



NATIONAL STRATEGY FORUM REVIEW

ASIA IN THE SHADOW OF A RISING POWER

THE US—PRC—TAIWAN TRIANGLE

John Allen Williams

A PACKAGE DEAL: CONTENDING WITH CHINA'S RE-INTEGRATION INTO THE GLOBAL ECONOMY

David Welker

CHINA AND THE FUTURE OF THE KOREAN PENINSULA

Bradley O. Babson

NORTH KOREA: WHAT ARE THE ISSUES AND US OPTIONS?

BOOK REVIEW: *20:21 Vision*

by Bill Emmott

STRATEGY WATCH

RESEARCH REPORTS: *The Transformation of National Security ~ International Law and the Preemptive Use of Force ~ Geriatric Teenagers ~ Post-Saddam Iraq: The Shiite Factor ~ The US and Israel: The Road Ahead ~ Why the Security Council Failed*

RECENT SPEAKERS: *Ambassador Richard Williamson ~ Ambassador Thomas Pickering*

The *National Strategy Forum Review*
is a quarterly publication of

NATIONAL STRATEGY FORUM

Richard E. Friedman
Chair/President

Board of Directors

Lester Crown

Richard A. Behrenhausen

James R. Donnelley

Michael P. Galvin

James N. Pritzker

William Wolf

Morris I. Leibman
(1911-1992)
Founding Chair



The National Strategy Forum is a not-for-profit, non-partisan organization committed to the following principles:

- The goal of United States national strategy is a genuine and just peace, sought in common cause with the community of free and independent nations.
- The advancement and preservation of democracy is essential to promote human rights, inspire principled cultural achievement, and maximize economic development.
- Informed public opinion and an enduring non-partisan consensus are fundamental parts of national security in a democratic society.

• • •

The National Strategy Forum has no membership fee, but it depends upon the support of its members. The Forum is a publicly supported charitable institution under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. As a non-profit organization, the Forum is funded solely by contributions from individuals, foundations, and corporations. All contributions to the Forum are tax deductible.

• • •

The opinions expressed in the National Strategy Forum Review do not necessarily reflect those of the National Strategy Forum or its members.

• • •

© 2003 National Strategy Forum, Inc.

National Strategy Forum
53 W. Jackson, Suite 516, Chicago, IL 60604

National Strategy Forum Review

Publisher
Richard E. Friedman

Editor
Lauren Bean

Editorial Board
Marilyn Diamond
Rachel E. Golden
John Allen Williams
Endy Zemenides

NATIONAL STRATEGY FORUM REVIEW

Volume 12, Issue 4

Summer 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Letter from the Publisher	4
The US–PRC–Taiwan Triangle <i>John Allen Williams</i>	5
China and the Future of the Korean Peninsula <i>Bradley O. Babson</i>	9
A Package Deal: Contending with China’s Re-integration into the Global Economy <i>David Welker</i>	14
North Korea: What are the Issues and US Options?	19
Book Review: 20:21 Vision by Bill Emmott Reviewed by <i>Lauren Bean</i>	25
Recent Speakers	27
Strategy Watch	30
Research Reports	36

NATIONAL STRATEGY FORUM REVIEW

LETTER FROM THE PUBLISHER

The theme of this issue of the *National Strategy Forum Review* is “Asia in the Shadow of a Rising Power.” The focus is on East Asia. However, we expanded the strategic geographic boundaries of Asia to include: on the west, Iran; on the east, Japan; on the north, the Arctic Ocean; and on the south, the Indian Ocean. About one-half of the world population lives in Asia. Iran and India loom large in future US strategic calculations.

Iran, a hybrid Islamic theocracy/democracy, is identified by the United States as having a nuclear weapons development program and providing a safe harbor for international terrorism. It also has a young generation with western aspirations who chafe at restrictions imposed by conservative religious leaders. The issue is whether this pivotal state can contribute to world stability and how can this be achieved.

India is well positioned to become a major Asian regional power and may become a world power, as well. It may now have more people than China. It is the world’s most populous democracy and has the world’s second largest Islamic population. A strong India-US relationship is developing.

Three articles in this issue focus on major problems affecting Asia:

- Economic development: What does increasing integration of world trade and financial markets mean for Asia? What are the effects of the PRC as an economic magnet in the region? Is globalization a positive or negative factor for Asia?

- The Korean Peninsula: North Korea’s nuclear weapons development program threatens stability in the region. How will the US react to North Korea, and will there be a multilateral coalition formed to deal with North Korea? Could the Korean problem strengthen the US-China relationship?
- The PRC-Taiwan-US triangle: Can a PRC-Taiwan conflict be avoided? Is there a role for the US? Does continuing tension between China and Taiwan threaten the evolving China-US relationship?

Another article looks behind the scenes at the formulation of US foreign policy and how to identify subjective judgments that frequently guide and justify strategic decisions. The test case is North Korea. We have adapted an ingenious software program developed by scholars at the University of Chicago Graduate School of Business to identify a wide range of issues affecting the Korean Peninsula to see how disciplined probability equations may apply to these issues.

A critical strategic decision for the US is whether it will seek to become part of a condominium of Asian states, including the PRC, Japan, and India. China’s strategic objectives are unknown: Will it seek hegemony or shared power in the region? The reciprocal consideration is whether the US strategic objective is dominance or shared power in the region. Answers to these questions will define future US-China relations and future stability for Asia.

THE US-PRC-TAIWAN TRIANGLE

John Allen Williams

The Chinese pictogram for "crisis" is a combination of "challenge" and "opportunity." That is certainly true of the crisis-laden relationships among the United States, the People's Republic of China, and the Republic of China on Taiwan. This brief essay can only touch upon the complex interactions among these international actors, but it hopes to outline some of their more important aspects.

To begin with the conclusions, the trilateral relationship between the US, the PRC, and Taiwan need not degenerate into armed conflict, although the possibility of this happening is the greatest conventional military threat faced by the US. The US needs to consider carefully the respective places of the PRC and Taiwan in its long term economic and security interests. Based on this assessment, the US needs to consider in advance what it would do to support Taiwan if the PRC decided to use force to resolve the issue of Taiwanese independence once and for all. Similarly, the possibility of catastrophic political or economic collapse of the PRC, while remote, is not outside the realm of possibility. It is important to think now about the issues that

would become important if that happened. Finally, everyone needs to consider the effect of public health issues in the region on the rest of the world.

The underlying political problem is the unresolved status of Taiwan. It is an almost intractable issue, with the PRC regarding Taiwan as a renegade province, Taiwan enjoying its *de facto* (but not *de jure*) independence but uncertain as to its best political future, and the United States hoping to keep the issue dormant to preserve stability in the region.

The United States' Perspective

The main concern of the United States is regional stability. With the significant exception of recent North Korean actions, the US is generally happy with the *status quo* in the Far East: a prosperous and increasingly democratic Taiwan, a China that is engaged with the world politically and economically, and a US viewed by most in the region as a benign and even welcome hegemon. Certainly there are storm clouds on the horizon, in particular the looming confrontation

Dr. John Allen Williams is a Professor of Political Science at Loyola University Chicago and chairs the Academic Advisory Committee of the National Strategy Forum. A frequent media commentator, he is a retired Captain in the U.S. Naval Reserve with extensive experience in the Pentagon as a strategic planner. He is Executive Director and President Elect of the Inter-University Seminar on Armed Forces and Society.

THE US-PRC-TAIWAN TRIANGLE

with North Korea on the issue of their nuclear program and technology exports. Overall, however, the US can be pleased with the direction the region has taken.

The US has long viewed itself as a protector of China, and many felt betrayed by the successful Communist revolution there and – worse still – Chinese involvement the following year in the war in Korea. Much of that paternal interest was transferred to the Kuomintang regime of Chiang Kai-shek when his nationalist government fled to Taiwan in 1949. Despite the rapprochement with China since President Nixon's 1972 visit, there remains considerable public and governmental support for Taiwan. This is particularly true of the US Congress, which has passed a number of resolutions of support for Taiwan in its resistance to forcible integration with China.

The official US position is that it does not care about the eventual resolution of the Taiwan issue, so long as it is accomplished peacefully and with the consent of the Taiwanese people. This is somewhat disingenuous, since the US would clearly not like to see an early integration of the Taiwanese economy with a China still under the authoritarian control of the Communist Party and seeking to increase its strategic power. Still, the US would have no choice but to accept a peaceful integration, and this is the best long term (perhaps very long term) outcome.

Of greater concern is what the US should do in the event of increasing pressure by the PRC to get the Taiwanese to agree to accelerate the pace of integration on PRC terms. Many forms of PRC military pressure have already been seen,

including missile tests near Taiwan intended to influence the Taiwanese presidential election (which it did, but in the opposite direction from that intended by the PRC), amphibious landing exercises, and a significant deployment of surface to surface missiles across the strait from Taiwan. US Congressional support for Taiwan has led some in Taiwan to believe (falsely) that US assistance can be assumed, even in the face of a Taiwanese declaration of independence from China. The position of the US executive branch is one of studied ambiguity, but the current administration has been more supportive of Taiwan than others in recent memory.

The US has not sold the Taiwanese all the sophisticated armaments they want, but bases its sales on the threat from across the strait. The PRC regards all such sales as illegitimate interference in the internal affairs of China. PRC cross straits military pressure is the rationale for the US sale of weapons to Taiwan.

The Mainland Chinese Perspective

After the fiasco getting the US Navy EP-3, electronic surveillance airplane back from China (in pieces) in 2001, US observers may view the Chinese perspective as arrogant and perhaps recklessly overconfident. In fact, actions that may appear as arrogant and reckless to an outside observer are often grounded on a combination of deep-seated and persistent PRC insecurities and genuine national security considerations. Americans tend to forget the years of Western domination of China in the 1800s, with spheres of influ-

ence, preferential trading relationships, and even extraterritoriality in large parts of coastal China. The Chinese have not forgotten, and for them national sovereignty is paramount. They do not wish to be subservient to another power, and are hypersensitive to any slight, real or imagined.

Taiwan is a central concern to the leaders of the PRC, and they are capable of viewing the most remote events as somehow related to the possible independence of Taiwan. Central to this is the desire to limit the international influence of the Taiwanese government as much as possible. In particular, Taiwan must be excluded from membership in any international organization that assumes government to government relations. This applies also to the Taiwanese bid for observer status in the World Health Organization. The current SARS crisis in Taiwan may have been exacerbated by the lack of official connection with the WHO, and the PRC's reluctance and delay in permitting official WHO visitors to Taiwan. Given the origins of SARS in a remote Chinese province and the Chinese cover-up of the existence and extent of the disease in its early stages, this was particularly galling to the Taiwanese.

Now that the status of Hong Kong and Macao is settled, the PRC wants to move ahead as quickly as possible toward the eventual reunification of Taiwan with the mainland. The "one China" policy is sufficiently vague to permit various interpretations, but the devil is in the details. (Recall that Chiang Kai-shek and Mao Zedong each had a "one China" policy, with the difference being who represented its legitimate

government.) One suggestion, made by NSF President Richard Friedman and the author in the *Washington Times*, was for a loosely defined confederation that delayed the difficult decisions and permitted at least the appearance of a political movement. This proposal is not on the table at this time. Any action that forces this issue prematurely, such as PRC provocations or a unilateral declaration of independence by Taiwan, is a grave threat to regional stability that could well involve the United States.

In the long run, the PRC wishes to become the hegemon of the region, and may have ambitions beyond that. This means that the influence of the US, Japan, and perhaps South Korea must be counterbalanced by an increase in Chinese economic and military power. Whatever the international developments may be, one may be certain that the elites governing mainland China will attempt to preserve their status at all costs.

The Taiwanese Perspective

The Taiwanese are in no hurry to move closer to the mainland politically, and would like to preserve the *status quo* as long as possible – at least until the PRC evolves politically and economically. There are differences among Taiwanese leaders on the desirability of closer economic ties, however. From a recent visit to Taiwan, it appears that leaders of the Kuomintang Party (KMT) are more supportive of close economic ties than are the leaders of the currently ruling Democratic Progressive Party (DPP), whose charter explicitly calls for an independent Tai-

THE US-PRC-TAIWAN TRIANGLE

wan. One problem presented by closer ties is that Taiwanese business elites tied to cross-strait economic arrangements become a pressure group for friendlier relations with the mainland than may be desired by political elites. Despite the misgivings of some, economic relations are growing and the amount of Taiwanese investment in China is a significant part of the Chinese economy, particularly in the high technology sector.

The Taiwanese are generally circumspect in their dealings with the PRC and in other dealings that relate to the PRC-Taiwanese relationship. Most leaders, even in the ruling DPP, understand that US and international support cannot be guaranteed if they provoke the PRC unnecessarily. In that connection it is interesting to note current calls by the Taiwanese government for international condemnation of the PRC for covering up the SARS epidemic and demanding a PRC apology for this. It seems a safe enough issue to make the point that the PRC was negligent in its international obligations, and it puts the PRC's subsequent reluctance to let official WHO representatives visit Taiwan in a particularly bad light. Health issues transcend national boundaries, and their resolution was clearly impeded by PRC policies with respect to Taiwan.

Problems and Complications

Predictions about the future tend to be linear extrapolations of current trends. One cannot anticipate radical discontinuities and so they often do not figure into planning. But there are several

possibilities that would greatly alter the terms of the triangular relationship were they to occur:

- PRC impatience with the pace of change, leading to military provocation.
- Taiwanese misunderstanding of the limits of US support, leading to a unilateral declaration of Taiwanese sovereignty.
- Some action on the part of Japan, such as the development of Japanese nuclear weapons in response to the challenge from North Korea.
- Expansion of the SARS epidemic or some other pandemic.

Economic and/or political collapse of the PRC, perhaps in response to the significant centrifugal forces already existing in the society and the additional stresses of a health crisis. Ironically enough, westernized Taiwanese political elites would be ideal candidates to strengthen a unified Chinese government, something current leaders on the mainland may realize all too well.

Whatever the future may hold for the relationship between the United States, the PRC, and Taiwan, it would behoove US strategists to consider the range of possibilities so they are not caught unawares by developments.

CHINA AND THE FUTURE OF THE KOREAN PENINSULA

Bradley O. Babson

The critical role that China played in bringing the U.S. and the Democratic Peoples Republic of Korea (DPRK) together for initial talks in Beijing in April 2003 is a harbinger of the future. This revealed the reality that China must play a proactive and not acquiescent role in creating an environment of cooperation towards finding solutions to the complex set of issues involved. China cannot avoid this role, and the U.S. cannot avoid adopting a strategic partnership with China in managing the global and regional dimensions of change on the Korean peninsula. This article will examine China's relations with the two Koreas, explore the underlying forces driving China and the U.S. towards this strategic partnership, and assess implications for future U.S. policy in Northeast Asia.

China and the Two Koreas

Chinese policy towards the two Koreas underwent a fundamental change in the early 1990's, reflecting a shift in the underlying structure of relationships that had remained stable since the

end of the Korean war. The sequence of events leading up to this shift is important:

- September 1990 -- the Soviet Union and the Republic of Korea (ROK) established diplomatic relations.
- September 1991 -- DPRK became a member of the United Nations in its own right, representing a de facto recognition by the international community of the two separate Korean states.
- December 1991 -- The Agreement on Reconciliation, Non-Aggression, Exchanges and Cooperation (Basic Agreement) was signed by the two Koreas.
- February 1992 -- The Joint Declaration of De-nuclearization of the Korean Peninsula was signed by the two Koreas.
- August 1992 -- China and ROK normalized relations.
- December 1992 -- The Soviet Union disintegrated.

The formal recognition of ROK, coupled with a period of warming relations between the two Koreas and UN acceptance of the two state

Bradley O. Babson is a consultant on Asian affairs with a specialization on economic engagement with DPRK and Northeast Asia economic cooperation, as well as Southeast Asia. He worked for the World Bank for 26 years before retiring in 2000, serving as a Senior Loan Officer on Indonesia from 1983-87, Division Chief for Education and Health for eight Asian countries from 1997-92, and the first Resident Representative to Hanoi, Vietnam from 1994-97. From 1997-2000 he served as Senior Advisor in the office of the Regional Vice President for East Asia.

CHINA AND THE FUTURE OF THE KOREAN PENINSULA

framework, anchored China's shift to active relations with both Koreas. The collapse of the Soviet Union created major complications for this new set of relations, as DPRK lost both political and economic support from the Soviet Union and was forced to rely increasingly on China as its benefactor, just when China was pulling back from its traditional role through warming ties with ROK and hardening of terms of economic assistance to DPRK. The nuclear and food crises that followed in the mid-1990's tested China's new policy of even handedness. The U.S. took center stage through the negotiations that led to the Agreed Framework, and inter-Korean reconciliation was put on the backburner. This led to a situation where China's role came to be dominated by efforts to maintain stability through expanded economic support to the failing DPRK system and encouragement of ROK to continue to pursue a policy of engagement with DPRK. Relations with the U.S. on DPRK remained awkward for both countries, but bound by a shared desire to seek a peaceful outcome that was reflected in cooperation for the Four Party peace talks that took place in a fitful way in the late 1990's.

In recent years China's relations with ROK have deepened considerably. China is now ROK's largest trading partner and the trend is for accelerating trade and investment ties following

China's accession to the World Trade Organization (WTO). Beijing has also worked closely with ROK both openly and quietly to manage expanding bilateral relations and sensitive aspects of relations with DPRK, including the ongoing need for food aid and increasing flow of refugees.

The expansion of Chinese-ROK ties also are having an affect on public opinion in ROK, with attitudes towards China becoming increasingly favorable at the same time that attitudes towards the U.S. are becoming more negative. There are many factors affecting shifts in public perceptions, but among them is the realization that ROK has a growing stake in its future relations with China and that it is in the Korean interest to balance this perception with future relations with the U.S.

Chinese relations with DPRK have been strained in recent years, but have retained the essential characteristics of DPRK dependence on Chinese political and economic aid to maintain the viability of the DPRK regime, which has been faced with great external and internal pressures for change. DPRK's decision to establish an industrial enterprise zone in Shiniju in 2002 and appoint a Chinese businessman with questionable credentials as the administrator, and the Chinese response of placing him under house arrest for tax evasion, illustrates the lack of close

coordination of DPRK and Chinese policy.

China's active courting of ROK and continued willingness to buttress the DPRK regime, despite embarrassing North Korean behaviors, are consistent with its larger national security objectives. In order to counter post Cold War dominance by the U.S., China adopted in the late 1990s a "new concept of security" in which it embraced regional security dialogue and cooperation. It has pursued this policy actively with the Asia Regional Forum sponsored by ASEAN, and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, which it helped create with Central Asian countries. In Northeast Asia, this tactic has been reflected in the pursuit of the two Korea policy.

Looking ahead, China can be expected to retain an honest broker relationship with the two Koreas, respecting the legitimate interests of each and seeking peaceful means to advance inter-Korean reconciliation, regional stability and increased economic ties. The recent change in Chinese leadership is also likely to lead to a hardening of Chinese intolerance for DPRK misbehaviors, even if there is no shift from the fundamental policy of not permitting the regime to collapse. The fact that China recently felt compelled to cut off temporarily oil pipeline flow to DPRK to constrain potential actions that would escalate tensions with the U.S. in the wake of the Iraq war, can be interpreted as a recognition and signal that the new leadership is prepared to act to reinforce its views on DPRK behavior.

Driving Forces Towards a Strategic Partnership with the U.S. on Korean Issues

The nuclear crisis that was triggered by DPRK's admission of a clandestine uranium enrichment program in October 2002 spelled the effective end to the Agreed Framework, which had excluded China as a partner in containing DPRK's nuclear program. U.S. recognition that a multilateral rather than bilateral dialogue process would be needed to forge a viable replacement for the Agreed Framework, was a tacit acceptance that China's influence on the Korean peninsula should be harnessed to achieve shared goals through active collaboration on the security agenda. This new working relationship has fundamentally altered the dynamics for managing the crisis and can be expected to be a major factor in future handling of Korean issues.

The need to contain the nuclear crisis is the primary reason that China has taken a more proactive role in international efforts to resolve Korean issues. China's interests are both short-term and long-term and its behavior is guided by both. In the short-term, China wants to maintain stability and avoid military confrontation over the nuclear issue while aiming for a negotiated solution. It also wants to minimize overflow problems of the breakdown in DPRK and create an environment supportive of a managed change process. Longer term, China would like to see a

CHINA AND THE FUTURE OF THE KOREAN PENINSULA

nuclear free Korean peninsula, a reduced military presence by the U.S., maintenance of a two state framework of peaceful coexistence between the two Koreas with a gradual process of reintegration, and a reform process for DPRK that reduces direct dependence on China while DPRK becomes increasingly integrated in regional economic and security relationships that are consistent with maintaining stability and expanded cooperation among the countries of the region.

The U.S. has accepted global responsibility for leadership in combating terrorism and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The success of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq have convinced the world that the U.S. will not shirk these responsibilities, and the main question for the future is how this leadership will be exercised. These developments have not fundamentally altered the equation of interests and objectives of containing DPRK's nuclear program, but they have altered perceptions of U.S. priorities and methods of achieving these objectives. This has consequences for the way the U.S. manages its relations with both Koreas and creates a new rationale for a continuing active policy towards the two Koreas that supercedes the old and now defunct Cold War rationale. For its part, China recognizes that it must accept U.S. leadership on the post Cold War global agenda, while at the same time it seeks to constrain potential expansion

of U.S. hegemony and methods that are incompatible with China's own interests. In dealing with DPRK, this requires that China actively collaborate with the U.S.

Longer term forces are active as well. A transformation process for DPRK aimed to integrate DPRK into the international community will require that new forms of regional security and regional economic cooperation be devised to reinforce the dynamics of managed change on the Korean peninsula. The architecture of conventional security structures based on Cold War alliance frameworks will need to give way to a new order in Northeast Asia. This will have to be buttressed by improved institutional mechanisms for regional economic cooperation. Anchoring the solution to the DPRK issues in these new regional cooperation mechanisms would both be consistent with China's "new concept of security" and with the U.S. view that a multilateral framework will be needed to ensure that DPRK does not shirk its transformation process and revert to old ways. The new administration of President Roh in ROK has already embraced the idea of regionalism as the future path for Korean security and prosperity. If this vision is to become reality, Chinese willingness to provide more proactive regional leadership will be essential. Support and encouragement from the U.S. will also be required, both in aligning future Asian security policy and deployment of the

U.S. military in Northeast Asia with these new frameworks, and in active participation in the economic agenda.

Implications for Future U.S. Policy in Asia

One implication for the U.S. of expanding cooperation with China on Korean issues is that the informal alliance structure with ROK and Japan will need to be realigned to embrace this reality. The Trilateral Coordination Group (TCOG) that was established during the Clinton Administration to coordinate policy towards DPRK between the U.S., has been an important mechanism to smooth differences in perception and approach to engagement with DPRK, even though the driving interests of the three countries do not completely coincide. Finding a way to broaden the consultation framework to include China, rather than relying solely on bilateral meetings with China by the three alliance countries would seem to be a desirable direction for the future.

If a nuclear agreement can be successfully negotiated with DPRK, then verification of compliance will be an important and long term requirement. Chinese participation in a future verification arrangement would be one way to help ensure DPTK compliance and reduce the risk of nuclear materials being shipped over the DPRK-Chinese border for potential sale to other

parties.

Another issue is the future of the Korea Peninsula Energy Development Organization (KEDO). Neither China nor Russia are members of KEDO. If KEDO will be given any new role in the future as a result of a negotiated solution to the DPRK nuclear crisis, it would be desirable to include both countries in a multilateral effort to deal with DPRK's energy needs, using this mechanism to forge a link to regional economic cooperation in energy.

More broadly, U.S. policy towards Northeast Asia in the future should be guided by a desire to promote long term stability in the region, based on increased transparency and expanded interdependence in security and economic relations. American economic interests should be pursued with an eye to expanded trade and investment opportunities driven by regional and not just globalization dynamics. Building an environment in which China's rise to power and exercise of leadership can be congruent with U.S. security and economic interests is the major policy challenge facing the U.S. in Asia. Putting a process of transformative change on the Korean peninsula into this framework would anchor U.S. Korea policy in the larger agenda to promote peace and prosperity in this critically important region.

A PACKAGE DEAL: CONTENDING WITH CHINA'S RE-INTEGRATION INTO THE GLOBAL ECONOMY

David Welker

China's domestic situation has historically been the only limiting factor as to how much influence China could exert in its neighborhood. When the internal forces contributed to civil war and disarray in China, the people at China's periphery were left alone to practice some form of 'self-government' without paying homage to the distant Chinese capital. When China's imperial rulers maintained solid central control, the neighboring peoples could expect emissaries, raiding parties and expectations of some form of subservience to the Chinese Son of Heaven. The post-colonial independent states in Asia are only facing the most recent instance of China's latest 'emergence' from itself. How to contend with China's integration to the regional and global economy is a question that China's neighbors have had to ask themselves for centuries. They've been here before.

The difference is that now the inter-relations between nation-states are at least nominally the realm of international law, governing regulation of maritime navigation, international commerce, exchange of alleged criminals or even in the conduct of warfare. Marking China's 'emergence'

on the international scene, there are more limitations on how China may act, as there are more channels for smaller Asian nations to counter China's actions either multilaterally or through international law. After emerging from its post-revolution self-isolation of the Mao years, even China's autocratic but "pragmatic" leadership recognized that there were rules to the game and have to one degree or another curbed the age-old impulse to dictate to its neighbors. The development of the rule of international law in the second half of the 20th century placed the large and powerful nations under some restraints.

David Zwing, in his book "Internationalizing China: Domestic Interests and Global Linkages", defines the re-integration or 'internationalization' of China in the last 25 years in his recent book in this way: "the expanded flows of goods, services and people across state boundaries, thereby increasing the share of transnational exchanges relative to domestic ones, along with a decline in the level of regulation affecting those flows many sections of China's society and economy have become increasingly more internationalized."

Other Asian leaders (there are exceptions,

David Welker is Special Projects Director at the Food & Allied Service Trades Department of the AFL-CIO. He previously was an Economic Policy Analyst at the Congressional U.S.-China Security Review Commission.

such as the Burmese junta or North Korea under both Kims) accepted the need to hitch their fortunes to the global institutions and practices that fed internationalization. And the Asian leaders, to one degree or another, implemented domestic policies that accommodated the flows in goods, services, capital and people. Japan and the four Asian Tigers – the Republic of China on Taiwan, South Korea, Singapore and the British colony Hong Kong – rode this wave to rapid industrialization and development. China was very late to this internationalization trend, making its tentative steps to reopen to the world only in 1979. China was always going to be bigger than its neighbors, but it was starting from a very low level of integration that would attract the global players in the 1980s.

Following the negative international reaction to the Tiananmen Massacre in 1989, the other Asian nations were able to make gains in the international market for trade and capital at the expense of the politically out of favor Chinese. Indonesia, Thailand, Malaysia, the Philippines and, to a lesser degree, India saw investment levels rise, trade flows increase, economic growth quicken and living standards rise steadily during the period of ‘globalization’ of the late 1980s to mid 1990s. China’s massive market always loomed large in the international players’ minds, but the infrastructure – the ‘hardware’ of airports, highways, seaports, electricity grids and waterways – and the economic regime – the ‘software’ of macro-economic policies, reliable contract regulation and an investor-friendly bureaucracy – often lagged in China.

By the mid-1990s, some observers of the regional economy felt China lagged behind its neighbors due to its ‘half-hearted’ embrace of globalization: China still maintained a huge state-owned industrial sector and banking system, it controlled its foreign exchange flows and flows of ‘hot capital’ into its nascent, flawed equity markets, and it refused to let its currency be traded on the open market. Ethnic Chinese from Hong Kong, Taiwan and elsewhere in Asia were the early adopters of China as the preferred investment destination, but overall the investment flows into Asia were balanced until the mid-1990s. Then the Asian contagion of 1997-1998 hit, where a series of competitive devaluations, a sudden evaporation of hot capital investment into Asian markets, a rolling wave of bank failures, an overall interruption in trade and capital flows, and the implosion of budgets in capital after capital shocked the entire region.

Oddly, China was not infected – at least that was the analysis at the time. Now there are considerable academic disputes ongoing as to whether China’s actually achieved its officially announced growth rates for the years 1998 to 2000 – and mostly because of what previously were policies criticized by the investing community. Its policies in implementing incremental reforms now were seen as the factors of China’s ‘stability’ in the days following the Asian crisis. The economic crisis created widespread political change in Indonesia and the Philippines or caused reforms of otherwise sclerotic economic policies in Thailand and South Korea. Yet these countries fell out of favor due to the ensuing

'instability' after the crisis. The one-party system in China provided 'stability' and the concept of the Chinese process of economic reforms as a 'model' emerged.

The overall improved attitude towards China's model in the investing community occurred at a time when the improvements in China's infrastructure reached a 'critical mass' to facilitate large investments in the export-processing sector in China. As many large multinational companies invested in ever-larger projects in China (following scores of smaller manufacturers from Hong Kong, Taiwan, South Korea and Singapore, who moved production to China over the decade to take advantage of lower wages), the other Asian nations contemplated how to adjust their practices to compete against the Chinese model.

One would have assumed that the questions of poor corporate governance and government oversight that were at least in part fingered for the Asian crisis would have resulted in one possible means for Asian countries to differentiate themselves from China. But in the last few years, the government's policies and individual firms' practices have been two steps forward and one step back. In South Korea, for example, the government has tolerated the purchase of control in banks or large industrial conglomerates by foreign interests. It's also pushed insolvent companies into bankruptcy to advance settlements to foreign creditors, while at the same time tolerating the creditors of Hynix Semiconductor to keep that company on life-support. Similarly,

Credit Lyonnais Securities Asia (CLSA) and the Asian Corporate Governance Association (ACGA) released a report on 380 publicly traded companies, which gave an average score of 62 out of 100 using such benchmarks as discipline, transparency, independence and accountability. The governments and corporations in Asia could use the poor level of governance in China today as a measuring standard to raise their own practices. Having made limited progress so far, they still must improve their supervisory bodies to convince investors that there have been real changes to set them apart from their Chinese competition.

Another possible way for Asian countries to improve their investment climates for international investors is to lower the bureaucratic hurdles for foreign companies. In comparing their regulatory regimes to those of China, some nations have determined that they can lessen demands in such areas as environmental controls or trade union rules to bring them closer to China's standards.

The Indian government began a policy in 2000 to establish special economic zones, meant to copy China's success in attracting foreign investment in export processing sectors; the plan attempts to create "areas with new infrastructure and relaxed labor, customs and tax regulations." But the democratically elected government in India must be more considerate of larger political questions. As the Wall St. Journal notes, "the government is treading carefully on how to relax labor laws within the zones" and leaving many

of the decisions to the states to tackle the harder questions. Maharashtra state "is set to enact legislation that will exempt the zones from regulations that help govern the formation of unions and the right to lay off workers."

Indonesia and Singapore are seeking to create similar zones, where regulations governing trade between the U.S. and companies on two islands are exempted in a bilateral trade agreement. Sandra Polaski, formerly of the State Department and now with the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, notes the agreement (which passed Congress in May 2003) "allows products produced in the Indonesian islands of Bintan and Batam to be treated as if they were of Singaporean for benefits under the agreement. However, neither Indonesia nor Singapore would be required to assume any of the obligations of the agreement...Adherence to labor laws, environmental protections, and other provisions of the trade agreement would not apply in the Indonesian territory." Polaski warns, "A U.S. congressional mandate that all U.S. trade agreements include such protections would be flouted and a dangerous precedent will be set." The governments in Asia again seem to be missing an opportunity to rise above China's poor standard by providing more protective and socially responsible regulatory regimes.

Many Asian nations are experiencing a degree of export growth that is tied to producing goods destined for China. The question remains open as to whether the shift of assembly or pro-

duction of certain segments of the global supply chain from these nations to China is a harbinger of longer-term trade relations. If China emerges as a steady market in its own right, not simply as a transfer point for goods that are eventually headed to the U.S. or other developed markets, then Asian nations would also be pulled along by a steadily growing Chinese customer base. Export figures from many Asian countries to China were up over the last few years, while the larger developed markets were experiencing slow growth (or in Japan, no growth). The always astute CLSA puts it this way in a January 2002 report: "China may have an absolute advantage in producing toys, shoes, semiconductors, and everything else, but it would make no sense for China to produce all of these goods exclusively. The reason is that it will have a comparative advantage in some goods while other countries (producers) will have a comparative advantage in others...China will not displace the rest of the world's production but rather it will add impetus to the forces of specialization that are the root of endogenous growth."

CLSA makes its comments on China's comparative advantage in the context of China's entry into the WTO. They conclude that discussion by saying, "China's entry to WTO is good for everyone." The Asian leaders have learned some lessons better than others, but their commitments to international rules and norms perversely still seem to put them at a disadvantage. In that context, the conclusion that China's en-

try in WTO is good for everyone seems blithe. China signed the most complex accession document in the WTO's brief history. The deal constituted a series of future dates and commitments; China's economy at the date of the signing was certainly not compliant with the spirit (and in places, even the law) of the WTO. Most observers give even odds that China will meet its commitments or will fail to meet its commitments.

So the other Asian nations are held to a different standard than their big neighbor China when it comes to the WTO. (Not to mention the obvious double standard toward a country like Russia, which is expecting similar 'deals' for 'future commitments' in exchange for admission today into the WTO.) But beyond the general respect for the rule of law, there are specific economic questions of fairness. China still maintains a soft peg of its currency to the American dollar; so as the greenback goes through its present softness (read: revaluation), the Chinese currency gains in competitive pricing against the currencies of other Asian nations. In this regard, the go-for-slow policies in China could be seen to be poised to undermine the market mechanisms and norms of other international actors.

Any article on China's 're-emergence' on the international scene at the opening of the 21st Century must address, even incompletely, the current epidemic of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) now afflicting Asia. At the time of this writing, the full extent of the illness in

China is not yet known. Neither is the scientific evidence yet gathered that would provide a conclusive decision on its origins. China scholars must investigate the reaction of the Chinese government to the disease in its earliest days of appearance. SARS has the potential to threaten the 25 years of methodical economic reform, while at the same time it also has the potential to stimulate long overdue political reforms. Some are calling the SARS outbreak China's Chernobyl. It remains to be seen what will be the outcome.

The snapshot of the disease and its impact at this point is provided by a Wall St. Journal piece from May 2, 2003. The article notes that Warren Buffett's holding company Berkshire Hathaway has quietly built up a 13% stake in state-run oil behemoth PetroChina. The author portrays this as a reflection of Buffett's belief in the economic potential in China. But the author also states, "As Berkshire was buying, China's cover up and bungling of the outbreak of SARS was in full swing. To some investors, the way China reacted to SARS demonstrated the danger of investing in Chinese companies." Just as a savvy investor like Buffett must consider the risks and rewards of China's full return to the world community, so do China's neighbors and the rest of us.

NORTH KOREA: WHAT ARE THE ISSUES AND US OPTIONS?

The decision-making process leading to the formulation of US foreign policy remains something of a mystery. We know that foreign policy decision makers base their decisions on some combination of subjective judgments and objective data, but it is possible that the latter may become blurred.

Is there a way for the National Strategy Forum members who are keen observers of US national security and national strategy to exercise disciplined judgment to guide their opinions? Can this technique work for foreign policy decision makers?

We explored this issue with Professor Willard Zangwill of the University Of Chicago Graduate School Of Business and his colleagues to determine whether his unique forecasting array could be applied to foreign policy issues. The result is heartening.

We chose the contemporary, vexing problem of North Korea's nuclear weapons program as a test case to analyze the decision-making process. The following section describes the methodology used. The next section is a matrix that applies the methodology to possible options and outcomes available to the US.

PART ONE: SOFTWARE FOR STRATEGY DECISIONS

by Keith Blume, Srikumar Chakravarty, and Willard Zangwill

When evaluating a complex problem, we tend to overemphasize information that supports our preferred hypothesis or solution and minimize evidence that suggests something different. The decision making process involves an enormous quantity of interacting factors and issues, so many that no human mind can possibly grasp and understand them. The information glut problem is real.

Human intelligence (HUMINT) is not impeccable. It is susceptible to personal bias— if the evidence supports the hypothesis, the individual stops the analysis because the hypothesis is “correct.” If the evidence does not support the initial hypothesis, the individual formulates

another and the process is repeated.

For example, a case officer from a US intelligence agency presents information he or she obtained from a high ranking contact of an infiltrated terrorist organization to an analyst. The analyst filters the case officer's personal biases, and processes information from multiple sources, including HUMINT, satellite reconnaissance, and electronic surveillance. The analyst encounters several challenges, from handling information volume, to sorting through conflicting information, to timely reporting. When bombarded with data from various sources, an analyst may miss the most crucial facts.

NORTH KOREA: WHAT ARE THE ISSUES AND US OPTIONS?

Professor Willard Zangwill of the University of Chicago Graduate School of Business and his team of graduate students (Jonathan Wilkenfeld, Amit Israni, and Swapan Jha) have developed IdealDecisions, a statistical software package that helps address this flaw in strategy analysis. The software analyzes what events may happen in the future, gives their probability of occurrence, and provides the chance you will be surprised or blindsided by an unforeseen event. Although it cannot specify what the surprise will be, using advanced statistics it estimates the chance such a blindsiding event will occur.

The software tool is most useful when inputs are incorporated from several people, ideally with different backgrounds and/or perspectives. However, this can introduce the issue of "Groupthink." Keith Blume, a student of Professor Zangwill, developed a methodology to minimize this concern.

The approach is easy. As a group, participants develop a set of hypotheses pertaining to a specific question. Individually, participants evaluate each item of information to determine what hypotheses it supports or contradicts. This allows each participant the opportunity to evaluate the hypotheses and information devoid of outside influences. The software calculates probabilities based on their beliefs forcing the participants to confront their biases and assumptions. Quantification exposes biases and enables a greater understanding of why we believe what we believe.

It is imperative to increase the accuracy and confidence of one's analysis and decision making ability. The software provides a logical framework for resolving issues. By identifying

evidence that is an influence on the results and providing a blindside factor, the software directs the analysis. By focusing research efforts on a few key points, one can better quantify and qualify the possible outcomes, and therefore reduce the blindside factor and improve one's confidence in the results.

The human mind is one of the most impressive tools of all time, but it can be fooled and has limitations. With the imminent challenges our nation faces in the war on terrorism, the Middle East and North Korea, the ramifications of our decisions become increasingly risky. The software helps overcome problems with conflicting information, personal bias, and groupthink. These features combine to create a more precise and comprehensive analysis than could be achieved otherwise.

PART TWO: WHAT ARE THE ISSUES AND US OPTIONS?

by Richard Friedman and Lauren Bean

The strategy options available to the US for resolving the North Korea crisis are multifaceted. We have examined the issue from the perspective of the major players: the US, China, Japan, South Korea, and Russia. For the purposes of this exercise, the variables are categorized: fundamental interests, levers of power, and US strategy options. This exercise is designed to provide a structure that will enable National Strategy Forum members to consider the variables and questions leading to options for the US.

NORTH KOREA: WHAT ARE THE ISSUES AND US OPTIONS?

FUNDAMENTAL INTERESTS

The fundamental interests are divided into four subsets: security, economic, regional, and humanitarian.

	SECURITY	ECONOMIC	REGIONAL	HUMANITARIAN
US	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International terrorism • Reduction of nuclear weapons 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Domestic prosperity base for world leadership • Ability to fund US military forces 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • World stability • Political stability in the US • Retain prominent position in Asia • Counterbalance China's ascension to regional hegemony 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assist the North Korean people without military intervention
CHINA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect its northern border from a military invasion by North Korea • Eliminate a nuclear weapon capability from the Korean Peninsula and the region • Prevent a flood of North Korean refugees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect its economic viability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain its diplomatic charm offensive in anticipation of the 2008 Olympics • Enhance its role as a regional and international power 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect population from a potential war on the Korean peninsula
JAPAN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection against a North Korean missile attack 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect its economic viability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain its position as a regional power in Asia • Avoid becoming a nuclear power, or significantly increasing its military force 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect population from a potential war on the Korean peninsula
SOUTH KOREA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection against an invasion by North Korean military forces • Protection against a North Korean nuclear, artillery, or missile attack 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeguard economic stability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phased reunification with North Korea, provided that South Korea remains the dominant partner 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevent population casualties in the event of an attack by North Korea
RUSSIA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevent a downslide to diminished world importance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeguard bilateral trade with North Korea and the region 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involvement in the foreign policy of North Korea 	

NORTH KOREA: WHAT ARE THE ISSUES AND US OPTIONS?

LEVERS OF POWER

The US, China, Japan, South Korea, and Russia have levers of power that may be used to induce North Korea to disarm.

LEVERS OF POWER	
US	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Form and lead a multilateral coalition • Political Capital • Military strength and dominance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Precision targeted bombs</i> capable of hitting nuclear facilities (unknown capability to hit underground facilities) • <i>Anti-missile defense system</i> (Patriot System) that can be used by South Korea and Japan. • <i>US military force of 37,000 troops</i> in South Korea is a trip wire (troops may be vulnerable in the early phase of the North Korean attack and may be repositioned) • Nuclear theater tactical weapons to stop a North Korean military offensive before reaching Seoul. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Use of MOAB</i> (Missile Optimized Anti-Ballistic) system against North Korean troop movement • Economic aid
CHINA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Korea depends on China's electric power grid (several years ago China cut off North Korea's electric power for three days) • China maintains a large military force that can repel a North Korean ground invasion and can seal off its border to prevent a flood of North Korean refugees • China can threaten to use military force against North Korea. This could restrain North Korea from invading South Korea • Cooperate with US on international terrorism intelligence gathering • Use of naval forces to interdict North Korean shipments of nuclear weapons and technology to other states
JAPAN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Threaten and/or create nuclear weapons capability and increase its military force • International terrorism intelligence gathering • Use of naval forces can interdict North Korean shipment of nuclear weapons to other states
SOUTH KOREA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offer incentives such as supplies of energy in return for disarmament • Economic aid
RUSSIA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International intelligence gathering • Use of naval forces to interdict North Korean shipment of nuclear weapons to other states

NORTH KOREA: WHAT ARE THE ISSUES AND US OPTIONS?

US STRATEGY OPTIONS

The following matrix provides seven strategy options for the US: economic incentives, burden shifting, regime change, defend South Korea, defend Japan, and interdiction of North Korea's nuclear weapons shipments and technology.

	US STRATEGY OPTIONS	OBJECTIVES
Economic Incentives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide economic and humanitarian aid mixed with contributions from other states conditioned on disarmament and verification. • Organize an international economic blockade 	Induce North Korea to disarm
Burden Shift	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seek to have China, Japan, and South Korea play an important role in a coalition • Negotiate a non-aggression treaty with North Korea in return for total disarmament coupled with a verifiable inspection regime 	Eliminate North Korea's nuclear weapons and nuclear capability by using the political and economic leverage of other states
Regime Change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Military intervention similar to the Persian Gulf War and the most recent Iraq military campaign • Organize an international economic blockade 	Destabilize the Kim regime
Defend South Korea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide military assistance to South Korea (Patriot anti-missile defense system and technical aid). • Re-deploy 37,000 troops in South Korea for force protection purposes. • Introduce 250,000-500,000 US troops in the event of a North Korean attack • Induce South Korea to spend more on defense by reducing or repositioning 37,000 US troops. 	Limit the adverse consequences of a North Korean military or missile attack; prevent population and economic loss
Defend Japan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide Patriot anti-missile defense system to Japan 	Defend Japan against a missile attack by North Korea; protect Japan in the event the US launches a retaliatory attack against North Korea
Diplomatic Initiative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognize the potential for US decreased influence and China's increased influence in the region. 	Maintain US leadership position in the region
Interdiction of North Korea's nuclear weapons and technology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seek international law change to allow interdiction of North Korean shipments of nuclear weapons and technology • Gain commitments from the China, South Korea, Japan, and Russia to interdict the shipment of North Korea's nuclear weapons and technology, and provide intelligence aimed at preventing future exports 	Prevent North Korea's nuclear weapons and technology exports

NORTH KOREA-US RELATIONSHIP

North Korea and the US do not trust each other. North Korea reneged on the 1994 Agreed Framework under which North Korea agreed to freeze and eventually dismantle its nuclear program, which would be verified by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). However, North Korea believes that the US reneged on its promise to provide economic aid. North Korea's negotiating posture may be to use extreme bluster. North Korea's primary negotiating asset is its nuclear weapons capability. Given these conditions, the traditional negotiating strategies may not be useful.

QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED

Bearing in mind the three matrices (fundamental interests, levers of power, and US strategy options), consider the following questions to determine the best US policy for resolving the conflict with North Korea:

- Does North Korea have nuclear weapons?
- Can the presence or absence of North Korea's nuclear weapons be determined with certainty?
- Will North Korea agree to a robust inspection and verification regime?
- Will economic sweeteners persuade North Korea to disarm?
- If North Korea has nuclear weapons, will it seek to make additional nuclear weapons?
- If North Korea continues production of nuclear weapons, will this change the underlying military and political equation?
- Is it likely that the US will initiate military action with North Korea?
- If the US does initiate military action, what is the likelihood that North Korea would invade South Korea?
- If the US interdicts the export of North Korea's WMD technology, what is the likelihood that Kim will retaliate and launch a missile attack on South Korea or Japan?
- What are the options available to the US other than military action for resolving the conflict with North Korea?

BLINDSIDE FACTORS

- Kim Jung Il is unpredictable — rational analysis of his behavior and policy may be inapplicable. Economic incentives and disincentives may have a low probability of affecting a desired result.
- Whether China will increase pressure of North Korea to disarm, and whether it will cooperate with the US.

20:21 Vision: Twentieth-Century Lessons for the Twenty-first Century

by *Bill Emmott*

Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2003, \$25.00, 373 pp.

Reviewed by Lauren Bean

Bill Emmott believes that the two most important questions for the twenty-first century are: Will American leadership endure, or will it “go the way of Britain in the twentieth century and decline?” And will capitalism survive in the twenty-first century with all of its strengths and weaknesses, or will it be challenged?

Emmott, Editor-in-Chief of the *Economist*, believes that one of the most notable events of the twentieth century was the US “taking over from Britain” as the policeman for world order. Emmott argues that American power is benign — it is not a “true hegemon.” America seeks to operate alongside multilateral institutions such as the UN and its allies. For the twenty-first century, Emmott envisages the persistence of strong American leadership — but not without friction.

The greatest challenge to American power will be China. However, Emmott writes that “China is several decades away from overtaking America in terms of any important measure.” China is in the process of reconstructing the economy; this process is nascent if one considers that China began adopting capitalism only twenty years ago. Thus, China should not be feared simply on the grounds of a burgeoning economy. Yet Emmott is properly concerned

about the America–China conflict over Taiwan. “If there is ever a fight between the United States and China, it is likely to arise from what would be the greatest and most fateful miscalculation in the history of mankind.”

Adding to tensions in East Asia is what Emmott terms “Japanese Vulnerability.” Since Japan’s stock and property markets crashed in 1990, the country has endured recurring bouts of frustration and a continuing economic slump. Emmott states that “a more national government, a more powerful navy and air force, a more visible military presence in the region, even, in the end, a publicly acknowledged program of nuclear research and development: all these must be considered likelihoods for Japan during the first few decades of the twenty-first century.”

Emmott is confident that the European Union will not challenge America’s global dominance. He does not deny the success of the EU. However, the EU is “far from united.” It is the accommodation of each country’s concerns that will prevent it from playing a dominant role in the international community. “In the end,” Emmott writes, “they are happy that the real adults, the Americans, are there to sort things out, to provide a secure home, and to pay the bills.”

Emmott believes that international terrorism will be the chief threat in the twenty-first century given the proliferation of weapons of mass de-

struction (WMD). However, Emmott states that “terrorism can be contained, even if not entirely quelled.” American leadership, coupled with the collective action of the international community, should be effective in both combating terrorism and containing the desire for and use of WMD.

As for capitalism, Emmott is cautiously optimistic that it will survive the twenty-first century. Emmott defends capitalism against the objections that it is unpopular, unstable, unequal, and unclean (the chapter headings). Capitalism is unpopular because it is “ruthless.” However, Emmott argues that better government regulations will make capitalism “behave properly” by correcting its dysfunctions — capitalism will continue to produce good and bad times.

Emmott argues that the instability of capitalism during the 1930’s can be avoided given the lessons of the Great Depression. He notes that evidence of capitalism’s continuing instability, such as the East Asian financial crisis of 1997-98, is apparent in any decade. Yet capitalism is flexible, and can adapt quickly once problems or opportunities emerge.

On inequality, Emmott notes that the gaps have widened between rich countries and poor countries; he argues that the gaps have narrowed within countries. According to him, the solution to the first problem lies in “improvements in public education” and efforts to ensure that economic growth is beneficial to both rich and poor. The solution to inequality within countries can be seen in poor countries that have advanced economically. A government that encourages economic freedom, “an open, competitive economy, a stable macroeconomic framework...and peace and consent,” is likely to enjoy economic

growth. Given the growth of world trade, investment flows, and technological advancements, Emmott states the promise of economic and social development in the twenty-first century for the world’s poor “is real.”

Emmott notes that globalization and the resulting inequality could threaten capitalism. Yet Emmott argues that globalization has made the world open. “Liberalization and integration with the world economy has recently spread to many poor and former communist countries.” Still, “globalization entails change, and change is destabilizing.”

As for the environment, Emmott argues that the world’s environmental problems are not the fault of capitalism but of government. Emmott acknowledges the importance of the environment and its problems, yet he argues that dramatic forecasts of many environmentalists “are unlikely ever to become true in any meaningful fashion.” Emmott agrees with Bjorn Lomborg, author of *The Skeptical Environmentalist*, who claims that the world is getting better rather than worse, and that the green movement is manipulating the truth to support its case.

In the epilogue, titled “Paranoid Optimism,” Emmott concludes that no one knows what will happen in the twenty-first century; however, it should be possible to make calculated predictions based on the trends of the twentieth century: America’s political and economic ascent; the growth of global trade and investment flows; the rise of social mobility, the fall of aristocracy; developments in technology, communication, and transportation, *etc.* It is a matter of maintaining “positive expectations and a keen awareness of risk.”

RECENT SPEAKERS

On April 1, 2003, Ambassador Richard Williamson, US Representative for Special Political Affairs for the US Mission to the United Nations, addressed the National Strategy Forum on the military conflict in Iraq and the future of the United Nations Security Council. Following is a summary of his remarks.

Ambassador Williamson states that problems with the UN's procedures, performance, and structure were exposed as a result of the conflict in Iraq. Williamson believes the UN has a role. However, he questions whether that role encompasses legitimizing the use of force.

Williamson believes that the Bush administration was correct to bring the Iraq issue to the UN, and to challenge a "brutal tyrant". He noted evidence that confirms Saddam Hussein's cruelty. For example, Iraq has more unresolved disappearances than any other UN member state — over 16,000 people. In 2000, Iraqi authorities introduced tongue amputations as punishment for criticizing Hussein. The regime has tortured and executed children, and taped the drugging and rapes of female relatives of government officials as a method of coercion. Hussein has launched a number of brutal attacks on his own people, the Kurds, and his neighbors. Also, there is evidence that Iraq has a nuclear weapons program. In the early 1990's, Iraq declared it had

10,000 nerve gas warheads, 1,500 chemical weapons, 412 tons of chemical agents, 25 long-range missiles, and biological agents. The UN discovered ten times the declared number of chemical weapons in Iraq.

All fifteen members of UN Security Council knew Iraq had WMD, they knew Iraq was in material breach, and they understood clearly that Resolution 1441 authorized use of force. The Security Council failed to act.

Adding to these tensions, the UN has fundamental structural problems. For example, the smallest country that has a vote equal to the US has a total geographic area of 1.7 kilometers.

Williamson believes that the UN Security Council could be useful in resolving regional conflicts in Sierra Leone and the Congo, but questions whether the Security Council can act on larger issues and whether it should be the sole venue for legitimizing the use of force. He concludes that the process of reconstruction will be long, but there is a role for the UN.

Questions and Answers

Williamson states that the UN "does not have the moral legitimacy" to deal with Israel and the reformation of the Palestinian authority. According to Williamson, some of the five permanent

RECENT SPEAKERS

members of UN Security Council (P5) have diminished influence, and use their position for political leverage. Israel has been the whipping boy of the UN for forty years. In the sixties and seventies, the UN relied on the Arab states to attack apartheid in Africa. The quid pro quo is that the UN helped the Arab states isolate Israel.

Williamson believes that the US-European divide is based on power and influence. During the Gulf War, European allies realized that they were far behind the US militarily. Since the 1990's, European defense spending has decreased. These countries rely on the US. The problem is that these countries want the US to help them but fail to understand that less power means less influence.

Williamson forecasts that post-conflict Iraq reconstruction will take many years. At present in Afghanistan, ethnic groups have representation in the government. Williamson believes that the same potential exists for ethnic groups in Iraq.

On April 28, 2003, Ambassador Thomas Pickering, former Ambassador and Representative to the United Nations, addressed the National Strategy Forum on the relationship of the US, Russia, and China. Professor Charles Lipson of the University of Chicago facilitated the question and answer portion of the event. Following is a summary of their remarks.

Ambassador Thomas Pickering states that Russia and China will play an increasing role in world affairs in the next two decades. However, this process will not occur without obstacles and tension.

After September 11th Russia and China were supportive of the US and the war on terrorism. For Russia, September 11th offered Russian President Vladimir Putin a chance for reorientation and integration into the international community. He made a strategic change to align Russia with the US and perhaps, Western Europe. For China, September 11th provided an opportunity for cooperation with the US. Even though China had misgivings about the US attack on Iraq, it did not take the lead in the Security Council to thwart US efforts. China continues to help the US in post-conflict Iraq.

For Russia, its weak economy hinders its ability to expand its relations with the international community. Economic reform is a critical objective of President Putin's agenda; he wants to attract greater foreign investment. Pickering suggests that Russia should focus on the export of agriculture by removing the old, continuing state farm system, and replacing it with a new agricultural system. Also, improvements in domestic law could result in a decline in corruption and attract more foreign investment. Pickering suggests that the US work with Russia on issues regarding trade and security, support Russia's entry into WTO, and work with the EU on better relations between Europe and Russia.

China's economic performance, unlike Russia's, is significant and positive. Last year, China saw 7%-8% growth. It is pursuing an active campaign to attract investment from the US and elsewhere.

Politically, Russian democracy must be fostered. Russia needs to be pushed to make an effort to stop crime and corruption. It is a permanent member of the UN Security Council, and the US must work with Russia on the international scene, global missile defense, and outer space. Also, the US must support changes in Russian policies regarding non-proliferation of WMD. It is important that Russia's oil and gas reserves be developed to bolster the Russian economy and provide the world with an alternate resource to Middle Eastern oil reserves.

For the US and China, the most critical area of tension and potential future conflict is Taiwan and the Taiwan Straits. Pickering believes that both sides of the Strait have made efforts to reduce the possibility of conflict and are looking to the future. The US and China have a common interest in the Korean Peninsula. Both oppose nuclear weapons on the peninsula. However, China does not want to pressure North Korea with sanctions and believes that the US should negotiate directly with North Korea. China played a major role in organizing and hosting talks in Beijing between North Korea and the US.

According to Pickering, the US, China, and Russia understand the strategic importance of

their relationships. Together, these three countries will begin to share the responsibility of world leadership.

Questions and Answer

Professor Charles Lipson believes that the European Union (EU) and Russia will develop a closer relationship. Yet there is a continuing debate over the enlargement of the EU. At a minimum, it is a free trade organization. The problem is that some states want it to be an organization that formulates foreign policy. However, a larger organization will make it more difficult for the member states to agree. Thus, the EU needs a central authority and a constitution.

In addressing democracy in Russia, Lipson states that there are no stable Russian institutions. But given the efforts of the Putin administration, it is likely that Russia will democratize.

Lipson states that China is a long way from becoming a peer competitor. It is showing economic growth, but needs to develop full-range components of a modern economy. The emerging infrastructure needs to decentralize its economic power to adapt to its growth.

Lipson states that the prospects for movement on the Palestinian and Israeli front are better than in 1994. The US has a larger footprint in the Arab-Muslim world. And, the threat of the militant Islamic world pre-commits the US to deal with failed states, rogue states, and terrorism.

STRATEGY WATCH

Asia

In early March, Brigadier-General Boer Buis is sentenced to five years in jail by an **Indonesian** court for failing to prevent massacres of civilians in East Timor in 1999. Zhu Rongji resigns as prime minister of **China** and is succeeded by his deputy Wen Jiabao. In **Hong Kong**, scientists identify the virus responsible for a fatal form of pneumonia called Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS). Beijing reports over 1,440 confirmed cases and 75 deaths. At least 10,000 people are quarantined. More than 372 people have died of the disease worldwide. **North Korea** withdraws from regular talks with US officers at Panmunjom, on the border of South Korea. Both **India** and **Pakistan** test-fire surface-to-surface missiles capable of delivering nuclear weapons. In mid-March the guerrillas of the Moro Islamic Liberation Front in the **Philippines** attack a village killing five people. Weeks later, bombers kill 16 people in the city of Davao. **Malaysia** bans tourists from mainland China in an effort to stop the spread of SARS. The US says it plans to move its garrison in central **Seoul** to a less conspicuous site outside the capital. In late March, **North Korea** abandons its demands that any talks on its nuclear program should be solely with the United States. **Japan** faces possible power cuts this summer as many of the country's nuclear reactors are shut down for safety checks. James Kelly, an American official, holds talks in **Beijing** with North Korean negotiator Li Gun in a move to try to persuade the North to end its nuclear weapons program.

China participated in the talks. In **Bangladesh**, two ferries sink in storms, killing 134 people. The trial of Abu Bakar Basyir, an Islamic cleric accused of plotting to overthrow the government in order to establish a Muslim state, begins in **Indonesia**. The US states that it is considering a conditional offer by **North Korea** to disband its nuclear weapons program but that it will not be rewarded.

Middle East

Mahmoud Abbas is appointed to the new post of prime minister of the **Palestinian** authority. Tayyip Erdogan, leader of the governing Justice and Development party, becomes Prime Minister of **Turkey**. In mid-March, the US-led war against Iraq begins with missile attacks on the Iraqi leadership in **Baghdad**. The UN withdraws its weapons inspectors from Iraq. Three of Britain's prime ministers resign in protest of Tony Blair's decision to go to war without the backing of the UN. In **Afghanistan**, American and Italian bases are attacked by rocket and machine gun fire from suspected Taliban and al-Qaeda forces. In **northern Iraq**, Kurdish *peshmerga* fighters, supported by American Special Forces, capture the stronghold of an extremist Islamist group which the US has accused of having links with terrorism and al-Qaeda. Indian troops kill the deputy leader of **Kashmir's** main militant group, Hizb-ul-Mujahideen. In April, American forces topple the regime of Saddam Hussein with large-scale assaults. Iraqis celebrate the fall of the Saddam's regime with widespread looting. Looters

THE NSF REVIEW STRATEGY WATCH
March 15, 2003–June 3, 2003

In the Moroccan capital of Casablanca, simultaneous suicide bombings kill 42 people, wound over 100.

In Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, nine suicide bombers ran their vehicles packed with explosives into three compounds housing expatriates, killing at least 34 people, eight of them American.

President Bush meets with South Korean President Roh Moo-hyun to discuss the North Korea crisis.

Both India and Pakistan test-fire surface-to-surface missiles capable of delivering nuclear weapons.

ransack government buildings, shops, hospitals, banks, and museums. Jay Garner, the retired American general appointed by the Bush administration to be the American civil administrator in Iraq, arrives in Baghdad. Mid-May, Jay Garner is replaced by Paul Bremer, a former head of counter-terrorism at the State Department. **British forces** kill “Chemical Ali” Hassan al-Majid, a senior member of the regime responsible for the defense of southern Iraq. Eleven Afghan civilians are killed when an American bomb goes astray and lands on a house in the outskirts of Shkin, in eastern **Afghanistan**. American-sponsored talks on the creation of a post-war administration begin in **Nasiriya**, south of Baghdad. Representatives of Sunni, Shia, Kurdish, and other factions begin the task of brokering a deal between Iraq’s ethnic and religious groups. America accuses **Syria** of helping the Iraqi regime during the war, offering refuge to fugitive Iraqis and developing chemical weapons. Syria denies the charges. In **Baghdad**, American forces capture Abu Abbas, the leader of the Palestinian group that seized an Italian cruise ship in 1985, killing an American tourist in a wheelchair. In May, the “road map”, an international blueprint for ending the conflict between the **Israelis** and **Palestinians** by 2005, is submitted to both governments after a new Palestinian cabinet is sworn in. American troops open fire on protesters in **Falouja**, a town near Baghdad, killing 13 people. The US states that it will pull all troops out of **Saudi Arabia**. **Pakistan** arrests six members of a group linked to al-Qaeda. One of the six is said to have been involved in an attack on an American warship, the USS Cole, in 2000. In Riyadh, **Saudi Arabia's** capital, nine suicide bombers ram their vehicles packed with

explosives into three compounds housing expatriates, killing at least 34 people, eight of them American. Remains of up to 3,000 people are found at a mass grave south of **Baghdad**. It is estimated that there could be as many as 11,000 people buried at the site presumably killed by the Saddam Hussein regime. In late May, simultaneous suicide bombings kill 42 people, wound over 100, in the **Moroccan** business capital of Casablanca.

Africa

In March, **Cote d’Ivoire** swears in a new prime minister, Seydou Diarra, as rebel groups and leading political parties prepare to form a coalition government as part of a peace deal aimed at ending nearly six months of civil war. **Uganda’s** government announces a ceasefire with the rebel group, the Lord’s Resistance Army. The UN and the **Cambodian** government agree on arrangements for Khmer Rouge leaders to be tried for crimes committed during their rule (1975-1979). In the **Central African Republic**, a coup overthrows president Félix Patassé, who has survived seven previous attempts. Weeks later, Francois Bozize, the coup leader and self-proclaimed president, appoints a prime minister. Tony Yengeni, a former chief assistant for **South Africa’s** ruling party, the African National Congress, is sentenced to four years in jail for fraud. Over 60 people are arrested in **Zimbabwe** after a general strike protesting Robert Mugabe’s assumption of the presidency. In **Nigeria**, seven people die in a clash of ethnic militiamen near the oil town of Warri. **Congo’s** government, rebel groups, and opposition factions sign a pact aimed at ending the country’s civil war, adopting a new constitu-

tion, and paving the way for elections. The president of **Malawi**, Bakili Muluzi, who had been seeking to change the constitution to allow him a third term in office, relents and names a successor. In April, **Congo** adopts a new constitution after peace talks in South Africa. **Sierra Leone**, which has set up its own Truth and Reconciliation Commission, holds its first hearings. The commission will take testimony from some 700 survivors of the country's decade-long civil war which ended in 2001. Olusegun Obasanjo is re-elected as president of **Nigeria**. Winnie Madikezela-Mandela, the ex-wife of Nelson Mandela, is convicted of theft and fraud in a **South African** court. Protesters in **Zimbabwe** strike to oppose a 210% hike in the price of petrol and the general misrule of President Robert Mugabe. A senior judge is shot dead in Phnom Penh, **Cambodia**. In May, **Malaysia, Indonesia**, and dozens of other countries are hit by debris from an Italian satellite falling to Earth after seven years in space. In **Nigeria**, 100 expatriate oil-workers are held hostage by their local colleagues on oil rigs off the coast of Nigeria. **Burundi** swears in a new president, Domitien Ndayizeye, a Hutu. **Somalia's** transitional government is shut out of its parliament building for non-payment of rent.

Europe

In March, **Russia** agrees to shut down its last three plutonium-producing reactors. **Serbia's** Prime Minister, Zoran Djindic, is assassinated outside the parliament in Belgrade. Weeks later, Serb police arrest the deputy commander of a special police unit, Zvezdan Jovanovic, and charge him with murdering Djindic. **Finland's** Centre party, led by Aneli Jaateenmaki, wins the

majority of the seats in a general election. In late March, Finland's politicians agree on a new coalition government to be headed by Anneli Jaateenmaki, Finland's first woman prime minister and leader of the conservative Centre Party. In **France**, the biggest corruption trial in French history begins with 37 defendants accused of milking Elf Aquitaine, a former state-owned oil company, of more than \$200 million dollars during the 1980's and 1990's. **Belgium** suggests the creation of a new coalition distinct from NATO composed of itself, France, and Germany. In **Chechnya**, nearly 90% of voters turn out for a referendum on a new constitution; over 95% of these back the new constitution. In Makhachkala, the capital of the southern Russian republic of **Dagestan**, 28 children die in a school fire. In April, **France, Germany, and Russia** meet in St. Petersburg to reiterate their call for the United Nations to oversee the administration of Iraq. The **EU's** fifteen member countries and the ten newcomers due to join next year plan to meet in Athens to sign a treaty of accession. **Malta's** voters re-elected the Nationalist Party. Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, president of the **European Union's** constitutional convention, produced his proposal for an enlarged EU including a European commission cut to 15 full members and a new European congress. The **Turkish-Cypriot** and **Greek-Cypriot** authorities temporarily open crossing-points between the communities' two zones. Sergei Yushenkov, the leader of a small **Russian** party, Liberal Russia, is shot dead outside of his home in Moscow. He is the tenth member of the Duma to be murdered in ten years. At a summit, **France, Germany, Belgium, and Luxembourg** agree on the outlines of a scheme for a multinational headquarters for non-NATO European defense operations. In

STRATEGY WATCH

May, **German** Chancellor Gerhard Schroder threatens to resign if his Social Democrats do not back his plans to reform unemployment rules and other aspects of his country's generous welfare state. In **Italy**, Cesare Previti, the former defense minister and close friend of Silvio Berlusconi, is sentenced to 11 years in prison for bribing judges. Suicide attackers drive a truck laden with explosives into a complex of government offices in Znamenskoye, in northern **Chechnya**, killing at least 54 people

South America

In March, a plane carrying three Americans crashes in a jungle in **Colombia**. Some 80 dissidents are arrested in **Cuba** for allegedly conspiring with the top American official on the island. In **Brazil**, Congress votes for a constitutional amendment paving the way for central bank independence. In April, the president of the central bank in **Chile** resigns after his secretary was found to have passed information to a corrupt financial firm. A mudslide in **Bolivia** kills 17 people and leaves 200 missing. In **Cuba**, a man carrying hand grenades hijacks a plane on a domestic flight and forces the pilot to fly to Florida. The following day, armed Cubans seize a Havana ferryboat with more than 50 passengers and sail it towards the US. In **Honduras**, 69 people are killed in a riot at a prison farm. An America pilot dies when his plane crashes in **Colombia** while spraying drug crops with weed killer. In **Cuba**, summary courts sentence 70 dissidents to 28 years in prison or more. The **Venezuelan** government and the opposition groups reach a "pre-agreement" to hold a referendum on Hugo Chavez's presidency. The UN Human Rights

Commission approves a resolution to send an outside investigator to look at human rights in **Cuba**. In May, two Peronists face a run-off election on May 18th for **Argentina's** presidency. The Colorado party, which has governed **Paraguay** for 56 years, will continue to govern for five more years. Nicanor Duarte Frutos, a former education minister, won the presidential election with 38% of the vote. Luiz Inácio Lula de Silva, the president of **Brazil**, presents draft bills to reform pensions and the tax system to Congress.

North America

In **Quebec**, liberals win a provincial election, ending nine years of rule by separatist Parti Québécois. Officials in **Toronto** react to a travel warning issued by the WTO for Canada's largest city, where SARS has killed 16. Two Sikh nationalists are put on trial in **Vancouver**; they are accused of involvement in the 1985 bombing of an Air India flight which killed 329 people. President Bush meets with South Korean President Roh Moo-hyun to discuss the North Korea crisis. Both leaders reaffirm their goal to eliminate North Korea's nuclear threat. Nineteen illegal immigrants die after riding in an airtight, sweltering trailer along the main highway from the Mexican border to Houston. Eight people are accused of conspiracy and transporting aliens.

RESEARCH REPORTS

Summaries of recent articles presenting new ideas on international affairs

Geriatric Teenagers

by Victor Davis Hanson

The National Review Online,

May 2, 2003

“The Paris-Berlin-Moscow axis needs some tough love.”

Dr. Victor Davis Hanson is a fellow at the Claremont Institute in California and a visiting professor at the US Naval Academy. Hanson offers little sympathy to those states that have proven to be fair weather allies of the US. Hanson envisions a major reorganization within the international community and a reassessment of international institutions.

Hanson writes that European elites are analogous to “spoiled teenagers” who “snap at and ridicule their patient and paying parents, even as they call on them *in extremis* for help whenever the car stalls and the rent is short.” Hanson writes that this attitude may be the result of jealousy of American power, different constitutions, or the American experience — “vast frontiers, immigration, assimilation, and the lack of national creed or race.” Hanson speculates that the current friction between the US and Paris-Berlin-Moscow will worsen as more evidence is uncovered revealing the true nature of Iraq’s relationship with Germany, France, and Russia.

According to Hanson, drastic shifts in Europe are nothing new. He refers to the Protestant Reformation of the 15th and 16th centuries (coupled

with trade with the New World and the attack on the Ottoman Empire) that shifted power from the Mediterranean to the new Europe of England, northern France, and Holland. Hanson also cites what he terms fits of “continental craziness” such as Napoleon’s willingness to risk millions of lives for the “pan-European dream”; and the rise of German Nazism, Italian fascism, and continental Marxism.

Hanson proposes that the appropriate answer to the disharmony is radical reforms aimed at eradicating shared institutions. First, Hanson writes, the US must differentiate its allies from the opposition (French, Belgians, and Germans). Eastern Europe does not share the same distrust of America, and Italy and Spain do not share the attitude of the naysayers. Next, the US should form a stronger coalition with the willing. He asserts that the US can begin this transformation by pulling all US troops out of Germany.

As for NATO, Hanson writes that given the antics of the Belgians, it is inappropriate to house NATO in Brussels. Furthermore, France should decide where it stands within the international community. In the meantime, the US should establish relationships with “those who know something of the history of the 20th century.”

Hanson argues that the UN should “be the centerpiece of [US] policy”. Among his many suggestions, Hanson names India, Brazil, and Japan as good candidates for the Security Council. Also, the “united tyrannies” of Libya, Syria,

North Korea, and Cuba should form their own institution and leave the General Assembly to the democratic governments.

Moreover, the US ambassadorships must be reassessed to ensure that the men and women serving in those positions are forcefully representing the US interests rather than apologizing for the US.

**The Transformation of National Security:
Five Redefinitions**

by Philip Zelikow

The National Interest, Spring 2003,
pp. 17-28

Philip Zelikow is the White Burkett Miller Professor of History and Director of the Miller Center of Public Affairs at the University of Virginia. In an examination of the Bush administration's *US National Security Strategy of the United States*, Zelikow identifies "five essential redefinitions" of what national security means for the United States in the 21st century.

Zelikow refutes the criticism that the United States is an empire. He writes that "real imperial power is sovereign power...Sovereignty means a direct monopoly control over the organization and use of armed might...and over the administration of justice" without limits of the ruler. He argues that the United States does not boast imperial power, nor does it seek imperial rule. However, it is unrealistic to deny the central role of the United States in the international community. The present focus must be on how the US exercises its role.

America's position as "the greatest power in this pluralistic world" has made the US vulner-

able not only to criticism, but also to danger. Consequently, the Bush administration developed a vision for US national security designed to reach beyond partisan politics and appeal to both conservatives and liberals. This vision is composed of five significant redefinitions: the geography of national security, the nexus between principles and power, the structure of international security, multilateralism, and national security as a function of time.

Zelikow writes that "in the past, the geography of national security was defined by foreign frontiers." Today, the threats against national security are not as clearly defined and they exist on a much larger scale. These threats are "defined more by the fault-lines within societies than by the territorial borders between them"; in other words "the clashes in this phase of history are not clashes between civilizations but inside them." As a result, the executive branch of the US government, the archetype of the US national security system, is undergoing the largest reorganization in the last fifty years with the creation of the Department of Homeland Security. US foreign policy must address individual societies, factions, and problems specific to those groups. According to Zelikow, US foreign policy must "transcend physical and material dimensions" to include "fundamental principles."

Zelikow defines what he terms "The New Centrality of Moral Principles" as a move away from realism vs. idealism, or power vs. concern for human rights, towards the union of authority and principle. He believes that the Bush administration's concept of "balance of power that favors freedom" supports relations among states and within states with a greater emphasis on

“human dignity.”

Zelikow writes “that for centuries, the structure of world politics has been defined by the rivalry of great powers.” The Bush administration is moving towards an integrated structure based upon active cooperation among all major global powers. The current position of the US presents an opportunity to challenge present and future partners, build and renew alliances, and partition the responsibilities of leadership.

Zelikow writes that “everything that America does in the world is done multilaterally.” For example, a network of governments is waging the war on terrorism. And, the operations in Afghanistan involve several countries. Zelikow argues that the argument is not about “unilateralism vs. multilateralism” but “five contrasting ways of conceiving and operationalizing multilateral action.”

The Bush administration strategy is based on:

- An inductive method that draws ideas from many sources and adapts them to specific conditions.
- International institutions that judge performance and stress accountability rather than those (United Nations) that maintain detached neutrality in order to preserve a friendly consensus.
- Multilateral strategies that rely on the sovereign accountability of states instead of strategies that limit sovereignty in order to link states in a common enterprise.
- A view of international law that emphasizes democratic accountability, linking the authority of international officials to constitu-

tional sources of political authority that are essentially national in character.

- Functional institutions (NATO) that produce concrete results instead of symbolic measures that might rally more support for an ideal, but at the cost of not doing much to further its attainment.

Threats to national security can emerge quickly and anonymously. Thus, it is hard to quarrel with the essential premise of the Bush administration’s open willingness to consider pre-emption.” Zelikow rejects the criticism that the US should wait until the threat is so acute that a consensus can be reached on military action. He writes that today “there is a kind of inverse continuum of threat and vulnerability.” WMD capabilities minimize the threat of military action. Therefore, the Bush administration has adapted the US national security strategy to the “new conditions of international life.” The strategy is “provocative”, and it will condition the international community to think about new threats and act cooperatively.

International Law and the Preemptive Use of Military Force

by Anthony Clark Arend

The Washington Quarterly, Spring 2003
pp. 89-103

Anthony Clark Arend is a professor in the Department of Government and the School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University. Arend examines the lawfulness of the Bush administration’s doctrine of preemption. He bases the examination on the United Nations Charter of 1945

and provides options for US policymakers in light of international law.

Arend writes that prior to the UN Charter, preemptive force was accepted by the international community if it was in self-defense. In 1945, the 51 delegates of the UN gathered to draft normative order that would save “succeeding generations from the scourge of war” by restricting the option of force. There are two exceptions: force authorized by the Security Council and force mounted in self-defense. Article 51 offers two different interpretations of the permissibility of preemptive force: one, “that the intent of Article 51 was to limit the use of force in self-defense to those circumstances in which an armed attack has occurred”; two, “that the framers of the charter intended for a continuation of the broad pre-UN Charter right of anticipatory self-defense.”

Given the ambiguity of the Charter, Arend notes that it is reasonable to examine the practices of states post-UN Charter. There were three cases in which the Security Council debated the efficacy of preemption: the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, the 1967 Six-Day War, and the 1981 Israeli attack on the Osirak reactor in Iraq. In all three cases, there was no clear consensus of opposition to the doctrine of preemption; there was conflict as to what justifies preemptive force under international law.

Arend states that the Bush administration “seeks to relax the traditional requirements of necessity.” The language of the 2002 *National Security Strategy* implies that the old requirements are no longer applicable because the threats to international security are greater. Arend defends this notion because the UN Charter

drafted in 1945 addressed “conventional threats posed by states.” The threats posed by WMD and terrorism were not anticipated by international law.

US policymakers could resolve this conflict by accepting the traditional criterion for preemption as defined by the UN Charter, claiming that the law should be reinterpreted in light of the proliferation of WMD and terrorism, or by declaring the UN Charter framework “dead.” Arend suggests that the US should accept the criterion of the charter. Moreover, the US should acknowledge that the existing legal structure is problematic and obsolete. The US should “take the lead” in identifying deficiencies and formulating solutions.

Post-Saddam Iraq: The Shiite Factor

by Amatzia Baram

Iraq Memo # 15, April 30, 2003

The Brookings Institution

Amatzia Baram is a visiting fellow at the Saban Center for Middle East Policy. Baram examines the Shiite response to the US presence in Iraq, Iran’s interests in Iraq, and Shiite Islam. He provides recommendations as to how to neutralize the radical Shiite influence on the post-conflict Iraq political orientation.

Baram states that soon after the fall of Baghdad, Shiite clergy exploited the absence of government in Iraq to stage a campaign for an Islamic Republic. Baram notes that while the immediacy of the mobilization, the massive number of demonstrators, and the intensity of the demonstrations were surprising, the demonstrators actually represent a minority. However, he

says if the radicals in the Shiite community are not neutralized, the result could be dangerous to the US and the entire international community.

The Shiite mullahs ruling Tehran oppose democracy in Iraq, especially US-sponsored democracy. They fear it will set an example for the younger generation in Iran and motivate them to rebel against the mullahs; it could eclipse the seminary at Qom. If a free, religious seminary were developed in the holy city of Najaf in Iraq, it could undermine the Iranian political system.

The young Iraqi Shiite clergy share similar interests with the Iranians. They see the current predicament as an opportunity to reclaim “the centrality of religion in their community’s life, and their own centrality within the community.” They want to dominate the Shiite community and Iraq. However, Baram notes, they know they cannot repair the damage to Iraq’s economy and infrastructure. Moreover, the Iraqi Shiite clergy do not want to see Iraq’s demise nor encourage Iranian occupation.

Baram states that the US must take steps to “neutralize the radical Shiite influence.” First, the US must declare that violence will be met with violence. Those who attack Coalition forces will be punished. Second, the US must ensure that the occupation is temporary. It must define its goal – to assist Iraq in becoming self-sufficient. Third, a “greater international presence” would provide assurance to the Iraqi people that the US does not intend to “colonize the country.” Moreover, the US and the international community should maintain some leverage over Iraq’s political development even after the US occupation ends.

The US must provide better services to the Iraqis than the Shiite clergy. Baram explains that Shiite clergy derive their following and influence from their ability to provide adequate social services, including humanitarian and technical support. “All services and economic aid must come from a central authority in Baghdad, and must be understood by all as coming from there.”

The US must gain support for democracy within the three major communities: Kurds, Sunni Arabs, and Shiite Arabs. These communities will be represented in the government.

The US must empower the minorities. Iraqi women should be encouraged to establish institutions and practices for socialization and progression. Although the Kurds and Sunnis are minorities, together, they form a majority. They must be encouraged to participate in the new state to counter Shiite dominance.

Through the media, the Iraqi people should be exposed to the discontent of the Iranian people, in particular the younger generation, and the tyrannical behavior of the Iranian mullahs should be denounced.

For the first time in decades, the Iraqi people have an opportunity to assert their identities. The Shiite Arabs are a majority and they want to secure their position within Iraq. Despite the massive demonstrations, few Iraqi leaders want to repeat the past.

The US and Israel: The Road Ahead

by Abraham D. Sofaer

Commentary Online

May 2, 2003

Abraham Sofaer is a Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution, Stanford University. Sofaer identifies the gaps in the Israel-Palestinian “road map” prepared by the US, the EU, the UN, and Russia, and provides policies and practices to the US that will result in a more effective diplomatic initiative.

The “road map” proposes a two-state solution to the Israel-Palestinian conflict. The plan is divided into three phases to be completed by 2005. During phase one, both Israel and Palestine are to declare an end to violence and terrorism. Palestine is to consolidate all security forces, and Israel is to cooperate in rebuilding a viable Palestinian security force. Phase two calls for the creation of the Palestinian state, and phase three is to result in a final agreement to settle any further issues.

Sofaer notes that the key problem with this road map is that there are expectations that this plan “will bring an end to Palestinian violence against Israel without addressing the reasons why Palestinians have deliberately and repeatedly chosen that path.” Sofaer explains that the Palestinian violence is the product of an environment that “fosters, shelters, encourages, and rewards acts aimed at nullifying Israel’s very existence.” It is the attitudes and actions of not only the Palestinians and the Arab world that enable the continuance of this conflict, but also those of the US and the international community.

Sofaer offers policies and practices to be applied to three issues: terrorism, Palestinian violence, and the acceptance of Israeli statehood. “Some longstanding American policies,” Sofaer writes, “have contributed to terrorism, and espe-

cially terrorism against Israel.” For example, the UN Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) subsidizes refugee camps that breed terrorism. Millions of people, many of whom are not refugees, subsist in horrendous conditions without any structure. Sofaer suggests a new program that would include plans for building homes for refugees and to encourage refugees to relocate. He also calls for a reassessment of the Palestinian education system. This system, partially funded by the UN, cultivates vitriolic attitudes towards the state of Israel in addition to “intolerance, fanaticism, and martyrdom.”

The US must recognize the seriousness of Palestinian violence. The Palestinian Authority (PA) and other terrorist groups receive massive funding from “private companies, humanitarian fronts, and wealthy individuals, some of them with American addresses.” Sofaer states that the US has been aware of the terrorist activities of organizations such as Hamas, which operate in Israel, yet continues to criticize Israel for capturing or killing the leaders of these organizations; “Such conduct,” he says, “is part of every state’s legitimate self-defense.”

EDITOR’S NOTE:

As we go to press, a summit has taken place in Aqaba, Jordan involving Jordanian King Abdullah II, Palestinian Prime Minister Mahmoud Abbas, Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon, and President Bush. Prime Minister Abbas affirmatively addressed the issue as defined by Sofaer: “there can be no peace until the Arabs of the region openly accept the existence of Israel as a permanent, sovereign state.” There may be cause for cautious optimism.

Why the Security Council Failed

by Michael J. Glennon

Foreign Affairs, May/June 2003

pp. 16-35

Michael Glennon is Professor of International Law at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University. Glennon examines three forces that discredited the United Nations Security Council: power, culture, and international law, and why these forces destabilized this institution.

According to Glennon, it was not the military conflict in Iraq that sealed the fate of the Security Council but the rise of American unilateralism. "Since the end of the cold war," Glennon states, "the French, the Chinese, and the Russians have sought to return the world to a more balanced system." The circumstances surrounding the conflict in Iraq were the culmination of decades of tension. France, China, and Russia seized the opportunity to use their position as members of the Security Council to thwart US efforts and prevent US advancement.

Another "fault line" that exists between the US and other UN states is cultural. It divides the North and South from the East and West especially on the issue of the use of force and humanitarian intervention. A further divide exists between the US and the rest of the West, in particular, the US and Europe, over the role of international law — who should make the rules: the states or supranational institutions? When should the rules be made? Because supranational institutions such as the European Union make decisions on behalf of Europeans, they are "comfortable with impingements on their sover-

eignty...Security Council decisions limiting the use of force are but one example." The US, however, would not permit an international regime to determine its policies. Americans prefer corrective laws that leave the field open to competition, and Europeans prefer preventive laws that avert crises.

"More than anything else, however, it has been still another underlying difference in attitude -- over the need to comply with the UN's rules on the use of force -- that has proved most disabling to the UN system." In framing the charter, the international community failed to anticipate when force would be deemed unacceptable. Glennon states that "the default position" of international law has been, "if no restriction has been authoritatively established, a country is considered free to act." The lesson — the use of force cannot be subject to archaic international law. This does not imply that the rules of the UN are dead and that international rule of law is ineffective. However, it does imply that the rules must be devised.

According to Glennon, one guiding principle underlies the destabilization of the UN Security Council: "states pursue security by pursuing power." Nations will continue to pursue power and self-interests. They will continue to disagree over the use of force. Therefore, new institutional laws should be devised based upon the reality of how nations behave. Glennon suggests considering the following questions: What are our objectives? What means have we chosen to meet those objectives? Are those means working? If not, why not? Are better alternatives available? What are they?

THE NATIONAL STRATEGY FORUM, INC.
53 West Jackson, Suite 516
Chicago, IL 60604

(312) 697-1286
(312) 697-1296 Fax
nsf@nationalstrategy.com
www.nationalstrategy.com