

November 14, 2001

Meet the Author Series
Reese Library
Augusta State University

Book: Jurgen Brauer and Keith Hartley (eds.) *The Economics of Regional Security: NATO, the Mediterranean, and Southern Africa*. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers, 2000.

by Jurgen Brauer

Let me first make a technical but important correction. I am not the author of the book to be discussed today; I am its co-editor. It is my understanding that I am the first person in this “Meet the Author” series at Reese Library to discuss an edited book, rather than an authored or co-authored monograph. In light of this novelty, and considering that I have now produced four edited books – published in 1993, 1997, 2000, and a new, forthcoming one in 2002 – and possess some how-to-do-it expertise, I thought it might be of general interest to discuss the background and process of producing an edited book rather than the contents of this particular one.

In all cases I have been the lead editor and had no particular need to take on a co-editor except that I found it, and still find it, rather more useful to have another person around to bounce off ideas.

The book under discussion today got its start ten years ago when I received a \$50,000 grant from the Ford Foundation to construct what came to be called the *Global Register of Experts on the Economics of Military Affairs* (GREEMA). At the time, the economics of military affairs had barely been established as a recognized field within the economics profession. Indeed, it did not even have a name like labor economics or urban economics or development economics or health economics. Some called it defense economics, some insisted on peace economics, some preferred the economics of conflict, war, and peace or, as I then did, the economics of military affairs. Most contributors to the nascent field worked primarily in other fields and wrote occasional pieces related to issues of defense and security, a field traditionally dominated – still dominated – by political scientists and international relations specialists. But during the mid- and late 1980s economists increasingly recognized that war and preparations for war are not conducive to economic well-being, and the arms

build-up and cold war nuclear saber-rattling during President Reagan's term of office caused concern and raised questions about the economic sacrifices involved. It was the classic "guns-versus-butter" argument, and economists thought that the trade-off between warfare and welfare might have reached unsustainable levels, that the cost of the arms race in terms of foregone opportunities for civilian betterment may have become too great for society to bear, and that alternative, less costly, ways of providing for global security needed to be sought. In a word, it became more urgent to study the extent of the trade-off.

Inspired by their medical colleagues, the *Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War*, several Nobel-Laureates in Economic Science formed, in 1989, a group then known as *Economists Against the Arms Race* (ECAAR). Of course, the Berlin Wall fell that year, in November 1989, and the Soviet Union ceased existence in December 1991. The arms race appeared over. The economists consequently renamed their new organization which then became *Economists Allied for Arms Reduction* (ECAAR), a somewhat inelegant formulation but with the redeeming virtue that it retained the acronym under which various foundations had already come to know it. Between the fall of the Berlin Wall and the fall of the Soviet Union, ECAAR held its first conference in 1990 at the University of Notre Dame. Before 1990, not only were conferences on the economics of military affairs rare but they suffered from a certain lack of attention within the profession. The Notre Dame conference was important because in attendance was the creme of the economics world. Several Nobel-Laureates, several past presidents of the American Economic Association, and other leading lights of the profession attended and joined with subject-matter experts. Then, in 1991, the emerging field produced its first academic journal, called *Defence Economics* (later renamed as *Defence and Peace Economics*).

In a word, the time seemed ripe to produce a global registry of all those who had in the past contributed in minor or major ways to the new field of study so that we would know of each other, would know how to reach each other, and would learn of each others' major pertinent studies and publications. I collected nearly 500 names from about 50 countries. Most of these of course were US-based scholars, but one of the non-US folks was a fellow by the name of Manuel Ennes Ferreira, a young professor in Portugal. Somehow or other, he had heard of my register, and he sent in the form.

While I was working on the registry, the cold war between the US and the USSR ended and economists' attention turned to the issues of disarmament and the conversion of economic resources from military to civilian applications, but this did not apply to other regions of the world. Indeed, as the Soviet Union died, so did the

need to sustain puppet governments and the urge to fight proxy wars in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Sadly, the end of the cold war ushered in a new period of history in which existing internal wars – for one really should not refer to them as “civil” wars – became ever more unconstrained and nasty. It was in this context that I received, in 1997, an utterly unexpected message from young Dr. Ennes Ferreira. Did I recall that he had filled in the form for the global registry? Did I remember him? Would I be willing and able – by tapping into my registry database – to help organize a defense and peace economics conference in Lisbon, to be held in June 1998?

Would I indeed! I joined the conference’s scientific advisory committee, to review and screen paper proposals, as well as its organizing committee to help arrange the conference details – scheduling, panel compositions – and the like, and I made phone calls and sent e-mails and invited all the really big names. Would they mind writing a paper to be presented in Lisbon, expenses paid? Would they indeed! In economics we call this a “moral hazard.” A moral hazard means that even if you had absolutely nothing worthwhile to say, you’d still fly to Lisbon. The rapidity of the affirmative responses might suggest that we all failed the moral hazard test, for we all flew to Lisbon, courtesy of the Portuguese Ministry of Defense, the Portuguese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Portuguese Defense Manufacturers Association, the Technical University of Lisbon, and various other sponsors. But in truth, as you might expect of economists – moreover of economists concerned with as deeply a moral issue as war and peace – most of us undertook a genuine effort to research and write good papers.

The book before you is a selection of edited papers originating with that conference in June 1998. Before I discuss the selection and editing process, let me say a word about Portugal. Why Portugal, why Lisbon? Why did Manuel Ennes Ferreira call me for help? To appreciate the answer you need to know that until 1975 Portugal was a major colonial power holding a smattering of territories – tiny and vast – across Asia, Africa, and South America. Its South America colony – Brazil – was lost and became independent in 1822 but other territories were picked up in Africa later on that century. Portugal also was ruled, from 1926 to 1974, a military dictatorship. Following World War II, anti-colonial struggles raged, especially in Africa, and became entwined with and in the superpower struggle between the US and the USSR. Anti-colonialism, anti-capitalism, and anti-westernization, supported and funded by the Soviet Union, became a rallying point around which to fight against the Portuguese colonial master. Its military commanders became unhappy and restive. Instead of the plush life of colonial administration, Portuguese soldiers now died on the anti-colonial battlefield. The repercussions were to result in a military coup, against the military government,

in Lisbon on 25 April 1974.

The revolution carried stunning consequences not just for Portugal but for its former colonies. For example, East Timor became independent for a few months and then suffered an invasion by Indonesia in 1975, which exercised a brutally repressive regime on the island. Only in 1999 did Indonesia turn the island over to UN administration, and only this year did the East Timorese hold an election to become politically independent again. The Portuguese closely monitored and debated the events of course. In Africa, after years of anti-colonial warfare, the huge swath of land known as Mozambique became independent in 1975 under a “socialist” government, to be followed by a nasty internal war that lasted until 1992. Angola, up the African west coast, also became independent in 1975, also under a “socialist” government, and also started an internal war that continues to this day. Angola now has seen forty years of continuous warfare. Again, these events were and are intensely monitored and debated in Portugal. Portugal’s various other territories likewise were set adrift to face their own fate on the high waters of global politics. As a colonial power Portugal was done for, and the bitterest of memories and recriminations formed. To this very day, the subject of the military in Portugal is spoken of very much in hushed voices.

In 1997, nearly a quarter-century after the Portuguese revolution, Manuel Ennes Ferreira called me. The time, he said, had finally ripened for non-military people to be permitted to address military topics in Portugal. But it must be important people, it must be foreigners, it must be people of international rank and reputation. It must be people who would not be looked down upon in status-conscious Portugal, yet whose opinions could be dismissed if needed. A slew of famous foreign professors would fit the bill.

As I indicated, East Timor was brewing, Mozambique had just ended its post-colonial internal war in 1992, and, after a lull, Angola’s internal war had flared up again. But Portugal was now a modern country, a real democracy, part of the EU, part of NATO, a new generation of leaders had grown up, and old generals had retired. Portugal was respectable again, and among the young generation a genuinely compassionate interest had developed in the fate of Portugal’s former colonies whose people, after all, still spoke Portuguese and came to Portugal to study. And so it passed that the Portuguese Ministries of Defense and Foreign Affairs and various other parties funded the conference, provided we could truly bring in the top-notch people of the field. Could I deliver? Yes.

The conference was held on the premises of the Portuguese National Defense Institute

in Lisbon – a concession of huge symbolic value, like inviting peaceniks to the Pentagon. The economics of conflict, war, and peace had arrived in Portugal. It had become an acceptable topic of discussion even within the military. It was a major achievement! We have since held another conference in the summer of 2000, and a third one is planned for the summer of 2002. As before, I am involved in a major way through my professional connections and my ready access to the “big names” both within the field as well as within the economics discipline at large. For instance, I was able to bring Nobel-Laureate Amartya Sen to Lisbon in 2001, and I was able to bring Joseph Stiglitz to Lisbon in 2000. At the time, Joe was the Chief Economist of the World Bank – from a practical point of view doubtless one of the most important economists in the entire world – and it was prime-time news in Portugal for him to give a speech related to the deleterious effects of war on the economic development of poor countries – such as Angola – and to explicitly point out that he had come on behalf of the peace economists. (A month ago, in October 2001, Joe Stiglitz was awarded his own Nobel-prize, resulting in yet another round of positive news coverage in Portugal.)

Similar sorts of networking are applied to Turkey where I myself and others have given an increasing number of lectures in recent years. We have not yet had a dedicated defense and peace economics conference in Turkey but we have a session at Turkey’s premier annual economics conference. We also succeeded earlier this year to hold a dedicated defense and peace economics conference in Greece for the very first time. I need not remind you that Turkey has had three military governments in recent years – in the early 1960s, early 1970s, and early 1980s – and that the military are, even today, never very far at all from intervention in Turkey’s democratically elected government. Likewise, Greece lived under military dictatorship in the mid-1960s until 1974 when both countries – although NATO members – very nearly went to war over the island of Cyprus. Since 1974, Turkey and Greece have had a number of high-alert stand-offs.

So much for the background of the book. Let me take a few minutes to talk about its contributors, its design, and the selection and editing process. A large number of papers were given, both in Portuguese and in English, by economists and by Portuguese military folks. It was decided early on to publish all papers in Portuguese as a simple proceedings volume – that is, slap all papers together, unedited, not reviewed, and put a heavy-stock cover around it. Job done. Much more politically sensitive was the negotiation to publish a special issue of the Defense Institute’s house-journal – *Nação e Defesa (Nation and Defense)* – with carefully selected conference papers, of course in Portuguese. The journal is prestigious, its audience

is military and high-level political. The issue would have to contain its complement of military writers – and it did – but it must also contain its contingent of foreigners. The papers of the two undisputed top scholars in the field, Professor Keith Hartley of the University of York in England and Professor Todd Sandler, now of the University of Southern California in Los Angeles, were selected for translation and publication. The only other paper by a foreigner was my own. There then followed intense discussion at the Defense Institute, not concluded even today, about adding an international board of advisors to the journal. In Portugal, the military still is a rather more touchy subject matter.

For English-language consumption, and for the wider *academic* respectability of the entire event, the aforementioned Professor Hartley and I were asked to edit and publish selected papers in book form with an established publishing house. This resulted in the book before you, published in the summer of 2000. The book includes chapters by the Englishman Keith Hartley, the American Todd Sandler, and the Frenchman Jacques Fontanel, all three leading lights in our field. In addition, we selected papers by authors originating from Belgium, Greece, Turkey, Canada, Portugal, Germany, and South Africa. The Belgian was just finishing his thesis work in Switzerland, the German worked on his thesis at Oxford University in the UK, the Canadian is a prominent economist at the Canadian Royal Military College, the Greeks and Turks had mostly studied in England and represented an up-and-coming generation of young, technically skilled economists. I always have an eye for authors from non-US and non-UK countries and for young authors, about to finish their PhD or just having finished it. I suppose it's a substitute for not having my own PhD students here at Augusta State University.

Since a large number of papers were presented on South Africa, we selected only a few for the book, and put some of the remainder into a special issue of *Defence and Peace Economics*, of which Prof. Hartley is the main editor. Thus, in the book we ended up with five papers on southern Africa, five papers on the eastern and western Mediterranean, and four more general, “overview” papers on issues such as European defense procurement and the future role of NATO, for a total of fourteen chapters, plus an introductory chapter written by Keith and myself. I was the lead editor, responsible for absolutely all details, and used my co-editor primarily to bounce off ideas, to discuss the contents and outline of the planned book, to approach and invite authors, to independently review the submitted papers, and to otherwise assist as needed. We jointly wrote a book proposal, sent it off for external review by a reviewer chosen by the prospective publisher, got the proposal accepted, and received a contract. Of course it helped, but did not sway, that my co-editor, Professor Hartley,

was the editor of the book series within which we hoped the book would be published! (Meanwhile, the series – *Studies in Defence Economics* – has migrated to Routledge, a respected commercial publisher out of London, and I have been named series co-editor. I am now also on the editorial board of the journal, *Defence and Peace Economics*).

As you might imagine, dealing with a total of sixteen authors from ten countries is a challenge. Have you ever tried to edit South African, Canadian, US, and British English to a common standard? Now throw in whatever English you get out of Turkey, Greece, France, Belgium, Portugal, and Germany and you get the idea! In many cases, I end up rewriting entire papers simply from an English-language and communications point of view. Usually the authors are grateful but you have to be able to put things “just so.” Moreover, since I don’t publish papers without technical merit, the papers have to be reviewed for their technical merit. You have to check the equations, you have to think about each number appearing in each table. You have to challenge the authors when you think they’ve got things wrong. After all, while it’s their name on the page it’s my name on the cover! You may even have to argue with the author about the paper’s conclusions. In one case, for example, I found a math error that substantially altered the conclusion. Indeed, the conclusion was entirely the opposite of what the author thought he had found!

One thing you may *not* do is to fail to publish merely because you disagree. If the work is credible scientific work, you publish! And I have published any number of papers whose results I did not “like.” In the long-run, I have more confidence in the scientific process than in myself. Over time, the process of scientific vetting and open debate will ferret out mistaken ideas far more surely than any one of us can. That is the nature of academic freedom.

Then you have to haggle with the authors over paper length – authors always want to publish more irrelevant pages – and you need to strenuously argue over which tables and figures to include, and which to leave out, how to more intelligently design tables and figures so that they yield information instead of cluttering up pages, you need to debate over style and wording, but also keep the entire stable of contributing authors to a common deadline. And which academic has ever kept a deadline?

Once the initial set of comments are sent back to the authors, you have to ensure that they stick to a second set of deadlines, namely for the revised papers. One of the more mind-numbing parts of editing a book is that you have to ensure that each contributor has put together a list of references, citations, that is in fact complete. Yes, I do need

the full name of the author cited, the exact title of the work, the journal in which it was published, the volume, the issue number, the date of publication, and the page numbers. I need the whole darn, complete citation, not any arbitrary part of it. After all, readers of your chapter may actually want to look up the work you cited. It helps to really be an expert in the field and to have much of the stuff readily available in your own personal library or on some computerized database or to be able to impose yet again on the invaluable Interlibrary Loan staff at Reese Library to check and confirm cited sources.

Further complications arise when some papers arrive in the mail on a disk, others by email, some prepared with excessive, useless formatting, some in Microsoft Word and others in WordPerfect format, each of them using the strangest language and formatting codes you ever saw. A special challenge is posed by highly mathematical papers – being from among the tribe of the econ I see a fair bit of those – which I often simply end up retyping since equations do not transfer well from one word processing program to another. This also gives me an opportunity to check the math, check each superscript, each bit of Greek notation, each derivative and integral to ensure there no unintended mistakes, no unwarranted conclusions.

And, by the way, mind the publisher who does not communicate to you, despite desperate pleas, the preferred in-house formatting and book layout style so that you are compelled to make up your own style and do your own complete page layout, and then pray that the publisher does not want everything redone after you sent in the manuscript (as happened with my forthcoming book – twice!).

Furthermore, you have to hunt down your authors yet again to get those darn copyright-assignment forms. Try, as with my forthcoming book, hunting down someone in a certain African country where email arrives months after you sent it, where there is one fax machine for an entire university campus, faxes are not passed on, and phone calls do not go through, try goading and mollifying an author in Latin America who does not want to sign the copyright-assignment form because he thinks it's a rip-off, try dealing with a publisher who while you were working on the book has been sold, whose entire staff has been replaced, who lost your original contract in the shuffle, and who tells you in person that the book is finally, actually, really in production (meaning in the printing press) when in fact it is not, try that and more ... and you get the idea. (And, yes, there are, as it were, more war-stories to be told.) Next time *you* write a book chapter, we editors would be grateful for your utmost cooperation.

There are of course also stories as pleasing as those that are not, and I have developed very strong professional respect for certain scholars, and less so for others. Indeed, I find that the authors of the best papers content-wise are also the authors who best communicate with me as the editor and who are the most considerate and cooperative ones to help me solve my problem which is to bring their work to light. They are, in a word, as obsessed as I am with the quality of the work that appears in their name. You might say they have a sense of shame. And the respect works the other around, too. Serious authors want serious editors, and you had better think twice before you say “yes” to someone offering to put your chapter into an edited book! Sloppy work does not generally bespeak a great mind, whether contributor, editor, or publisher. Academic respect has to be earned, and it is best earned through good works.

I thank you for your attention, I will take a few questions, and I hope that I have stimulated some of you to pick up the book and peruse one or the other of its chapters.