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Let me lay out my initial premises to be perfectly clear at the beginning. I am convinced that nuclear proliferation, the spread of nuclear weapons to a great number of additional countries, would be very bad for the world. I think it would greatly increase the damage done in any war that happened. It would also, in many cases, increase the chances of the war happening. At the same time, I feel a certain kind of optimism in that I think many states around the world, many observers around the world, many political leaders share this feeling, share this apprehension, and in a certain kind of self-denying prophecy will take moves to head off the spread of nuclear weapons. They, in effect, will see how bad this possibility is and will, despite various things they say publicly, despite the posturing that goes on at the U.N. General Assembly or N.P.T. review conferences, quietly in various ways outline and take steps to reduce the number of countries that have nuclear weapons by the year 2000 or 2010.

Let me start with some of the items of the bad news. There are several countries that are edging closer to nuclear weapons right as we stand here. Pakistan has continued to move in the direction of buying and installing the kinds of equipment that would let it produce fissionable material. The United States has been letting the Paksitanis know that we are very much opposed to this. There is a distinct possibility that India will then feel that it has to do something to match this. There is some speculation that India has been tempted over the past three or four years to launch a preemptive air attack comparable to what Israel directed at the Iraqi facility at Osirak. Most people are saying it is probably too late for India to do that. The vintage year for trying to close down Pakistani nuclear capabilities by military attack perhaps has been passed in 1983 or 1984.

A second kind of generic piece of bad news is that west European nuclear suppliers continue from time to time to be irresponsibly selling equipment that they sort of know will be useful for producing nuclear explosives in Pakistan or Iraq or Libya. Then they pretend that they did not know, react as if they are terribly ashamed when it is called to their attention that this sale should not have gone through, and swear that they will never do it again. The temptation is very great because all these countries want to sell equipment if they can to improve their balance of payments and also to recover the costs of their investment, i.e., if you can find a customer for a reactor or for some sensitive piece of equipment, it is much easier to have that equipment for yourself. The cost of producing five or so per unit is much less than the cost of producing one or two. It may make the difference between this being a profitable venture or an unprofitable one.

But every so often one hears scandalous stories of things being sold that should not have been sold if the major countries are serious about preventing the spread of nuclear weapons. Now this is against a back-
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drop which still has not reached most
of us in the United States, namely that
we are no longer the source of seri-
ous nuclear technology. The bad
news, if you will, is that the U.S. mo-
poly on things that are sensitive is
gone. It has been gone for quite a
while. A miniature version of the bad
news is that American individuals,
and even American congressmen,
have not totally digested yet how
many other sources there are of sen-
sitive bits of technology, the kinds of
nuclear technology that can be used
to make nuclear weapons though of-
officially they may be intended only to
produce electricity by nuclear means.

A different kind of bad news is that
there have been a number of wars in
the past seven or eight years involving
countries close to nuclear weap-
os or involving even the close
proximity of nuclear weapons. The
first one that should raise eyebrows
is the South Atlantic war between
Great Britain and Argentina where
after the war was over rumors start-
ed emerging that the British navy had
sailed into the combat zone with
ships carrying nuclear weapons on-
board. One account says there were
nuclear warheads onboard the
H.M.S. Sheffield which was sunk by
the Argentine air force. The British
had to send divers down to try to
recover those warheads that were
down at the bottom of the ocean.
Now, since Argentina is one of the
countries that we keep trying to dis-
suade from reaching for nuclear
weapons, with the British allegedly
helping us, this nuclear nonprolifera-
tion effort as a serious and respon-
sible undertaking of all the major
powers suddenly becomes some-
what hypocritical. You tell the
Argentines, “Don’t get nuclear weapons
because if you had them around you
might be tempted to use them some-
day when you were in a war and it’s
better to put that temptation behind
you.” And here the British go into the
South Atlantic, not putting tempta-
tion behind them, but bringing tempta-
tion right along with them.

A similar kind of situation is with
us every day right now between Iran
and Iraq. There is always a possibility
the Iranians will break through and
make their advance on Basra, and
then their advance on Baghdad.
Some people are speculating that the
uranium that is sitting in the Iraqi re-
actor, the one the Israelis attacked,
would be enough for one atomic bomb if you put it together properly.
The irony is that if the Israelis had
not attacked Osirak, that reactor
would have been in operation and
the uranium core would have been
contaminated enough by now that it
could not be made into a bomb. But
because the Israelis attacked, they
kept the Iraqi stockpile up at one,
possibly, instead of below one, down
closer to zero. Again, it is dangerous
when a country that you worry about
as to whether it will get nuclear
weapons is involved in a war which
may threaten its very existence, when
warfare gets closer to where reactors
are, when the Iraqi reactor is not on-
ly being attacked by Israeli aircraft
but also by Iranian aircraft some of
the time, and where the Iraqis, in
turn, are attacking Iranian reactors
that have not been in operation.

The last sensitive place that is be-
coming a zone of warfare is South
Africa. The pot is boiling in South Af-
rica in a way that millions of us approve
of, but also worry about how will it
end. South Africa is a place that is
like Israel in that it is rumored to be
making nuclear weapons, hiding
them in the basement, perhaps hav-
ing 15, 20, 25 of them, perhaps never
admitting that it has them but quietly
letting the rumors out that it has
them. What if guerilla warfare grows
in South Africa and urban terrorism
and guerilla warfare in the coun-
tryside? Won’t we be getting into a sit-
uation where somebody in South
Africa says, “We have to bring our
nuclear potential more to bear.”

Continuing on with the list of bad
news, something that has been with
us for the entire time of the Reagan
administration is much greater ten-
sion between the United States and
the Soviet Union. There is an almost
automatic attitude that if the Soviets
propose something we have to de-
nounce it, if we propose something
the Soviets have to denounce it. Now
this Soviet-American lack of coop-
eration compared to the years be-
fore 1980 is bad or good, depending
on how you see superpower rela-
tions on their own. I think most of us
regret it. With regard to the issue of
nuclear proliferation, it hurts in at
least two ways. First, it gives an ex-
cuse to erstwhile seekers of nuclear
weapons to move in that direction
on a moralistic argument that says,
“If the Soviets and the Americans
cannot agree to limit their arsenal,
why should we limit ours? How can
the superpowers ask us to avoid
nuclear weapons when they are going
to SDI and cruise missiles and all
these new weapons?” Secondly, this
kind of bitterness between the United
States and the Soviet Union is ele-
mentally a threat to further coop-
eration between us and the Russians
on the nonproliferation issue.

Let me shift to the good news be-
cause I think there is good news that
is not as likely to get headlines. The
first point would be almost a pro-
position about international law. I think
that the world is coming to a certain
kind of consensus about nuclear
proliferation that has remarkable
bonding powers seen in few cases
implemented by a formal treaty. Did
you or did you not sign the Nonpro-
liferation Treaty? Did you or did you
not ratify it? Aren’t you bound by it?
In many cases it goes beyond that
and starts to tie people’s hands even
if they didn’t agree by treaty to sub-
mit to it, just because everybody else
is binding themselves.

Now this is a lot like the mutual
deterrence model. The mutual de-
terrence model says, “I’ve got a bomb
and you’ve got a bomb. I won’t use
it as long as you don’t and you won’t
use it if I don’t.” And that mutual
deterrence model would have struck
many people as strange in 1945. If I
had given a lecture to military offi-
cers in 1945 saying that these weap-
os will be built that won’t be used,
people would have said, “You’re
much too idealistic. Where are you
getting this from? There’s never been
anything like that in history.”

Now this is one step further that
says, “I could make bombs, you could
make bombs, but neither one of us
will do it as long as the other doesn’t
because we know that if we do it you
will and vice versa.” I think this is the
attitude that is now starting to show
up between Argentina and Brazil. I
think there are lots of people in Ar-
gentina who would love to be the
only country in Latin America to have nuclear weapons but don't particularly look forward to a world in which they and the Brazilians and maybe the Chileans and the Peruvians also have them. It is an attitude that sometimes is based on the treaty but sometimes goes around it. For historic reasons, none of those countries are probably ever going to ratify the nuclear nonproliferation treaty, but they might do it indirectly via the Latin American Nuclear-Free Zone. That's made in Latin America. The Yankees didn't tell them to do that. Or even if Argentina and Brazil don't sign the Latin American Nuclear-Free Zone, more recently there has been talk of joint Argentine-Brazilian research on nuclear matters. If you are an alarmist you think that would mean a joint bomb for the two of them. And if you believe in a joint bomb for Argentina and Brazil, you are seeing something I cannot possibly see. What that joint research would do would be an opportunity for each side to test what the others is doing and reassure each side about what the other is not doing, and steering forward into the future of a world of "You didn't get bombs and I didn't get bombs."

What you are seeing at NPT review conferences, U.N. General Assembly sessions, and a lot of other places is a new international norm that says, "If you get nuclear weapons you're rocking the boat. If you get nuclear weapons you are needlessly upsetting this region," and even going a little further saying, "If you don't submit your nuclear activities to international safeguards such as are provided by the International Atomic Energy Agency, the IAEA, you are needlessly panicking other people." This is not just the United States, Britain, and the Soviet Union speaking. In fact, since Reagan and his administration adopted its lower profile on nonproliferation it has actually smoked out of the woodwork a number of Third World leaders and European leaders who had to say to themselves, "My God, if the Americans don't push for nonproliferation then we have to do more about it." The bottom line on this would be that an awful lot of countries are now quietly, or not so quietly, showing that they value the nuclear nonproliferation regime.

Soviet-American cooperation in this area has been as good as you could ever find. There are various ways to illustrate this. All through the history of the resistance to the spread of nuclear weapons the pattern has been that we get together with the Russians in smoke-filled rooms and talk about how to handle the Romansians and the French and the Germans and the Indians and Swedes. There have been instances where the Soviets would send a note across the table saying, "We were out celebrating last night and didn't have a chance to read the Brazilian motion. What do you think we should do? Vote no? Abstain?" And the Americans would send back a note saying, "We are going to abstain." And then the Russians would abstain too. There is a Frenchman I know who goes to all the meetings. His complaint is that he has to listen to all the speeches and translations through earphones and he can never tell whether the Russians are speaking or the Americans are speaking because they say exactly the same thing.

There was some doubt as to whether the Reagan administration could see this. Could they believe that there was something in which we and the Russians actually had the same interest? Wasn't the Nonproliferation Treaty some sort of a Soviet trick? If they're in favor, it must be a trick. The other point is the Soviets have done their homework. They have locked up all of their satellite countries on the nonproliferation front. I asked somebody from the IAA which country had given them the best cooperation in terms of accepting inspection by your agency as they are supposed to under the NPT. He said, "That's easy: East Germany. It's a mixture of German attention to detail and Soviet orders from the top that say 'You will cooperate with the people from Vienna. You will show them everything. You will not give them a hard time. You will bend over backward.'" The Soviets don't want nuclear weapons to spread. I think they have the same good reasons we do to keep nuclear weapons from spreading. They may make wars hor-

rible where they otherwise would have only been medium horrible. They may even make wars more likely.

One piece of good news may simply be that over the years the Arab states have accepted the rumors and come to terms with the fact that they cannot push Israel into the sea. Why does Israel need nuclear weapons much more than the Arab states need them? Because Israel is a status quo power and the Arabs are anti-status quo. They think it is an outrage that Palestine is under alien rule. They say that they want all of the people who have arrived since 1922 to leave and talk about killing them all or deporting them all. What has happened with the rumors of nuclear proliferation is that the fondest dream is spoiled. It now has a nightmare attached to the end. If that works we may have the best of both worlds in the end in that the Arabs come to terms with the existence of Israel without finalizing that Israel did make bombs, that the Chinese communists come to terms with the independence of Taiwan, and that Kim II Soong comes to terms with the independence of South Korea without detonations of nuclear weapons, without rocking the boat, without finalizing that Israel did make bombs.

On nonproliferation, it is possible and still possible that the U.S. government is just as worried about the spread of nuclear weapons now as it was under Carter and Mondale, but learned that the way to address your worries is not to give them away but to pretend you are not so concerned and smoke out some other people who had been getting a free ride out of your own concern. If you have to watch successful negotiations on stopping Pakistan or stopping Taiwan from getting nuclear weapons, those will probably become unsuccessful negotiations. If you try to make it open and clear that you are stopping the Brazilians, you irritate people, you humiliate them, get them angry, and then you do not get the results you want. It is possible that this administration cares just as much and is being successful at it and that what we have to do is trust them because the only way for them to be really successful is to be subtle. To be sub-
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t is to be hidden, murky, or whatever. My bottom line is that we will get to the year 2000, maybe the year 2010, very possibly with only eight or nine countries having nuclear weapons: the five that are openly there, plus India which in effect has been there for 10 years now, and maybe Pakistan. And then, of course, you have to deal with Israel and South Africa and the inherent possibilities of bombs in the basement.

There is a terrible tendency on the part of most of us who talk about nuclear proliferation to be pessimistic. It is because if we are wrong nobody minds and if we are right, at least we covered ourselves. There have been studies again and again that say there will be 15 countries, 25 countries, 50 countries to have nuclear weapons. A few of you who know me from the past know that I was a weather forecaster once in my life. The analogy is very similar. A whole lot more tornadoes get predicted than ever happen. Why is that? Because if you are wrong nobody minds and if you right, at least you are covered. When there is a chance of tornadoes, you don’t dare say no tornadoes. You go out the other way and say tornadoes—and three inches of snow even if there is only going to be one inch. What I worry about, which is different from tornadoes, is that too much of this pessimism could be self-confirming. To my knowledge there has never been a tornado that has happened just because everybody predicted it and it became a self-confirming phenomenon. The risk with nuclear weapons spread is that we all get to be too pessimistic and since I have to watch your rumors and base my action on it, I will get scared and I will confirm the rumors on my side because I am taking precautions against what you are doing. That, I think, would be a uniquely influential impact of social science on the real world and would be a very bad impact. And that is why I am more optimistic than some of the other people you could have asked.

Rusk Center Activities

—The Center continued as the principal sponsor of the University of Georgia Canadian Interest Group. The Canadian Embassy awarded the Center a program development grant to expand Canadian studies at the University.


—The Center continued as co-organizer of the Committee on Asian Studies at the University of Georgia.

—Dorinda Dallmeyer, Research Director of the Center, was a principal speaker in a symposium on Science, Technology, and Arms Control held in February 1987. The topics discussed included: (1) the contribution of the scientific and technological enterprise to the development of new weapons systems, (2) the roles that scientific and technological enterprises play in arms control and disarmament agreements, (3) the information derived from scientific and technological research which enhances arms control processes, (4) the implications of current research for the development of future weapons systems, and (5) aspects of existing arms control agreements related to science and technology.

—On March 30, 1987, the Center organized a one-day conference, “Japan in the ’80s,” an interdisciplinary look at problems of external relations facing Japan, emphasizing defense and trade issues.

—The director of the Center continued as a member of the Board of Directors of the University of Georgia Latin American Studies Center.

—The Rusk Center published the following monographs: (1) Dynamics of Japanese-United States Trade Relations (1986); (2) International Protection of Intellectual Property Rights under the United States Trade Laws (1986); (3) How to Achieve Free and Fair Trade between the United States and Canada (1986); (4) The Dynamics of Arms Control: From Hiroshima to the Year 2000 (1987); and (5) Antidumping and Countervailing Duties and the GATT: An Evaluation and a Proposal for a Unified Remedy for Unfair International Trade (1987).

—The Center sponsored public lectures by the following speakers: (1) Ambassador Tapley Bennett on...
Rusk Center Activities (cont.)


—The Center continued to work on opening a Dean Rusk Research Collection at the University of Georgia. This research collection will consist of the papers of Dean Rusk gathered from various libraries and other sources throughout the United States and brought together to be housed at the University of Georgia Library. The Rusk Research Collection will also contain extensive oral history recordings of Dean Rusk and his associates. The principal organizer of the collection is Savanna Jackson.

—in May 1987, the Rusk Center, in cooperation with the University of Georgia Geography Department, organized a symposium on maritime boundaries, "Rights to Oceanic Resources," an interdisciplinary examination of the problem of trying maritime boundaries which are disputed in various places throughout the world. It is contemplated that the proceedings of this conference will be published as a Rusk Center monograph.

—The Rusk Center continued to sponsor the Arms Control Forum, a group devoted to research and the discussion of ideas on arms control.

—The Center continued its investigation of the problem of the regulation of nuclear power. The focus of this research is to look at nuclear power regulation in other countries, notably Japan and France, to determine if the regulation of nuclear power in the United States can be made more efficient and less costly without sacrificing safety considerations.

Selected Recent Acquisitions
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Legal Aspects of Doing Business with China, 1985,
Legislative Responses To Terrorism, Bordrecht:
Litigance Between the International Court of
Justice and the Security Council, Theodoor J.H.
Elsen, 1986.
NATO'S Future: Toward a New Transatlantic Bar-
Ollenu's Principles of Customary Land Law In
Ghana, 2nd Edition, Nii Amaa Ollenu, Birmingham,
Sea-Bed Energy and Mineral Resources and the
Taxation of Natural Resources, Jozef Lysen, 1966.
Trade Protection in the United States: 31 Case
Studies, Gary Clyde Hufbauer, Diane T. Berliner, and
Trading for Growth: The Next Round of Trade Ne-
tiagotiations, Gary Clyde Hufbauer and Jeffrey H.
Schott, (#11, Policy Analyses in International Eco-
nomics series), Washington, D.C.: Institute for In-

Dean Rusk Center Monograph Series
New Releases

Dynamics of Japanese-United States Trade Relations. Edited by Thomas J.
Schoenbaum, Mitsuo Matsumita, and Dorinda G. Dallmeyer. Japan is
America's largest overseas trading partner and, for Japan, the United
States is the most important trading relationship, the basis of her postwar
prosperity. If the United States and Japan are engaged in a war over trade
as the doomsayers suggest, why are economic conditions relatively good,
and why are we doing more business together than ever before?
The papers in this monograph represent an intensive study of U.S.-Japan
trade issues undertaken over the past three years by a Japanese and an
American research team. Over a period of three years the project
produced research papers and conducted workshop sessions in Tokyo
Athens, New Orleans, Vancouver, Melbourne, and Sydney. Order
directly from the Rusk Center at a cost of $15.00.
The Strategic Defense Initiative: New Perspectives On Deterrence. Edited by
Dorinda G. Dallmeyer. The Strategic Defense Initiative or "Star Wars"
has evolved into a massively-funded research and development effort with
profound implications not only for weapons technology but also for
East-West relations. In this volume preeminent figures from the policy-
making and defense communities address critical aspects of the pro-
gram, offering widely divergent points of view. Their essays compose
an authoritative reference work on one of the major controversies of the
decade.
This monograph is a result of the highly successful conference cospon-
sored by the Rusk Center and School of Social Sciences at Georgia
Tech in November 1985. Order directly from the publisher: Westview
Press, Customer Service Department, 5500 Central Ave., Boulder, Colora-
da 80301. Cost $17.45.
How To Achieve Free and Fair Trade Between the United States and Can-
ada. Edited by Thomas J. Schoen-
baum and Dorinda G. Dallmeyer.
Canada and the United States are each other's most important trading
partner. This interdependent trade relationship was emphasized by a
joint proposal in 1985 that the two governments negotiate a free trade
agreement to more completely open markets on both sides of the border.
Since that time, however, the legal, economic, and social impediments
to free trade have become more ap-
parent.
In February 1986 the Rusk Center held a day-long roundtable to ana-
lyze the progress towards a free trade
pact. In this volume, government offi-
cials, academicians, and students from both Canada and the United
States discuss prospects, problems, and potential solutions to facilitate
free trade. Order directly from the Rusk Center at a cost of $15.00.
The Dynamics of Arms Control: From Hiroshima to the Year 2000. Edited by
Dorinda G. Dallmeyer. Over forty
years have passed without the firing of a nuclear weapon in anger. Yet with
the development of smaller, faster, stealthier weapons we may be drift-
ing towards a less secure world and the basis of nuclear deterrence itself
may become obsolete. In October
1985 the Rusk Center sponsored a four-hour nationally broadcast tele-
conference on the future of arms control. In a lively, thought-provoking
discussion Dean Rusk, Alexander
Haig, McGeorge Bundy, John Chan-
cellar, and Martin Hillenbrand look at the past, present, and future of
arms control. Order directly from the Rusk Center at a cost of $12.50.
International Protection of Intellec-
tual Property Rights Under the
United States Trade Laws by Douglas
H. Yarn. In the federal courts it is
often quite difficult to obtain jurisdic-
tion over foreign producers who are
infringing on intellectual property
rights such as copyrights, trademarks, and patents. As an alternative
to this lengthy litigation in the federal
courts, Section 337 proceedings be-
fore the International Trade Com-
mmission allow the injured party to
receive rapid relief. Although Sec-
tion 337 offers significant strategic
advantages to the initiated, the pro-
ceedings pose many traps for the un-
warny. Practitioners should be
particularly interested in this volume
Continued
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which compares and contrasts Section 337 with the available statutory civil remedies for intellectual property right infringement. The book is especially valuable for its discussion of practice and procedure, elements of the case, defenses, and strategy. Order directly from the Rusk Center at a cost of $10.00.

Antidumping and Countervailing Duties and the GATT: An Evaluation and a Proposal for a Unified Remedy for Unfair International Trade by Thomas J. Schoenbaum. International trade's antidumping and countervailing duty regulations were designed to prevent price discrimi-
nation and subsidies that injure domestic commerce. This book discusses how they have become so legalistic as to be protectionist obstacles to free and fair trade and suggests remedies to return them to their original purpose. Order directly from the Rusk Center at a cost of $10.00.

THE DEAN RUSK CENTER MONOGRAPH SERIES is published by the Dean Rusk Center for International and Comparative Law, School of Law, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia; Thomas J. Schoenbaum, General Editor; Dorinda G. Dallmeyer, Project Editor.

International Developments

Based on the number of workers on payrolls of foreign-affiliated corporations, the Commerce Department's Bureau of Economic Analysis reports that Georgia, the Carolinas, and the rest of the Southeast had one-quarter of all workers in the U.S. employed by affiliates of overseas companies, excluding foreign banks. A growing number of overseas-affiliated companies are choosing to locate in the Southeast and Southwest instead of traditional states. Of states with more than 50,000 foreign-company workers, Georgia had the fastest growth rate of any state, 16 percent. Texas, Arizona, and the other Southwestern States had just 10 percent of the nation's foreign affiliated employment as of 1983, the latest year the BEA has figures.

***

The Coca-Cola Company's increasing emphasis on its international business resulted in an international volume increase of about 12 percent in 1986. Volume in Europe, which provides 26 percent of Coca-Cola's overseas market, grew by 12 percent and volume in Brazil, which accounts for 10 percent of Coca-Cola's overseas market, increased by 56 percent. Coca-Cola products control 41 percent of the international soft drink market. Coca-Cola, which makes more than half of its earnings outside the United States, is further expanding its market through agreements with Russia and China. The company's operations will increase substantially through a $10 million agreement with China that calls for construction of several bottling and can plants.

***

Organizers of a new bank, Summit National, plan to serve Atlanta's growing international community. Most of the bank employers will be bilingual or multilingual. The bank organizers are filing for a national charter, rather than a state charter, in hopes of encouraging and reassuring foreign investors seeking to enter the U.S. market. An initial $3 million will be invested in the bank and its holding company, Inter Union Corp. Later this year, an additional $7 million is expected to be raised through a public offering. By the bank's fifth year of operation, organizers expect to have a 1.18 percent return on assets with a $110 million asset base.

Societe Auxiliare d'Entreprises (SAE), a Paris-based construction firm, has purchased two Atlanta companies, Pinkerton and Laws Company, a construction firm, and Carlson Group, an architectural, engineering, and construction firm. The $2.9 billion French firm often acquires competing American firms because the competition helps generate more income for the firm. Currently, the firm has contracted to do two projects for Disney in Orlando. In Europe, SAE is one of five French companies involved in building the tunnel under the English Channel to join France with Great Britain.

***

Business activity between Japan and Atlanta should increase substantially since Delta Air Lines began 5 weekly flights to Tokyo this spring and Japan Air Lines plans to begin service to Atlanta this summer. Atlanta-based Delta has filed a request with the U.S. Department of Transportation for permission to add service to Seoul, South Korea in July. Delta expects the 1988 Olympics, which are scheduled to be held in Seoul, will help make Korea one of the fastest growing tourist destinations in the world.
The Georgia Journal of International and Comparative Law

The Georgia Journal of International and Comparative Law recently has completed publication of Volume 16:Supplement and Volume 17:1. Volume 16:Supplement is a special issue commemorating the 200th anniversary of the Constitution and the Congress it created. This issue includes a collection of essays by distinguished authors that discuss the role of the Congress in the field of international law.

The lead piece in Volume 17:1 is an article by Professor Gary Born addressing United States jurisdiction over foreign defendants. Professor Born’s article was cited by the Supreme Court of the United States on February 24, 1987 in Asahi Metal Industry Co., Ltd. v. Superior Court of California (available on LEXIS). The 1986 Dean Rusk Award, authored by Roland Behm, also appears in Volume 17:1.

The Georgia Journal is published three times a year at the School of Law, The University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia 30602, U.S.A. Telephone: (404) 542-7289. Subscriptions, inquiries, and manuscripts should be sent to the above address.