



National Security Law Report

Volume 16, Number 11 STANDING COMMITTEE ON LAW AND NATIONAL SECURITY November 1994

Dr. Edward Teller Emphasizes Need for International Cooperation

Dr. Edward Teller, the legendary "father of the atom bomb," addressed the Standing Committee's November 9 monthly breakfast meeting. In one of the most humorous presentations in recent memory, Dr. Teller discussed a wide-range of issues concerning the nation's future.

While the current state of affairs is not "horrible," he said there was a "complete absence of hope" for the future among many voters. In reality, he said, "we have enormous opportunities," but these opportunities are "temporary" and they "are being missed." We can not keep missing them much longer "without disastrous consequences."

One of these opportunities, he said, is the collapse of the Soviet Union—an "incredible accomplishment." A native Hungarian, Dr. Teller said that after not having visited that country for more than fifty years, he has visited Hungary more than five times since the collapse of the Soviet Union. This has given him a vivid impression of how important the collapse has been, and he believes that "we now have an opportunity for a new, stable, and just international order—not one dominated by the United States but one based on the kind of agreement that disagreeing people can achieve."

The solution is not a simple expression like "democracy" or "international law"—which he argued "does not exist" because the "common emotional foundations" do not exist. It is the creation of international foundations of common understanding and common behavior on which future laws will have to be built. The critical trend is "cooperation."

For example, we have the means of observing from the ground and from space everything from

"who is preparing for aggression," and "what the weather will be like," to "what is the truth about contamination." This is something from which everyone can participate and benefit. International cooperation makes sense for everyone. He said that he found more understanding of the need for cooperation during his recent visit to Moscow than he finds in Washington.

Turning next to the recently announced nuclear agreement with North Korea, Dr. Teller said "The fact that the Korean deal was necessary, that we had to buy off a bunch of nobodies who don't know how to govern at all," has "encouraged two dozen other nations to behave in a way that we will have to buy them off—that is the problem." He lamented that "We did not use the passing advantage of an open world which at best comes once in a century."

The possibilities of "technology" are limitless, he said. For example, modern developments in DNA research give us "the opportunity to improve the animals and vegetables on which we live." He said we are "full of fears" of how new knowledge can hurt us—"even to the absurd extent of not to acquire that new knowledge, as though we were the only ones in

Continued on page 2

Les Aspin to Address January 19 Breakfast

Former Secretary of Defense Les Aspin has agreed to address the Standing Committee's first breakfast of 1995, which will take place at the International Club on Thursday, January 19.

A veteran of two decades in the House of Representatives, where he chaired the Armed Services Committee, since early August Secretary Aspin has chaired the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board (PFIAB). By the time this issue is published he will probably have been named to chair the bipartisan 17-member presidential commission to study the role of the intelligence community in the post-Cold War world, which was established by the FY 1995 Intelligence Authorization Bill. For further information contact Holly Stewart McMahon (see box at the bottom of page 5).

Inside

- 3 Review—Rummel's *Death by Government*
- 3 Chemical Weapons Conference Set
- 4 Calendar of Events

Teller Breakfast . . .

Continued from page 1

the world capable of acquiring that new knowledge." Fear of freon has started to hurt us "to the tune of billions of dollars a year." It is argued that freon will deplete the ozone layer by the year 2030, he noted, but "the amount is only the difference between New York and Washington." "You can achieve that same catastrophe," he argued, "by being elected to the House from New York."

"We regulate and we regulate, but we fail to understand." We need to understand both what to do on the international scene, and what to do about the solely American idea of "progress." Don't "regulate it away," he said, but "use it."

While arguing that international law is "at present impossible," he recognized an important role for lawyers at the present time. The task at this stage is not "to formulate the laws," but rather "to agree upon an approach to the laws—the development of laws." The American *Federalist* papers performed the splendid service of pointing out that "all government is evil," he argued, and thus we ought to have a minimum of it. "This was a discussion that paid off."

"I am not talking about a world government at all, I am talking about a world-wide consciousness of what is right and what is wrong." He argued that all of the "doomsayers"—about contamination, about running out of materials—are wrong. "We have only one problem, and it is tremendous: how to get along with each other. That is not the exclusive business of lawyers, it is everybody's business. But it is the business of lawyers to notice how the rules of behavior emerge and how then can be formulated, how conditions can be solidified."

Dr. Teller concluded by saying: "We have great opportunities ahead of us, in the international sphere and in the sphere of new science. . . . Surely, this new capability will call for regulation, not forbidding it but regulating it. This is a tremendous challenge, and to my mind this is where people here in this room can contribute most."

During the question period, Dr. Teller discussed one of his ideas for weapons of the future. He argued that the technology exists to design an anti-sniper system that would identify incoming bullets from the heat produced as they travel through air, track back to their source, and automatically return effective fire against the shooter. Such a system, he argued would send a message: "If you shoot at me, you may or may not hit me, but you will be dead in half-a-second." He indicated that such a system could be particularly useful in protecting

forces in places like Bosnia and Rwanda.

Asked about the continuing need for a Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), Dr. Teller responded: "Missile defense works because of rapidly increasing methods of great accuracy so that we can hit a missile with a missile in a very effective way." It works well, whether the threat is high explosive, chemical, biological, or nuclear. He said that senior Soviet officials had identified fear of SDI as one of the "strong reasons for the collapse of the Soviet Union." For a fraction of what we will otherwise spend, we could within three years build a missile defense system that would discourage "all of these relatively petty aggressions" from less powerful States.

In response to a question about future nuclear weapons policy, Dr. Teller discussed the possibility of building "multi-ton" yield highly accurate nuclear weapons in lieu of weapons yielding megatons or even kilotons of destructive power. A weapon with a yield of "a small fraction of a ton" might be used against conventional weapons. "The real mass killers have not been the nuclear explosions, which have killed a little more than 100 thousand people in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the mass killers are the tanks and airplanes—which killed 100 million." It may be, he said, that weapons accuracy will reach the point that eventually we may not need nuclear weapons.

Dr. Teller emphasized the need for international cooperation to stop proliferators. "I believe that we had best stop it, not under United States authority but on international authority—possibly United Nations authority." How to bring that about, he said, is "a very big problem, partly technical and partly political."

John H. Shenefield

Chairman, Standing Committee on Law and National Security

Holly Stewart McMahon

Staff Director

Robert F. Turner

Editor

Jackson R. Sharman III

Associate Editor

The *National Security Law Report*, which is published monthly, contains articles concerning the law relating to the security of the Nation and associated topics. The *National Security Law Report* is sponsored by the ABA Standing Committee on Law and National Security. The views expressed in this publication are not necessarily those of the Standing Committee or the American Bar Association. Comments or original articles should be directed to Professor Robert F. Turner, c/o Staff Director Holly Stewart McMahon at the Standing Committee's Washington office (see box on page 5).

Copyright © 1994 American Bar Association, ISSN 0736-2773.

BOOK REVIEW

by Robert F. Turner

DEATH BY GOVERNMENT

By Professor R.J. Rummel

New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers (1994)

Pages: 519. Price: \$49.95

This may well be the most important book on the subject of world peace written in decades. Its value is multiplied by its timing, for the solution it suggests may ultimately prove achievable in the aftermath of the Cold War.

Professor Rudy Rummel teaches in the Political Science Department at the University of Hawaii, where he also directs the Haiku Peace Research Center. For many years he has been doing research and writing books about conflict, war, genocide, and mass murder—including: *Lethal Politics: Soviet Genocide and Mass Murder since 1917* (1990), *China's Bloody Century: Genocide and Mass Murder since 1900* (1991), and *Democide: Nazi Genocide and Mass Murder* (1991).

Death by Government builds upon many years of careful research in addressing the problem of "democide"—government mass murder and genocide. After an introduction and three background chapters, Professor Rummel devotes four chapters to what he calls the "Dekamegamurders"—regimes that killed more than ten million of their own people. At the head of this category is the Soviet Union, followed by the People's Republic of China, Nazi

Germany, and the Nationalist Chinese regime of Chiang Kai-shek.

The next seven chapters are devoted to "The Lesser Megamurderers," beginning with Japan's military period and examining Cambodia under the Khmer Rouge, the extermination of Armenians in Turkey during the first quarter of the century, Communist Vietnam, Poland, and Yugoslavia, and Pakistan in the 1970s. The final three chapters discuss "the suspected megamurderers" of North Korea, Mexico (1900-1920), and Feudal Russia.

As is almost always the case, Professor Rummel's landmark contribution builds upon the work of many who have preceded him and many of his contemporaries. Indeed, the entire project began as an effort to "test the theory that democracies are inherently nonviolent"—a theory dating back at least to the publication of Immanuel Kant's *Perpetual Peace* in 1795, and embraced today in the works of such eminent scholars as Yale's Bruce Russett and Virginia's John Norton Moore.

In his preface, Professor Rummel summarizes his conclusions:

[T]he results here clearly and decisively show that democracies commit less democide than other regimes. These results also well illustrate the principle underlying all my findings on war, collective violence, and democide: The less freedom people have, the greater the violence; the more freedom, the less the violence. I offer this proposition here as the Power Principle: power kills, and absolute power kills absolutely. . . . What has kept me at this was the belief, as preliminary research seemed to suggest, that there was a positive solution to all this killing

Continued on page 4

Standing Committee to Cosponsor Chemical Weapons Conference

The Standing Committee has agreed to cosponsor a conference on "Implementing the Chemical Weapons Convention: The Nuts and Bolts of Compliance," at the Capitol Hilton Hotel in Washington DC on February 7, 1995. The convention, which will enter into force next year, is expected to receive Senate consent to ratification and be the subject of implementing legislation in the coming months. Unlike most arms control treaties, the CWC will impose substantial obligations upon private industry, including requirements for intrusive and warrantless inspections. While the program is still being finalized, an impressive list of participants have already agreed to take part, including ACDA Director John Holum, and Deputy Under Secretary of Commerce Barry Carter.

Other sponsors include the Chemical and Biological Arms Control Institute; the DePaul University International Human Rights Law Institute; the Committee on International Environmental Law of the ABA Section of International Law and Practice; and the ABA Section of Natural Resources, Energy and Environmental Law. The program is also being supported by the Chemical Manufacturers Association and the Lawyers Alliance for World Security. For further information, contact either Philip Fleming at (202) 624-2755 or Mary Sears at (312) 988-5602.



Review—Rummel on Democide . . .

Continued from page 3

and a clear course of political action and policy to end it. And the results verify this. The problem is Power. The solution is democracy. The course of action is to foster freedom.

Using as his threshold “any military action in which at least 1,000 persons are killed,” Professor Rummel examines more than 350 “wars” fought between 1816 and 1991. He asserts: “Never has there been a war involving violent military action between stable democracies . . .” This by itself is a critically important realization, but Professor Rummel acknowledges that it is hardly original. Indeed, it is increasingly recognized by serious students of political science.

Professor Rummel’s contribution is to examine the other aspect of violence *vis-à-vis* democracies and non-democracies—what he terms *democide*. He concludes that approximately 38.5 million people have died in all of the “wars” of this century, whereas the fifteen “megamurderers” he has studied in depth killed an estimated 151 million people exclusive of legitimate casualties of war. Put differently, totalitarian regimes have been responsible for nearly *four times* as many deaths as all of the wars of this century.

It is a well-documented phenomenon that Americans have difficulty fathoming such figures—we can compassionately rally behind efforts to rescue seven-year-old Suzy Brown stuck in a well in Peoria, but the idea of hundreds of thousands of African children starving to death is simply incomprehensible. To help put the human consequences of totalitarian oppression in perspective, Professor Rummel writes:

Putting the human cost of war and democide together, Power has killed over 203 million people in this century. If one were to sit at a table and have this many people come in one door, walk at three miles per hour across the room with three feet between them . . . and exit an opposite door, it would take over five years and nine months for them all to pass, twenty-four hours a day, 365 days a year. If all these dead were laid out head to toe, assuming each to be an average of 5 feet tall, they would reach from Honolulu, Hawaii, across the vast Pacific and then the huge continental United States, *and then back again almost twenty times.*

Had this book been published during the Cold War, when much of Professor Rummel’s original research was done, it would likely have been dismissed with disbelief. Critics would certainly have charged that his figures on democide were grossly

inflated—the same basic response that greeted the publication of Robert Conquest’s 1968 masterpiece, *The Great Terror: Stalin’s Purge of the Thirties*. Fortunately, in the past five years we have received a wealth of new data from sources within the former Soviet Union (including official communist party archives) suggesting that, if anything, Conquest *understated* the horror of Stalin’s excesses. (See, e.g., “Prominent Historian John Lewis Gaddis Rebutts ‘Revisionist’ Cold War History,” in the February 1994 issue of the *Report*, page 5.)

To document his conclusions, Professor Rummel has prepared a supplemental volume entitled *Statistics of Democide: Estimates, Sources, and Calculations on 20th Century Genocide and Mass Murder*, which has not to date been published. The various tables of this volume include more than 18,000 rows of data, with one table alone requiring more than 50 pages to display. Despite the importance of the subject matter, such a volume of statistical tables is unlikely to make the best seller list—but it needs to be published and available, at least in libraries, to provide credibility to Professor Rummel’s remarkable conclusions.

Some may ask: “Are all of Rummel’s figures accurate.” He provides the answer himself clearly and up front—certainly not. While specific figures on some democides are well documented and quite reliable, it is simply not possible to come up with a precise figure for the widespread slaughter under the Khmer Rouge in primitive Cambodia or the total number of killings in a society as closed as Kim Il Sung’s North Korea. To surmount this problem, Professor Rummel has gathered data and estimates from a wide-range of sources (some of which he acknowledges are not academically respectable), and in every case he gives a range of estimates before offering his own conclusions based upon a review of all available evidence. Thus, for example, he notes that the Khmer Rouge may have killed as few as 600,000 or as many as 3 million people; and the estimates for Communist China range from under 6 million to more than 100 million (Rummel

Calendar of Events

January 19—Breakfast Meeting, International Club (Speaker: Les Aspin, Chairman, President’s Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board)

February 7—Conference on Implementing the Chemical Weapons Convention, Capitol Hilton Hotel, Washington DC (see box on page 3)

estimates something over 35 million).

By way of comparison, it is worth noting that estimates provided four months ago by *Washington Post* staff writers ("How Many Died?" July 17, 1994, p. A22) give a range for Mao, Stalin, and Hitler of from 112 to 162 million "unnatural deaths"—figures substantially higher than Professor Rummel's estimate of 106 million.

The reviewer has neither the time nor the expertise to pass judgment upon Professor Rummel's specific figures for each of the regimes discussed. Having authored a 500-page book of his own on *Vietnamese Communism: Its Origins and Development*, while a scholar at Stanford's Hoover Institute on War, Revolution and Peace, however, the reviewer does feel comfortable in assessing Professor Rummel's conclusions about the human costs of the 1953-56 "land reform" purges in North Vietnam. After nearly a decade of research—including extensive interviews with witnesses inside Vietnam—the reviewer concluded that total deaths ranged from 300 thousand to 500 thousand. By contrast, Professor Rummel's figure for this period is a conservative 150,000.

But even if Professor Rummel's good faith estimates are wrong—even if they are overestimated by a factor of *three*—his basic conclusion that totalitarian regimes have killed more people by democide than all of the victims that have died in all of the wars of this century remains valid. As indicated, the growing evidence coming out of countries once ruled by Communism suggests strongly that his estimates are not far off the mark and may even be understated.

In 1797, Thomas Jefferson wrote in a letter to Elbridge Gerry that "war" was "the greatest scourge of mankind." Few intelligent people would have quarreled with that observation, or with the conclusion of Sydney Smith—published in the *Edinburgh Review* sixteen years later—that "It here is more of

misery inflicted upon mankind by one year of war than by all the civil peculations and oppressions in a century." Thanks to Professor Rummel's new book, we now know that they were wrong—or at least that their observations are inaccurate as applied to the twentieth century.

What does all of this mean—what are the practical uses of Professor Rummel's recently published insights? First of all, it should bring to an end the debate in this country over the wisdom of promoting "democracy" as a cardinal element of US foreign policy. Woodrow Wilson envisioned the League of Nations as a "covenant of cooperation" between democratic States that would guarantee world peace, and the Charter of the Organization of American States expressly stated that the American system was to be based upon "the effective exercise of representative democracy." By the 1960s and '70s, however, it was popular to dismiss that view as chauvinistic and to argue that pressuring other countries to establish democratic regimes was an infringement of their right to "self-determination."

As usual, Jefferson got it right. While Secretary of State, he argued that the new United States ought to "acknowledge any government to be rightful which is formed by the will of the nation substantially declared." The case for democracy is even stronger today than it was two centuries ago, as there is now almost universal agreement—at least in theory—that sovereign power is derived from the *people* of a State. Meaningful "self-determination" ought therefore to involve a right of the people to select the government of their choice rather than the right of dictators to impose a political regime of their preference on the people of a State.

Let us hope that Jefferson was right in another sense, as well. He envisioned a day when democracy would be embraced as the only legitimate form of government around the globe. Writing to John

Continued on page 6

Standing Committee on Law and National Security

Chairman: John H. Shenefield. *Members:* Russell J. Bruemmer, Richard E. Friedman, Philip B. Heymann, Edward Hidalgo, Lucinda A. Low, J. Michael McWilliams, Elizabeth R. Rindskopf, L. Britt Snider, Paul Schott Stevens, Richard K. Willard
Advisory Committee Chair: Kathleen Buck

Staff Director: Holly Stewart McMahon
1800 M Street, N.W. • Suite 200
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 466-8463
fax (202) 331-2220

Review—Rummel on Democide . . .

Continued from page 5

Adams in September of 1821, Jefferson argued that “[t]he flames kindled on the 4th of July, 1776, have spread over too much of the globe to be extinguished by the feeble engines of despotism; on the contrary, they will consume these engines and all who work them....”

Two centuries later, Jefferson’s vision of a democratic world is approaching reality. The 1980s witnessed a dramatic expansion of democracy in Latin America, and the collapse of the Soviet Empire has produced a remarkable consensus even among States once ruled by Leninist dictatorships that democracy is the only legitimate basis of human government.

Consider, for example, the 1990 “Charter of Paris for a New Europe,” embraced by the thirty-four Heads of State of the participants in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) process, which provided in part:

We undertake to build, consolidate and strengthen democracy as the only system of government of our nations. In this endeavor, we will abide by the following:
Human rights and fundamental freedoms are the birthright of all human beings, are inalienable and

are guaranteed by law. Their protection and promotion is the first responsibility of government. . . . Democratic government is based on the will of the people, expressed regularly through free and fair elections. Democracy has as its foundation respect for the human person and the rule of law. . . .

According to the prestigious human rights group Freedom House, 1991 was the first year in which “both the number of Free countries and their populations outnumbered the Not Free countries and their populations.” Indeed, the Freedom House data indicate that more than 70 percent of the 171 nations examined that year were either democracies or in some stage of democratic transition. To be sure, the struggle continues and much remains to be done. It is not foreordained that democracy will ultimately prevail as the sole legitimate form of government across the globe. Nor, for that matter, does the publication of Professor Rummel’s remarkable new book guarantee success in that struggle. But for anyone enamored with peace and the sanctity of human life, Rummel provides the most persuasive case we have heard in many years. It is not only “recommended” reading—this book is an essential part of the literature that belongs in the library of every educated friend of peace and freedom.

Truman and Korea—Comments & Corrections

We received an unusual amount of mail (most of it positive) concerning the piece in the September issue entitled “Truman Didn’t ‘Ignore Congress’ on Korean War” (including notes from Standing Committee Counselors Eugene Rostow and Max Kampelman). Former Senate Foreign Relations Committee Staff Director Pat Holt, who spent 30 years with the committee, wrote: “Quite right. I was there at the time. With the conspicuous exception of Robert A. Taft, most of Congress didn’t want to touch that issue with a ten-foot pole.” He included several pages from his 1980 book *Invitation to Struggle* (coauthored with Professor Cecil V. Crabb) making the same basic point—and, indeed, including a portion of the same quotation from Senator Tom Connally’s autobiography used in our piece.

Unfortunately, two errors appeared in the article as printed—and we are at a loss to explain how either occurred. First, the collection of declassified documents on which the story was based is entitled *Foreign Relations of the United States 1950*—which is correct on our copy of the computer disk. Presumably, in an effort to correct an apparent error, someone added “Since” before the date 1950. A second error—resulting in the misnumbering of several endnotes—was called to our attention by Dr. Louis Fisher, of the Library of Congress, who noted that an endnote number was apparently dropped from the text on page 4—throwing off by one note the last seven or eight citations. Whatever the cause, we regret the resulting misnumbered notes.

More interestingly, Dr. Fisher—who is justly recognized as one of the nation’s most able scholars in this field—announced that he has written a piece on this same issue, concluding that “Truman violated the Constitution and . . . the UN Participation Act,” that will appear in a forthcoming issue of the *American Journal of International Law*. Perhaps we shall be able to continue this debate in greater detail in that forum, and we invite those seeking an alternative viewpoint to watch for Dr. Fisher’s article. —RFT