the east is crazy and we shouldn't do it." John Kenneth Galbraith gave a more extended answer:

The expansion of NATO seems to be an extraordinarily aggravating thing. I expect we're going to have to keep NATO because it has regular meetings, the travel is interesting, the food is quite good, they serve wine, no intelligence is required of anybody attending and nobody remembers anything that happened as a result of a NATO meeting. So to anybody who has a sense of social well-being there should be a continuation of this organization for the enjoyment of the participants. . . . But to do anything as annoying as expanding it into Eastern Europe and excluding Russia. . . is a very questionable thing.

Readers of this newsletter are urged to read "NATO Expansion: Flirting with Disaster" in the November/December 1995 *Defense Monitor*, published by the Center for Defense Information in which it is noted that there are 77 generals and admirals assigned to lead the US forces in NATO(!); the proposed expansion pushes Russia "closer to the nuclear trigger;" and Vice Admiral John Shanahan, USN (Ret.) after questioning whether "we are ready to risk the unraveling of U.S.-Russian relations and important treaties just to bring Poland into the NATO club," urges that "NATO should be given a medal and be put to bed." You can get a copy from CDI, 1500 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20005.

In this light, an important question to ponder and raise in public forums is the following: Why isn't the Bosnian bailout being done under the auspices of the United Nations? Was it only designed at this late date in the civil slaughter merely to justify NATO's existence?

Alice Slater is Executive Director of ECAAR.

ECAAR Receives Consultative Status to the UN's ECOSOC

By Robert Schwartz

ECAAR was granted Consultative Status to ECOSOC in Category II, which entitles us to submit written statements at the meetings of various ECOSOC bodies, to sit as observers at all public meetings of the Council and its subsidiaries and, at the councils' discretion, to be consulted by it and make oral statements to it.

This year's NGO reviewing committee consisted of 19 country delegations, including four official nuclear weapon states, US, UK, Russia, and China. At hearings on applications, over 90 NGOs were questioned in different degrees of intensity and depth, and all were either approved for higher status by consensus or postponed for further consideration or additional information. But when Peter Weiss, an officer of the International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms (IALANA) was questioned, the British, Russian and US members of the Committee were obviously antagonistic and contended that IALANA was not suited for ECOSOC membership since it was concerned only with nuclear issues.

To many of us, it appeared that objections were made solely because IALANA had organized an effort (endorsed by ECAAR in 1994) which gained the support of the World Health Organization to go to the World Court for an advisory opinion on whether the use of nuclear weapons was illegal. Many non-nuclear countries, led by Cuba and Costa Rica, were favorable to IALANA, so a decision was postponed when it became apparent that there was no consensus. According to rumor, consultation by the delegates went as far as the G7 meeting then in session in Halifax. Word reached us that ECAAR would get the same treatment, which it did.

Only one person was allowed to testify for each organization and my description of ECAAR and its projects for economic development, environmental protection, better education and other fundamental concerns of ECOSOC was received rather coldly by three of the nuclear power members, and a decision was postponed. Over the next two days, I had discussions with representatives of three nuclear powers, and with the more supportive Ambassadors of Costa Rica, Emilia Castro de Barish, and Cuba, Juan Antonio Fernandez. The Chinese delegation did not speak on the issue. I was assured by a personal friend, who was visiting from Beijing and had spoken with them about ECAAR, that it would object to our request.

The time approached for a decision without a consensus, and the smaller nations, led by Cuba, said they would force a vote, and we would be accepted. The Russian representative told me that he was still waiting for word from Moscow. When the time came for a vote, Russia had its answer, and Irish Ambassador John Biggar, who was acting as Chair relinquished it to speak in our favor. The US, UK, and Russia voted for ECAAR and congratulated us for our presentation. Although they voted against IALANA, it was also admitted by a large majority vote.

ECAAR now has added responsibility and opportunity at the UN. I arranged to meet with Ahmad Kamal, President of

(Continued on page 9)

The Land Mine Crisis

By Dorrie Weiss

While the world's attention has been focused on the specter of nuclear holocaust, a land-mine catastrophe has been quietly building. It has been largely silent—small casualties in farms and fields, most of them in underdeveloped countries, many unreported because the victims were too far from medical help. But the statistics have been accumulating, limb by limb and death by death.

- There are about 100 million land-mines scattered in 64 countries. Afghanistan alone is infested with 10 million mines.

- Last year, about 100,000 were cleared. From two to five million new land-mines were planted.

- At the current rate of clearance, it would take about 1100 years to clear the land-mines that have already been laid—and only if no new mines were laid beginning in 1966.

- Every fifteen minutes—of every day, every year—someone falls victim to a land-mine. About 10,000 civilians are killed each year, 90% of all casualties. Another 20,000 are maimed, blinded, or otherwise injured.

- Because mines take their toll in rural areas, far from hospitals, some 54% of the victims die before getting help. Most of those are women.

- In Angola, the number of uncleared mines is roughly equal to the population. In Cambodia, there are twice as many land-mines as children and one out of every 234 people is an amputee.

- Mines remain active for decades. Mines planted today will be active in the middle of the next century.

The figures add up to a staggering sum of human misery. War torn countries cannot rebuild; war never ends for civilian populations left with the detritus of military strife. Humanitarian assistance is hampered. Millions of refugees and displaced persons cannot return to their homes because roads are mined. Farmers cannot till their fields, exacerbating food shortages. Infrastructure defies repair, since roads, power plants, and dams have been mined. Mines can break the spirit of a country and create a learned helplessness. People are afraid to stray from narrow paths. Often the edges of a minefield are defined by children killed by curiosity.

Types of Mines

The two basic types of mines are anti-personnel, needing only small pressure to trigger them, and anti-tank, designed to be set off by vehicle. There are more than 360 designs of each. The anti-personnel mines are most worrisome because of the toll they take on the civilian population. They are small, usually the size of a child's yo-yo that can fit easily in the palm of the hand.

Modern mines are made of plastic, making them hard to detect with conventional metal detecting equipment. New mines that contain no metal are the most frightening because they are virtually undetectable. Plastic mines are usually highly colored and attractive to children; in some areas, where there has not been much education for awareness, children collect and trade them.

Mines are intended to maim rather than to kill, on the assumption that killing a soldier removes a single person from the battlefield, while maiming a person requires a great expenditure of resources. Emergency medical treatment must be provided, and prostheses fitted for amputated limbs. People who are blinded, or who are suffering from internal injuries, cause overburdened health care systems to falter. The maimed person becomes a burden on society. The mine problem is considered a humanitarian disaster and a public health crisis, like an endemic disease caused by human malevolence.

Unexploded ordinance left behind after wars also function as mines. In Laos, for example, unloaded cluster bombs left by the U.S.—more than two million tons of bombs were dropped from '63 to '73—create explosion showers of 100 or more steel ball bearings when they are detonated. Nearly half the accident victims there are children.

Difficulty of Cleanup

Mine clearance technology has hardly advanced in the last fifty years, although the technology for making deadlier mines has progressed rapidly. Clearance is still done arduously by hand, as a person crawls along, poking the ground every inch or so. Inattention will cause death. Metal detectors become increasingly useless as the amount of metal in a mine decreases. Stray bits of shrapnel set off detectors, and these false alarms increase a worker's risk: In Cambodia, an average of 129 harmless metal pieces are uncovered for every mine that is unearthed. Mine clearance is a low-technology operation. The most sensitive instrument so far discovered is a dog's nose: Dogs have been trained to sniff out mines. There have been very few canine casualties.

Such technology as does exist is designed for battlefield use, for breaching minefields with a narrow lane that will allow forces to move through quickly. This often delays the problems to civilians because mines are pushed to one side and left. Blasting through a minefield also assumes a logical system of mine planting. In many of today's internal conflicts, there is a random, patternless, almost casual laying of mines. As borders shift quickly, new mines are laid behind retreating troops who cannot remember where they put the first ones.

Cost of Mines

Mines are cheap. They have been called the "Saturday Nite Specials of regional conflict." Most cost about \$3 to buy, but between \$300 and a thousand dollars to remove. It will cost \$33 billion to remove today's mines, if no new mines are planted tomorrow.

According to Stephen Goose of the Human Rights Watch Arms Projects, global production amounts to less than \$100 million per year and accounts for a very small part of the profits in the arms trade. "The commodity nature of the conventional mine business makes cheap labor a key to economic success, which has tended to shift production from developed to developing nations," he writes. Over thirty nations have exported mines. When estimating the true cost of a mine, Goose notes,

South African Diary

By Robert Schwartz

At the invitation of the Institute for Democracy in South Africa, I joined in a review of a Draft White Paper on National Defense on behalf of ECAAR. The Paper was for the Minister of Defense, Joseph Modise, to submit to President Mandela and the Parliament to be used in the drafting of a new constitution. Leaders from government agencies, church, academic and non-profit organizations participated, including Nobel Peace laureate Desmond Tutu, of the South African Anglican Church; the former Executive Director of the Institute for Democracy in South Africa, Dr. A. Boraine, now of Justice in Transition; Dr. Jackie Cock, a prominent sociologist at Witwatersrand University; and Terry Crawford-Browne, advisor to Archbishop Tutu, convener of ECAAR South Africa and an expert on disarmament issues.

The Paper is premised on the proposition that South Africa has no external military threats and its foreign policy should be based upon the new government's stated commitment to democracy and human rights. It notes that threats to the country's security are primarily domestic and non-military, ie, economic inequalities, poverty, crime, inadequacies in housing, medical care and education. The Draft Paper was prepared by Laurie Nathan, Director of the Center for Conflict Resolution at Capetown University, and Peter Batchelor, also of the Center, was the rapporteur.

It proposes that security is not achieved through military means and that the apartheid government was not only destructive of South Africa but did extensive damage to Southern Africa by offensive, aggressive military policies, arms exports, and destabilization. South Africa now recognizes a moral responsibility to the region and should seek common regional security.

A consensus was expressed to halt arms exports and to work "toward dismantling and converting the local defense industry." Archbishop Tutu, just returned from Burundi and Rwanda, felt very deeply about the genocide there in which South African arms exports played a major role. South Africa offers hope and could lead the way in arms reduction as it has done by being the only country to dismantle its nuclear weapons. The military budget has been cut by 50%, and I believe that President Mandela would listen seriously to the possibility of terminating arms exports on a rapid schedule.

Given the likelihood of redirecting military expenditures in South Africa, ECAAR is prepared to offer its expertise in conversion, disarmament and peace economics. To lay the groundwork for this program, the following series of meetings took place:

- Janet Garvey, the director of United States Information Service (USIS), South Africa, was supportive of ECAAR's potential to contribute and suggested the possibility of using their facilities for a television conference exchange by ECAAR from Washington with people in Cape Town;

- Peter Batchelor, one of the few South Africans working in the economics of arms reduction, Terry Crawford-Browne and I met to evaluate a proper role for ECAAR South Africa. We concluded that a base for an ECAAR chapter could be seminars in the economics of disarmament, conversion, peace, and the military;

- Professor Gavin Cawthra, convener of the Defense Management Programme, Graduate School of Public and Development Management at the University of Witwatersrand in Johannesburg, said he would be pleased to cooperate and work with us to advance his courses and develop the base of an ECAAR chapter. His students are almost all military colonels and brigadiers, and people from Armscor and Denel, the defense industry, and businessmen, but he agrees that students also should come from the five other southern African countries.

- In New York, Leland Miles, Co-President of the International Association of University Presidents/UN Peace Disarmament Commission, who organized three peace and disarmament courses in South Africa which need an economic component, thought ECAAR could make a contribution by recruiting economists from various countries including the US, Costa Rica, England, France, Germany, Japan, and the Netherlands. Funding is all that is needed! *Trustee Robert Schwartz is the Treasurer & Founder of ECAAR.*

ECAAR Tritium Report Distributed

William Weida, Director of ECAAR's Community Education Campaign: Local Employment Alternatives at the US Nuclear Weapons Complex has just completed an analysis of tritium requirements and the various proposed ways to meet them. Weida's 25-page report, *Does the U.S. Need a New Tritium Source? An Analysis of Options for the Nuclear Arsenal of the Future*, examines the amount of tritium that would be needed given different sizes of the future U.S. nuclear weapons stockpile. For example, if the United States keeps only the number of warheads allowed under START II—3,000 to 3,500 warheads—no replacement tritium will be required until 2020. A decision to rely on this number of warheads would allow the U.S. to postpone for ten years an exceedingly expensive accelerator project, estimated at \$6.4 to \$14.8 billion, and a DOE purchase of a civilian light water reactor, costing an estimated \$200 million to \$4.5 billion.

Weida's studies have been submitted as comments, both by ECAAR and by activist groups, to the DOE's plans to construct a new tritium reactor and to support the "Triple Play Reactor" which would produce tritium, "burn" plutonium, and generate electricity. His most recent report has been widely distributed to members of Congress by grassroots activists. *Copies of this report may be obtained from the ECAAR office.*

Dr. Theodore Taylor, former Los Alamos nuclear weapons designer, 12-7-95 at the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists Public Hearing on Setting of the Doomsday Clock

US and Russian nuclear weaponeers continue working on new types of nuclear explosive technologies. These include possibilities for pure fusion weapons, and for weapons that can beam microwaves... to disable targets in space or on the ground. Some of this work is now being done cooperatively by weaponeers from both countries... The billions of dollars being allocated by the US Department of Energy to what is euphemistically called "stockpile stewardship" are to be used to keep US nuclear weaponeers actively working on their wares whether or not a zero yield Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty goes into force soon.

Scholars' Network Addresses

Conversion in the U.S. and Abroad

For the second year, ECAAR's Peace Economics and Conversion Resource Network initiated by Ann Markusen, Lloyd Dumas, and William Weida, tackled issues of conversion and peace economics in a two-day meeting at The Colorado College. Evaluating our progress since last year, Markusen reported that a Brookings colleague found our *Journal* article on last year's conference very helpful in evaluating the state of the discipline; we had produced a strategy booklet; published a curriculum guide and reading lists; established an e-mail network; and had received a commitment from the ECAAR Board to establish a field code with the AEA. Areas for further development include the need for an initiative to organize data assessment; further evaluation of what works in conversion; "academic survival" as peace economists; setting standards for economic studies; and media outreach.

A freewheeling discussion and update on conversion initiatives in the U.S. in a period of dramatic change raised a number of issues for further study. One intriguing question raised was "Is efficiency a landmark for economic conversion or should economic conversion be a developmental process?" We ask for planning to build up the military economy but not to build it down. We just don't know how to demobilize. What does the public think compared to what the researchers know? Economists need to set the record straight on what's happening and on reporting successes. Dan Flaming urged research on the correlation between the massive loss of jobs and the rise in welfare payments and prison construction. California spent more this year on prisons than on schools.

Participants from England, Germany, and Japan discussed conversion initiatives abroad. Peter Wilke, of the Bonn International Conversion Center reported that conversion is an issue in Eastern Europe, Russia, Germany, the UK, Italy, China and South Africa. John Lovering at Cardiff College, Wales, reported that the Europeans believe that they are at a disadvantage to the U.S. in terms of mergers such as Lockheed Martin and the massive government support for U.S. arms sales overseas.

Michael Oden at Rutgers University and John Lovering volunteered to draft a proposal for a Network meeting next year in Europe. A similar meeting was organized in Tokyo last summer by ECAAR-Japan with Japanese scholars to address Asian research issues. A number of participants agreed to be available as a resource to activists with conversion issues in their communities. We agreed to contact the grassroots National Economic Conversion Alliance to see if we could combine our meetings next year in the U.S. Other topics which we may address in the coming year are how to structure field research for undergraduates; setting a five-year research agenda; effects of internationalization of military production on the nation state; the nature of the security state; restructuring of the international arms trade; ethnic and regional conflicts. Ron Friesen at Bluffton College is still gathering curricula and reading guides for an update of the Eno River Press publication of material gathered thus far. (See announcement of publication on page 11.) A full report of the 2-day meeting will be available in the ECAAR office early in 1996.

Land Mine Crisis (Continued from page 5)

one must consider that each victim will consume from \$3,000-\$5,000 for surgery and prostheses during a lifetime, for a cost of \$750 million to the international community. This does not include the cost of lost agriculture and commerce, food relief, and resettlement of refugees.

UN Land Mine Protocol

A 1980 Convention to regulate land mines was reviewed in Vienna this fall. Only 53 States have ratified it. Although most land-mine abuse results from internal conflicts, the Convention only applies to international conflicts; there is no provision for verification; it deals only with use; and does not address production or stockpiling.

Unilateral steps have been taken by individual countries. The U.S. initiated a moratorium on the export of anti-personnel mines. Eighteen countries have followed suit, but the moratoria are not legally binding. A few countries have already announced that they will resume production and export soon.

The recently concluded Review Conference failed to reach agreement on a revised protocol and deadlocked on technical and military questions, while humanitarian issues were given only lip-service. (During the three weeks of the Conference about 1,500 civilians were killed or maimed by land-mines, 243 in Cambodia alone.) Delegates debated implementation procedures and verification mechanisms. They questioned whether the protocol should apply to internal conflicts as well as to international ones and whether there should be a ban on anti-handling devices, which cause the mines to explode when tilted, killing or maiming anyone trying to hand-clear them. They discussed requiring that mines be detectable and self-destructing—but could not agree on how much metal should be required in each mine, or for how long a mine could be active. In the end, they shrugged off the task entirely and agreed only to try again when they meet in January 1996. They were not even able to issue a statement that land-mines should be eliminated eventually, or that weapons that indiscriminately targeted civilians and caused unnecessary suffering were against international law.

The greatest gain made at the Conference was the adoption of a new protocol banning the use and transfer of laser weapons that cause irrevocable blindness but here too, certain exceptions threaten to swallow up the progress made.

NGO Platform

A coalition of 280 non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have banded together with the International Committee of the Red Cross to form the International Campaign to ban land-mines. They call for an international ban on mine use, production, stockpiling, sale, transfer, or export as well as the establishment of an international fund administered by the United Nations to finance education, assistance, and clearance operations.

(Contact the Campaign through Jody Williams, Land Mines Campaign, Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation (VVAF), 1347 Upper Dummerston Road, Brattleboro, Vermont 05301, USA. Tel: (802) 254-8807. Fax (802) 254-8808.)

Missed Opportunity (Continued from page 1)

succeeded in helping to persuade Ukraine that becoming a non-nuclear-weapon state was in its national interest. And the Administration is quietly negotiating proposals for increases in the transparency and irreversibility of nuclear-warhead elimination.

The Nuclear Posture Non-Review

However, decisions about the future of US nuclear forces have been left largely to the Department of Defense—for whose planners the need to keep enough nuclear weapons to target thousands of military sites in a potentially “resurgent” Stalinist Russia and else where is more important than reducing the number of warheads that the mythical new Stalin would have available to him.

In the DoD’s Nuclear Posture Review, DoD’s planners rejected proposals for further cuts beyond START II. Proposed US reductions under START II are also designed so that they could be largely reversed within a matter of months—by remounting warheads “downloaded” from Minuteman II and Trident missiles and by renuclearizing the B-1 bombers.

Headless Expansion of NATO

Even more damaging however has been the disregard in the US defense policy establishment of the likely reaction in Russia to new US security initiatives. Perhaps we have been listening too much to our own triumphal rhetoric declaring the US to be “the only remaining superpower.” Or perhaps nostalgic Cold Warriors are trying to goad Russia to assume a more threatening posture again.

The decision to push for the expansion of NATO, in particular, has had a terrible effect on Russian internal politics. We are seen as giving our highest priority to containing Russia instead of to building up multilateral institutions to support Russia’s transition to a prosperous democracy. I believe NATO should be kept available in the closet “just in case,” but making it the centerpiece of our policy for Europe puts our nightmare on track to becoming a self-fulfilling prophecy.

After World War II, the West recognizing that the Versailles Treaty which was forced on Germany after its defeat in World War I had been counter productive, decided to try to integrate Germany into Western Europe. In the wake of the Cold War, it appears that we may not have the wisdom to try a similar “strategy of embrace” with Russia.

Trashing of the ABM Treaty

The decision to expand NATO has greatly reduced Russia’s interest in nuclear disarmament. This effect has been reinforced, however, by US policy in another area: ballistic-missile defense. There is no plausible reason for the US today to build anew offensive missile systems, but the huge amount of media attention to Iraq’s SCUD attacks during the Gulf War—and to the defensive efforts of our valiant Patriot batteries—did create a political climate for support of new investments in defensive systems. The Army, the Navy and the Air Force all responded by bringing out of their closets technologies that had been developed as part of the Reagan Administration’s Strategic Defense Initiative.

I should not have been surprising to the Clinton Administration that its lawyers found that, because the proposed mobile theater-missile defense systems would have capabilities against strategic missiles, their development would violate the US-Soviet Treaty Limiting Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems (the

“ABM Treaty”). The Administration’s response was, however, not to reconsider the design of the hardware but to propose amendments to the ABM Treaty which would allow development and deployment of the US systems to go forward. When Russia was unwilling to go all the way, the Administration perhaps worried about aerospace jobs in California and under mounting pressure from right-wingers in Congress, decided to go ahead anyway.

Even the Administration’s decision to violate the ABM Treaty was not enough for the new Congress, however. In compromise language, which was negotiated with the Republic leadership by Senators Nunn and Levin, and apparently accepted by Secretary of Defense Perry (but subsequently rejected by the House as too weak), the Senate decided to order the Secretary of Defense to develop “an affordable and operationally effective national missile defense system to counter a limited, accidental, or unauthorized missile attack, and which is capable of attaining initial operational capability by the end of 2003.” As such a system would violate the ABM Treaty, the Senate language also suggested helpfully that, if Russia was unwilling to amend the Treaty to permit national missile defense, the US could withdraw from the Treaty altogether, by invoking US “supreme interest.”

Not surprisingly, nationalists in Russia have seen the revived US interest in ballistic missile defense as threatening to Russia’s nuclear deterrent and therefore one more reason to halt ratification of START II. If START II doesn’t get ratified, any discussion of deeper reductions gets postponed indefinitely. Thus the US government appears to be opting for a policy which will keep thousand of extra warheads deployed and on hair trigger in a country in whose future rationality, judging from our NATO policy, we do not have great confidence. We are doing this even though we know, as a result of decades of public debate, that these defense can be neutralized by relatively simple counter-measures within the capabilities of any country capable of building ballistic missiles.

Deep Reduction Would Be Better

Deep reductions and removal of the warheads from most of the remaining ballistic missiles deployed by the five acknowledged nuclear-weapon states would yield much more security for the US than porous ballistic-missile defenses. The other threats cited by the Senate as justifications for its proposals: that North Korea might within five years deploy missiles that could reach Alaska or that rogue states might “acquire intercontinental ballistic missiles in the near future” (presumably from Russia) are further evidence of the hallucinations which have come to dominate Washington’s policy debate since the election of 1994.

Thus the end of the Cold War and the indefinite extension of the Nonproliferation Treaty have not been sufficient to lay the basis for deep cuts in nuclear armaments from tens of thousands to hundreds of warheads. The Cold War strategy of threatening massive strikes on military targets in the name of deterrence has become too imbedded in the psyche of the US nuclear-weapons establishment. And, instead of being pressed forward by a global nuclear disarmament movement—as would be justified by the objective situation—we suddenly find the disarmament movement largely demobilized, hawks in control of the US Congress and an Administration trying to compete in solicitousness for the needs of the US weapons complex. If we are not lucky we may soon see the same configuration emerge in Russia as well.

Guatemala Project is Launched

Thanks to the generosity of the Columbia Foundation and the General Service Foundation, ECAAR and the Arias Foundation for Peace and Reconciliation will begin the research component of our joint project, **The Economic Benefits of Demilitarization, Phase One: Guatemala**. Project Director Thomas Scheetz and Senior Advisor Lawrence Klein, our Co-Chair, will meet shortly to design the research. ECAAR will continue to seek the balance of the funds needed for the dissemination portion of this timely project and would welcome your suggestions for funding.

Rogues' Gallery (Continued from page 2)

sein had accumulated in 1990, is squared off against a South Korean military that boasts a superior air force, better trained troops and a stronger industrial base. Even if a single "Iraq-sized" contingency could be scraped together out of these scattered and preoccupied foes, the United States would almost certainly not be fighting alone, but alongside well-equipped allies such as South Korea and Israel.

If fighting two major regional conflicts at once makes no sense, what would be a more sensible basis for U.S. defense strategy in the post-Cold War era? Klare's final chapter, "Beyond the Rogues: Military Doctrine in a World of Chaos," offers a useful first stab at this complex problem, emphasizing the importance of preventing and/or limiting ethnic conflicts at the outset through means such as limits on the global weapons trade, diplomatic initiatives aimed at resolving regional conflicts and timely deployment of U.N. peacekeeping forces. He also notes that any serious strategy for stemming the spread of nuclear weapons must include energetic efforts to reduce the United States' oversized nuclear arsenal, so that the U.S. government is not in the embarrassing posture of telling would-be nuclear weapons states in the developing world to "do as I say, not as I do." The final chapter is the most tentative section of the book, but that is perhaps as it should be. There are no simple answers to the security conundrums of the 1990s and beyond, and we shouldn't pretend that there will be. But Klare also makes it clear that we can't afford to rely on the self-interested expertise of the Pentagon. He raises all the key questions the United States needs to address if we are ever going to come up with a sensible defense strategy for the new era in international relations. *Rogue States and Nuclear Outlaws*, in other words, is essential reading for any citizen seeking to challenge the witless "Pentagon-first" dogmas that have captured the hearts and minds of our elected representatives in Washington. For a one-year subscription to *In These Times*, send a check for \$35.95 to *In These Times*, 2040 N. Milwaukee Avenue, Chicago, IL 60647.

Dr. Joseph Rotblat, "Remember Your Humanity," upon receiving the Nobel Peace prize in Oslo, 12-10-95

"If the militarily most powerful—and least threatened—states need nuclear weapons for their security, how can one deny such security to other countries that are truly insecure? The present nuclear policy is a recipe for proliferation. It is a policy for disaster."

ECOSOC (Continued from page 4)

ECOSOC, ECAAR Co-Chair Lawrence Klein, Executive Director Alice Slater, and NGO Representative Dorrie Weiss, to explore how ECAAR could fulfill its new UN obligations with ECOSOC. ECAAR members will be called upon for their research and to cover special meetings such as the upcoming Habitat II, and follow up meetings for the Social Development, Beijing Women's and Sustainable Development Conferences. To participate with ECAAR's UN team, contact Dorrie Weiss at (201) 265-1679.



Nuclear Wastelands (Continued from page 3)

country has in place a feasible long-term waste management plan for high-level waste. In the U.S., the only high-level waste repository is the controversial program at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, a site that has 32 known active fault lines. In Russia, according to a retired physicist-engineer who worked at the Russian Tomsk-7 complex, high-level waste has in the past been dumped on land and into reservoirs.

The study concludes with a series of recommendations, including an end to secrecy surrounding health and environmental matters; a halt to plutonium and uranium production; the establishment of radiation standards which protect public health; and cleanup and waste management decisions that fully involve the public. In a statement sent to the news conference at which the study was released, Dr. Jim Rutenber, one of the books authors, also criticized Congress' decision to cut the Energy Department's \$61 million budget for studying the effect of radiation on workers and the public to \$22.5 million. "It is terribly sad that studies that could finally result in at least a partial truth being told to the workers and neighbors of U.S. weapons plants might be either terminated or severely cut back." Coupled with recent events in French Polynesia, it is also a depressing sign that the dismal facts disclosed in *Nuclear Wastelands* have not yet sunk in.



Economic Resources (Continued from page 1)

for programs to assist demobilization, the promotion of full transparency, and reductions in military budgets.

Klein urged that "we need to take a good look at the question of what gains the world can realize from the end of the Cold War, and particularly, how we can reverse the tendency to walk away from the steady three and four percent annual reduction in military spending that we were having for nearly ten years." Galbraith counselled the audience, that "in our concern for development support. . . don't imagine that you have accomplished anything merely by attending this meeting this afternoon. [W]hat really counts is the educational effort, and the political effort, the persuasion that follows this meeting." To participate in Dr. Arias' Campaign 2000 or to obtain copies of the transcript and/or video of the proceedings, please contact the ECAAR office: (212) 768-2080 (tel); (212) 768-2167 (fax).

San Francisco, January 5-7, 1996

(NOTE: all panels will be in the Marriott Hotel)

Friday, January 5

Saturday, January 6

8:00 am Peace Economics I: Contributed Papers

Chair: Manas Chatterji, Binghamton University
 Christos Kollias, Centre of Planning and Economic Research - Athens and Paul Refenes, London Business School *Modeling the Effects of Defense Spending Reductions Using Neural Networks: Evidence from Greece*
 Robert E. Looney, Naval Postgraduate School *Pakistan, Defense Expenditures and External Debt: Patterns of Causation and Constraint*
 Stanislav Menchikov, *The Future of the Russian Economy*
 Remy Herrera, OECD Development Centre, Somnath Sen, University of Birmingham, and Jean-Claude Berthelemy, OEC Development Centre *Military Expenditure, Public Policy and Economic Development in India and Pakistan*
 Walter Isard and Jose Lobo, Cornell University *The Cold War Demise: A Noise-Induced Transition?*
 Location: Marriott/Pacific Suite C

10:15 am Peace Economics II: U.S. Budget Proposals and Their Implications, A Roundtable Discussion

Chair: Robert Eisner
 Paul Davidson, University of Tennessee
 Lloyd J. Dumas, University of Texas, Dallas
 John Tepper Marlin, Office of the New York City Comptroller
 Murray Weidenbaum, Washington University
 Location: Marriott/Pacific Suite C

2:30 pm Peace Economics III: Chinese Military Conversion

Chair: Murray Wolfson, California State University (Fullerton)
 Jean-Claude Berthelemy, OECD, Development Centre
 Saadet Deger and Somnath Sen, University of Birmingham
Conversion of Military Industries to Civilian Production in China: Prospects, Problems & Policies
 Charles Anderton, Holy Cross College *The Relocation of Chinese Converted Defense Activity and Employment*
 Discussants: Clark Abt, Boston University
 Joseph Ben-Dak, United Nations
 Gerald Adams, University of Pennsylvania
 Location: Marriott/ Sierra Suite B

8:00 am Conflict Between the Developed and Developing Nations

Jointly with the American Economic Association
 Chair: Walter Isard, Cornell University
 Iwan Azis, University of Indonesia *The Developing Nations' Perspective, Objective and Aspirations*
 Gustav Rani, Yale University *North/South Conflicts & Their Management*
 Discussants: Wing Thye Woo, University of California-Davis
 Philip Swagel, Northwestern University
 Solomon Polachek, Binghamton University
 Location: Marriot/ Marina E & F

10:15 am Disarmament and Development: From Military Spending to Social Development Programs

Jointly with the American Economic Association
 Chair: Robert J. Schwartz, Founder and Trustee, ECAAR
 Ahmad Kamal, UN ECOSOC
 Lawrence Klein, University of Pennsylvania
 Michael Intriligator, University of California-Los Angeles
 Discussant: Dorrie Weiss, ECAAR's UN Representative
 Dietrich Fischer, Pace University
 Location: Marriott/Marina E & F

2:30 pm Recent Progress in Research on Conversion

Chair: Ann Markusen, Rutgers University
 Jay Stowsky, University of California-Berkeley *Dual Use Technology Policy: An Evaluation of the Clinton Effort*
 Paul Ong, University of California-Los Angeles *Defense Downsizing: Consequences and Strategies for Workers*
 Dan Flaming, Economic Roundtable *Seven Years to Meltdown: Defense Conversion in Los Angeles*
 Ann Markusen & Michael Oden, Rutgers University *Post-Cold War Conversion: Comparing Los Angeles with St. Louis, Long Island, Seattle, & Northern New Mexico*
 Location: Marriott/Pacific Suite I

Sunday, January 7

8:00 am Barriers to a Sustainable Energy Future: Military and Civilian Nuclear Programs

Chair: William Weida, The Colorado College
 Erik Ferguson, Erik Ferguson Associates
 Michael Oden, Rutgers University
 Jackie Cabasso, Western States Legal Foundation
 Discussant: Alice Slater, ECAAR
 Location: Marriott/ Pacific Suite A

10:15 am Peace Economics IV: Game Theoretic and Related Approaches to Social Issues

Chair: Murray Wolfson, California State University (Fullerton)
 George Downs, Princeton University *Role of Enforcement in Compliance with International Arms Control, Environment and Other Regulatory Regimes*
 Peyton Young, John Hopkins University *Evolution and Norms of Justice*
 Raymond Dacey, University of Idaho *The Maintenance of Authority: Risk Attitude and the Deterrance of Civil Disobedience*
 Catherine Langlois, Georgetown University and Jean-Pierre Langlois San Francisco State University *Changing Trade Relations Between U.S. and China: A Game Theoretic Approach*
 Location: Marriot Pacific Suite A

If you're coming to the 1996 AEA meetings in San Francisco, join us for the annual ECAAR General Membership Meeting

Dr. Lawrence Klein, presiding

Friday, January 5, 1996

4:45-6:45 p.m.

**Marriott Hotel
Pacific Suite E**

Affiliate News

ECAAR-Japan

ECAAR-Japan sponsored a UN 50th Anniversary Symposium at Fukoka University from November 11-12. ECAAR Co-Chair Lawrence Klein was the keynote speaker and ECAAR Board members Dietrich Fischer, Michael Intriligator, and Dorrie Weiss also spoke on collective security, the United Nations and Nongovernmental Organizations, and reforming the UN.

At the ECAAR-Japan meeting which preceded the symposium, ECAAR member Koichi Hamada of Yale University presented a paper, "The Structure of the Arms Race Before and After the Cold War: From Strategic Substitutes to Strategic Complements."

ECAAR-Israel

The conference, Defense Conversion in the Middle East scheduled for December in Tel Aviv will be rescheduled and an announcement will follow. ECAAR and its Israeli affiliate mourn the death of Yitzak Rabin.

ECAAR-India

An international seminar on Arms, Security and Development in South Asia will be held at Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi on January 15-16, 1996. The conference will launch an Indian affiliate of ECAAR under the initiative of Vice Chancellor Dr. Yoginder Alagh working with ECAAR Board member Manas Chatterji. Persons interested in presenting papers or actively participating in the seminar are invited to contact: Manas Chatterji, Professor of Management, State University of New York, Binghamton, NY 13902 USA (Tel: (607) 777-2475 Fax: (607) 777-4422.

ECAAR-South Africa

A conference scheduled for late March 1996 to consider the future of the armaments industry in South Africa is being organized by the Institute for Democracy in South Africa (IDASA). ECAAR intends to arrange pre-conference gatherings in Cape Town and Johannesburg of economists and other academics to emphasize the economic and social distortions of the armaments industry in a country which faces crises in housing, education, and health services because of militarization and apartheid. For more information on contact Terry Crawford-Browne at 27-21-794-3208 tel; 27-21-794-7551 fax.

ECAAR-Dutch/Flemish Chapter

The Dutch/Flemish affiliate of ECAAR is planning for the 1996 Isaac Roet Prize for the best student essay on the subject of the promotion of world peace. Open to university students, the competition will be judged by an international panel which includes ECAAR-Netherlands/EVV Chair Annemarie Rima; Haim Roet, Secretary-General of the Israeli Foundation for Quality Management; Andries Klaasse Bos from the University of Amsterdam; and representatives from ECAAR Board of Trustees. For more information on the contest, please contact Joel van der Beek, Economen voor Vrede, Tinbergen Institute, Oostamaaslaan 950-952, NL 3063 DM, Rotterdam, The Netherlands. Phone: 31-10-408-8964; Fax: 31-10-452-7347.

ECAAR-France

This year ECAAR-France organized, co-organized or participated at four main conferences: Conversion in Russia with the Prometee project; the French armament industries with Jean-Paul Hebert; the French military budget with Rolland de Penaros; and Conversion in Russia, II with the Prometee project. ECAAR-France also published a number of articles and books. It contributed to the Special issue of Defense and Peace Economics (Special Editors, Jaques Fontanel and Ivan Samson), and published five books this year on issues of conversion and peace economics. On November 25th ECAAR-France held its General Assembly in Paris. For more information about the activities of ECAAR-France, please contact Jacques Fontanel, Directeur, Espace Europeen, Universite Pierre Mendes France, Faculte des Sciences Economiques, BP47X, 38040 Grenoble, Cedex 9, France.

After Hiroshima: Remembrance, Reflection, the Future

This half hour TV show has aired on more than 20 PBS stations and overseas on every continent. The first program to call for abolition of nuclear weapons and look at health, environmental, economic, and political impacts of the bomb—as well as ongoing risks posed by existing arsenals, 50 years of radioactive waste, and continued development of new nuclear weapons through virtual reality computer simulations. Produced by the Emmy award-winning Director of Sesame Street, Emily Squires, from an event at New York's Cathedral of St. John the Divine where over 1,500 citizens gathered to hear the Hiroshima Mayor, Ellen Burstyn, physicists Ted Taylor and Michio Kaku, author Robert Jay Lifton, Native American leader Grace Thorpe, Celeste Holm, Peter Yarrow, Lukas Foss, and other artists and performers. An excellent educational tool available for your community TV station. To order, see back page coupon.

Eastern Economic Association Members Needed in Boston

If you would like to organize an ECAAR panel at the Eastern Economic Association (EEA) Meetings in Boston, March 15-17, please let us know. The theme for this year's conference will be "World Trade: The Politics and Economics." Call Alice Slater at ECAAR, (212) 768-2080, or fax (212) 768-2167.

ECAAR Curriculum Guide Available!

Curricula and reading lists collected by ECAAR's Peace Economics and Conversion Resource Network under the leadership of Professor Ron Friesen of Bluffton College with the help of ECAAR Board Member Jurgen Brauer have been published by Eno River Press. The guide, *Public Economics III: Public, Choice, Political Economy, Peace & War*, is volume twenty of the popular Eno River Press series, *Economics: Reading Lists, Course Outlines, Exams, Puzzles & Problems* and includes reading lists from courses taught by ECAAR members including Ann Markusen, Lloyd Jeff Dumas, Fredric Raines, as well as Brauer, Friesen and others. To obtain a copy, fax credit card information or send a check or money order for \$24 plus \$3 shipping to Eno River Press, 115 Stoneridge Drive, Chapel Hill, NC 27514-9737. Fax: (919) 967-8246.

Yes, I want to support ECAAR

Enclosed is my contribution of \$ _____

Enclosed are my membership dues:

_____ \$100 Sustainer _____ \$50 Supporter
_____ \$ 35 Basic Membership _____ \$10 Student

Please contact me to:

_____ Join the **Peace Economics & Conversion Resource Network** e-mail conference
_____ Form a chapter in my community
_____ Work with ECAAR's UN team
_____ Work with the **Community Education Campaign** at US nuclear weapons sites
_____ Volunteer in the ECAAR New York Office

Please send me the following:

_____ *Global Register of Economists and Experts on Military Spending* on IBM-compatible disks (\$10)
_____ *After Hiroshima: Remembrance, Reflection, the Future*, video (\$19.95)
_____ *ECAAR UN Symposium*, transcript (\$10)
_____ *ECAAR UN Symposium*, video (\$20)
_____ *An Evening with Robert Heilbroner*, transcript and video (\$15)
_____ *Peace Economics, Peace Science and Public Policy Journal* @ \$10 each
_____ Vol. 1, nos. 1-4, 1994 (please specify) _____ Vol. 2, nos. 1-3, 1995 (please specify)

Name _____

Title _____ Affiliation _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Phone: _____ Fax: _____ E-mail _____

Return to: ECAAR, 25 West 45th Street, Room 1401, New York, NY 10036

ECAAR NewsNetwork
25 West 45th Street, Room 1401
New York, NY 10036
212-768-2080 (tel)/ 212-768-2167 (fax)

Non Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
New York, NY
Permit No. 04947



**FORWARDING & ADDRESS
CORRECTION REQUESTED**