

bulletin

No. 19

1 April 2001

Steps for Making Sanctions Smarter

by Ludger Volmer

Four actors are of the utmost relevance in our attempts to help to ban violence and threats to international peace and security by improving the design and implementation of UN sanctions. These are:

- the UN Security Council,
- the UN Secretariat,
- the UN Member States and
- the party responsible for provoking the sanctions against itself.

When violence escalated in the Kosovo region of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in 1998, we saw a Security Council which was paralyzed by a self-blockade. The Security Council did mandate an arms embargo under Resolution 1160 in March 1998—but this was based on minimum consensus and proved insufficient! Only the European Union and a few like-minded states reached a consensus on a visa ban list and on a flight ban for Yugoslav Airline. Effective targeted sanctions, however, need wide, broad-based support.

When we talk about smarter sanctions, we should therefore think about possible combinations of targeted measures. The need to coordinate international reaction to a crisis or conflict sees the Council in the driver's seat—otherwise we might be faced with the question: Is the Security Council the only authoritative body when it comes to future sanctions?

I am convinced that a more representative Security Council—equipped with review procedures—would reach more comprehensive decisions and would have a broader legitimacy and authority.

Members of the Security Council need and have the right to support from the UN Secretariat in finding an

appropriate way to deal with all the questions arising in Sanctions Committees. It has been an unwritten rule that permanent members do not chair these committees. The Secretariat is requested to support the non-permanent members with all its expertise and experience accumulated over the decades—in particular during the last decade with more than a dozen committees. In order to cope with the relevant questions, the Sanctions Committees should be able to gather all the information necessary—including information from non-Council members.

I hope that the concept of a Sanctions Unit will be looked at very carefully when the Secretariat is restructured—with due respect paid to our obligation to minimize the impact or side effects of sanctions on those who are not responsible for a threat to peace, be it a third country or the population of a country whose government stands under a sanctions regime.

Without the full implementation of sanctions by all Member States, even the most precise UN embargo resolution will not force those who are responsible for a threat to peace to, at least, comply with the UN Charter.

The national implementation of UN sanctions should therefore be harmonized to the highest level: we need standards for control over and for the efficiency of sanctions implementation. A single loophole in implementation can put an entire sanctions regime at risk. I see this as a crucial point, particularly with respect to arms embargoes. However good our intentions, we sometimes fail when it comes to controlling borders. In the case of small arms, this can have tremendous adverse effects and lead to further suffering on the part of innocent civilians.

I raised the topic of small arms at the EU/Southern African Development Community (SADC) meeting in Gabarone and I am pleased that the ministerial meeting of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) dealt extensively with this topic for the first time in Bamako in November 2000.

It is “our obligation to minimize the impact ... of sanctions on those who are not responsible for a threat to peace ...”

The role of the addressee of sanctions, i.e. the party responsible for provoking the sanctions, must be included in any discussion on effective, targeted sanctions. If our common goal is compliance with the principles of the UN Charter—and not punishment—then the success of sanctions depends to a large degree on the reactions of the addressee, whether it is a government or, as in cases such as Angola and Afghanistan, the leadership of a group within a country.

The public discussions about the ‘victims of sanctions’ and ‘unfair sanctions’ reveal the risks of implementing ‘smart sanctions’: not only can the international community’s approach be discredited through sanctions which are too weak, but also through sanctions which are too strong and have unintended, and some will say unacceptable, humanitarian impacts. This is shown in the debate on Iraq for example. Sanctions must therefore achieve an acceptable balance between the necessary degree of force and the probable prospect of compliance. Secretary General Kofi Annan recently underlined the need for fine-tuning, for a ‘sticks and carrots’ approach, to induce and help the violator to return to the realm of international law and to thus ‘break the circle of sanctions’.

The ‘Bonn-Berlin Process’ will help to mandate—and lift—sanctions with the necessary care and flexibility. The Kosovo case shows how targeted sanctions open the way to flexible answers: the flight ban was lifted following the democratic change in Belgrade, and the new government negotiated the relaxation of the ban list which had been targeted at officials in specific positions, but not at their democratically elected successors. The arms embargo under Resolution 1160 was meant to promote a de-escalation in the region, not to punish the regime, but to prevent imports of arms to fuel the conflict. I do not think that the time has come yet to lift this arms embargo, as this would in no way further the reconciliation process in Kosovo.

I am very impressed by the results of the ‘Bonn-Berlin Process’ organized by BICC. They will provide the Security Council with clear guidance for better targeted, ‘smarter’ sanctions—sanctions that are both effective and avoid the unnecessary involvement or suffering of innocent people.

Extracts from the statement made by Minister of State Ludger Volmer, German Federal Foreign Office, at the Final Expert Seminar of the ‘Bonn-Berlin Process’ on improving arms embargoes and travel sanctions, organized by BICC in Berlin, 3–5 December 2000.

→ Further information on the ‘Bonn-Berlin Process’ as well as papers from the Expert Seminars can be found at www.smartsanctions.de

Staff Spotlight:



**Andreas
Heinemann-Grüder**

Andreas Heinemann-Grüder joined BICC in November 1999 as leader of a project on *Demobilization and the Build-up of Armed Forces in Eastern Europe*, which compares the security policies of Poland, the Baltic states, Ukraine, Hungary, and parts of former Yugoslavia (Bosnia/Kosovo).

Scholarship is biography, and Andreas makes no exception. His father told him what war was about—no embellishment added, no romanticism left—a mixture of “Slaughterhouse No. 5” and “Catch 22”. With this kind of upbringing, Andreas became a draft resister in a pre-historic state, which, now defunct, was once known under the acronym “GDR”. Unfortunately, his decision to resist the draft was perceived by the “GDR” authorities as an unfriendly act and—to cut a long story short—led to separation. Andreas went on to study history and political science at the Free University in—West—Berlin (1977–82) and taught for a while as a high school teacher, finding this incentive enough to return to academia. Nourished by a research sojourn in Gorbachev’s Moscow in 1987/88, he wrote a dissertation on the now archaeological theme *Soviet Foreign Policy in the Middle East*. After that, he worked for the Berghof Institute of Peace and Conflict Research in Berlin from 1989–92, studying the Soviet-Russian armaments industry and writing about the making of the first Soviet atomic bomb. With the Soviet Union gone, Andreas joined the Humboldt University, teaching and researching comparative politics, particularly transformation in Eastern Europe. Following a visiting professorship at Duke University in 1995, Andreas opted for a long-term DAAD professorship in European politics at the University of Pennsylvania (1996–99). His research during these years centered mainly on comparative federalism and included in particular a study on Russia’s emerging federalism. Andreas teaches courses as a guest professor at the Humboldt University. His favorite activities include spending time with his daughter, running marathons, and enjoying concerts at Cologne’s Philharmonic Hall.

→ For further information please contact
→ Andreas Heinemann-Grüder at hg@bicc.de

The Kosovo Liberation Army— What Happened to the Fighters?

Even with a democratic regime in place in Belgrade and a massive international presence in Kosovo, the southern part of the Balkans remains one of Europe's trouble spots. In the wake of democratic transformation in Serbia, international attention has focussed on hostilities in Presevo Valley in the south.

Ethnic Albanians, who represent the majority of the population in this part of the country, are fighting a bloody war of secession against Serb police forces in a zone which was supposedly demilitarized under the terms of an international agreement. Meanwhile, further south in Macedonia, a similar scenario seems possible with a hitherto unknown Albanian National Army disrupting peace in the multi-ethnic north of the country.

Evidence seems to suggest a link between these groups and remnants of the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA)—a guerilla group that was formally disbanded by the Kosovo Protection Force (KFOR) in 1999.

A new project, which is partly funded by the Skopje office of the Friedrich-Naumann Foundation, will analyze the demobilization process of the KLA, as well as the role which former fighters are currently playing in Kosovo politics, the Kosovo Protection Corps and the Kosovo Police Force.

For further information please contact

→ Wolf-Christian Paes at paes@bicc.de or
Andreas Heinemann-Grüder at hg@bicc.de

Taking up the Conversion Challenge: 145 Military Bases in Germany to be Closed or Downsized

Federal Minister of Defense Rudolf Scharping presented his final plans for the structural reform of the Bundeswehr to parliament at the end of January. In his opening remarks, Scharping stated that—according to the criteria of economic efficiency and effectiveness—he should really have closed almost twice the number of military bases. What then followed was a rather conservative plan for the closure or downsizing of a total of 145 military bases: 59 bases will be shut down, and another 40 downsized to varying degrees. In addition, 46 base closures that had already been determined by Scharping's predecessor, Volker Rühle, are now to be implemented. In terms of employment, this means that approximately 60,000 jobs will be affected.

These numbers are fairly small compared with the first wave of base closures which took place in the early nineties after the end of the Cold War: then 700,000 jobs were lost due to the withdrawal of the allied forces. Still, this comparison is small comfort for communities affected by the reform. These reacted promptly, staging public demonstrations calling for the reversal of Scharping's decision. While there is broad consensus amongst all political parties and among the German public at large that the Bundeswehr reform is necessary, many communities affected are unwilling to give up their bases when it comes to the crunch. From their perspective, the decision to close down a military site often means a costly and time-consuming process to develop a sustainable alternative option for reuse. Thus, they are justified in demanding as much government support as possible in the upcoming conversion process.

BICC was well prepared for this "second wave of base closures". A timely press release describing BICC's extensive experience in the field of advising communities affected by base closures was distributed nationwide. Staff at BICC gave numerous press, TV and radio interviews, highlighting BICC's expertise in the field of base conversion.

BICC is currently working in a consultative capacity on behalf of the state government of North Rhine-Westphalia. Recent developments indicate that BICC will become even more involved in the second wave of base closures.

For further information please contact

→ Renée Ernst at ernst@bicc.de or
Ulrich Schirowski at us@bicc.de

**Bonn International Center for Conversion
bulletin
No. 19**

The Bonn International Center for Conversion (BICC) is an independent non-profit organization dedicated to promoting and facilitating the processes whereby people, skills, technology, equipment, and financial and economic resources can be shifted away from the defense sector and applied to alternative civilian uses.

This newsletter is published quarterly by

© Bonn International Center for Conversion (BICC)
An der Elisabethkirche 25, 53113 Bonn, Germany.

Publishing management: Michael Dedek
Responsible for this issue: Wolf-Christian Paes,
Lynn Benstead (editing) and Svenja Bends (layout).

Phone: +49-228-911960
Fax: +49-228-241215
E-mail: bicc@bicc.de
Internet: www.bicc.de

BICC Publications

In addition to its annual *conversion survey*, the BICC publishes *reports*, *briefs*, and *papers*. These series analyze the international conversion process, report on conversion projects and experiences, and offer scientific as well as practical know-how. Further details can be obtained at www.bicc.de/publications/.

Brief 18: Peter Batchelor, Jacklyn Cook and Penny McKenzie, *Conversion in South Africa in the 1990s: Defense Downsizing and Human Development Challenges*, December 2000

Paper 18: Brian Gormally, *Conversion from War to Peace: Reintegration of Ex-Prisoners in Northern Ireland*, February 2001

Hartmut Kühle. 2001. *Rüstungsindustrie im Umbruch: Strategien deutscher Unternehmen und Ansätze einer europäischen Neuordnung (Arms Industry Restructuring: German Companies in a New European Setting)*, Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, Baden-Baden

BICC Notes

Peacekeeping operations are a mixed blessing for the host nations. While the Blue Helmets may bring peace and security, they also tend to bring other, less welcome changes. Shady deals, and the spread of prostitution and HIV/AIDS are frequent camp-followers, as is a clash of cultures and the distortion of the local economy.

Vanessa Farr, Ford Fellow at BICC, Henri Myrntinen and Wolf-Christian Paes are working on a proposal for a project that would deal with the “**unwanted consequences of peace-keeping**” with a specific focus on gender relations.

For further information please contact
→ Vanessa Farr at farr@bicc.de

There are plans for **new demobilizations** following the recent peace agreement between **Eritrea and Ethiopia**. From 15 January till 8 February 2001, a multi-donor assessment mission assisted the Government of Eritrea in designing a demobilization and reintegration program. The program aims to include 200,000 soldiers and will be conducted in four phases. Amanuel Mehreteab (fellow at BICC) acted as advisor to the mission.

For further information please contact
→ Kees Kingma at kingma@bicc.de

BICC has co-operated with the International Peace Research Institute, Oslo and the Copenhagen Peace Research Institute in producing a **bibliography on disarmament and conversion**. Over 2000 entries are referenced. *Making Peace Pay*, edited by Nils Petter Gleditsch and others, and with an introductory essay on defense industry conversion by BICC's Michael Brzoska is available from Regina Books in the USA and PRIO in Europe (info@prio.no).

For further information please contact
→ Michael Brzoska at mb@bicc.de

On 19 February BICC together with Medico International, the German Church Conference for Development and the South African section of Economists Allied for Arms Reduction held a press conference in Berlin calling for a moratorium on German arms exports to South Africa. The moratorium is necessary in view of the allegations of serious corruption in South Africa. The topic was well covered in both the German and the South African Press.

For further information please contact
→ Michael Dedek at dedek@bicc.de

Upcoming BICC Events

BICC is organizing a **Conference on Curbing the Demand Side of Small Arms in IGAD States: Potentials and Pitfalls**. The conference will take place in Addis Ababa/Ethiopia from 23–26 April 2001. It is co-hosted by the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) and BICC's partner organization, the International Resource Group on Disarmament and Security in the Horn of Africa (IRG). One of the objectives of the conference is to bring together researchers and academics, decision-shapers and makers, donor and UN agencies, and disarmament experts. The conference will present case studies on the dynamics of small arms and will draft policy recommendations. This gathering of state and non-state actors is an important step prior to the UN Conference on Small Arms which will take place in July 2001. Contact: Mariska Wijt at wijt@bicc.de or Kiflemariam Gebrewold at gebre@bicc.de

BICC is co-sponsoring an International Conference on **Disarmament, Arms Industries and Conversion in the Regions** to be held in Bremen City Hall on 27/28 April 2001. Organized by Wolfram Elsner, University of Bremen, and the Bremen Foundation for Arms Conversion and Peace Research, the conference will discuss a wide range of experiences in the field of industrial conversion and base closures, and will assess future needs for conversion. It expects to attract conversion experts and activists from a large number of European countries. Contact: www.conversion2001.de

A **Workshop on Small Arms Issues** will take place at the Evangelische Akademie, Hofgeismar from 18–20 May 2001. Jointly organized by UNICEF and BICC, the event will bring together academics, representatives of NGOs and interested individuals to discuss the proliferation of small arms and measures to resolve this situation. The conference language is German and the event is open to all participants. Contact: Wolf-Christian Paes at paes@bicc.de

BICC and a number of other institutions (GTZ, NUPI, UNIDIR, UNOPS) are organizing a workshop on **Practical Disarmament: Weapons and Development** to take place in New York on 10 July in the margins of the UN Conference on Small Arms and Light Weapons. The BICC International Board will meet in New York on 11 July to review BICC projects and to advise on the Center's future program. Contact: Michael Brzoska at mb@bicc.de