STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

RIDING THE SUPERHIGHWAY TO GLORY: JODY WILLIAMS V. U.S.

BY

LIEUTENANT COLONEL HENRY A. DURAN
United States Army

19980605 048

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited.

USAWC CLASS OF 1998

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 4

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

Riding the Superhighway to Glory: Jody Williams v. U.S.

by

Henry A. Duran

Dr. Douglas V. Johnson
Project Advisor

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited.

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Henry A Duran

TITLE: Riding the Superhighway to Glory: Jody Williams v. U.S.

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 16 MAR 1998 PAGES: 33 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The Internet has given rise to an entirely new set of organizations that can form, do business, and promulgate their agendas with marginal resources and no physical proximity. These organizations are capable of enormous power through influence and are difficult for existing nation state governments to control. Jody Williams of the International Campaign to Ban Land Mines gave U.S. policy and prestige a notable set back with minimal resources.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....iii

RIDING THE SUPERHIGHWAY TO GLORY: JODY WILLIAMS V. U.S.....1

FROM ORATORY TO E-MAIL.....2

THE NEWLY EMPOWERED.....6

JODY WILLIAMS AND THE INTERNATIONAL CAMPAIGN TO BAN LAND MINES..8

THE SEPTEMBER CONFERENCE; ODD MAN OUT.....10

OPTIONS FOR THE UNITED STATES- NONE GOOD.....15

THE AFTERMATH.....19

ENDNOTES.....23

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....27

RIDING THE SUPERHIGHWAY TO GLORY: JODY WILLIAMS V. U.S.

> We cannot do without force…and the only force you can substitute for an armed mankind is the concerted force of the combined action of mankind.
>
> —President Woodrow Wilson, 1919
> Speech at Sioux Falls, Iowa
> September 18, 1919

The Internet, hailed as the "information superhighway" by the President of the United States, has effected a quantum leap in the ability of interest groups to form, interact as parts of a larger whole and to promulgate their agendas. Two factors; the global reach of the communications involved, regardless of geographic and political constraints, and the near equal footing of the U. S. government with its panoply of power and Jane Public with her PC constitute the basis of the leap.[1] The nature of the Internet, everywhere and nowhere makes it very difficult for any entity to control the discourse that takes place.[23] The system is readily accessible to anyone with a personal computer (PC) and a modem. The 1997 Land Mine Accord negotiated in September 1997 and signed in Ottawa by an overwhelming majority of U.S. allies in the face of a full court U. S. effort to control the process is illustrative of the power that can be created. A grass roots effort of geographically separated, mostly poorly funded, non-governmental organizations (NGO's)

carried the day with the overwhelming majority of world governments despite the best efforts of the U. S. Executive Branch. In the end, they became well funded, widely recognized, powerful entities capable of collectively wielding the traditional forms of public power.

FROM ORATORY TO E-MAIL

In the Greek Polis political influence within the state was largely a function of public speech. Thucydides is replete with examples of oratory carrying the day in deciding public policy. Athens' downfall was arguably caused by the ascent of demagogues such as Cleon, whose sharp tongue and self serving wit unintentionally accomplished what the sharp swords of the Spartan's could not. The coin of influence was the spoken word and the position to employ it. The informed despot controlled public speech- the palace balcony was his to speak from. Others' speech would be from less imposing settings and might well be controlled through the despot's agents in all but private venues. The time was the present and any effect was generally transitory. The space was limited to the area immediately surrounding the speaker. It was difficult to organize any group unless one had physical contact with them on a regular basis. Word of mouth might carry, but the effect was generally under

the control of the powerful. In less civilized days, the sword frequently proved mightier than the mouth.

The advent of the printing press changed the scope of influence. The audience first hand might be limited to the literate, but printed matter would travel, endure and could be accessed by an interested party at a time of the reader's choosing. Those who read it might well discuss it. Literacy spread and so did the printing press. Pamphleteering in the West, from Swift to Paine, became a powerful tool. The media evolved from painfully reproduced handwork to larger than life cinematography and the glossy assortment of published material available on virtually any street corner.

This power to represent a position to large numbers meant that control of the press, or other major media, created an almost insurmountable advantage in forming public opinion. The television offered a virtual podium in the living room to those with the means to use it. Television, widely distributed movies, mass media in general, all had one thing in common; they were the instruments of power and they took power to use. Everyman might make a flyer. Hyde Park was still available for voicing one's opinion, but the media with impact was controlled by huge organizations. The castle balcony belongs to the well bankrolled. Although frowned upon by most of the world, it was

quite possible for a government to effectively control all but the least significant forms of public communications.

The Internet has a full circle effect; Everyman can talk and Anyman can listen. The traditional media were almost exclusively one way- letters went back and forth over the course of days or weeks, but from the pamphlet through the motion picture the message was one way. The Internet requires minimal resources to operate on- no press, no studio, just a PC, phone line, and modem. The message can be disseminated in near real time, and the recipients can respond as quickly. Organizations can form with detailed interaction without ever coming into physical proximity.

This interaction is nearly impossible for a government to monitor given the bounds imposed by current social norms. The denizens of the Internet, both individual and organizational, are quite uncontrollable. No physical "there" need be there. Many of the newly empowered feel a much less pressing attachment to the status quo of national organizations than the power users of the past. To use the past system, one had to be a part of it.

Is this a paean to the intellectual virtues of the Internet? Hardly. The Internet, as with all past forms of media, is capable of delivering the superficially "thoughtful" analyses of McNews with a vengeance.

"Everyone knows what you do with the Web: You surf, sliding from site to site at the click of a mouse button. Exactly which (educational) problem will Web-surfing attack? ...Insufficient shallowness? Stubborn unwillingness to push on to the next topic until they have mastered the last?"[4]

Easily used for misinformation, the web caters to gossip as well as research among those who would deem themselves more thoughtful than the "average Joe". It gives an aura of respectability to material that is thoroughly unvetted and encourages a "search, click, got-the-scoop-on-that-one" approach to forming opinions notionally based upon a sound consideration of the issues. It is nirvana for the narrow interest mind-made-up types who thrive on reading like-minded material, e.g. conspiracy theorists. It appeals to those looking for causes.

The Internet allows for ready access to a daunting array of data; some in depth, some incredibly shallow. It all emerges from cyberspace on a modem and the apparent difference between the product of a multi-million dollar USIS effort and a three diet coke hacker's home page is only that no one is likely to have defaced the hacker's page. The glossy pages of professional presses, the patina of a Hollywood production, the effect of well-groomed governmental figures standing in carefully chosen settings addressing issues in circumlocutious terms don't count when the message streams through a modem.

The Internet that expands in explosive speed is introduced immediately in NPOs INGOs. Developments of

> the network and the organizations have much relevance each other historically and they also have the same points of spontaneity, globalization and horizontal relationship. Though many organizations adopt the Internet, they don't make the most use of it. This remains as a problem to be solved. International NGOs (INGOs) that are engaged in international cooperative activities have similar tendency among the NPOs. In our thesis, we reveal the INGOs' present situation and significance of using the Internet through our investigation and other researches. Finally we conclude that the Internet can be not only media to exchange information effectively and smoothly but also media to reform our society darastically.[5]

Thus the philosophy of use towards social revision coupled with a graphic demonstration of the absolute lack of editorial oversight that distinguishes the Internet as a tool of information dissemination. This has given the marginally resourced an equality of access to the public that they have long sought. The above example loses a bit through the sloppiness of the translation- but gigabyte after gigabyte is available with a veneer of literacy over both the thoughtful and "Elvis is alive and advising the President."

THE NEWLY EMPOWERED

"The 'Globalizers' ...see the world economy as one, period... All other power and institutions, in particular the nation state, must fall into its sovereignty."[6]

> The Internet would bring people all across the globe together in new and better forms of dialogue and understanding. It would 'make us free of the constraints of geography,' and do away with the

'tyranny of territoriality, which is how we have organized ourselves for centuries.'[7]

This embrace of the peoples of the world as a whole wholly independent of the nation states continues to fuel the plethora of NGO's without borders. These organizations have always been present in one form or another. Today's crop has come a long way from the "Missionaries among the cannibals", supported by various social organizations and producing the occasional foldout distributed as "junk mail" or church bulletin inserts. The United Nations interacts with a cornucopia of NGO's.

> A non-governmental organization (NGO) is any non-profit, voluntary citizens' group which is organized on a local, national or international level. Task oriented and driven by people with a common interest, NGO's perform a variety of service and humanitarian functions; bring citizen concerns to Governments, advocate and monitor policies and encourage political participation through provision of information. Some are organized around specific issues such as human right, environment, or health. They provide analysis and expertise, serve as early warning mechanisms and help monitor and implement international agreements. Their relationship with offices and agencies of the United Nations system differs depending on their goals, their venue, and the mandate of a particular institution.[8]

The above definition is extracted from the NGO page under the United Nations Internet pages. It quite clearly offers a one-world view. The array of organizations (in excess of 4,000) carried under its aegis is truly staggering in both quantity and variety. Until the age of the Internet, few were able to achieve more than a very localized effect. Some of the largest,

the International Red Cross and its brethren, had sufficient funds to appear with lobbyists and occasional advertisements in major publications, but most simply existed. The Internet gives them a voice that can be widely heard.

It also allows those, with the time and inclination to do so, an opportunity to develop associations with like-minded individuals and organizations of every size and stripe without regard to physical proximity. With the communications between the participants having the permanence of the written word (Internet communications are noticeably more transitory than stone tablets, but considerably more permanent than phone conversation) the creation of complex entities previously unformable without extensive travel, substantial administrative overhead and vast numbers is relatively easy. The International Committee to Ban Land Mines (ICBL), is such an organization.

JODY WILLIAMS AND THE INTERNATIONAL CAMPAIGN TO BAN LAND MINES

Jody Williams, chief coordinator for the ICBL is based in Vermont. She, from her home office in Burlington, became the Nobel Prize winning leader of a worldwide effort to achieve a treaty banning the use of land mines that flew in the face of the best efforts of a U. S. Government caught unawares. The ICBL was a "coalition of more than 1,000 non-governmental organizations in more than sixty countries."[9] Sponsored by the

Vietnam Veterans Foundation of America, she did most of her Nobel Prize winning work from her desktop in Vermont. The ICBL met regularly, coordinated their efforts to target key figures in various governments, and exchanged information from all those widely dispersed sources. They also created numerous informational presentations replete with pictures, "scientific analysis through statistics", and the usual folderol associated with major media presentations. These, produced at minimal cost, were available world wide to denizens of the net everywhere. This amounted to a reach into the circles of those who were liable to take action on such things previously unattainable without very deep pockets. She, and the various NGO's she associated with, adopted the Internet and made full use of it. The virtual community they constructed replaced the protocol of black tie diplomacy developed over scores of years with a direct person to person approach- person to person between members from diverse and scattered organizations and person to person with key government officials. The campaign was eventually able to expand from the literati to the glitterati. "Important people" from Princess Diana (whose spectacular demise in a royal version of the live fast die young tradition lent additional maudlin weight to the McNews aspect of the campaign) to noted weapons specialist Emmylou Harris. The virtual organization emerged from the ether into the traditional media world in a big way.

Each of the 1,000 organizations in the coalition share this honor. Our strength has been not only in our numbers and diversity, but also in our determination and cooperation. The ICBL brings together humanitarian, human rights, children's, peace, veterans, medical, development, arms control, religious, environmental and women's groups in a common call for a complete ban on anti-personnel mines, and increased resources for humanitarian demining and mine victim rehabilitation and assistance.

A comprehensive treaty banning all anti-personnel mines was adopted in Oslo, Norway on September 18 after three weeks of international negotiations. More than one hundred nations are expected to sign the treaty in Ottawa, Canada on December 3-4. "Those who do not sign the treaty should be stigmatized," said Ms. Williams, "and those who continue to use mines should be ostracized by the international community. The recognition of the importance of this Campaign by the Nobel Committee should make it abundantly clear to all that governments that refuse to sign the mine ban treaty in December are on the wrong side of humanity." Governments indicating they will not sign include the United States, Russia, China, India and Pakistan. Those undecided include Japan and Australia.

The ICBL has been praised by numerous governments and U.N. agencies for being the driving force in the spectacular success of the movement to ban anti-personnel mines. Begun by just a handful of NGO's less than six years ago, the ICBL has played the key role in educating the world about the land mines crisis, and convincing governments to take urgent action to eliminate the weapon.[10]

THE SEPTEMBER CONFERENCE; ODD MAN OUT

As the summer of 1997 opened, the APLM ban was still a back burner issue for the U.S. Senator Leahy of Vermont had taken up the cause, and the effective campaigners of the ICBL had

mobilized sufficient letter writers and E-mailers to cause Congress to begin to take notice, but the state department and DOD were both confident in their ability to steer world events. After all, we were clearly in charge as the sole surviving superpower. By August, it was clear that things were seriously wrong. Nation after nation fell into line behind the treaty as carefully coordinated ICBL protests and political activists, none of them attending the black tie diplomatic soirees of State Department policy-making, pressured local politicians throughout the world. The U.S. was deserted time and again by non-aligned and traditional allies alike and nothing seemed to work. By the September conference prior to the signing, the U.S was clearly on the defensive.

The U.S. policy on anti-personnel land mine (APLM) use was clearly articulated in 17 September remarks by President Clinton.[11] These were carefully coordinated with the simultaneous release of remarks by the Secretary of Defense on U.S. land mine policy and a variety of releases from the White House Press Secretary and other staffers on aspects of the same subject.[12 13] This major effort was forced by the inability of the U.S. to negotiate exemptions allowing it to join the 90 plus nations participating in the "Ottawa process" creating a treaty to ban APLM use without exception.[14] This ban, driven not by major powers, but by an assortment of NGO's, includes neither

the U.S. nor China- but, as of the 10th of October did include Russia (eventually, Russia declined to become a signatory) and eventually would include Japan. The conference was not part of any overarching United Nations or other governmentally driven negotiating process. The treaty, to be signed in Ottawa at a 2-4 December conference, would be seen as, if placed into force without U.S. participation, a direct blow to the American leadership explicitly cited as a key component of the U.S. National Security Strategy.[15] [16] The U.S. was facing a challenge, not from nation state competitors, but from a collection of transnational organizations with no military power, very limited economic power, but with a substantial influence over the information media of the modern world. The APLM ban- most appropriately a small subset of the "Respond" area- was clearly degrading our ability to "Shape[17]" the international environment in the future, and so assumed a disproportionately large place in national strategy.

The U.S. land mine policy as of September 17 at the national level included four steps. Directives were issued to DOD to develop alternatives to land mines, appoint a personal advisor to the President to work on the problem, and to provide increased support to worldwide demining programs. The President himself, trying to regarb himself in the mantle of world leadership, presented the fourth:

> We will redouble our efforts to establish serious negotiations for a global anti-personnel land mine ban in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. … The people who caused this problems (sic) because they're making and selling these land mines--- none of them were present. We've got to get them on board…[18]

The Secretary of Defense was more specific on mine usage.[19] He outlined current U.S. efforts; a unilateral ban on mine exports, the ongoing destruction of non-smart APLM stockpiles, the removal of "all U.S. emplaced land mines around the world save Guantanamo Bay," and ongoing assistance programs for training in land mine removal for non-U.S. emplaced mines. He outlined several additional actions as a result of the President's policy; a goal of no APL use by 2003 except in Korea through to be developed alternatives, clearance at Guantanamo by 1999, and continued use of smart AP submunitions in anti-tank mines.[20] The U. S. Executive Branch position was very tightly coordinated.

The position did not satisfy the requirements of the APLM opponents. The U. S. request for exceptions for both the DMZ in Korea, and for the anti-tamper APLM's in regards to anti-tank mines was non-negotiable for the purposes of the treaty as driven by the NGO's. China's "Disarmament Ambassador" explained his nation's abstention from the treaty; "It gives little or no consideration to the relevant countries' military need for their just land defense."[21] Finland, close by the former Soviet Union,

felt the same. The drivers of the process have no nation hence no boundaries. "Doctors Without Borders," one supporting NGO, does not make territorial protection a priority issue. Indeed the priority for this and the other associated NGO's is a "one-world free access for all" philosophy which is difficult to reconcile even with relatively clear cut cases (to the U.S. and most nation states) of border protection such as the Korean DMZ. There was no one at the conference table who had any interest in, or who gave any credence to, the tactical considerations which caused the creation of and were the justification for continued use of, the APLM's. The potential death of "a few soldiers," men in an abhorrent profession of marginal utility in the new age, was not any counter at all to the death of thousands of innocent bystanders.

The wide support of the campaign to ban land mines was demonstrated by the October 10th awarding of the Nobel Prize to the ICBL and its coordinator, Jody Williams. The death of the Princess of Wales helped propel the campaign into the spotlight, but the base of support included retired U.S. general officers. A group of 15 former officers, headed by General (Ret.) Schwarzkopf, urged a ban, with a full page advertisement in the 2 April 1997 N.Y. Times, sponsored by the Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation. This support absolutely destroyed what little credibility might have been accorded to arguments of

military necessity in the public forum. Even a cursory review of the most readily available sites on the U.S. administration dubbed "information superhighway" revealed literally hundreds of anti-mine activist sites replete with advice on how to put pressure on various governments, with an emphasis on the U.S., to "ban 'em now." Based on the same search, only one lone Heritage Foundation pro-mine use site was listed. The U.S. Information Service (USIS), a Krauthammer piece, and a translation from the China "Disarmament Ambassador" were the only other countervailing views in the top 100 under "+land +mine +ban" using the Webcrawler search engine. A February 1998 search using the same criteria revealed a significant increase in the amount of USIS coverage. Multiple sites presenting U.S. Government efforts to remove mines, control mines, aid mine victims, etc. as well as other anti-ban sites have sprung up, but too late.

OPTIONS FOR THE UNITED STATES- NONE GOOD

The power of such a volume of public discourse is immense. It easily carries along many nations. Without a "center of gravity" it leaves even the "sole surviving superpower" in a position of relative helplessness. The channels of diplomatic power, where the U. S. can expect to wield influence as it "shapes" the world, do not run through the under-arching

organizations that have brought about the APLM situation. Many of the organizations are run from the U.S., but the overall effect of the ease of communication effected by the Internet has been to render the physical location of the individual actors irrelevant. Relatively few, widely dispersed individuals can mobilize large volumes of politically and intellectually active people in a way that is difficult, if not impossible for the U.S. "first amendment constrained" administrations to control.

There were three primary alternatives available to the U.S. The first was to stand by the positions as outlined in the 17 September releases. The second was to eliminate all specifically anti-personnel land mines and seek to retain the smart anti-tank anti-tamper munitions as a separate category. The third was to give up all AP munitions and sign the treaty while attempting to claim that it was our position all along as the world leader on peace and progress.

The first option is to continue to diplomatically twist arms for exemption status for APLM's in Korea and for the anti-tamper munitions. It maintains a balance within the Government between the strong defense advocates who want no compromise in U.S. military capabilities whatsoever and an administration widely perceived as being "soft on defense." With the accession of Russia to the accords, it leaves the U.S. "in the company of North Korea, Iraq, and China." The blow to U.S. prestige as a

leader in shaping world peace would inevitably be coupled to a perceived loss of control in shaping other norms as well. Perception in these affairs oft becomes reality. It also leaves the U.S. with its inventory of expensive smart mines still useable and with no lessening of "resolve" in the continuing Korean face-off. It leaves the "respond" arm of strategy intact. Any change in policy would be seen as backing down and would lend new energy to the next NGO "crusade," potentially offsetting any prestige gains in the "shape" category. Still we would gain the opportunity to be signatories, if successful. We would also have put on a pretty substantial show of diplomatic force.

The second option, coupled with sufficient back-channel diplomacy to the actual nation-state signatories could enable the U.S. to retain the anti-tank capabilities while losing the anti-personnel capability and then become a signatory. The actual military requirement for specific APLM's as a dynamic area denial device is arguably dispensable for dynamic situations.[22] We are already committed to an accelerated research process for changing the anti-tank system. We are also already committed to de-mining Guantanamo, and by a transfer of the mines in the DMZ to South Korea, we could conceivably claim compliance with the APLM ban. The drawbacks are the isolation of South Korea, a U.S. ally, the lack of any real chance at

forcing a break between the hard line ICBL positions and the governments already committed to sign in December, and the hard fact that if we compromise at all for the purpose of reclaiming leadership a halfway effort will get us most of the drawbacks with almost none of the gain.

Finally, giving up all anti-personnel devices, both the APLM's and the smart devices incorporated in the anti-tank mines would enable the U.S. to sign the treaty and reassert itself as the shaper of the process. The shortfall in the DMZ would be a powerful tool for administration critics, and potentially destabilizing to the Korean Theater. The U.S. would be left with a very expensive and "legally" useless set of anti-tank munitions with no alternative readily to hand. The perceived total capitulation would set the stage for an endless series of campaigns on the U.S. by assorted NGO's and, despite the best efforts of U.S. diplomats, we'll be hard pressed to accrue any credit for signing on to the treaty at the last minute.

Clearly the best course of action was one. That does not mean it was a particularly desirable one, merely the best of bad choices. This was essentially the same course pursued during the framing conference in September. The continued application of diplomatic efforts might have gotten the U.S. the desired exemptions and allowed us to sign on in December, but it seemed unlikely. The traditional forms of public information campaigns

have little effect in this environment. Indeed the NGO actors are by their natures predisposed to be deeply suspicious of government sponsored pronouncements. The other nations involved had little to lose in this except U.S. support, and there is strength in numbers on their side. The U. S. could not strong arm everyone. Russia, in signing on at the last moment, may indeed have been using the opportunity to tweak the American nose at little cost. Even Japan, very tightly tied to the U.S. militarily, had announced that it might join the signers. The administration has taken what are probably the most forceful actions possible in the short term. The DMZ is politically untouchable, and we have bought into an expensive inventory of anti-tank mines that can not be dropped without a replacement on hand.

THE AFTERMATH

The treaty was signed with the U.S. "in the company of rogues." Land mine debate continues. Japan eventually did join the ranks of the ICBL, and Russia opted out. The U.S Senate is passing assorted resolutions to address their constituents' concerns with support for the Noble Laureate, Ms. Williams. The DOD is in a pickle as it balances the political needs of the government against military requirements.

The real U.S. interest in the matter is the effect on our national ability to "shape" the environment. The land mine issue is a single example of the rising tide of powers beyond national controls that exercise substantial power and are not susceptible to traditional forms of influence. The U.S. State Department has proven unable to cope with what largely amounts to a cottage industry of PC users. When push came to shove, State couldn't deliver even a marginal number of votes. National consideration of the world community must change to encompass the newly influential "shapers " and develop the ways to bring them under control.

No longer a back channel issue, the full range of communication is now involved. On the Internet front the USIS is now fully engaged. The same search criteria; "+land +mine +ban" now reveals a rich source of USIS sites touting U.S. efforts to remove existing mines, control the spread of new ones, and generally showing a "deep concern" for the issues all designed to mitigate the damage done in the Ottawa fiasco. Any number of other web sites such as the "Center for Security Policy" carry an extensive array of anti-ban material.[23] The USIS sites, well designed, with good graphics, easy navigation, and helpful links, also seem to be popular sites for "virtual graffiti". A quick review of several such sites by the author revealed electronic spray paint on three of the eight pages

visited; one generic "@*&^% you guys," a more thoughtful diatribe along the "Great Satan" line of thought, and "facili decensus Averni," from the great Roman.

The ICBL, formed in cyberspace, drew together sufficient support to have a decidedly real world impact. This organization is now sufficiently well developed that it can flourish in the well endowed world of a major organization with star endorsements, TV coverage, and well-groomed governmental figures standing in carefully chosen settings addressing issues in circumlocutious terms. For the present it has a foot firmly planted in the real world, although it still maintains its footing in cyberspace.

The freedom of association granted by the Internet; free from legal encumbrance, free from social impediments, free from all but the most minimal financial constraint, and free from spatial constraints, leveled the playing field for the ICBL. As the "Center for Security Policy" would have it "the United States is being relegated to the role of just another nation-not even *primer inter pares*, with no more say or influence …than Mauritania."[24] In this case it's a little worse than that, merely another page on the Web.

-5200 words exclusive of endnotes/ bibliography

ENDNOTES

[1] Clearly a Government could pass laws restricting access, but enforcing them would involve detailed control over the telecommunications system. It would also, in all but the most radically oppressive regimes, be socially unacceptable.

[2] "Everywhere" is a relative thing. The "everywhere" is intended as available to those who feel they have a need for it. The starving beggar living in a cardboard box hasn't access- but he probably hasn't the inclination either. Here is a brief breakdown of overall web users and their purposes:

Percent of WWW Users who have used it for business purposes who have used it for…

Collaborating with others	54%
Publishing information	33%
Gathering information	77%
Researching competitors	46%
Selling products or services	13%
Purchasing products or services	23%
Providing customer service and support	38%
Communicating Internally	44%
Providing vendor support and communications	50%

Education WWW User demographics as opposed to US and Canadian population demographics …

Less than High School	4%	11%
High School	8%	33%
Technical School	1%	3%
Some College	24%	24%
Completed College	29%	17%
Some Post Grad	9%	3%
Post Grad	26%	8%

Nielsen,"Internet Demographics and Statistics," November 1995; available from <http://www2.chaicenter.org/otn/aboutinternet/Demographics-Nielsen.html>; Internet; accessed 8 March 1998.

[3] "All of the technological, demographic and political factors have converged to the point that elections…will be won or lost on the Internet. 65% (of net users) frequently discuss political issues and 83% are registered to vote."

Philip Noble, in an extract from the Congressional Quarterly, "Reaching Netizens," Harrisburg Patriot-News, 7 January 1998, sec. A, p. 2.

[4] Bill Maxwell, "Riding the Web right out of school," Harrisburg Patriot-News, 18 February 1998, page A10.

[5] Yoichi Tsutsui, Etsuji Miyata, Masakatsu Nakashima, "Present Situation and Its Significance of Using the Internet by International NGO's in Japan," 12 February 1998; available from <http-//v@ww.toyama-u.ac.jp/hmt/scs/ggp/gaiyou.html>; Internet; accessed 12 February 1998.

[6] Georgie Anne Geyer, "Globalizers can't erase cultural differences," Harrisburg Patriot-News, 12 January 1998, page A12.

[7] Ibid.

[8] NGO Executive Committee at the United Nations, EXECOM- The Executive Committee of Non-Governmental Organizations Associated with the United Nations Department of Public Information, "Definition," undated; available from <http://www.ngo.org>; Internet; accessed 21 November 1997.

[9] Peace 2000, "News Highlights," December 1997; available from <http://www.peace.is/INFO/news.htm>; Internet; accessed 23 February 1998.

[10] Ibid.

[11] USIS, "17-09-97 TRANSCRIPT: CLINTON REMARKS ON LAND MINES," 17 September 1997; available from <http://www.usembassy.org.uk/mines.html>; Internet; accessed 12 October 1997.

[12] USIS, "18-09-97 TEXT: DEFENSE SECRETARY COHEN ON LAND MINE POLICY AND DEMINING," 18 September 1997; available from <http://www.usembassy.org.uk/mines.html>; Internet; accessed 12 October 1997.

[13] There is an assortment of texts from NSC staffers and White House Public Affairs officials on the subject. These clearly form an effort to control the "spin" of affairs after the failure of the U.S. negotiators to win concessions for Korea and U.S. anti-tank mines; September 1997; available at <http://www.usembassy.org.uk/mines.html>; Internet; accessed 12 October 1997.

[14] ICBL,"90+ Governments Commit to Land mine Ban Treaty in December," September 1997; available from <http://www.web.net/~pgs/pages/ldbr976r.html>; Internet; accessed 12 October 1997

[15] VVAF, "Upcoming Events," July 1997; available from <http://www.vvaf.org/land mine.html/international/can_do/index.html>; Internet; accessed 12 October 1997.

[16] The White House ,A National Security Strategy for a New Century, May 1997, ii.

[17] Ibid., 7. The "shape, respond, prepare" triad spelled out here as the U.S. approach is echoed in the DOD QDR.

[18] USIS, "17-09-97 TRANSCRIPT: CLINTON REMARKS ON LAND MINES," 17 September 1997; available from <http://www.usembassy.org.uk/mines.html>; Internet; accessed 12 October 1997.

[19] USIS, "18-09-97 TEXT: DEFENSE SECRETARY COHEN ON LAND MINE POLICY AND DEMINING," 18 September 1997; available from <http://www.usembassy.org.uk/mines.html; Internet; accessed 12 October 1997.

[20] U.S. anti-tank munitions incorporate several smart anti-personnel devices within the same munition. The idea is that when you deploy the anti-tank mine, the anti-personnel devices scatter about it and prevent enemy troops from just picking the thing up and moving it. They are designed to deactivate after a preset period.

[21] The US China Policy Foundation, "China's Position on the Problem of Land mines," July 1997; available from <http://sbwm.erols.com/uscpf/1997/06/062797.html>; Internet; accessed 3 September 1997.

[22] The support for the treaty ban by numerous retired U.S. General Officers would clearly indicate to the vast majority of people that the point is certainly debatable, regardless of current DOD positions.

[23] The Center for Security Policy, available at <HTTP://www.security-policy.org>

[24] The Center for Security Policy, "Welcome to the New World Order," September 1997; available from <http://www.security-policy.org/papers/97-D125.html#N_1>; Internet; accessed 11 January 1998.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Cox, Robert and Jacobson, Harold eds. The Anatomy of Influence. New Haven, Conn., Yale University Press, 1973.

Feld, Werner; Jordan, Robert; Hurwitz, Leon. International Organizations. 3rd ed. Westport, Conn., Praeger, 1994.

Gordenker, Leon and Weiss, Thomas eds. NGO's, the UN, & Global Governance. Boulder, CO., Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 1996.

Haas, Ernst B. When Knowledge is Power. Berkeley, CA.: University of California Press, 1990.

Luard, Evan, ed. The Evolution of International Organizations. New York, Frederick A. Praeger, 1966.Schwartau, Winn. Information Warfare: Chaos on the Electronic Superhighway. New York, Thunder Mouth Press, 1994.

Thucydides. The Landmark Thucydides. Translated by Richard Crawley, edited by Robert Strassler. New York: The Free Press, 1996.