



ECAAR NewsNetwork

The Newsletter of Economists Allied for Arms Reduction



Summer 1995

Volume 7, Number 2

Financing The UN

By John Langmore

As of February 15, 1995, UN member states owed the United Nations an overall total of \$3.4 billion. Of this, \$1.3 billion is for the regular budget and \$2.1 billion is for peacekeeping operations. The UN Secretary-General has said that the financial crisis is now threatening the organization's ability to carry out its major functions, including peacekeeping and support for development.

These debts are symptomatic of the financial limitations which have been one of the principal constraints on the UN fulfilling the purposes of its charter. Particularly severe during the last decade, these financial limitations are likely to be intensified by the determination of the current US Congress to cut support for UN peacekeeping even further.

This is a tragedy, for cooperative international action is now an essential component of strategies not only to resolve conflict but also to improve human, economic, and environmental security. The accelerating globalization of financial and communications markets, as well as the increasing proportion of all types of goods and services which are traded, are rapidly increasing international integration. Therefore an increasing number of economic, social and environmental issues — let alone the conventional strategic questions — require both national policy and international action. Yet the capacity of the UN to provide the forum and the expertise to coordinate such activity is extremely limited. The most heart-wrenching examples of this financial inca-

(Continued on page 4)

ECAAR member John Langmore is a Member of the Australian Parliament.

Nuclear Testing Alert

By Alice Slater

With the ink barely dry on the recent decision to extend the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) permanently, President Clinton is now being urged by powerful Pentagon forces to scrap the deal we just made at the May UN conference. The "nuclear have-nots", in return for their vote to make the NPT permanent, were promised by the "nuclear haves" that a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) would be negotiated by 1996.

Yet US nuclear weaponeers are now arguing that the US go back on its word to negotiate a CTBT. Instead, the US is urged to negotiate a treaty which would permit "low-yield" nuclear test explosions equivalent to hundreds of tons of dynamite, capable of inflicting massive damage and creating even more indestructible and lethal radioactive waste, the disposal of which remains a major conundrum of the nuclear age with no hint of resolution in sight.

Even if we are successful in efforts to stop the proposed "low-yield" explosions in the hundred of tons, reports indicate that in 1994 the Clinton administration promised the weaponeers support for explosions of up to four pounds, to permit the continued testing and development of new weapons, in return for dropping an "easy exit" proposal in a CTBT which would have allowed us to withdraw after only ten years. Miniaturized testing technology, unique to the US and Russia, is the basis upon which China and France justify their larger tests. They too want the capacity to perform computer-simulated virtual reality tests.

Failure to maintain our NPT promise to negotiate a truly Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty would undermine our efforts to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons by other countries. We would be sending the wrong signal to the rest of the world and would be in

(Continued on page 6)

Alice Slater is Executive Director of ECAAR.

You're Invited to ECAAR's UN 50th Anniversary Symposium "Economic Resources for Peace" with ECAAR Board Members Dr. Oscar Arias, Dr. Lawrence Klein, Dr. James Tobin and Dr. John Kenneth Galbraith

See page 4 for details

inside...

U.N. Summit's Solutions for Poverty	2
US is in a Wasteful Arms Race With Itself	3
Washington Report	5
Nukes in Space: Documentary Review	5
Affiliate News	6
Announcements	7

New Solutions for Poverty

By Genevieve Guth-Kitts

The World Summit for Social Development, held in Copenhagen in March, called for a commitment by world governments to work together in order to eradicate absolute poverty. Included on the agenda were key issues such as unemployment, international labor standards, social exclusion, gender equality and international debt.

At Summit preparatory meetings, Chairman Juan O. Somavia, Chile's permanent representative to the UN, had announced that the highest priority was "listening to the people" yet Nongovernmental Organizations (NGOs) were barred from all the important bargaining sessions and remained in the background. It was impossible to enter the area reserved for delegates and therefore extremely difficult to have any contact with them. On the last day, NGOs were allowed to attend some meetings dealing only with secondary issues. Despite disappointment and frustration at the lack of access, the Summit enabled citizens of different countries to communicate and debate face-to-face problems of development and possible solutions.

The harsh neo-liberal and deregulation policies that have been implemented since the cold war's end have caused — at all levels of societies — more violence, more marginalization, and more poverty. Yet, the concept of global peace through arms reductions and substantial cuts in military expenditures is still a politically sensitive issue, shrouded in secrecy, and was absent from the official agenda of the Summit. No one wants to raise the issue of the responsibility of either supplier countries which derive enormous profits from arms sales or of importing countries whose leaders spend up to 30% of GNP on the military at the expense of their people's welfare. A proposal to devote 3% of the peace dividend (money saved on military cuts), which could meet the basic needs of deprived people, was discussed but ultimately tabled.

The relationship between poverty and the enormous sums spent on arms was not officially addressed, although it was discussed at length among NGOs in caucus sessions. One important gain was achieved: adoption of Commitment 9 for "appropriate reduction in excessive military expenditures and investments for arms production and acquisition, consistent with national security requirements, in order to increase resources for social and economic development." Now action must be linked to this commitment.

A major achievement of peace NGOs was the inclusion in the final document of a statement addressing land mines. There are an estimated 8 to 10

million land mines in Cambodia alone and over 100 million land mines in 60 other countries. In Cambodia, a land mine can be bought on the black market for as little as 10 dollars, but it takes more than 30 times that cost to remove it, an unbearable burden for the civilian budget. Entire rural areas are strewn with mines, further crippling the economy. The Peace Caucus also recommended a new definition of security, to meet the goals of the Social Summit which would include political, economic, social and ecological aspects of security.

The NGOs affirmed the need for global solidarity and collective action. Basic health care and education, refugee relief, natural disasters, and environmental problems cost money and the UN should no longer have to beg for funds. To establish financial independence, alternative sources of funding must be found (the Tobin Tax, global taxes on pollution and/or airline tickets, etc).

The expression of power is changing between men and women, parents and children, employers and employees, and rich and poor. The old power imbalances and structures will not work in the future, and individual interests must be set aside in a common search for solutions for global problems. NGOs left the Summit more firmly committed to bringing these new realities to the attention of their national governments and to urging appropriate action. *Professor Genevieve Guth-Kitts, The Sorbonne, represented ECAAR at the World Summit.*

Peace Economics and Conversion Scholars & Experts to Brainstorm at Second Annual Meeting

ECAAR's Peace Economics and Conversion Resource Network will meet again, September 28 through October 1, at The Colorado College in Colorado Springs. Unlike a conference or symposium, the ECAAR meeting will bring academics, researchers, and policy analysts together for focused brainstorming sessions on national disarmament and conversion policy, international aspects of conversion, teaching peace and defense economics, and micro- and macroeconomic analysis of conversion. To participate, or for more information about the conference, contact ECAAR 212-768-2080(tel); 212-768-2167(fax); <Alice.Slater@environet.org> (e-mail).

Achieving peace through arms reductions & substantial cuts in military expenditures is still a politically sensitive issue, shrouded in secrecy.

US is in a Wasteful Arms Race With Itself

By Eugene J. Carroll

During the 45 years of the cold war, the United States engaged in a heated arms race with the Soviet Union. Now it appears that America is in an arms race with itself. Incredibly, this race is heating up in a bidding war between a Republican Congress committed under the Contract with America to increase defense spending, and the Clinton Administration, determined not to be outdone in its support for increased military readiness.

Our present level of military spending virtually equals the combined military spending of all other nations. Nevertheless, spending would have risen from \$264 billion this year to \$287 billion by 2001 under the budget President Clinton submitted to Congress. This comes in the face of drastically reduced spending by Russia, as well as by our closest friends and allies. Combined military spending by the six nations frequently cited by the Pentagon as potential enemies (Iraq, Iran, Libya, Syria, North Korea and Cuba) is less than \$15 billion a year, or only 6% of the U.S. military budget. [ed. note: *Russia will spend US\$12 billion in 1995 according to Defense News March 20, 1995.*]

A primary reason put forward to justify this huge disparity in spending is that we must continue to modernize our forces in order to retain technological dominance in weaponry, a proposition that needs careful examination.

Most of the new U.S. weapons in production or under development were proposed as necessary to defeat the Soviet Union in the 21st Century. These include such technological marvels as the F-22 fighter, the Sea Wolf attack submarine, the DDG51-class guided missile destroyer, the B-2 Stealth Bomber, and additional nuclear aircraft carriers. Clearly, the threat of technologically competitive Soviet forces vanished with the demise of the USSR. Even more clearly, the need for additional bombers, fighters and warships disappeared at the same time. These two changes provide arguments for saving huge sums by delaying or canceling further investments in unneeded weapons. If new weapons are produced, it will be necessary to retire those presently in use although their service life is far from ended.

Examples of this problem highlight the waste that will result under present plans. The Air Force plans to build 422 F-22 fighters costing \$71.5 billion. If it does so, it must start early re-

tirement of F-15 fighters well before the year 2014, when the first of the approximately 900 now flying will begin reaching the end of normal service. Today's F-15 is the finest air superiority fighter ever built, and no challenger will exist before the year 2014, if then.

Similar situations exist in many other weapons systems. If the Navy proceeds with the Sea Wolf Submarine and efforts to develop a newer sub design, it will need to scrap as many as 13 modern Los Angeles class subs. Production of additional nuclear supercarriers at \$5 billion each will force the premature retirement of five conventionally powerful aircraft carriers which are more economical to operate than nuclear behemoths.

Perhaps the most wasteful proposal of all is to build at least 20 more B-2 Stealth Bombers. Current plans require the Air Force to maintain a fleet of 100 long-range heavy bombers to carry out a two-war strategy. A recent Air Force study shows that if it acquires 20 more B-2 aircrafts at an estimated life cycle cost of \$30 billion, the additional cost would force retirement of 94 B-1B bombers that are less than 10 years old. Another option is to retire 94 B-52 bombers, which were used for heavy conventional bombing as well as cruise-missile attacks against Iraq in 1991. The B-1Bs have an expected service life until 2018, and upgraded B-52s could be used, if needed, until 2030.

Technological superiority over an adversary is highly desirable, but rushing into production of new generations of weapons to surpass the quality of your own first-class weapons verges on the absurd. If Congress is serious about balancing the budget, a good place to start would be to examine the wisdom of turning warships into razor blades and putting first-class aircraft into storage long before their useful service life has ended. Cancellation or delay of many of the new systems while continuing to use highly effective weapons already bought and paid for would produce savings of or more than \$50 billion over the next six years.

Programs to perpetuate the classic cold war struggle for technological superiority over the Soviet Union only put us in a wasteful arms race with ourselves — no one else is even close. *Retired Adm. Eugene J. Carroll is Deputy Director of the Center for Defense Information. Reprinted from New York Newsday, May 24, 1995.*

In fact, the Senate Armed Service Committee actually approved a military budget, for the fiscal year beginning Oct. 1, 1995, which is \$7 billion more than the Pentagon's request!

— NY Times, July 5, 1995, p. A1

ECAAR Symposium in honor of UN 50th Anniversary

ECAAR has organized a symposium, *Economic Resources for Peace*, to be held on October 19th at the United Nations. Moderated by Dr. John Kenneth Galbraith, the panel includes ECAAR Board Members Dr. Oscar Arias, Dr. Lawrence Klein, and Dr. James Tobin. For more details, please contact the ECAAR office at 212-768-2080.

UN Funding ... (Continued from page 1)

capacity to act are the failure to intervene in Rwanda or Somalia until governments could be persuaded to increase their voluntary contributions — by which time thousands more people had died or been killed.

There are five aspects to overcoming this crisis. First, countries must be strongly encouraged to pay their obligatory assessed dues on time. At the end of October 1994, fifty-two out of the 185 member states had made no payment that year to their regular budget assessment. Introduction of a penalty interest charge on overdue assessments would create an incentive to pay on time. Loss of the right to vote after, say, a year of non-payment would increase the pressure.

Second, disinformation about the UN should be countered and its achievements proclaimed. The UN is in fact a tiny organization, rather than the massive, inefficient bureaucracy which is often portrayed. The whole system — the UN itself plus all its agencies including the voluntarily financed development and relief funds — employs only a total of 52,000 staff, including both regular and non-permanent personnel, which is less than the total governmental staff of the state of Wyoming.

Third, governments should be encouraged to finance peacekeeping from their defense budgets and the revolving fund for peacekeeping should be increased to at least the \$400 million recommended by the Ogata-Volker Report on the financing of the UN. The establishment of the standing volunteer UN force favored by an increasing number of people concerned with conflict resolution, including ECAAR Co-Chair Dr. Lawrence Klein, would require major additions to the UN's budget.

Fourth, expansion of voluntary contributions for development and disaster relief must be encouraged. However such growth seems increasingly improbable, given the expenditure cutbacks underway in many donor countries to achieve deficit reduction. The deterioration of the climate for outlays financed through national budgets clearly suggests

the need to consider new and innovative ideas for generating funds, as recommended by the World Summit for Social Development.

The proposal which excited the most interest around the corridors of the Social Summit was the idea of the introduction of a small levy on foreign exchange transactions, sometimes called the Tobin Tax after the originator of the idea, Dr. James Tobin. Such a levy would discourage short term speculation and reduce the volume of foreign exchange transactions, the volatility of exchange rates, international financial disorder, and the capacity of financial markets to influence economic and social development nationally and internationally.

Such a levy would have to be negotiated by at least the countries with the major financial markets, with the participation of all other countries sought, and penalties introduced on funds transferred from tax havens unwilling to cooperate. Governments would benefit from the greater capacity for discretionary monetary policy and from the additional source of substantive revenue.

The tax could be set at a rate which would be too small to deter trade or movements of investment capital, but which would penalize short term speculation. The question for business is whether the benefits for trade and investment from reduced exchange rate volatility, reduced cost of hedging, and improved effectiveness of macroeconomic policies would be sufficient to offset the cost of paying the tax. This depends in part on the rate at which the levy is set.

Although Tobin originally proposed a tax rate of 0.5%, a more politically realistic and probably adequate figure to reduce instability would be 0.1%. Assuming that around US\$ 1 trillion is traded daily during 240 trading days per year and that 20% of these trades are exempt from the tax, 20% of the remaining trades evade the tax, and that the resulting volume of transactions falls by 50% due to the impact of the tax, the effective tax base would be about \$77 trillion a year with tax revenue of about \$77 billion.

If each country agreed to allocate one-tenth of this to the UN for peacekeeping, development and disaster relief, this would cover about 75% of current UN outlays. Such a proportion would be attractive to some governments (including the US) as it would reduce the call of the UN on their budgets. The benefit to the UN would be the enhanced reliability of a substantial part of its revenue and the capacity to expand peacekeeping and development activities, depending on the extent to which governments maintained their existing allocations. For the global community, strategic, economic, and environmental security would be enhanced.

As of October 1994, 52 out of the 185 member states had made no payment for UN dues.

Washington Report

By David Carrier

At a meeting of WE*CAN, a coalition working on issues involving the conversion from military to nonmilitary economic activity, the progress of legislation concerning the Base Realignment Commission (BRAC), the Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP), and the Economic Development Administration (EDA) was discussed. Estimates of industry and military job losses due to base closings occurring in 1988, 1991, 1993 totalled approximately 1.1 million, about 75% of which are indirect job losses. The projected job losses from 1993 to the completion of the commission's work in 1997 is another 1 million.

The Economic Development Administration was established, in part, to provide assistance to localities experiencing economic hardship as a result of these base closings. A little over half of EDA grants are provided to BRAC and the remainder are provided directly to defense industries to help them with conversion plans. Since the EDA is under the Department of Commerce, it is unclear whether it would be eliminated in the Republican plan to abolish the Department of Commerce, or whether its functions would be transferred to another agency. Another option would be to establish a public/private economic development corporation like Fannie Mae.

Since the districts of both Republican and Democratic legislators receive economic development loans and assistance, and an economic development corporation would be independent and for-profit, there is potential bipartisan support for this alternative.

A very significant contribution could be made by economists who are familiar with EDA success stories, if they were to write newspaper editorials or invite press accounts of EDA achievements and/or tell these stories to members of Congress emphasizing the feasibility of an economic development corporation and the fact that it need not cost taxpayers a cent.

The Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP) was established by the National Institute of Standards and Technology in the mid 1980's to help small and mid-size firms upgrade their design, production, and marketing capabilities and improve their productivity. It does this by matching state investments in new technology and by offering other assistance through its local and regional centers. Firms that use MEP centers report benefits of almost \$7 for every dollar of federal money the centers receive. Yet it also has been targeted for elimination by Republican leaders in both the House and Senate. Like the EDA, it has considerable support among members of Congress who realize the benefits of the program, and it could be saved with some grassroots support.

ECAAR member David Carrier is our Washington DC representative.

Nukes in Space: The Nuclearization and Weaponization of the Heavens.

Documentary Video, produced by Karl Grossman and Steve Jambeck for Envirovideo and Green Sphere, Inc. (1995)

Review by Frances Goulart

"The whole nuclear enterprise represents a wrong turning in human history" comments George Wald, Nobel Laureate and Professor Emeritus at Harvard University in the course of this hour-long documentary's devastating indictment of the government's efforts to project nuclear weapons and nuclear power into space.

The video illustrates just how wrong this turn has been, beginning with documentation of what one expert predicts could usher in an era of "Chernobyls falling from the sky" — NASA's projected \$3.4 billion Cassini space probe which will use 72.3 pounds of plutonium just to generate electricity for the instruments on board despite the availability of solar cells which are now being widely used in European space missions. The Cassini will be mounted atop a Titan IV, a rocket that has a history of exploding upon launching. Despite a NASA environmental impact admission that inadvertent entry of the Cassini into the atmosphere during fly-by could expose billions of people to deadly radiation, the plutonium-powered probe is scheduled for a 1997 launch from Cape Canaveral.

Nukes in Space also examines US activity in ground-testing Russian-made Topaz space nuclear reactors purchased for the Strategic Defense Initiative program, the Republican Congressional majority's push to revive Star Wars (reincarnated in the Clinton Administration era as Ballistic Missile Defense), the Defense Department's plans for orbiting battle stations in space powered by nuclear reactors, and the use of the nuclear-propelled Timberland Rocket.

Despite the fact that these moves represent a clear violation of the Outer Space Treaty of 1967, it illustrates the folly of trying to create a nuclear shield around the US. This global protection system could more sensibly be powered by solar energy technology that is already being used in European satellites.

Produced and directed by the award-winning team of Karl Grossman, a documentarian and professor of journalism at the State University of New York, and Steve Jambeck, a veteran of network TV, the video includes insightful commentary from numerous experts including Dr. Helen Caldicott, Dr. Michio Kaku, Dr. Ernest Sternglass, and Greenpeace International's Harvey Wasserman. There is also impressive archival footage documenting the

ECAAR

NewsNetwork is published quarterly by Economists Allied for Arms Reduction (ECAAR). ECAAR uses the expertise of economists to contribute to the public dialogue in demonstrating the destructive effects of military economies on human welfare.

ECAAR

NewsNetwork:
25 W. 45, Rm 1401,
New York, NY
10036
tel: 212-768-2080
fax: 212-768-2167

Alice Slater, Editor
Gina Neff, Design

Contributors:

David Carrier
Eugene J. Carroll
Terry Crawford-
Browne
Frances Goulart
Genevieve
Guth-Kitts
John Langmore
Gina Neff

(Continued on page 7)

Nuclear Testing Alert (Continued from page 1)

breach of our solemn treaty obligations.

Contact President Clinton and your Congressional representatives and ask them to hold the line against unreconstructed cold warriors in the Pentagon and Dr. Strangeloves in the weapons labs who continue to drive the arms race. Leading scientists agree, including Frank von Hippel, former White House Deputy Science Advisor on National Defense, who stated that "there is no need to pay the very large diplomatic price it would cost" for continued nuclear testing.

If the non-nuclear states see that the US failed to deliver the promised test ban, they might begin their own weapons programs and shatter the newly extended Non-Proliferation Treaty. We would have no moral authority to convince China which is currently testing, and France, which has already announced plans to conduct eight nuclear tests on the fragile coral atoll of Moruroa in the South Pacific, to end their weapons development programs.

At the NPT conference, ECAAR joined with over 220 citizens organizations to form a Nuclear Abolition Caucus which lobbied the UN delegates **to begin negotiations on a convention to eliminate nuclear weapons**, just as the world has done for chemical and biological weapons. The group also called for a series of steps to fulfill the NPT commitments for nuclear disarmament some of which include:

- Pledge no first use of nuclear weapons
- Negotiate a CTBT
- Begin a global accounting and inventory of all weapons usable radioactive materials
- End all nuclear weapons research, design, development, and testing; establish international monitoring of all weapons labs; and close all nuclear test sites
- Support the World Court Project which seeks an advisory opinion that the use or the threat to use nuclear weapons is illegal
- Establish an international energy agency to promote and support the development of sustainable and environmentally safe energy sources just as the IAEA promotes nuclear energy under the NPT
- Create mechanisms for citizen participation in planning and monitoring the process of nuclear abolition

At the NPT, the International Network of Engineers and Scientists for Global Responsibility, to which ECAAR belongs, issued a report, *Beyond the NPT: A Nuclear-Weapons-Free World* which demonstrates that nuclear disarmament is technically feasible. What's needed is the political will. (Copies of the report are available at the ECAAR office.)

If you would like more information about the Abolition Caucus by e-mail, contact The Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, <pmeidell@igc.apc.org> or, in Europe, Xanthe Hall at the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, <IPPNW@oln.comlink.de>. To receive information by fax, contact Selma Brackman, War and Peace Foundation, 212-995-9652. To support the World Court Project, contact Alyn Ware, Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy, 212-674-7790.

Affiliate News**ECAAR-Japan**

ECAAR-Japan will sponsor a panel at the World Congress of the Econometric Society August 24th at Keio University. ECAAR Board Members Lawrence Klein, Michael Intrilligator, and Robert MacNamara will be panelists. On August 28, they will be joined by ECAAR Founder Robert Schwartz at an ECAAR-Japan symposium.

Dr. Akira Hattori, Chair of ECAAR-Japan, has organized a conference sponsored by Fukuoka University in honor of the 50th anniversary of the United Nations. ECAAR Board Member Dorrie Weiss will participate. For more information, contact Dr. Hattori, +81 2871 6631(tel); +81 2864 2938(fax).

ECAAR-Dutch/Flemish Chapter

At the general members' meeting of the Dutch/Flemish chapter of ECAAR (EVV) on 13 May in Utrecht, a joint symposium, *Economic Sanctions: An Instrument for Peace*, was chaired by Wout Klein Haneveld, Chair of the Dutch chapter of the International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms and Annemarie Rima, Chair of the Dutch/Flemish chapter of ECAAR. Mr. R. van der Laan of the University of Groningen discussed the economic impact of sanctions, and Dr. A.J.H. Korrer of the Dutch Red Cross confronted the audience with the physical and psychological consequences of economic sanctions. Mr. K.J. Hartogh, a representative of the Ministry of Economic Affairs, participated. A report will be published.

As a token of reconciliation for the bombing of Rotterdam, the German churches have given a building to be used for "justice and peace" to the town of Rotterdam. ECAAR's Dutch/Flemish affiliate is headquartered in this building and will hold a conference on UN financing there to address various alternatives for UN financing and the formulation of a realistic research agenda for an operational system which will enhance global capacity to optimize development and security.

Since the Tinbergen Institute is planning to move to a different building, the ECAAR-Dutch/Flemish board would like to establish an international and interdisciplinary institute in the building. Suggestions and support are extremely welcome.

Blinding weapons

A seminar on "blinding weapons" based on new laser technology was organized by the Flemish section of the EVV in conjunction with other peace organizations of Flanders. Specialists from the International Red Cross, Handicap International and Pax Christi participated, and a publication will follow.

Cooperation with other peace organizations

To strengthen cooperation with other peace organizations, the Dutch chapter of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War organized a meeting with the Dutch/Flemish chapter of ECAAR and the Dutch chapter of the International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms, at which it was decided to do joint research on topics related to their missions. For more information contact Joel van der Beek, EVV-ECAAR, +31 10 4088964 (tel); +31 10 4527347(fax).

ECAAR-Israel

The ECAAR-Israel conference on *Defense Conversion in the Middle East* will be held in mid-December 1995 at the Jaffe Center for Strategic Studies at Tel-Aviv University, Israel. For more information contact Dr. Alex Mintz, Chair of ECAAR-Israel, phone: (409) 845-1410, fax: (409) 847-8924, <E339AM@TAMVM1.TAMU.EDU>.

ECAAR-South Africa

The University of Cape Town's Centre for Conflict Resolution has agreed to house ECAAR South Africa and to make available library and administrative resources. Funds are now being solicited for a formal launch of ECAAR South Africa late this year or early 1996.

Through the Anglican Church's written submission, ECAAR has offered its services as project managers for the dismantlement of ARMSCOR and DENEL, the two organizations which control South Africa's arms industry.

The Cameron Commission of Inquiry into ARMSCOR will begin its second phase with public hearings in Cape Town June 19-30 to consider South Africa's arms trade policy. The Anglican Church has called upon the government to end the authorization of arms exports immediately, to dismantle the armaments industry progressively and rapidly, and to deploy its resources for peaceful development.

ECAAR South Africa has made a written submission to the Constitutional Assembly, which is currently drafting South Africa's permanent constitution, recommending a constitutional commitment towards a demilitarized society. The submission has been acknowledged, and a formal invitation to testify is awaited.

To contact Terry Crawford-Browne, convenor of ECAAR-South Africa, phone +27-21-794-3208 or fax +27-21-794-7551.

ECAAR-Chile

ECAAR-Chile will hold a workshop to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II. Universities throughout the world have been invited to participate in the workshop, to be held in October at the Universidad Tecnológica Metropolitana in Santiago (UTEM).

Dr. Aedil Suarez, chair of ECAAR-Chile, was recently appointed as Coordinator of Industrial Engineering at UTEM.

Nukes in Space (Continued from page 5)

whole: deceit-ridden history of the arms race and the controlling role played by arms manufacturers, as well as coverage of the growing counter movement opposing "nukes in space", including the Colorado-based Citizens for Peace in Space and the Florida-based Global Network Against Weapons and Nuclear Power in Space.

This video will be aired on public access TV with public screenings worldwide and is available for use at meetings and for local cable access TV. Further information on any video in the Eco-expose series is available by calling 1-800-ECO-TV46.

Announcements

Peace Network Publications

Curriculum guides and course materials compiled by Ron Friesen of Bluffton College in Ohio as a project of the Peace Economics and Conversion Resource Network (PERN) will soon be published as part of a series by Eno River Press which publishes a popular collection of economics course syllabi with accompanying exams, puzzles, and problems. The ECAAR materials will be published later this year in volume 20 of the series, *Public Choice, Political Economy, Law and War*.

PERN members Susan Strong of the Center for Economic Conversion and Fred Rose of Tufts University, have compiled a booklet of conversion policy statements as a result of last fall's PERN meeting. Essays by some of the top thinkers in the field focus on strategies for implementing a coherent conversion policy. Contact the ECAAR office for more information.

Call for Papers

ECAAR Board Member Jurgen Brauer with Professor William Gissy of Morehouse College in Atlanta will co-edit a book on peace and conflict economics to be published by Avebury Press. They seek contributions of original high-level research grounded in economics which take a step forward to suggest and discuss the "how-to" of achieving security at a low cost. International submissions are especially welcome. For information, please contact Dr. Jurgen Brauer at 706-737-1560 (tel); 706-667-4064 (fax); <jbrauer@admin.ac.edu> (e-mail).

New Studies on the US Nuclear Complex

Coming in from the Cold: The Future of Los Alamos and Sandia National Laboratories by Ann Markusen, James Raffel, Michael Oden, and Marlen Llanes, Rutgers University, 1995. A thorough and thoughtful review of conversion possibilities in which the authors note that the labs are at a critical crossroads and must choose whether to pursue a more diversified portfolio or to "hunker down under the nuclear umbrella . . . to keep their designers happy."

Atomic Audit: What the US Nuclear Arsenal Really Cost, a preliminary report by The US Nuclear Weapons Cost Study Project, a task force on which ECAAR Project Director William Weida participated, which observes that the US has spent nearly \$4 trillion for its nuclear arsenal since the dawn of the nuclear age, and is still spending \$25 billion this year on its nuclear program — while the entire Manhattan Project cost only \$20 billion in 1995 dollars.

Potential Socioeconomic Impacts from Construction and Operation of a Source for Tritium Production, by William Weida analyzes the need for a new tritium reactor which has been approved for construction by Congress. Weida notes that under Start II no replacement tritium would be required until 2020. Since DOE calculates a 15 year lead time requirement, no replacement source planning would be necessary until 2005. Deeper cuts in the arsenal would push that date back even further.

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
_____ Donate desktop publishing and/or graphic arts experience

Please send me the following:

_____ *Global Register of Economists and Experts on Military Spending* on two IBM-compatible disks (\$10).
_____ "An evening with Robert McNamara" transcript (\$5).
_____ *Alternative Galvin Report On Futures for the DOE Nuclear Weapons Laboratories* (\$5).
_____ *Peace Economics, Peace Science and Public Policy Journal* @ \$10 each
 _____ Vol. 2, no. 2, Spring 95 _____ Vol. 1, nos. 1-4 (please specify)
 _____ Vol. 2, no.1, Winter 95

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**