

practical forum in which to address the dangers of conventional weapons and technology proliferation, and its modest objectives can be expanded over time. The existence of the forum raises questions which each party must answer: should a country develop arms transfers policies separate from policies for maintenance of the defense industrial base? Is a particular sale of arms in the country's national security interests? Does the sale enhance regional and international security?

The Convention on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW)

Since its signing in 1980, the CCW has become the focus of international efforts to address the global landmine crisis, although many of the most affected states--the victims of landmines--and those countries who contribute to the problem remain outside of the regime. On 3 May 1996, negotiators at the first CCW review conference approved a revised protocol (Protocol II) that places new limits on the use, production, and transfer of anti-personnel mines. The protocol requires CCW parties to incorporate both self-destruct and self-deactivation features on anti-personnel mines used outside of marked and monitored areas or remotely delivered. States may take up to nine years to convert their stockpiles; however, all anti-personnel landmines produced after 1 January 1997 must contain materials or devices to make them more detectable.

Because of intense opposition from a number of countries including China, Russia, India, and Pakistan, CCW parties did not attempt to negotiate an immediate global ban. This decision has been severely criticized by some analysts, while others have praised the new initiatives as being the best that could be achieved at the time. The debate between these two points of view intensified when the United States announced that, while reaffirming support for the "aggressive" pursuit of an international agreement to ban their use, it would, in any negotiations, reserve the right to continue using anti-personnel mines on the Korean Peninsula until "the risk of aggression" has been removed or an alternative to mines is available.³²

The debate over the outcome of the CCW review conference underlines the fact that there is no agreed-upon criteria, either within the U.S. Government or multilaterally, for evaluating the CCW. The view that a reduction in post-combat civilian casualties associated with landmines and a reduction in land denial caused by landmines are achievable goals is in marked contrast to the requirement that nothing less than all land mines be banned. The sides in this debate remain diametrically opposed, as demonstrated by two recent articles on the subject in the United States. In one, the chief U.S. negotiator at the Review Conference claims that "what was achieved at the conference is, undoubtedly less categorical than a total ban, but, as an interim step toward a global ban, undoubtedly more effective in reducing civilian casualties than a ban that lacked

³² The quotations are taken from a Fact Sheet released by Office of the Press Secretary, The White House, dated 16 May 1996.