

Germany effective nationhood.

Said Howard: "It would be legitimate, indeed, to extend [the troubled period of the Cold War] backward for a generation, to 1914, for the two world wars had a basic continuity: So far as Europe was concerned, they can be regarded almost as a single Thirty Years' War. So in broader historical perspective the years between 1914 and 1989 may come to be seen as ones of continuous armed confrontation and conflict, broken by periods of uneasy truce, not unlike the wars of the French Revolution and Napoleonic conquest between 1793 and 1815; except that in our own time we had to endure not one but two prolonged conflicts with two different major adversaries; and those conflicts shaped the minds, not of one generation, but of three.

"Now, like the statesmen gathered at Vienna at the conclusion of the Napoleonic Wars, we have to adjust ourselves to an entirely new situation. . . .

"If we take the Napoleonic analogy seriously, the good news is that after 1815, nearly half a century was to pass before Europe saw another international war, and a century before there was a conflict on anything like so considerable a scale. The bad news is that during those years developments were under way that made the European system increasingly unstable; unstable internally, as industrialization transformed the economies of western Europe, bringing in its wake growing class-conflict and fear of revolution; externally, *as the growth of railways (in particular) created a new major political and economic power in the center of Europe which was to shatter the international system with a new series of wars* — wars that began with the Prussian challenge to the Austrian Empire in 1866 and *did not really conclude until the defeat and destruction of Nazi Germany in 1945*" (emphasis added).

### The civilizing mission of railroads

With these words, Howard is striking at the heart of those "Hamiltonian" economic policies which have brought about whatever development there has been in western economies over the past 200 years, policies which have always driven the British "free trade" fanatics apoplectic.

It is worth recalling, that the drive for the development of railways in Germany came from Friedrich List, who was close to Mathew Carey and Henry Carey in the United States, and who was a rigorous Hamiltonian in economic policy outlook. Later in the 19th century, Russia's Count Sergei Witte was strongly influenced by List's ideas, in motivating his own projects for railway development in Russia; it was common for Witte to write, in poetical terms, about the railway as the greatest factor in humanizing and upgrading backward rural peoples. On one occasion, he stated, "The railroad is like a leaven, which creates a cultural fermentation among the population. Even if it passed through an absolutely wild people along its way, it would raise them in a short time to the level prerequisite for its operation."

## U.S. makes NPT the issue in S. Asia

by Ramtanu Maitra

With the arrival of the Indian Foreign Secretary J.N. Dixit in Washington, there are expectations that India-U.S. relations may get beyond contentious non-proliferation and security issues. Expectations, however, can hardly be justified considering the one-dimensional South Asia policy of the Clinton administration so far.

Irritated by Washington's continuous sermonizing on non-proliferation and the American perception of India's security concerns, and embittered by U.S. criticism of India's "poor" human rights record, New Delhi initially welcomed the changing of the guard in the White House. Even the grating visit of Acting Undersecretary of State John Malott to South Asia in the spring did not quite dampen hope. Later, the selection of Mrs. Robin Raphel as assistant secretary of state for South Asian affairs raised hopes, since Raphel was serving as political counselor at the U.S. embassy in New Delhi at the time of her appointment. It was hoped that since she was aware of the political situation of both India and Pakistan from her first-hand experiences, she might be able to bring a multidimensional policy in tune with the sensitivities of the subcontinent and enrich U.S. policy toward South Asia.

But Raphel, testifying before a U.S. Senate panel recently, emphasized that her main objective in her new post is to pressure India and Pakistan to take down their nuclear capabilities.

Starting her career as a CIA economic analyst, before opting for the foreign office, Raphel reportedly attended Oxford with President Clinton, and hence, has the President's ear. She was earlier married to the U.S. ambassador to Pakistan, Arnold Raphel, who, along with the Pakistani President Mohammed Zia ul-Haq, was killed in a mysterious air crash in 1988. Since then, Mrs. Raphel has married a South African and was posted at Pretoria prior to her arrival in Delhi. Her two postings in Pakistan — one in the 1970s when Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was prime minister, and later as Ambassador Raphel's wife — make her a Pakistan expert, she claims.

### Echoing the Carnegie Endowment

Mrs. Raphel's testimony to the Senate, however, indicates that she is more likely to enhance conflict and friction between the two largest democracies in the world. Her state-

ments so far remarkably resemble the printed analysis of the Carnegie Endowment for Peace and such individuals as Prof. Roger Hilsman of Columbia University, who had earlier served as a high-profile assistant secretary of state during the Kennedy administration, and Prof. Alvin Z. Rubinstein of the University of Pennsylvania. Both these professors recently visited India, and made clear that non-proliferation is the major irritant in Indo-U.S. ties.

In dealing with South Asia, the Clinton administration appears to have taken a leaf out of Jimmy Carter's diary. According to reports circulating in New Delhi, President Clinton is soon to announce a policy initiative on curbing the spread of weapons of mass destruction, which would target those who have not signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), but not those who have the weapons.

The projected Clinton policy would also seriously jeopardize India's three-decade nuclear power generation policy. According to available reports, the centerpiece of Clinton's initiative would be a worldwide ban on the production of highly enriched uranium and plutonium. While highly enriched uranium is a requirement of high-temperature gas-cooled reactors, India's major concern will be the ban on plutonium production. Indian nuclear strategy, set forth in the 1960s, is to use plutonium, obtained from the spent fuel of the Indian-built Candu heavy-water reactors, as the fissile material in fast breeder reactors. India has already begun to operate a fast breeder test reactor fueled with plutonium, and plans are afoot to build 500-megawatt (MW) fast breeder reactors by the year 2000.

### Missile control a threat

Also included in the Clinton initiative is the prevention of missile technology development. In pursuing this policy, Washington has fallen back on the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) of April 1987, which was amended last January. The MTCR, an informal arrangement among the Group of Seven (G-7) industrialized countries that now includes another 16 countries, had originally set guidelines ostensibly to limit the proliferation of missile technology that could contribute to nuclear weapons delivery systems, and a listing of related equipment and technology to be controlled by member countries by appropriate domestic export controls.

The January amendments extended the scope of the control regime to include missiles capable of delivering biological and chemical weapons, and restricted development of short-range battlefield missiles. Clinton's proposed initiative is likely to be the amended version of Guidelines 2, which states:

"Particular restraint will be exercised in the consideration of Category I transfers *regardless of their purpose*, and there will be a strong presumption to deny such transfers. Particular restraint will also be exercised in the consideration of any items in the Annex, or of any missiles (whether or not in the

Annex), if the government judges, on the basis of all available persuasive information evaluated according to factors including those in the Guidelines 3, that they are intended to be used for the delivery of weapons of mass destruction, and there will be a strong presumption to deny such transfers."

Reportedly, the United States has already informed New Delhi that Washington would not want India to deploy the short-range Prithvi missiles, developed and built by India. Recognizing that the recent sanctions imposed against the Indian Space Research Organization by Washington for the former's contract to buy cryogenic engine and related technologies from Russia did not have the desired effect, Washington is now putting direct pressure on India not to deploy the Prithvi missiles.

### Pressure to 'de-nuclearize'

While the White House was intent to step on sovereign nations and prevent them from developing missiles, which in present-day military doctrine are an integral part of modern military forces, think-tanks related to the Pentagon are churning out reports on the nuclear problem in South Asia. The bottom line of the reports is that India and Pakistan are heading inevitably toward a nuclear war, and it would be the "humanitarian" thing to do to "de-nuclearize" these two nations. The argument is then used to force India and Pakistan to sign the NPT, and to bolster Clinton's initiative to ban enriched uranium and use of plutonium and to curb missile development. The process will lead to the collapse of India's space program and nuclear power program, and make the military vulnerable to those who do have "weapons of mass destruction."

Other countries are echoing the U.S. pressure. Recently, India was surprised to find that Germany put the issue at the top of the annual bilateral meeting agenda in Bonn. Germany has thus joined the nations having bilateral talks with India on non-proliferation issues — the United States, Britain, and Japan.

The Monterey Institute on Missile Proliferation, which has focused its studies on China and India in collaboration with a Japanese institute, has come out recently with a report entitled "India: Emerging Missile Power." The report said that India has the technological infrastructure to undertake development of intercontinental ballistic missiles and cruise missiles. In emphasizing that the Indian missile program cannot be curtailed through sanctions, it said: "Technology embargoes and sanctions may have some near-term effect in slowing down New Delhi's missile program, but its missile-related infrastructure has been developed to the point that it is no longer feasible for outside interests to bring the program to a halt."

Having read that, the Clinton administration is now going full tilt to force India to give up the deployment of the Prithvi missile and stop any further development of the middle-range Agni missile.