American Foreign Policy

NEW VOICES, HARD CHOICES

At a time when most American people are feeling economically strapped and when the nation is $4 trillion in debt, crises at home and abroad keep hurling themselves onto front pages. Each of these cry out for the financial, intellectual, and moral resources of the US government and its citizens.

But how much can we do? What are our priorities? How do we allocate resources between domestic and foreign efforts? Are there new ways to think about these issues? Who’s doing that kind of thinking? Who will make the decisions?

(Continued on page 2)
The Cold War has been declared over and the new world order has been announced. But there seems to be little order in the new world order. What’s clear is that this is an era of profound change. Many old assumptions about the nature of global politics are no longer valid.

One overriding question is: How will America relate to the world? Absent an answer to this question, we will continue to drift from crisis to crisis.

There is widespread speculation within the foreign policy establishment attempting to explain the changes in the world. The problem with the speculation is that it is not producing much new thinking.

The old guard in foreign affairs, the pundits and the politicians, may have to make room for new players. However, it’s not just the traditional foreign policy establishment which is having trouble adapting to the changes in the world, so are its usual critics.

It is with these uncertainties in mind that the Stanley Foundation launched a new conference series this spring entitled “Global Changes and Domestic Transformations: New Possibilities for American Foreign Policy.” David Doerge, vice president of the Stanley Foundation, and Michael Clough, director of the World Policy Institute, organized the conference. Over the past year Clough and Doerge have been exploring how to begin a dialogue that would broaden the range of debate on the future of US foreign policy.

Both the Iowa City setting and the participants reflected the efforts to break out of the traditional foreign policy mold. Some of the participants were African-Americans, Latinos, and Asian-Americans from states as diverse as Texas, Washington, and Kentucky. Charlayne Hunter-Gault, national correspondent for the “MacNeil/Lehrer News Hour,” chaired the discussion. Quoting the poet Robert Lowell, Hunter-Gault said “New occasions teach new duties” and call for new voices to be heard. Others seconded this view as a rare time in foreign policy when “the pond is not frozen.”

To begin the dialogue, Clough and Doerge laid out a series of questions to consider such as:

- Will American security and welfare be any more or less intertwined with the security and welfare of other parts of the world in the post-Cold War era than it was during the Cold War?

- Can we envision a policymaking process that will reflect the growing diversity of American society and permit the United States to play a leadership role in fostering peace and prosperity in the twenty-first century?

Isolationism vs. Integration

As Doerge and Clough noted, beyond a radical transformation of US foreign policy, there is little consensus on what the future holds. “Some observers envision a new pax Americana, others predict a retreat to neo-isolationism.” Many analysts see the collapse of communism as an opportunity for the United States to take the lead in reinvigorating international institutions and promoting regional stability, economic cooperation, and democracy, while many others believe it provides an opportunity for the United States to retreat from the world. What will it be? We don’t know, but we do know that it will be a conversation, not a monologue. The question is: Who will be heard?”
States to give more priority to national interests.”

Much of the discussion focused on three predominant perspectives among foreign policy analysts that have emerged since the end of the Cold War. Those perspectives were summarized in the final report of the conference:

"From the first perspective, it is time to celebrate our victory over communism and to contemplate the new pax Americana. Those who think in these terms usually call on Washington to recreate its post-World War II role as the architect of a reconstructed international order. From the second perspective, victory is bittersweet. The Soviets lost, but so did we. The real winners of the Cold War are Germany and Japan, and we need to begin to prepare for life as a normal great power.

The final perspective yields a deeper insight into the causes of the end of the Cold War. It sees the Soviet Union as a victim (rather than a cause) of global change. It collapsed because its leaders and institutions were too insular, too rigid, too bureaucratized, and, most of all, too closed to adapt to a world of microchips, modems, and mobile money. Gorbachev ended the Cold War in hopes of buying time to allow the dinosaur to evolve, but it was already too far down the wrong evolutionary path to survive. From this perspective, it is far too early to judge whether we will be the beneficiaries or the victims of global change."

Domestic vs. Foreign Policy
There is little doubt that the end of the Cold War and the removal of the Soviet threat have turned America’s attention inward, to its own domestic problems. Unfortunately, as one conference participant noted, “our foreign policy now seems to be at war with our domestic policy.” But few envision a complete return to isolationism. Instead, competing forms of internationalism seem to be emerging, characterized in the report as “bureaucratic internationalists, corporate internationalists, and activist internationalists.”

“The first group,” as noted in the conference report, “includes those who populate the vast national security bureaucracy that was spawned by the Cold War.... It is traditionally minded in assuming that nation-states and existing international institutions like the United Nations will continue to be the dominant actors. The other two groups have a more radical vision of the future. Corporate internationalists see the world in global, market-oriented economic terms. In their view, national boundaries are increasingly irrelevant to the flow of capital, goods, labor, and technology. The third group which reflects the growing number of internationally oriented nongovernmental organizations is equally globally minded; but they are concerned with issues and causes, not economics. More and more, it is the latter two groups that are defining the shape of the future and establishing the limits within which governments can operate.”

The participants at the Stanley Foundation conference were generally positive about the prospect of including different voices in the foreign policy process, though a few risks were mentioned. Some cautioned that different groups, each with its own agenda, could create incoherent, inconsistent, and thus, ineffective policies. But that wouldn’t necessarily happen if new, integrative approaches were used.

This conference series, just like American foreign policy in general, is about change. It is the start of a dialogue that will, as the report states, “engage new voices in new debates in hopes that, eventually, new and more creative visions of America’s relationship with the world will emerge.”

Mary Gray
East-West relations have been a focal point for the Stanley Foundation throughout its history. Interest in the relationship continues into the post-Cold War era. This summer two foundation staff members who are particularly interested in building human relationships between citizens of former enemy countries travelled to . . .

Bulgaria

Jill Goldesberry works on global education for the foundation. She was one of six Iowa educators who conducted training workshops on conflict resolution and global education for school teachers and administrators. The workshops were held in Sofia and Varna. One image stands out among her recollections.

Near the Institute for Higher Teaching Qualifications, which was our residence in Varna, is a hill capped by an enormous granite monument (see below). Officially the monument was to symbolize “friendship and cooperation between the Soviet Union and Bulgaria.” Indeed it symbolized the relationship between the two countries, but not one of friendship.

Because of its position on the hill, and my location off to one side from below, I only saw part of it at first, which was three huge Darth Vader-like figures, each holding a gun—the most ominous representation of soldiers I have seen. I assumed it was a monument to dead soldiers. But a few days later, viewing the monument from another vantage point, I realized it was V-shaped. On the side I had missed were three smaller figures of young, beautiful Bulgarian girls holding flowers, heads slightly bowed. To me the message was clear—total domination of Bulgaria by the Soviet Union.

I perceived the images of Soviet soldiers “protecting” innocent-looking girls as symbolic of rape. But it wasn’t until a few days later that I heard the accompanying story of the rape of the community that had taken place in order that the monument might be built.

Before the monument, little homes and small vegetable gardens dotted the hillside. At the bottom of the hill is a school. According to a young teacher who was a student of the school at the time, “The Communists came one day and told all of the people who lived there to leave. Get out.” Then the bulldozers came. Another former student said the students were required to do all of the landscaping around the monument. It was publicized as a volunteer effort.

So what do people think about it now?
“[It needs to remain. People should never forget].”
“It is ugly. It should be blown up—removed.”
“It is a blatant reminder of our past.”
“There is much vandalism of it because people hate it so.”
“It should stand forever as a monument to stupidity.”

The fact that Bulgarians can openly talk about their feelings and share their thoughts about the monument is miraculous. And they know it. So many times, in many different situations, people used the phrase, “Well, it’s a free country!” This was usually said in jest, but behind the smile I saw pride in the reality of the statement. May they never lose that feeling!

- Jill Goldesberry
Dan Clark has been to the former Soviet Union four times in the past eight years and has been especially involved in the sister-city relationship between Muscatine and Kislovodsk in southern Russia. He brought back personal observations of a country in the midst of profound change.

Much seemed the same, but I saw changes. Some of the best construction work I’ve seen in Russia is in the recent repair and rebuilding of churches. Television, pop music, and clothing are quickly blending with world culture. More goods are available, and in greater variety. I visited a store in Moscow that felt like the West, and most shoppers were Russian. Steep inflation and crash privatization efforts make prices very high in relation to income. People have more gardens than ever before (even city dwellers). The informal economy still seems to be the one that works, but street vendors took either dollars or rubles, legally and close to the official exchange rate.

I found people eager to talk business and trade, including many communists-turned-entrepreneurs. In Moscow, a linguist with the reconstituted Russian Friendship Society told me insistently, “The time is past for friendship activities. Now we must have practical projects.” We talked late into the night about what these projects could be.

Whenever Russians approached me for business talk, I asked about communications. Many times I said: “If we can establish fast and reliable communications, then anything else can follow.” In recent months, we have been able to direct-dial calls to Kislovodsk, but the phone lines inside Russia are few and poor. On this trip we devoted much effort to trying to establish electronic-mail and fax links—with small success.

My most optimistic moments were with fellow Iowan Jerry Perkins on a demonstration farm near Stavropol, the capital of Iowa’s sister-state region. Before our visit to Chapayev farm on a gray, rainy day, he warned, “Russian mud was a problem for Napoleon and will be for you too.” Our slippery ride through black, Iowa-like mud was rewarded with a walk in a beautiful cornfield. We also saw soybeans grown from seed flown in by US military transport. “This soybean field looks very good, even by American standards,” Perkins said.

The Iowa Agribusiness Center brings Midwestern teachers and business representatives to southern Russia to conduct seminars for “the top people on the farms—top managers, chief veterinarians, collective-farm directors, chief agronomists—people who can make decisions on buying.” Along with education, the center provides opportunities for making deals in production, processing, packaging, and marketing of farm products. “Our partners want practice, not theory,” Perkins told me. He said a recent speaker “walked through examples” of how to buy a farm, make debt payments, compute interest rates, and arrange rentals.

Perkins came in May and brought his family in July. All will stay until after harvest. “When the Russians saw I was willing to make such a commitment, they [knew] I was serious. That made a big difference.” He said that sister-state activities had greatly helped credibility too.

Perhaps the most moving story came from Pyotr Shipovskoi who said his experience of freedom and friendship in Muscatine gave him the courage to speak out in lonely support of Yeltsin during the attempted coup in August 1991.

Although we saw evidence of ethnic tensions, the official rhetoric was embodied in a festival organized by the city government, a celebration of “nationalities” living together in peace. In the background, unarmored Interior Ministry troops patrolled in threes. With our hosts, we watched Yugoslavia reports on the evening news as well as stories about fighting in Moldova and Nagorno-Karabakh. While we were there, Moscow News expressed alarm over “thirty million weapons in private hands” throughout the former Soviet Union.

I focus on Russia for reasons both personal and philosophical. I keep in touch with my friends, and we work to overcome old enemy images—not only between our nations but as an example to the rest of the world.

Dan Clark
SOVEREIGNTY
IN A NEW WORLD

The concept of sovereignty (supreme and independent power or authority in a state) no longer provides the neat framework for international relations that it has for hundreds of years. Legitimate authority on the world stage has been diffused—no longer held solely by nation-states. Whether they like it or not, nation-states are sharing power with transnational corporations, international nongovernmental organizations (INGOs), religious and ethnic groups, the media, and supranational political organizations.

While this development can be viewed neither as wholly positive nor wholly negative, it does call for a change in thinking. On a practical level the decline in sovereign power is a tremendous obstacle for organizations like the United Nations—particularly since the UN Charter is a pledge to defend national sovereignty. Facing this reality, 22 UN experts and diplomats came to the Stanley Foundation’s 27th annual United Nations of the Next Decade conference this summer to discuss “Changing Concepts of Sovereignty: Can the United Nations Keep Pace?”

Participants acknowledged that while nation-states had more autonomy in the past, they are still powerful actors. In fact, the decline in sovereign power is taking place unevenly around the world. In Western Europe, nations are voluntarily ceding great authority to a supranational European Community. In Eastern European countries, sovereignty was repressed by the Soviet empire, but freedom has shown many of them lacking the legitimacy to hold together anyway. In some developing countries, sovereignty is such a new experience that they have understandably put a priority on maintaining it. And in eastern Asia, stability of the state is sometimes a more valued concept than even individual rights.

A Global Agenda?
A substantial number of conference participants shed no tears for the decline of sovereignty, saying: “It [the state] is too big for the small tasks and too little for the large tasks,” and, “The future of humanity is in giving up state sovereignty.” Yet the diffusion of power presents problems for the United Nations which, while not granting sovereignty, licenses it when it admits states to membership. The United Nations is sometimes caught between potentially conflicting obligations—defending sovereignty and respecting individual rights.

The UN’s dilemma is being more frequently exposed by interconnected issues of global proportion. Participants identified several urgent problems that the world must address. In many of these crises, the new nonstate actors are more influential than states:

- Weapons proliferation
- Disputes between ethnic and religious groups
- Refugees and displaced people
• Health, nutrition, and housing in the least-developed countries
• Population growth
• Hunger
• Environmental degradation
• Human rights
• Illegal drugs
• Children’s needs

While there are many different kinds of nonstate actors, conference participants focused on the INGOs. INGOs, such as the International Red Cross, Amnesty International, and World Wildlife Fund, are seen as particularly influential and becoming more so. INGOs cross national boundaries to bring transnational concerns to the problems they address. Ideally, but not always in practice, they are without political bias and hold expertise that makes them both competent and invaluable to governments and other groups they address.

Currently, coordination is lacking among these groups which often results in patchwork (or overlapping) action. Additionally, persons served by INGOs often have little input into the policies or activities of the organizations. At the conference, some suggested that creating a code of conduct or ethics could help guide the behavior of INGOs.

**War and Peace**

Questions of national sovereignty have direct impact on issues of national security. Nation-states alone can wage war and declare peace, yet the roots of conflict are often grounded in subnational or transnational causes. The main security apparatus of the UN, the Security Council, has acted in a unified manner on many issues recently; yet concerns about these actions persist, as do questions about the composition of the council.

Some at the conference said the Security Council was effective against Iraq only because China, Russia, and the developing world were not in a position to challenge Western interests. And the action against Iraq was ominous for parts of the developing world because those countries’ support for the UN is conditional on its promise to protect the sovereignty of states—not invade them. Furthermore, the make-up of the Security Council is under constant fire since it gives permanent membership and veto power only to the World War II victors.

Concern over representation in UN organs and agencies other than the Security Council was also discussed at the conference. Participants agreed that nongovernmental organizations, minority groups within countries, religious movements that span borders, and ordinary citizens should have more of a voice at the United Nations. One suggestion was the creation of representation for large minorities within national borders, perhaps headed by a High Commissioner for Minorities. Other ideas around the table included new UN membership options like a second assembly for INGOs, a directly elected assembly, or a revamped Trusteeship Council to represent ethnic groups without state status. Others suggested giving the Secretary-General broader authority to be the UN’s liaison with nonstate actors.

While many ideas were discussed, conference participants offered no definite plan for helping the UN keep pace with the changing role of sovereignty in the world. All agreed, however, that new nonstate actors are becoming too powerful to ignore and that the United Nations should promote dialogue among all pertinent actors.

—Keith Porter

---

**Defining Sovereignty**

Sovereignty, according to the *New Columbia Encyclopedia*, is the supreme authority in a political community. The word carries connotations of autonomy and freedom from external control. Political theorists since Plato have attempted to define it. Thomas Hobbes furthered the concept of kingly sovereignty by stating that the king not only declares law but also creates it.... King Louis XIV of France claimed absolute sovereignty when he stated at the Parliament of Paris in 1655, “L’Etat c’est moi.”

Over the years sovereignty became the cornerstone of the modern nation-state system. A sovereign state is considered free and independent.... It had the right, authority, and ability to conduct its domestic affairs without outside interference and to use its international power and influence with full discretion.

The late nineteenth century saw minor infringements of absolute sovereignty.... The League of Nations was an abortive attempt to restrict aggression after World War I. The Second World War demonstrated that the freedom of the sovereign state to commit aggression should be curbed, and the United Nations Charter was created primarily to restrain this aspect of national sovereignty.... Yet, significantly, the Charter and membership in the United Nations codified and preserved the sovereignty of member nations.

...Today’s real challenge to sovereignty comes not from nations agreeing to cede it but from a fundamental erosion of the autonomous power of the state to control and manage its internal and international affairs. The sovereign power historically exercised is being diffused and dispersed by the emergence and empowerment of comparatively new supranational, transnational, and subnational institutions and groups. This process is fostered and facilitated by the fact that the major issues of today and the future do not respect national boundaries, nor do human activity and allegiances.

—from the opening remarks of Foundation President Richard H. Stanley to the 27th Conference on the United Nations of the Next Decade
"I wouldn’t say it was controversial, but it was definitely uncomfortable," said Elise Dawson, curator of education of the State Historical Society of Iowa, commenting on reaction to a recent travelling photo display of the plight of refugees. The exhibit originated from the Los Angeles Municipal Art Gallery. She went on to explain that often when people are confronted with unpleasant situations as depicted in this display, they will react with indignation that this type of thing doesn’t “belong here.” However, Dawson said there was very little of that.

From late March through May, the State Historical Society presented *Forced Out: The Agony of the Refugee in Our Time* with the cooperation and assistance of the Bureau of Refugee Services of the Iowa Department of Human Services, Lutheran Social Service of Iowa, Iowa Peace Institute, The Stanley Foundation, and the Office of Intercultural Programs of the Des Moines Public Schools.

Viewers were invited to share their feelings by drawing pictures and/or writing comments in a journal. Dawson explained those activities proved to be an excellent way to work out the powerful feelings the exhibit evoked. Many of the viewers were school children, ranging from second graders to high-school age. Shown here are just a few of the hundreds of drawings and comments left in Des Moines.

"I know I should feel lucky but I don’t because I wish I could help stop all of this madness.”

"I think it is sad very very sad”

"How could someone do this?”

-Kathy Christensen
Isn't Human Life Worth more to us than this?

"We see these poor people in pictures and we feel sorry but some of us do nothing to help. Some cry by the pictures shown but just sit and watch them die."

-Amanda

A Cry For Help [unedited]

Now that you have kicked us out, And you say we should not shout. You used your guns and swords All we have left is the dear Lord You say we have rights But we can not get them without a fight. You say you are so smart; But you truly broke our heart. You took our land, And all we have left is the are the things in our hands. They say we are to love our neighbor Thanks a lot, and do us no more favors. You gave another place to live but we Are dying to many at a time, if you see That you can do something Do something good Help us out if you would. John 3:16

The Torture Machine

WHEN I READ ABOUT THE TORTURE MACHINE IT MADE ME SICK TO MY STOMACH

-Catherine

-Carmen
**Common Ground**
**Selected Cassettes**

**To order** cassettes of the foundation’s radio program *Common Ground*, call toll free: (800) 767-1929. Cassette are $7.95 each plus $1.75 for shipping and handling ($1.00 handling is charged for each additional cassette per order).

**New Programs**

9235—**An Agenda for Peace.** Two UN experts debate the Secretary-General’s proposed changes to peacemaking and peacekeeping functions. (September 1992)

9234—**Global Breakup: Crisis or Opportunity?** While the US basks in post-Cold War euphoria, the rest of the world hears alarm bells, warns two foreign policy analysts. (September 1992)

9233—**The Future of Sovereignty.** This program considers whether the nation-state system can survive into the 21st century. (August 1992)

9232—**Oscar Arias on the Forgotten War.** Arias fears the current peace in Central America may be short lived if democracy can’t deliver the goods. (August 1992)

9231—**Giandomenico Picco and the UN.** Former Assistant Secretary-General Picco looks back on a career that culminated in the release of all Western hostages in Lebanon. (August 1992)

9230—**Amnesty International.** Amnesty’s Secretary-General Ian Martin discusses the agenda of the Nobel prize-winning human rights group. (July 1992)

9228—**Toward a More Democratic Foreign Policy.** The thoughts of three participants in the Stanley Foundation’s spring conference on changes and transformations in US foreign policy. (July 1992)

9227—**The Work of Women.** The coordinator of the UN’s Gender Statistics Program reveals the extent to which women’s work has been unaccounted for. (July 1992)

9225—**Freedom’s Progress.** Two scholars at Freedom House talk about their 1992 Survey of Freedom around the world. (June 1992)

9224—**What’s American?** Historian Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., discusses his latest book, *The Disuniting of America*. (June 1992)

9221—**The Danger in Russia.** The former editor-in-chief of the Literary Gazette warns that authoritarianism on the rise in Russia. (June 1992)

9220—**Listening to Women for a Change.** Bella Abzug on women’s contributions to world affairs. (May 1992)

9217—**The Not-So-New-World Order.** Author Michael Parenti, *The Sword and the Dollar*, believes the fall of communism leaves the US with a not-so-lofty foreign policy agenda. (May 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.

**US Policy Toward a Post-Socialist USSR.** Daunting problems with high stakes face the peoples of the former Soviet Union. Here experts define a set of principles to guide US policymakers through a turbulent period. October 1991, 20pp.


---

**Changes & Transformations**

**Global Changes and Domestic Transformations: New Possibilities for American Foreign Policy.** This 16-page booklet is the first in a series of anticipated publications entitled, “Changes & Transformations,” documenting a process of inquiry into and dialogue on America’s relationship with the world. April 1992.

---

**Global Education**

**Issues in Education: Local is Global is Local.** In this conference summary, the author endeavors to share a number of valuable insights that emerged from exploring ways community educators and global educators can work together. January 1992, 20pp.

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

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.


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)
(Please do not use this form to order cassettes.)

<table>
<thead>
<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>Common Ground catalog</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Publications

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

*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.
THE FORGOTTEN WAR ZONE

Ten years ago, Central America was at the top of Washington’s foreign policy agenda. Today, with the communist threat gone, it’s again near the bottom. This summer the Stanley Foundation’s radio program on international affairs, Common Ground, featured Nobel laureate Oscar Arias Sanchez, architect of the Central American Peace Plan and former president of Costa Rica. Arias discussed the fragile peace in Central America and why the world must pay attention to the region. The full interview is available on cassette for $7.95 by calling 1-800-767-1929.

Q: Are you optimistic about the future for Central America?
Arias: Yes. I am much more optimistic; but at the same time, there is a need for the industrialized world to pay more attention to Third World countries. Otherwise, what we have gained can easily be lost in a matter of weeks, months, a few years. With the end of the Cold War there is no reason why, if you don’t have an enemy any longer because communism is dead, if you don’t have to spend so much money on military...why selfishness should prevail over solidarity.... The only way to build a new world order, the only way to enjoy freedom and peace and security in the twenty first century, is if we address the basic challenges of humankind—illness, ignorance, poverty, inequality, environmental decay, drugs, hunger. If we don’t put an end to those needs, we won’t be able to enjoy a new century of peace.... Today Central America is ignored. No one talks about it. No one reads about it. It is very sad indeed. But this is the reality. Peace is no news.... We have fragile democracies, it is true; but in order to consolidate them, the democracy in Central America has to deliver the goods. Here is where I am a little bit worried, because it is not delivering the goods.

Q: You’re talking about the necessities for life?
Arias: Yes.... Otherwise, we’ll see in many other countries what already happened in Haiti, in Peru, what almost happened in Venezuela.... This could happen unless we are capable of building more egalitarian societies and some justice is done to the poor. Up to now, the gap between the very rich and the very poor has increased.... So when we talk about sustainable development, we should have in mind not only the environment but also protecting the very poor. Otherwise people are going to question their political system. They might even prefer the dictatorship of the past if democracy is unable to satisfy the basic needs to fulfill their aspirations. Let us always remember that democracy is not an end in itself.

Q: The world cheered the Central American Peace Accords, which you engineered. Has that led to much monetary support for rebuilding the region?
Arias: For some countries this is true.... But not for Costa Rica, not for Honduras, not for Guatemala, not for Panama necessarily. I think it’s very difficult for Central America to compete with Boris Yeltsin. I think it’s very difficult for us to compete with Eastern Europe, eastern Germany. Western Germany is spending about $100 billion a year in support of eastern Germany. That is...$6000 per person. While we get $14 per person...from the United States. There is a need to build an awareness in this country and the rest of the North that unless you put much more attention to the hunger and poverty that prevails in the world, you will have a boomerang. That is, many more people from the Third World trying to reach your shores.

Q: What is the legacy of the 1980s? It’s often referred to as a lost decade for Central America.
Arias: It wasn’t a lost decade.... I think that we live in a different environment today in Central America. There are very solid reasons to be optimistic, to look at the future with some optimism and hope. This wasn’t the case five, six, seven years ago. For the first time in many years we see light at the other side of the tunnel. What we need now is leadership.... We need to redefine security. Security won’t be achieved by military means. It will only be achieved if we confront those challenges [of development]. If we want a lasting security we need to redefine the concept of security. That is perhaps our greatest challenge ahead of us.

Mary Gray

The Stanley Foundation
216 Sycamore Street, Suite 500
Muscatine, Iowa 52761-3831

Address Correction Requested

Photo exhibit evokes strong emotions. Students react through writing and drawing, see pages 8 & 9.
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