"We had kids at night school—outcasts. We had kids in day school. They didn’t know each other or anything about the kids in the other group. They looked at each other as if they had come from foreign countries."

—Mary Wildermuth, Muscatine High School, Evening School Coordinator

Many things divide us. Continents, borders. Race, ethnicity, religion. Gender. Day school, night school. Distinguishing between you and me, between us and them, is one of the earliest concepts we learn. Used perversely, differences help us to identify enemies.

At the same time, the world is highly interdependent—economically, socially, politically, and naturally. We need each other more often and in more ways than ever before. Helping young people to understand and even to appreciate this paradox is the work of global educators.

Evolving Definition
The Stanley Foundation has supported the evolution of global education for over twenty years, when no more than a handful of teachers were applying the term to themselves. Today the concept is much more widely embraced. Yet there is no single definition.

A recent Stanley Foundation Issues in Education report notes that most global educators understand the world’s interdependence, yet respond to that understanding differently. The range of people who call themselves global educators...

(Continued on page 2)
include “those who want to educate about specific global issues...those who work in the school improvement world seeking to globalize school curricula...and [those] who are motivated by a holistic and spiritual (not religious) understanding of the world and the task of educators.” Helping to define and clarify the concept of global education through discussions among its practitioners has been one element of the foundation’s global education program. The discussions have helped global education gain wider acceptance. But the heart and soul of the foundation’s efforts in this field are at the local and state level.

The Muscatine Laboratory
When the foundation launched Project Enrichment in the Muscatine schools in 1970 no one expected that it would be the beginning of a lengthy, collaborative exploration of global education. Project Enrichment was designed to strengthen Muscatine schools in general.

But even as interdependence was gaining credibility as a valid concept among foreign policy professionals in the world’s capitals, a few teachers in Muscatine were sensing its reality and wanting to inject global themes into their classrooms. The foundation gave modest support to their efforts, providing resources and creating opportunities for them to meet and share ideas. As these teachers became energized, they drew the attention of others; and over the course of years the Muscatine Global Education Task Force was developed.

Teachers from every building in the district meet several times during the year. They share experiences and plan activities that promote global themes. The task force has gained widespread support from students, administrators, and other teachers. It has become a model for other school districts, and every year the foundation receives requests from districts seeking information on ways to create a similar program.

The Summer Special is another local effort, this one completely organized and conducted by foundation staff. The two-week summer program is open to students who will be entering fifth, sixth, or seventh grade. It engages them in play and exploration of the natural and cultural diversity in the local surroundings. And it encourages them to contemplate the role that they and their community play in the world. The emphasis is on fun—learning as an exciting experience.

The newest experiment in global education is “Voices,” a program intended to help “at-risk” students (the night school kids) and “mainstream students” (the day school kids) learn about and from one another. (See adjoining story.)

The foundation never set out to make Muscatine a laboratory for global education. Nor has anyone been interested in creating packaged programs that can be plugged into other communities. But given the local interest and the foundation’s desire to promote international understanding, Muscatine has proven to be an excellent location for experimenting and learning.

In Iowa
Global education is part of official educational policy in Iowa. Since

Learning through play. Students in the Muscatine Summer Special build a pyramid to learn about interdependence.
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1989 the state has mandated that school boards “adopt a plan which incorporates global perspectives into all areas and levels of the educational program...” The mandate is one achievement of the Iowa Global Education Association (IGEA).

IGEA can trace its history back to 1980 when the Stanley Foundation began to convene meetings attended by Muscatine teachers working on global education and by teachers from other parts of the state who were doing their own experimenting. In the early days the foundation provided the same kind of support it had done in Muscatine—a few resources, lots of encouragement, and occasionally a place to meet.

The seventy or so teachers regularly involved with IGEA have been working together for over a decade. During that time they have sponsored and cosponsored many meetings which have created a multiplier effect, injecting global education themes into many classrooms. The organization has also helped publish a book of global activities for use in classes from kindergarten through high school.

Outlook

Global education is achieving a high level of acceptance. Jill Goldesberry, project coordinator at the foundation and a member of the IGEA secretariat, says global education is becoming so mainstream that “people are doing it, and they don’t know they’re doing it.” But, she notes, institutionalizing global education is a secondary objective. The members of IGEA care more about the individuals—retaining their ability to learn and grow—than they do about the organization.

By its nature, global education requires continued experimentation and learning. Mary Steinmaus, another project coordinator at the foundation, works primarily with the Muscatine programs. She says, “Global education is changing. There’s a lot of experimenting, and the concept is evolving. We’re encouraging much teaching across the curriculum.” For example, Muscatine High School teachers who cover subjects from history to social studies to foods recently staged a “hunger meal,” an activity which graphically instructs students on the realities of world hunger and scarcity.

In a world that is changing more rapidly than ever before and where long-held assumptions are being challenged, there is great opportunity and danger. Rapid change shows us possibilities but can also accentuate our differences. In such a world, global educators are desperately needed. Their challenge is to help students appreciate rather than fear the diversity in the world.

-Jeffrey Martin

VOICES

Mary Wildermuth is a Muscatine High School administrator who works with at-risk kids—the ones who have dropped out and are trying to come back; others have had babies. These students attend an alternative school at night.

Last January she wrote to the Stanley Foundation observing that these students are not connected to peers their age. They also have trouble seeing opportunities for taking charge of a problem and showing leadership. Her concerns started a dialogue which eventually prompted the foundation to convene a weekend retreat for twenty-five students, called the Muscatine Youth Leadership Conference. The retreat mixed at-risk and mainstream students. They explored their understanding of the world and were surprised to find they had more in common than they expected, according to the foundation’s Mary Steinmaus.

At the close, the students formed a new group called “Voices,” an expression of their desire to be heard and to be involved at the local level. They resolved to continue working on commonly held concerns. But Steinmaus observed that the team-building necessary to take effective action had not been taken. The group was struggling. A second retreat was held, and this time a concrete project (tree planting, a project which showed the students’ concern for the environment) was chosen. Teams were created and, working with other groups in the community, a tree-planting project was organized. “The kids pretty much did it themselves,” said Steinmaus.

Steinmaus and Wildermuth hope to continue the project in the fall, mixing in new students to replace those who have graduated or dropped out. Both acknowledge they have a lot to learn. Says Wildermuth, “We do better at getting students to take responsibility when we’re at the retreats, in a controlled environment; but it’s harder in the real world.” Steinmaus adds, “We found that we’re still losing the at-risk kids. We’re still experimenting.”

Both see working on this problem as a long-term process. Even a record of mixed success is far more appealing than making no attempt.

-Jeffrey Martin

Trees.
Members of "Voices" took part in a community wide tree-planting project.
Delegates to the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro this June have a long list of items to negotiate. Global warming and protection of biodiversity are the subjects of two agreements that should be ready for signing at the conference. A declaration of principles, called the Earth Charter, is being prepared for adoption, as is a lengthy plan of action for dealing with environment and development, called “Agenda 21.” Financing arrangements and provisions for transfer of technology are other thorny issues being addressed by working groups who have spent more than two-and-a-half years preparing for the Rio event that is officially titled the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED).

Institutional arrangements are under consideration as well. Those issues do not seem glamorous compared to discussions on the destruction of rainforests and limits on carbon dioxide emissions. Yet many experts believe that creating effective institutions is a most critical element for successful implementation of sustainable development plans. A major contribution in this area could potentially be one of the most significant outcomes of the Earth Summit.

In late February, just before the final Preparatory Committee (PrepComm IV) meeting for UNCED, the Stanley Foundation convened a conference for a private discussion among experts on institutional questions. Many participants were delegates to the PrepComm IV, and the meeting was intended to help resolve differences prior to the formal negotiating session.

Agreement on Principles
Participants at the conference agreed on several principles that should guide institutional arrangements:

1. Development and environment activities should be integrated at the national and international levels. As the report from the conference states, “The approach to integrating...will vary among nations, international agencies, and localities but must ensure broad participation from national, local, public, and private sectors.” Many participants urged use of national environmental action plans to ensure that development plans are sustainable.

2. A global partnership between industrialized and developing countries must be created. It should respect the industrialized countries’ growing concerns over environmental degradation and the developing countries’ desire for economic growth.

3. Organizations and nations must be held accountable. Promises made at Rio must be fulfilled, and institutions should be equipped to monitor and facilitate compliance.

Suggested Instruments
One of the primary long-term needs is the coordination of policymaking between governments. There was consensus among the participants that the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) of the United Nations should be charged with this function. Some suggested that a Sustainable Development Commission should be created as a subsidiary body to ECOSOC and should have specific responsibility for policymaking and coordination.
Skeptics doubt whether ECOSOC is up to the task. They noted that the council has been terribly ineffective almost since its inception. More hopeful participants noted that new efforts at reforming ECOSOC are underway and may have a better chance at succeeding than previous failed attempts. Participants agreed that if ECOSOC is to play an important role it must engage high-level officials from governments, not just the lower-ranking foreign service officials who usually attend meetings now.

Coordinating the environmental and development work of the numerous agencies and programs of the highly decentralized UN system is another challenge. A group called the Administrative Committee on Coordination (ACC), comprised of the heads of the UN agencies, is responsible for coordination but is seen as ineffective—a place where bureaucratic turf wars are fought. Nevertheless, many participants said a reformed ACC is the best choice available. A companion measure that generates some hope for improved coherence is Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali’s efforts at streamlining the United Nations sprawling bureaucracy.

**Money Issues**
Implementing sustainable development is an expensive proposition. The UNCED Secretariat estimated that carrying out Agenda 21 in developing countries will cost $125 billion per year. That is far more in development assistance than industrialized countries pay now. Hopes for reaching that target are slim, but some hold out hope for a substantial infusion of new cash. In any event, the participants at this conference agreed that new and additional financial resources are necessary. Providing them should be linked to the articulation of development plans that are clearly sustainable over the long term.

Methods for distributing funds are also up for reconsideration. Many developing countries have called for the establishment of a new “green fund.” But most participants said funds should be channeled through existing channels—bilateral aid, the World Bank and regional banks, the United Nations Development Programme, and the private sector.

**Urgency**
The Earth Summit is the beginning of a process, not the end. That is why effective institutions are essential. The experts at this conference believed that strengthened and clarified existing mechanisms are up to the tasks required for sustainable development. What is important, they said, is that sustainable development projects get the highest priority. The report concludes, “The stakes are too high for it not to be.”

—Jeffrey Martin

---

*Deforestation. Economic pressures have helped drive the destruction of rainforests, with disastrous environmental consequences.*
THE DEFENSE BUDGET

New World, New Worries

"When on the brink of history, we often don't realize it," said Professor John Lewis Gaddis in his opening remarks to congressional staff members at the Stanley Foundation's 1992 Foreign Policy Forum. Thirty-two staff members from the House and Senate came to Annapolis, Maryland, to meet several defense experts at this three-day event in March.

Titled "Rethinking Defense Priorities: Missions, Force Structure, and Budgets," Stanley Foundation Vice President and conference organizer David Doerge said this forum was a unique opportunity. "The end of the Cold War has unleashed a mind-boggling array of changes, program alternatives, and recommendations on defense matters," said Doerge. "Yet Congress is being pressed this year to make major defense decisions that will have critical long-term implications. We wanted to give congressional staff an opportunity to sort through the expanding mass of defense information."

Gaddis, a noted historian and author from Ohio University, compared predicting the future to predicting earthquakes. He said we should look for fault lines between five major forces: the obsolescence of great power war, the triumph of capitalism, the growth of democracy, the persistence of the immaterial in people's lives (like ideology, conviction, and belief), and ecological restraints. The interaction of these forces raises many questions such as: With the obsolescence of great power war, could a country (like Japan) become a superpower solely by economic means? What are the ramifications of the uneven distribution of wealth and the growing awareness of that unevenness? Gaddis also asked participants to think about the underlying tensions that exist between the concepts of democracy and self-determination and between democracy and prosperity.

Nuclear Proliferation.
Military officers from North and South Korea discuss the presence of nuclear weapons on the Korean Peninsula.

Conventional Forces
While Gaddis sketched a view of the long-term future, other sessions looked at more immediate defense issues. One was on "Rethinking Conventional Missions and Force Structures" where staffers heard from Dr. Stephen Van Evera of MIT, Dr. Stephen P. Rosen of Harvard, and Dr. Barry R. Posen of MIT.

Van Evera advocated "threat-based" planning similar to that proposed by Representative Les Aspin, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. This involves, according to Van Evera, defining our global interests, defining threats to those interests, developing a strategy to meet those threats, and finally, deciding what military forces we need to carry out that strategy.

Rosen took a different approach. He said the United States is facing no compelling threats right now, and that history suggests what is successful in such transitional times. During the 1920s and 1930s the United States had no clearly defined threats, but leaders asked, "What is the nature of the world in which we might have to use military force?" They determined that aviation had changed naval warfare, and the Navy began a shift from battleships to aircraft carriers. Again between 1945 and 1950, Rosen said the United States had left World War II with no clear threat and many new technologies emerging. Money was spent on research and development; and when

Haitians returned.
The future of the US military may include more roles like this mission by the Joint Military Task Force earlier this year.
it started to become clear what would work (and what threats developed), the United States was able to make sophisticated choices about what to build. This is the type of “insurance policy” Rosen suggests for current defense-planning needs.

Starting from the position that the United States is very secure, Posen told participants of two security problems: the existence of nuclear weapons in the world and the need for the United States to prevent large regional wars. To that end, he offered a number of elements that must play a role in future US defense policy. These include a continued US presence in Europe, the Persian Gulf, and the Korean peninsula. He also noted that if the United States is to continue a large role in international peacekeeping operations, then it needs to develop equipment and training to prepare troops for that possibility.

Changing Mission.
US forces helped resettle Iraqi Kurds last year.

Strategic Forces
Another session addressed “Rethinking Strategic Missions and Force Structure.” Participants examined the future of US strategic nuclear forces with Dr. Michael E. Brown of the International Institute for Strategic Studies, Dr. Charles L. Glaser of the University of Chicago, and Dr. Steven E. Miller of Harvard.

Miller spoke to the concerns over nuclear weapons in the former Soviet Union. The United States, he said, should help stabilize the situation and deter proliferation no matter what happens. He said that even if all 27,000 nuclear weapons do end up in Russia, the preferred outcome, the United States must make sure they are properly stored and dismantled. He also warned that Washington can’t foreclose the possibility that unfriendly forces may still win in Russia.

The United States nuclear relationship with Russia, according to Glaser, will evolve along one of three lines: disarmament, superiority, or mutual defense. He said disarmament and superiority would have negative effects on the United States relationship with Russia and that the United States should therefore adopt a “least-threatening nuclear policy.” This would include consideration that proceeding with ballistic missile defense would put pressure on Russia at the wrong time.

Deterrence, defense, and arms control are the three tools the United States has to deal with nuclear weapons in the world, Brown told participants. He examined different mixtures of those three tools and finally suggested policymakers think about what he termed a “radical option”—complete global nuclear disarmament. Although he said he holds largely conservative views on defense matters, he thinks a ban on nuclear weapons, nuclear weapons production facilities, and ballistic missiles might succeed. He said, “If it could be done, US national security would be enhanced in ways we cannot imagine.” Brown said he realizes the international climate, especially in China, would have to change and that national sovereignty might be impinged by inspection measures. But he said, “We owe it to ourselves to at least explore this option.”

Money
The budget process was the focal point of a session on “Reducing the Defense Budget: Plans, Priorities, and Impact.” Stanley E. Collender, director of Federal Budget Policy for Price Waterhouse, said the current Budget Enforcement Act makes it impossible to shift money from defense to domestic spending as many people would like to do. Even though that will change with the new Congress next year, he said the budget debates for the next three or four years will be even more difficult than this year.

“The peace dividend has been declared, and we spent it,” said Assistant Secretary of Defense for Program Analysis and Evaluation David S. C. Chu. He defended the Bush administration’s claim that only a 25 percent reduction over the next five years in the defense budget is necessary. Chu said that the Defense Department needs to be prepared to deal with a number of regional scenarios and perhaps more than one simultaneously.

Lawrence Korb, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, said he thinks the defense budget should be cut 50 percent over the next decade. His vision includes a strategic nuclear deterrent, a strategic defense, flexible and technologically sophisticated (although smaller) conventional forces, and a plan for splitting costs with countries that want a US presence. He also advocated spending $1 billion on economic adjustment for communities that lose military bases or defense contractors. “And maybe a billion for the Soviets to do the same,” he said. He also suggested that US obligations to international peacekeeping operations be paid out of the defense budget.

“When you work on the Hill, you look too much at political aspects, so it’s good to talk with people who have a different perspective and are very knowledgeable,” said Rob Green, a staff member for Congressman William F. Golding (R-PA) and a conference participant. Andrew Stephens, another participant and a staff member for House Majority Leader Richard Gephardt (D-MO), summed up the conference when he said, “We get a flood of defense information, and this is a chance to sort it out.”

—Keith Porter
THINKING GLOBALLY, ACTING LOCALLY

We stopped being scared when we saw 30 seconds of television showing the fall of the Berlin Wall. When the Soviet troops didn’t move in Berlin, we thought they probably wouldn’t move in our cities either.” That realization was a turning point for the Czechoslovak people, according to Rita Klimova, the ambassador to the United States from the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic. The time was November 1989 and the beginning of Czechoslovakia’s “Velvet Revolution,” which overthrew forty years of Communist rule.

Klimova was recounting the tumultuous period for an audience attending the third Global Cedar Rapids Conference this past March in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. The courage displayed by the people of Czechoslovakia in 1989 exemplified the theme of the conference, “Citizens Making a Difference in World Affairs.” Klimova accepted the conference’s International Award on behalf of her president, Vaclav Havel.

Courage to confront political tyranny was not the only power recognized at the annual conference. David Brower, founding member of the Sierra Club and twice nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize, was given the Global Cedar Rapids National Award for his environmental stands. In accepting the award, he called for “a healing time on earth.” He said, “We’ve multiplied all too well. But we’ve done nothing to replenish the earth. All we do is take, without giving anything back to the environment that supports us. But time is running out.” Brower pointed out that, on the average, Americans consume ten times more natural resources than the rest of the world. “The United States is fiddling while the rest of the world burns. We must take care of what we have and try to restore what we’ve lost.”

Dan Clark, a program officer at the Stanley Foundation, was honored with the Global Cedar Rapids State Award. His work also embodies the theme of “citizens making a difference in world affairs.” Among his many responsibilities as a “professional peace worker,” Clark travels throughout the state of Iowa organizing and planning programs on peacemaking and conflict resolution. During the Cold War, many of his events brought together citizens of the United States and the former Soviet Union. Bob Anderson, executive director of the Iowa Peace Institute, presented Clark with the Global Cedar Rapids award saying, “Dan has been a model...of a professional peace worker.” Clark responded that “I feel both proud and humble to be called a model for young people. This award reminds me of what John F. Kennedy wrote when he was a young journalist covering the creation of the United Nations: ‘War will exist until that distant day when the conscientious objector enjoys the same reputation and prestige that the warrior does today.’ I think ‘that distant day’ comes a little nearer whenever nonviolent achievement is acknowledged.”

The Global Cedar Rapids Local Award was given to an Iowa couple who have long worked to promote better international understanding. Byron and Martie Olson run American International Homestays, Inc., which arranges for Americans and people in many former Soviet bloc countries to live for short periods with families in another country. The program began in 1988 as American-Soviet Homestays and has expanded recently with the opening up of Eastern Europe.

-Mary Gray
The end of the Cold War has brought hard times for millions employed in the military industries of both the United States and the former Soviet Union.

"The main difference is our market is empty—we need everything. Your market is full." Dr. Yuri V. Andreev repeated these words in Colorado, California, Iowa, Illinois, New York, and Washington, DC, during a US tour arranged by the Stanley Foundation in February and March 1992.

Andreev is academic secretary of the Peace Research Institute in the Russian Academy of Sciences in Moscow. He is also secretary of the Russian Commission for Promotion of Conversion, the independent successor to a similarly named official Soviet commission appointed by President Mikhail Gorbachev in 1989.

"Conversion begins in the head," he said, explaining that his commission’s purpose is promotion, not implementation. "Promotion means creating an environment for the complex process of conversion. We need this climate everywhere, on both sides."

Andreev’s US itinerary included meetings with government officials, think-tank experts, and community leaders involved in local conversion efforts plus public presentations, call-in shows, and interviews. In Washington, DC, he spoke at a forum hosted by the Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies, and he visited the Office of Economic Adjustment in the Pentagon—the office which assists US communities impacted by loss of military jobs.

"I’ve learned on my trip here that the community ought to be involved. It’s not the case in Russia, unfortunately. We need more emphasis on social aspects—retraining, redeploying people—not so much with technical, technological, and investment problems."

"Yeltsin is absolutely ready to go for deep conversion of a considerable part of the Russian military economy. About 70 percent of military production is in Russia. Another 15-20 percent is in Ukraine, and the rest is in the other states. The conversion process in Russia now involves more than 460 defense-oriented factories and about 200 research and design organizations of the military-industrial complex. This is a very serious and formidable power, and we should use it skillfully. I am sure that without conversion of a considerable part of the military-industrial complex of Russia, we won’t be able to solve the dramatic economic problems which we are facing now." Andreev had this advice for Americans, "With due respect for people who want to give us humanitarian assistance, I don’t believe in it because actually you are not able to sustain us. But cooperation, mutually beneficial cooperation between our converting and your enterprises, that is one of the major avenues that should be used."

-Keith Porter

Rethinking Priorities

The end of the Cold War has led some people to question the future and even the need for a peace movement. But an April gathering of Iowa peace leaders and activists proved the movement does not define its mission in the narrow sense of war-related issues.

The theme of this year’s eleventh annual Peace Agenda Conference sponsored by the Stanley Foundation was "Post-Cold War Priorities," Discussion focused on how to make sure Iowa benefits from a peace dividend and emphasized economic and social justice.

Keynote speaker Osha Gray Davidson (right), author of Broken Heartland: The Rise of America’s Rural Ghetto, called this period the "second wave of the farm crisis," but cautioned the audience to approach economic development carefully. Davidson explained that some rural areas are now finding that the incentives they had given firms to locate in their area have often resulted in poorer working conditions and wages, a lower tax base, and did not guarantee the company would even stay.

One proposal to strengthen Iowa’s economy came from the Iowa Citizens Budget Campaign which asks: "What if we cut in half the $2.8 billion in federal taxes that is Iowa’s share for military spending each year, and what if we had $1.4 billion more to spend to meet human needs and reduce the deficit?"

The conference included presentations on other ongoing work within the state concerning the resettling of refugees, this summer’s Earth Summit in Brazil, and the evolution of the state-supported Iowa Peace Institute.

-Mary Gray
Common Ground
Selected Cassettes

To order cassettes of the foundation's radio program Common Ground, call toll free: (800) 767-1929. Cassettes are $7.95 each plus $.75 for shipping and handling ($.50 handling is charged for each additional cassette per order).

Red entries indicate new resources.

9201—The New Germany: The Post-Wall Hangover
9202—The New Germany: Economy and Environment
9203—The New Germany: Foreign Relations
9204—The New Germany: What Does the Future Hold?

This four-part series explores the situation today in the united Germany and the different issues confronting the nation. (January 1992)

9205—Inspecting Iraq. The frustrating search for Iraq's dangerous weapons is the topic discussed here by two experts, one of whom was held captive last summer in an Iraqi parking lot. (February 1992)

9206—Surviving China's Cultural Revolution. Nien Cheng, author of Life and Death in Shanghai, tells of her harrowing seven-year imprisonment during one of China's most infamous upheavals. (February 1992)

9208—China Conundrum. Three China experts debate how Washington should deal with China's hard-line regime. (February 1992)

9209—Witness for Peace. This program relates the work of Witness for Peace, which has been documenting the killing and wounding of innocent civilians in war-torn areas. (March 1992)

9210—Return to South Africa. Author Lewis Nkosi describes his journey back to South Africa this past December after thirty years in exile. (March 1992)

9211/9212—Defense for a New World. This series explores the radical changes taking place in US defense policy. (March 1992)

9213—UNCED Preview. Maurice Strong, Secretary-General of the UN Conference on Environment and Development, discusses the Earth Summit in Brazil this summer. (March 1992)

Publications

Regional Issues

Change and Stability in the Middle East: How Do We Get There From Here? US policymakers and regional experts discuss major social, political, and economic trends in the Middle East as they relate to US goals and how US policy might best affect them. September 1991, 22pp.

Changing Realities in the Horn of Africa: Implications for Africa and US Policy. Experts discuss how momentous changes in the Horn and in the international environment mean a new era of political uncertainty for the region. This report examines how US policymakers should respond. October 1991, 28pp.

Deadlock Over China Policy: Is a New Consensus Possible? Experts discuss the current low in US-China relations, particularly the divide over human rights and other issues. This report lists major concerns that must be addressed before relations can improve. October 1991, 20pp.


Global Change and Africa: Implications for US Policy. This report examines the impact of the Cold War's end on Africa and the challenge of developing new ways of understanding and addressing the continent’s problems. October 1989, 16pp.

US-Soviet Relations


United Nations


Global Education


Issues in Education: Developing Leaders for a Global Age. A weekend conversation of youth development practitioners from around the nation is summarized in a 16-page report. April 1990.


Issues in Education: Multicultural and Global Education: Seeking Common Ground. Professionals from both fields met to clarify their relationship, assess areas of tension and compatibility, and explore potential for mutually beneficial work. January 1989, 16pp.

Security and Disarmament

Redefining Arms Control in US Foreign Policy. The Cold War restrained arms control just as it did other areas of foreign policy. But now the opportunities and the necessity for arms control may be greater than ever. This report presents an important arms control agenda for the next decade. October 1991, 20pp.


Addiction to Arms. This 16-page address by Jack M. Smith, vice president of the Stanley Foundation, records his view that definite similarities exist between an addiction to alcohol or drugs and a nation’s addiction to nuclear weapons.

Environment


Other Topics of Interest

Middle America. This bimonthly publication features an exchange of views from Midwesterners working for a “secure peace with freedom and justice.” A sample of this “conversation in print” is available upon request.


Foreign Aid Beyond the Cold War. This report summarizes a discussion on the need for a new foreign aid rationale. October 1990, 20pp.


To Order Publications (please print)

<table>
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<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Item by Title</th>
<th>Cost/Each</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Press Review sample</td>
<td>Free*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle America sample</td>
<td>Free*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>Free*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please send completed form to:
The Stanley Foundation
216 Sycamore Street, Suite 500
Muscatine, Iowa 52761-3831
(319) 264-1500

IMPORTANT! Please use order form so that your mailing label is left intact on the reverse side. Please correct your name and address if necessary.

*Quantity Orders
These items are available in quantity for postage and handling charges as follows:
Individual copies: FREE
2-10: $2.00
11-25: $4.00
26-50: $6.00
Over 50: Contact the foundation for special pricing.

World Press Review

The foundation’s monthly magazine features excerpts from the press outside the United States and interviews with prominent international specialists on a wide range of issues. You may order a sample copy using the order form to the left.
THE NEW GERMANY

Common Ground, the Stanley Foundation's radio program on world affairs, began in 1992 with a four-part series on "The New Germany." The interviews, conducted in Berlin, Bonn, and other parts of Germany, examined changes in culture, industry, environment, and lifestyles one year after unification. The following excerpts focus on German foreign policy with Dr. Angelika Volle from the German Council on Foreign Relations and Dr. Gerhard von Glinski, deputy editor of Rheinischer Merkur, a weekly newspaper on international affairs. Please see the resource page for ordering information.

Q: Will German foreign policy focus on European affairs or will it exert a global influence?

Volle: Well, I think Germany's global influence is certainly needed; but, for the time being, Germany is well-advised to look at Europe and European affairs in a European Community context.

Q: One expert said that over the last few years the conventional wisdom in the world has been that we would see either a fully integrated Europe or we would see a Europe dominated by Germany. But now this expert says what we are getting is both. Would you agree with that?

von Glinski: No, we will not have a fully integrated Europe. Neither will we have domination of Germany over the European states. We will have a Europe of single nations as General DeGaulle has said. We will have some process, some little steps for further cooperation; but we will not have an immediately fully integrated Europe. That is impossible for the moment.

Q: Some say there is a hidden agenda to push American influence off the European continent.

Volle: I believe to talk about a difference between America and Europe is wrong. [The French], say the Americans want to be the 13th member of the EC—and that they cannot be. I fully agree with the French on that. But, I believe the Americans, who are our friends and partners and a nation that is politically and economically so intertwined worldwide with the EC, need at least a voice—if not a say—in European affairs.

von Glinski: The United States came in advance. They announced it first that they will withdraw their troops from Germany. And there are a lot of people here in Germany who are not very happy about that. Not military people, but burgermeisters—local people who know the withdrawal means less income and less economic welfare, so they are not eager to see the troops leave. But there will always remain a very close military relationship between Bonn and Washington—that's quite natural.

Q: How does unification change German foreign policy?

Volle: There is still a divide between eastern Germany and western Germany. We were more divided between the two Germanies than between [West] Germany and Poland or Czechoslovakia. I had friends in Poland and Czechoslovakia. Until unification, I didn't know anyone in East Germany. So we still have, as some learned people call it, "the wall in our heads."

During the gulf war I detected a difference between eastern German thinking and western German thinking on the Israeli-Palestinian question. The western Germans in general have come to terms with the past, including their guilt with the Holocaust. We have tried very hard to get our children and our children's children to learn about the atrocities we Germans committed during World War II. Unfortunately, this had not been done to the same extent in East Germany; and, therefore, because the Palestinians during those forty years of Communist rule were "the greatest friends," the Israelis used to be "the greatest enemy."

We will have to learn and cooperate more. We will have to establish more contacts among young eastern Germans and abroad, also between the older generation and abroad. I think there is still a great task ahead for us western Germans to remove brick by brick "the wall in our heads."

Keith Porter
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