

## Providing the Former Soviet Union with National Security Advice

The end of the Cold War has relaxed NATO's requirement for military readiness. But what of the countries in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, which now face severe political, social, and economic challenges? They are confronted with the need to develop their own individual national security policies.

To help these nations formulate their own defense policies in the unfamiliar context of civilian democratic control, the AAAS Directorate for International Programs and the RAND Corporation co-sponsored a pair of short courses to explain Western security policies and processes and to discuss international cooperation.

The 2-week courses, organized by AAAS International Security program coordinator Elizabeth Kirk and RAND's Rose Gottemoeller, took place throughout October. Conducted in Kiev, Ukraine, and Alma Ata, Kazakhstan, the workshops brought together 30 to 35 mid-level bureaucrats to discuss broad national security issues.

"The course covered soup to nuts," says arms control defense analyst and course instructor Ralph Hallenbeck. "We discussed policy-making, defense acquisition, arms control, peace-keeping, and civil-military relations." The first hour of each session was reserved for formal lectures, with group discussions about practical applications taking up the rest of the day. For the most part, Hallenbeck says the students were not looking for academic lectures: "They wanted to talk about their specific problems," and they invariably sought the bottom line—"How do we do it, and how is it going to help us?"

No longer part of a larger Soviet system, individual states must now make decisions about how to plan a defense budget and whether to maintain their nuclear arsenals and large conventional force capabilities. In addition to developing independent security sys-



**"Some professors started using our materials in classes they were teaching that week."**

**—Elizabeth Kirk, International Security Program coordinator**

tems, International Security program director Tom Wander notes that nations in the former Soviet Union will need to become integrated into the broader international community. He stresses the importance of "emphasizing the notion of accountability and an appreciation of international standards of behavior."

These states must also develop a "pluralistic political system," adds Hallenbeck. "They need to learn that the interests of the minority must not be trampled by the will of the majority; win or lose, there must be no victor, no vanquished," he says.

Although they're not likely to adopt the American system, the course provides a forum for discussing general principles and

sharing the Western experience. Hallenbeck says that the lectures demonstrated "how we think about our country's security and how we go about blending civilian and military concerns, and external and domestic considerations."

This acceptance by the military of civilian analysts and legislative oversight, commonplace in the West, is something these countries need to adapt to their systems and build upon, says Wander. To highlight these interactions, course participants were garnered from both military and civilian sectors. Attendees hailed from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Defense, and from non-governmental institutes and universities. Says Wander, "They will need to broaden their acceptance of developing civilian control of military planning, budgeting, and spending."

Further, Hallenbeck and Wander agree that these new nations must be prudent in their national security planning. Each state has its particular geostrategic considerations, and neither wishes to antagonize its neighbors, including Russia.

An additional goal of sending representatives to the former Soviet Union is to "help them develop enduring networks that cut across traditional lines," says Wander. This much is already working. Program coordinator Kirk reports that "groups that didn't know each other existed want to get together to maintain the newly established networks." Course leaders assembled a roster containing the students' names, affiliations, and contact numbers so that after the Westerners withdraw, the participants can arrange to continue meeting on their own.

As for the course content, "some professors started using our materials in classes they were

teaching that week," says Kirk.

"Everyone wants us to come back to offer more specialized courses," she adds. The International Security program plans to organize two or three future courses that will focus on specific problems, like collective regional security issues and issues concerning nuclear proliferation, safety, and terrorism.

"The immediate goal is to go back in the spring," says Kirk. After reorganizing and incorporating new material, the group plans to offer the first course again. To further increase regional cooperation, Wander says that this time they'll encourage attendance of individuals from neighboring states.

In the end, Kirk says she'd like to see a host institution adopt the courses and commit to teaching them in the future.

Hallenbeck and the course organizers agree that at first the participants were reluctant to interact with one another, and were somewhat suspicious about the Americans' intentions. "There was skepticism," says Kirk. The participants probably wondered "who are these nongovernmental people and what is their motivation?" As Wander points out, these states, which are just beginning to enjoy freedom, "don't want to be in Washington's pocket."

But any reluctance to join in the exchange of ideas dissolved as the course progressed. "In the end there was equal exchange," says Kirk. "We presented information in a descriptive and in-depth way and they came back with what they thought about it within their own security context."

"We had a decent discussion of the world as a whole, with some good give and take," says Hallenbeck. "I learned a lot, and I think they did, too."

For more information about these courses, or about the International Directorate's involvement in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, contact Elizabeth Kirk at 202-326-6493.

## Assessing UNCED: Where Do We Go from Rio?

"It was the greatest meeting in recent history," says Cyril Ponnampertuma, a representative for the Third World Academy of Sciences. "One hundred fourteen heads of state gathered around a single table and agreed to save the planet Earth."

He refers to the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED)—better known as the Earth Summit. But aside from boosting Rio's economy, what did UNCED accomplish this past July?

On 18 November, the AAAS Global Change program and the American Chemical Society co-sponsored a 1-day symposium to address the accomplishments of this meeting and discussed what needs to be done next.

The symposium, entitled Environment and Development at the Close of the 20th Century: The Road from UNCED, began

with a review of the documents signed at the Earth Summit and a discussion of their potential impact. Approximately 140 attendees, including Capitol Hill staff, diplomatic science advisers, agency representatives, and interested local scientists and press were treated to a discussion of the value of UNCED, led by World Bank Environment Director Mohamed El-Ashry. A panel of UNCED attendees, including Ponnampertuma and representatives from the National Wildlife Federation, the Environmental Protection Agency, and an international agriculture research group also offered their take on the results of the Earth Summit.

In the afternoon, panels on engineering and population dynamics provided a more "forward-looking" perspective, according to Global Change program direc-

tor Michael Strauss. "We were looking at things that were treated as side issues, and not directly discussed at UNCED."

The goals of the symposium mesh well with those of the AAAS Global Change program. In order to provide technical information in a form useful for the scientific policy community,

Strauss says that attendees received a large packet of information for future reference contributed by various groups.

Strauss says that these meetings aid in creating a heightened awareness of the issues. Further, they constitute an important step toward implementing the policies recommended by UNCED, like Agenda 21.

"I'm very happy AAAS brought this together," says Ponnampertuma. "It is important to keep interest from flagging."

"The lofty ideas that the world would arrive at UNCED, sign a packet of agreements, and the environmental problems would be solved were not realized," says Strauss. Since the treaties signed at UNCED still need to be ratified by individual governments, the Earth Summit was not the end, but just the beginning.

"I was exhilarated by my experience in Rio—the realization that we are all in this together," says Ponnampertuma. "I hope that the spirit of Rio will continue, and Agenda 21 will become reality."

To receive more information about The Road from UNCED, or the Global Change program, contact Michael Strauss at 202-326-6656.

## Do We Have a Right to Health Care?

Thanks to the U.S. Constitution, Americans enjoy certain basic rights, such as the right to privacy and freedom of speech. Should health care be declared an in-

alienable right? If so, how can it be defined, implemented, and monitored?

To consider this topic, AAAS is sponsoring a series of 1-day consultations examining issues related to the right to health care. The goal of the second meeting in the series, held 13 November, was to evaluate methodologies for establishing a minimum adequate standard of health care.

"The recognition of the right to health care is already a part of the political systems of Western European countries and Canada," says Science and Human Rights program director Audrey Chapman. Participants expressed hope that the new Clinton Administration will keep its promise to overhaul the health care system. "It's not a question of whether to have health care reform," says Chapman, "but what the underlying premises and goals will be."

The panelists debated various approaches to defining a minimum benefits package, and examined the Oregon plan. In discussing how to justify and define the societal obligation to provide adequate health care, speakers also raised the more practical issues of cost-control, fair access, management, and limitations.

"We must specify practical ways to implement a program," says Mary Ann Bailey, an adjunct associate professor of economics and public policy at George Washington University. While Bailey discussed the need to guarantee an adequate level of care for everyone, she stresses that "no individual's claim on the system is absolute."

"People have to accept that they'll gain universal access if they're willing to accept reasonable limits on what they're going to get," she says.

American College of Physicians research associate Janet Weiner responds, "The purpose of the basic benefit package is to provide appropriate health care, not to limit it." She emphasizes the need for everyone to be involved, or at least represented, in designing the new package. Adds

## Who Am I?

Like former vice presidential candidate Admiral James Stockdale, we all ask this question from time to time. And AAAS is no exception. The Office of Membership and Circulation frequently compiles data analyzing the makeup of our membership.

AAAS currently has about 133,000 individual members, 10,000 of whom hail from Canada and other countries outside the U.S.

Who are these members? What are their scientific interests and where do they carry out their research? For those who wish to know who we are, a current breakdown of AAAS membership follows.

This information was compiled in October by member research manager Kathleen Markey. The data were culled from subscription information and responses to a member profile survey.

Discipline		Employer	
Biological sciences	42%	University/College	43%
Medical sciences	23%	Industry	16%
Chemistry	9%	Government	14%
Engineering	7%	Medical school/Hospital	11%
Social and Behavioral sciences	6%	Independent consultant	5%
Physics or Astronomy	5%	Other	12%
Earth sciences	4%		
Math and Computer sciences	4%		
Gender		Age	
Male	81%	Under 33 years	9%
Female	19%	33 to 42 years	26%
		43 to 52 years	27%
		53 to 62 years	17%
		Over 62 years	21%

Weiner, "special attention must be paid to children, the elderly, women, minorities, people with disabilities, and the urban population." The afternoon panel addressed how to design a minimum benefits package responsive to the needs of these communities that Chapman agrees are not adequately served by our current health care system.

Future consultations will address the implications of using a human rights approach for setting health care priorities and developing standards and indicators for measuring the right to health care. The next meetings are tentatively scheduled for 4 December 1992 and 26 February 1993. Chapman says that the resulting conclusions and recommendations should be finalized by late March or early April. From there she hopes to see the recommendations submitted to the relevant congressional committees, where they will feed into the overall health care policy debate.

For more information about the Right to Health Care consultations, contact Audrey Chapman at 202-326-6600.

### Responding to Research Misconduct

AAAS joins the Association of American Medical Colleges in sponsoring a workshop to provide university and medical school faculty and administrators with information about dealing with scientific misconduct.

This 1-day symposium, to be held on 14 December 1992 in San Francisco, will focus on the inquiry stage that follows an allegation of misconduct. It will also cover recordkeeping, protecting whistle-blowers, and dealing with the government and the press.

Similar information was presented at a workshop earlier this year in Chicago. The AAAS Directorate for Science and Policy Programs anticipates preparing a follow-up practicum to discuss the investigation of scientific misconduct.

For more information about this workshop, contact Deborah Runkle at 202-326-6794.

### Wanted: Policy Wonks with Ph.D.'s

The AAAS Directorate for Science and Policy Programs seeks Ph.D.-level to mid-career scientists and engineers interested in science policy to spend some time inside the Beltway. Must speak and write well, and have "tolerance for ambiguity."



1992-93 Congressional, Diplomatic, and Executive Branch Fellows.

Sound intriguing? The ability to communicate effectively and to cope with the frustrations of bureaucracy are just a few of the qualities that Science, Technology, and Government program director Stephen Nelson looks for in Policy Fellows. He oversees four separate fellowship programs that give scientists the opportunity to influence domestic and international science policy by working with Congress and the Administration.

Fellows in the Congressional program spend a year on Capitol Hill working with members or on congressional committees. Over the past 18 years, legislative science devotees like Senator Al Gore and Representative George Brown have benefited from the expert counsel of AAAS Fellows.

The Executive Branch pro-

gram, sponsored by the Sloan Foundation, places Fellows at the Office of Science and Technology Policy for 1 year. This relationship seems particularly apt, notes Nelson, considering that a 1975 AAAS Fellow participated in the negotiations that helped reestablish this office after it was dismantled by Richard Nixon.

In the Diplomacy program, co-sponsored by the AAAS International Directorate, Fellows spend their year at the State Department or the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID). The State Department Fellows

address international issues relating to health, the environment, global change, and scientific cooperation. At AID, the Fellows work with a broad range of issues relevant to developing countries, including energy, health, population, nutrition, and agriculture.

Lastly, the Environmental program supports Fellows for a 10-week engagement at the Environmental Protection Agency, where they serve as research consultants assessing long-range environmental problems.

What type of scientists get involved in these programs? "The type that are aware of the impact that science and engineering have on solving society's problems," says fellowship program manager Claudia Sturges. "They understand the broader applications of science in the world beyond their lab bench."

Each year about 60 new Fellows attend an intense 3-week orientation, where Sturges reports they are immersed in information about the history and culture of Washington, the purpose of government, and how science policy fits in. They then focus on policy issues and processes, including budgeting, lobbying, and other governmental activities.

Of the 760 scientists that have participated in these fellowship programs, Nelson estimates that about one-third return to science, and two-thirds pursue careers in science policy formulation—either in Washington or elsewhere in the private sector.

"Most Fellows say it's one of the best years of their lives," says Sturges, "and professionally one of the most pivotal."

But how do the policy wonks feel about science nerds invading their territory? "They keep coming back for more," says Sturges. They appreciate the Fellows, because "their scientific way of looking at things is a valuable resource to these offices."

The application deadline for the 1993 fellowship programs is 15 January 1993. To receive more information, or application instructions, contact Christopher McPhaul at 202-326-6600, or write to the AAAS Directorate for Science and Policy Programs, 1333 H Street, NW, Washington, DC, 20005.

### Science Policy and the '92 Election

On 20 November 1992, the AAAS Directorate for Science and Policy programs held a half-day seminar entitled "Election 1992: Outcomes and Implications for Science & Technology."

Representatives from the 103rd Congress and the new Administration exchanged views on the effects of the election outcomes on science and technology.

An account of this discussion will appear in the December issue of *Inside AAAS*.