ECAAR Announces Four First Prizes in International Essay Contest

by Richard Maranda

Archbishop Desmond Tutu presented the top awards in ECAAR's essay contest, Arms Reduction and Global Reconstruction: A Blueprint for the Year 2000, at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C. Essay judges Robert Schwartz and Akira Hattori were also there to greet the prize winners and the press. The four best essays were tied and the top awards received $8,000 prizes each. The first prize winners were Lieutenant Commander Timothy J. Dooley, a U.S. Navy intelligence officer stationed in Virginia; Boaz Moselle an English graduate student in economics at Harvard; Dr. David Burress, an economist at the University of Kansas; and Erik Thompson, a banker in Milan, Minnesota who had served in the Peace Corps in Micronesia and spent three months in federal prison for trespassing on the Nevada nuclear test site during a protest demonstration.

The eight $1000 second prize winners were Julie Ajlour, a health care worker in Seattle, Washington; Frank M. Gren, a U.S. Navy officer and aviator in Tampa, Florida; Roger E. Ison, a computer scientist in Loveland, Colorado; Georgi Kirov, a jurist-pensioner in Sofia, Bulgaria; Karen Kwiatkowski, an Air Force officer stationed in Italy; Dr. K. Srinath Reddy, a cardiologist in New Delhi; Kevin Sanders, special projects director of the War and Peace Foundation in New York City; and James Wurst, a journalist, also from New York, who edits the U.N.'s Disarmament Times. We received over 850 essays, from 49 countries, each of which was read at least twice before being further screened by ECAAR Board members who selected the best entries to be forwarded to the panel of judges.

Timothy Dooley, one of the three members of the U.S. Armed Services numbered among the prize winners, contends that "the world community must pool its resources to end the arms race and build a strategy of peace.

(continued on page 4)


by Alice Slater

ECAAR's project, to provide grassroots activists at the U.S. nuclear weapons complex with economic expertise for making the case for employment alternatives to continued weapons production, is off to a rousing start. Now fully funded with additional grants of $35,000 from the W. Alton Jones Foundation and $20,000 from the Compton Foundation, Project Director, Dr. William Weida, has been networking with ECAAR members and community groups in Tennessee, Oklahoma, Colorado, New Mexico, California, Nevada, and other states with nuclear facilities and training them to analyze employment data for testimony at Department of Energy Hearings and other public meetings.

At an MPN meeting in West Virginia, the five national MPN priorities, nuclear testing, radioactive waste management, dismantlement, government secrecy, and citizen participation in the reconfiguration of the nuclear complex, were reviewed and discussed. ECAAR has taken a leading role on the testing issue. We have been distributing Walter Isard's cost/benefit analysis of resumed testing and worked with the Comprehensive Test Ban Coalition to place two ads in the New York Times urging the President not to resume testing. ECAAR member Suzanne Alfeld produced a 30 second spot for TV, circulated by the Coalition, to raise public awareness of the imminent possibility that nuclear testing might be resumed.

The MPN dismantlement position calls for environmental safeguards and public involvement with fully disclosed government information before any government decisions are made on how to reduce our nuclear arsenal, without endangering our people, and before any decisions are made as to what will be done with the plutonium and uranium from retired warheads. Government disclosure and

(continued on page 5)

IN THIS ISSUE

ECAAR Awards Essay Prizes ........................................... 1
Grassroots Organize Against Testing and Waste............... 1
U.N. Controversy on Nuclear Testing ............................ 2
Testing Threatens Non-Proliferation Treaty ..................... 2
Colloquium in France ................................................. 2
Galbraith and Markusen in New York ............................. 3
Global Register in Latin America ................................. 3
China's Policy on Nuclear Weapons ............................. 4
Affiliate News ........................................................... 6
Conferences, Meetings & Announcements ..................... 7
Controversy at UN Conference Over Nuclear Testing
by Barbara Howell

By far the most hotly debated subject at the April 20-23 NGO International Disarmament Conference at the United Nations was nuclear testing.

Although all delegates at the April 22nd morning session on a Comprehensive Test Ban decried nuclear-testing-in-general, they were divided as to when the U.S. should stop all underground nuclear testing.

One side argued that if the U.S. broke the current moratorium and resumed limited nuclear testing for reasons of "safety and reliability," this was an inconsequential side issue and would not affect President Clinton's resolve to sign a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) in 1996.

This view was vigorously opposed by speakers from the floor, among them Robert Schwartz of ECAAR. At the press conference that followed the session, Daniel Ellsberg of Manhattan Project II and Physicians for Social Responsibility declared the President Clinton cannot claim to be for a CTBT while continuing to test.

Other participants voiced the suspicion that any new testing by the United States would not be for safety, but to try out a whole new category of weapons, namely "mininukes." Whether or not this is so, they said, a new round of tests for whatever reason would give other nations—France, China, Iraq and Pakistan—an excuse to test their own weapons currently under development.

Roland Timmerbaev, the former Ambassador for Disarmament for the USSR, focused mainly on Russia's nuclear strategy. He assured the conference that Russia had no problems with a test ban treaty, especially since two of Russia's main test sites are now unusable. However, he warned, there are still many Russian scientists who want to resume testing elsewhere and that plutonium continues to be produced in Russia. He declared that an unambiguous statement of purpose by the U.S. is needed to silence the right wing elements in Russia.

Patricia Lewis of VERTIC (Verification Technology Information Center) said tests conducted by the UK

(continued on page 5)

Nuclear Testing Threatens Non-Proliferation Treaty
by Dorrie Weiss


Because delegates attended in their personal, rather than their official capacities, they were free to speak without the restraints that confine speech in a more formal setting.

The defection of North Korea from the NPT which had registered for the conference, but did not attend, was very much on everyone's mind. The discussions were charged with their unseen, but strongly felt, presence -- a reminder of the fragility of the NPT. Their absence also pointed up the need to improve the safeguard regime of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). IAEA safeguards had not been adequate to prevent the Korean denouement, and the credibility of those safeguards had been impaired.

Another major concern was that the nuclear powers were not meeting their obligations under Article VI of the NPT, when they promised in 1970 to negotiate "on a treaty on general and complete disarmament." Some countries indicated that they would balk at extending the NPT unless there was substantial progress on nuclear disarmament, preceded by a CTB. There was also a concern that some signatories to the treaty are discriminated against and are subject to sanctions, while non-signatories violate nuclear prohibitions without fear of reprisal.

Suggestions to revise the NPT generated discomfort. Some fear that opening the treaty for revision would lead to stalemate and defeat. But many delegates from non-aligned states proposed radical revision, with ironclad security assurances, as the only path that would lead to indefinite extension. Some even rejected the treaty, arguing that if a Comprehensive Test Ban (CTB) were firmly in place, and a strong move toward a treaty on the abolition of nuclear weapons were begun, there would be no need for an NPT. There is general agreement that a CTB would have to precede the NPT; many smaller states are adamant about

(continued on page 6)
John Kenneth Galbraith and Ann Markusen in New York
by Alice Slater

Hosted by Domna and Frank Stanton in their beautiful New York City home, ECAAR supporters gathered for a dialogue with ECAAR Board members John Kenneth Galbraith and Ann Markusen. Galbraith urged the guests to consider whether “the whole vast structure of military activity is not an exception to the accepted flow of economic process” in which “the consumer, or the public at large through its expenditures will determine what is produced and in what amount.” He pointed out that the selection of weapons and the determination of force levels “is a decision which is taken not by the public at large. It is taken under classified protection by the military establishment itself, with very little engagement of ideas or attitudes from outside that structure. And when it comes to the matter of demand, there can be surely little doubt that it is the military establishment, through its power of the budget process and its power in the Congress, that determines the flow of income that will justify that selection.”

Galbraith noted that “although we are all committed to neo-classical economics, we see here an enormous exception where there is power unto itself, where there is selection as to the product and then, of all things, the provision of the income which buys that product.” He contended that this observation “has not penetrated the enormous expenditure every year for what is called ‘instruction in economics.’” In some textbooks it is addressed insufficiently and in many, not at all. He commended ECAAR for trying to bring “the economic attitudes abreast of this reality,” using the talents of the “most distinguished in the profession” to “bring into popular consciousness and . . . into teaching . . . this isolated, self-sufficient power of the military absorbing a very substantial part of our gross domestic product.”

Galbraith noted the peril of failing to curtail our military spending in the aftermath of the Cold War and using our resources more wisely. He thought our inability to extend financial aid to the nations of Eastern Europe because of bloat of military spending, might cause those countries “to see liberty as a disaster” if no aid is given to help them make the transition to democracy and modern mixed-economies. He concluded his remarks by noting the devastating effect of military spending on poor countries, where military spending has “exceeded health care and education by a huge margin” and there has been a “succession of conflict, disorder, slaughter, which we have helped finance.”

Markusen Calls for Conversion Program

Ann Markusen observed that “50% of that debt that we now owe today was accumulated in the 1980s for the defense buildup.” Noting the resistance to military cuts (so far military spending has only been cut by 10% and even with the Clinton budget cuts we will only cut 20% more over the next 5 years), she attributed it to the fear of employment losses. Pointing out that “there are two sides on which we have to fight the conversion issue,” Markusen noted that on the demand side, “the Cold War was the organizing principle for the American economy” and “accounted for a great deal of the innovation” in sectors such as aircraft, communications and electronics and arms, which are our “top American

The Global Register in Latin America
by Marí Teresa Lepeley

ECAAR’s Global Register of experts is working its way around the world. Getting the attention and collaboration of experts from different nations, continents and hemispheres is an endeavor that calls for an awareness of local conditions and a great deal of networking, listening and perseverance. Although most people agree that arms reduction is a need largely warranted by the positive effects of economic integration and globalization, the logic behind this objective differs among countries and regions. Consequently parameters that are valid for the United States and other industrial nations after the end of the Cold War are not necessarily imperatives for arms reductions in countries of the developing world.

In Latin America, where economic integration is gaining strength, democracies are becoming the rule rather than the exception, and some emerging and a few successful open market economies continue promising recoveries after the “Lost Decade of the 80’s.” Issues on military participation and expenditures have shifted from interests in national defense to concerns for national security.

Real and permanent solutions for national security and stability are rooted in increasing investments in education, human capital, job creation, and economic opportunity for the population at large. Investments in education are crucial today for Latin America as the region makes efforts to increase competitiveness and integration into regional and global markets.

The Register is working consistently to understand military issues in the region, to attract the interest of Latin American experts, and facilitate collaboration among them. It now counts the participation of experts from Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Mexico, Nicaragua and Peru. We have established new channels of communication in Spanish but we do need any new leads you may be able to provide to reach other experts in Latin America and other regions, particularly less developed ones. Your language skills would be appreciated to
China States Its Position on Nuclear Weapons at UN Conference

by Tappan Hoher and Alice Slater

ECAAR hosted a five-member delegation from the Chinese People’s Association for Peace and Disarmament (CPAPD) during April’s UN Disarmament Conference in New York. Over 500 NGO members gathered at the conference with experts from all over the world to discuss disarmament, peacebuilding and global security. The conference opened with talks by the Mayors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Takashi Hiraoka and Hitoshi Motoshima. Motoshima called for the elimination of “the satanic weapons created by mankind during the 20th century” and said that the survivors of the atomic devastation in his city and in Hiroshima are “resolved never to relent until the last nuclear weapon is dismantled.”

Mr. Zhu Dacheng, CPAPD Coordinator, joined a panel, What Transformations in the International System Are Prerequisites for the Complete Elimination of Nuclear Weapons? Zhu called on the international community to urge the U.S. and Russia to make further cuts in their nuclear arsenals which will still possess more nuclear weapons than all other countries combined, 3000 and 3500 respectively, even after the START treaty goes into effect. Until these further reductions are made the prospects for complete nuclear disarmament are not hopeful. In the interim, Zhu urged all nuclear weapons states to declare a “no first use” policy, and called for an international agreement declaring that there would be no use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapons states. He also called for support of the establishment of nuclear free zones, the withdrawal of nuclear weapons deployed abroad by any country, and a commitment not to extend weapons systems into space. Such a transition would enable nuclear disarmament to move forward. Zhu made no mention of China’s nuclear testing policy. China’s last test was conducted in September, 1992, just before the current U.S. moratorium went into effect and it is believed that China may be observing a de facto moratorium during this historic year of 1993, the first year in 48 years that no nation has tested a nuclear weapon.

Our Chinese guests visited the high spots in New York and went on to Washington, DC, where the American Friends Service Committee showed them the Pentagon and Capitol Hill and Admiral Gene LaRocque of the Center for Defense Information hosted them for lunch, and then to Lee, Massachusetts, as guests of Dorrie Weiss and Ben Baker, who took them to a nuclear power station, a Shaker village, and other sights, and finally to San Francisco before returning home. Special thanks to ECAAR Trustee Robert Schwartz and his wife, Dr. Jo Martin, who gave the delegation lodging and a lovely reception and dinner in their home, and to Marcelle and Ina Greenfield, Maurice and Jacqueline Papin, and Phyllis LaFarge who also provided housing for our guests.

Essay Contest

remaining defense resources for global collective security” and that “only the U.N. has the moral authority and internationally recognized legal charter to confront the new challenges to international stability.” David Burress calls for a representative democratic world government noting that, at present, “no ruler or citizen has a direct personal stake in the security of the entire world.” Burress points out that the UN will have “to replace the fundamental principle of 'one nation, one vote’ with the principle of 'one person, one vote’ and suggests some beginning steps towards that goal.

Beaaz Moselle proposes that economic interdependence of neighboring countries arising through trade will create strong constituencies for peace. Using the model of the European Community, he proposes that “rather than turn swords into plowshares, I aim to replace warriors by grocers.” He sets forth some measures to increase regional economic cooperation, reduce trade barriers, and enumerates the kinds of investments in physical and human capital to accomplish peaceful interdependence through trade. Erik Thompson, using the metaphor of constructing a house as his “Blueprint for the Year 2000,” posits that the foundation of the house is the political will for world peace which needs to be strengthened by the mass media “from which perceptions arise” and which “must display the good work that does occur.” In the interim, he proposes that we work on the roof, developing a “shield to protect our home from the reign of militarism.” Various measures are proposed such as limiting the arms trade, establishing nonmilitary zones, and collective security, but “until such time as this roof is completed . . . military leaks will continue to damage the rooms below.” Suggestions are made for work in the kitchen to address world hunger, the living room to create a “life-supporting natural and social environment,” the bedroom to deal with population growth, and methods of financing the “construction.”

Board member Walter Isard is trying to publish the essays either in book form or in a planned joint publication of ECAAR and the Peace
Testing, Waste, Secrecy
(continued from page 1)

citizen participation is also required to deal with the sorry state of the toxic wastes created during the Cold War. It is clear that the lack of an informed citizenry and excessive government secrecy supported the build-up of the poisonous legacy of the atomic age.

At a workshop presented by the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research for MPN members, I learned that there is no sound or sensible way to "clean-up" radio active waste. Indeed, "clean-up" is a misnomer. The best we can do at present is to contain the waste and store it where we can watch it and guard it until new technology is discovered. We have tens of thousands of years to find that technology, before the substances lose their toxicity. The government's present haste to bury the detritus of the nuclear age in New Mexico and Idaho where it can affect our underground water supply is unseemly. The MPN is calling for a Blue Ribbon Commission to study the problem before any action is taken. There is no need to "poison the well" and it is heartening to know that MPN members from all over the country are working for sensible nuclear waste management and that ECAAR members can be a resource for them in the process.

Testing Controversy at U.N.
(continued from page 2)

have always been for modernization and progress, not safety. However, the U.K. would defer to the U.S. on the question of testing since all U.K. tests are conducted on American soil in Nevada. France was more problematic, she said, but huge progress was made when France signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty. She predicted France would agree to the CTBT if America did. She emphasized that improved verification methods would not only instill greater confidence among the nuclear powers, they could produce important new information on earthquakes.

Ambassador Miguel Marin Bosch, from Mexico summed up the matter most succinctly when he stated that: "President Clinton has the chance to grasp the high moral ground. He can be the last president to test or the first to ban tests."

Clearly the whole world is waiting to see which way the President will swing on this issue. Right now, preparations are being made in Nevada to conduct a kiloton underground test in September. This would be followed by eleven more small-scale U.S. tests and three U.K. tests to be completed by 1995. The Department of Energy has requested $2.8 billion in their budget to this end.

At the time of this writing, the President has still not commented on this crucial matter, much less announced his decision. The stakes are high. He has a chance to lock in the current testing moratorium by banning all U.S. testing now or he can allow fifteen more tests and possibly provoke a new round of testing worldwide, which will inevitably lead to further nuclear proliferation.

Members of Congress have written to the President urging him to maintain the moratorium. Editorials in the New York Times, the Washington Post and other respected newspapers have commented adversely on the tests proposed by the D.O.E. ECAAR has joined anti-testing advocacy groups in publishing a newspaper ad ("Please Don't Blow It, Bill!") inviting readers to write to the President and their Senators.

Despite these well-meaning actions and words, many Americans are blissfully unaware that the United States is considering the resumption of tests.

Most unthinkingly believe that all nuclear testing stopped somewhere around the time the Berlin Wall came down. In April, several journalists were startled when told by members of ECAAR that the DOE had recommended more underground testing. To date, no mention of resumed testing has been made on network television.

Our main task today is to get the people to focus their attention on this crucial issue. But how? One way is to abandon the technical jargon in which all discussions of nuclear weaponry are couched. We desperately need new words and images to get the anti-testing message across. Somehow, we must convince ordinary citizens of the danger and world wide significance of further testing in simple, easy-to-understand language, accompanied by fresh visual symbols. Somehow we must make this issue as memorable and newsworthy as a $200 haircut. ECAAR member Barbara Honnell, a former journalist and a novelist, is the author of Balancing Act, a novel about nuclear disarmament.

Global Register
(continued from page 3)

communicate with Latin America or other regions in the developing world. To participate, please contact Dr. Jurgen Brauer, Project Director, Augusta College, 2500 Walton Way, Augusta, GA 30910. ECAAR Member Maria Teresa Lepeley is our Global Register Project Coordinator for Latin America.

Editor's Note: We now have 472 people registered from 45 countries and still need contacts, particularly in Africa and Asia as well as in Latin America.

New York \ Hold the Date

Fifth Annual East Hampton Forum

Saturday, August 7th 6:00 to 8:00 PM

guest speaker

DR. JEFFREY SACHS

ECAAR Board Member, Professor, Harvard University and an Economic Advisor to the Russian government

For further details, call the ECAAR office, 212-768-2080
manufacturing export industries.” Even now, 80% of all R&D spent by the aircraft industry comes from the Pentagon which “had a very powerful shaping force on the American economy” and this was “the industrial policy we have had.”

Markusen proposes that instead of our current approach of “funding a bunch of critical technologies,” a portion of the peace dividend from military cuts be devoted to “new missions in the economy like environment transportation, energy and housing; places where we can argue that there’s market failure and a public interest in developing those areas” which with “some amount of jump-starting on the part of government . . . in terms of R&D, regulation, and procurement” would lead to internationally successful industries. On the supply-side of the conversion problem, with over 9 million people now unemployed, and 2.5 million expected to exit the armed services and defense related industries over the next 5 to 7 years, Markusen contends that “this is not just an issue of trying to mitigate the political resistance to defense cuts, it’s also an issue of efficiency: how do we move people as fast as possible from defense-related production into civilian activities?” She added that “it’s also the morally right thing to do. The government has been the employer of first resort for these people for a very long period of time.” Noting the fragmented conversion-adjustment programs enacted by Congress, with bits of 26 programs scattered among numerous government departments, she called for a “one-stop shopping operation right in the White House” that would provide efficient government assistance in the transition.

Markusen concluded by agreeing with Galbraith that in her years in graduate school in economics during the Viet Nam War she “never read a word about the military-industrial complex except what I read in Ken Galbraith’s books and a few others” and that any writing on the subject “was not part of our training as economists.” She also agreed with Galbraith that “there has been an appalling escalation” in U.S. arms sales since the Gulf War with $61 billion in new arms export licenses issued by the Pentagon in 1991 alone. She called for the initiation of GATT type agreements immediately to start reducing arms sales and arms production in developing countries.

Editors Note: ECAAR is preparing a 30 minute videotape of the speakers remarks which will be shown on public access cable-TV in New York. Copies of the tape may be ordered from the ECAAR office at $25 to cover our costs.

French Colloquium (continued from page 2)

read by Professor Michael Ward whose own paper gave insights into military spending and development in less developed countries. Professor Jacques Aben, Pierre Pascaljon and Jacques Percebois spoke about arms production and exports in France. Professor Ruslan Kumakhov presented an analysis of the state of Russia’s economy and its arms industry and Professor Stanislav Menshikov detailed the conversion process.

Annemarie Rima and Robert Schwartz analyzed the role of economists in disarmament, conversion and peace with emphasis on Holland and the U.S. Manas Chatterji’s paper discussed the techniques of Peace Science, Peace Economics and Conflict Management applied to analysis of the economics of security. Ron Smith and Keith Hartley gave extensive information about the impact of defense cuts for the U.K. economy.


The meeting provided an effective forum for discussion between American, British, French and Russian economists on arms spending, conversion, national economy and security to an audience of students and faculty and to the general public via an interview broadcast on French television with a few of the speakers including Jacques Fontanel. A list of conference papers on file is available in the ECAAR office.

CONFERENCES, MEETINGS, ANNOUNCEMENTS

Affiliates

News from the ECAAR Dutch/Flemish Chapter (EVV)
by Annemarie Rima

Annual General Meeting
At the annual general meeting of the EVV lectures were presented by Gerrit De Vylder on International Trade and Economics Development, by Bruno van Rompuy on Disarmament and Sustainable Development and by Patrick Dupont on The Forecast of Regional Conflicts in Africa.

World Court Project
The EVV is supporting the World Court Project, a worldwide activity to obtain a judgment of the International Court of Justice on the legality of the use of nuclear weapons. A leaflet on the project has been sent to all members of the EVV with the request to sign the Martens clause, which was designed in 1907 to prevent States from attempting to justify barbaric new methods of slaughter not explicitly prohibited.

Jan Tinbergen Celebrated 90th Birthday
On the 12th of April Jan Tinbergen celebrated his 90th birthday. Despite his many years, Jan Tinbergen is still very active and productive on subjects relating to international security. On the occasion of his birthday, the Tinbergen Institute established a small but nice exhibition on the life and work of Jan Tinbergen.

ECAAR Canada Now Established
by Kanta Maruwah

The Canadian affiliate of ECAAR was founded on June 5, 1993 in Ottawa at a special session of the Canadian Economic Association’s annual meetings held at Carleton University. ECAAR’s Co-Chair, Dr. Lawrence R. Klein, and ECAAR Board member, Dr. Manas Chatterji were present on this occasion.

The theme of this special session was Economics of Peacekeeping. The session was well attended, by about forty people. Dr. Klein gave the keynote address. Arms Trade: The Next Step in Arms Reduction. Two other papers presented in the session were: Military...
Keynesianism and the Problem of Peacekeeping by Professor S. Muthuchidambaram from the University of Regina, and The Trade in Arms by Professor Edward S. Shaffer from the University of Alberta. Professor Norman Cameron from the University of Manitoba and Richard Sanders of Coalition Against the Arms Trade provided valuable discussion. The session was enthusiastically received.

Professors Kanta Marwah and Thomas K. Rymes from Carleton University have agreed to function as the Co-conveners of the Canadian affiliate. They have called for volunteers to help form the Board of Advisors. The Canadian affiliate would try to hold an ECAAR session at the annual meetings of the Canadian Economic Association and will begin planning a full conference to be held within the next few years.

ECAAR, New York will continue to handle the membership list of the Canadian Chapter. For further information, please contact either of the Co-conveners at the Economics Department, Carleton University, 1125 Colonel By Drive, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1S 5B6, (603) 788-2600, ext. (Marwah) 3757, (Rymes) 3771

ECAAR-Japan
by Akira Hattori
Takeo Fukuda, the former Prime Minister of Japan (1976-78), and now the Supreme Advisor of the ruling Liberal Democratic Party, is serving as a special advisor to ECAAR-Japan. In 1977, Mr. Fukuda defined Japan's diplomacy in the "Fukuda Doctrine" which clarified that Japan will never become a military power and will contribute to the peace and prosperity of Southeast Asia through active and positive efforts aimed at reconciliation of existing differences, not only through economic cooperation, but on the basis of genuinely equal partnership based on "heart-to-heart exchanges." Mr. Fukuda, the first Japanese Prime Minister to manage Japan's economic policies with an international perspective, doubled Japan's foreign assistance during his term of office. Today Japan is the largest donor of foreign aid. In 1983, Mr. Fukuda organized the InterAction Council of former heads of states together with Helmut Schmidt, former Federal Chancellor of West Germany. The Council focuses on issues of peace and disarmament, revitalization of the world economy, and development of the third world.

Washington, DC

Workplace Economic Conversion Action Network Conference, July 13-14, 1993

ECAAR is co-sponsoring this "cutting-edge" conference to tackle conversion as part of the WECAN network with a large group of organizations including religious, environmental, labor, government, and other non-profit groups. Participants include Senator Ted Kennedy, Congressman John Lewis, ECAAR Board member John Tepper Marlin, and ECAAR member Mary Ann McGovern of the St. Louis Defense Conversion Project. To participate, call Alice Slater, 212-768-2080.

Beijing International Conference, October 11-14, 1993

An international conference, Regional Science in the Developing Countries will be held on October 11-14, 1993 at Peking University, Beijing, China on the subject of urban and regional change. To participate, contact ECAAR Board member, Professor Manas Chatterji, School of Management, Binghamton University, POB 6000, Binghamton, NY 13902-6000; Tel: 607-777-2475; Fax: 607-777-4422.

ECAAR panels at AEA Meeting, Boston, January 3-5, 1994


New Members Join ECAAR Board

ECAAR is pleased to welcome new Board members William Baumol, Robert McNamara, Amartya Sen, Leonard Silk, Alan Sinai, Dorrie Weiss, and the Chairs of our International Affiliates, Jacques Fontanel (France), Akira Hattori (Japan), Annemarie Rina (The Netherlands), Adel Suarez (Chile), and David Throsby (Australia). We send our best wishes and many thanks for their service to Isabel Sawhill and Lawrence Summers who resigned from the ECAAR Board to serve in President Clinton's new administration, Dr. Sawhill at OMB and Dr. Summers at the Treasury Department.

Journal of Peace Research

ECAAR member Nils Petter Gleditsch who edits the quarterly Journal of Peace Research, would like to call fellow members' attention to this journal as a forum for discussion of the economics of defense and disarmament in a broader context of conflict and peace studies. In the past few years virtually every issue of JPR has contained one or more articles on the economics of war and peace, making the journal an important vehicle for cross-disciplinary discussion between economists and other social scientists. Submissions to JPR are invited from readers of this newsletter. Articles are refereed by an international panel of peer reviewers and extensive feedback provided to the authors. Editorial address: Journal of Peace Research, Fuglehauggata 11, 0260 Oslo, Norway. FAX #47 22 558422.

ECAAR members and supporters are invited to subscribe to the Journal of Peace Research at a special introductory rate of $36 for one year (usually $46) or $72 for two years (usually $92). Checks should be made payable to Sage Publications, P.O. Box 5096, Newbury Park, CA 91359.

ECAAR mourns the death of Kenneth Boulding, a visionary economist and philosopher, honored at our founders meeting in 1989, who was the first to speak of the "economics of peace" and published a book of that title in 1945. A Kenneth Boulding Peace Research Fund has been established at the University of Colorado in Boulder.
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