



THE DEFENSE MONITOR

The Center for Defense Information believes that strong social, economic, political, and military components and a healthy environment contribute equally to the nation's security. CDI opposes excessive expenditures for weapons and policies that increase the danger of war.

©1999 Center for Defense Information — Washington, DC

I.S.S.N. # 0195-6450

Volume XXVIII, Number 3

1999

This Time China Is Ours to Lose

"Who lost China?"

The question, really an accusation, became a congressional refrain in 1949 and 1950 after the Chinese communists under Mao Tse-tung drove America's World War II ally, Generalissimo Chang Kai-shek, from the Asian mainland. The congressional search for those who were "responsible," who were "soft on communism," devastated the State Department's China section and set back U.S. understanding of that nation for years.

China, of course, was not ours to lose in 1949. But in 1999 it is.

Six factors are at work in the current uproar over U.S. policy toward China: human rights, particularly in but not limited to Tibet; transfer of satellite, communications, missile, and computer technology; Chinese technological aid to Middle East countries and to Pakistan; the persistent U.S. trade deficit with China; China's attempts to intimidate Taiwan; and Chinese spying, especially the possible loss of U.S. nuclear secrets.

Human Rights

Human rights is the only one of the six issues not politically driven. March 14 of this year was the 40th anniversary of the start of the failed Tibetan uprising against China's occupation of Tibet and the exile of the Dalai Lama. Since then the Tibetans have known neither political nor cultural freedom. The Tiananmen Square massacre was

(continued on page 5)

SPECIAL EDITION

In the Defense Monitor you usually read of weapons, defense budgets, military strategy and tactics, force levels and other topics focused closely on national security issues. This Monitor takes a broader, longer range look at American security in the 21st century by asking a fundamental question: will the future role of the United States in world affairs be based primarily on confrontation or cooperation?

America's Future: Confrontation or Cooperation?

Today Americans are the most fortunate people on earth. We are citizens of the most prosperous nation, the most powerful nation, a republic which has endured for more than 200 years under a Constitution which accords to each one of us the full protection of the law. Not only that, we are living here in the American Century. Never in the history of the world has one nation exercised the preeminent influence on world affairs which America has wielded in the 20th Century.

Given our immense good fortune, the question becomes, what lies ahead in the 21st Century for our children – and theirs? Will it be another American Century? Or could this great power slip away, be thrown away, and the 21st Century become the anti-American Century?

The answer to that depends on whether we attempt to perpetuate an American global hegemony as the world's only military superpower – or if we seek to exercise constructive leadership as a cooperative member in a peaceful world community governed by the rule of law.

It would seem that the lessons of history and common sense would make the choice very clear. After all, not one of the imperial regimes of history has ever secured a permanent place in the world order through military supremacy. Even in high school we learned of the rise and fall of empires – Assyrian, Persian, Roman, Ottoman, Austro-Hungarian. In this century we all watched the sun set on the British Empire as they exhausted their strength in the far reaches of Africa and Asia. One truth stands out in history – every nation or empire which would subjugate others will ultimately fail if it attempts to base its dominion on military force. There are two reasons for this. First, the people of the hegemon will finally refuse to make the sacrifices in blood and treasure necessary to maintain military control over others. Second, the subjugated will ultimately rise in opposition to reject the sovereign. The birth of the United States of America is a classic example of both of these principles in action. (continued on page 2)

Question:

How much did the President request and how much did Congress appropriate in emergency spending for DoD and for humanitarian support in Kosovo?

see page 5

In the face of history and common sense, the U.S. Congress and the Executive seemed determined to deny both by making military power the primary instrument of U.S. foreign policy. We are the only nation in history which has formally divided the globe into military zones and appointed a general or an admiral to be commander-in-chief within each zone. We keep nearly a quarter of a million uniformed troops permanently assigned to these commanders, heavily armed and fully combat ready to intervene militarily in not one, but two conflicts anywhere on earth and to win both wars nearly simultaneously. President Clinton has proclaimed that we will act multilaterally where possible but are prepared to act unilaterally when necessary.

This aggressive posture is called "forward presence" in current jargon. In truth, it is no more than gun boat diplomacy which, through the implied threat of military action, is intended to influence and control events to our advantage. This confrontational approach to foreign relations is extremely negative because it is based upon coercion rather than efforts to develop constructive approaches of mutual benefit. It also creates pressure to use military force when significant issues lead to public awareness of pending problems with another nation. All too often the United States finds that gun boat diplomacy puts us in a position where the use of force will not resolve a problem but we will look foolish and impotent if we fail to act after threatening to do so. Kosovo is only the latest example of this process.

Nuclear Confrontation

Yet another dangerous, perhaps fatal, form of confrontation is intensifying through U.S. nuclear policies. In 1995 we led efforts to extend the Non-Proliferation Treaty indefinitely. To inspire the non-nuclear states to agree, we joined the other four nuclear powers to make a formal

pledge in a statement titled, "Principles and Objectives For Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament." This contained a joint commitment to "the determined pursuit by the nuclear weapons states of systematic and progressive efforts to reduce nuclear weapons globally, with the ultimate goal of eliminating those weapons...." To a layman, that is an unequivocal commitment to get rid of all nuclear weapons.

Despite this, two years later President Clinton flatly renounced any intention to honor that commitment. In Presidential Decision Directive #60, parts of which were revealed to the media, he approved a policy which declared that nuclear weapons would remain the cornerstone of U.S. security indefinitely. The directive also sets forth a number of other policies directly contrary to the goals of non-proliferation.

Forward presence...is no more than gun boat diplomacy.

This directive is supported by many ongoing measures to sustain and enhance U.S. nuclear warfighting capabilities at an annual cost of more than \$30 billion. Our deeds, which speak far more clearly than our empty promises, send clear signals to the world community that the world's foremost nuclear power regards its weapons as key elements of national security and military strength. This is an affront to all of the nations which consented to the indefinite extension of the Non-Proliferation Treaty at our urging, and it openly confronts other nations with the need to create their own nuclear weapons.

Isolation as Confrontation

Turning from these dangerous confrontational military measures, consider another form of confrontation: American unwillingness to enter into or support constructive

cooperative measures within the community of nations. As the world's superpower we stand aloof from the community. Such growing isolation is pernicious and endangers our long term interests economically, politically and militarily.

The Law of the Sea Convention

The starkest example of growing isolation is epitomized in the U.N. Convention on the Law of the Sea. Negotiations on this major effort to develop international law began in 1958 with strong U.S. participation and leadership. This process took 36 years to come to fruition in a Convention which met every significant U.S. security, economic, and legal requirement.

Isolation is pernicious and endangers our long term interests.

President Clinton submitted it to the U.S. Senate for advice and consent to ratification four years ago. Regrettably, the LOS Convention came into force on November 16, 1994 without American accession which is still being blocked in the U.S. Senate.

The result is that the United States has lost all rights to participate in the administration of the Treaty. We are barred from membership on the LOS Tribunal and the Continental Shelf Commission as well as the right to name arbitrators to the special arbitral panels where inter-state disputes will be settled. Furthermore, we are barred from membership in the International Sea Bed Authority where parties to the Convention organize and direct exploitation of the mineral resources of the deep seabed.

In short, the Senate has isolated America from the development of a body of international law which covers 70% of the earth's surface and protects freedom of navigation, fisheries, the oceanic environment and the wealth

of the global seabed. Worse, we are doing this even though the provisions of the Convention have been shaped through strong U.S. leadership to protect all of America's political, economic and security interests. It is difficult to conceive of a more foolish, shortsighted failure to advance the rule of law in the world order, nor one more certain to generate unnecessary confrontations with other nations.

The International Criminal Court

A similar failure occurred last year in Rome. In this case our negotiations were on the provisions for an International Criminal Court. In the early phases of this initiative the U.S. was a leading proponent of a permanent international tribunal which would have jurisdiction over war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide. In effect, we were working to create a permanent successor to the Nuremberg Tribunal and obviate the need for *ad hoc* arrangements for special bodies such as the one now sitting in the Hague to consider crimes committed during the dismemberment of Yugoslavia.

Unfortunately, our efforts were directed toward creating a Tribunal which would remain firmly under the control of the U.N. Security Council where we could exercise a U.S. veto if the ICC moved to act in a way we considered inimical to U.S. interests. During increasingly acrimonious deliberations in Rome in June and July, U.S. insistence on retaining a means to deny jurisdiction to the ICC created a storm of criticism of the U.S. position by even our closest friends and allies. The final vote in Rome on a charter for the ICC was 120-7 against the U.S. position. Even worse than the crushing defeat is that America voted with nations such as Iraq, Libya and Yemen, radical states little noted for their devotion to human rights and the rule of law.

Now it appears certain that the overwhelming majority of the world's

democracies will become participating members in an effort initiated by the U.S. to expand the rule of law within the world community. It is sadly ironic that the world's leading democracy has chosen to exclude itself from this initiative. It is even more disheartening that this is only one more among many efforts to establish just and peaceful international norms to which the U.S. refuses to accede.

Other U.S. Rejected International Agreements

Other international agreements which the United States has yet to ratify are the Comprehensive [Nuclear] Test Ban Treaty, the Convention on the Rights of the Child, and the Ottawa Anti-Personnel Land Mine Treaty. The first of these three is absolutely critical to efforts to control future proliferation of nuclear weapons. There is strong public support in America for the Test Ban Treaty and it seems Senate approval is certain if members are permitted to vote. Regrettably, Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC) continues to refuse to hold hearings in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the Treaty in order to prevent a vote by all Senators.

The Convention on the Rights of the Child of 1989, now in force, has been signed by 191 nations. Only Somalia and the United States have not signed. This basic humane declaration that the children of the world have certain inalienable rights sets forth standards which are American to the core. Nevertheless, there seems to be an instinctive U.S. rejection on the grounds that other nations have no right to prescribe the rights of American children. Another sticking point is the current effort by signatories to raise the minimum age for military service from 15 to 18, to which the Pentagon is adamantly opposed.

The Ottawa Treaty outlawing anti-personnel land mines came into force on March 1st this year but is also

strongly opposed by the Pentagon. President Clinton has conceded that at some date in the future we will consider adhering to the Treaty, but first we must find military alternatives to these indiscriminate killers of soldiers and innocent civilians alike. Meanwhile, we ignore the fact that more than 133 nations are already committed to the ban while we stand in opposition with such nations as China, Iraq, Iran, Syria, Congo, and Cuba.

Our leaders seem to believe that...we alone are empowered to proclaim and enforce standards.

Even more contentious is the current U.S. position on the Chemical Weapons Convention which outlaws the manufacture, possession or use of chemical weapons. It was entirely logical and helpful for the United States to ratify this international convention two years ago because by public law we are required to eliminate our own arsenal of chemical weapons by the year 2004. If we are going to be without such weapons in five years, it is devoutly to be desired that other nations also eliminate theirs, and 168 nations have already agreed to do this. Unfortunately, the U.S. Congress refuses to appropriate the money needed to implement the verification inspections required by the Convention. Now many other signatories are balking at implementing the agreement because the United States is not in compliance with its requirements. This is a classic case of refusing to cooperate in an international program to do exactly what the United States wants done because some members of Congress do not want "foreigners" to have the right to inspect U.S. facilities.

This attitude seems to be at the very root of America's rejection of cooperative efforts to make the world

a safer place under the rule of law. Chauvinistic jingoists claim to see a threat to U.S. sovereignty in every agreement which subjects Americans to international norms. Our leaders seem to believe that as the world's most powerful nation we alone are empowered to proclaim and enforce standards and judgments anywhere in the world. We refuse to accept any international rules adopted by global consensus which could in any way infringe upon or limit U.S. freedom to act independently in our own interests as we define them.

Paying the Costs of Confrontation

The purpose of detailing these specific examples of U.S. resistance to Conventions which propose to bind us to international law is to illustrate how confrontational America is. The spirit of the world's remaining superpower seems to be, as President George Bush put it so elegantly, "We call the shots." To some degree, that is true. We do today – but how about tomorrow? There is a critical reason to be concerned about that question. No nation is wealthy enough to sustain the burden indefinitely of being the superpower on guard everywhere around the globe. This year we will spend more than \$290 billion to perform that role, and the present five year plan calls for increases each year through 2005 when military spending will reach \$333 billion. This would be more, on average, than we spent confronting the Soviet Union during 40 years of the Cold War, but today we have no significant military enemy nor is there one in the foreseeable future.

American citizens will soon become unwilling to pay the costs...of serving as the world's policeman.

At exactly the same time that military spending is climbing steeply, spending for the conduct of International Affairs by the Department of State is on the

rocks. The White House requested only \$17.4 billion for Fiscal Year 2000 and the Senate Budget Resolution has reduced that figure to \$12.5 billion while increasing military spending by another \$8.8 billion. For some time the U.S. military has been the primary instrument of U.S. foreign policy, but if these trends continue our military forces may well become the only tool of U.S. foreign policy.

We can use the gift of time to build a new, long term approach to security in the 21st Century.

There are two other reasons, mentioned earlier, why military domination is not possible in the long term. Lacking a military threat, American citizens will soon become unwilling to pay the costs, in blood and treasure, of serving as the world's policeman. Troop barracks in foreign lands afford vulnerable targets for terrorists who resent our military presence. It costs an extra \$1.8 billion per year just to pay for 7,000 troops in Bosnia. Our present intervention in Yugoslavia will cost far more than that. Think also of what we are paying to keep more than 200,000 troops overseas at all times. The other reason is that foreign nations will ultimately reject our efforts to maintain a military-based hegemony permanently. If the Philippine people can throw us out after 90 years, it can and will happen elsewhere. Okinawa may well be next.

All of this simply reflects history. Empires rise and fall. Alliances wax and wane. Wars erupt and subside – with few long term changes or benefits. In trying to perpetuate a concept of foreign relations based on military power, the U.S. is wasting a priceless opportunity to move from a confrontational posture to a cooperative one. Jonathan Schell's latest book, *The Gift of Time*, focuses on the need to get rid of nuclear

weapons while there is no active threat to American security except nuclear weapons. By extension, we can use the gift of time to build a new, long term approach to security in the 21st Century.

From Confrontation to Cooperation

Progress from confrontation to cooperation can be advanced one step at a time through practical measures of international cooperation such as U.S. accession to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. In this one step we would accept the jurisdiction of international tribunals and panels capable of peacefully resolving international disputes in regions covering 70% of the earth's surface.

Another step is to achieve U.S. acceptance of the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court and increased submission of disputes for adjudication by the International Court of Justice at the Hague. Implementing the already ratified Chemical Weapons Convention is a straightforward legislative matter while accession to the Ottawa Anti-Personnel Land Mine Treaty and the U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child will require an affirmative response by both the Defense Department and the Senate. All these measures already have strong acceptance in the world community and active constituencies here in the United States.

Step by step progress in international cooperation will make it possible to increase confidence in and support for the concept of global governance. Only then can we finally turn to the U.N. and help it grow into the role of world peacekeeper for which it was created 50 years ago with U.S. leadership.

The future security and well being of all Americans rests on far more than tanks, aircraft carriers and strategic bombers. As the present tragic situation in Kosovo demonstrates vividly, we cannot wave America's magic

superpower wand to make long standing problems disappear. Our security, and the solution to such problems in the future,

will be promoted far more effectively through wise U.S. foreign policies that lead away from

confrontation and make America the leader in a more peaceful, cooperative world order in the 21st Century.

CDI RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE U.S. FOR A PEACEFUL 21st CENTURY

1. Work cooperatively in the United Nations and in regional fora such as the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and the Organization of American States to develop global and regional norms of peaceful conduct for the increasingly interdependent world community of the 21st Century.
2. Ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, declare a U.S. "no first-use policy," de-alert strategic weapons now and develop verification procedures for separation of warheads from delivery vehicles.
3. Proceed, in conjunction with Russia, with phased reductions of nuclear weapons to 1,000, at which point other nuclear powers should be invited to join discussions on further reductions.
4. Ratify international treaties such as the Law of the Sea Convention that will bind all nations into agreements in which international tribunals or panels have the authority to resolve disputes before they lead to violence.
5. Accept the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court and employ the power of the International Court of Justice at the Hague to resolve international disputes peacefully.
6. Enact legislation to implement the already ratified Chemical Weapons Convention, and ratify the Ottawa Anti-Personnel Land Mine Treaty and the U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child as has been done by the majority of the world's nations.

(continued from page 1 "China")

but ten years ago, and Chinese authorities continue to harass, arrest, and imprison those who speak out or test the limits of political freedom. Further, the State Department's annual Country Report on Human Rights Practices for 1998 (released in February 1999) notes that the Chinese government "continued to commit widespread and well-documented human rights abuses, in violation of internationally accepted norms."

Ever sensitive to their own problems with ethnic minorities, the Chinese initially and unequivocally condemned NATO's air campaign against Slobodan Milosevic's ethnic cleansing of Kosovo. More recently, official Chinese media have started reporting on the humanitarian disaster created by Yugoslav forces. Chinese authorities reportedly have also created committees to review current policies toward ethnic minorities in China.

Technology Transfer Issues

The controversy surrounding the unauthorized transfer of technology by Loral and Hughes Electronics is complicated by the separate controversy over corporate political donations. On the basic issue, it was President Reagan who first decided to allow launches of U.S.

commercial satellites using Chinese launch facilities. Since 1988, twenty U.S. satellites have been launched by China. What changed under the Clinton Administration was the locus of U.S. licensing authority which moved from the State to the Commerce Department. Nonetheless, as before, Pentagon representatives continued to safeguard each satellite being launched by the Chinese until the launch was completed.

The practice of using Chinese facilities became a political issue only when the failure of a Chinese rocket destroyed a \$200 million U.S. communications satellite. In consulting with the Chinese on how to avoid future failures, a Loral subdivision may have provided information useful in military applications. Subsequent hearings

in Congress (chiefly that chaired by Representative Christopher Cox (R-CA), whose report was issued May 25) concluded that the Chinese military probably benefitted from these discussions as the missiles used to launch commercial satellites are virtually the same as Chinese intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM). Reacting to the congressional uproar, the White House reversed its earlier decision transferring licensing authority for commercial satellite exports to the Commerce Department.

Equally contentious is the transfer of missile technology from China to Pakistan, Iran, Iraq, and even Saudi Arabia. In the early 1990s China agreed to observe the restrictions contained in the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR). However, as China did not sign the MTCR it could not be held to that promise and in fact continued

Answer:

The President requested \$5.49 billion for DoD and \$566 million for humanitarian assistance in Kosovo. Congress doubled both: it gave DoD \$10.87 billion and appropriated \$1.07 billion for Kosovo relief.

selling missile technology. In 1993 the U.S. imposed sanctions, and in October 1994 the Chinese again agreed to abide by the principles of the MTCR. In April 1998, John Holum, then Acting Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security Affairs, said that the U.S. had “no reason to believe they have violated those specific commitments.” Furthermore, in March 1999 the Chinese undertook to “actively study” formal membership in the MTCR.

We simply must do a better job of protecting our technology.

While the U.S. sees a continuing threat from a China outside the MTCR, the Chinese see a threat from U.S. plans to deploy a “limited” national missile defense (NMD) against rogue nations and accidental launches of a few missiles. Such a U.S. system would virtually render impotent China’s current ICBM force. Unlike Russia, the Chinese have no more than 20 missiles capable of reaching American territory. The logical, almost inevitable Chinese response to U.S. deployment of NMD will be to increase their strategic forces. It is difficult to accept that America would be more secure from missile attack by deploying a “limited” NMD if the result is an increased Chinese offensive nuclear capability aimed at America.

Those who want tight controls on United States-Chinese technological exchanges and business ventures overlook the fact that technology inevitably diffuses outward. At best, the U.S. might be able to slow this diffusion, but it cannot be stopped. While it is important to safeguard our technology both for military and commercial reasons, punitive steps against a country that succeeds in obtaining information is not the proper response to a failure on the part of U.S. safeguards. We simply must do a better job of protecting our technology.

Nuclear Secrets

This is also the lesson from the latest alleged security breach at Los Alamos National Weapons Laboratory. A Taiwanese born U.S. citizen is thought to have provided information to China about how the U.S. miniaturizes nuclear warheads and to have transferred other nuclear weapons data from a classified to an unclassified computer from which the information could be retrieved by uncleared persons. The security breaches apparently occurred in the late 1980s and into the 1990s but were discovered only in 1995. Although the suspect has not been formally charged with espionage, he has been dismissed from the lab and the Department of Energy has introduced new, stricter security and counterintelligence measures.

That China seeks U.S. technology of all kinds and will employ “spies” to obtain it should come as no surprise. Even our “friends” spy on us, as we do on them. Overall, more harm in the late Cold War era and in the 1990s has been done, not by foreigners, but by U.S. citizens such as Aldrich Ames and Jonathan Pollard. Again the fault lies not so much with those who benefit from the spying but in the failure of U.S. security procedures. As Senator Arlen Specter (R-PA) said, “I regard it as a national security problem for the nation because the errors were made on the watches of both Republicans and Democrats.”

Taiwan

It is important to recognize that both China and Taiwan accept that there is only “one China.” Differences lie in the manner in which this status will be maintained and the degree of autonomy Taiwan will have within “one China.” In the interim, both are locked into a complex interaction of economic engagement, political dialogue, calculated defiance and the

threat of force. Thus in 1996 China fired ballistic missiles into the Taiwan Straits when the island was preparing for presidential elections. More recently, China has moved additional missiles into the mainland provinces closest to Taiwan. In turn, Taiwan is considering development of a missile defense system and has approached the U.S. for possible assistance. As mandated by the Fiscal Year 1999 National Defense Authorization Act, the Pentagon in May issued a report that details potential missile defense needs for Taiwan and other East Asian allies.

More harm [to national security] has been done, not by foreigners, but by U.S. citizens.

Despite these and other tensions created by the continued U.S. transfer of weapons to Taiwan, China has agreed to resume its on-off dialogue with Taiwan. As talks resume, the U.S. should carefully avoid unilateral actions that might sour the atmosphere and lead to renewed Chinese-Taiwanese confrontation. To this end, discreet communications from the U.S. should remind the government of Taiwan that we will not come to their defense if a conflict arises as a result of deliberately provocative actions by Taiwan such as declaring independence from China.

Trade

Finally, there is the imbalance of trade with China. Considering other U.S.-Chinese issues, some believe this is an unmerited benefit to China of the U.S. policy of engagement. Yet every year Congress votes to retain China’s most-favored-nation trade status with the United States. Some in Congress also oppose China’s bid to enter the World Trade Organization (WTO), a bid unexpectedly rejected by President Clinton when Chinese Premier Zhu Rongji visited the U.S. in April. (Subsequently, Mr. Clinton pledged to work for Chinese admission before the

November 1999 meeting of the WTO.) At the same time, House Resolution 56 urges the Administration to support Taiwan's application to join the WTO and Senate Resolution 26 urges reinstatement of Taiwan's membership in the World Health Organization. To say that these send conflicting signals to China is clearly an understatement.

Cooperation vs. Confrontation

If we truly want to enlist China to help effect constructive, cooperative changes which would increase the security of both our nations, we should abandon the practice of publicly criticizing China for what we deem unacceptable practices. Nothing is clearer than the fact that China will react negatively, sometimes even violently, to such criticism. Neither their political system nor their long, proud culture permit them to tolerate moralistic lecturing by foreigners who profess the superiority of their own systems, values and judgments. To work out mutually beneficial compromises and accommodations, we must employ very private contacts through

commercial, scientific, and diplomatic channels rather than bombastic declarations by members of Congress and the Executive branch. Furthermore, whenever possible, discussions, particularly those concerning human rights and trade, should proceed on a multilateral basis so that Chinese concessions do not appear to be coerced by the United States.

China is not...an adversary – and will not become one unless U.S. policies drive China into this position.

We must never be under any illusion that China is a “strategic partner” of the United States. On many issues where interests coincide, we can work with China, but China is and will remain an economic, political, and military competitor. Conversely, China is not the new “evil empire” or even an adversary – and will not become one unless U.S. policies drive China into this position.

The Administration and Congress must decide precisely what the U.S. wants from China; what costs in what areas (political, economic, military) we are willing to incur to achieve our long-range objectives; and what, if any, are the alternatives available in pursuit of these objectives.

Once these questions are answered, the U.S. must act with patience, recognizing that China is in a period of modernization and transformation as significant as any in its long history. At the same time, we must act with resolve, insisting that the Chinese government accept international norms of behavior with respect to the human and political rights of its citizens and abide by other international treaties and agreements.

If we get it wrong, we will “lose China” by making her our enemy.

If we get it right, we will have a worthy competitor, sometime partner, and non-threatening neighbor in the Pacific. That is a combination hard to surpass.

CDI RECOMMENDATIONS FOR U.S. RELATIONS WITH CHINA

1. Stop publicly demonizing China or attempting to cast China as the new “evil empire” in place of the former USSR.
2. Press for Chinese formal accession to the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR). In the interim, press for Chinese adherence to the principles of the MTCR.
3. Resume talks with the Chinese on the conditions for Chinese accession to the World Trade Organization which, by requiring China to open more of its economy to world competition, could ease the current U.S. - Chinese trade imbalance.
4. Carefully review any potential U.S. arms sales to Taiwan solely on the basis of U.S. national security interests. Arms should not be transferred to maintain or enhance the commercial health of U.S. arms manufacturers.
5. Accept our responsibility for the failure of U.S. counterintelligence agencies to detect and prevent the alleged loss of U.S. nuclear technology to China rather than trying to blame the Chinese for “stealing” secrets. Tighten security procedures.



If you have one or more friends who you think would enjoy receiving our Defense Monitor, please let us know the name and address of such person(s). We are anxious to expand our mailing list and share CDI's very professional analyses of these very important military issues.



What Does It All Mean?

The message of this Defense Monitor is, quite simply, the need to avoid a 21st Century repeat of the disastrous conflicts the world endured in the 20th. As the world's leading economic and military power, the U.S. is uniquely situated to influence the course of international events. Our goals – avoiding war, stopping the spread of nuclear weapons, reducing worldwide arms expenditures – will be reached only if we can preclude renewed military competition with other nations. Thus the main objective of our international strategy must be to bring our main competitors, Russia and China, into the family of nations as partners, not adversaries. We may still compete, but peaceful competition will be less costly and much less dangerous than military confrontation. For our children as for ourselves, such cooperation is the only rational choice.



Center for Defense Information
1779 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036
(202)332-0600 • Fax: (202)462-4559
www.cdi.org

NONPROFIT ORG.
US POSTAGE
PAID
Washington D.C.
Permit No. 4627

Address Correction Requested

For a single copy of this issue, send \$1.00. CDI's publication, *The Defense Monitor*, is sent without charge to all donors of \$35 or more. CDI receives no funds from the Pentagon or from military contractors. The Center is financed by voluntary tax-deductible contributions from individuals and grants from foundations. Contributions may be mailed to the Center for Defense Information, 1779 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Washington DC 20036. Attention: Sen. Dale Bumpers, (Ret.).



THE STAFF

Director:
Dale Bumpers, U.S. Senator (Ret.)

Deputy Director:
Rear Admiral Eugene J. Carroll, Jr.
U.S.N. (Ret.)

Chairman of Board:
Rear Admiral Gene R. La Rocque
U.S.N. (Ret.)

Chief of Staff:
Mary Davis

Chief of Research:
Colonel Daniel Smith
U.S.A. (Ret.)

Senior Fellows:
David T. Johnson
Lt. Colonel Piers M. Wood
U.S.A.R. (Ret.)

Administrative Assistant:
Eleanor Harrison

Research Staff:
Christopher Hellman
Oscar Lurie
Anna Klingsberg
Jeffrey Mason
Rachel Stohl
Tomas Valasek

Interns:

Douglas Black (Georgetown)
Theodore W. Bridges (Georgetown)
Doug Gritzmacher (Washington St.)
Greg Wilson

Systems Manager:

Mark Ashton

Web Design:

David Groomes

TV Production Staff

America's Defense Monitor:

Glenn Baker
Moon Callison
Laura Feinstein
Jon Lottman
Stephen Sapienza
Mark Sugg

Development:

Lynn Schuster

Consultants:

Samuel J. Gorlitz
Margaret Brenman-Gibson, Professor,
Harvard University School
of Medicine

Principal Analysts This Issue:

Colonel Daniel Smith
U.S.A. (Ret.)
Rear Admiral Eugene J. Carroll, Jr.
U.S.N. (Ret.)

BOARD OF ADVISORS

Doris Z. Bato—Santa Fe, NM
Arthur D. Berliss, Jr.—Captain, USNR (Ret.); former Vice-President, Allen-Hollander Co., New York, NY
Edward H.R. Blitzer—Former Chairman, Lightolier Inc., New York, NY
Dick Brukenfeld—Dobbs Ferry, NY
Ben Cohen—Chairman, Ben & Jerry's Homemade, Inc., South Burlington, VT
James R. Compton—President, J.R. Compton Developments; Chair, Fund for Peace Board, Los Gatos, CA
Joseph N. Deblinger—President, Deblinger Sales & Marketing Corp., Manhasset, NY
Gay Dillingham—CNS Communications, Santa Fe, NM
James A. Donovan—Colonel, USMC (Ret.), Author, former publisher Journal of the Armed Forces, Atlanta, GA
Robert L. Frome—Senior Partner, Olshan, Grundman and Frome, Attorneys, New York, NY
Seth M. Glickenhau—Investment Banker, New York, NY
Yoel Haller, M.D.—Santa Barbara, CA
Mrs. Eva Haller—Santa Barbara, CA
Dr. James D. Head—President, Strategy Development Company, Freeland, MI
David H. Horowitz—New York, NY
Robert G. James—Rear Admiral, USNR (Ret.), President, Enterprise Development Associates, New York, NY
Dr. Alan F. Kay—Businessman, St. Augustine, FL

Eugene M. Lang—Founder/ Chairman Emeritus, REFAC Technology Development Corp. and "I Have A Dream" Foundation, New York, NY
Paul Newman—Motion Pictures, Los Angeles, CA
Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Pulitzer IV—St. Louis, MO
Rudolph S. Rasin—President, The Rasin Corporation, Chicago, IL
John M. Rockwood—Publisher, Chicago, IL
Martha S. Schaus—River Forest, IL
Julie Schecter, Ph.D.—Director, Peaked Hill Trust, Wayland, MA
Richard Schuckman—Business Executive, Fair Lawn, NJ
John J. Shanahan—Vice Admiral, USN (Ret.), Ormond Beach, FL
Luella B. Slaner—Scarsdale, NY
Adele E. Starr—Mamaroneck, NY
Phillip A. Straus—Partner, Neuberger and Berman, Members, New York Stock Exchange, New York, NY
Phillip A. Straus, Jr.—Photographer, Philadelphia, PA
Andrew Ungerleider—Earthstone International Ltd., Santa Fe, NM
Albert B. Wells—President, The Abelard Foundation, Inc.; Kingsley, Schreck, Wells & Reichling, Private Investments, San Francisco, CA
Harold Willens—Former Chairman, Factory Equipment Corporation, Los Angeles, CA
Joanne Woodward—Actress-Director, Westport, CT

© Copyright 1999 by the Center for Defense Information. The Center for Defense Information encourages quotation and reprinting of any of the material, provided the Center is credited. The Center requests a copy of such use.